TRANSFER PLAN REVIEW UPDATE

Sound Cities Association Public Issues Committee

September 11, 2013

King County

Department of Natural Resources and Parks

Solid Waste Division

Transfer Plan Review

King County Ordinance #17619

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

- Purpose
  - Determine if changes are needed to ensure that the transfer system is sized/configured appropriately to meet current and future needs
  - Determine whether changes could be made that could reduce future expenditures while still meeting desired service objectives and levels
- Not in scope
  - Cedar Hills development or future disposal
  - Intermodal development/waste export
  - Public vs. private
  - Rural transfer system

Review Process Overview

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

Schedule

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

Workshop 1

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

Workshop 2

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

Alternatives Considered

Five basic alternatives

	Base (Current Plan)	Alternative A (no Northeast)	Alternative B (no Factoria)	Alternative C (no South County and no Factoria)	Alternative D (no South County and no Northeast)
Open Facilities	Shoreline Bow Lake Factoria Northeast South County	Shoreline Bow Lake Factoria South County	Shoreline Bow Lake Northeast South County	Shoreline Bow Lake Northeast	Shoreline Bow Lake Factoria
Closed (or never opened) Facilities	Algona Renton Houghton	Algona Renton Houghton* Northeast	Algona Renton Houghton Factoria	Algona** Renton Houghton Factoria South County	Algona** Renton Houghton* Northeast South County

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

Risks/Challenges

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

Workshop 3

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

Comparing Alternatives – Key Elements

- Costs
  - Capital
  - Operating
  - Collection
- Equitable distribution of facilities and services
- Flexibility to meet future needs
- Level-of-service criteria
  - Drive time
  - Time on site
  - Facility hours
  - Recycling services
  - Tonnage capacity
  - Vehicle capacity
  - Storage capacity
  - Compaction
  - Building and safety standards
  - Noise and odor standards
  - Traffic standards
  - Proximity to residences
  - Compatibility with surrounding land use

Project Website

Provides:

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

http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/plan-review.asp