

	Construction)	
<p>Consider building a regional resource recovery park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>That is outside the scope of the Transfer Plan review.</p>
<p>Partner with Cities for alternative spaces and drop box sites using City real estate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>Drop boxes would not provide sufficient capacity in the urban area. Drop boxes may have greater neighborhood impacts as they are not fully enclosed.</p>
<p>Cedar Hills Landfill</p>		
<p>Consider effects of Cedar Hills' closure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Cindy Flanagan • Nathan (surname not provided) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Rainier Audubon Society • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott 	<p>The Cedar Hills Regional Landfill (Cedar Hills) is currently projected to close after the end of 2025; projections will be updated in 2014. The division will work with its advisory committees to identify options for disposal post-Cedar Hills. Regardless of the method that is chosen for disposal after closure of Cedar Hills, transfer stations are an integral part of the solid waste system.</p>

	Construction)	
<p>Stop landfilling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phillip Schmidt-Pathmann 	<p>That is outside the scope of this review; the division will work with its advisory committees to identify options for disposal and criteria for decision making.</p> <p>The County's currently adopted plans call for continued to use of Cedar Hills until it reaches capacity and then for export to an out-of-county landfill. However, the division has recommended exploring other options for disposal after Cedar Hills reaches capacity and closes and exploring options to reduce the amount of waste going to Cedar Hills during its lifetime through the use of waste conversion technologies as well as expanded recycling.</p>
<p>Include effect of changes to Cedar Hills rent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>The rent paid to the County's general fund for use of the property owned by the general fund was determined by an independent appraisal. The rent payment schedule assumes the current landfill development plan and will be updated if there are changes to that plan in the future. The rent payment schedule was integrated into the 2012 rate study.</p>
<p>Transfer station at Cedar Hills (now or post-closure)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) 	<p>The role of Cedar Hills in the solid waste system after the landfill reaches capacity and closes will be considered in future plans; however, due to its location it would not be an adequate substitute for a South County RTS.</p>
<p>Need a second proxy disposal location to represent post-closure operations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>Identification of another proxy location could not be supported.</p>

<p>Include post-closure long-haul costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>Costs for disposal after closure of Cedar Hills are estimated in the <u>2012 Rate Study</u>.</p>
<p>Consider using direct haul to Cedar Hills instead of keeping facilities open during transfer station construction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>The division is considering allowing some additional curbside collection vehicles to use the landfill during the Factoria construction to help alleviate traffic at the site.</p>
<p>Consider using direct haul to Cedar Hills during peak periods and emergencies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Kenmore • City of Redmond • City of Shoreline • City of Woodinville • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>Based on conditions, such as roads, additional use of Cedar Hills will be considered on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>Capacity</p>		
<p>Consider future system capacity in case Bellevue does not leave the system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keith Livingston 	<p>The division recommends retaining the option to construct a Northeast facility in the future, should Bellevue decide to sign an extended ILA.</p>
<p>Extend facility hours to increase capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>To strengthen the feasibility of alternatives, increased service hours were assumed if the station would be receiving additional waste.</p>

	<p>Development)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nathan (surname not provided) • City of Auburn 	
<p>Mandatory garbage collection and recycling services could reduce the need for transfer station capacity</p>		<p>Mandatory garbage collection is at the discretion of each city. Currently, garbage collection is mandatory in 13 cities including Auburn, Bothell, Enumclaw, Kent, Kirkland, and Renton. However, everyone in King County has access to garbage collection, almost all have access to recycling and yard waste collection, and the majority of King County residents do subscribe to curbside services. However, many also periodically use the transfer stations. The most recent customer survey (2011) indicates that most self-haulers use a transfer station because they have a large amount of garbage or yard debris or a bulky item which cannot be accommodated by the regular curbside collection. Most self-haulers are not using the transfer station to dispose of regular household trash.</p> <p>Because much of the material self-haulers dispose at the transfer stations is recyclable, current station designs and the draft comprehensive solid waste management plan prioritize inclusion of increased recycling at new transfer facilities. Current plans prioritize collection of yard waste, clean wood, card board, and scrap metal.</p> <p>Recycling rates vary from city to city depending on the level of service being provided, the rate structure and mandatory pay/participation policies. Mandatory garbage collection does not always correlate to high recycling rates. For example, both Algona and Auburn have mandatory garbage collection but Auburn’s single family recycling rate is 53 percent while Algona’s is 37 percent. In nearly all cities and unincorporated areas of King County the cost of curbside recycling service is included in the cost of curbside garbage service, so if a customer has garbage collection they are likely to use the curbside recycling service as well.</p> <p>No city or unincorporated area in King County – except Seattle, which is not part of the King County system – requires their residents to recycle. However, all communities prohibit single-family customers from putting yard waste in their garbage. This requirement has resulted in very high recycling rate – over 90 percent – for yard waste from single-family homes. Eleven cities in King County (including Seattle) include the cost of yard waste collection in the cost of curbside garbage service. These cities also have the highest single-family recycling rates in the county (57 to 66 percent). Note</p>

		<p>that even Seattle with mandatory garbage collection and requirements for their residents to recycle and separate their food scraps and yard waste for composting still finds the need to provide self-haul services at their transfer stations.</p>
<p>Increased recycling/waste reduction could reduce the need for transfer station capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>The County's current recycling rate, overall, is about 52 percent. The tonnage forecast used for analysis of transfer system alternatives assumes that a 70 percent recycling rate, which is consistent with the county's Zero Waste of Resources goal, will be gradually achieved. New transfer facilities with expanded recycling and other recommendations from the Optimized Transfer Station Recycling Feasibility Study will support the 70 percent recycling goal, as will product stewardship, and other expanded waste prevention and recycling programs. Policy actions by both the county and the cities, such as implementing mandatory recycling and disposal bans, will also be necessary to achieve a 70 percent recycling rate. Without regional support, the county will not achieve the 70 percent recycling goal.</p>
<p>Restrictions on self-haul could reduce the need for transfer station capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>Self-haul restrictions were considered in several of the alternatives. While restrictions on self-haul might encourage some customers to sign up for curbside collection, the vast majority of self-haulers are not disposing of regular household waste. Restrictions on self-haul would primarily change traffic and use patterns at transfer facilities, but would not provide a significant overall reduction in the number of customers. During the review process, many stakeholders expressed concern that self-haul restrictions would increase illegal dumping.</p>
<p>Waste from Auburn in Pierce County is going to the Algona Transfer Station; disincentives could reduce the need for transfer capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega 	<p>The portions of Auburn that are within Pierce County are part of the King County solid waste system and should be going to a King County facility. That tonnage is included in the forecast and provides revenue to the solid waste system.</p>

	Riggers & Erectors) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nathan Jay Maribel Mesina 	
Curbside collection of bulky waste could reduce need for transfer capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) Nathan Jay Maribel Mesina 	As recommended in the draft comprehensive solid waste management plan, the division will continue to work with the cities and others to explore options to increase the efficiency and reduce the price of curbside collection of bulky items, while diverting as many items as possible for reuse or recycling, which could help alleviate some self-haul traffic at facilities. In the division's 2011 survey of customers, about 12 percent of residential self-haulers said that they were coming to the transfer station because they had items too big to fit in the garbage can.
Alternative disposal methods (such as waste-to-energy, refuse derived fuel, composting, anaerobic digestion) could reduce the need for transfer station capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dana Brekke Jan Brekke John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) Nathan (surname not provided) 	Most jurisdictions that use alternative disposal technologies still use transfer stations as the receiving locations where smaller vehicles take their loads for consolidation into larger loads that then go to further processing. The division is exploring options for adding alternative technologies to current and future facilities and for alternatives to disposal at the Cedar Hills landfill.
Increased use of onsite compactors at commercial properties will reduce need for transactional capacity at transfer stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dana Brekke Jan Brekke John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) Nathan (surname not provided) 	The majority of the self-haul transactions are currently from single family residences. The division will continue to work with cities and others to identify cost effective options for curbside collection of materials, such as bulky waste, and will track developments that lead to significant changes in transactions.
Current system has excess capacity, direct commercial haulers to underutilized facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dana Brekke Jan Brekke John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	In some areas (Shoreline and Enumclaw) there is additional capacity; however, there is not sufficient capacity in the areas served by the Algona, Factoria, or Houghton facilities. E1 considers how to make use of system capacity through directing commercial haulers to specific facilities. Directing commercial haulers is a policy change that would require

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) 	<p>action by the King County Council and would affect curbside collection rates for customers in the affected areas.</p>
<p>Restrict out-of-system self-haulers to reduce need for capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties Dana Brekke Jan Brekke John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) Nathan Jay Maribel Mesina Nathan (surname not provided) Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) 	<p>The number of customers bringing solid waste from outside of the system does not contribute significantly to the need for transfer stations and increases revenue. The county does not encourage out-of-system customers.</p>
<p>Okay to exceed capacity 2021-2028</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dana Brekke Jan Brekke John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>Exceeding vehicle capacity has a variety of consequences such as the time it takes commercial haulers to unload at the transfer station, which influences curbside collection costs, and queue length which can impact local streets. The division seeks to provide adequate service in all areas of the county.</p>
<p>Level of Service (LOS)</p>		
<p>Provide original level of service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Brekke (Brekke 	<p>Please see <u>Milestone Report 2</u> for detailed information on the level of service standards</p>

<p>Page 113 results</p>	<p>failures of existing urban transfer stations and what, if any, mitigation measures exist.</p>	<p>failures of existing urban transfer stations and what, if any, mitigation measures exist.</p>
<p>Reconsider LOS criteria (especially drive time and emergency capacity), drive time standard is not important</p>	<p>Properties, Viking Development)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>The LOS standards were developed by regional consensus. Drive time does not appear to be a deciding factor.</p>
<p>Dislikes LOS system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>The criteria were developed with extensive stakeholder input as an objective method for evaluating the transfer system and reflect broad interest.</p>
<p>LOS capacity standards incorrectly applied/C should not be considered failing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>The standard used in the 2006 Transfer System Plan was developed using transportation industry standards of measurement for capacity of roadways and intersections – called a level of service or LOS measurement. An LOS measurement is a qualitative measure based on quantitative data. For the 2006 Plan consultants were retained to refine methodology and to apply them to the transfer stations; for this analysis the division applied the same methodology.</p> <p>An LOS of C was the target for capacity, not a failing grade.</p>

<p>Include LOS data for different years/ include LOS data for each transfer station</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke s • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Cindy Flanagan • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>The division analyzed two different years to provide a snapshot of capacity. 2027 was used because it was the final full year that Bellevue would be part of the system. See http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/TWMP-Alternatives-Station-Detail.pdf for more detail on individual facilities.</p>
<p>Detailed drive-time data show failures are isolated and limited</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>Results show that drive time LOS failures are not a significant factor in the need for transfer system upgrades. However, it is important to note that increases in drive time, whether they result in LOS failure or not, will increase collection costs for curbside customers and for self-haul customers will increase cost and greenhouse gas emissions due to longer drive times.</p>
<p>Drive time maps have overlaps</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>More than one facility was considered when evaluating drive times.</p>
<p>Disaster agreements with neighboring jurisdictions eliminate need for emergency storage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>Any region wide disaster would likely have the same effect on neighboring jurisdictions.</p>

Rates/Fees

<p>Charge differential rates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Bothell • City of Kirkland • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina 	<p>A future rate study will consider differential rates that could be based on recovery of capital costs for transfer system improvements over two different time periods (through June 2028 and through December 2040) and/or other consequences of some cities not adopting the amended and restated interlocal agreement. Input on the rate study will be sought from the division's advisory committees.</p>
<p>Self-haul service should be charged more</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) 	<p>The fee for self-haul customers will be considered in a future rate study.</p>
<p>Develop a rate forecast through 2040</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Kenmore • City of Redmond • City of Shoreline • City of Woodinville 	<p>Decisions related to the capital program are a key input to the rate analysis. Policy decisions made through this process will be incorporated into a future rate study.</p>

<p>Rate discussion needs more depth</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties 	<p>Policy decisions made through this process will be incorporated into a future rate study. For a more in depth discussion of rates see the <u>2012 Rate Study</u>.</p>
<p>Separate rate for small business self-haulers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) 	<p>A future rate study could consider small business self-haulers as a separate customer class.</p>
<p>Reduced regional direct rate would decrease demand for transfer stations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott 	<p>By definition, "regional direct" is solid waste that has gone through a transfer station. Currently, there is not private transfer station capacity sufficient to accept the amounts of waste that were processed prior to elimination of the regional direct fee subsidy.</p>

<p>Increase fees to match neighboring jurisdictions – higher tipping fees would reduce demand</p>	<p>Construction)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) 	<p>Solid waste fees are based on the cost to provide programs and services; fees are not set higher than necessary.</p>
<p>Interlocal Agreements</p>		
<p>County has not signed extended interlocal agreements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina 	<p>The King County Council approved Ordinance 17677 on October 21, 2013, which authorized the King County Executive to enter into amended and restated interlocal agreements with any city that is part of the King County solid waste system. The County signed the amended and restated interlocal agreements on November 6, 2013. Thirty-two cities have adopted the new ILA which extends commitment to the system through 2040.</p>
<p>Consider how new interlocal agreements could affect solid waste plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>Under the current interlocal agreements, the County is responsible for management of waste from 37 cities through June 2028, and for management of waste from 32 cities through 2040. The County will continue discussions with cities of issues arising as a result of some cities' choice not to enter into the new ILA.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nathan (surname not provided) 	
<p>Give cities a deadline to sign the new interlocal agreement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Kirkland • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) 	<p>The County submitted the amended and restated ILA to the Cities for approval on December 28, 2012 with a request for a statement of interest by February 28 and action by April 30, 2013. This date was set so that the County could make the appropriate decision on refinancing debt that was primarily incurred during Bow Lake construction. Based on the response received, bonds were financed at historically low rates, to the advantage of ratepayers. April 30, 2013 was not intended as a deadline after which a city could not chose to extend its commitment to the King County solid waste system.</p> <p>Having as many cities as possible adopt the amended and restated ILA is in the interest of solid waste system ratepayers as it provides even greater economies of scale; therefore, the County will continue to work with those cities that have not yet signed the new ILA to encourage a longer commitment to the regional solid waste system. The County will discuss with cities how to manage the issues associated with having non-extending cities in the system. This discussion will include considerations of latecomer provisions if cities opt to extend at a later date and development of a rate structure which appropriately allocates costs among extending and non-extending cities.</p>
<p>Haulers' Role and Collection Costs</p>		
<p>Collection cost data insufficient/unreliable/requires further study</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Algona • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Cindy Flanagan • Nathan Jay 	<p>The division very much appreciates the information that was provided by the commercial haulers and respects the difficulty of projecting potential cost increases without detailed studies. While specific, detailed information was not provided, throughout this process, and in past discussions related to transfer system configuration, the haulers have consistently stated that the further they must drive to reach a transfer facility, the higher the cost will be for their collection customers.</p> <p>CleanScapes has provided some updated information which has been incorporated into the report in Table 5.</p> <p>A map of the commercial hauler's collection areas can be found on the Transfer Plan review project website http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/TWMP-SW-</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maribel Mesina • Nathan (surname not provided) • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) • City of Auburn 	<p>Collection-Service-Areas-2014-07.pdf.pdf.</p>
<p>Include the division's initial request for collection cost information in the report</p>		<p>The following email was sent to each hauler operating in King County:</p> <p>Thank you for your participation in the first workshop of the King County Transfer & Waste Management Plan Review. As we discussed at the meeting, the Solid Waste Division is developing alternative scenarios for reconfiguring King County's planned transfer station system.</p> <p>King County's current transfer station plan calls for construction of three new full-service facilities: a Northeast King County facility located north of Lake Sammamish; a South King County facility in the Auburn-Algona area; and a new Factoria facility adjacent to the current Factoria station. The Algona, Houghton, Renton, and the existing Factoria transfer facilities would all be closed.</p> <p>The alternative scenarios being considered all include closure of Algona, Renton, Houghton, and the existing Factoria transfer stations, except for one scenario that might keep Houghton open for self-haulers only. However, these scenarios present various options for reducing construction of new replacement transfer facilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build Factoria and South County facilities only; • Build Northeast and South County facilities only; and • Build Northeast facility only. <p>A summary of the current plan and alternative scenarios is attached.</p> <p>To fully identify the impacts of each scenario, we need input from _____ and the other haulers serving King County. We are requesting your assistance in identifying potential impacts to your operations and your customers for each scenario. We have specifically been requested by stakeholders to estimate the cost impacts to commercial collection companies associated with extra drive time and how these costs will affect the collection rates charged to residents and businesses.</p> <p>Given the quick timeline for this review, we would appreciate receiving input from</p>

		<p>_____ before the end of August if possible.</p> <p>If you have any questions about this request, please contact me. Further information about the Plan Review, including materials distributed at the first meeting, is available at a dedicated website: http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/plan-review.asp#schedule</p> <p>Thank you for your assistance.</p>
<p>Convert haulers' data to same format</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>The division attempted to provide information in a uniform manner by estimating cost per average household for some alternatives. The impacts of collection cost increases would not be uniform across the county.</p>
<p>Include cost impacts by city</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>This information is not available.</p>
<p>Include individual city and private hauler contract terms, costs and contract duration data in the report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina 	<p>This information is available from each city.</p>
<p>Cities need time to negotiate collection rates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Aigner, Harsch Investment Properties • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>Cities that contract with private haulers are on individual contract cycles. In any given year, only a few cities will negotiate new contracts.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) 	
<p>Show haulers' base of operations on facility maps</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina 	<p>This information is available from the commercial haulers.</p>
<p>Alternative fuels will reduce collection costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>The majority of the collection vehicles already use compressed natural gas.</p>
<p>Haulers decide where to take</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking 	<p>In accordance with state law RCW 81.77.020 and 36.58.040, counties are prohibited from providing curbside garbage collection services. Legal authority for regulating</p>

	<p>Development)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) 	<p>collection is shared primarily between the state – acting through the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) – and the cities. The WUTC sets and adjusts rates and requires compliance with the state and local adopted solid waste management plans and related ordinances. RCW 81.77 also includes a process for allowing cities to opt out of the WUTC regulatory structure and either contract directly for solid waste collection or provide city-operated collection systems.</p> <p>Most of the garbage, recyclables, and organics collection in the county’s service area are provided by four private-sector companies – Republic Services, Inc. (formerly Allied Waste, Inc.), Waste Management, Inc., Waste Connections, Inc., and CleanScapes, Inc. Except for CleanScapes, which only provides contracted services, these companies operate both through the WUTC and service contracts with individual cities.</p> <p>Most of the 37 cities in the service area contract directly with one or more of these private companies for collection services. Eight cities (Beaux Arts, Black Diamond, Covington, Hunts Point, Kenmore, Medina, Woodinville, and Yarrow Point) and all of the unincorporated areas receive collection services from these private companies operating under certificates issued by the WUTC. Two cities – Enumclaw and Skykomish – provide municipal collection services within their own jurisdictions.</p> <p>Both the original and the amended and restated interlocal agreements assign responsibility for different aspects of solid waste management to the county and the cities. The county is assigned operating authority for transfer and disposal services, is tasked with providing support and assistance to the cities for the establishment of waste prevention and recycling programs, and is the planning authority for solid waste. Each city is the designated authority for collection services within their corporate boundaries and agrees to direct solid waste generated and/or collected within those boundaries to the King County transfer and disposal system. While a city might direct, through a service contract with a hauler, at which facility solid waste must be transferred, the County currently has no authority to do so. Alternative E1 considers a policy change that would require action by the King County Council, which would allow the division to direct haulers to a particular facility.</p>
<p>Have a third-party review of commercial hauler collection costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke) 	<p>The review process, as set by ordinance, does not include a third-party review. Were there to be a third-party review, the County could not compel the haulers to</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Cindy Flanagan • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina • Nathan (surname not provided) • Jeff Scott (R.W. Scott Construction) 	participate.
Revise Table 5 "Collection Cost Estimate Summary" to reflect updated information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CleanScapes 	Table 5 has been revised to reflect the updated information.
Miscellaneous		
Change code regarding salvaging at transfer stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Nathan (surname not provided) 	State law, WAC 173-350-310, requires that scavenging (salvaging) be prohibited at intermediate solid waste handling facilities (transfer stations).
Update King County Performance Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	The King County Council has included a follow-up to the 2011 Performance Audit in the County Auditor's work program. This follow-up will focus on recommendation 4 from the audit that the Solid Waste Division should update the transfer system plan to provide "systematic analysis of the incremental cost impacts of the number, capacities and functionality of the transfer stations and assessment of project financing and delivery methods".

<p>Include adjacent land owned by King County at Factoria, Algona, Houghton, Bow Lake and other sites in retention and repair costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Nathan (surname not provided) 	<p>The division considered how to repair and retain current facilities. Expansion onto adjacent property would not be considered repair and retention.</p>
<p>200 lineal feet not required for compactors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) • Eleanor Brekke-Parks (Brekke Properties) • Mike Cotter (Omega Riggers & Erectors) • Nathan Jay • Maribel Mesina 	<p>To safely maneuver (backing up) the tractor-trailer combination, 200 lineal feet is needed. The division considered a pull through design for the Houghton Transfer Station, but that would reduce the handling capacity by one-half.</p>
<p>Reconsider Milestone Report Three public/private recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke 	<p>Evaluation of the public/private structure of the system is outside the scope of the Transfer Plan review.</p>
<p>Include framework for financial policies and host city mitigation, including compensation agreements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Brekke • Jan Brekke • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>These topics are outside the scope of the Transfer Plan review. The County will continue discussions with cities on these topics.</p>
<p>Include advantages and cost of an intermodal transfer station</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brekke (Brekke Properties, Viking Development) 	<p>Evaluation of an intermodal is outside the scope of the Transfer Plan review.</p>

Councilmember Dini Duclos

April 18, 2014

Page



King County

Solid Waste Division

Department of Natural Resources and Parks

King Street Center

201 South Jackson Street, Suite 701

Seattle, WA 98104-3855

206-296-6542

711 TTY Relay

www.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste

April 25, 2014

The Honorable Dini Duclos
Federal Way City Councilmember
Chair, SCA Caucus of the RPC
6300 Southcenter Blvd
Tukwila, WA 98188

Dear Chair Duclos:

Thank you for your letter of April 15, 2014, requesting answers to questions the Regional Policies Committee have about the Solid Waste Plan Final Report. The report recommended the following;

- Proceed this year with a new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station using current design and permits (with minor modifications to retain flexibility)
- Continue siting process for a South County Recycling and Transfer Station
- Work with stakeholders on developing the optimal “no-build” option for future Northeast capacity and compare trade-offs and benefits with the adopted Transfer Plan

With that in mind, we offer the following answers to your questions.

CLOSURE OF EXISTING TRANSFER STATIONS

1. Kirkland’s MOU with King County provides that the “County should focus investment in part to expand, relocate, or replace, ... transfer stations when safety, efficiency, capacity, or customer services needs cannot be met by existing transfer facilities.” Given that the Houghton Transfer station is the second busiest station in the system and fails to meet 18 of 26 level-of-service criteria in the Transfer Plan, and given that the County has repeatedly promised to close Houghton, how can the SWD justify anything other than closing Houghton by 2021?

Answer: The three Alternatives recommended for further evaluation – Base, E1, and E2 – all include closing Houghton in 2021.

2. Similarly, how does the SWD justify not closing Renton as scheduled by 2018?

Answer: As part of the Transfer Plan review, the division was requested to assess whether changes could be made that could reduce future capital expenditures while still meeting desired service objectives and levels. Alternatives E1 and E2 considered keeping Renton open as means to reduce capital expenditures while maintaining a higher level of service than would be available if it were to close.

Subsequently, the division has received input from the City of Renton opposing keeping the station open. Closure of the Renton Transfer Station would be incorporated into the further evaluation of Alternatives E1 and E2.

3. In solid waste as in realty, it is "location, location, location." What is the current population served by the Houghton station?

Answer: The Houghton Transfer Station currently serves a population of approximately 270,000 people.

4. If Houghton is closed without a replacement, what populations and uses would Shoreline and Factoria stations have to serve?

Answer: Options E1 and E2 call for policy changes that would impact the populations served either by redirecting waste or limiting self-haul. Other demand management options could also be employed that could impact population served. The division is recommending a discussion of these options by the region. It is anticipated that both stations would provide services for commercial and self-haul garbage customers, recycling services, and Factoria would provide Household Hazardous Waste services.

COST

1. What are the rate impacts of the different scenarios vs. the base plan?

Answer: The cost per ton impacts to current rates ranged from as high as \$16.39 (Base Plan) to as low as \$5.16 (D***). This equates to an added cost per month for the average household of \$0.34 to \$1.08. Attachment 1 provides estimates based on forecasts for inflation and bond rates that were available at the time of the Transfer Plan review analysis and assume 20-year bonds at 5 percent. This chart has been corrected from a previous version to add .21 cents per ton to the average cost for scenarios that include South County. Other figures remain unchanged.

2. What are the estimated capital costs for each of the remaining transfer stations to be built under the Base Plan and Option E? Include all costs (including but not limited to design, engineering, land acquisition, environmental studies and compliance, permitting, construction, mitigation, overhead, etc.).

Answer: See Attachment 2 – Cost and Debt Service By Facility and By Year

3. What is the annual debt service by year for each new facility in the Base Plan and Option E through 2040? List the assumptions (i.e. costs, length of bonds, interest rates, etc.) that form the basis of your calculations.

Answer: See Attachment 2– Cost and Debt Service By Facility and By Year

4. What is the rate impact for annual debt service for each new facility in the Base Plan and Option E using the most recent tonnage projections? List the yearly tonnage projections used in your calculations.

Answer: See Attachment 2 – Cost and Debt Service By Facility and By Year

5. What are the total annual estimated operating costs for each of the transfer stations in the system for the Base Plan and Option E and what is the rate impact?

Answer: Operating costs are not expected to vary significantly between alternatives, because the system must handle the same number of tons and transactions. For this reason, the division did not perform in-depth analysis of this issue. Regardless of the number of transfer stations, the number of tons and transactions remains essentially the same, requiring staff and equipment to receive, process, and transport. Transportation costs will vary depending on distance to the disposal or processing location.

The division is recommending continued evaluation of E1 and E2 and comparison with the Base Plan. More detailed operational cost analysis could be included in that evaluation.

6. Alternatives E1/E2 do not meet 12 of the 26 service criteria and only save \$0.38 to \$0.42 per month for the average rate-payer compared to the base plan. Do these costs include hauling costs? Alternatives E1/E2 would involve hauling further distances because the transfer stations are not distributed regionally. King County's September 2013 analysis of Alternative C showed that for that option hauling costs are a larger component of the monthly rates than the capital costs of building the new transfer station facilities. Unless the projected cost saving of between 38-cents and 42-cents per month for Alternatives E1/E2 include hauling costs, the costs may be incomplete and misleading.

Answer: This appears to be a reference to Appendix G, which was an early evaluation tool that was replaced and superseded in the final report by the chart comparing impacts of the Base Plan and E1 and E2. The Appendix is of limited utility because the table was structured so that only a system with entirely new stations could meet all service level criteria (and if any station did not meet a particular criterion, the alternative was assigned a “no” for that criterion, even if all other stations satisfied the criterion. Ultimately, the “E” alternatives were determined to be feasible. The projected savings are for capital costs only. The division recommended additional analysis regarding costs comparing E1/E2 (or some combination) and the Base Plan.

7. What happens to the rate if the tonnage drops and you do not meet your projections?

Answer: Fixed costs, such as debt service, would need to be spread over a smaller base requiring either reductions in expenditures or an increase in revenue.

8. Is there anything the County can do to cover the bond payments if the tonnage drops, short of cutting services or increasing the rate?

Answer: The division is evaluating ways to optimize non-tip fee revenue, such as revenue from carbon credits.

9. According to your last rate submittal, disposal operations at the Cedar Hills landfill cost approximately \$13M and estimated disposal costs in 2026 after Cedar Hills closes in 2025 were \$56M for waste export. What is the impact on the rate for disposal costs after Cedar Hills closes in 2025?

Answer: In 2015, the system will save an estimated \$7 to \$8 per ton by disposing at Cedar Hills as compared to the cost of waste export to an out-of-county landfill. This is one of the reasons that King County’s disposal costs are significantly lower than Seattle’s. When Cedar Hills closes, disposal costs are expected to increase; the extent of the increase will depend on a number of factors including the disposal option(s) chosen.

FACTORIA

1. The County has a current permit to rebuild the Factoria Transfer Station. The permit was approved based on a certain number of vehicle transactions and certain acceptable traffic levels at the station and on local streets. How would the E1 and E2 alternatives impact the number of vehicle transactions (both commercial and self-haul) and traffic on local streets as compared to the assumptions in the current permit?

Answer: The number of vehicles using the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station is expected to increase under Alternatives E1 and E2.

2. Why do you think it is a good idea to extend the hours that the Factoria transfer station is open for self-haul to 11pm on weeknights? Who is going to think that is a good idea on a nice summer evening, when windows are open, only to hear garbage being dumped into transfer trailer beds?

Answer: For Alternatives E1 and E2, the division modeled extended hours at Factoria to increase capacity. Unlike the current facility, the new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station will be fully enclosed.

LEVEL OF SERVICE

1. The County proposed two less expensive alternatives (E1 and E2) which fail to meet 12 of 26 level-of-service criteria to include standards for vehicle capacity, self-haul, recycling, and local traffic. The more expensive Base Plan satisfies all level-of-service criteria for a cost to the average rate-payer of between .38 cents to .42 cents more per month. Does the County share the concern that the E1 and E2 alternatives may create a second class transfer system and that we may regret not implementing the Base Plan?

Answer: See comments above regarding Appendix G. The division recommends further evaluation of E1 and E2 and comparison with the Base Plan.

2. Arrayed over the service hours of the day, what are the projected drive times for concentric bands served by Houghton compared to the next nearest existing station?

Answer: This level of analysis is complex and costly. As a result, the division would like to understand the specific concerns to determine if other information can address the issues.

NORTHEAST TRANSFER STATION

1. Is it true that a transfer station siting process can take years to complete and starting a siting process now to identify viable and available properties for a Northeast Transfer Station does not obligate the County to actually design or construct the station?

Answer: A siting process is expected to take 2 to 3 years. A siting process would not obligate the County to design or construct a Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station.

2. How certain is the SWD that no Northeast Transfer Station (NETS) is needed? What are the risks if the Solid Waste Division is wrong?

Answer: Based on current projections, the E1 and E2 options (or some combination) provide sufficient capacity for tonnage and transactions without a new NE station. The Solid Waste Division's recommendation is to refine the E1 and E2 options to determine the optimal "no build" option and then compare the costs and benefits of that option to the Base Plan (which is more expensive, but provides higher levels of service). The Solid Waste Division agrees with the Auditor that further a regional discussion is appropriate and that options should be kept open regarding whether or when a new northeast facility would be needed.

RECYCLING

1. During the RPC presentation we were informed that self-haulers recycle about 5% of their loads, which is well under the 52% that is recycled via curbside pick-up. If that's the case, why would we want to encourage customers to self-haul their trash to transfer stations? Wouldn't it be better to discourage that behavior by keeping curbside pick-up prices down?

Answer: More than two-thirds of self-haul customers do use curbside service. Most self-haulers use the transfer stations to dispose of bulky materials or amounts of material that are too large to be picked up with regular curbside service, including many materials that could be recycled such as scrap metal, large loads of yard debris, large amounts of cardboard, and recyclable wood. New transfer stations facilitate expanded recycling.

SEPA AND EIS

1. Will there be a SEPA process on a closure without opening a new northeast station to allow us to understand the impact of packer trucks and self-haulers on other highways?

Answer: Any significant changes to the Transfer Plan would likely be subject to environmental review under SEPA, which would include traffic analysis.

2. If King County selects an alternative (E1 or E2) to the Base Plan as recommended in the 2006 Transfer Station Plan, would the SWD be required to complete another Environmental Impact Statement to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the alternative recommendations before the new plan could be implemented?

Answer: It is likely that material changes to the Base Plan would require environmental review.

TONNAGE ESTIMATES

1. In 2005, the County estimated 1.6m tons would be processed by the system in 2030. Revised tonnage estimates call for 785,000 and 860,000 tons in 2030 and 2040, respectively. How confident is the County in its revised tonnage estimates and its ability to provide service under Alternatives E1/E2?

Answer: Forecasts are based on the best available information and based on current projections, alternatives E1 and E2 can accommodate system tonnage and transactions.

2. Bellevue has indicated that it does not intend to sign an extended interlocal agreement (ILA) with the County, and that it will leave the system when the current ILA expires in 2028. Does the Solid Waste Division (SWD) believe that it is prudent to plan for a regional system that does not include the tonnage produced by Bellevue at this time?

Answer: The division works to retain as much flexibility as possible while incorporating the best information available at the time, thus the current tonnage forecast does not include tonnage that is not contractually committed to the system.

3. The fact that Bellevue has decided to not extend its ILA with the County makes planning for the future of the system challenging. A new Northeast Transfer Station is needed to handle Bellevue's tonnage. In order for both Bellevue and King County to plan, the County should establish a deadline. When should that deadline be?

Answer: The financial policies committee of MSWMAC is evaluating latecomer provisions, which could include a recommended deadline. However, presumably, any deadline could be changed in the future if the region determined it was beneficial to do so.

4. Even if Bellevue opts out of the County system, King County's projections show the tonnage rising back up to the current levels in upcoming years. Considering the length of time that siting a station requires, would it not be prudent to move forward with siting a NE station for the future?

Answer: There is sufficient time for further discussions with stakeholders, and the division agrees with the Auditor that additional regional discussions on this issue are appropriate.

5. Under Alternative E1, how will the County legally require haulers to take waste to specific transfer stations to maximize the use of the system's available tonnage capacity? What enforcement mechanism will be used?

Answer: The County would likely adopt an ordinance directing certain tonnage to specific stations. The enforcement mechanism would be identified in the ordinance.

6. How much solid waste tonnage reduction and slower growth projections is converted to increased tonnage in new and existing recyclables, requiring more efficient and compartmentalized stations to handle it?

Answer: The current forecast assumes a one percent annual increase in recycling until a recycling rate of 70 percent is achieved. Achieving the 70 percent recycling goal assumes that transfer stations will recycle 35 percent of the solid waste delivered by self-haul customers. Expanded recycling capabilities will be needed to achieve that goal.

7. What are the tonnage reduction factors that would drive a closure of Houghton?

Answer: Tonnage reduction would not be the driving factor in closing Houghton.

8. Is it realistic to drive 18% of the system tonnage to other existing stations?

Answer: Operational and policy changes would be needed. The division would work with stakeholders to identify which changes to pursue.

9. What future increases in tonnage would drive a need for a new Northeast station if Houghton is closed without a replacement in place?

Answer: The need for a new station could be driven by tonnage increases or by desire for new or improved services.

10. By recommending the "No build" Alternatives E1 and E2, the County is gambling that its tonnage projections are correct. In 2008, the economy experienced an unforeseen recession which resulted in a significant decrease in the tonnage projections made in the 2006 Transfer Plan which indicates that the County's tonnage estimates may be wrong. The tonnage projections are based on a 70% recycling rate. However the region is only at 52%. What if the County is wrong about the recycling rate and what if the economy rebounds? What is the County's back-up plan if the tonnage estimates are too low? Would the County be willing to conduct a sensitivity analysis of their risk before excluding the Northeast Transfer Station option?

Answer: The division is recommending continued evaluation of E1 and E2 in consultation with stakeholders. A sensitivity analysis as described above could be included in that evaluation.

The 70 percent recycling goal was established in consultation with MSWMAC during development of the draft comprehensive solid waste management plan. MSWMAC's current work program includes revisiting that draft plan beginning in August. Reaching the 70 percent goal would require significant commitment and involvement from cities and hauler partners.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

1. What are the traffic impacts to the north end cities from diverted trips to the Shoreline Transfer Station? What routes would diverted traffic take? What will be the impact on SR 522 and SR 104 if Houghton closes? What provisions will be made for diversions of transfer station traffic due to unforeseen detours? Will the impacted cities receive ongoing mitigation dollars for roadway repairs? If a decision is made to add to traffic in some locations for a public service, would there be mitigation payments or support for mitigation projects?

Answer: The division would work with the region on these implementation issues, if the determination is made to redirect commercial traffic to Shoreline.

TRANSACTIONAL CAPACITY

1. Regarding transactional capacity at a new Factoria station, there will be 2.75 times more self-haul unloading bays, almost three times the self-haul trip capacity on weekdays and three-and-a-half times more self-haul unloading bays and self-haul trip capacity on weekend days, so why does the SWD conclude that "the point of failure is managing the transactions"? (Currently, the Factoria transfer station has 4 unloading bays for self-haul and the new Factoria transfer station will have 11 unloading bays during the weekdays and 14 unloading bays during the weekend days for self-haul.)

Answer: Currently, at Factoria waste is disposed on two sides of the pit. One side has eight self-haul stalls and the other side has four commercial stalls (commercial stalls are twice as large as self-haul stalls.) Typically, the station is operated so that commercial haulers and self-haulers do not dump across from one another, which means that only four self-haul stalls and two commercial stalls are typically used at the same time. However, the station is sometimes operated to allow dumping in all eight self-haul stalls and all four commercial stalls during busier periods to avoid excessive queuing. In addition, on weekends when commercial haulers are generally not present, eight self-haul stalls are commonly used, and the commercial side of the station may be opened to self-haul customers as needed for a maximum of 16 stalls.

The new station will generally operate with three commercial bays and 11 self-haul bays. However, the flat floor design provides significantly more flexibility than the current outdated pit design. The operating area can be reconfigured as demand changes between the time of day, week, or year. This will allow us to reallocate the available space based on the type of customer demand being served.

2. What operational changes can be made to the system to handle sufficient transaction/vehicle capacity (e.g. longer hours, build second compactor at Factoria now and add queuing lane, etc.)?

Answer: There is potential for adding a scale and a queuing lane at Factoria, among other options (and an additional compactor is proposed to be included in the current construction contract). The division would work with stakeholders to identify preferred options.

3. What is the maximum vehicular and transactions capacity of the system? Does the calculation assume the closure of Houghton and Renton open or the closure of both stations?

Answer: See Attachment 3. To determine capacity, the division extrapolates based on the historical inflow of both tons and vehicles on an hourly basis. Considering these well-established patterns provides a more accurate picture of how a station will actually function rather than averaging activity across all days or hours.

OTHER

1. Has mandatory curbside collection, that some cities already have, been considered?

Answer: The County cannot require cities to institute mandatory collection, and there is still demand for self-haul services from residents and businesses in cities with mandatory collection. Over 80 percent of our self-haul customers have curbside collection services, so a mandatory system would not likely make a significant difference in our self-haul transactional volume.

2. Can the system incentivize commercial haulers to utilize the Cedar Hills Landfill and bypass the transfer stations (using the Regional Direct Rate)?

Answer: When the Regional Direct rate was increased, most tonnage that previously went directly to Cedar Hills went to Bow Lake instead. As a result, it is not anticipated that adjusting the Regional Direct rate would address capacity issues in NE King County. Pages 45 and 46 of the Transfer Plan Review Final Report provide more detailed information.

QUESTIONS FOR THE AUDITOR

Three additional questions in your letter were identified as better directed to the King County Auditor. I understand that those questions have since been responded to directly by Audit staff.

Dini Duclos
April 25, 2014
Page 11

Thank you again for taking the time to write. If you have any further questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 206-477-4501 or by email at pat.mclaughlin@kingcounty.gov.

Sincerely,



Pat D. McLaughlin
Division Director

cc: Sound Cities Association Board of Directors
Sound Cities Association Public Issues Committee
Sound Cities Association Mayors and Managers/Administrators
Metropolitan King County Councilmembers
 ATTN: Michael Woywod, Chief of Staff
 Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council
King County Regional Policy Committee
Ben Thompson, Deputy Auditor, King County Auditor
Bob Thomas, Senior Principal Management Auditor, King County Auditor
Dow Constantine, King County Executive
Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives, King County Executive's Office
Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources & Parks (DNRP)
Kevin Kiernan, Assistant Division Director, Solid Waste Division (SWD), DNRP
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison, SWD, DNRP




Metropolitan King County Council
King County Auditor's Office
KyMBER Waltmunson, King County Auditor
King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue, Room W1033
Seattle, WA 98104-3272
206.477.1033 Fax 206.296.0159
Email: KCAO@kingcounty.gov
TTY Relay: 711
www.kingcounty.gov/auditor

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 18, 2014

TO: Councilmember Dini Duclos, Federal Way City Council
Chair, Sound Cities Association Caucus of the Regional Policy Committee

FROM: KyMBER Waltmunson, King County Auditor 

SUBJECT: Questions for the Auditor's Office regarding the Follow-up on the 2011 Performance Audit of Solid Waste Transfer Station Capital Projects

Thank you for your letter of April 15, 2014, and your interest in the management letter we issued in March 2014 as part of our follow-up to our 2011 performance audit. Both the original audit and the follow-up are posted on our webpage, www.kingcounty.gov/auditor. As you may know, our original audit recommended an update of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan (Plan) with an analysis of the functionalities and the cost impacts of the number and capacities of the transfer stations. The main reason for this recommendation was our finding in 2011 that the information and analyses underlying the 2006 Plan, especially the tonnage forecast, were out of date.

Now, with the revised forecast showing even lower waste tonnage, implementing our recommendation remains important. We are encouraged that work began on the update last year and that the Solid Waste Division (SWD) is currently engaged in an iterative process wherein stakeholder input can help to improve the Plan.

Our answers to the three questions you directed to the auditor follow.

Question 1:

Regarding the Northeast Transfer Station and Financial Risk from Overbuilding:
In your independent review of the Solid Waste Transfer System, why did you conclude there is no need for a new Northeast transfer station and overbuilding poses a financial risk?

We welcome this opportunity to clarify what the report says on the matter of a new northeast transfer station. It is important to note that we did *not* conclude there is no need for a new northeast transfer station. Here are two passages from our management letter that are pertinent to your question:

Based on SWD analyses and our review, service demands warrant the completion of a Factoria Transfer Station and provision of a South County Regional Transfer Station (SCRTS). The analyses also indicate, however, that there will be adequate tonnage and transaction capacity within the system as a whole without a new Northeast Regional Transfer Station (NERTS).

Given all of the uncertainties with planning assumptions, the County and its partners should consider keeping options open as to whether or when a northeast facility would be needed and whether or when to close or limit the types of transactions at Houghton and Renton.

What our modeling showed was that, in the case of tonnage handling, there would be sufficient systemwide tonnage-handling capacity without a northeast station based on the currently planned number of compactors and hours of operations by the time Factoria would be built, and then especially if a new south facility comes on board to replace Algona. The same was true for systemwide transactional capacity. See more about capacity in our answer to your other two questions below.

We also found, however, that with the closure of Renton and Houghton, and without a new northeast station, there could be problems at Factoria in handling self-haul transactions during the busiest years in the planning period at certain times per day. The reason this could happen, despite the overall adequate system capacity, is that each station has its own transaction-handling capacity per hour, which can be surpassed if customers arrive in large numbers during certain periods. These potential problems, in terms of wait times and queues, could be addressed through a number of strategies as detailed in our report, and as SWD has outlined in its presentation to the Regional Policy Committee on April 9, 2014.

Building a northeast station would be one way to address transactional capacity issues and hence we would not say, without exception, that there is no need for the station; but there are many other ways as well to deal with the transactional capacity issue. A financial risk results from committing to build a facility that may not be needed if there are other, less expensive ways to handle customer service issues. Once a facility is built the decision cannot be undone. Maintaining flexibility in decision-making now could position the County and its partners to respond to changing conditions and new technology.

Questions 2 and 3:

Regarding Maximum Capacity of Transfer Station System:

What is the maximum tonnage capacity of the transfer station system today (2014), not the amount of tons handled, but the maximum capacity that could be handled?

What is the maximum tonnage capacity of the transfer station system once it is built-out with a new Factoria and South King County transfer stations?

Regarding Transactional Capacity at Factoria: What is the transactional capacity for the new Factoria transfer station and how does this compare with the transactional capacity today?

Regarding questions 2 and 3, some caveats about assumptions and how information is portrayed are important to consider. Based on information provided to us from SWD for the newer stations (Shoreline, Bow Lake, Factoria, SCRTS, and NERTS) the upward limiting factors for tonnage handling are the number and capacity of the compactors and the hours of operations. For transactions, some of the key limiting factors include hours of operation, the number of stalls, and how vehicles are processed in and out of the station.

We mention these caveats, because there are different ways that capacity can be portrayed yet still be accurate. For example, the Shoreline Transfer Station currently has one compactor installed, but has space and was designed for adding a second compactor. Its upward limiting capacity can therefore be portrayed both as 100 tons per hour with one compactor, or 200 tons per hour if the second compactor is installed. Similarly, the planning concept for SCRSTS is to have one compactor initially in operation but the ability to operate two.

The way council staff presented and explained tonnage and transactional capacity estimates at the Council's Committee of the Whole meeting on April 16, 2014 was helpful. Council staff used the same numbers we have, and described how they got to their estimates. They also appropriately mentioned that the numbers were theoretical in terms of what tons and transactions could be handled if arrivals of customers could be spread out to make full utilization of capacity.

The Committee of the Whole's agenda materials for April 16, 2014, which include the council staff PowerPoint presentation materials and the capacity estimates are linked [here](#). The PowerPoint can be found as attachment 14 to agenda item 7. Since these estimates are based on the same information we have, and were fairly presented, we refer you to those estimates in answer to your questions.

cc: King County Councilmembers
King County Regional Policy Committee
Sound Cities Association
Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks
(DNRP) Pat McLaughlin, Director, Solid Waste Division, DNRP
Ben Thompson, Deputy County Auditor, King County Auditor's Office (KCAO)
Bob Thomas, Senior Principal Management Auditor, KCAO

Appendix J: Comments Received

<http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/TWMP-Comments-on-Report.pdf>

