1. **Welcome and Roll Call**
PIC Chair Council President Ed Prince, Renton, called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM. 30 cities had representation [Attachment A](#). Guests present included Council President Angela Birney, Redmond (PIC Alternate); Liz Tennant, King County Local Hazardous Waste Management Program; Lynda Ransley, King County Local Hazardous Waste Management Program; Michael Huddleston, King County Council staff; Jenny Huston, King County Executive’s Office staff; Michael Murphy, King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks staff; Councilmember Hank Myers, Redmond; and Councilmember Matt Mahoney, Des Moines.

2. **Public Comment**
Chair Prince asked if any member of the public had any public comment. Councilmember Carol Simpson, Newcastle, commented that the Newcastle library is sponsoring a civic discussion on how small city governments are run. She distributed a handout [Attachment B](#). There was no further public comment.

3. **Approval of the January 10, 2018 Minutes**
The Chair asked if the group had reviewed the January PIC minutes and would like to approve them.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, moved, seconded by Mayor Christie Malchow, Sammamish, to approve the January 10, 2018 PIC minutes. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Chair’s Report**
Chair Prince reminded committee members to RSVP for meetings. He also asked the committee to let staff know if they would like a printed packet with the meeting materials in advance. He informed the group that staff will assume that an electronic copy is sufficient unless a printed copy is requested.

The Chair reported that SCA representatives had met with Mayor Jenny Durkan of Seattle. He noted that he is looking forward to her attendance at the SCA Networking event on February 28. He let the group know that the new board and commission appointee orientation went well. The Chair also noted that SCA leadership had met with County Executive Dow Constantine. He shared that they had discussed the Regional Transportation System Initiative (RTSI), solid waste, and the Land Conservation Initiative.
5. Executive Director’s Report
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, gave an update on One Table, an initiative co-chaired by Executive Constantine, Auburn Mayor Nancy Backus, and Seattle Mayor Jenny Durkan to focus on root causes of homelessness, including lack of affordable housing, behavioral health, the child welfare system, the criminal justice system, and workforce development. Work groups have been formed around each of those areas and will be meeting regularly over the next three months to develop recommended actions. In addition to Mayor Backus, SCA is represented on One Table by Bellevue Mayor John Chelminiak, Kent Mayor Dana Ralph, PIC Chair Ed Prince of Renton, and SCA President Mayor Amy Walen of Kirkland. SCA will host a pre-PIC workshop on One Table in March.

Dawson gave an update on the Regional Transportation System Initiative (RTSI). A second convening of elected officials was held on February 2, 2018 at the Mercer Island Community Center. SCA leadership discussed next steps with Executive Constantine earlier on February 14. The group recognized that good work had been done to identify a network of regional roads, and the $7-8 billion gap between current revenue and needs of the system. At the meeting on February 2, cities identified that the transportation system is broader than just the roads network, and includes bike/ped and transit. Additionally, many cities noted the need to engage with Pierce and Snohomish County on efforts. The work done to date will help guide SCA and King County in planning at PSRC in the T2040 financial strategy, and will also give cities an ability to communicate with legislators about regional transportation needs.

Dawson gave an update on discussions around Regional Economic Development, and noted that the EDC Board had voted to proceed with forming a Regional Economic Development Alliance at its Board meeting on February 8.

Dawson noted that the SCA Board held a retreat on January 19, 2018.

6. Joint Recommendations Committee Appointment
PIC Nominating Committee Chair Leanne Guier provided a report on the February 6, 2018 meeting of the PIC Nominating Committee. The PIC Nominating Committee met to consider applications for one vacancy on the Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC). The PIC Nominating Committee recommended that Councilmember Chris Ross, Sammamish be appointed as a member to the JRC.

Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific, seconded by Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors that Councilmember Chris Ross, Sammamish, be appointed to the JRC.

Mayor Christie Malchow, Sammamish, spoke in support of Councilmember Ross.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. King County Land Conservation Initiative
Brian Parry, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported on the King County Land Conservation Initiative. The King County Land Conservation Initiative was proposed by County Executive Constantine in March 2016 with the goal to “protect the remaining high conservation value lands and secure our regional trail network within 30 years.”

An Advisory Group was convened in September 2016 to review the Executive’s Land Conservation and Preservation Work Plan, and the Advisory Group transmitted its final recommendations on December 29, 2017. The final report identifies goals and strategies to protect and maintain approximately 65,000 acres of “high conservation value lands.” The Advisory Group recommended funding the Initiative through an increase to the Conservation Futures Tax levy from its current rate of approximately $0.04 per thousand of assessed value to the statutory maximum of $0.0625. Increasing the levy rate would require voter approval. In addition, the Advisory Group recommended King County evaluate options to fund an estimated $530 million in future operation and maintenance of the proposed acquisition properties through the King County Parks Levy. Parry said that it is anticipated funding would be allocated in a similar fashion to the existing Conservation Futures Levy program, but that the match requirement for cities applying for funding may be reduced by as much as two-thirds.

Parry said a decision is expected from County Executive Constantine in 2018 as to when to transmit a conservation proposal, including funding package, to the County Council.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, said that a primary concern raised by members of the Kirkland City Council is voter tax fatigue. He noted the Lake Washington School District bond measure was failing in the latest election returns and expressed concern about the public’s willingness to pass levies for basic city services. He said the property being proposed for purchase would be removed from the tax rolls, which would increase the cost for taxpayers for the Initiative. He said that there is a declared homelessness emergency in King County and other important needs for limited public funding.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, agreed that voter tax fatigue is a concern and that he is worried about the cumulative impact of various tax proposals. He said the supporters of the Initiative would need to prove to residents why this is an important priority to pursue right now. He said he supported the proposed reduction in match requirements for Conservation Futures funding.

Mayor Christie Malchow, Sammamish, said that she is also concerned about the cumulative impact of many small tax increases. She noted that Sammamish has already set-aside funding to purchase open spaces over the next six years. She said she would like more information about how much of the proposed acquisition property is already unbuildable.

Councilmember Anthony Wright, Enumclaw, said that he agreed with concern about tax fatigue. He said his community may be supportive of the Initiative because there is a lot of interest in preserving farmland near the City. He said the City is working to protect those lands by encouraging development within city limits.
Parry said that members could contact him if they are interested in more information about the properties identified by King County as high priorities and that he would work with King County staff to answer any questions.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, said that he participated in the Advisory Group meetings as the SCA representative. He said that he recognized the challenge of repeatedly asking voters for more money, but that this is how the tax system is set up in Washington State. He said that the best approach is to ask the voters and they will decide what they are willing to support. He said that many organizations were involved with the Advisory Group that are very supportive of the Initiative and that they will likely put forward a good argument to voters. He said that the proposal would add to existing county conservation efforts and that it offers a chance to make a big difference for the future of the region.

Councilmember John Stokes, Bellevue, said that he also participated in the Advisory Group meetings, as a representative of Bellevue. He said that it is important to look at the proposal from a long-term perspective and what we can preserve for future generations. He said that he supported the recommendation of the Advisory Group to set aside funding for open spaces in areas historically underserved by park and open space lands. He added that the total cost is large, but that it is important to remember the proposal is looking out over 30 years.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, said that the proposal would cost the average homeowner between $10 and $12 per year, but would preserve a significant amount of open space in the region.

Councilmember James McNeal, Bothell, said that he also served on the Advisory Group and that he supports saving lands for future generations. He said he is excited to have heard from several cities how engaged the county has been with them while developing the proposal. He said Bothell recently had a big win by saving the Wayne Golf Course but that there is much more that can be done. He agreed with concern about tax fatigue, but said that he supports giving voters the opportunity to decide on the proposal.

Deputy Mayor Austin Bell, Burien, said that the fast pace of growth in the region gives good reason to invest in land conservation. He said that our natural environment is an important reason why companies choose to locate in the region and that we should view land conservation as having an economic development component.

Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific, said that south sound cities are very concerned and that increasing taxes are hurting residents that are struggling to afford to stay in their homes. She said that she supports conservation, but that residents need a break from tax increases. She noted that there are many initiatives that south sound residents have voted against, but that they are paying for anyway because they were approved overall countywide.

Council President Ed Prince, Renton, said that he agreed with Mayor Guier’s comments and that he is especially concerned about the impact of rising taxes on seniors living on fixed incomes.
Parry provided a handout produced by King County with information about the Land Conservation Initiative [Attachment C].

Councilmember Katherine Ross, Snoqualmie, said that a concern for cities in the Snoqualmie Valley is that the land proposed for conservation will cause them to be landlocked.

Councilmember Traci Buxton, Des Moines, said that residents are concerned about other potential costs, including recent news that the region may be responsible for infrastructure funding that had been anticipated from the federal government.

Deputy Mayor Sheree Wen, Medina, requested clarification about cost estimates included on the King County handout. Parry responded that the estimates shown for cities were used for estimating total cost and that city priorities may change over the course of the Initiative. He said that some cities did not provide conservation property estimates as noted on the handout, but that this would not preclude them from applying for any available funding through the Conservation Futures Program.

8. Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Rate Proposal
Ellie Wilson Jones, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported on a proposed rate increase to fund the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP). The LHWMP is a multi-jurisdictional program created to fulfill state requirements that local governments have a plan for addressing hazardous waste. The LHWMP serves all of King County, is enabled under the King County Board of Health code, and is funded through fees on solid waste and sewer services. The LWHMP is overseen by a Management Coordination Committee, on which SCA is represented by Redmond Councilmember Hank Myers.

The LHWMP provides a variety of resources across the county for the disposal of hazardous waste including grants for city collection events, four fixed location collection sites, and a Wastemobile. The LWHMP also engages in more upstream work at the policy level and provides technical assistance aimed at eliminating the use of hazardous products.

The current LHWMP fees were last increased in 2012, with the exception of a partial rate restructure that occurred in 2015 intended to more fairly distribute fees based on volume of waste generated. The program indicates that projected revenues at the current rate will not be enough to sustain the program, and the LHWMP Management Coordination Committee has been engaged in developing a proposal to increase the rates that fund LHWMP. That proposal will go next to the King County Board of Health.

The proposed phased rate increase would begin in 2019, as show in Table 1 on page 22 of the PIC Packet. Wilson-Jones noted that the impact to average ratepayers is summarized in Table 2 on page 23 of the PIC Packet. Additionally, the program is continuing to evaluate its rate proposal and is in the process of reviewing year-end savings for 2017 and may bring forward a revised rate proposal.

The Board of Health is scheduled to receive an initial briefing in March and to take action to adjust the rate later this spring, with the intention of ensuring that billing entities and others...
have significant lead time to make adjustments to their billing systems. Wilson-Jones concluded by noting that SCA Management Coordination Committee representative and Redmond Councilmember Hank Myers, SCA Board of Health Caucus Chair and Redmond Council President Angela Birney, Board of Health Alternate and Kenmore Mayor David Baker, LHWMP Program Director Lynda Ransley, and LHWMP Strategic Advisor Liz Tennant were in attendance to hear the PIC’s feedback and questions.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, noted that the proposal would represent a 50 percent increase over six years and that additional information is needed to support the increase. Nixon stated that he would provide SCA staff with a list of questions and offered, as examples, that more information is needed about specific assumptions and drivers for inflation, about specific assumptions and drivers of labor and overhead costs exceeding general inflation, what the level of demand is for LHWMP services and whether that demand is different by sector, and how much a new South King County facility will cost and what alternatives have been considered. Nixon highlighted the importance of having answers to these questions to explain the proposed rate increase to residents (Note: Attachment D provides Kirkland’s questions together with responses and supporting materials prepared by LHWMP staff).

Wilson-Jones noted that the questions posed by the City of Kirkland are consistent with topics explored by the Management Coordination Committee during the development of the rate proposal and that she would provide additional information to Nixon.

Councilmember Sheree Wen, Medina, requested additional information about how fees to support the LWHMP are collected. Wilson-Jones reported that fees to support LHWMP are charged on wastewater and solid waste services as a pass-through fee. Twenty-three different billing entities, including some cities and private haulers, collect the fees and transmit them to the LHWMP.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, noted that he previously served on the LHWMP Management Coordination Committee as SCA’s representative and that the program uses its funds judiciously and provides substantial benefit to the region. Other than the 2015 partial rate adjustment, rates to support the program were last changed in 2012. Baker requested clarification about the impacts to average ratepayers. Wilson-Jones noted that in the first year, the increase currently under consideration represents a $0.07 increase to the monthly charge for an average single family ratepayer, and, over the rate period, the rate would increase from $0.87 per month currently to $1.31 per month in 2024.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, asked LHWMP staff whether the program had gone through a Lean process. Lynda Ransley, LHWMP Program Director, responded that parts of the LWHMP program have utilized the Lean process and that the program is continuing to look at ways to reduce costs.

9. Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan
Cynthia Foley, SCA Policy Analyst, reported on the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. Foley noted that the draft plan is currently out for public comment, and the public
comment period will be ending on March 8. She stated that the draft plan outlines policies and recommended actions to manage King County’s solid waste system.

Foley reported that there are two issues presented in the draft plan that are likely to interest cities. The first issue of interest was the need for increased capacity in the Northeast Service Area. The second issue was how waste will be disposed when Cedar Hills Regional Landfill runs out of capacity, as projected, in 2028. Presentation slides from Foley’s staff report are provided as [Attachment E].

Foley shared that in November of 2017, the City of Bellevue signed an interlocal committing to stay in the solid waste system through 2040. This led the County Council to determine that additional transfer capacity would be needed in the Northeast Service Area. Foley noted that the draft plan outlines options for increasing waste transfer capacity in the Northeast, which include continuing operations at the Houghton Transfer Station, building a new transfer station, or constructing several smaller transfer sites.

Foley stated that another issue presented in the plan is the waste disposal method after the landfill reaches capacity in 2028. Options in the plan include expanding the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill, waste export to regional landfills outside King County, and the construction of a waste to energy plant.

If Cedar Hills Landfill is expanded, it would be modified to increase the height from approximately 800 feet to eight 830 feet. This would extend the life of the landfill until 2040, when it is projected that all capacity will be depleted.

A second option detailed in the draft plan is waste export. Under this option, the County would export waste to an out-of-county landfill by rail. This option requires the least capital investment, but relies on higher operating costs.

The final option for disposal after 2028 detailed in the draft report is construction of a Waste to Energy Facility. The facility modeled in the Draft Plan would process 4,000 tons-per-day. To handle forecast tons, additional capacity would be required beyond 2048. Some operating costs would be offset by the sale of electricity.

The projected costs and greenhouse gas emissions for each disposal option are summarized on slide 4 of [Attachment E].

Foley noted that one of the greenhouse gas emissions projections is incorrect in the Draft plan and, as a result, in the staff memo. In the WARM model for the calculation greenhouse gas, the maximum projected for Waste to Energy emissions is 80,000 Metric Tons Carbon Dioxide Equivalents. The correct numbers are included in [Attachment E], slide 4.

She stated that policy highlights for the disposal and transfer chapters in the Draft Plan are shown in [Attachment A on page 38 in the PIC Packet].
Foley outlined the comprehensive plan approval process. During April and May of 2018, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) and Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) will review public comments. Next, the County Executive, the Regional Policy Committee, and the King County Council will take action to adopt or approve the draft plan. Finally, all 37 cities in the system are invited to adopt the plan. Seattle and Milton are not in the King County Solid Waste System. Cities representing three-quarters of the total population of cities that choose to take formal action on the plan, must adopt before it can be submitted to the Department of Ecology for final approval. Foley noted that the plan approval process is shown in Attachment A on page 39 of the PIC Packet.

Foley that the King County Executive will provide a recommendation on additional capacity in the Northeast Service Area and a selection of a disposal option in July of 2018. Elements of this recommendation might be included in the 2019 King County Budget.

Foley invited the group to discuss the draft plan and asked what additional information they might need on the topic presented. Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, shared that the Solid Waste director came to a city council meeting in Woodinville. He noted that there is a private recycling plant in Woodinville that gets high levels of tonnage and traffic. He noted that Woodinville is already being heavily impacted by the waste system. He asked that this be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific, asked if there are other private transfer stations. Foley clarified that transfer stations are public, but other elements of the systems, such as recycling centers are private.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, asked if anything had changed regarding long-term need for capacity in the Northeast. Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, commented that the County Council made a finding in November that additional capacity would be needed in the Northeast and funded a process to work with cities to get input on how this capacity should be implemented.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, noted that encouraging recycling, composting, and waste prevention at the city level can reduce waste in the system. He asked if there is information on best practices for waste diversion in the draft plan.

Foley noted that the draft plan does provide information about efforts to improve waste diversion, but does not provide best practices for cities.

Councilmember John Stokes, Bellevue, commented that Bellevue has significant transfer needs, and reentering the system creates additional impact on the system. He stated that he would like to see more data on this. He also noted that eventually the county would need an alternative to the landfill, but stated that we are not to that point yet.

Mayor Christie Malchow, Sammamish, asked how many jurisdictions require recycling. Staff will follow up with this information.
Councilmember Carol Simpson, Newcastle, commented that King County would like cities to be more uniform in how they handle trash. She noted that some cities do not require pick-up and do not have yard waste year-round. She noted that King County would like to get to 70 percent waste diversion.

Mayor Talmas asked if there has been a whitepaper on the impacts of mandatory recycling.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, replied that many in his city had been uncomfortable with requiring waste pickup due to financial impacts on low income residents.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, noted that you can recycle as a self-hauler. The fee structure encourages recycling.

Councilmember Linda Johnson, Maple Valley, stated that this issue is also affected by unincorporated King County.

10. Tobacco-Free Parks and Stadiums
Ellie Wilson Jones, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that the King County Board of Health is currently considering policies related to tobacco-free parks and stadiums. Last year, the Board of Health was briefed on work going on nationally to eliminate the use of tobacco and vapor products in stadiums, with a particular focus on eliminating the use of smokeless tobacco by Major League Baseball players, who serve as role models to young viewers. Currently, tobacco and vapor products are not permitted to be used by spectators at Safeco Field, but that ban does not extend to ballplayers. Under their most recent collective bargaining agreement, MLB players joining the league going forward are prohibited from using smokeless tobacco products at games, but that stipulation does not cover those already active in the league. Following the Board of Health briefing last year on the potential to ban the use of tobacco and vapor products at stadiums, Board of Health Chair and King County Councilmember Rod Dembowski indicated his interest in pursuing a broader policy aimed at eliminating all tobacco and vapor product use from both parks and stadiums throughout King County.

The Board of Health was briefed in January on existing parks policies and the policies in place for stadiums. Attachment A on page 45 of the PIC Packet provides a map showing what kind of local policies have been adopted related to tobacco, smoking, and vapor product use in parks. During the January Board of Health discussion, members offered their initial reactions to pursuing a countywide ban on tobacco and vapor product use in parks and stadiums, as has been proposed by the BOH Chair. There were concerns about enforcement. Local jurisdictions would be left to enforce any ban adopted by the Board of Health, so there were concerns about a lack of resources to do so and the potential for disparate enforcement across jurisdictions and for disproportionate impacts. There was also discussion about the public health benefits of eliminating the use of such products in open air environments.

Board of Health Chair Dembowski now indicates his intention is to bring forward a narrower policy in March that would ban the use of tobacco and vapor products in stadiums and that he wants to get more input from cities before pursuing a broader policy related to parks. Wilson-
Jones concluded by seeking PIC member input on a series of questions beginning on page 43 of the PIC Packet.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, noted that the Kenmore has not pursued a ban on the use of tobacco or vapor products in parks due to concerns about enforceability, but that he is comfortable with a policy applicable to stadiums.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, stated the Kirkland’s decision not to adopt a parks policy was based on the cost of enforcement and a lack of complaints from residents about use of tobacco in parks. Instead of adopting a ban, the city has posted signs encouraging respectful behavior in high use areas. He noted that the city would be concerned about additional countywide regulation of parks that would then need to be enforced locally without any additional support. He stated that he did not have concerns about a policy applicable to smokeless tobacco use in stadiums.

Councilmember Benson Wong, Mercer Island, reported that Mercer Island considered the issue in 2012, but did not adopt a ban because of enforcement concerns.

Councilmember Ross Loudenback, North Bend, asked whether the Board of Health had reviewed information from cities that do have bans in place about their enforcement practices and the number of infractions. He suggested the Board of Health consider that information to determine whether a countywide policy would provide benefit.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, noted that after pushing for a ban in Redmond parks for many years, the city recently adopted a tobacco use prohibition while updating parks policies more generally. The city worked with the community to develop the new rules and to hear their priorities. Enforcement in Redmond will be graduated and will focus on changing behavior. Margeson asked whether the Board of Health would have authority to restrict the use of smokeless tobacco products by Major League Baseball players who are not already banned from doing so by their collective bargaining agreement. Wilson-Jones reported that public health staff indicate that the Board of Health has authority to prohibit the use of tobacco and vapor products in stadiums and that MLB teams nationally have cooperated with local restrictions.

Margeson encouraged cities considering adoption of a parks policy to contact the Redmond staff for more information about the Redmond’s approach to banning tobacco product use in parks.

Councilmember Toni Troutner, Kent, noted that Kent has banned the use of tobacco products in parks to encourage public health, but that the policy is rarely enforced by police because officers must observe the infraction in order to issue a ticket. Rather, the policy is more commonly enforced informally among parks users.

Councilmember John Holman, Auburn, noted that requirements for the citation of people in violation of smoking laws can set up unrealistic expectations about enforcement, which can be challenging.
11. 2018 State Legislative Session
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, provided an update on the progress of the 2018 state legislative session. In January, the PIC voted to make two refinements to the SCA legislative agenda to better align SCA’s Housing Trust Fund ask with partners and to broaden the language of SCA’s housing affordability and homelessness legislative priority. The updated SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda was approved by the SCA Board January 19 and is in the PIC Packet on page 51.

Wilson-Jones reported that the deadline for the House and Senate to pass bills to the opposite chamber passed at 5 p.m. before the evening’s PIC meeting and that there had been a substantial amount of movement for legislation addressing SCA’s housing affordability and homelessness legislative priority. The capital budget passed last month included nearly $107 million for the Housing Trust Fund, consistent with SCA’s request. Additionally, the document recording fee bill, HB 1570, recently passed over from the House to the Senate on a 51-47 vote. House and Senate Source of Income Discrimination bills, SB 5407 and HB 2578 respectively, each moved over to the opposite chamber last week.

Wilson-Jones concluded by noting progress for legislation related to policy positions SCA has taken in support of product stewardship programs and King County’s local drug takeback program. With a vote of 86-12, HB 1047 requiring drug manufacturers to operate a take-back program has advanced from the House to the Senate. The King County Board of Health and other counties have already required similar programs at the county-level, but this would make those requirements statewide.

12. Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County
Brian Parry, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported on the result of levies and ballot measures in King County on the February 13, 2018 ballot and provided a handout (Attachment F). Parry noted that nearly all of the levies and bonds proposed by local school districts were passing with ballots yet to be counted, but by lower margins than in the most recent comparable election. As compared to 2014, when local school districts proposed a similar slate of levy and bond proposals, the overall percentage of “yes” votes went down by just over ten percent across all districts. Some of the most pronounced examples include measures proposed by the Bellevue School District, which saw a nearly 20-point reduction in support; the Tahoma School District, Issaquah School District, and Snoqualmie Valley School District, which saw votes in favor fall by nearly 16-points; and, the Kent School District, which saw a reduction in support of just over 8.5-points. Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, asked what voter turnout for the election was in King County. As of February 20, 2018, voter turnout was reported by King County Elections as 31.79% percent.

13. Potential Upcoming SCA Issues
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, reported that the March 14 pre-PIC workshop will be on the One Table initiative and sought feedback on topics for upcoming Pre-PIC workshops. Dawson reported that PIC members have expressed interest in alternating policy briefings and trainings, and invited feedback on topics identified to date, listed on page 57 of the PIC Packet.
Councilmember John Holman, Auburn, noted that a National League of Cities (NLC) meeting will conflict with the March PIC meeting. Three PIC members noted that they would be attending the NLC meeting. Dawson encouraged PIC members attending the NLC meeting to arrange for an alternate to attend the March PIC meeting.

Councilmember Sheree Wen, Medina, reported that the Emergency Management Advisory Committee is interested in providing an emergency management related presentation for SCA members.

Councilmember Lydia Assefa-Dawson, Federal Way, suggested including equity and social justice for a future meeting topic and highlighted King County’s Equity and Social Justice program. may be a good topic. Dawson reported that SCA is working with cities and other partners to develop a full-day equity and inclusion conference for this fall and that members will be engaged in providing further input into the event.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, suggested conducting a poll to evaluate member interest in proposed topics and, if sufficient interest exists, advised consideration of additional meetings to convene members for briefings and trainings.

14. Informational Item
Chair Prince reported that an informational item on the Metro Connects Development Program is contained in the PIC Packet beginning on page 59.

15. Upcoming Events
The next SCA Networking Dinner will be held on February 28, 2018 at 5:30 PM at the Renton Pavilion Event Center, featuring Seattle Mayor Jenny Durkan as the guest speaker.

The next PIC meeting will be held on March 14, 2018 from 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM at Renton City Hall with a pre-PIC workshop at 6:00 PM.

16. For the Good of the Order
Chair Prince asked if any member wished to offer further comments.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, reported on a recent police incident in Tukwila wherein officers placed an individual in custody on a warrant from US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Kruller noted that Tukwila was proud of being an inclusive city. She encouraged cities to learn the difference between administrative warrants and judicially issued warrants, and to contact Tukwila’s mayor or police chief if they would like to know more about the incident.

Councilmember Lydia Assefa-Dawson, Federal Way, reported that the Housing Development Consortium is hosting an affordable housing tour on March 9.

Councilmember Anthony Wright, Enumclaw, advised cities to adopt a cyber security awareness program. The City of Enumclaw was recently targeted by a cyber-attack, and staff has since received training in follow-up.
Councilmember Sheree Wen, Medina, noted that FEMA is providing grants to religious institutions that will serve as emergency shelters. The deadline is March 18.

17. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 PM.
Public Issues Committee Meeting  
February 14, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>Bill Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Nancy Backus</td>
<td>John Holman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts Village</td>
<td>Tom Stowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>John Stokes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Janie Edelman</td>
<td>Tamie Deady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>James McNeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Austin Bell</td>
<td>Nancy Tosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>Dustin Green</td>
<td>Kim Lisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Fran Hollums</td>
<td>Joseph Cimaomo, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Traci Buxton</td>
<td>Rob Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Michelle Hogg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Anthony Wright</td>
<td>Mike Sando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Lydia Assefa-Dawson</td>
<td>Martin Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Joseph Sabey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Chris Reh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td>Nigel Herbig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Bill Boyce</td>
<td>Toni Troutner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td>Jay Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Sean Kelly</td>
<td>Linda Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Sheree Wen</td>
<td>Alex Morcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Benson Wong</td>
<td>Wendy Weiker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Shanna Styron</td>
<td>Mary Tompkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherrrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Carol Simpson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Sue-Ann Hohimer</td>
<td>Jonathan Chicquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Jonathan Rosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>David Storaasli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>Angela Birney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Ed Prince</td>
<td>Armondo Pavone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Christie Malchow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Erin Sitterley</td>
<td>Pam Fernald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Keith Scully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Katherine Ross</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td>Thomas McLeod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie Talmas</td>
<td>Susan Boundy-Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow Point</td>
<td>Dicker Cahill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Deanna Dawson</td>
<td>Brian Parry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynthia Foley</td>
<td>Ellie Wilson-Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting members are highlighted in gray. Cities represented are **bolded**.
Civics & Discussion

Citizens Academy
Featuring the City of Newcastle

This free three-week course introduces you to the inner workings of city governments. Meet the people behind the departments at the City of Newcastle and learn what goes on behind the scenes to ensure the services and amenities of a top-rated city. Light refreshments served. Certificate awarded for attending all three sessions!
Sponsored in part by Friends of the Newcastle Library.

Newcastle Library, Thursday, March 1, 8 and 15, 7pm

Week 1: Administrative & Finance 101: The History and Mystery Behind City Hall
A brief history of Newcastle: from coal mines to incorporation. • Who’s running this show? An explanation of city governments, the city manager, city council and city clerk. • Money, money, money! The finance director explains where the money comes from, where the money goes, and how we know the money’s safe. • Putting it all together: Budgeting 101.

Week 2:
Part 1: Community & Economic Development: Taking the ZZZZZ Out of Zoning
City codes, permits and inspections, oh my! • Impress your friends; Commercial development, Comprehensive Plan, and GMA. • Meet Planning and Community Activities Commissioners and find out what the h*ck they do.
Part 2: Public Works: Where the Magic Happens
Transportation, streets and traffic calming. • Parks, trails and open space amenities. • Storm water utility, drainage and salmon protection. • Garbage & recycling: who takes this away and where does it go?

Week 3:
Police, Fire & Emergency Management: When the Stuff Hits the Fan
Police 101 with Chief Irvine • Bellevue Fire’s got our backs • Emergency management, your city has a plan (and it involves you!).

Newcastle Library • 12001 Newcastle Way • Newcastle, WA 98056 • 425.255.0111
Monday-Thursday, 10am-9pm • Friday, 10am-6pm • Saturday, 10am-5pm
kcls.org/newcastle • visit.kCLS.org/NewcastleLibrary
King County Land Conservation Initiative

WHAT is the Land Conservation Initiative

• Vision & Plan to protect the remaining high conservation value lands and secure our trail network within the next 30 years

• Regional effort/regional collaboration – county & all 39 cities, with input from over 100 stakeholder groups, non-profits, businesses and healthcare organizations.

• Protects 65,000 acres of our most vital conservation lands and urban greenspaces, without compromising our ability to accommodate projected growth.

• Includes $160M dedicated to investments in open space equity

• Total 30 year cost to acquire: $4.14B; $2.25B covered by existing revenue sources and private revenue ($292M); 30 year Gap = $1.89B

• Fill gap by restoring existing CFT to its state-authorized cap and original levy rate.
  
  o CFT Restoration = $10 - 12/yr to the owner of the median-value home
  o Re-set CFT one or two additional times during 30 year period
  o Same Council oversight, continued use of CFT Committee process
  o CFT effective rate has decreased 38% (i.e. from 6.25 cents in 2003 to 3.8 cents in 2018)
  o No increase in match (cities get more CFT $ w/ same amount of local funds)

• O&M on new lands covered in future King County Parks Levy ($3-4/HH/yr impact)

WHY is this important / What is at stake

• KC growing quickly: 48,600 new residents in 2017 + 180,000 people next 10 years

• Need to protect the livability, health, and ecological integrity of KC – for everyone

• More people need more greenspace – our parks and recreation areas are over crowded
  
  o Access to nature and open space is the foundation to our collective quality of life and the competitive edge of our business community
  o Health: ready access to open space has proven mental & physical health benefits
  o Equity: 500,000 people in KC do not live within ready access to public green space

WHY now

• Action now vs status quo saves $15 billion: real estate is only getting more expensive

• If we wait we lose opportunities; and KC’s quality of life & competitive edge erode

• Open Space is infrastructure: investing in our natural infrastructure will yield dividends well beyond up-front costs, just like utilities, roads, and transit.
### KING COUNTY CONSERVATION PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% Easement / % Fee</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (30 year $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Lands (includes multi-objective urban &amp; rural zone parcels)</td>
<td>20,500 acres</td>
<td>42% easement / 58% fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers (not including multi-objective Rivers parcels; Rivers priorities total 480 acres across all zones)</td>
<td>100 acres</td>
<td>9% easement / 91% fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests (includes multi-objective forest zone parcels)</td>
<td>26,500 acres</td>
<td>96% easement / 4% fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland (includes multi-objective agricultural zone parcels)</td>
<td>13,500 acres</td>
<td>90% easement / 10% fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Trails</td>
<td>125 miles</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,600 acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>76% easement / 24% fee</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,400,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acres* does not incorporate Advisory Group recommendation to retain some parcels in Current Use Taxation over the next 30 years; ‘Estimated Cost’ does incorporate this recommendation.

### EQUITY CONSERVATION PRIORITIES

| Open Space Equity Lands | $160,000,000 |

### CITY CONSERVATION PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (30 year $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$12,429,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$682,641,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$2,387,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$36,805,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$6,774,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$4,582,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$22,472,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$16,614,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$3,626,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$94,953,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$85,548,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$44,886,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$46,637,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** | **2,363** | **$1,757,640,000** |

City figures updated since Advisory Group Report to include Bellevue; they do not reflect placeholder for ‘TBD’ cities ($500M was the 30-year placeholder cost used in report.}
1. **Why are you asking for a six year rate instead of two or three years?**
   We are asking for a six year rate to improve predictability for our rate-paying entities. Six years allows the Program to go through three biennial budget cycles. (King County now requires biennial budgets. The Management Coordination Committee (MCC) considered a four year and six year time period and opted for the six year time period, with a mid-point check back with the Board of Health to adjust rates if needed (e.g. not increase in the out years if that isn’t needed.)

   Most bill-paying entities want to have a longer lead time and more predictability in their rates than would be feasible. A three year cycle would not align with King County’s biennial budget process, and therefore would be troublesome. In addition it would be administratively burdensome and not a good use of ratepayer money to for our office to spend most of our time on rate adjustments (which we would with a short cycle).

2. **What are the specific assumptions and drivers in the catch all ‘general inflation” category?**
   Inflation was calculated using the Seattle Area CPI-W as directed by King County Budget Office. You can see the cumulative impact of inflation between 2015 and 2024 in the attached summary of cost drivers (Attachment A). The cumulative impact of inflation since 2012 (the last rate increase) is 32.5%.

3. **What are the specific assumptions and drivers in the Labor and Overhead Exceeding Inflation category?**
   Our agency partners and King County Budget office provide us with the inflators and projections to use for staff salary and benefits and for agency overhead cost projections. Please see Attachment B for specific assumptions used in our rate model. This needs to be updated with 2017 actuals but will give you a sense of the assumptions use.

4. **Please provide information on historical service demands and provide data and documentation to substantiate your forecast for increases in service demand over the six year rate period. Is there increased demand in one sector or all sectors?**
   - **Growing population in King County** – The number of people living in King County is steadily growing and is projected to continue to grow.
   - **Growing number and diversity in populations of color** within King County, including immigrant and non-English speakers. It likely will cost more to provide equitable access to available services
   - **We are seeing increasing demand for MRW collection services**, particularly at the North Seattle and Auburn collection sites.
   - **We expect to see more demand for all of our services** due to comprehensive marketing and information outreach.
5. Are there any new staff or management positions included in your rate proposal and how do each contribute to the value our customers receive?

No, we are not proposing to add staff to our program. When vacancies occur we consider whether the position is needed, whether it should be reclassified (for a different skill set) or whether we should eliminate the position. This is done on a case by case basis.

One position that we are reformulating will be of specific benefit to you and other city partners. We will be recruiting an Intergovernmental and Community Planner to work more closely with our city partners to increase communications and better leverage and support each other’s efforts.

6. How will the proposed new South County hazardous waste facility be funded and what are the terms of that funding? Bonds? Cash? A combination of the two?

King County Solid Waste Division is obtaining 20 year bonds to build the new South King County facility, including the portion of the facility where the MRW Collection service will be located. LHWMP’s share of capital costs are projected to be about $8.4 Million ($418,000 per year starting) when the MRW facility opens, projected to be in 2022.

7. How much will the proposed new facility cost?

Operating costs are projected assuming six days of operations with the proviso that efforts will be made to reduce this to three days per week. This is provided to cost $285,000 more per year than the Auburn Wastemobile (which is open two days per week.)

8. Are there alternatives to building a new facility such as renting a warehouse or office space in the South County Kent/Auburn valley?

This option was explored during the 2007-2008 Household Hazardous Waste Service Level Study, which ended up recommending regular collection at the formerly named Auburn Supermall. That service has been offered since 2009. In 2016-2017 the MRW Collection Service Level Work Group examined the options available in South King County to determine whether to continue to offer collection on weekends at the Auburn Wastemobile or whether to take advantage of the opportunity to co-locate collection service at the new facility. The study group recommended co-location on the basis that it would improve service access and service equity for south county residents. MCC approved co-location, with a preference to operate three days per week if feasible. (Labor conditions may require being open six days per week.)

9. Will the proposed rate increase result in any additional services or programs for customers in the NE County, such as increased grant funding, more visits by the Waste Mobile, addition of more kinds of accepted MRW, etc?

The new rate increase will allow LHWMP to continue to provide regular Wastemobile service to residents in Northeast King County as well as technical assistance, information, financial incentives and work on policy and prevention efforts that benefit residents in NE County as well as other areas of King County. Without it the Program will have to cut services.

10. Is any of the rate increase a result of the 2015 change from a flat fee to a fee based upon container size? Has the container-based rate structure resulted in higher or lower revenues that the old flat fee rates?
LHWMP’s revenue remained stable following the 2015 change from the flat fee to the fee based upon container size. The adjusted amount received in the first year was 1% less than projected (negligible).
2. Cost Drivers

The first table shows general inflation rates through 2024. The second table shows various LHWMP cost drivers over the same period of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual % Change</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % Change</td>
<td>7.82%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
<td>17.16%</td>
<td>20.27%</td>
<td>23.47%</td>
<td>26.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Labor Costs</td>
<td>MRW – 12.1%</td>
<td>MRW – 5%</td>
<td>MRW – 5%</td>
<td>MRW – 5%</td>
<td>MRW – 5%</td>
<td>MRW – 3%</td>
<td>MRW – 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other – &lt; 1%</td>
<td>Other – 3%</td>
<td>Other – 3%</td>
<td>Other – 3%</td>
<td>Other – 3%</td>
<td>Other – 3%</td>
<td>Other – 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Overhead</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRW Adds</td>
<td>$50K</td>
<td>$50K</td>
<td>$60K</td>
<td>$753,603</td>
<td>$802,739</td>
<td>$811,728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % Change</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
<td>13.94%</td>
<td>17.36%</td>
<td>25.57%</td>
<td>29.34%</td>
<td>33.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The inflation projections in this chart are based on the August 2017 Seattle CIP-W projections from the King County Office of Economic Analysis. The cumulative rate of inflation has been compounded.

2 LHWMP costs, 2015-2018, are based on MCC adopted budgets and spending plans. The annual rate of growth is shown for LHWMP cost drivers between 2019 and 2024. These projections have been calculated based on the rate model. They have not been compounded. The actual compounded result would be modestly higher. For example, labor costs are projected to increase by 3% per year (6 x 3 = 18%). When compounded, a 3% yearly increase would result in a 19.41% increase over six years. Inflation compounds more than yearly, so the actual increase would be somewhat more than 19.41%.

3 Includes current Moderate Risk Waste Collection and Disposal Operations. City and tribal contracts, Public Health inspections of city and tribal MRW collection events and the Disaster Debris fund placeholder.
Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Financial Assumptions for the 2019 Rate Analysis

October 23, 2017

1. LHWMP’s rate calculations are based on information provided by official sources to the maximum extent possible. Where such information was not available, revenues were projected to be flat based on 2016 actual revenue for that category.

2. These projections assume that LHWMP will continue to provide the same level of service as in 2016, except that MRW collection service will be increased to meet service needs in Seattle and to provide somewhat expanded MRW collection in South King County.

3. The 2016 revenue and expenditure numbers are year-end actuals based on the King County General Ledger Report (03/21/17).

4. The Fund Forecast is based on King County budget office guidance, March 2017 CPI-W and revenue and expenditures projections updated as of 9/27/2017.

Revenue Projections and Assumptions, 2017 - 2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Assumptions and Comments regarding projected payments into the Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Interest Income</td>
<td>Based on the King County Investment Pool Rate of Return Forecast as of March 2017 (1.17% in 2019, 1.50% in 2020, 1.78% in 2021, 2.03% in 2022, 2.25% in 2023, and 2.44% in 2024).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grant funding</td>
<td>The 2017-2018 Adopted budget assumes that no state grant funds will be received after 2017. This source of revenue continues to be politically vulnerable and continually shrinks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Wastewater Fees</td>
<td>Based on wastewater flow projections provided by King County Wastewater Treatment Division, March 29, 2017. Payments are based on actual wastewater flows. Volumes fluctuate with population, weather, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sewer Fees</td>
<td>Projected to be flat based on 2016 flow data (calculated from 2016 actual revenue). Payments are based on actual wastewater flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Station Fees</td>
<td>Based on the number of self-haul visits (PLV) and tonnage (Non-PLV).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Private transfer station Non-PLV revenue is projected a 1% growth rate based on 2016 actual revenue (and tonnage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Seattle PLV and Non-PLV projections are based on data provided by Seattle Public Utilities as of 8/23/2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ King County projections are projected a 1% growth rate based on 2016 implied tons (Non-PLV) and 2016 implied customers (PLV).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Financial Assumptions for the 2019 Rate Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Assumptions and Comments regarding projected payments into the Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Account fees</td>
<td>Based on actual number of residential accounts and commercial solid waste services. Adjusted Seattle projections provided by Seattle Public Utilities as of 8/23/2017. City and private hauler solid waste account fees are projected to be flat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Assumptions and Comments regarding projected expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 MCC-Approved, Revised Budget</td>
<td>The 2017-2018 biennial budget package was approved by MCC in May 2016 and adopted by King County Council in November 2016. In January 2017 MCC approved a work-plan aligned 2017 spending plan and the revised agency and project budgets which are reflected in these projections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projections, 2019 - 2024</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Salary and benefits have been inflated based on King County Financial Planning Expenditure Assumptions and Guidance (2017-2026) as of 3/8/2016 using updated projections from partner agencies. See Attachment A for King County guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MRW Disposal operating costs were provided by the Program Partners from 2019-2024. This includes continuing collection every weekend at the Auburn Supermall until 2020. Seattle costs are projected to increase by 4% in 2019 thru 2024. King County costs are projected to increase at the rate of inflation (2.2% in 2019, 5.0% in 2020, 5.1% in 2021, -2.5% in 2022, 3.0% in 2023, and 3.0% in 2024).^2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MRW Facility Improvement and capital costs were provided by King County Solid Waste Division. This assumes that LHWMP will reimburse King County Solid Waste Division for its share of a 20 year capital bond project to be repaid over a 20 year period. LHWMP’s share of capital costs are projected to be about $8.4 Million ($418K per year starting in 2022 when the MRW facility opens). South County operating costs are projected assuming six days of operation, with the proviso that efforts will be made to reduce this. This is projected to cost $285,000 more per year than the Auburn Wastemobile starting in 2022 (provided that MCC approves).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project non-salary costs have been inflated based on the approved 2017-2018 spending plan and have been inflated using the March 2017 Seattle CPI-W (2.43% in 2019, 2.53% in 2020, 2.43% in 2021, 2.76% in 2022, 2.73% in 2023, and 2.67% in 2024).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agency overhead projections vary by Program Partners. King County Program Partners are projected by using the PSB expenditure assumptions as of 3/8/2016 (3.8% in 2019, 4.3% in 2020, 4.5% in 2021, 4.7% in 2022, 4.80% in 2023, and 4.7% in 2024) and 2.5% for Seattle Public Utilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 King County Investment Pool Rate of Return adjusted for management fees.
2 Seattle Public Utilities and King County Solid Waste Division provided MRW cost projections.
Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Financial Assumptions for the 2019 Rate Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projections, 2019 - 2024 continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>City and Tribal grants</strong> were increased at the rate of inflation using the March 2017 Seattle CPI-W (2.43% in 2019, 2.53% in 2020, 2.43% in 2021, 2.76% in 2022, 2.73% in 2023, and 2.67% in 2024).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Public Health Inspections of City and Tribal MRW Collection events</strong> was budgeted at $24K as requested by Public Health, and inflated at the rate of inflation using March 2017 Seattle CPI-W (2.43% in 2019, 2.53% in 2020, 2.43% in 2021, 2.76% in 2022, 2.73% in 2023, and 2.67% in 2024).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Disaster Debris Management.</strong> LHWMP has an interest in promoting proper hazardous waste management in the event of disasters. However local jurisdictions are responsible for developing individual disaster debris management plans and for pre-establishing contracts with FEMA to help with reimbursing disasters. We have maintained this placeholder contingency fund in case it is needed in the event of a disaster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ending Fund Balance Projections, 2017 -2024**
- 2017: $12.8 Million
- 2018: $9.3 Million
- 2019: $5.3 Million
- 2020: $ 581,728 (below 2-month operating reserve, but likely to offset by under spending).

The two month operating reserve is based on 60 days of expenses.
THE COMPREHENSIVE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

WASTE TRANSFER IN THE NE

• Continue operations at the Houghton Transfer Station

• Build a new transfer station in the NE service area

• Construct several smaller transfer sites
DISPOSAL AFTER 2028

- Expand Cedar Hills Regional Landfill
- Waste Export
- Waste to Energy Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Cedar Hills Expansion</th>
<th>Waste Export</th>
<th>Waste-To-Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Period</td>
<td>2028-2040</td>
<td>2028-2048</td>
<td>2028-2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Capital Cost</td>
<td>$241 Million</td>
<td>$4.6 Million</td>
<td>$1.1 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating Cost</td>
<td>$20 Million</td>
<td>$43 Million</td>
<td>$41 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$1-$3 Million</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27-$41 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>-114,000 Metric Tons CO2/Year</td>
<td>-66,000 Metric Tons CO2/Year</td>
<td>12,000-80,000 Metric Tons CO2/Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WARM Model¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>99,000 Metric Tons CO2/Year</td>
<td>99,000 Metric Tons CO2/Year</td>
<td>1.2 Million Metric Tons CO2/Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MRR Model²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### February 2018 Levy and Ballot Measure Results as of 2/14/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bellevue School District | Educational Programs and Operations Levy renewal (levy rate of $0.99 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $68 million in 2019) | Approved: 53.42  
Rejected: 46.58 |
| Bellevue School District | Technology and Capital Projects Levy renewal (levy rate of $0.54 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $37 million in 2019) | Approved: 51.59   
Rejected: 48.41 |
| Bellevue School District | School Bus Levy (one year levy at a rate of $0.12 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $8 million in 2019) | Approved: 54.55   
Rejected: 45.45 |
| Black Diamond          | Recall election                                                         | Recall Yes: 67.07  
Recall No: 32.93 |
| Enumclaw School District | Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $6.3 million in 2019) | Approved: 56.32  
Rejected: 43.68 |
| Highline School District | Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $47.3 million in 2019) | Approved: 57.94  
Rejected: 42.06 |
| Federal Way School District | Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $33 million in 2019) | Approved: 57.54  
Rejected: 42.46 |
| Issaquah School District | Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate estimated to be $1.13 per $1,000 of assessed value in 2019 raising approximately $36.3 million; $1.33 per $1,000 in 2020 raising approximately $44.9 million) | Approved: 51.0  
Rejected: 49.0 |
| School District               | Description                                                                                                                                   | Approved: 57.06  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah School District</td>
<td>School Bus Levy Renewal (one year levy at a rate of $0.06 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $2 million)</td>
<td>42.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah School District</td>
<td>Capital Projects Levy Renewal (levy rate of $0.53 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $17 million in 2019)</td>
<td>53.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent School District</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $44 million in 2019)</td>
<td>50.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent School District</td>
<td>Capital Improvements Levy for Safety, Security, Instruction, Classroom and Support Services Technology (levy rate of $0.75 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $20 million in 2019)</td>
<td>50.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington School District</td>
<td>Bond Renewal (authority to issue approximately $299 million in general obligation bonds)</td>
<td>46.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington School District</td>
<td>Capital Projects Levy Renewal (levy rate of $0.59 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately 34.2 million in 2019)</td>
<td>54.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington School District</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.03 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $59.2 million in 2019)</td>
<td>45.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island School District</td>
<td>Educational Maintenance and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.00 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $11.7 million in 2019)</td>
<td>71.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northshore School District</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $57 million in 2019)</td>
<td>60.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northshore School District</td>
<td>Capital Projects Bond (authority to issue approximately $275 million in general obligation bonds)</td>
<td>40.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northshore School District</td>
<td>Technology Levy Renewal (levy rate of $0.51 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $15.5 million in 2019)</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The percentages in the Approved and Rejected columns are rounded to one decimal place for ease of reading.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Levy Description</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverview School District</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.93 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $8.5 million in 2019)</td>
<td>52.23</td>
<td>47.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview School District</td>
<td>Capital Projects Technology Levy Renewal (levy rate of $0.65 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $2.8 million in 2019)</td>
<td>53.43</td>
<td>46.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview School District</td>
<td>Transportation Vehicle Fund Levy (levy rate of $0.15 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $640,000 in 2019)</td>
<td>55.32</td>
<td>44.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline School District</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $21.3 million in 2019)</td>
<td>66.95</td>
<td>33.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline School District</td>
<td>Capital Projects Technology Levy Renewal (levy rate of $0.23 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $3.25 million in 2019)</td>
<td>68.55</td>
<td>31.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish School District</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per thousand raising approximately $291,000 in 2019)</td>
<td>57.24</td>
<td>42.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie Valley School District</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per thousand raising approximately $14.2 million in 2019)</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>49.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie Valley School District</td>
<td>Capital Projects Technology Levy Renewal (levy rate of $0.44 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $4.2 million in 2019)</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td>48.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoma School District</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Operations Levy Renewal (levy rate of $1.50 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $10.7 million in 2019)</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoma School District</td>
<td>Capital Projects Technology Levy (levy rate of $0.39 per $1,000 of assessed value raising approximately $2.7 million in 2019)</td>
<td>46.21</td>
<td>53.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoma School District</td>
<td>School Bus Levy (two-year levy at a rate of $0.14 per $1,000 of assessed value in 2019 raising approximately $1 million per year)</td>
<td>47.95</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Regional Fire Authority</td>
<td>Continuation of benefit charge</td>
<td>Approved: 77.13</td>
<td>Rejected: 22.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Requires 60% for passage and must meet minimum turnout threshold*