



expressed concern about traffic and environmental impacts if garbage were to be hauled from the eastside to the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station only to have to be transported back to the eastside or Cedar Hills.

The division has ranked PCL Construction Services Inc. as the best proposer for construction of a new Factorial Recycling and Transfer Station. The legislative package is scheduled to be transmitted to the Council on April 10. Contract execution is scheduled for July 11, with submittals and limited site work to start July 16.

Meetings with the Financial Policies Subcommittee of MSWMAC which was formed last summer have resumed. The committee is working to satisfy Section 6.1.h. of the amended and restated ILA which says, "The County will maintain financial policies to guide the system's operations and investments...The policies shall be developed and/or revised through discussion with MSWAC..."

February 13, SWD employees met with neighbors of the Cedar Hills Landfill – primarily members of three households with whom the division has had frequent communication concerning the Dec. 7, 2013 pipeline break – to provide information and respond to questions. Much of the meeting involved responding to questions from the neighbors.

The Compost Days promotional campaign received a Totem Award from the Public Relations Society of America. SWD partnered with Seattle Public Utilities, Cedar Grove Composting, and Waste Management to develop the 2013 Compost Days campaign celebrating the diversion of 350,000 tons of organics from landfills. By offering free and deeply discounted compost, the campaign increased awareness of the benefits of compost and proper organics recycling methods, and increased compost sales. Compost sales during the campaign were significantly higher than in previous years.

MSWMAC was provided with copies of a [report from the King County Auditor's Office](#). This report demonstrates that the division receives external oversight. In particular, the second page shows the division's response to the audit recommendations.

#### SWAC

SWAC reviewed their work plan and received information about the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study (SSWMS) and the Transfer Plan Review Report.

#### Other

The City of Maple Valley awarded a seven year contract to Recology/CleanScapes which will begin in September.

## **Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study**

The consultant working with the Solid Waste Division on the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study (SSWMS) is incorporating feedback from both MSWMAC and SWAC in their evaluation of best practices and evaluation criteria. The division is discussing ways to present an overview of the information graphically and with brief summaries. Each practice will also have a detailed write up. Those materials will be sent to MSWMAC in advance of the next meeting. MSWMAC members are asked to review at least the overview page prior to the next meeting.

A member noted that:

- There are fourteen criteria and they are not weighted. Without that information, it will be difficult to determine which of the best practices to implement.
- Since specific rate impacts are also not available, it is not possible to make an informed decision.
- The [timeline](#) provided at the beginning of the meeting says the division will begin to implement this report in 2015. How can that occur without rate impacts?
- It's unclear how this work relates to the Optimized Transfer Station Recycling Feasibility Study which hasn't been presented to MSWMAC. Isn't this duplicative work that has already been paid for elsewhere?
- This study addresses five areas. How will those five areas be integrated for a decision?
- This appears to be a piecemeal way to address these issues.

The division responded that:

- This study is intended to identify which of the best practices should be pursued further. In some cases the analysis in the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study may be sufficient. In others, more detailed analysis will be needed before reaching a decision. At this level, where rate impacts and other details are not available the discussion is a bit subjective. Some of that discussion and subjective analysis will happen at the advisory groups.
- Not all of the best practices would have significant rate impacts and some could begin in 2015. Others may begin specific planning in 2015 and implementation during another rate period.
- The [Optimized Transfer Station Recycling Feasibility Study](#) was discussed during the transfer plan review process and has been available to MSWMAC online since that time. SSWMS consultants were given that study as well as other resources to inform their work. They were instructed to review them and build on what has already been done. The Optimized Transfer Station Recycling Feasibility Study was more limited than SSWMS. For example, it did not consider options at Cedar Hills or sustainable financing.
- Rather than piecemeal, the work on these decisions about the future has been incremental. The work is designed to be flexible enough to accommodate future changes.

### **Rate Analysis**

MSWMAC received a [presentation on the rate modeling process](#). Severn noted that a rate analysis does not always mean a rate increase. She said that the rate analysis process begins with the current fund balance. Additionally, tonnage forecasts include a growth percentage and the forecast for 2013 was within 1% of actual tonnage received.

Huddleston said that landfill projects are not funded by debt. The division's debt service is, with the exception of a few small closed landfill projects, directly related to transfer stations. He noted that the amount of debt service in the division's budget has historically been low because the debt for the transfer stations built in the 60's has been paid.

### **Transfer Plan Review Report**

MSWMAC received a [presentation on the Transfer Plan Review Final Report](#) which was submitted to the Executive on March 3. Based on extensive analysis developed for the Transfer Plan review, the report includes the following recommendation from the division.

- Proceed this year with a new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Stations using current design and permits (with minor modifications to retain flexibility)
- Continue siting evaluations for a South County recycling and Transfer Station
- In collaboration with stakeholders, evaluate implementation of operational approaches that would provide service for the northeast county without building an additional transfer station and compare trade-offs and benefits with the adopted Transfer Plan

The report and motion will on the Committee of the Whole's agenda on March 19 and on April 2. Though Council only needs to acknowledge receipt of the report to comply with the budget proviso, the division is hopeful of additional instruction in order to move forward.

Huddleston said that Council has asked for MSWMAC's recommendation regarding the report and was told no recommendation had been made. He noted some questions that he expects will be asked by Councilmembers and said a written version of the questions would be provided.

1. Each of the alternatives identified provide adequate disposal capacity. However, most of the options fail to meet some of the service criteria. The difference between the least expensive and most expensive option is \$110M. Are the cities certain they are willing to spend that much money for better service and recycling? If most recycling is done curbside and only twenty percent of the tonnage comes from self-haul is it worth that investment? Be sure you want this because it does impact rates.
2. Option A is an expanded Factoria station. Option B is an expanded NE station. How can one cost \$50M more than the other? Is there an engineering study or plan? Can we save some money in an enhanced transfer facility?
3. The recommended option has the most operational changes and doesn't meet 9 of the 14 criteria. Council members found that alarming. That appears to mean that the

NE transfer station isn't needed and Council wonders if the County is overbuilding elsewhere in the system.

4. Is compacting (at transfer stations) essential for Cedar Hills until the landfill reaches capacity?
5. Are you sure you want to build three more transfer stations when you don't need to based on capacity?

Additional comments included:

- New stations bring capital costs that are shared across the system. Choosing not to site a station moves the costs from shared capital cost to travel costs and only those cities a further distance from transfer services will pay those higher travel costs.
- The two years as shown in the timeline for starting the discussion about a Northeast transfer station does not seem reasonable.
- The same criteria were used in the Transfer Plan Review as was used in the previous transfer plan. The criteria were developed collaboratively with MSWMAC. The level of service criteria refer to a percentage of time as opposed to one or two days per month.
- One of the criteria is how far users travel to transfer stations. Do we know how many self-haulers this represents?
- According to surveys, most self-haulers aren't bringing regular household trash to transfer stations. Instead they are cleaning out garages, bringing debris from small construction projects and disposing of bulky items.
- Many people in Burien do self-haul their normal household trash so not having self-haul service would be a hardship.

Chair Eggen said that this topic will be on the agenda in April for further discussion and possible action.

#### **Budget Proviso Response: Financial Policies**

MSWMAC received a [presentation regarding proposed financial policies](#) accepted by the MSWMAC Financial Policies Subcommittee. The proposed policies are available [here](#).

Comments included:

- The "rainy day" reserve policy is intended to replace the previous practice of retaining an average of a 45 day operating reserve across the rate period. That practice was intended to both provide an operating reserve and stabilize the rate. This "rainy day" reserve when combined with the proposed rate stabilization reserve accomplishes the same intent but makes it more visible.
- The division depends on FEMA to help with reimbursement of catastrophic expenses.
- It would be useful to have all the policies in one place for comparison.

Contact Kiernan with questions or objections.

#### **Public Comment**

Jon Lindenauer provided the following comments during the public comment period.

My name is Jon Lindenauer and I represent the No North Auburn Garbage citizen's group. King County Solid Waste Division's Transfer Plan Review Final Report should receive a grade of 'F'. The report fails to investigate any issues in Waste Transfer Plan unique to the remaining transfer stations on Northeast side, Factoria and South King County. SWD failed to perform a transparent and accurate review. Ample input was provided by interested citizens, concerned business owners, city government and members of SWAC, but SWD failed to heed these ideas

We the citizens and city representative request an Independent Audit of the Transfer Plan.

No feedback was used to answer the transfer Plan Review's 4 governing questions:

1. Given the current tonnage projections through 2040, what are out options for reconfiguring our Transfer Station system?

The tonnage projections are almost 50% off! The SWD confirmed that future tonnage projections are 'uncertain.' How can SWD justify building three more oversized transfer stations? Decreased tonnage will result when the Sustainable Waste Study is completed in four months and when recycling is increased to 70%.

2. What are the major cost drivers in the construction of these new facilities and what options are there to reduce those expenses?

The major cost drivers are the following:

- SWD's failure to estimate accurate tonnage.
- SWD's failure to build right-sized transfer stations.
- SWD's failure to gather accurate and interpretable data.

Options that will reduce expenses are to build smarter by renovating Algona and saving \$120 million in capital costs.

3. What current policy decisions could be modified to reduce our capital or operating expense at a new facility?
  - Remodel or rebuild Algona at the current and adjacent KC owned sites.
  - Redirect Federal Way waste to Bow Lake which is operating under capacity.
  - Redirect waste to Shoreline which is currently operating at 25%.

This will reduce capital and operating expenses by over \$120 Million.

4. What are the customer impacts associated with any given change in terms of cost and service?

The customer is going to be the victim paying higher tipping fees and collections costs because SWD has overbuilt.

SWD has had nine months to come up with viable alternatives to the outdated and arcane 2006 Transfer Plan. Instead, it chose to regurgitate and copy/past its old base plan.

An independent audit is required of the SWD Transfer Plan.

The City of Auburn stated in its letter during the comment period of the Transfer Plan Review, "It is obvious that the County approached this effort with a foregone conclusion that a new solid waste handling facility is required, since the choices are limited to build or not to build,

that the only solution is a one size fits all approach to transfer stations, and that it fails to incorporate any innovative approaches. A more genuine approach would have been to allow an outside audit of the report.”

We ask for an independent review because it is a conflict of interest for KCSWD to have the final say on the Transfer Review Plan. I hope that those of you who are here on behalf of your city will take a more proactive stance and formally request an independent audit of the Transfer Plan so that we can have a Transfer Station System that is modern, environmentally friendly and economically viable.

Thank you,  
Jon Lindenauer  
No North Auburn Garbage Citizen’s Group

John Brekke provided the following public comments during the public comment period. My name is John Brekke and I represent a coalition that includes some of King County’s largest property owners along with Emerald Downs and members of the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties.

On behalf of our coalition, I am here to ask that an independent, third party review of the Transfer Plan Final Report is performed.

King County Solid Waste has just issued its Transfer Plan Final Report in response to Ordinance 17619. The exercise of the Ordinance was not to have King County Solid Waste defend the dated 2006 Solid Waste Transfer Plan, but in part to determine if changes could be made that could reduce future expenditures.

The Final Report lacks new ideas, innovation and thinking that challenge and examine the dated 2006 Solid Waste Transfer Plan.

Additionally, the King County Auditor’s Office shares these concerns and has recently issued a response to the Final Report. The auditor raises issues and provides suggestions that the Final Report failed to incorporate. These include:

- Future transfer system needs are subject to a large degree of uncertainty and the Final Report rests on many assumptions which can vary widely.
- Secondly, King County did not evaluate how the transfer system could be redesigned in response to future changes and new technologies. King County can reduce risks by maintaining maximum system flexibility.
- Lastly, the Auditor feels that there are further strategies to reduce peak hour demand, mitigate impacts on customers and optimize recycling thereby reducing the need to build new transfer stations.

An independent, third party review is necessary given the King County Auditor's concerns and Solid Waste's use of assumptions, lack of innovation, and desire to continue with only a minor variation of the Base Plan (possibly phase North King County).

An independent, third party review happened with the original 2006 Solid Waste Transfer Plan and therefore it is important to do so now, especially given Solid Waste's position. Had the Solid Waste Division demonstrated they were thorough in their reporting and innovative in their approach, it may not be necessary. The Final Report has shown differently and therefore an unbiased, independent, third party review is required before spending \$100Ms dollars.

Thank you for taking this request seriously,

John W. Brekke  
South King County Business Coalition on Transfer Stations  
[john@brekkeproperties.com](mailto:john@brekkeproperties.com)  
425-451-1511