1. **Welcome and Roll Call**
Mia Gregerson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Twenty-five cities had representation ([Attachment A](#)). Guests present included: Diane Carlson, King County Executive’s office; Pam Elardo, King County Wastewater Treatment Division; Sharman Herrin, King County Wastewater Treatment Division; Joyce Nichols, City of Bellevue; Michelle Clark, King County Councilmember Larry Gossett’s office; and Don Davidson, City of Bellevue Council.

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

3. **Approval of the April 10, 2013 Minutes**
Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Jim Haggerton, Tukwila, to approve the June 12, 2013 meeting minutes.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Chair’s Report**
Chair Gregerson recently traveled to Washington D.C. for the National League of Cities (NLC) Annual Conference. Gregerson praised Senator Patty Murray for her leadership as chair of the Senate Budget Committee. Murray’s staff will be releasing a draft report on the budget this month. There are a number of federal budget issues that will have an impact on cities.

Gregerson spoke about our nation’s lack of preparedness for epidemic outbreaks, as well as the staggering incidence of women veterans experiencing homelessness, the rate of which has nearly doubled in recent years. Gregerson also encouraged cities to participate in Youth Master Planning, creating opportunities for municipal leadership to make children, youth, and family issues a community-wide priority.

The 2013 Annual NLC Conference will be held November 13, 2013 – November 16, 2013 at the Washington State Convention Center in Seattle. Mayor Odell, Sammamish encouraged members to attend, noting that there will be a special discounted rate for first time attendees.
5. Executive Director’s Report
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, reported on the Association of Washington Cities Annual Conference. The conference was well attended by SCA member cities. ED Dawson highlighted the many valuable networking opportunities these conferences provide, particularly with members throughout the state that are facing similar issues. Jennifer Hooper, former SCA intern from The Evergreen State College, presented at the conference on citizen engagement. A copy of her presentation is available online at www.awcnet.org/portals/0/documents/training/materials/conference/2013/36CivicEngagementHooperPPT.pdf.

ED Dawson reported on the close of the legislative session. Chair Gregerson requested details regarding the impact of the state budget on cities. ED Dawson noted that additional information and analysis will be transmitted in the coming weeks from the AWC; in the meantime, she provided a high level summary. The state budget was balanced in part by cutting close to one quarter of a billion dollars in funds for cities. Most of the Public Works Trust Fund is gone. The legislature also severely cut the amount of liquor taxes used by cities to fund public safety. This is a huge hit for cities at a time when liquor sales and the number of retail outlets are increasing, in addition to public safety challenges resulting from marijuana legalization.

ED Dawson spoke about the extreme disappointment throughout the region in reaction to the absence of a statewide funding package for transportation. SCA leadership recently met with Executive Constantine to discuss potential next steps. The Executive is committed to continuing the partnership with cities and the business community, seeking a transportation package that will fund both roads and transit.

ED Dawson reported that the call for nominations will be coming out soon. She noted that there is going to be a lot of turnover this year. ED Dawson encouraged members to reach out to SCA staff and/or begin attending committee meetings. A list of regional boards and committee appointments can be found on SCA’s website www.soundcities.org/2013-regional-boards-and-committee-appointments. ED Dawson thanked the PIC Nominating Committee for their hard work and encouraged members to apply to serve on the Nominating Committee if interested.

ED Dawson announced that, in response to requests from the PIC, SCA staff has investigated the possibility of an alternate location for an upcoming PIC meeting. The November PIC meeting can be held in Kirkland, if PIC members are interested. PIC members expressed support for this proposal.

ED Dawson noted that staff is planning on holding a PIC meeting in August, which will include a pre-PIC workshop on solid waste transfer station plan updates. PIC members expressed support for meeting in August.

ED Dawson spoke about the Executive’s Healthcare Enrollment Campaign, an effort to enroll uninsured residents in King County. ED Dawson passed out a fact sheet: “Coverage is Here” King County (Attachment B), provided by the King County Executive’s office. As part of this
effort, a group has been formed to provide outreach; Chair Gregerson will be representing cities.

ED Dawson also updated members on the Executive’s Health and Human Services Transformation Plan. PIC Chair Gregerson expressed support for SCA being involved in the process moving forward.

ED Dawson called attention to the ‘Did You Know?’ section of the agenda. This month the agenda highlighted the work of the Regional Food Policy Council. Chair Gregerson and Tukwila City Councilmember De’Sean Quinn will be presenting on the recent work of the Regional Food Policy Council at the August meeting of the PIC.

This matter came to the PIC at the recommendation of the SCA Caucus of the Regional Policy Committee (RPC), who asked the PIC to consider adopting a public policy position supporting consideration of waste-to-energy options as the Solid Waste Division conducts updates to the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. At the June 12, 2013 PIC meeting, the PIC voted unanimously to bring back this public policy position for action at the July meeting.

ED Dawson reported that the Solid Waste Division is moving forward on a Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study, which will help to inform the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan updates.

Pete Lewis, Auburn, moved, seconded by Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, to recommend the following policy position to the SCA Board of Directors:

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

Mayor Lewis commented that many of the issues regarding solid waste the RPC has addressed this year are intertwined. SCA RPC members have done an excellent job representing the interests of all cities. He thanked his fellow committee members and SCA staff for their efforts.

Mayor Talmas, Woodinville commented on the critical need for a more intensive study, noting SCA’s role in moving this process forward. Councilmember Ockerlander concurred, adding that this is a great opportunity to discover ways of doing things better in the future.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. Water Quality Assessment Scope of Work
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst reported that in 2012, SCA was briefed on the Combined Sewer Overflow Control (CSO) Plan. The Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study, required by King County Ordinance 17413 (adopting the CSO Plan) was presented to the
Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC) at their June meeting. The SCA caucus was not comfortable with the range of costs ($2.25M - $5M) for the Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study. The caucus also found that the scope of work did not contain sufficient information to assess the costs and study components. Since then, SCA staff has been working with the King County Wastewater Treatment Division to address the caucus’s concerns and to provide additional detail and analysis.

Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, moved, seconded by Jamie Perry, Kent, to bring forward to the next meeting of the PIC the following potential policy position:

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.

Councilmember Rheaume, Bothell questioned whether the division would be utilizing other water quality monitoring efforts already underway in the region. He also questioned what the outcome of the study would be. Pam Elardo, Director of the King County Wastewater Treatment Division responded that they will be compiling information from other agencies; the study is intended to fill the gaps. Elardo also spoke about specific elements of the study required by the CSO program update and the opportunity for potential savings if the study were to result in the re-sequencing of projects. Mayor Hill inquired if there were cost savings as a result of the study, whether ratepayers would see a reduction in rates. Elardo confirmed that would be the case.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Solid Waste – Transfer Station Plan
ED Dawson reported that since the approval of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan, tonnage at transfer stations has decreased due to the economic downturn, and changes in technology and behavior. In addition, the City of Bellevue has
declined to sign the extended interlocal agreement with King County, and will therefore not be a part of the system after 2028.

In response to these changes, the SCA Board adopted a public policy position on April 17, 2013 requesting that the Solid Waste Division (SWD) conduct a review of the Plan, and update the Plan as appropriate.

In response to a request for clarification from the SWD, on June 11, 2013 the SCA Board sent a follow up letter to Chris Eggen, Chair of Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) and to the SWD (Attachment C).

The King County Council has now also asked the SWD to review the Plan. At the July 2, 2013 Budget and Fiscal Management (BFM) Committee meeting, the BFM recommended a budget proviso requiring a review of the Plan that is closely aligned with the SCA request for review. ED Dawson highlighted that this is not just a box checking exercise. The Council and Executive have expressed support for conducting a thorough review of and update to the plan.

An update to the plan could result in fewer facilities being built and/or less costly facilities being constructed, and substantial savings to the region as a result. A handout was distributed to PIC members (Attachment D), which included an overview of what the review might include. The plan will include feedback from the Regional Policy Committee, SCA, MSWMAC, and SWAC. There will also be workshops with a chance for in depth review and feedback. As part of the proviso, the SWD will be required to document outreach and feedback.

ED Dawson noted that this review is on a very compressed time schedule. Dawson requested feedback from SCA members on what scenarios the review should and should not include. SCA staff is also planning a pre-PIC workshop on the Plan review for August.

Mayor Lewis commented that RPC members inquired about flexibility and timing. The division was very upfront that they do have permits for a certain period of time; however, they can be extended. Lewis reinforced the need to look at plans post 2006/2007. He is supportive of having technical staff working on this review.

Councilmember Nixon, Kirkland spoke about Bellevue’s withdrawal from system. He noted that Bellevue currently doesn’t require their residents to pay for garbage service, approximately 15% self-haul. If Bellevue continues to allow their residents to self-haul, cities paying into the system will be subsidizing Bellevue.

Councilmember Margeson, Redmond thanked the RPC for helping to push this forward. He added that it is important that MSWMAC, SWAC, RPC, and PIC deliver a consistent message. He expressed concern that the timeframe is rushed. Redmond supports full recycling capacity at each station.

Chair Gregerson expressed concern that compost isn’t being tested.
ED Dawson complimented Deputy Mayor Eggen for his participation in this process. SCA has benefited greatly from his leadership and expertise.

9. **King County Flood Control District 2014 Work Program and Budget**

Monica Whitman, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reminded members that this item was a continuation from the PIC discussion that occurred on June 12, 2013.

The King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee (KCFCDAC) reviews and recommends an annual work program and budget for the district, including capital improvement program projects and funding levels. A report must be transmitted to the Flood Control District Board by August 31, 2013.

Whitman prepared a memo ([Attachment E](#)) based on feedback received from cities following the last meeting of the PIC. In recent years, a substantial amount of policy input/direction has been provided to the Board of Supervisors by a Citizens Advisory Committee (formed to provide comment on the King County Flood Hazard Management Plan Update) and the Basin Technical Committees, bypassing the KCFCDAC.

Councilmember Roberts, Shoreline stated that his council had a healthy discussion and identified two areas of concern. First, there should be extra funding devoted to urban streams and seawall replacement. There also needs to be a competitive process for cities that have these issues and are currently unable to compete based on the general risk assessment. Secondly, the council is not sold on FEMA accreditation being priority of the district. No river can be entirely safe. Making accreditation a priority could be detrimental to the regions efforts.

Councilmember Mhoon, Covington commented that the Covington City Council agrees with the current priorities established by King County.

Mayor Lewis commented on the fact that information has been given to the Board of Supervisors that the KCFCDAC hasn’t seen. He noted that King County staff wants to work with us, and there appears to be a path moving forward. He also commented that FEMA accreditation isn’t a perfect standard. Uncertified levies impact thousands of property owners’ flood insurance rates, as well as, the ability to sell their homes/businesses.

Mayor Berger, Carnation is generally supportive of the Flood Control District. He commented that Carnation has a huge land mass and a huge amount of water with very few residents. He is supportive of a regional approach to funding projects.

Mayor Haggerton, Tukwila commented on the Citizens Advisory Committee which was first mentioned to the KCFCDAC a couple months ago, this came as a total surprise. The Flood Control District has been operating very well over last few years. He is leery of any changes to the governance structure of the district, particularly at a time when a new Executive Director will be coming onboard.
Councilmember Perry, Kent commented that the standards for ranking projects should be updated more frequently. Kent would like the priority of the district to be more clearly stated: protecting people first, life safety, and neighborhoods. Also, the severity and consequences of flooding should be taking into consideration. In response to FEMA accreditation, Perry stated that it is possible. Kent is requesting revisions of FEMA maps based on a substantial amount of work that's already been completed. If they don’t receive FEMA accreditation, there will be detrimental effects on our regional economy, particularly the Ports. Development improvements will cost substantially more. The Kent Valley is the primary industrial and manufacturing center in the region. Kent’s substantial investment in accreditation should be factored into the equation.

Whitman will share the PIC’s feedback with the SCA KCFCDAC Caucus prior to their next meeting.

10. Informational Items
Chair Gregerson asked that members take the informational item included in their packets back to their councils and contact SCA know if there are any questions. Informational item include: PSRC Transportation 2040 – Decision Point B.

11. Upcoming Events
a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee Meeting – Wednesday, August 14, 2013, 7:00 p.m. at Renton City Hall
b) SCA Pre-PIC Workshop: Solid Waste – Wednesday, August 14, 2013, 6:00 p.m. at Renton City Hall
c) Future SCA Networking Dinners:
   • Wednesday, September 25, 2013, 5:30 p.m. at the TPC Snoqualmie Ridge Golf Club, Snoqualmie – SCA will be joined by Attorney General Bob Ferguson
   • Wednesday, November 20, 2013, 5:30 p.m. 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
ED Dawson reported that SCA is still looking for a sponsor for the upcoming September Dinner. (NOTE: The dinner has now been sponsored. Thanks to Foster Pepper PLLC for their support of SCA!)

Mayor Odell shared Sammamish’s success this 4th of July. The Sammamish City Council passed a strict ordinance on fireworks including a $500 fine if in possession of fireworks and a $1000 fine for setting them off. The City did a lot of education and outreach, very few citations were given and compliance was high.

PIC members highlighted the following upcoming events:
• Mercer Island will be having their Summer Celebration July 13 and 14. Summer celebration will include fireworks, a parade, and the dedication of Aubrey Davis Park.
• Redmond Derby Days begins Friday July 12 at 6pm at city hall. This will be 73rd derby days.
• Kirkland will be celebrating Kirkland Uncorked July 19 – July 24.
• Timber! Outdoor Music Festival in Carnation will be July 26 and 27. Music, camping, and more!
• Saturday, July 13 is Pacific Days. Algona Days will be the following week! Featuring a parade and hamster balls.
• Cornucopia Days in Kent begins Friday, July 12. Featuring over 600 booths and dragon boat races.
• Duvall’s 1st Annual SnoRiver Rock Concert & Lighter than Air Fare will take place on August 3. Music, sandcastles, a redo of the rock festival in the 60s, beer garden, and the famous piano drop!

ED Dawson encouraged members to send event information for the SCA website and social media.

Chair Gregerson thanked Whitman for her work organizing two successful workshops for SCA Regional Transit Committee caucus members.

13. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.
## 2013 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting
*July 10, 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>MJ Durkan</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 Rheume</td>
<td>Tom Agnew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Jerry Robison</td>
<td>Bob Edgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>Jim Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Marlla Mhoon</td>
<td>Margaret Harto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Matt Pina</td>
<td>Melissa Musser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Amy Ockerlander</td>
<td>Will Ibershof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Liz Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Jeanne Burbidge</td>
<td>Dini Duclos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Fred McConkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Paul Winterstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Jamie Perry</td>
<td>Dennis Higgins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td>Amy Walen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Layne Barnes</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Tana Senn</td>
<td>Bruce Bassett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Jim Manley</td>
<td>Debra Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Lisa Jensen</td>
<td>Rich Crispo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Shawn McEvoy</td>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Ken Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>John Stilin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Rich Zwicker</td>
<td>Ed Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Tom Odell</td>
<td>Ramiro Valderrama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Mia Gregerson</td>
<td>Barry Ladenburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Chris Eggen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Kingston Wall</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Jim Haggerton</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td>Kimberly Matej</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie 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.
Fact Sheet

Coverage is Here King County
Increasing access to health coverage in King County

This fall we have an opportunity to enroll about 180,000 uninsured King County residents in free or low-cost health insurance. King County has made it a countywide priority to ensure the enrollment of all residents who are newly eligible for health coverage.

The opportunity
The Affordable Care Act will significantly improve people’s ability to access health insurance.

- **Medicaid** will expand by increasing the income eligibility to 138% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). This means many childless adults will become eligible for the first time.
- Our state’s **Health Benefit Exchange**, Washington Healthplanfinder, will give consumers and small businesses a new way to find, compare and enroll in affordable health insurance.
- **Employers** with more than 50 employees will be required to provide health insurance. Small business will receive tax incentives to provide insurance to their staff.

King County’s approach
King County is taking a leadership role to maximize the enrollment and retention of all residents who will be newly eligible for health coverage. Our approach will involve:

- Providing enrollment assistance to King County residents, especially those who need extra help understanding the process.
- Leveraging partnerships to maximize our reach in the community.
- Broad communication and outreach to businesses and the general public to increase awareness of new coverage options.

In addition, King County Executive Dow Constantine has convened a **Leadership Circle** to champion enrollment. The group consists of prominent community leaders from local business, health and community-based organizations, education, cities, media and other sectors, all of whom have made a commitment to engage their respective constituencies.

For more information, visit www.kingcounty.gov/health/reform.
Health insurance access in King County

**Coverage is Here King County: Our best opportunity to address health inequity**

Wide disparities exist in King County related to place, race/ethnicity, education and income. In fact, King County has some of the greatest disparities in the U.S. in a number of determinants of health, including health coverage.

- In King County, low income households are 16 times more likely to be uninsured than higher income households. This disparity is most extreme relative to other large US counties.

- Lack of health insurance is much more common in some communities. For example, 26% of residents in Des Moines and Normandy Park are uninsured, while only 2% of residents in Mercer Island are uninsured.
June 11, 2013

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

Dear Chair Eggen:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Cc: SCA Board of Directors
SCA Public Issues Committee
Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Pat McLaughlin, Division Director, King County Solid Waste Division
Kevin Kiernan, Assistant Division Director, King County Solid Waste Division
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison, King County Solid Waste Division
Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks Director
Given recent trends, the economic downturn and potential changes in users of the system in the future, it is timely to conduct a review of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan. A meaningful review of the planned facilities will help to ensure that approaching planned actions still meet the needs and interest of the system beneficiaries. This document seeks to outline at a high level a recommended approach for carrying out the review in a collaborative, transparent, and effective manner.

**Purpose of Review**

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

**Guiding Principles**

- The system shall maximize ratepayer value and ensure that residents of King County have access to efficient and reliable regional solid waste handling and disposal services at rates as low as reasonably possible, consistent with sound financial and environmental stewardship.
- Future system facilities will be designed to provide flexibility to accommodate changes in growth, anticipated future customer needs, and future waste disposal options and technologies.
- The system complies with all applicable state and federal law, including requirements for storage for disasters.
- This review will comply with the requirements of ORDINANCE 2013-0258, VERSION 2 as amended and adopted on July 8, 2013.

**Assumptions**

1. Given the significant prior work undertaken to develop the Transfer System Plan, the scope of this plan review will be limited to key issues that have the most potential to impact costs of the remaining planned facilities. The evaluation will identify impacts associated with change scenarios as compared with existing criteria.
2. The recommendations received from stakeholders will inform recommendations that SWD makes regarding potential changes to the plan.

**Process Overview**

1. The purpose of the process is to review transfer station options and resulting impacts to cost and service. The result will be to inform any necessary changes to the current plans for the Factoria, South County, and Northeast county projects.
2. SWD workshop meetings will be held on the fourth Friday in July, August, and September and open to all interested parties including MSWMAC, SWAC, city staff, business partners and interested citizens.
3. SWD will utilize MSWAC and SWAC as the primary bodies to provide information, seek input and obtain feedback and recommendations. In addition to the workshop meetings, SWD will provide updates to the advisory committees during their normally scheduled meetings, and provide briefings to others such as the Regional Policy Committee and Sound Cities Association PIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July</th>
<th>August-September</th>
<th>October-November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• MSWAC and SWAC review proposed process</td>
<td>• MSWAC and SWAC review data, discuss options, and evaluate impacts.</td>
<td>• Executive presents draft report to stakeholders by October 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional briefings to PIC and RPC</td>
<td>• Pre PIC workshop in August</td>
<td>• Executive presents final report to Council by November 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RPC September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SWD finalizes analysis and develops recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions that will be answered as a result of the process:

1. Given the current tonnage projections through 2040 and requirements of capacity for storage for disasters, what are our options for reconfiguring our Transfer Station system with the remaining decisions to be made? (i.e.: If we build Factoria, will we need a Northeast facility as well or could the volume be absorbed by the other stations? What about South County?)
2. What are the major cost drivers in the construction of these new facilities and what options are there to reduce those expenses?
3. What current policy decisions could be modified to reduce our capital or operating expense at a new facility? (i.e.; self haul, recycling, emergency storage, etc.)
4. What are the customer impacts associated with any given change in terms of cost and service? (i.e.: tipping fees, collection costs, and wait time)

Data to be considered in the review includes:

1. The identified issues and recommendations noted in the 2011 “King County Performance Audit of Solid Waste Transfer Station Capital Projects” will be reconciled to the current/planned status.
2. The items to consider noted in the 2007 “Independent, Third Party Review of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export Plan” will be reconciled to the current/planned status.
3. Tonnage projections through 2040 will consider the potential changes in use based on cities committing to remain in the system.
4. For any given system configuration and transfer station features reviewed during this effort, calculations will be estimated for;
   a. System cost per ton
   b. Operating cost by transfer station
   c. Transfer station capacity utilization in 2040 for tonnage and transactions
5. “What If” scenarios will be run for go/no-go and capacity decisions of the South County, Factoria, and Northeast County facilities. Financial, environmental, and service impacts will be estimated based on the various scenarios.
MEMO

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

FROM:  Monica Whitman, Senior Policy Analyst

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

DATE:  July 3, 2013

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Not necessary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

5. Should the 2012 resolution approving the sandbag removal expenditures on the Green be amended?
No response

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

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