

**ADDENDUM TO MILESTONE REPORT #2
APPLICATION OF CRITERION 17 TO FIVE URBAN TRANSFER STATIONS
September 14, 2005**

Background

King County Ordinance 14971 requires development of a waste export system plan for the transfer and disposal of waste after the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill closes. The plan will be submitted to the council April 30, 2006. Four milestone reports are required in preparation for submitting the final plan. Milestone Report #1 developed 19 level of service evaluation criteria to assess transfer system needs and capacity. Report #1 was submitted to the King County Council October 15, 2004 and adopted December 6, 2004.

Milestone Report #2 applied Criteria 1 through 16 to five of the six urban King County transfer stations: Algona, Bow Lake, Factoria, Houghton, and Renton.¹ See map on page 3. These 16 criteria contain objective standards for measuring transfer station needs and capacity. Criteria 18 and 19 address cost and rate considerations and will be part of the development of system alternatives in Milestone Report #4.

Criterion 17 – called Local and Regional Considerations – was intended to address two issues that are more subjective than those addressed by the other criteria: (a) the compatibility of transfer stations with surrounding land uses; and (2) whether each is getting its “fair share” of tonnage and customers, which addressed concerns about “regional equity.”

The Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) recognized that more time would be needed to adequately evaluate these issues. Rather than delay Milestone Report #2, MSWMAC decided to issue it without Criterion 17, and follow up with an addendum that focuses on Criterion 17 only. Report #2 was submitted to the King County Council on April 15, 2005 and adopted on May 31, 2005.

Development and Application of Criterion 17

Compatibility with Surrounding Land Use

To determine whether the five urban transfer stations are compatible with surrounding land use, MSWMAC developed a set of objective subcriteria that address consistency with land use plans and zoning regulations, aesthetics, noise, odor, traffic, distance of active area from nearest residence, and compliance with state and local regulations. These are all factors that contribute to land use compatibility.

¹ The first NE Transfer Station is not included because it is scheduled to be rebuilt in 2006. Vashon and Enumclaw are also not included, because they are relatively new stations.

After applying the subcriteria to the five transfer stations under study, MSWMAC analyzed whether each transfer station, in its current condition, is compatible with surrounding land use. Table 1 shows the results of that analysis.

The Houghton Transfer Station was determined to be incompatible with surrounding residential and recreational land use due to aesthetic considerations, one verifiable odor complaint within the last two years, and the location of transfer trailer parking within 100 feet of a residence. Factoria was determined to be incompatible with surrounding land use due to aesthetic and traffic considerations, although this is a close call because of the commercial/industrial nature of the surrounding uses. The other transfer stations were determined to be compatible with surrounding land use.

Distribution of Tonnage and Customers

To determine whether the five transfer stations are getting a “fair share” of tonnage and customers, MSWMAC asked Solid Waste Division (SWD) staff to develop tables showing the distribution of tonnage and transactions among King County transfer stations in the first quarter of 2005. Initially, SWD staff included only the five urban transfer stations under study in the table because Vashon and, to a lesser extent, Enumclaw and First NE, serve geographically discrete areas. Upon further discussion, the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG), which includes staff from the division, central King County Council staff and suburban cities staff, recommended, and MSWMAC agreed, that it would be more useful if the tables showed population and the distribution of tonnage and transactions at all transfer stations but Vashon. This distribution is shown in Tables 2a and 2b.

MSWMAC considered applying a criterion to the data in Tables 2a and 2b so that conclusions could be reached about whether a particular transfer station is getting a “fair share” of total tonnage and transactions. As noted previously, this was intended to be a measure of “regional equity.” However, MSWMAC recognized that the terms “fair share” and “regional equity” constitute value judgments that are difficult to objectively define and quantify. The committee therefore decided that only the raw distribution data in Tables 2a and 2b would be presented in this addendum.

Further discussion of distribution of tonnage and transactions by geographic area as well as the potential need to redefine those areas or add new service will occur as part of Milestone Report #4. In addition, as part of Report #4, MSWMAC will develop terminology and definitions to allow a better understanding of what “regional equity” is and how it can be measured.

King County Transfer Stations

