SCA Public Issues Committee
AGENDA
September 11, 2013 – 7:00 PM
Renton City Hall
Council Chambers, 7th Floor
1055 S. Grady Way - Renton, WA 98057

1. Welcome and Roll Call – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac - Chair
2. Public Comment – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac
3. Approval of minutes – August 14, 2013 meeting
   Page 4
4. Chair’s Report – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac 5 minutes
5. Executive Director’s Report – Deanna Dawson, SCA 8 minutes
6. PIC Nominating Committee Recommendation
   ACTION ITEM 5 minutes
   Redmond City Councilmember Hank Margeson, PIC Nominating Committee Member
   Page 22
   (2 minute update, 3 minute discussion)
7. Support for Sound Transit 145th Street Station – City of Shoreline
   ACTION ITEM 7 minutes
   Deanna Dawson, SCA
   Page 24
   (2 minute update, 5 minute discussion)
8. Solid Waste Transfer Plan Review Update
   POTENTIAL FUTURE ACTION ITEM 20 minutes
   Deanna Dawson and Doreen Booth, SCA
   Kevin Kiernan, Assistant Division Director, King County Solid Waste Division
   Page 26
   (5 minute update, 15 minute discussion)
   POTENTIAL FUTURE ACTION ITEM 15 minutes
   Doreen Booth, SCA
   Kenmore Mayor David Baker, SCA Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Representative
   Page 42
   (3 minute update, 12 minute discussion)
10. **Balancing the T2040 Financial Strategy** – PSRC Transportation Policy Board
   DISCUSSION ITEM
   Monica Whitman, SCA
   Page 53
   (3 minute update, 12 minute discussion)

11. **Board of Health 2014 Work Program** – King County Board of Health
   DISCUSSION ITEM
   Doreen Booth, SCA
   Page 67
   (2 minute update, 5 minute discussion)

12. **Informational Items**
   a) **Local Hazardous Waste Management Program – 2012 Highlights / Program Information**
      Page 71
   b) **2014 SCA Call for Nominations to Regional Boards and Committees**
      Page 76

13. **Upcoming Events**
   a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee meeting – Wednesday, October 9, 2013 7:00 PM
      - Renton City Hall
   b) Future SCA Networking Dinners:
      - Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:30 PM – TPC Snoqualmie Ridge Golf Club – SCA
        will be joined by Attorney General Bob Ferguson
      - Annual Meeting - Wednesday, November 20, 2013 5:30 PM

14. **For the Good of the Order**

15. **Adjourn**

---

**Did You Know?**


According to recent studies the Pacific Northwest is more at risk of a large tsunami than previously thought. “Scientists just returned from a month long research cruise in the Pacific Ocean off Washington state, where they were trying to find the stickiest point on a section of the Cascadia Subduction Zone, the huge undersea fault that breaks loose every few hundred years and generates a massive tsunami and earthquake.” ([Undersea fault off Washington may trigger bigger tsunami but cause less earthquake damage](http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/localnews/2012222012_tsunami3.html), Seattle Times September 3, 2013).

For more information on how your community can be tsunami ready visit the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s website [www.tsunamiready.noaa.gov](http://www.tsunamiready.noaa.gov).
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.
SCA Public Issues Committee  
DRAFT Minutes  
August 14, 2013 – 7:00 PM  
Renton City Hall Council Chambers  
1055 S. Grady Way - Renton, WA 98057

1. Welcome and Roll Call
Mia Gregerson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Twenty-two cities had representation (Attachment A). Guests present included: Bill Knutsen, King Conservation District; Jessica Saavedra, King Conversation District; Richard Conlin, Seattle City Council; Liz Underwood-Bultmann, Puget Sound Regional Council; Alex Saldano, Gordon Thomas Honeywell Government Affairs.

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

3. Approval of the July 10, 2013 Minutes
Hank Margeson, Redmond, moved, seconded by Ross Loudenback, North Bend, to approve the July 10, 2013 meeting minutes.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Chair’s Report
Chair Gregerson reported on the Affordable Care Act. One of the preeminent provisions of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) is the requirement that most individuals in the U.S. must have health coverage beginning January 1, 2014. Individuals may enroll in health insurance plans offered through the Washington State Health Benefit Exchange beginning October 1, 2013. Chair Gregerson encouraged cities to reach out to the King County Department of Health. A number of cities have already requested presentations to their city councils.

5. Executive Director’s Report
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, welcomed new PIC attendee Joe Forkner of Issaquah.

Dawson reported that SCA leadership met earlier in the day with Executive Constantine. One of the topics discussed is the forthcoming update to the King County Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan is a key tool used to reform county government by focusing on customer service, partnerships and ways to bring down the cost of government. Executive Constantine is seeking input on best ways to engage with city elected officials. Members expressed an
interest in having a pre-PIC workshop on the King County Strategic Plan update, most likely in October.

SCA leadership and Executive Constantine also discussed upcoming ballot measures in 2014. Next year, the County is looking to place a major radio replacement measure on the ballot, plus a possible item on transportation. ED Dawson requested that members send SCA information on what cities are lining up for 2014. SCA will compile this information.

The Executive’s office has begun implementing the King County Health and Human Services Transformation Plan. SCA leadership and the Executive discussed next steps, and how cities might be able to engage in planning for expansion of Human Services capacity in King County.

ED Dawson reported that there have been discussions about a possible third special session of the legislature called to address transportation funding. The Senate majority coalition is scheduling a “listening tour” across the State, including a meeting scheduled for October 1, 2013 at WSDOT NW Region Office in Seattle.

ED Dawson and SCA leadership recently met with Port Commissioners Albro and Bowman to discuss ways we can be working together to address the economic needs of the region, including transportation. SCA staff is working with Port staff as a follow up.

ED Dawson also recently met with leaders in Snohomish County to discuss common needs between King and Snohomish County on transportation.

The SCA Women’s Leadership Group will be meeting the third Thursday of the month beginning on September 19, 2013 at 7:30 AM at the Island Crust Café, 7525 SE 24th St #100 Mercer Island, WA 98040.

The SCA 2014 call for nominations will be coming out soon. There are a number of board and committee vacancies. ED Dawson encouraged members to apply.

ED Dawson also reminded members that the November meeting of the PIC will be held in Kirkland.

6. **Water Quality Assessment Scope of Work**
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, reported that this matter initially came to the PIC at the recommendation of the SCA Caucus of the Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC) who asked the PIC to consider adopting a public policy position in support of the current scope of work for the proposed Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study, subject to a number of caveats.

At the July 10, 2013 PIC meeting, the PIC voted unanimously to bring back this public policy position for action at the August meeting. Subsequent to the July PIC meeting, the City of Kirkland proposed an amendment to SCA’s proposed position. Kirkland’s recommended addition is to add the following:
• SCA supports the addition of a cost benefit analysis as a separate study to provide data and evaluation of the best investments of $1 billion to achieve acceptable water quality standards by 2030.

The Kirkland City Council approved a resolution supporting this position at their August 6, 2013 city council meeting. The City of Kirkland also prepared the attached CSO Interest Paper (Attachment B). Kirkland’s position is that a cost benefit analysis should be completed as a companion product of the Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring study. Pam Bissonnette, Kirkland’s interim Public Works Director, reported that the expense of a cost benefit analysis is not included in the current budget. Kirkland is also recommending that an independent financial firm be selected to conduct the study, lending credibility to the process with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The cost benefit analysis would take place following completion of the water quality assessment.

Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, moved, seconded by Amy Walen, Kirkland, to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors that: SCA generally supports the current scope of work for the proposed Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study, but has concerns about the wide range of estimated costs for each element and the high ends of the estimated cost ranges. SCA supports approval of the Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study scope of work with the following caveats:

• The primary focus of the scope of work shall be to address items required as part of the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) program review, plan update, and program implementation;
• Discretionary items including: the “Synthesis Report” (Element 3) and “Scientific and Technical Review Team” (Element 4) should be included in the scope of work if the anticipated outcomes will produce long term cost savings for King County ratepayers;
• The need for an Executive Advisory Panel (as set forth in Element 5) has not been clearly established. Until and unless the need for a Panel is clearly demonstrated to RWQC and the County Council, the up to $450,000 budgeted for this line item should not be expended;
• SCA requests that the Wastewater Treatment Division provide an annual report to the RWQC, which shall include detail regarding the costs expended and benefits received as a result of the expenditures.
• SCA supports the addition of a cost benefit analysis as a separate study to provide data and evaluation of the best investments of $1 billion to achieve acceptable water quality standards by 2030.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. Support for Sound Transit 145th Street Station
ED Dawson reported that this matter was brought to the PIC at the request of the City of Shoreline, and members of the North End Mayors group.
Under Sound Transit’s ST2 plan approved by voters in 2008, there were two stations identified north of Northgate in King County – I-5 and NE 145th Street, and I-5 and NE 185th Street. As a part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, Sound Transit (ST) was also asked to look at alternate station locations. ST recently released the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Lynnwood Link Extension. The draft EIS shows that stations at NE 145th Street and an alternate location at NE 155th Street are comparable based on criteria including ridership, cost, environmental impact and transit oriented development potential.

Shoreline’s preferred alternative is a station at NE 145th Street Station. There is no freeway access to a NE 155th Street station. NE 145th Street is also more closely aligned with Shoreline’s long term planning goals. A station at NE 155th Street would have a substantial negative impact on Shoreline residents.

Members discussed some of the advantages and disadvantages of utilizing service streets as opposed to freeway access. Councilmember Eggen noted that NE 155th Street isn’t a through street. Freeway access at NE 145th Street would create a more direct connection to neighboring jurisdictions; NE 155th Street is currently a neighborhood arterial. Eggen also noted that both corridors would require significant improvements. Members expressed support for Shoreline, noting that if all criteria are equal, the siting agency should defer to the wishes of the host community particularly where, as here, the city has long term plans for the corridor that will be beneficial to the economic vitality of the city, and the region.

Amy Ockerlander, Duvall stated Duvall is outside of the Sound Transit service area and typically abstains from voting on issues related to Sound Transit.

Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park noted that their council had taken action in support of a station at NE 145th Street.

Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, to bring forward to the next meeting of the PIC the following potential policy position:

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

The Motion passed. 21 ayes; no nays; 1 abstention, Duvall.

8. **King Conservation District Update**

ED Dawson provided an update on the King Conservation District’s efforts since SCA adopted a position regarding the King Conservation District (KCD) in August 2012. Since that time, the County has entered into a new interlocal agreement with the KCD which modified the methodology for funding the KCD, as well as the amount of funding to the KCD. The County and the KCD have also established two advisory groups to review the program of work and
funding for the KCD: the Task Force (comprised of staff) and Conservation Panel (comprised of elected officials). These advisory groups have been meeting on a regular basis since April of 2013. Based on reports from both groups, the process has been a positive one, largely due to the greatly increased transparency about the KCD’s program of work.

The attached letter (Attachment C) was transmitted by the KCD Board to task force members earlier in the day, reaffirming the Board’s commitment to addressing the task force’s concerns, which are consistent with SCA’s adopted policy. The KCD is proposing reconvening an advisory body. This body will review the budget and provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, help the KCD better understand inter-jurisdictional perspectives and provide greater transparency.

Members were pleased that the process is moving forward and that the KCD is providing greater transparency. Members expressed support for retooling the Conservation District’s election process. Members did not express any interest in increasing the amount of funding to the KCD at this time. Members reaffirmed their commitment to the principles adopted by SCA in 2012. ED Dawson encouraged members to share any additional feedback with SCA King Conservation District Task Force and Conservation Panel Members prior to their September meeting.

9. Food Policy Blueprints
Tukwila City Councilmember De’Sean Quinn and Seattle City Councilmember Richard Conlin, Chair of the Food Policy Council, presented on the recent work of the PSRC Food Policy Council. Their presentation highlighted how jurisdictions can address the local food economy and food access through policy and planning.

Several members spoke about the benefits Farmers Markets contribute to their communities. Members also highlighted several successful programs including SNAP Benefits, KABOOM, and a neighborhood program that transformed a patch of blackberries into an orchard featured on King 5 news. Attached is a copy of the PowerPoint slides referenced during the presentation (Attachment D).

10. Informational Items
Chair Gregerson noted there is one informational item this month: SCA 2013 Communications Efforts. ED Dawson encouraged members to read about the many things SCA has accomplished this year.

11. Upcoming Events
a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee Meeting – Wednesday, September 11, 2013, 7:00 p.m. at Renton City Hall
b) Future SCA Networking Dinners:
   • Wednesday, September 25, 2013, 5:30 p.m. at the TPC Snoqualmie Ridge Golf Club, Snoqualmie – SCA will be joined by Attorney General Bob Ferguson
• Wednesday, November 20, 2013, 5:30 p.m. at the Renton Pavilion Event Center – SCA will be joined by Governor Jay Inslee (note: this is also the 2013 SCA Annual Membership Meeting)

12. For the Good of the Order
Mayor Lewis encouraged cities to have their finance directors keep a close eye on the bankruptcy situation in Detroit. An article in CNBC noted that Detroit is trying to treat GO bonds as unsecured debt in the bankruptcy. If Detroit succeeds, it would be the first occurrence in the $3.7 trillion muni market, and could bring into question the standing and ratings of some other GO bonds. This could negatively impact other municipalities.

Members expressed their sympathy to the King County Metro bus driver who was shot earlier in the week, his family, and his colleagues. Mayor Lewis noted that the driver’s wife is the City of Auburn’s Finance Director.

Mayor Baker encouraged members to attend the 2013 Annual National League of Cities Conference being held this November 13– November 16, 2013 at the Washington State Convention Center in Seattle. There will be a special one day rate for nonmembers.

13. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.
## 2013 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting
**August 14, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>Lynda Osborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Pete Lewis</td>
<td>Nancy Backus</td>
<td>Bill Peloza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
<td>Richard Leider</td>
<td>Tom Stowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Rebecca Olness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Andy Rheáume</td>
<td>Tom Agnew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Jerry Robison</td>
<td>Bob Edgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>Jim Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Marlla Mhoon</td>
<td>Margaret Harto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Matt Pina</td>
<td>Melissa Musser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Amy Ockerlander</td>
<td>Will Ibershof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Liz Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Jeanne Burbidge</td>
<td>Dini Duclos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Fred McConkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Paul Winterstein</td>
<td>Joe Fortner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Jamie Perry</td>
<td>Dennis Higgins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Walen</td>
<td>Pam Bissonnette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
<td>Mary Jane Goss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Layne Barnes</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Tana Senn</td>
<td>Bruce Bassett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Jim Manley</td>
<td>Debra Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Lisa Jensen</td>
<td>Rich Crisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Shawn McEvoy</td>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Ken Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>John Stilin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Rich Zwicker</td>
<td>Ed Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Tom Odell</td>
<td>Ramiro Valderrama</td>
<td>Tom Vance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Mia Gregerson</td>
<td>Barry Ladenburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Chris Eggen</td>
<td>Scott MacColl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Kingston Wall</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Jim Haggerton</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td>De’Sean Quinn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie Talmas</td>
<td>Susan Boundy-Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deanna Dawson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electeds present are highlighted in gray. Cities represented are bolded.
King County has proposed a Water Quality Assessment related to its Combined Sewer Overflow [CSO] program and its associated Consent Decree requiring all CSOs to comply with the state standard of no more than one overflow per CSO per year by 2030. The CSO program is stated to be over $700 million in 2010 dollars, and closer to $1 billion in today’s dollars - about half the cost of Brightwater. This is important to Sound Cities Association (SCA) because these high costs will be borne by all wastewater ratepayers in the King County Wastewater service area even though CSOs only exist in about 40% of Seattle. Combined sewers exist in the oldest part of Seattle, and also in portions of cities such as Tacoma, Everett, Bremerton, and a few others in Washington that date back to early development. Combined sewer overflows are essentially 90% or more stormwater. The overflows occur when the pipes and pumps are unable to handle the large combined volume of stormwater within which a very small amount of sanitary wastewater is mixed. These large volumes also impact the wastewater treatment plant. West Point accepts the combined stormwater and wastewater from the City of Seattle.

As a region we all benefit from good water quality; however, prior scientific studies starting in 1998 have shown that the water quality benefits of King County’s CSO program could be negligible. And some of King County’s uncontrolled CSOs already comply with the Federal CSO standard of no more than 4 system overflows per CSO per year.

The Puget Sound Partnership, tasked with the cleanup of Puget Sound and its watersheds, has prioritized stormwater in their Action Agenda as the most significant contributor to poor water quality resulting in water quality standards not being met. Yet funding for stormwater control and treatment is far short of the need. CSO reduction does result in a small amount of stormwater being treated, but at very high cost. The contrast of the need for stormwater controls and treatment compared to the investment in CSO reduction calls for a thorough analysis to determine the best investment to achieve water quality standards in Puget Sound and its watersheds within King County. To do that, the proposed WTD Water Quality Assessment needs to be paired with a parallel cost benefit analysis conducted by King County and partners.

If such studies demonstrate that a more integrated approach to achieve water quality standards results in less CSO investment and more stormwater investment, the County may pursue renegotiating the Consent Decree to allow resources to be directed to where they will provide the greatest environmental benefit. Another possible avenue for shifting funding to the highest priority could include recognizing King County Wastewater’s integrated and comprehensive role in water pollution abatement as envisioned by its original state authorization statute. A third approach could include offsetting high wastewater rates for the proposed CSO program with
increases in stormwater rates to raise funding for high priority stormwater treatment as an alternative. Investigating funding methods and providing options could be a part of the cost benefit analysis study.

*It is recommended that the proposed King County Water Quality Assessment be paired with a cost benefit analysis to provide data and analyses on the best investments of $1 billion to achieve acceptable water quality standards by 2030.*
King Conservation District
1107 SW Grady Way, Suite 130 • Renton, Washington 98057
Phone (425) 282-1900 • Fax (425) 282-1898 • e-mail: district@kingcd.org

King County/King Conservation District Task Force

August 14, 2013

Dear Task Force Members,

The King Conservation District Board of Supervisors met on August 12th, 2013 to discuss the Objective 3 concerns raised by the Task Force and the Conservation District’s recommended approach to resolving each concern raised by Task Force members. We provide this letter to you as a KCD statement of intent and proposed starting point for our discussions of the Objective 3 concerns. We look forward to working with you during the few short weeks we have remaining to either address each concern or develop a recommended approach for addressing it.

Lack of evidence that private land management leads to regional benefit — We at KCD recognize the need to do a better job explaining the regional benefits created by private land stewardship while making the case to both elected officials and citizens that public dollars invested in private land stewardship are good long term investments. The KCD is committed to meeting with the leadership of each and every city in the next year to discuss both how everyone in the region benefits from private land stewardship and what specific stewardship opportunities exist within the boundaries of each jurisdiction.

Too much energy and time in two-year process – The KCD cannot agree more with this concern. The KCD proposes a 5 to 10 year contractual arrangement with the County and participating King County cities that clarifies roles, responsibilities and a common long term vision. We hope the Task Force process is the starting point to developing the long term vision and contractual relationship for moving forward together.

Siloed problem solving / lack of inter-jurisdictional coordination - KCD proposes reconvening an advisory body. Regardless of recollections of past practices, please know every member of the Board of Supervisors feels strongly that the membership of the advisory body be appointed by the group or agency they represent and not the Board. The advisory body would be convened for the following purposes:
1. Review proposed budgets and related decisions and provide suggested recommendations to the Board of Supervisors prior to submission of budget to the King County Council.
2. Assist KCD Board of Supervisors in understanding the inter-jurisdictional perspectives and needs for natural resource conservation within the King County region.
3. Provide opportunity for more transparency and accountability, with substantive input from participating jurisdictions, special interests, and the general public on the programs, revenues, and budgets of the King Conservation District.

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

**Need to balance interests** – The King Conservation District recognizes there is a broad range of interests to balance with limited resources. We also recognize that because of the Jurisdictional Grant Program and current funding levels, we operate with significantly less revenue per capita than any of the other neighboring conservation districts in urban counties. Revenues have also been strained by footing the costs for defending against recent lawsuits. The point we are trying to make is that we can reprioritize and balance interests, but please recognize the KCD at existing funding levels is a very small pie and cut too many ways will not adequately serve anyone. We propose addressing the funding question as part of the negotiation of a longer term contractual agreement as we also attempt to balance interests and multiple objectives.

**Election process** – The KCD, along with a few of its fellow conservation districts, has long supported the concept of retooling the Conservation District election process. There is a cadre of legislators and counties in accord with this issue. We look forward to working with legislators, King County, King County cities, the Washington Association of Conservation Districts (WACD), and other interests in proposing a thoughtful alternative to the way the Conservation District’s election and appointment process is currently configured.

**Demonstrating KCD value within cities** – The KCD wants to work directly with each of the King County cities prior to the next ILA negotiation to better understand the perspectives of the Cities. We think establishing direct working relationships will help the KCD more effectively focus resources and bring direct value to every community in King County. We also want the opportunity to make the case that investments in working lands and other natural resource properties outside cities also benefit all King County citizens.

**Duplication or supplanting of services** – Through the Task Force process we have identified existing services and unmet needs. These tools reveal where potential duplications may occur. Conservation District dollars are scarce. They are more flexible in that they can be invested on private lands and across jurisdictional boundaries. We agree these dollars need to be targeted where they get the biggest bang for the buck and avoid duplication or supplanting of existing programs.
Shrinking funds – Every jurisdiction and governmental entity is experiencing shrinking funds and increasing costs related to natural resource conservation, especially in the arena of shorelines and clean water. There are potential opportunities using King Conservation District services and programs to provide stewardship and landowner education programs that otherwise would be required by SMA and CWA. There are also opportunities to develop programs across jurisdictional boundaries that are more efficient and offer better economies of scale, especially for small jurisdictions. More work needs to be done to explore cost saving opportunities. We hope the Task Force will recommend further exploration of cost saving opportunities.

Clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the parties. The Board of Supervisors is very supportive of the need for a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities for everyone. Agreement on a process that is inclusive of everyone’s interests while clarifying the roles and responsibilities is an essential part of any long term inter-local agreement.

Thank you for your consideration of the KCD recommendations and proposed pathways for moving forward on Objective 3 concerns. We look forward to addressing these concerns to the satisfaction of all parties around the table. We are committed to building the trust relationships needed to move forward together on a long term vision. We hope you will see the wisdom of doing the same.

Sincerely,

Bill Knutsen

Chair, Board of Supervisors

cc: Task Force members
    Alison Bennett, City of Bellevue
    Siri Erickson-Brown, Local Roots Farm and King County Agriculture Commission
    Sara Hemphill, King Conservation District
    Michael Huddleston, King County
    Bobbi Lindemulder, Rural At-Large
    Scott MacColl, City of Shoreline and Sound Cities Association
    Kathy Minsch, City of Seattle
    Eric Nelson, King Conservation District
    Carolyn Robertson, City of Auburn and Sound Cities Association
    Dick Ryon, King County Rural Forest Commission
    Nicole Sanders, City of Snoqualmie and Sound Cities Association
    Christie True, King County

Conservation Panel Members
    The Honorable Jim Berger, Mayor, City of Carnation
    The Honorable Richard Conlin, Councilmember, City of Seattle
    The Honorable Don Davidson, Councilmember, City of Bellevue
    The Honorable Reagan Dunn, Metropolitan King County Council
The Honorable Chris Eggen, Deputy Mayor, City of Shoreline
Fred Jarrett, Deputy County Executive, King County
The Honorable Kate Kruller, Councilmember, City of Tukwila
Kit LEDbetter, King Conservation District
Max Prinsen, King Conservation District

Facilitators
Rhonda Hilyer
Shawn Bunney
Why Food Policy?

Agriculture
- From 1997 to 2007, the region lost 11.6% of its farmland and 321 farms

Economic Impact
- Agriculture counts for more than $8 billion of our state’s revenue

Overview

Regional Food Policy Council Overview

SCA Public Issues Committee
August 14, 2013
Overview

Health and Hunger

- Over 4 million visits to regional food banks in 2008
- 26% of the region’s adults are classified as obese.

Regional Food Policy Council Goals

- Agriculture
- Economic Development
- Education
- Environment
- Equity
- Health
- Policy

Members include:

- Local Government
- Tribes
- Farmers
- Grocers and Distributors
- Conservation and Farmland Preservation
- Public Health
- Education
- Anti-Hunger and Food Access
- Private Business
- Waste

Mission

The Regional Food Policy Council develops just and integrated policy and action recommendations that promote health, sustain and strengthen the local and regional food system, and engage and partner with agriculture, business, communities and governments in the four-county region.
Projects & Events

Regional Food Assessment (UW Studio)

Comprehensive Plan Resources (Seattle project)

Food Policy Scan Report (forthcoming)

Policy Blueprints

Designed as resources for local governments

Topics Addressed:
- Comprehensive Planning
- Farmers Markets
- Local Food Procurement
- Urban Agriculture
- Rural Farmland Preservation (coming soon)

King County Farm Tour

Public Health & Food Economy Summits
Comprehensive Plan Policies

Incorporate supportive policies in the comprehensive plan:
- Agriculture and community gardening
- Healthy food access
- Local food economy
- Procurement

Farmers Markets

- Streamline permitting and fees
- Identify locations for farmers markets
- Consider permitting markets to operate on city-owned property.
- Define farmers markets

Local Food Procurement

Support institutional procurement policies that encourage purchases of locally grown food products.
- Target Percentage of Local Food Purchases
- Mandated Percent Price Purchases
- Geographic Preference
- Comprehensive Plan Policies to Promote Local Food Procurement

Urban Agriculture

Facilitate urban agriculture activities by ensuring they are permitted by development regulations and other municipal code, and have adequate space to occur
- Code Changes
- Identify land available and used for urban agriculture
Future Presentations

Staff and councilmembers willing to meet with local councils or city/county staff

Contact
Liz Underwood-Bultmann, Assistant Planner
LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org

http://www.psrc.org/growth/foodpolicy

For More Information

Liz Underwood-Bultmann, Assistant Planner
lunderwood-bultmann@psrc.org, 206-464-6174

Rebeccah Maskin, Senior Planner
Rmaskin@psrc.org, 206-464-5833

Project Website
http://www.psrc.org/growth/foodpolicy
Item 6:
Recommendation from the PIC Nominating Committee

Action Item

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

SCA PIC Nominating Committee Representatives
Chair Jim Haggerton, Mayor of Tukwila; Dave Hill, Mayor of Algona; Hank Margeson, Redmond City Councilmember; Ross Loudenback, North Bend City Councilmember.

To recommend the following appointment to the SCA Board of Directors:
To follow the recommendation of the PIC Nominating Committee, and appoint Mayor David Baker of Kenmore to the King County PSAP Recommendations Committee.

Background Information
King County recently conducted a study looking at PSAPs (Public Safety Answering Points), and possible consolidation. That study evaluated the current provision of services, and a consultant hired by the County made a series of recommendations. The results of that will be available in September.

On August 29, 2013 Executive Dawson sent out a call for volunteers to serve on a King County E-911 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Future Configuration Recommendation Committee. Each PSAP will have representation on the committee. In addition, the County agreed to have participation from an SCA city that has no direct relationship to any of the existing PSAPs. These cities are:

- Shoreline
- Woodinville
- Sammamish
- Burien
- Covington
- Kenmore
- Maple Valley
- Newcastle
- North Bend
- SeaTac
- Beaux Arts
- Skykomish

The PSAP Recommendation Committee will discuss the consultant recommendations, consider new or additional ideas, and provide recommendations to King County. With input from a Technical Committee comprised of PSAP Directors and Police, Fire, and Emergency Medical Services representatives (most of which served on the Steering Committee in the first phase), the Recommendation Committee will meet once or twice a month between October 2013 and August 2014 to develop and evaluate PSAP options. The Committee will need to reach
consensus on PSAP options by May 31, 2014 and develop a Final Recommendations Report for King County by August 31, 2014.

The PIC Nominating Committee met on Friday, September 6, 2013 and recommended that Mayor David Baker of Kenmore be appointed as an SCA representative on the committee.
Item 7:
Support for Shoreline’s Preferred Alternative - 145th Street Link Station
City of Shoreline

Action Item

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

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

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

Background

This matter was brought to the PIC at the request of the City of Shoreline, and the North End Mayors. At the August 14, 2013 meeting of the PIC Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, to bring forward to the next meeting of the PIC the following proposed policy position:

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

Under the ST2 plan that was approved by voters in 2008, there were two stations identified north of Northgate in King County – I-5 and NE 145th Street, and I-5 and NE 185th Street. As a part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, Sound Transit (ST) was also asked to look at alternate station locations. King County Metro asked to have NE 155th Street considered as a potential alternative to 145th. A final decision on station locations will be made by the ST Board. ST recently released the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Lynnwood Link Extension.

The draft EIS shows that the stations at NE 145th Street and NE 155th Street are comparable based on criteria including ridership, cost, environmental impact and transit oriented
development potential. However, as noted above, putting a station at NE 155th Street would significantly increase traffic through Shoreline neighborhoods.

Shoreline requested that SCA adopt this policy position in support of the 145th Street Station location on the basis that:

- There is no freeway access to a NE 155th Street station. Locating the station at this location would require a high volume of commuters to drive through Shoreline neighborhoods, and would have a substantial negative impact on Shoreline residents;
- Where, as here, there is no substantive difference between the two proposed locations ST should give deference to the City hosting the proposed station, and its long term planning goals;
- Locating the station at NE 145th Street will better serve commuters from neighboring jurisdictions including north Seattle, Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell, and Woodinville.

At the August meeting of the PIC members expressed their support for Shoreline, noting that if all criteria are equal, the siting agency should defer to the preference of the host community particularly where, as here, the city has long term plans for the corridor that will be beneficial to the economic vitality of the city, and the region.

The ST Board is tentatively scheduled to vote on which preferred alternative to take forward into the final EIS at its October 2013 Board Meeting. This preferred alternative will include designation of station locations.


### Background

On April 17, 2013, SCA adopted the following position: “SCA requests that the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) and the King County Solid Waste Division review and recommend any appropriate updates to the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan.” In July 2013, the King County Council amended Ordinance 17619, limiting expenditures for the Factoria Transfer Station until a review of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan was completed. The first meeting of the Transfer Station Plan Review was on July 26th; the second meeting on August 22nd and there is one remaining meeting scheduled for September 22nd. The Executive is scheduled to submit a draft plan to stakeholders on October 9th and submit the final report to the King County Council on November 27th.

There are currently 5 alternatives, the Base Plan and Alternatives A-D, being evaluated. The “Base Plan” would be to build (in addition to the facilities recently built in Shoreline and Bow Lake) new facilities in Factoria, South County, and Northeast County. Alternative A would be to not construct the proposed Northeast facility. Alternative B would be to not construct the proposed Factoria facility. Alternative C would be to build neither the proposed Factoria, nor the proposed South facility. Alternative D would be to build neither the proposed Northeast, nor the proposed South facility. The Solid Waste Division (SWD) is also considering a number of variations on these alternatives. (For example, alternative D** involves not building Northeast,
mental. Building Factoria, and remodeling the current South station and keeping it open for self-haul only.) A complete list of these alternatives can be found in Attachment A.

The meetings to date have had presentations on a number of topic areas including:
- Forecasting Garbage Tonnage
- Compaction
- Self-Haul
- Retention and Repair Costs for Existing Transfer Stations
- Transfer Station Recycling
- Drive Time Analysis
- Alternative Disposal Technology
- Storage Capacity
- Transfer System Cost Drivers
- Transfer System Alternatives

Links to all of these presentations can be found at www.your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/plan-review.asp#presentations.

There are also additional materials provided on the webpage, www.your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/plan-review.asp#notes, under the Transfer Station Plan Review Workshop #1 Supplemental Information and the Workshop #2 Morning and Afternoon handouts.

At the September Transfer Station Review meeting on September 22nd, the following items will be addressed:
- Collection cost
- Which areas of the county would be affected?
- Estimated average collection cost increases
- Rate impacts
- Estimated average tipping fee increases
- How would tipping fee increases compare to collection cost increases?
- Cost to the average household

SCA Potential Action
Once the review is completed, the County will make a decision on whether to proceed with the “Base Plan” of the current Transfer Station Plan, or to construct fewer transfer station than the Plan currently calls for. The budget proviso adopted by the County Council requires the SWD to collect feedback from various stakeholders, including SCA. SCA may wish to adopt a formal policy position to give guidance to the Council.

Because the review is not yet complete, proposing a policy position at this juncture would be premature. But members will be able to discuss the pros and cons of the various alternatives at the September meeting, based on existing information. This will help to give guidance to the SWD as it drafts its plan, which is due on October 9. That is the same date as the October PIC meeting.

The cost information scheduled to be provided in September, together with the data already presented by the Solid Waste Division, should allow elected officials to take a position on a preferred alternative. SCA members are encouraged to attend the September 22nd review meeting to obtain additional background information to assist in making a recommendation,
and in order to give feedback to the SWD on preferred alternatives. We will also schedule this matter to return to PIC at the October 9th PIC meeting, and the November 13th PIC meeting.

**Attachments**

A.  [Transfer Plan Review Alternatives](#)
B.  [Transfer Plan Review Update – PowerPoint](#)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives Summary</th>
<th>Base (Transfer Plan)</th>
<th>A*</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D**</th>
<th>D***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open facilities</strong></td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria) Houghton – 7 days/week weekends and limited weekday hours</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed facilities</strong></td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria) Houghton – 7 days/week weekends and limited weekday hours</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
<td>Shoreline Bow Lake limited self-haul (expands to Factoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-load computers</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storage capacity</strong></td>
<td>3 days everywhere except Houghton</td>
<td>3 days everywhere except Houghton</td>
<td>3 days everywhere except Houghton</td>
<td>3 days everywhere except Houghton</td>
<td>3 days everywhere except Houghton</td>
<td>3 days everywhere except Houghton</td>
<td>3 days everywhere except Houghton</td>
<td>3 days everywhere except Houghton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-haul service</strong></td>
<td>All stations, all hours</td>
<td>All stations, all hours</td>
<td>All stations, all hours</td>
<td>All stations, all hours</td>
<td>All stations, all hours</td>
<td>All stations, all hours</td>
<td>All stations, all hours</td>
<td>All stations, all hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling service</strong></td>
<td>Recycling scenario 3 at all stations</td>
<td>Recycling scenario 3 at all stations</td>
<td>Recycling scenario 3 at all stations</td>
<td>Recycling scenario 3 at all stations</td>
<td>Recycling scenario 3 at all stations</td>
<td>Recycling scenario 3 at all stations</td>
<td>Recycling scenario 3 at all stations</td>
<td>Recycling scenario 3 at all stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HHW service</strong></td>
<td>Factory 6 days/week</td>
<td>Factory 6 days/week</td>
<td>Factory 6 days/week</td>
<td>Factory 6 days/week</td>
<td>Factory 6 days/week</td>
<td>Factory 6 days/week</td>
<td>Factory 6 days/week</td>
<td>Factory 6 days/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Map Reference</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>9, 10, 11</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contents of this document explore alternatives without regard to policy. Additional environmental and financial review may be necessary to fully understand the implications of any given alternative. Policy decisions are left to a higher authority for application at an appropriate time. Statistics, charts, and numbers are for research and comparison purposes only and should not be applied out of context.
## Transfer Plan Level-of-Service Criteria Applied to Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A*</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C**</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Estimated time to a transfer facility within the service area for 90% of users</td>
<td>&lt; 30 min = YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time on site meets standard for 90% of trips</td>
<td>&lt; 16 min = YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. commercial vehicles</td>
<td>&lt; 30 min = YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. business self-haulers</td>
<td>&lt; 30 min = YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. residential self-haulers</td>
<td>&lt; 30 min = YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facility hours meet user demand</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recycling services meet Plan policies</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. business self-haulers</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. residential self-haulers</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vehicle capacity</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. meets 2027 forecast needs</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. meets 2040 forecast needs</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Average daily handling capacity (tons)</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. meets 2027 forecast needs</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. meets 2040 forecast needs</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Space for 3 days’ storage</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. at time of construction</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. meets 2040 forecast needs</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Space to expand on-site</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Minimum roof clearance of 25 ft.</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Meets facility safety goals</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ability to compact waste</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Safety</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Meets goals for structural integrity</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Meets FEMA immediate occupancy standards</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Meets applicable local noise ordinance levels</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Meets PSCAA standards for odors</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Meets goals for traffic on local streets</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Meets LOS standard</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Traffic does not extend onto local streets 95% of the time</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 100 foot buffer between active area and nearest residence</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Transfer station is compatible with surrounding land use</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Criteria applied to the overall system alternative – individual transfer stations may vary
2. See drive time map 8
3. See drive time map 13
4. Analysis based on vehicle capacity LOS rating
5. Hours may be adjusted at some facilities to meet user demand
6. "NO" if one or more facilities in the alternative did not have an LOS score of at least a C – see vehicle capacity detail for information about each facility
7. This criterion has been adapted to indicate future flexibility to expand service, e.g., HHW, or to support waste conversion technology
8. Represents an assumed outcome; this criterion would need more thorough assessment

The contents of this document explore alternatives without regard to policy. Additional environmental and financial reviews may be necessary to fully understand the implications of any given alternative. Policy decisions are left to a higher authority level for application at an appropriate time. Statistics, charts, and numbers are for research and comparison purposes only and should not be applied out of context.
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Transfer Plan Review

King County Ordinance #17619

SCA letter to Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee Chair, June 11, 2013

• Purpose
  • Determine if changes are needed to ensure that the transfer system is sized/configured appropriately to meet current and future needs
  • Determine whether changes could be made that could reduce future expenditures while still meeting desired service objectives and levels

• Not in scope
  • Cedar Hills development or future disposal
  • Intermodal development/waste export
  • Public vs. private
  • Rural transfer system
Review Process Overview

- Review transfer system alternatives and resulting impacts to cost, service, and the environment
- The review will inform potential changes to current plans for the Factoria, South County, and Northeast recycling and transfer station projects
- Workshops held in July, August and September open to interested parties including MSWMAC, SWAC, city staff, business partners and interested citizens
- SWD will provide updates to MSWMAC and SWAC during normally scheduled meetings, and provide briefings to others such as the Regional Policy Committee and Sound Cities Association
Schedule

- July 26 – Workshop 1
- August 14
  - Brief Regional Policy Committee
  - Brief Sound Cities Association Public Issues Committee
- August 22 – Workshop 2
- September 4 – City Managers’ Meeting
- September 11 - Sound Cities Association Public Issues Committee
- September 27 – Workshop 3 (*RSVP requested*)
- October 9 – Draft report to stakeholders
- November 27 – Final report to County Council
Workshop 1

- Third Party (GBB) Review
- 2011 Performance Audit
- Tonnage Forecast
- Compaction
- Retention and Repair Costs for Current Transfer Stations
- Self-haul
- Transfer Station Recycling
- Drive Time
Workshop 2

- Transfer system relationship to waste conversion technologies and waste-to-energy
- Transfer station storage capacity
- Transfer station construction cost drivers
- Transfer system alternatives
  - Level-of-Service Criteria
    - Level of service to customers
    - Station capacity and structural integrity
    - Effects on surrounding communities
  - Preliminary cost information
## Alternatives Considered

### Five basic alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base (Current Plan)</th>
<th>Alternative A (no Northeast)</th>
<th>Alternative B (no Factoria)</th>
<th>Alternative C (no South County and no Factoria)</th>
<th>Alternative D (no South County and no Northeast)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Factoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>South County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed (or never opened) Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Algona**</td>
<td>Algona**</td>
<td>Algona**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Houghton*</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Houghton*</td>
<td>Houghton*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and four variations that would keep Houghton and/or Algona open for self-haul customers only
Risks/Challenges

- Siting
  - Siting any new facility is challenging and comes with the risk that an appropriate site will not be identified (Base, A, A*, B, C, C**)
  - Siting a larger facility with longer hours increases challenge and risk (B, C, C**)
- Development on the Eastgate property is inconsistent with current zoning and with Bellevue’s I-90 corridor plan (A, D)
- Self-haul only stations (A*, C**, D**, D***)
  - Direct self-haul traffic to very constrained facilities – increased traffic, stations operating over-capacity, loss of customers and revenue
  - Direct commercial haulers to fewer facilities – increased curbside collection costs
  - Increased traffic during limited hours and stations operating over capacity during those hours, loss of customers and revenue
- Fewer facilities (all alternatives to some degree)
  - Increased curbside collection cost
  - Increased traffic around remaining facilities
Workshop 3

- Transfer system alternatives continued
  - Collection cost
    - Which areas of the county would be affected?
    - Estimated average collection cost increases
  - Rate impacts
    - Estimated average tipping fee increases
    - How would tipping fee increases compare to collection cost increases?
  - Cost to the average household

- Project delivery and financing
Comparing Alternatives – Key Elements

- Costs
  - Capital
  - Operating
  - Collection

- Equitable distribution of facilities and services

- Flexibility to meet future needs

- Level-of-service criteria

- Drive time
- Time on site
- Facility hours
- Recycling services
- Tonnage capacity
- Vehicle capacity

- Storage capacity
- Compaction
- Building and safety standards
- Noise and odor standards

- Traffic standards
- Proximity to residences
- Compatibility with surrounding land use
Project Website

Provides:

- Information about scheduled workshops
- Workshop summaries and links to presentations
- Reference materials
- Contact information and a comment form

hw/your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/plan-review.asp
Item 9:
Product Stewardship Policy
Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP)

Potential Future Action Item

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

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

To recommend the following policy position to the SCA Board of Directors:
The Sound Cities Association supports product stewardship approaches that enhance our existing reuse, recycling and waste management systems by requiring product manufacturers to be responsible for their products that contain toxic and hazardous materials.

Background
The Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP) in King County is a multi-jurisdictional coalition of agency, city and tribal partners who work together to reduce the threat posed by the production, use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials.

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

Mayor Baker, Kenmore is SCA’s representative on LHWMP’s Management Coordinating Committee (MCC). Other MCC members represent Seattle-King County Public Health, King County Solid Waste Division, Seattle Public Utilities, and King County Water & Land Resources Division.

The Program’s mission is to protect and enhance public health and environmental quality in King County by reducing the threat posed by the production, use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials. LHWMP works with residents and businesses throughout King County to:
1. Reduce the production (upstream) of toxics and hazardous products and to promote stewardship of those products by their manufacturers.
2. Reduce the use of, and properly store, toxics and other hazardous products.
3. Ensure the proper disposal of toxics and hazardous waste.
To find out more about the work of the Program in 2012, see Informational Item 12a in this packet.

It is the first program area, product stewardship, which is the subject of the proposed policy. Product stewardship is devoted to reducing the production of toxics and hazardous products and to promoting “cradle-to-cradle” lifecycle management of those products by their manufacturers. Attachment A is a PowerPoint presentation on product stewardship given to the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) at its August meeting; it provides general information about product stewardship.

The LHWMP has been involved in product stewardship since the Program’s inception and has been instrumental in two statewide product stewardship programs, Electronic Products - Recycling of TVs and Computers; and Mercury-Containing Lighting. The Program also was a major supporter of the statewide efforts to create a medicine take back program and supported the King County Board of Health’s successful effort to create a King County medicine take back program.

The LHWMP supports statewide legislation for product stewardship of toxic products that:

1. Will provide benefit to the residents and businesses of King County;
2. Has been developed through stakeholder processes at the local or national levels that have strived to engage all stakeholders, including product manufacturers and waste management companies;
3. Are supported by a coalition of stakeholders, including other local governments; and
4. Are consistent with policy principles developed and supported by the LHWMP and the NW Product Stewardship Council, including policies that ensure:
   a. producers play a primary role in responsibility for end-of-life management of their products;
   b. a level playing field and fairness for producers and all stakeholders;
   c. performance goals and standards to adequately protect human health and the environment, and address local needs;
   d. sufficient oversight, reporting and transparency to government and citizens; and
   e. appropriate definition of roles for stakeholders to create a fair and effective system.

Current Product Stewardship Efforts
The LHWMP’s current initiatives include:

1. Supporting WA’s existing product stewardship laws, including electronic products and mercury-containing lighting.
2. Creating stewardship programs for hazardous products with inadequate management systems including programs for pharmaceuticals and latex paint. See Attachment B, the NW Product Stewardship Council’s (NWPSC) “Why We Need A Paint Stewardship Law in Washington State”.
3. Supporting and expanding voluntary product stewardship programs, including for rechargeable batteries. See Attachment C, the NWPSC – “Why We Need A Rechargeable Battery Recycling Law in Washington State”.
4. Exploring other toxic products that should be handled by stewardship approaches.

With local and national partners, the LHWMP is engaged in discussions over additional products or product categories which should be addressed through stewardship policies due to their health impacts, environmental impacts, or challenges in end-of-life management through existing systems.

**Request for support from SCA**

The LHWMP is involved in developing and supporting statewide legislation related to product stewardship. Support from a broad coalition of stakeholders, including local governments, is critical to passage of product stewardship legislation. Currently, most product manufacturers externalize disposal or recycling costs for their toxic products onto governments and their funders (taxpayers and ratepayers). The advantages to local governments of supporting product stewardship legislation could include: shifting from a system focused on government-funded and ratepayer-financed waste disposal and diversion, to one that relies on producer responsibility in order to reduce public costs; increasing accessibility to services; attaining higher environmental benefits; and driving improvements in product design that promote sustainability for public health and environmental quality.

The Local Hazardous Waste Management Program staff is requesting SCA’s support of product stewardship efforts at the state legislature. Such support would be in the form of an SCA policy supporting product stewardship.

**Attachments**

A. PowerPoint on Product Stewardship
B. NW Product Stewardship Council publication - “Why We Need A Paint Stewardship Law in Washington State”.
C. NW Product Stewardship Council publication - “Why We Need A Rechargeable Battery Recycling Law in Washington State”.
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Product Stewardship

Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee Meeting

August 9, 2013

The problem

- Manufacturers make products that are toxic, hard to handle or unrecyclable
  - electronics, fluorescent lamps, medicines, paint, mattresses
- Local government programs cannot always meet the demand for convenient service
  - Curbside collection was not designed to collect toxic and hard to handle materials
  - Expensive to provide recycling/proper disposal
  - Need to balance customer demand with the cost of providing service (e.g., raising rates to pay for service)

One solution: product stewardship

- Funded by manufacturers
- Safer management of toxic materials
- Increased convenience
- Manufacturers connected to their products’ end-of-life management – and design products to be more recyclable, less toxic

One of many tools to achieve our 70% recycling goal.

Enabling laws and guidance

- King County Ordinance No. 14236 adopting 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan
- KC Product Stewardship Programs and Strategies Report to Council 2002
- Draft 2013 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan
  Developed in partnership with MSWMAC, SWAC and King County cities
  - Materials include paint, carpet, fluorescent bulbs/tubes, mercury thermostats, rechargeable batteries, pharmaceuticals, mattresses, junk mail, and telephone books
Product stewardship for electronics

- Public wanted to recycle computers, monitors, TVs and other electronics
- No recycling options were available for households and small businesses
- King County partnered with private sector

Sharing responsibility

- Needed legislation to "level the playing field"
- **2003 – 2006** Coalition formed to support electronics stewardship legislation
  - King County and the Northwest Product Stewardship Council
  - King County cities
  - Hewlett Packard
  - Goodwill
  - Amazon.com
  - Consumer Electronics Retailers Coalition
  - Washington Conservation Voters
  - Washington Environmental Council

Good start - but not perfect

- Funded by recycling fees
- Export and unsafe recycling practices
- No manufacturer involvement

Involving manufacturers
Product stewardship works well

When...
- There is no local infrastructure
- It is expensive to manage properly
- Products contain toxic materials and must be safely managed
- Want to influence the design of the product to be more environmentally sound

Where are we now?
- Stewardship legislation passed
  - Electronics (2006)
  - Mercury-containing lamps (2010)
  - Secure Medicine Return (2013 in King County)
- Manufacturers backing stewardship legislation (paint and rechargeable batteries)
- Opposition by solid waste collection companies
  - Washington Refuse and Recycling Association (WRRA) blocking paint stewardship legislation

Next steps!
1. Stakeholder meetings to discuss positions on product stewardship
   - SWAC and MSWMAC
   - Cities that contract with solid waste collection companies
   - Solid waste collection companies in King County
     - CleanScapes
     - Republic Services (WRRA Member)
     - WasteConnections (WRRA Member)
     - Waste Management
Next steps!

2. Visit the Oregon Paint Stewardship program
   - To experience the paint stewardship program
   - Talk with retail collectors, processors and the stewardship organization
   - Invite our solid waste management companies, cities and elected officials

Next steps!

3. Develop and agree to position statement on product stewardship
   - Based on work with cities and solid waste companies
   - Define toxic, hard-to-handle products
   - Define position on materials collected in curbside bins
   - Revisit criteria for selecting products
   - Coordinate with LHWMP and NWPSC efforts

Next steps!

4. Help support stewardship legislation in 2014
   - Agency-request legislation for mercury-containing lamps
   - Paint
   - Rechargeable batteries
Good for Consumers  
Good for Business  
Good for the Environment  
Good for Local Government

**Problem:** Unused, leftover oil-based and latex paints pose a health risk to our Washington families and the environment. Methods for recycling and disposing of paint in WA are not meeting consumer needs.

- Consumers need a hassle-free way to recycle or properly dispose of their leftover paint.
- Many paint products contain toxic chemicals that are linked to illnesses including cancer, asthma, and reproductive health issues.
- The cost of managing unwanted paint is burdensome on local governments and ratepayers all over the State. And too many communities have no programs for proper paint recycling and disposal.
- Liquids, including latex and oil-based paints, are prohibited from many residential garbage programs to prevent spills and splashes; toxic paint does not belong in area landfills; and latex paint going to a landfill is a waste of a valuable resource.

What can residents and paint contractors do with their remaining paint?

**Solution:** Paint stewardship is a common sense approach that solves the puzzle of how to fund a convenient, cost effective reuse and recycling program for leftover paint.

- Consumers will pay a small assessment for interior or exterior house paints built into the price of the paint at the time of purchase.
- Consumers take unwanted leftover paint to one of many collection sites for easy recycling—at no additional cost.

In 2010, costs to local government and their ratepayers for managing unwanted paint were nearly $3 million dollars. Despite this, 60% of state residents have nowhere to recycle latex paint in their counties.
Supported by the paint industry:

This bill was initiated by the paint industry group American Coatings Association. They support common sense legislation to take back and properly manage the products they produce.

It’s good for their bottom line; more collection sites mean more business for participating paint retailers as consumer foot traffic increases.

And painting contractors and other businesses will have convenient collection sites where they can take their unwanted paint at no additional cost.

As the paint industry continues to create paint stewardship programs across the U.S., Washington can join neighboring Oregon, as well as California, Connecticut and Rhode Island, in legislating a successful and healthy paint recycling program.

Washington agencies supporting a paint stewardship management approach (2008 Paint MOU)\(^1\):

Benton-Franklin Health Dept., City of Walla Walla, City of Spokane, Solid Waste Dept., City of Vancouver Solid Waste Division, Clark County, Cowlitz County Public Works, Grays Harbor County, King County Solid Waste Division, Kitsap County Solid Waste Division, Lincoln County Public Works, Local Hazardous Waste Management Program in King County, Pend Oreille County, Snohomish County Solid Waste Division, Whatcom County Executive, Whitman County Solid Waste Department, Yakima County Solid Waste, WA State Department of Ecology

The proposed Paint Stewardship Law will ensure safe management of latex and oil-based architectural paints sold in Washington State.

For More Information Contact:

Terri Thomas  Thomaste@co.thurston.wa.us  360-867-2279

---

\(^1\) Product Stewardship Institute, Paint Product Stewardship Initiative Memorandum of Understanding. October, 2007  http://productstewardship.net/sites/default/files/Docs/paint/2nd_paint_mou_signers.doc
Rechargeable Battery Stewardship: Good for Washington’s Residents and Local Governments

- Consumer use of rechargeable batteries is increasing and safe recycling of these batteries prevents toxic metals and other materials from harming people and our environment.
- Recycling batteries also recaptures valuable metals and other substances that can be returned to commerce and remanufactured into new products.
- Washington State is fortunate to have 486 active rechargeable battery collection locations funded by battery manufacturers through the Call2Recycle program.¹

Call2Recycle is a voluntary product stewardship program provided by the major rechargeable battery manufacturers. The program covers the costs of on-site signage, and collection boxes, shipping and processing.

The Rechargeable Battery Recycling Corporation, which operates the Call2Recycle program on behalf of battery manufacturers, has proposed the Small Rechargeable Battery Recycling Act to the Washington State Legislature.

Many rechargeable batteries contain toxic heavy metals such as cadmium and lead.

$1.6 million . . . The direct savings to local governments are only a small part of the equation. The annual benefit to Washington communities from Call2Recycle’s rechargeable battery stewardship program is estimated at over $1.6 million.²

Call2Recycle is Convenient for Consumers

The majority of Call2Recycle’s collection sites are located in retail stores that sell products using rechargeable batteries. Worn out rechargeable batteries get dropped off when new ones are needed.

Call2Recycle Saves Money for Local Governments

About 50 government agencies in 30 counties use Call2Recycle’s program to recycle batteries collected at their municipal facilities. Many other government agencies, such as fire and police departments, utilize the Call2Recycle program to properly recycle their own batteries.
If Call2Recycle has an Effective Voluntary Program, Why is Legislation Needed?

Call2Recycle cannot remain solvent and viable in Washington without legislation to level the playing field so all rechargeable battery manufacturers pay their fair share.

There are now more rechargeable batteries and new types of rechargeables on the market than 18 years ago when Call2Recycle was formed by many of the major battery manufacturers. Many of the newcomer manufacturers do not support Call2Recycle financially, though Call2Recycle accepts and processes their products. “Free riders” threaten the existence of the Call2Recycle by increasing costs without paying a share of expenses. This is why responsible battery manufacturers are supporting passage of the Small Rechargeable Battery Stewardship Act.

What the Small Rechargeable Battery Stewardship Act will do:

• All manufacturers and marketers of small rechargeable batteries sold in the state would need to participate in an approved recycling program and provide equitable funding. The bill applies to rechargeables that are easily removable from products.
• Manufacturers and marketers complying with the law are empowered to seek damages from “free riders,” which will compel those companies to either join Call2Recycle or provide their own stewardship program.
• The legislation defines smart standards for all recycling programs to ensure safe and effective recycling of rechargeable batteries in our state.

Benefits of the Legislation for Washington Communities:

• With the passage of legislation in Washington State, the Call2Recycle recycling program will be able to maintain and expand its already substantial collection network.
• Consumers will continue to have many convenient battery collection locations.
• Local governments will continue their partnership with Call2Recycle, saving money to benefit ratepayers and taxpayers.
• More rechargeable batteries will be recycled, ensuring that more metals and harmful substances are captured for proper recycling and handling.
• As new battery chemistries are developed and as single-use battery manufacturers move forward with collecting their batteries, a fully funded and stable rechargeable battery stewardship program will not only serve as a good model, it could evolve to collect these other battery types as well.

Legislation is needed to “level the playing field” so all rechargeable battery manufacturers pay their fair share.
Item 10:
Balancing the Transportation 2040 Financial Strategy
PSRC Transportation Policy Board

Discussion Item

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

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

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

PSRC is required by federal transportation planning requirements to adopt a “fiscally constrained” long range transportation plan, and to update said plan every four years. “Fiscally constrained” means that there is a reasonable estimate of existing and future revenues available to cover anticipated investments. Due to the economic downturn, updated project costs, and updated preservation estimates, there is a substantial revenue gap that must be addressed must be addressed in order balance the T2040 Financial Strategy.

PSRC staff is seeking direction from the Transportation Policy Board to proceed with scenario analysis, and has developed three scenarios for consideration at the September 12, 2013 meeting of the Transportation Policy Board’s (TPB). The SCA Caucus of the TPB is seeking feedback from the PIC in advance of that meeting.

Background

Attached is a 4 page summary prepared by PSRC staff regarding the Transportation 2040 Policy Framework for Balancing the Financial Strategy (Attachment A). In July, the Executive Board approved this framework as a means for balancing the Transportation 2040 Financial Strategy.

Approved Policy Framework
1. Use updated State of Good Repair (Preservation) information
   - Including updated City/County pavement estimates ($5 billion higher).
   - Endorse updated local transit operations estimates. ($10.5 billion lower) with understanding that this may need to be adjusted in next plan update cycle.

2. Focus cost reductions on system improvement investments (NOT State of Good Repair)
   - Reinforces the priority of State of Good Repair
   - Highlights the unfunded system improvement needs

3. Share the pain: Cost reductions across system expansion programs (highways, arterials, transit, bike & pedestrian) to close the $9 Billion gap
   - Sound Transit: Work with Sound Transit to balance their costs and revenues
   - WSDOT Ferries: Maintain current costs – no reductions
   - Scenarios for all other programs (local transit, city streets, county roads, state highways and other regional projects)

Based on this direction, three scenarios have been developed. Each of the scenarios has an associated project list with related project costs.

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

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

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

- **Hybrid: A combination of the three?** Staff has also discussed the possibility that there be a “Hybrid” scenario. Since there are overlaps between the 3 projects lists associated with the scenarios described above, a hybrid that removes duplications between the lists could also be analyzed.

In addition to the 4 page summary provided (attachment A) there are three project lists attached, one for each of the proposed scenarios. Additional information can also be found on PSRC’s website [www.psrc.org/transportation/transportation-2040-update](http://www.psrc.org/transportation/transportation-2040-update).
Next steps

- **October 10, 2013** – Transportation Policy Board (TPB) reviews scenario analysis results; re-run as directed by TPB.
- **October 2013** – TPB discussion on scenario analysis.
- **November 14, 2013** - TPB reviews initial Draft Plan and scenario analysis results.
- **December 5, 2013** – Executive Board (EB) sees results of analysis, initial draft plan.
- **December 12, 2013** – TPB reviews and provides input on Draft Plan.
- **January 9, 2014** – TPB reviews and provides input on Draft Plan.
- **March 10, 2014** – 45 day public comment period concludes.
- **March 13, 2014** – TPB reviews summary of public comments, prepares for April approval of Transportation 2040 Plan Update
- **April 10, 2014** – TPB makes recommendation to EB.
- **April 24, 2014** – EB Action on Draft Plan.
- **April 24-May 14, 2014** – Required SEPA waiting period before General Assembly action.
- **May 2014** – Transportation 2040 Plan Update adoption by General Assembly (date TBD).

Attachments

A. [4-Page Summary Balancing the Transportation 2040 Financial Strategy](#)
B. [Scenario 1: Prioritization – Lowest Quartile Projects](#)
C. [Scenario 2: WSDOT Right-Sizing and Phasing](#)
D. [Scenario 3: Third Decade Projects](#)
Overview of Policy Framework for Balancing the Transportation 2040 Financial Strategy
DRAFT - September 4, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Federal transportation planning requirements call for a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), such as PSRC, to have a long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan that is updated every four years. For the central Puget Sound region (Kitsap, King, Pierce and Snohomish counties), this is the Transportation 2040 plan. An additional requirement is that the plan be “fiscally constrained,” meaning that there is a reasonable estimate of existing and future revenues available to cover anticipated investments.

An update to the Transportation 2040 plan is underway and includes a number of refinements to the financial strategy. Changes to estimated expenditures can be attributed to several factors, including updated state of good repair estimates, updated project and program costs, and the incorporation of the latest historic period of expenditures informing programmatic estimates. The economic downturn has had a significant impact on current law revenue estimates. The impact of these updates is a revenue gap that needs to be addressed in order to satisfy the federal fiscal constraint requirement of the plan.

Between December 2013 and January 2014, the Executive Board is scheduled to release a draft updated plan for public comments. The Draft Transportation 2040 Update must have a fiscally constrained financial strategy.

This document summarizes the following Policy Framework endorsed by the Executive Board at its July 2013 meeting.

- Emphasize the importance of the “State of Good Repair,” which refers to preserving, maintaining and operating the existing system. As noted above, this emphasis on state of good repair results in an updated estimate of $5 billion more than the existing Transportation 2040 plan.

- Seek to balance the financial strategy through moving system improvement projects from the “Financially Constrained” portion of the plan to the Unprogrammed portion. As illustrated in the graphic below, the Unprogrammed portion of the plan is included as part of the full plan. Projects contained in the Unprogrammed portion of the plan are eligible for planning work, but not construction.
SCENARIOS

To balance the Transportation 2040 financial strategy, the Executive Board gave staff direction to proceed with the development of three scenarios that would apply to the system improvement project lists. Each of the scenarios has an associated project list with related project costs.

Assuming the Transportation Policy Board gives direction to proceed with scenario analysis in September, these scenarios will be analyzed to assess transportation system performance and regional impacts. The results will be provided to the boards in October. The boards can then choose to have some additional analysis before the process will need to wrap up by December 2013. Again, the objective is to use the scenarios to create a financially balanced plan.

### TABLE 1: FINANCIAL SUMMARY 2010-2040

(millions of year 2008 constant dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENTS</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>DRAFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>New Revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>State of Good Repair</th>
<th>System Expansion</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Current Law</th>
<th>Dedicated New Revenue</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Revenue Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>$12,900</td>
<td>($2,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transit</td>
<td>$27,300</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$46,800</td>
<td>$37,700</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
<td>$46,800</td>
<td>($6,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>$25,700</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>($-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Ferries</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>($2,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highways</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$21,900</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>($14,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>($4,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$80,600</td>
<td>$92,600</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td>$110,500</td>
<td>$33,400</td>
<td>$143,900</td>
<td>($29,400)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undedicated New Revenue* | $26,060 | $ (3,340)

*Note: Undedicated new revenues are generated through assumed fuel tax increases, road usage charges, and highway tolls. Revenue sources should be considered when allocating undedicated revenues.

POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR BALANCING THE FINANCIAL STRATEGY

As noted above, the PSRC Executive Board endorsed the Policy Framework designed to balance the financial strategy for the Transportation 2040 Update. The framework reinforces the importance of maintaining and operating the existing transportation system prior to enhancement, distributes cost reductions across the primary program areas with two notable exceptions discussed below, and implements the project and program prioritization process developed over the last two years.

**State of Good Repair Adjustment.** Currently included direction:

1. An increase over the adopted plan of an additional $5 billion for cities and counties to maintain local pavement conditions and signal/Intelligent Transportation System operations, and meet increasingly stringent stormwater mitigation requirements as a result of the enhanced National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).

2. Additionally, this estimate includes a reduction in the cost to maintain existing local transit services through the horizon year of Transportation 2040 per new cost control policies adopted by local transit agencies. The adopted Transportation 2040 plan assumes an annual service delivery cost increase of 5.3% to account for inflation and an increment of schedule maintenance. However, due to recent reductions in transit revenue, several operators have established new policies to hold these annual increases to the rate of inflation, reflected in the previous plan update materials at 3.5%. Based on concerns expressed by PSRC board members that this rate of inflation increase was not sustainable due to external factors that impact service delivery costs, the annual cost increase has been adjusted from 3.5% to 3.7%. For the next Metropolitan Transportation Plan
(MTP) update, local transit providers have agreed to revise the future transit network. The new network will be developed in close coordination with the region’s transportation operators and will make use of updated Transit Tools and models as appropriate. This task will develop a future transit network that:

- Incorporates future land use.
- Includes the assumed (with extensions to Everett, Redmond and Tacoma) high capacity network provided by Sound Transit.
- Addresses future local transit network in proximity to future regional high capacity transit (e.g., whether to truncate certain existing transit network routes, retain some level of duplication within the corridor, or other methods).
- Explores options for optimizing future transit network in a way consistent with recent practice of local transit operators that both improves the MTP and assists transit agencies in planning for long-term future needs.

**System Improvement Reductions.** Currently included direction:

1. Reduce costs from system improvements through cost reductions across all program areas except for Sound Transit and Washington State Ferries.
2. Investment reduction targets of 6.5% for each program (see Table 2).

**TABLE 2: SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT REDUCTION TARGETS (PROJECTS W/ FUNDING REMOVED)**

(millions of year 2008 constant dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>System Expansion Investment</th>
<th>Investment Reduction Target</th>
<th>Revised Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$436</td>
<td>$6,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>$17,300</td>
<td>$1,125</td>
<td>$16,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transit</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT HWY &amp; Ferries</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$1,424</td>
<td>$21,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$468</td>
<td>$6,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>$89,149</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated target necessary to bring costs in alignment with available revenues - 6.5% of System Improvement Total by program

**Sound Transit** In order to update the financial assumptions in Transportation 2040, PSRC staff has been working closely with Sound Transit staff. The proposed Transportation 2040 Update maintains the same assumptions for the Sound Transit program as those in the adopted Transportation 2040 plan, including:

- The operation of all existing Sound Transit services and maintenance/preservation of existing assets
- Full implementation of Sound Transit 2 services and capital projects
- Completing the Link Light Rail “Spine,” including extensions to Everett, Tacoma and Redmond

The Transportation 2040 financial strategy has been updated to reflect:

- Refined Sound Transit 2 project costs and timing per Sound Transit 2 Program Realignment
- A combination of continued collection of current tax authority plus an increment of new authority to fully fund the three Sound Transit program elements described above

**Testing 3 Investment Cost Reduction Scenarios.** System improvement program areas include cities; counties; state highways; local transit; and “other regional programs,” which include port and tribal projects, regional transportation demand management programs, and intelligent transportation system operations. Again, the Transportation Policy Board will review the project lists in September and the analysis results in October.
For consideration:

**Scenario 1: Lowest quartile from Prioritization Process.** Move lowest quartile of Prioritization Scorecard results from the Constrained to the Unprogrammed portion of Transportation 2040.

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

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

Table 3 identifies system improvement cost reductions that are possible through the scenarios. This table includes only projects eligible for Prioritization. Those with funding for stages beyond Preliminary Engineering have been removed.

**TABLE 3: IMPACTS OF IMPLEMENTING FINANCIAL STRATEGY BALANCING APPROACHES (PROJECTS W/ FUNDING REMOVED)**

(millions of year 2008 constant dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>System Expansion Investment</th>
<th>Investment Reduction Target</th>
<th>Revised Total</th>
<th>Scenario 1 - Prioritization - Lowest Quartile</th>
<th>Remaining to Meet Target</th>
<th>Scenario 2 - Prioritization/DOT Right-Sizing</th>
<th>Remaining to Meet Target</th>
<th>Scenario 3 - Third Decade/Project Timing</th>
<th>Remaining to Meet Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$436</td>
<td>$6,265</td>
<td>$439</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$439</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$137</td>
<td>(299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>$17,300</td>
<td>$1,125</td>
<td>$16,176</td>
<td>$267</td>
<td>(858)</td>
<td>$267</td>
<td>(858)</td>
<td>$243</td>
<td>(882)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transit</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT HWY &amp; Ferries</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$1,424</td>
<td>$21,977</td>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td>(314)</td>
<td>$1,379</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>$3,370</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$468</td>
<td>$6,732</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>(435)</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>(435)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(468)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,149</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,849</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,603)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,118</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,334)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>298</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated target necessary to bring costs in alignment with available revenues - 6.5% of System Improvement Total by program

** Note: Undedicated new revenues are generated through assumed fuel tax increases, road usage charges, and highway tolls. Revenue sources should be considered when allocating undedicated revenues.

A hybrid approach may be the best way to balance the financial strategy, since none of the scenarios completely address the shortfall. If, after a scenario or combination of scenarios is selected and the resulting investment reduction still does not meet the targets, programmatic components will be evaluated as one approach to reduce the remaining amount necessary to balance the financial strategy.
## SCENARIO 1: PRIORITY - LOWEST QUARTILE PROJECTS

TRANSPORTATION 2040 REGIONAL CAPACITY PROJECTS IN THE CONSTRAINED PLAN

(projects subject to Prioritization only - these projects are a sub-set of all projects in the T-2040 Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funded Phases*</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>BPA Trail (W Auburn CL to E Auburn CL)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4513</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>White River Trail</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4514</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Williams Trail (White River Trail to Lake Tapps Parkway)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>4056</td>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Bothell Transit Center and Park and Ride</td>
<td>$38,574,989</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4288</td>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>SR 516 – Jenkins Creek to 185th Place SE</td>
<td>$14,478,911</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>SR 410 Widening (244th Ave E - Farman St)</td>
<td>$6,684,831</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>3659</td>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>32nd Ave S - Widening, Nonmotor (Military Rd S - S 320th St)</td>
<td>$7,410,644</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>12th Ave NW/SR900/NW Sammamish Rd Widening</td>
<td>$5,772,202</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>212th Street</td>
<td>$30,173,646</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>4411</td>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>156th St. NE Interchange</td>
<td>$25,759,248</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4410</td>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>SR 529 @ I-5 Half Interchange</td>
<td>$37,849,792</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>2829</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Centennial Trail (Extension through Monroe CL)</td>
<td>$4,299,026</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>2687</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>US Hwy 2 Trail Extension (Monroe CL - SR 203)</td>
<td>$2,521,176</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4010</td>
<td>Mukilteo</td>
<td>Mukilteo Lane Waterfront Access - Parking, Ped Bridge (Park Ave - Mt. Baker X-ing)</td>
<td>$6,713,606</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>3359</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Lake Tapps Pkwy/8th St Bike Path (Interurban Trail to E CL)</td>
<td>$456,671</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>5518</td>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Puget Sound Energy Trail: (Sammamish River Trail - Avondale)</td>
<td>$4,975,966</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>5274</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Westcrest Park Trail</td>
<td>$2,003,586</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>5225</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Puget Park Trail (SW Dakota St to SW Dawson St)</td>
<td>$2,003,586</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>5281</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Woodland Park Trail (N 50th St to W Green Lake Way N)</td>
<td>$2,003,586</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>2676</td>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Meadowbrook Farm Trail Extension (Planned I-90 Trail)</td>
<td>$737,699</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>4460</td>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>Stewart Road (8th Street) Bridge</td>
<td>$10,063,092</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Tukwila Intl Blvd - Widening, Nonmotor (Boeing Access Rd to S 116th St)</td>
<td>$3,763,770</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>E Marginal Way - Widening, Sidewalks (Boeing Access Rd to S 112th St)</td>
<td>$2,452,723</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>New BNSF Intermodal Railyard Access (Tukwila)</td>
<td>$4,284,425</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>3557</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Tukwila Station Access - New arterial (S 156th St to 16th Ave)</td>
<td>$31,615,666</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Tukwila Urban Center Transit Center</td>
<td>$12,545,899</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Proposed Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City Subtotal:** $267,144,739
### SCENARIO 1: PRIORITIZATION - LOWEST QUARTILE PROJECTS

**TRANSPORTATION 2040 REGIONAL CAPACITY PROJECTS IN THE CONSTRAINED PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funded Phases*</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>4556</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Issaquah Hobart Road (I-90 - SR 18)</td>
<td>$100,017</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>4554</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Avondale Road - Capacity, ITS, Pedestrian Improvements (City of Redmond - Woodinville-Duvall Rd)</td>
<td>$42,064,947</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>4562</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Novelty Hill Road</td>
<td>$99,394,228</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4620</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Soos Creek Trail Phase 7 (To SR18)</td>
<td>$2,682,102</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>2273</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Soos Creek Trail, Phase 5 (192nd to Petro)</td>
<td>$3,512,852</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4045</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Tolt Pipeline Trail (NE Big Rock Rd - NE North Fork Rd)</td>
<td>$1,245,262</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4604</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Foothills (Enumclaw Plateau) Trail - White River Bridge</td>
<td>$5,747,361</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4613</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Laughing Jacobs Creek Trail Segment (E Lk Samm Trail - W terminus E Plateau Trail)</td>
<td>$1,724,208</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4602</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Foothills (Enumclaw Plateau) Trail - North</td>
<td>$14,464,192</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Lake to Sound Trail Trail 6</td>
<td>$1,825,190</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4011</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Eastside ERC Trail, Woodinville Spur (NE 124th Street to Woodinville)</td>
<td>$1,685,970</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4044</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Tolt Pipeline Trail (Sammamish River Trail - 104th Ave NE)</td>
<td>$3,352,627</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>East Plateau Trails (Issaquah Highlands to Duthie Hill Park)</td>
<td>$18,104,188</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4028</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Snoqualmie Valley Trail - (Tokul Rd - Reing Rd)</td>
<td>$5,843,150</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4616</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Snoqualmie Regional Connector (Snoqualmie River Bridge to Snoqualmie Valley Trail)</td>
<td>$2,490,523</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4042</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Snoqualmie Valley Trail (Woodinville Duvall Rd - Snohomish CL)</td>
<td>$10,728,407</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4614</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Puget Power (PSE) Trail - East Segment (Ferrel-McWhirter Park - Redmond Ridge)</td>
<td>$6,705,255</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4624</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Tolt Pipeline Trail Bridge over Snoqualmie River (near NE 165th St west of SR 203)</td>
<td>$3,735,785</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4445</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>ERC Trail, Mainline, Woodinville</td>
<td>$16,198,560</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>4622</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Soos Creek Trail (to Lake Youngs Trail)</td>
<td>$383,157</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Milton-Edgewood Interurban Trail</td>
<td>$1,053,856</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Chief Sealth Trail Extension</td>
<td>$1,440,269</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>3647</td>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>Bethel Road/Bethel Ave SE</td>
<td>$6,743,879</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>Canyon Road East Extension</td>
<td>$69,109,288</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>Wollochet Drive NW Widening, Nonmotor (Filmore Dr. - 40th St. NW)</td>
<td>$11,731,408</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>176th St E - New Arterial, Nonmotor (130th Ave E to Calistoga Ave)</td>
<td>$45,595,252</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>Airport Way Widening (SR 9 - Snohomish CL)</td>
<td>$10,863,266</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SCENARIO 1: PRIORITIZATION - LOWEST QUARTILE PROJECTS

TRANSPORTATION 2040 REGIONAL CAPACITY PROJECTS IN THE CONSTRAINED PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bike/Ped</th>
<th>2842</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>Centennial Trail (Snohomish CL - Monroe CL)</th>
<th>$30,359,430</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>Centennial Trail (Snohomish CL - Arlington CL)</td>
<td>$19,850,397</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Subtotal: $438,735,024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funded Phases*</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>5348</td>
<td>Port of Seattle</td>
<td>Hanford &amp; Main SIG’s Entry Gate Improvements (Colorado Ave S to E Marginal Way)</td>
<td>$288,675</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>5350</td>
<td>Port of Seattle</td>
<td>West Marginal Way/Chelan Street/Spokane Street Intersection - Signal Improvements</td>
<td>$561,990</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>3443</td>
<td>Puyallup Tribe</td>
<td>Lister Gulch Nonmotor (Tribal Admin. Center - Portland Ave area)</td>
<td>$58,089</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>5429</td>
<td>Tulalip Tribe</td>
<td>I-5 @ 116th Street NE Interchange (Phase 4, Single Point Urban Interchange)</td>
<td>$31,667,043</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Regional Subtotal: $32,575,797

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funded Phases*</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4409</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 202/Tokul Road Roundabout</td>
<td>$4,290,005</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 522 Widening to Monroe</td>
<td>$85,808,620</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>5535</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5 @ SR 18/161 I/C Triangle Project</td>
<td>$101,589,516</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Conditionally Approved for Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 162 (SR 410 to 96th St E)</td>
<td>$106,478,635</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4091</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5 @ 272nd St I/C</td>
<td>$81,440,576</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4216</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 18 Widening Program over Tiger Mountain</td>
<td>$72,779,923</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4217</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 18</td>
<td>$87,000,765</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>5390</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 518/99: New I/C</td>
<td>$87,453,659</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4416</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 518/Des Moines Memorial Drive Vicinity - I/C Improvements</td>
<td>$65,835,924</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5 Snohomish County North Interchanges</td>
<td>$50,970,255</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3 North Program (SR 305 to SR 104)</td>
<td>$56,726,013</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3: Kinman-Big Valley Rd to SR 104</td>
<td>$27,261,600</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4414</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-90 @ SR 18: Phase 1</td>
<td>$177,535,077</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>5439</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-90 I/C improvements in Issaquah</td>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>5437</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-90</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>4181</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3 (Pioneer Way to Kinman-Big Valley Rd)</td>
<td>$13,311,442</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Subtotal: $1,110,482,010

TOTAL, BOTTOM QUARTILE OF SCORES: $1,848,937,570

* Information sourced from funds programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, or identified by the sponsor via the Prioritization Scorecard or annual survey information.
# SCENARIO 2: WSDOT Right-Sizing and Phasing

(Changes in project scope, cost or status, all other WSDOT projects in the 2040 plan remain unchanged)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>MTP Proposed Status Change</th>
<th>Costs moving from Constrained to Unprogrammed</th>
<th>WS DOT Justification</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>PSRC Priority Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>US 2: Monroe Bypass phases 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$144,000,000</td>
<td>This project did not have a high Benefit/Cost score.</td>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>5390</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 518</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$87,453,659</td>
<td>This interchange was not identified as a high priority in the Route Development Plan for SR 518.</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4307</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 Interchange (Lind half-diamond component)</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4308</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 Interchange (Lind to Talbot frontage roads)</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4309</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 Interchange</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$86,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4315</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 to SR 169 Widening</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4316</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 to SR 169 Widening (Renton Hill access component)</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4317</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 to SR 169 Widening (BNRR and Cedar Bridge crossings)</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4373</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 169 Direct Connection Ramp</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4348</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 520 to SR 522 (NE 70th I/C)</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4346</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 520 to SR 522 (aux lanes)</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4349</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 520 to SR 522 (NE 85th I/C connections and direct access)</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4351</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: NE 85th - NE 124th</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4425</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5/SR 512 Lakewood interchange improvements</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$526,641,436</td>
<td>The I-5 HOV lanes to the SR 512 interchange need to be completed before the interchange is rebuilt.</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4421</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5/JBLM, Berkeley Drive I/C</td>
<td>Proposed Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$82,658,359</td>
<td>Efficient construction sequencing favors completion of other I-5 JBLM corridor improvements in advance of this interchange project.</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4181</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3: Pioneer Way to Kinman-Big Valley Rd</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$13,311,442</td>
<td>Southbound improvements are less urgent than northbound improvements tied to Hood Canal Bridge opening/operations.</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3: SR 304 to Luxe Eagens Blvd - HOV Widening</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$14,883,020</td>
<td>Completion of SR 3/Gorst interchange improvements are the higher priority in this corridor.</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>5422</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3 Gorst to Imperial Way</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$10,900,000</td>
<td>This project responds to long-range growth, the timeline for that growth in demand is uncertain.</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3: SR 305 to SR 104</td>
<td>Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$56,726,013</td>
<td>Completion of SR 3/Gorst interchange improvements are the higher priority in this corridor.</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5/JBLM, 41st Division Dr. I/C</td>
<td>Proposed Candidate to Unprogrammed</td>
<td>$18,352,199</td>
<td>To address near term traffic operation issues other I-5 JBLM corridor improvements should be made first.</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These projects have updated Unprogrammed costs

Total Costs moving from Constrained to Unprogrammed: $1,872,226,310
### Projects right-sized or with major cost adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>MTP Status</th>
<th>&quot;Right Sizing&quot; Cost Changes to Constrained Plan</th>
<th>WSDOT Justification</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>PSRC Priority Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4419</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5/JBLM Dupont-Stellacoom - New Interchange</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>$6,244,123</td>
<td>Efficient construction sequencing favors early completion of this I-5/JBLM project.</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4422</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5/JBLM, Thorne Lane Interchange</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>-$12,021,610</td>
<td>Cost adjustment to reflect the I-5/JBLM corridor plan.</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4423</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5/Thorne Lane to Gravelly Lake Drive - Frontage Road</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>-$2,391,335</td>
<td>Cost adjustment to reflect the I-5/JBLM corridor plan.</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4189*</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5: Gore HOV Widening (SR 512 to SR 16)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>$105,789,755</td>
<td>Revised project description and cost. I-5 South Tacoma HOV - replaces current project description &amp; cost ($312,000,000) - adds $216,000,000</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3: Kinman-Big Valley Rd to SR 104</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Description change</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1803*</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5: Mounts-Old Nesqually Road to 41st Division Drive, JBLM</td>
<td>Unprogrammed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4182</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3/SR 304 Bremerton interchange improvement</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>-$5,333,438</td>
<td>Revised cost estimate - SR 3/SR 304 Bremerton interchange improvement = $11,000,000 MTP identifies cost as $19,000,000 savings of $8,000,000</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These projects include a scope change in addition to any cost changes already noted.

**$92,287,496** (preliminary estimate)

Sum of proposed 'right sizing' cost changes to Constrained Plan

### Projects moved from unprogrammed to the constrained plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>MTP Status</th>
<th>Costs Moving from Unprogrammed to Constrained</th>
<th>WSDOT Justification</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>PSRC Priority Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4382</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 520 Interchange (HOV direct connection ramps)</td>
<td>Unprogrammed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-phases the project by moving a high priority component from unprogrammed to the constrained plan. The cost increase for the constrained plan is reflected in #4383 below.</td>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4383*</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 520 Interchange (HOV direct connection ramps)</td>
<td>Unprogrammed to Candidate</td>
<td>$287,467,397</td>
<td>These ramps connect the SR 520 corridor to the I-405 Express Toll Lane system, this improves system continuity and reduces the interchange bottleneck.</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4194*</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5, 41st Division Drive to Thorne Ln.</td>
<td>Unprogrammed to Candidate</td>
<td>$113,161,769</td>
<td>This project addresses an existing bottleneck on I-5 and is complementary to other high priority JBLM improvements.</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$400,629,166**

Total costs added to constrained plan
### TRANSPORTATION 2040 REGIONAL CAPACITY PROJECTS IN THE CONSTRAINED PLAN

(projects subject to Prioritization only - these projects are a sub-set of all projects in the T-2040 Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funded Phases*</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>4056</td>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Transit Center and Parking Garage (Bothell)</td>
<td>$38,574,989</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>124th Ave NE Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>$38,650,046</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>5518</td>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Puget Sound Energy Trail Improvements</td>
<td>$4,975,966</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>4092</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Seattle Priority Bus Corridor 9: Aurora Village to Downtown via SR 99</td>
<td>$151,347,176</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>5183</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>MLK Jr Way Trail</td>
<td>$5,008,964</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>5229</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Ravenna Ave NE Corridor Trail Improvements</td>
<td>$400,717</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>5274</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Westcrest Park Trail</td>
<td>$2,003,586</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>5281</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Woodland Park Trail</td>
<td>$2,003,586</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City Subtotal:** $242,965,030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funded Phases*</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td>4621</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Soos Creek Trail Phase 8 (SR18-GRT)</td>
<td>$2,203,155</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>East Plateau Trails - Issaquah Highlands to Duthie Hill Park</td>
<td>$18,104,188</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td>4624</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Tol Pipeline Trail Bridge - Snoqualmie River</td>
<td>$3,735,785</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>Canyon Rd E</td>
<td>$55,750,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>176th St E</td>
<td>$45,595,252</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td>5505</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>SR 302 Trail</td>
<td>$11,286,976</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Subtotal:** $136,675,355

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor Category</th>
<th>MTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Funded Phases*</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-5 @ SR 96 / 128th St SW</td>
<td>$96,664,613</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4183</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3 @ SR 304 I/C - Interchange Reconstruction</td>
<td>$48,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 704 - Cross Base Highway, I-5 to Spanaway Loop Rd</td>
<td>$407,147,721</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Conditionally Approved for Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4216</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 18</td>
<td>$72,779,923</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4217</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 18</td>
<td>$87,000,765</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3: SR 304 to Loxie Eagens Blvd - HOV Widening</td>
<td>$14,883,205</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>US 2: Bickford to Monroe</td>
<td>$340,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3: SR 305 to SR 104</td>
<td>$56,726,013</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4184</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 3: SR 16 to SR 304 - HOV Widening</td>
<td>$256,759,848</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4303</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 181 to SR 167 Widening</td>
<td>$86,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4304</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: Green River Crossing</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4305</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 181 I/C</td>
<td>$114,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 Interchange</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>4307</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 Interchange (Lind half-diamond component)</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Scenario 3: Third Decade Projects

## Transportation 2040 Regional Capacity Projects in the Constrained Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>WSDOT</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4308</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 Interchange (Lind to Talbot frontage roads)</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4309</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 Interchange</td>
<td>$86,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4314</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 to SR 169 Widening</td>
<td>$157,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4315</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 to SR 169 Widening</td>
<td>$71,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4316</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 to SR 169 Widening (Renton Hill access component)</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4317</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 167 to SR 169 Widening (BNRR and Cedar Bridge crossings)</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4346</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 520 to SR 522 (aux lanes)</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4348</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 520 to SR 522 (NE 70th I/C)</td>
<td>$200,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4349</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 520 to SR 522 (NE 85th I/C connections and direct access)</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4351</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: NE 85th - NE 124th</td>
<td>$31,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-405 Corridor: SR 169 Direct Connection Ramp</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4429</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 509 Extension (with I-5), Phase 2</td>
<td>$120,431,157</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5324</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>US 2: Trestle Widening - Stage 2</td>
<td>$591,783,589</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5422</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>US 3</td>
<td>$109,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5437</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-90</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5439</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>I-90</td>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Subtotal:** $3,370,176,836  
**TOTAL:** $3,749,817,220

*Information sourced from funds programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, or identified by the sponsor via the Prioritization Scorecard or annual survey information.*
**Item 11:**
2014 Board of Health Work Plan Items

*Discussion Item*

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

**SCA Board of Health Members:**
Issaquah Mayor Ava Frisinger, Kenmore Mayor David Baker, Auburn Councilmember Largo Wales (alternate)

The SCA caucus of the Board of Health is requesting input from PIC members on the 2014 Board of Health Work Plan.

The Board of Health will be determining its 2014 Work Plan in the coming months. The Board of Health Chair, King County Councilmember Joe McDermott, reaches out annually to Board of Health members to aid in creating that work plan. The SCA caucus of the Board of Health is requesting PIC feedback on any work plan items that your city might like to include in the 2014 Work Plan.

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

To find a full list of regulations adopted by the Board of Health from 2000-August 2013, go to [http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/BOH/regulations.aspx](http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/BOH/regulations.aspx). Those regulations address a wide range of public health issues, including the following: requirements for wearing bicycle helmets; prohibiting smoking in public places and places of employment; requiring menu labeling; banning Trans fats in restaurants; and most recently, requiring the creation and operation of a medicine take back program by the pharmaceutical industry.

Attached for your information is the 2013 Board of Health Work Plan. One of the items on the work plan, the continuation of work on a King County Secure Medicine Return regulation, was brought to the Board of Health by Kenmore Mayor Baker and was approved in June, 2013.

In addition to regulations, the Board of Health can approve Guidelines and Recommendation’s, [http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/BOH/guidelines.aspx](http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/BOH/guidelines.aspx). There have been two
occasions recently (both in 2011) where the Board of Health adopted Guidelines and Recommendations:

G&R 11-01 – Planning for Healthy Communities Guidelines; To inform transportation planners working at the regional and county level of government of strategies to improve the health of residents communities throughout King County.

G&R 11-02: Healthy Vending Guidelines; To improve nutritional quality of food and beverages in vending; one strategy to ensure King County residents have healthy food and beverage options where they live, work and play.

Request
SCA’s Board of Health members are requesting input from PIC members on public health-related issues member cities would like to propose for consideration in the 2014 Board of Health Work Plan. Board of Health members will be asked for work plan items at the October 17th Board of Health meeting, and would like to have SCA cities’ suggested items prior to that date.

Attachment

A. 2013 Board of Health Work Plan
2013 King County Board of Health Work Plan

There is increasing evidence that some King County communities are inequitably impacted by poor health, and community-based changes are needed to prevent chronic diseases like those related to obesity and smoking. With the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, there are also new opportunities for public health to have a greater positive impact on the lives of King County residents. The Board of Health work plan focuses on policies and issues that will make the most difference for the most vulnerable of our community members. Some categories for consideration include:

Annual Report to the Board of Health
- Update the Board on current patterns and trends in the health King County

Public Health Financing
- Support maintenance of federal and state public health funding
- Explore innovative funding examples from other states and counties with potential for Board of Health recommendations

Health Care Reform
- Leverage the Board of Health’s influence and support to assure maximum early enrollment in health care coverage for the residents of King County, including the expansion of the Medicaid program in 2014.
- Support efforts to monitor the health system’s capacity and its measurement of coverage and quality of care.
- Encourage and recognize strategies that help county residents take advantage of free preventive services, which were greatly expanded under the Affordable Care Act.
- Access to health care for underserved populations including GLBTQ, ineligible residents and others.
- Community Benefit – Support and accelerate the work to coordinate efforts across King County hospitals to use their community benefit investments for community-based health and wellness interventions

Integration Planning
- Support the development of an integration plan that bridges across clinical services, community-based prevention, and human services in King County in order to reduce inequities and create a healthier, happier population.
- Consider and advise on the impacts to the public’s health of proposed county departmental reorganization and integration options

Secure Medicine Return
- Continue subcommittee work with goal of bringing a rule and regulation for consideration by the full Board

Healthy Eating Active Living (HEAL)
- Revise menu labeling regulations to incorporate required federal changes.
- Educational briefing on sodium
- Healthy school environments

Tobacco Prevention
- Understand how new cannabis law intersects with existing clean air regulations at state and local level

Healthy Housing
- Explore Guideline and Recommendation
  - Include environmental factors that contribute to childhood asthma (CM Lambert’s request)

Public Health Accreditation
- Update on efforts to prepare for accreditation
- Workforce development
EMS Levy Renewal
- Briefing on EMS Levy scheduled to be on the ballot in 2013

Health Care for the Homeless
- Endorse the Governance Plan for the Federal Health Care for the Homeless Health Center Grant

Board of Health Code and Fee Ordinance Maintenance
- Align Title 5 Food-Service Establishments with updated Washington State Food Code
- Align Title 14 Water Recreation Facilities with federal and state standards
- Environmental Health Fee Ordinance

Emerging Issues
- Gun violence
- Overdose prevention and treatment (Naloxone)
Item 12a:  
2012 Highlights  
Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP)  
*Informational Item*

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

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

The purpose of this item is to provide general information about the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program and to share the Program’s 2012 highlights with PIC members.

[Attachment A](#) is a brochure, “Working Together To Reduce Toxics At Home, At Work And In The Environment.” The brochure provides an overview of how residents can protect their businesses, homes and families from toxic materials.

The brochure provides an overview of many of the services the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program provides. King County businesses are eligible for services that could include: in-person assistance; no cost disposal; a cost share plan for work or equipment related to managing hazardous materials; help identifying disposal options and business promotion opportunities such as EnviroStars.

For residents, services provided include: access to the Household Hazards Line; disposing of hazardous materials and products at no cost; home collection services for eligible residents; and access to the “Take It Back Network” for recycling some difficult to dispose of products.

[Attachment B](#) highlights the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program’s activities in 2012.

More information about the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program can be found at [www.hazwastehelp.org](http://www.hazwastehelp.org).

**Attachments**

A. [Working Together To Reduce Toxics At Home, At Work And In The Environment](#)  
B. [2012 Program Highlights](#)
Local governments for health and the environment.

*No cost disposal for hazardous products for King County residents and qualifying businesses.
Managing hazardous materials is important to your employees, the environment and your bottom line. Our hazardous waste services can help you:

- navigate regulations
- find safer chemicals, equipment or practices
- cost share for business improvements
- host multi-language workshops for staff
- access our no-fee disposal
- become an EnviroStar!

In-person assistance
Schedule an appointment or call the Business Waste Line at 206-263-8899 for information.

No cost disposal
For qualifying small businesses at hazardous waste facilities.

Cost share for business improvements
The Voucher Incentive Program offers 50% reimbursement up to $500 for work or equipment related to managing hazardous materials or disposal. Call 206-263-3038.

Help identify disposal options
Waste Characterization can help identify your wastes and determine disposal options. The Waste Directory (Yellow Book) lists contacts, wastes, disposal information, and vendors. Call for a free copy or visit the website below.

Call the Business Waste Line at 206-263-8899 or visit HazWasteHelp.org

These services are paid for in your utility bills: Use them!*  

Technical visits provide individual consulting for your business

Use IMEX, the Industrial Materials Exchange to advertise materials online that you no longer need. Call 206-263-8465, toll-free 1-888-TRY-IMEX, 1-888-879-4639; UseImex.org

Join EnviroStars for business recognition and promotion
The Two–Five Star certification earns your business free marketing and is recognized in five Washington counties. Call 206-263-3063, toll-free 1-877-220-STAR (7827); EnviroStars.org

How can you tell which products in your home are hazardous? If the label says CAUTION, WARNING, DANGER or POISON.

Call the Household Hazards Line for questions on hazardous products, disposal and less toxic alternatives.

Dispose of hazardous products at no cost.* Find city and tribal collection events on the events calendar, and Wastemobile and facility schedules at HazWasteHelp.org

Home collection service is available for eligible seniors or residents with disabilities who don’t drive or have access to a car.

The Take it Back Network has recyclers for fluorescent light bulbs, computers, TVs and mattresses, call 206-296-4466; takeitbacknetwork.org

The Garden Hotline has practical advice on less toxic lawn and garden chemicals and techniques, 206-633-0224; gardenhotline.org

Grow Smart, Grow Safe rates over 600 pesticides, fertilizers and soil amendments to help you find safer products. Visit growsmartgrowsafe.org/

Call the Household Hazards Line at 206-296-4692 or visit HazWasteHelp.org

Alternative formats available
206-263-3050 TTY Relay: 711

Printed on recycled paper. Please recycle.

* Board of Health 2.08.090

Technical visits provide individual consulting for your business

Use IMEX, the Industrial Materials Exchange to advertise materials online that you no longer need. Call 206-263-8465, toll-free 1-888-TRY-IMEX, 1-888-879-4639; UseImex.org

Join EnviroStars for business recognition and promotion
The Two–Five Star certification earns your business free marketing and is recognized in five Washington counties. Call 206-263-3063, toll-free 1-877-220-STAR (7827); EnviroStars.org

Help identify disposal options
Waste Characterization can help identify your wastes and determine disposal options. The Waste Directory (Yellow Book) lists contacts, wastes, disposal information, and vendors. Call for a free copy or visit the website below.

Call the Business Waste Line at 206-263-8899 or visit HazWasteHelp.org

These services are paid for in your utility bills: Use them!*

Technical visits provide individual consulting for your business

Use IMEX, the Industrial Materials Exchange to advertise materials online that you no longer need. Call 206-263-8465, toll-free 1-888-TRY-IMEX, 1-888-879-4639; UseImex.org

Join EnviroStars for business recognition and promotion
The Two–Five Star certification earns your business free marketing and is recognized in five Washington counties. Call 206-263-3063, toll-free 1-877-220-STAR (7827); EnviroStars.org

Help identify disposal options
Waste Characterization can help identify your wastes and determine disposal options. The Waste Directory (Yellow Book) lists contacts, wastes, disposal information, and vendors. Call for a free copy or visit the website below.

Call the Business Waste Line at 206-263-8899 or visit HazWasteHelp.org

These services are paid for in your utility bills: Use them!*

Technical visits provide individual consulting for your business

Use IMEX, the Industrial Materials Exchange to advertise materials online that you no longer need. Call 206-263-8465, toll-free 1-888-TRY-IMEX, 1-888-879-4639; UseImex.org

Join EnviroStars for business recognition and promotion
The Two–Five Star certification earns your business free marketing and is recognized in five Washington counties. Call 206-263-3063, toll-free 1-877-220-STAR (7827); EnviroStars.org

Help identify disposal options
Waste Characterization can help identify your wastes and determine disposal options. The Waste Directory (Yellow Book) lists contacts, wastes, disposal information, and vendors. Call for a free copy or visit the website below.

Call the Business Waste Line at 206-263-8899 or visit HazWasteHelp.org

These services are paid for in your utility bills: Use them!*

Technical visits provide individual consulting for your business

Use IMEX, the Industrial Materials Exchange to advertise materials online that you no longer need. Call 206-263-8465, toll-free 1-888-TRY-IMEX, 1-888-879-4639; UseImex.org

Join EnviroStars for business recognition and promotion
The Two–Five Star certification earns your business free marketing and is recognized in five Washington counties. Call 206-263-3063, toll-free 1-877-220-STAR (7827); EnviroStars.org

Help identify disposal options
Waste Characterization can help identify your wastes and determine disposal options. The Waste Directory (Yellow Book) lists contacts, wastes, disposal information, and vendors. Call for a free copy or visit the website below.

Call the Business Waste Line at 206-263-8899 or visit HazWasteHelp.org

These services are paid for in your utility bills: Use them!*

Technical visits provide individual consulting for your business

Use IMEX, the Industrial Materials Exchange to advertise materials online that you no longer need. Call 206-263-8465, toll-free 1-888-TRY-IMEX, 1-888-879-4639; UseImex.org

Join EnviroStars for business recognition and promotion
The Two–Five Star certification earns your business free marketing and is recognized in five Washington counties. Call 206-263-3063, toll-free 1-877-220-STAR (7827); EnviroStars.org

Help identify disposal options
Waste Characterization can help identify your wastes and determine disposal options. The Waste Directory (Yellow Book) lists contacts, wastes, disposal information, and vendors. Call for a free copy or visit the website below.

Call the Business Waste Line at 206-263-8899 or visit HazWasteHelp.org

These services are paid for in your utility bills: Use them!*

Technical visits provide individual consulting for your business

Use IMEX, the Industrial Materials Exchange to advertise materials online that you no longer need. Call 206-263-8465, toll-free 1-888-TRY-IMEX, 1-888-879-4639; UseImex.org

Join EnviroStars for business recognition and promotion
The Two–Five Star certification earns your business free marketing and is recognized in five Washington counties. Call 206-263-3063, toll-free 1-877-220-STAR (7827); EnviroStars.org

Help identify disposal options
Waste Characterization can help identify your wastes and determine disposal options. The Waste Directory (Yellow Book) lists contacts, wastes, disposal information, and vendors. Call for a free copy or visit the website below.

Call the Business Waste Line at 206-263-8899 or visit HazWasteHelp.org

These services are paid for in your utility bills: Use them!*

Technical visits provide individual consulting for your business

Use IMEX, the Industrial Materials Exchange to advertise materials online that you no longer need. Call 206-263-8465, toll-free 1-888-TRY-IMEX, 1-888-879-4639; UseImex.org

Join EnviroStars for business recognition and promotion
The Two–Five Star certification earns your business free marketing and is recognized in five Washington counties. Call 206-263-3063, toll-free 1-877-220-STAR (7827); EnviroStars.org

Help identify disposal options
Waste Characterization can help identify your wastes and determine disposal options. The Waste Directory (Yellow Book) lists contacts, wastes, disposal information, and vendors. Call for a free copy or visit the website below.
Over 40 city, county, and tribal governments in King County work together to help residents, businesses, organizations and agencies to reduce threats posed from hazardous materials and wastes.

**USE, STORAGE AND EXPOSURE**
Provided services to businesses and residents to reduce exposure at home and at work to hazardous materials, wastes and products.

- **Customer Service Lines** – hazardous waste and disposal information for over 6,200 callers.
- **Garden Hotline** – practical, pesticide-free gardening information for over 17,000 callers.
- **Community information** - tips on reducing hazardous exposures provided to 39,500 residents through workshops, trainings, classes and events.
- **King County families** - over 86,000 received WA state’s Child Profile mailer on preventing toxic exposures.

**Business Site Summary by Project**

- **Businesses** - Almost 600 businesses improved their storage and disposal practices as a result of 826 consulting visits. Over 100 tons of hazardous products and waste moved into safer storage and disposal.

**Collection and Disposal**

- **Disposal** - 1,478 tons of moderate risk waste (MRW) from 46,298 residents and 583 businesses and schools.

**2012 MRW Collections by Site**

- City and Tribal events collected 116 tons of MRW from more than 29,000 residents.
UPSTREAM
Continued efforts to promote producer responsibility for hazardous products.
• Defended Mercury Lighting Product Stewardship Law from potential lighting industry efforts to erode the producer responsibility provisions.
• Supported TakeItBackNetwork.org fluorescent lighting returns to reduce mercury; 176,440 lights collected.
• Staffed King County Board of Health in researching options for a countywide secure medicine return program.

Pharmaceutical Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Year</th>
<th>Pounds Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- DEA Events  Law Enforcement  Bartells  Group Health

• Supported medicine take-back programs in King County at some Bartell Drugs, Group Health Cooperative, law enforcement offices, and Drug Enforcement Administration Take Back Days (TakeBackYourMeds.org).

PROGRAM SUPPORT
• Implemented 2011 Service Equity Policy with staff training, resources and pilot projects including Latino outreach, nail salons (Vietnamese), janitors (Hispanic and immigrant), indoor pesticides (low income), dry cleaners (Korean), and supporting the Environmental Justice Network in Action (EJNA) project.
• Improved technology for project planning, management and reporting.

FINANCIAL
Services are funded through sewer and solid waste fees. In 2012, we spent $12,734,644 on service delivery.

2012 Expenditures by Implementing Agency

- King County Solid Waste 21%
- Seattle Public Utilities 21%
- City & Tribes 4%
- King County Water & Land 36%
- Other 0%

2012 Expenditures by Mission Area

- Use, Storage & Exposure 43%
- Collection & Disposal 51%
- Upstream Work 6%

Local Hazardous Waste Management Program in King County, Washington

150 Nickerson Street, Suite 100, Seattle, WA 98109-1634
Phone: 206-263-3050  Fax: 206-263-3070
HazWasteHelp.org

Alternative formats available
206-263-3050  TTY Relay: 711
Item 12b:
2014 Call for Nominations to Regional Boards and Committees

Informational Item

SCA Staff Contact
Kristy Burwell, Administrative Manager, SCA@soundcities.org; 206-433-7168

Background
Sound Cities Association (SCA) makes appointments to 26 regional boards and committees. For 2014, there will be open seats on 22 boards and committees. The attached Nomination Form lists those boards and committees with open seats, and the number of seats available on each.

For detailed information about each committee, please refer to: http://soundcities.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/2013-appointments-booklet.pdf. This guide contains helpful information about each committee, including: the roles and responsibilities of each committee; the dates, times, and location of committee meetings; the SCA staff person responsible for each committee; and the 2013 representatives and alternates to each committee.

Nominations for 2014 board and committee appointments are due no later than October 18, 2013. All interested members (including those currently serving on boards and committees) must submit a nomination form in order to be considered for appointment. Due to term limits and retirements, many committees will not have incumbent members reapplying this year.

Applications for boards and committees are reviewed by the PIC Nominating Committee, which is comprised of one representative from each SCA Caucus (South, North, South Valley, and Snoqualmie Valley). The PIC Nominating Committee considers a variety of factors in making appointments. Some boards and committees have specific requirements for appointments. The committee also strives to maintain balanced geographic distribution, and a balance of membership from large and small cities. The background and interest level of applicants is considered, as is the applicant’s past service on boards and committees. The committee also looks to balance the need for institutional knowledge and expertise with a desire to obtain fresh perspectives and new voices. SCA values diversity, and strives to create an inclusive environment. All SCA members are encouraged to apply for boards and committees.

The Nominating Committee recommends a slate of appointments to the SCA Public Issues Committee (PIC), which in turn submits recommendations for appointments to the SCA Board of Directors for approval.
To apply for a board or committee, complete and submit an application (Attachment A) including the nomination form, and a statement of interest, via email to SCA@SoundCities.org on or before the October 18, 2013 deadline.

**Important Dates for 2014 Board and Committee Appointments:**

- Deadline for nominations to 2014 boards and committees - **October 18, 2013**
- PIC Nominating Committee forwards recommended slate of appointees to PIC - **November 6, 2013**
- PIC makes a recommendation to the Board of Directors - **November 13, 2013**
- SCA Board of Directors finalizes appointments - **December 18, 2013**
- Board and Committee Appointee Orientation - **January 2014**

If you have questions about the application process, please contact SCA Executive Director Deanna Dawson at Deanna@SoundCities.org or (206) 433-7170. For additional information about specific committees, please contact SCA policy analysts Monica Whitman at Monica@SoundCities.org, (206) 433-7169, or Doreen Booth at Doreen@SoundCities.org, (206) 433-7147.

**Attachment**

A. [Application – 2014 SCA Board and Committee Appointments]
2014 CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
Appointments to Regional Boards and Committees

Sound Cities Association (SCA) makes appointments or recommends for appointment to 26 regional boards and committees. For 2014, there will be open seats on 22 boards and committees (please see attached).

For detailed information about each committee, please refer to:

This guide contains helpful information about each committee, including: the roles and responsibilities of each committee; the dates, times, and location of committee meetings; the SCA staff person responsible for each committee; and the 2013 representatives to each committee.

Nominations for 2014 board and committee appointments are due October 18, 2013. All interested members (including those currently serving on boards and committees) must submit a nomination form in order to be considered for appointment.

Applications for boards and committees are reviewed by the PIC Nominating Committee, which is comprised of one representative from each SCA Caucus (South, North, South Valley, and Snoqualmie Valley). The PIC Nominating Committee considers a variety of factors in making appointments. Some boards and committees have specific requirements for appointments. The committee also strives to maintain balanced geographic distribution, and a balance of membership from large and small cities. The background and interest level of applicants is considered, as is the applicant’s past service on boards and committees. The committee also looks to balance the need for institutional knowledge and expertise with a desire to obtain fresh perspectives and new voices. SCA values diversity, and strives to create an inclusive environment. All SCA members are encouraged to apply for boards and committees. The Nominating Committee recommends a slate of appointments to the SCA Public Issues Committee (PIC), which in turn submits recommendations for appointments to the SCA Board of Directors for approval.

Deadline for nominations to 2014 boards and committees
PIC Nominating Committee forwards recommended slate of appointees to PIC
PIC makes a recommendation on the slate to the Board of Directors
SCA Board of Directors finalizes 2014 board and committee appointments
Board and Committee Appointee Orientation

Please submit your completed nomination form via email to sca@soundcities.org on or before the October 18, 2013 deadline.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Committee Name</th>
<th># of Seats</th>
<th>Nominee’s Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Policy Committee (RPC)</td>
<td>4M / 2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transit Committee (RTC)</td>
<td>8M / 4A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC)</td>
<td>4M / 2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Executive Board</td>
<td>3M / 3A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Operations Committee</td>
<td>1M / 1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Growth Management Policy Board (GMPB)</td>
<td>3M / 3A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Transportation Policy Board (TPB)</td>
<td>3M / 3A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Economic Development District Board (EDD) *</td>
<td>2M / 2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other King County Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC)</td>
<td>6M / 4A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Law, Safety, and Justice Committee (RLSJ)</td>
<td>6M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Consortium Joint Recommendations Committee for CDBG (JRC)</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee (KCFCDAC) *</td>
<td>4M / 4A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Coordinating Committee (LHWMP)</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Health (BoH)</td>
<td>2M / 1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Initiative (DVI)</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Action Area Caucus Group (SCAACG)</td>
<td>2M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive Appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Advisory Committee (EMAC)</td>
<td>1M / 1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(electeds or staff) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) *</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness &amp; Drug Dependency Oversight Committee (MIDD) *</td>
<td>1M / 1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Council (EDC) (formerly enterpriseSeattle) – City must be EDC Investor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Regional Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) (staff) *</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Advisory Council to End Homelessness in King County (IAC) (staff) *</td>
<td>1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates that this appointment is for a multi-year term. Two-year terms: EDDB, KCFCDAC, CEH, and MIDD. Three-year terms: EMAC, AFIS, and IAC.
Please provide a statement detailing your interest in, background, and qualifications for each position.