

APPENDIX A
RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

APPENDIX A – RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
General Comments		
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	Heading hierarchies are inconsistent.	Formatting will be completed for the final draft.
Bill Beck, SWAC Member	When do you intend to add your recommendations?	Recommendations will be included in the Waste Export System Plan.
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	The report needs a Summary.	The final report will include an Executive Summary.
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	More references are needed throughout the report to supporting documentation.	References and footnotes will be included.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Each chapter should begin with a brief summary to orient the reader.	Text revised throughout report. See chapter synopses.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Add a list of acronyms.	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Update table of contents to reflect new chapter order.	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Footer should include chapter as well as page numbers.	Text revised throughout report.
Executive Summary		
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	p.3, end of first paragraph, add the following before the period: "(see Next Steps on the following page)."	Text revised under Intermodal.
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	Delete "therefore" and add "continuing the rent payments on the landfill and" on Page 4. Extension of the life of the landfill by early waste export has two revenue effects. It doesn't just defer the high cost of waste export, it continues the rent payments on the landfill.	Text revised under Sensitivity Analysis. Rent is one component of the division's operating costs. It does not generate revenue for the division.
City of Redmond	<i>Revise sentence as follows:</i> "Total # of Facilities" column in the table includes the five facilities for which a determination had been made in the previous milestone reports that they did not need modification	Text revised to meet intent of suggested language.
City of Redmond	Replace the word "Washington" with the abbreviation 'WA" in the columns so that the name of the transfer station can be on one line (it is confusing as it currently appears).	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Redmond	Private options <i>Delete the last sentence.</i> The sentence as written does not add value and leads the reader to question the statement being made	Text revised.
City of Redmond	<i>Intermodal: remove the following language from the beginning of the sentence:</i> Once Solid Waste is exported	Text revised.
City of Redmond	<i>Next Steps: Delete the second and third sentences of this paragraph</i>	Comment noted.
City of Auburn	Page 3 Public Private Options, First paragraph last sentence: By what criteria did you use on whether an intermodal facility or facilities should be privately owned and/or operated will not be include in the Waste Export System Plan? Why is the recommendation for the transfer stations included but not the intermodal facilities?	See next steps. Due to potential changes in the marketplace such as changes in long haul and disposal costs and fluctuating available intermodal capacity, it is prudent to defer the intermodal decision until the county is closer to moving to waste export.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Emphasize the importance of extending the lifespan of Cedar Hills.	Text revised.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Add key points.	Text revised.
February 17, 2006, SWAC	Skykomish and Cedar Falls were not analyzed for LOS standards.	Text revised.
Chapter One: Introduction		
City of Bellevue	While it is arguably the situation that long-haul will occur once CH Landfill reaches capacity and closes, it is still part of the analysis, and it is possible that long-haul will occur before Cedar Hills' closure.	The statement is consistent with current county policy and Report Four Assumptions
City of Bellevue	Not all cities adopted the 2001 Solid Waste Plan- is this relevant?	CSWMP page 2-13 addresses adoption procedures: The plan requires adoption by cities representing ¾ of the total population of the cities that act on the plan during the 120 day adoption period.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Reorganize the beginning of the chapter.	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter One: Policy Framework, Purpose and Goals		
City of Bellevue	It is unclear which plan this refers to.	Export Plan. Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Second bullet list does not highlight the possibility of needing new facilities and replacing or closing existing facilities.	See bullet three.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	It is not clear which plan is meant on page 3, second paragraph.	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Inform should be form on page 3.	Comment noted.
Chapter One: Baseline Assumptions		
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Move the options on page 4 to follow the assumptions.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	I suggest breaking out assumptions into a separate one-page table rather than have them in the text. Then there won't be so much text between where the assumptions are first mentioned & where they are listed. I believe there is value in having the assumptions on one page.	Comment noted.
City of Bellevue	ITSG Additional Issues & responsiveness summary should be referenced and included as an attachment.	See Appendix A. At its December 19, 2005 meeting MSWMAC approved inclusion of this appendix.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Insert "Discussion of these issues has been incorporated into the appropriate sections of the report," after mention of Additional Issues.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Don't understand how private sector is making capital investments in waste reduction (Waste Stream Assumptions, second point).	These assumptions have been finalized by MSWMAC.
City of Bellevue	Waste Stream Assumptions, point 3, I thought we got rid of the last part.	Assumptions appear as approved by MSWMAC.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Two: General Comments		
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Chapter Two should be reorganized and a section on Compaction added.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Refer to the packages consistently in the subjunctive tense.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Three of the transfer station packages presented in the Report rebuild and expand the current Factoria transfer station on a new site located on Eastgate Way, adjacent to the existing Factoria site. However, the Report does not evaluate or even discuss the significant issues associated with locating a transfer station on the Eastgate Way site, such as traffic impacts and compatibility with surrounding land uses. That portion of the I-90 corridor is developing as a commercial center, serves as a gateway to Bellevue and appears incompatible with a transfer station.	Comment noted. The division is looking at options to address Bellevue's expressed concerns. The division has proposed options to the city of Bellevue to mitigate traffic and compatibility issues raised by the city.
Chapter Two: Geographic Areas		
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Identify additional benefits of well-sited transfer stations.	Text revised.
Chapter Two: Existing Solid Waste Transfer System		
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Recognize the importance of convenience as well as distance.	Text revised.
February 17, 2006, SWAC	These are goals. Report 2 concluded that the functions are not all met.	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Title – This section is not about the future system.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	The heading "Existing Transfer Station Conditions" is unnecessary.	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	The last sentence on page 9 should be the first in the paragraph.	Text revised.
City of Tukwila	This section provides a good summary of the impact self-haul has on the transfer system in terms of traffic, safety, support and maintenance and operations. It would be helpful if the report included analysis of true self-haul costs in a typical transfer station.	Comment noted: self-haul and its associated costs will be discussed in the Comp Plan update process.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Federal Way	Table 2-1 "Ability to Compact Waste" all are marked NO, yet alternative technologies may allow container movement in less space than typical installations. Perhaps this criterion should be retitled?	All of the criteria in Table 2-1 address current conditions.
Cities of Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way	How does table 2-1 show stations are efficiently distributed or that service hours meet customer needs?	See Table 2-1 Criteria 1 and 3. All stations receive a 'Yes' rating for these criteria.
City of SeaTac	Move item #15 in Table 2-1 to the section on traffic on the previous page.	Table 2-1 appears as adopted in Milestone Report 2.
City of SeaTac	Retain original title "Local and Regional Considerations" for Criterion 17.	New draft reflects conclusions for Criterion 17 only. Subcriteria are presented in the Appendix.
City of SeaTac	Explain why the three "no's" listed for Bow Lake resulted in a "yes" rating overall. If the final conclusion is based on all subcriteria under Criteria 17, then the title of the last row "Conclusion regarding Land Use Compatibility" should be changed. The City of SeaTac agrees that Bow Lake rates compatible with surrounding land use –it does not however rate a "yes" for "Local and Regional Considerations" particularly not for traffic. This also applies to Algona.	New draft reflects conclusions for Criterion 17 only. Criterion 17 appeared as approved by MSWMAC.
February 17, 2006, SWAC	Table 2-1 Criterion 14 footnote is self-serving.	Table 2-1 appears as approved by SWAC, MSWMAC, RPC and King County Council in Report 2.
City of Redmond	Eliminate shading from table 2-1.	Text revised.
Bill Beck, SWAC Member	Why not include the rural facilities? Does Enumclaw interact differently with each package?	These stations meet, or will meet, all the standards established for evaluation of the older transfer stations. Enumclaw does not interact differently with each package.
City of Federal Way	Why not include the rural facilities? Are there savings from shifting rural waste to a transfer station?	Rural facilities and 1 st NE were specifically excluded from the analysis. Rural waste goes to transfer stations or drop boxes.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Suggested change: Division is currently securing additional land that would make needed improvements possible including improved access.	Orillia Road traffic is a regional issue that is not solved by station improvements.
December 16, 2005, SWAC	Criterion 9 needs a footnote.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Tables should include Criteria 17-19	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Criterion 17 should be integrated into Table 2-1.	Text revised.
City of Redmond	<i>Delete first sentence and revise the last sentence to read as follows:</i> “In addition, structural changes are necessary to improve emergency response and future operational efficiency, as well as to meet desired safety goals are also necessary.”	Comment noted.
Chapter Two: Transfer System Customer Base		
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Future Transfer Station System – this is all existing information.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	What about tonnage changes due to demographic changes?	See Appendix on Tonnage Forecast.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	What is the impact of self-haul garbage being uncompacted?	The impacts of long-hauling uncompacted waste are reflected in package costs.
City of Auburn	Provide business self-haul use information.	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	It looks like the Percentage of total (y-axis) is not to scale.	Y values are daily percentages of total weekly trips. Daily values across the entire week add to 100%.
City of Federal Way	Self haul takes twice as long as commercial per ton or transaction?	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	The graphs on page 15 should be bar graphs.	Bar graphs were produced and found to be less illustrative of the distribution.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Text explaining graphs should be on the same page.	Text and graphs will appear on facing pages for ease of comparison.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Title on page 14 should be “Customer Characteristics.”	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Two: Waste Compaction		
City of Redmond	<i>Revise the second paragraph.</i> The city strongly believes that the Solid Waste division has not drawn the correct conclusion regarding the ability to compact at the current transfer stations.	The division stands by its conclusion regarding the ability to compact at the existing transfer stations.
City of Redmond	The analysis requested by Bellevue to rebuild the Factoria transfer station at the current site (or possibly at the current site with minor expansion onto the Eastgate site) must be conducted before the division reaches a conclusion about the ability to compact at Factoria.	The division is looking at options to address Bellevue's expressed concerns. An EIS developed jointly by King County and Bellevue (issued by the city of Bellevue in 1993) found the Factoria property to have significant unavoidable adverse impacts.
Chapter Two: Transfer Station Improvement Options, Central County		
City of Tukwila	If the purchase or lease of additional property adjacent to the Bow Lake facility fails, what impact would this have on reconstructing Bow Lake?	WashDOT has already agreed to sell property.
City of SeaTac	<p>Suggested addition: Currently there are twice as many trucks traveling from Bow Lake transfer station to Cedar Hills a day compared to any one of the other transfer stations. Over the next 25 years as much as 10–14 million square feet of office and retail space is planned in the immediate area surrounding Bow Lake transfer station. The draft IS for this development indicates capacity restraints on Orillia Rd will be exceeded during some hours of the day, which may impact the amount of tonnage processed at Bow Lake.</p> <p>The access in and out of Bow Lake transfer station is on a 90-degree curve on a busy arterial street (Orillia Rd.) and immediately adjacent to the northbound access ramps to I-5. There is heavy traffic many hours of the day, turning conflicts, and limited sight distance. Traffic studies will be needed to address these significant traffic concerns at that intersection.</p>	The division recognizes intersection level of service will be an issue at the Orillia Rd./S. 192 nd Street intersection. This intersection serves regional traffic accessing Interstate 5, SeaTac International Airport, and other regional destinations such as the proposed Tukwila South development. Urban Corridors mega-project(s) planned for this area could also have an effect on the performance of this intersection. As such, addressing the off-site traffic issues will require a regional effort.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Two: Transfer Station Improvement Options		
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Suggested change: The division purchased the Eastgate site for that purpose after a formal siting process that included evaluation of alternative sites and preparation of an EIS.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Why doesn't the range of possibilities include rebuilding on the Factoria site?	1993 Environmental Impact Statement coauthored by King County and the City of Bellevue eliminated this option.
January 18, 2006, MSWMAC	Add language to the effect that during design, traffic studies will be conducted to analyze access to the facility and propose improvements if necessary at Bow Lake.	See text revision under Analysis of Potential Transfer Station Packages final bullet.
January 18, 2006, MSWMAC	Note should say that Eastgate must be evaluated for all LOS criteria, not just traffic.	See text revision under Analysis of Potential Transfer Station Packages final bullet.
City of SeaTac	Add: Note that traffic studies for the Bow Lake site will be needed to determine whether or not the site meets LOS Criteria 17.	See text revision under Analysis of Potential Transfer Station Packages final bullet.
City of Bellevue	There may be potential for the County to sell the Eastgate Way site and use the proceeds to help fund needed improvements or new facilities in the system, including the possibility of an improved Factoria Transfer Station on its current site.	Comment noted.
City of Bellevue	Each package proposing to rebuild the Factoria Transfer Station on the Eastgate Way site should contain a statement that explicitly recognizes that the Level of Service Criteria (traffic, land use compatibility, aesthetics, etc.) have not been applied to a new transfer station on the Eastgate Way site. Studies will be needed to determine if a transfer station on that site would meet the criteria, and packages including the Eastgate Way option should not contain the statement that the package meets the criteria, since that is unknown at this time.	See text revision under Analysis of Potential Transfer Station Packages.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Bellevue	Regional equity is also an issue that will have to be addressed. The majority of the growth in the Northeast Lake Washington area is occurring outside of Bellevue, to the north and east. Bellevue should not have to bear any additional burden for future growth in the region. Similar to Brightwater, new facilities should be located where the growth and need for the facilities are occurring.	A new facility in the NE Lake Washington area is being proposed in addition to the Factoria/Eastgate facility.
City of Redmond	<i>Add the following sentence after the second sentence:</i> Another potential option is to rebuilt Factoria on the existing site or on the existing site with minor expansion onto Eastgate property.	Text revised.
City of Auburn	Page 17: The first paragraph needs a discussion on impacts when building new sites. A list of impacts needs to be addressed and could include: Littering, Economic, Traffic, Aesthetic, Noise, Environmental, Political, Cultural, Residential. Appendix F addresses siting criteria, but not impacts of the transfer station in the community.	Appendix F: The Transfer Station Siting Process, addresses community specific impacts that a facility may have. See Community-Specific Criteria
Chapter Two: Intermodal Co-location		
December 19, 2005, MSWMAC	Should identify site requirements of co-location, not constraints.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Statement about whether co-location eliminates other stations should go above site requirements.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Rewrite paragraph following site requirements.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Statements about co-location and transfer station elimination are unclear.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the analysis of the pros and cons of co-location?	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Is there an analysis of the benefits of co-location?	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Harbor Island should be discussed here.	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Redmond	<i>Please provide analysis</i> to indicate the amount/percent of the waste stream this could reasonably accommodate.	Analysis cannot be completed until potential sites are identified.
Chapter Two: Analysis of Potential Transfer Station Packages		
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Add clarifying language to bullet 6 on page 20.	Text revised.
City of Redmond	The bullet states that all options can be financed within the 1999 rate plus inflation. However, the chart on page 41 shows that the rate would need to exceed that level from just past 2016 until 2022. These statements are inconsistent and need to be reconciled in the report.	Text revised in first bullet.
City of Redmond	<i>Rewrite the second sentence as follows:</i> Operations will remain the same as previously proposed at the First Northeast facility (soon to be reconstructed) and current operations at the four rural facilities will not change.	Text revised in seventh bullet.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Add construction timelines.	Text revised.
City of Tukwila	Second bullet: if available, recommend the Division include a construction schedule or timeline by location.	See Appendix G.
City of Tukwila	Algona Transfer Station should be added as another facility that Bow Lake self-haulers could use during reconstruction at Bow Lake.	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	If redevelopment of Houghton costs the same as building a new facility, it could be rebuilt with a pit feed system without reducing capacity.	Comment noted.
City of Federal Way	Is there any update on property availability that would lead to closure of Bow Lake and co-location of in the south county?	The division is not evaluating closure of Bow Lake.
December 19, 2005, MSWMAC	Add construction timelines.	See Appendix G.
City of Auburn	Show expected construction timelines.	See Appendix G.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Add a reference to Appendix D at the end of the section headed "Analysis of Potential Transfer Station Packages".	Text revised.
December 19, 2005, MSWMAC	It is not clear that new facilities are assumed to meet all LOS criteria.	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	It would be useful to have a table summary of the relative pros-cons of the packages.	Table will be added.
City of Federal Way	Could you add a chart that shows how well the various "packages" meet capacity forecasts in the near term and in the future? (Or are they all equivalent in this regard?)	The intent is that all packages will meet capacity requirements.
City of SeaTac	Include pros and cons for each package for ease of comparison.	See new text under "Longer Term Financial Outlook."
City of SeaTac	Include a transfer station location map for each package and note customer type.	Maps cannot reflect facilities that have not been sited.
City of Bellevue	The Report needs to include an evaluation of the potential to rebuild the transfer station on the current site; it is not acceptable to rely on a 12 year old Environmental Impact Statement to conclude rebuilding cannot be accomplished, especially when both the size & scope of the new transfer station as well as the regulatory environment have changed.	See Reports 1 and 2 for current evaluation of the Factoria Transfer Station. All new and remodeled facilities will have an environmental review to identify environmental issues and potential mitigation measures to address them.
City of Auburn	Page 20: In bulleted section, add the list of possible impacts.	Appendix F: The Transfer Station Siting Process, addresses community specific impacts that a facility may have. See Community Specific Criteria.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Explain why complete data is not available for Package 1a.	Text revised.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Explain the rate commitment.	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Two: Self-haul Only Facilities		
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Change "operations" to "facilities". Improve language in this paragraph.	Text revised.
December 19, 2005, MSWMAC	The statement about retrofitting Houghton with a compactor is unclear.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Does this assume no change at the existing sites other than no commercial loads?	Yes.
City of Auburn	Where do you show feasibility of shipping uncompacted waste from self-haul only facilities?	This is embedded in the calculations of cost for self-haul only facilities.
City of Auburn	First paragraph starting "The financial" needs a title "Impact on Ratepayers."	Text revised.
January 18, 2006, MSWMAC	Bring out how the decision whether or not to compact at self-haul stations is being made.	See revised text under Self-Haul Only Facilities.
City of Redmond	<i>Delete the first sentence.</i> It is not supported by the table. Few criteria improve with the removal of commercial vehicles. As stated by Solid Waste staff, most of the time the two types of customers, commercial and self-haul, are using the facility at different times. This first sentence, "Many of the deficiencies identified in Table 2-1 "Application of level of Service Criteria to Transfer Station" are directly attributed to conflicts arising from commercial and self-haul customers..." is not true.	Text revised for clarification.
City of Redmond	Table 2-4 seems to indicate that Business self-haul can't use self-haul only facilities. The report does not specify if Business self-haul can use self-haul only facilities. Can Business self-haul use self-haul only facilities? If so, Table 2-4, section 2.b. needs to be revised.	Business self-haul contributes 1-2% of the tonnage in the system. Operating procedures and vehicle type will determine which stations business self-haul customers use.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Federal Way	Suggested text: The General rule is that uncompacted waste will cost more to export and dispose than compacted waste. However, if a transfer station is converted to a self-haul only facility, it may <i>not</i> make economic sense to add the cost of waste compaction for that facility, since a dedicated self-haul facility may handle a very small percentage of the overall waste stream subject to waste export– it would handle a lot of customers, but not a lot of tons. It’s also conceivable that this waste could be short-hauled to Cedar Hills at least in the near term and possibly longer if Cedar Hills is operating at an extended lifespan either due to early waste export or expansion of its capacity-while the bulk of the system’s compacted wastes is exported via transfer stations that serve private haulers and handle much larger amounts of trash.	Text revised to reflect intent of suggested language in Self-Haul Only Facilities.
Chapter Two: Package One		
City of Bellevue	New package submitted.	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Would Package 1 also lead to the lowest ongoing disposal cost?	Yes.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	This provides a description of the package but no real analysis.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the analysis showing that this package is the only one that meets all LOS criteria?	Appendix H.
Chapter Two: Package Two		
Waste Connections	New package submitted.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	This provides a description of the package but no real analysis.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the analysis applying LOS criteria to this package?	Appendix H.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Two: Package Three		
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Do not attribute the package to Bellevue.	Text revised.
December 19, 2005, MSWMAC	Do not attribute packages in the text.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	This provides a description of the package but no real analysis.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Sale of the Eastgate property was included in analysis of Package 3. Was sale of Algona, Renton and Houghton included in analysis for other packages?	Algona, Renton & Houghton properties are owned by the county, not the division. Revenue from their sale would go to the Current Expense (General) Fund.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Define "mega" the first time the term is used.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the analysis applying LOS criteria to this package?	Appendix H.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	There is no analysis of remodeling would allow compaction at existing sites.	Report 2 concluded there is no room at Algona and Houghton is not compatible with surrounding land use. The 1993 EIS coauthored by King County and the City of Bellevue eliminated this option for Factoria.
Cities of Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way	Where is the analysis of other possibilities that provide for basically the same outcome as this package presents?	The division is having discussions with Bellevue staff on the Factoria/ Eastgate property.
Chapter Two: Package Four		
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Do not attribute the package to haulers.	Text revised.
December 19, 2005, MSWMAC	Do not attribute packages in the text.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	This provides a description of the package but no real analysis.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the analysis applying LOS criteria to this package?	Appendix H.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	There is no analysis of remodeling would allow compaction at existing sites limited to self-haul service.	Report 2 concluded there is no room at Algona and Houghton is not compatible with surrounding land use. The 1993 EIS coauthored by King County and the City of Bellevue eliminated this option for Factoria.
Chapter Two: Cost Information		
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Cost information was so insufficient and provided at such a high level that it appears meaningless. The conclusion is cost is not a basis for decision making.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where are the assumptions for this list of factors in the model?	The assumptions are described in the following paragraphs under their respective headings, and explained in greater detail in the appendices.
Bill Beck, SWAC Member	Does Table 2.5 include the rural stations?	No, those stations are not part of the analysis.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Table 2-5 says there is no cost difference. Why not come up with a package that meets all interests?	Comment noted.
City of Federal Way	If costs are essentially the same, is there a package that will satisfy everyone?	Comment noted.
City of Federal Way	Do packages account for projected wage/benefit increases?	Yes.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Are these costs included in the financial model?	No.
City of Federal Way	How can the package with most facilities be cheapest?	See "Cost Summary."
City of Federal Way	It is not clear with complete cost data is not available for Package 1a - it's not that much different than Package 1...	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	How much funding is already held in reserve by the County for capital transfer and intermodal system development? Is this funding built into the cost estimates for the "packages"?	Transfer station packages' capital costs will be funded through debt service. All existing reserves, \$16.5 million, will be used to fund a portion of the First NE Transfer Station rebuild.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Bellevue	It is important to note that the results of the cost analysis presented in the Report show that the various transfer facility alternatives proposed by the Solid Waste Division are all approximately the same cost. Some have slightly higher or lower capital or staffing costs, but at the planning level, all come out about the same. Given that, the region should be able to agree on a package that meets all of the interests of the host cities, including Bellevue. <u>Bellevue proposes Package 1a – which is the same as Package 1, except that Factoria is rebuilt on its existing site and the Eastgate Way site is sold.</u>	See additional analysis in “The Longer Term Financial Outlook.”
Chapter Two: Tonnage Forecast		
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Suggested new text under “Tonnage Forecast” heading.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Use “forecast was” consistently.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the tonnage forecasts?	See Appendix C.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Clarify 5% in Package 3 footnote.	If a facility is moved, it is assumed a small percentage of customers will use another facility instead of the new location. Five percent was selected for that percentage.
City of Federal Way	The actual forecast is in an appendix, which should be referenced.	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Enumclaw and Vashon represent new capacity.	Report 4 only addresses the urban transfer stations.
City of Federal Way	The report should identify how much capacity is needed, when where and at what cost.	See Report 2. Stations are already over capacity.
City of Federal Way	Will self-haul capacity need to be provided at the same relative levels? Will commercial haulers increase collection efficiency and thereby require less transfer station access? Will more relative customers move from self-haul to commercial collection?	Self-haul will be discussed as part of the Comp Plan process. The division can’t speak to commercial haulers’ actions. Historically, it has never happened.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	Footnote to second table. I suggest removing the word "will" and adding the words "was assumed to."	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Would it make sense to discuss how the system can be designed to allow for flexibility within the "packages" to ensure that the system is scaled to meet projected needs? Will the package selected mean the system be safer? Will the new system operate at a lower comparable cost/ton than the current transfer system? Can this be forecasted and quantified? Factored into table 2-5?	That is the intent; the stations will be designed to meet safety standards; yes; included and factored into table 2.5
Chapter Two: Costs to Site Design and Construct Facilities by Facility Type		
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Add Size as a critical assumption.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	The dollar estimates from each of the three groups are not included.	The three engineering groups reached consensus on costs.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	What does it take to make compaction work at an existing site?	The intent is to meet LOS standards from Reports 1 & 2, so retrofitting sites will not work.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is it shown that commercial facilities cost less to site design and construct?	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	The 20 acre site should not be called a requirement on page 36.	Text revised.
Chapter Two: Schedule for Capital Projects		
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Add "including environmental review" to Land Use Permitting	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Could the report include a graphic for each package showing the timeline and generic facility construction or renovation necessary to allow waste export to commence?	See Appendix G, Project Implementation Schedules.
Chapter Two: Financing/Debt Service Assumptions		
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Change "into a" to "into the" and change "our" to "the division's".	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Add a section, Effect of Packages on Disposal Rates	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the discussion about the need for new capacity?	See Milestone Report 2.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the financial analysis?	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Is the relative cost of compacted versus partially compacted disposal factored into Table 2-5.	Yes.
City of Federal Way	Is there also a need to replace pilings under Algona and is this cost in the packages? Replacing the pilings may provide an opportunity to consider more comprehensive improvements.	For a self-haul only station the need for pilings is not as immediate as it would be for a full service facility.
Chapter Two: Cost Summary		
City of Redmond	“Full service only” to “commercial only”	Text revised.
City of Redmond	Add columns to the table for longer time frames. We understand that interlocal agreements only go to 2028. However, the stations potentially have a longer life than just the 22 years. Please show 30 years out and 40 years out what the costs would be. This may indicate a greater variation in costs that could help evaluate options. Additionally, this could provide additional financing alternatives.	See additional analysis in “The Longer Term Financial Outlook.”
City of Federal Way	Please add a cost analysis for all “packages” based on useful life to better compare long-term costs. The extended term analysis may mean that this assertion needs to be qualified.	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Federal Way	Regarding my comment on extended cost analysis for Table 2-5, I think the text in "Cost Summary" could include the following statement at the end of the first paragraph: "See Appendix H and the following section on (The Longer Term Outlook) for information on system costs beyond the ILA term. System costs will vary considerably into the future based on labor needs to operate facilities. The more facilities there are in a given package, the higher the long term cost."	See "The Longer Term Outlook."
Chapter Two: Effect of Transfer System Packages on Disposal Rates		
City of Redmond	Typographical error – reates.	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Explain that the rate commitment does not include the cost of disposal after waste export.	See Effect of Transfer System Packages on Disposal Rates, paragraph 4.
City of Redmond	Include the assumptions used in the model behind each of the 'inputs', so that MWSMAC can review them, and discuss and understand the rate setting model. In order to support a final waste export plan, MSWMAC must conclude the county is able to meets the Solid Waste divisions' commitment " <i>that the per-ton tipping fees will not increase by more than the rate of inflation</i> " (page 39 of the draft report) or the final plan must include a different rate recommendation.	Financial policy assumptions are provided in Appendix D. Summary methodology for financial analysis is provided in Chapter Two. More detailed information is available on request. ITSG has received two briefings by the Solid Waste Division's economist as well as an additional briefing from the City of Bellevue's consulting economist.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Redmond	<p>Include the rate impact from long-haul transport of compacted vs. uncompacted waste. A few questions are posed to identify the types of issues that should be addressed regarding self-haul and the design of the future system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the “tipping point” where it is not economically feasible to transport uncompacted waste? • Should policy makers evaluate whether or not self-haul should occur at all or establish different rates for self-haul to cover the increased costs of self-haul? • Should the county consider re-building any transfer stations (other than already proposed in the transfer station packages) to accommodate commercial and self-haul as the costs of operating a self-haul transfer station, coupled with long-haul transport costs of uncompacted waste, are too high? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two cost components are affected by compaction: short haul and long haul costs. The division would see an approximate 30% reduction in short haul costs due to compaction. Short of a procurement process, precise long-haul cost information is not available. • This is an issue that will be addressed in the update of the 2001 Comp Plan. • Milestone Report 2 concluded that sites proposed as self-haul only in the packages cannot be rebuilt as full service facilities.
City of Federal Way	<p>Can the report address which of the packages best maintain long-term competition for waste export and disposal (and therefore the lowest rate impact during the planning horizon – and beyond, factoring in projected ‘useful life’ for these facilities)? Are all packages equivalent in this regard?</p>	<p>Recommendations will be made in the Waste Export System Plan.</p>

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Federal Way	Which packages best support a system that builds in long-term cost efficiency (for example, by supporting continued competition among the private haulers)? Are there any differences among the packages as far as keeping costs down during the first bid process as well as subsequent bid openers and re-bids for waste export and disposal?	Recommendations will be made in the Waste Export System Plan.
Chapter Three: General		
City of Bellevue	The analysis seems to say that privatization is not an option.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	There is no real analysis in this section.	Comment noted.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	How can Clark and Grays Harbor counties have private systems?	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	How are customer satisfaction ratings developed?	Through customer surveys.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	How can we advise our policymakers without thorough discussion and analysis of impacts?	Comment noted.
City of Bellevue	The second sentence under Public Only belongs in the Private Only section.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Need to elaborate on labor issues under public-private partnership.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Is historical precedent outside of King County relevant?	Any precedent within Washington State is relevant.
City of Bellevue	Would like to have labor issues be the topic of a meeting for more in-depth discussion.	Comment noted.
December 19, 2005, MSWMAC	Identify policy considerations in summary.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Table 3-1 is confusing. Grays Harbor and Clark Counties data appears to conflict with text.	Text revised.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	It's worth providing additional explanation about the specific circumstances in each county described in Table 3-1.	Research in progress.
City of Bellevue	Table 3-1, Clark County Backup Landfill?	No, Clark County is considering acquiring local backup.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Table 3-1, Snohomish County has both public and private collection.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Which customers are we talking about in the last paragraph of Private Only? How is customer satisfaction determined?	All customers are included in surveys to determine customer satisfaction.
City of Bellevue	Table 3-1, Clark County- completely privatized system, how?	Table revised.
City of Federal Way	P. 34: What is the impact of the 'no contract out' labor clause on the proposed "packages"? Is it the same regardless of "package" or variables?	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Does the 'no contract out' labor clause automatically preclude the "private only" option? If so, is this a conclusion that can be stated in the Summary?	No. Text revised.
City of Federal Way	If policy makers are to address system configuration, the 'playing field' should be clearly defined in this report where they will be able to make policy analysis.	Text revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Move the new sentence in Public Only to the next section.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	The chapter in the Report does not provide decision makers with enough detail on the relative benefits of a public, private or combined public/private system. Although the chapter does provide some background regarding the King County Solid Waste staff view of the constraints of changing to a system with some privatized components, the chapter is lacking in a meaningful comparison of costs and other potential benefits of privatizing some portions of the system. <u>Bellevue staff feel strongly that a robust independent analysis is needed regarding privatization of the solid waste management system in King County.</u>	The Solid Waste Division supports an independent analysis of this issue.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Four: Potential for Developing Additional Capacity		
Jean Garber, MSWMAC Chair	Change Item 4, last sentence to "This alternative would require new operating permits and environmental review, which could involve preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.	Text revised.
City of Redmond	<i>Rewrite heading as follows: Increased Capacity at the Cedar Hills landfill from 2012-2015. Add a new sub-heading: A. Factors leading to increased capacity.</i>	Comment noted.
City of Redmond	<i>Replace table 4-1 with the following table:</i>	All feasible combinations are already aggregated in Table 4-1.
Chapter Four: Out of County Landfills		
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Table 4-1 should be retitled and available capacity should be included.	Table (now 4-2) revised.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Benefits of preserving backup capacity should be spelled out.	See Benefits of Extended Life and Backup Capacity paragraph 1.
Cities of Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way	The statement that diverting tonnage from Cedar Hills increases the average cost of disposal is not necessarily supported by the sensitivity analysis.	In all cases, sensitivity analysis agreed with this statement. Early export of 200,000 tons requires further analysis because other benefits may justify extra costs.
Chapter Four: Back-up Capacity		
City of Federal Way	There appears to be 29 million cubic yards of capacity at the LRI Landfill in Pierce County. Is this [presumably] private capacity not suitable for 'backup capacity'? Perhaps the word 'public' should be added before 'capacity'.	Yes, it is private capacity.
City of Federal Way	Is the disposal backup only being considered for emergency situations or for future bid 'alternative' support too? Can you discuss the pros/cons of holding capacity for bid support?	Backup capacity is for emergencies only.
City of Federal Way	What threshold would be envisioned for use of dedicated backup capacity?	During emergency situations.
City of Federal Way	'Total' Tonnage Capacity is equated to 'annual' capacity in the footnote. Instead of 'unlimited' in the table, it may be better to say 'no limit set'.	"Unlimited" is the term provided by the landfill owner.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Redmond	<p><i>After section 3, add a new sub-heading: B. New and expanded plans and programs leading to increased capacity. Change the next two bullets to numbers 1 & 2 Move the section titled 'Benefits of Extended Life' after Table 4-1. Rewrite sub-heading as follows: Potential for Developing Additional Capacity at Cedar Hills landfill beyond 2015 Revise the sentence after the sub-heading as follows: The following development scenarios present alternatives to extend the useful life of the Cedar Hills landfill beyond 2015 Remove statement 1. and renumber 2, 3 & 4</i></p>	Text revised - Final draft formatting will conform to King County style guide.
City of Federal Way	Could Report 4 include more info about the pros/cons of holding onto landfill 'back-up' capacity to foster better bids in the long term? Or will this discussion occur in Report 5?	Text Revised. Also see "Effect of Transfer System Packages on Disposal Rates."
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Mention potential railroad negotiating leverage provided by backup capacity at Cedar Hills.	See Chapter 7: Partial Early Export.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Emphasize the benefits of extended life at Cedar Hills.	Text revised.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Discuss historical and potential impact of recycling on Cedar Hills' lifespan.	Text revised.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Clarify which actions to extend Cedar Hills' lifespan have already been taken vs. which are in progress or are merely potential actions.	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Five: Long Haul Transport Options		
City of Federal Way	It seems that rail haul is the way to go- if this chapter preceded the intermodal chapter, intermodal analysis could focus more on rail mode parameters.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Table 5-1 – Would like to know who owns the landfills.	See Table 4-2.
City of Bellevue	Table 5-1- Do we honestly think we might haul our waste to California? Not sure this needs to be part of the analysis.	Maximum competition can result in lower rates despite increased distance. For analysis, a hypothetical 260 miles from Seattle is used.
City of Federal Way	Only one landfill has access by both railroad companies. How do its contract disposal rates compare? Does this lend any credence to the argument that access to both railroad companies is required to spur competition? Does the intermodal site need access to both railroad companies to create landfill competition?	It is important to have intermodal access to both railroads in order to have access to multiple landfills.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Figure 5-1: Which three landfills?	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Table 5-2 – Need to have difference in containers explained.	This is explained in the text for each transport type.
January 18, 2006, MSWMAC	Add a note to the text saying that costs are estimates based on current contracts, and actual costs will depend on bids at the time of procurement.	See text under Rail Transport Operating Costs.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Redmond	The City requests further elaboration of the rate analysis that was conducted by the Solid Waste division and the impacts on rates resulting from different capital and operational scenarios that are proposed. Waste export and long-haul transport operating and capital costs should be included. Given the significant cost overruns incurred by Sound Transit in implementing commuter rail from Tacoma to Everett, it is important to include long-haul transport costs, and have these cost assumptions be informed by Sound Transit's recent experience with rail.	Short of a procurement process, precise long-haul cost information is not available.
Chapter Five: Barge – Containers and Equipment		
City of Bellevue	Are these standard sized shipping containers?	Yes.
Chapter Five: Rail – System Reliability		
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Statement is based on what data? Our understanding is that the trains and containers are dedicated unit trains that provide daily service.	Service disruptions are not related to containers, but can result from strikes, weather events, & rail line damage from flooding or land slides. Recent events in Snohomish County provide an example.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Given the current service interruptions to commuter rail, where is the county's analysis of potential service interruptions.	Haulers have stated at MSWMAC that rail contract terms address service disruptions and back-up capacity as a standard practice.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Specify that the Snohomish County costs used in the analysis are current.	Text revised.
Chapter Six: Intermodal Facility		
Cities of Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way	Why is co-location analysis not included?	Co-location is a siting issue. See discussion in Chapter Two: Transfer Station Co-location.
Cities of Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way	Why isn't there consideration of more than one intermodal facility?	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Waste can be compacted at the intermodal facility- paragraph 1 does not recognize that.	Comment noted.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Bellevue	Is any backhauling done? Seems like a waste of energy to haul back empty containers.	Solid waste containers cannot be backhauled with other commodities.
City of Federal Way	Is "sealing" part of the compaction process, or a separate step? What happens to the trailers when they are hauled back to the intermodal site?	Yes, trailers are either loaded or unloaded onto trains.
City of Bellevue	Paragraph two: does this imply partial or full early export will not be done?	No.
City of Redmond	Analyze the range of options for (public or private) intermodal facility(ies) to provide maximum flexibility in implementing waste export. Include at a minimum operational and cost impacts of providing an Intermodal Facility in south King County (the transportation infrastructure for moving waste from the transfer stations to another location is already in place, i.e. routes).	Comment noted.
City of Redmond	<i>Replace language in the summary with the following language:</i> The Waste Export Plan should allow for decision making on intermodal facility(ies) after a procurement process that provides the county with sufficient information on the costs/operations of a privately run and operated intermodal facility(ies); this will facilitate informed decision making. It may therefore be beneficial to decide the best alternative for intermodal facility(ies), at some point in the future, since full waste export will not occur for close to a decade.	Comment noted.
City of Redmond	<i>Delete the fourth paragraph.</i> This paragraph provides summary statements that are more appropriate at the end of this section.	Comment noted.
Chapter Six: Background –Regional Experience		
December 16, 2005, SWAC	Intermodal facilities currently handle CDL as a part of the solid waste system.	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Bellevue	It would be nice to read the discussions with other utilities.	Discussions were summarized for confidentiality purposes.
City of Bellevue	What is realistic backup emergency capacity for King County? Lack of available sites could impact economic redevelopment and disaster recovery costs.	KCSWD staff are discussing this issue with other solid waste utilities in the Puget Sound area.
Chapter Six: Intermodal Facility Considerations - General		
City of Federal Way	If the transport mode is apparent, discussion of siting intermodal can focus on maintaining long term competition for disposal services.	Comment noted.
December 16, 2005, SWAC	Accessibility to both railroads is essential for the intermodal site.	See following comment.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Accessibility to both railroads is ideal, not essential.	Text returned to original.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Eliminate reference to "ideal intermodal site" because there may be more than one site.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Intermodal Facility Considerations- Where do these minimum requirements come from?	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Wouldn't siting intermodal near rail and marine facilities be part of the decision process – it seems redundant to be convenient to both.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	On what data is the comment that intermodal capacity is insufficient based?	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Where is the competition for intermodal capacity coming from?	Commercial shipping.
Cities of Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way	Why isn't the BNSF letter in the report?	See comment below.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Remove reference to BNSF letter.	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Does the south County 'valley' rail corridor have this cargo handling constraint? Does the south County 'valley' rail corridor allow for rail access by both rail companies?	There is rail access to both lines through much of the south corridor.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the county's analysis of costs to use BNSF's track and any potential needed improvements?	Snohomish County's actual costs were used in the analysis, shown in Ch. Five. Potential improvements are site specific and can't be identified at this time.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Federal Way	Could you include a general map of where suitable access exists within King County? It might be interesting to compare this with transfer station locations, and see where overlaps occur that could change the needs of the various “packages”.	The corridor within KC with access to both railroad companies is Harbor Island to the southern edge of King County.
City of Federal Way	A key sentence that bears emphasis is the last sentence of paragraph 1. But, when it states ‘rail lines’, I believe it means ‘railroad companies’.	Yes, these terms are used interchangeably.
City of Federal Way	define: mainline versus rail line	These terms mean the same thing.
Chapter Six: Existing Intermodal Facilities		
City of Bellevue	Need to explain what is meant in Spot Facilities first paragraph – is it that the shorter trains are moved up to this facility for assembling into a longer train that then moves to the final destination?	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the analysis?	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	How much capacity have these three companies already secured? How does it compare to projected needs? Is there enough intermodal capacity to share among the three companies? Would this be workable from a logistics and contract perspective?	Capacity will be determined through a procurement process.
City of Federal Way	Instead of rail lines, say railroad companies. Consider changing it to say “to all feasible remote disposal sites”.	Comment noted.
City of Federal Way	How will customers ‘see evidence’?	Text revised.
Chapter Six: Regional Intermodal Needs		
SWAC December 16, 2003	The last paragraph on prioritizing of rail customers is speculative and should be deleted.	Text revised.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the supporting data for the statement that current facilities are built out?	HDR “Business Case for a County Owned Intermodal Facility”, 2003.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Bellevue	A letter dated 6/27/2003 from BNSF General Manager R.D. Jackson to King County Executive Sims & Councilwoman Cynthia Sullivan contradicts the statement about intermodal capacity. BNSF says they want the business and will provide capacity.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Regional Intermodal Needs, first sentence – are existing intermodal facilities operating at full capacity.	Currently yes, expansion can only be achieved through additional work shifts and tighter rail schedules.
City of Bellevue	What rail lines serve the known disposal sites?	See Table 4-2.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	<i>BNSF are likely to give priority to their larger national and international commercial cargo customers. ...</i> Where is the supporting data for this statement and the entire paragraph?	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Paragraph five – Not necessarily, depends on the procurement process. True competition means you open the process to all sorts of options and let the market bid on providing what you need, and that there are entities that are able and willing to bid/compete.	Comment noted.
City of Federal Way	Page 6-4, 2nd paragraph: Comment on whether or not the south corridor rail system has the same level of constraints regarding future commercial cargo handling competing with waste export, referenced for the Port of Seattle area over the next 20 years. Is the perceived constraint systemic throughout the county, or just in a specific area? Could it be better, or cheaper, to site an intermodal facility in the south corridor rail system? Or, would higher transfer costs from 1st NE or New NE Lake Washington eat any savings?	Comment noted. As discussed in Feb. 10 MSWMAC siting of an intermodal facility or facilities will be determined at a later date.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Federal Way	Is having an intermodal site in the heart of the Port of Seattle area (i.e. Harbor Island) a potential detriment because of commercial cargo handling competing with waste export in the future? Does this report infer that the intermodal site should not be near the Port area?	Comment noted. As discussed in Feb. 10 MSWMAC siting of an intermodal facility or facilities will be determined at a later date.
Chapter Six: County's Intermodal Facility Needs		
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	First sentence is based on what?	Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan
City of Bellevue	First paragraph- how can you do this if you can't negotiate labor costs?	King County does negotiate labor costs.
Chapter Six: Promotion of Competitive Choices		
City of Bellevue	Paragraph three – What about developing more than one intermodal facility- whether full scale or spot?	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	This discussion gives the impression that there will not be enough rail capacity even if there is enough intermodal capacity. This conflicts with the analysis in Chapter 5.	There is sufficient rail capacity to handle King County's waste through the planning horizon. Existing intermodal capacity may be insufficient to process the county's waste.
City of Bellevue	Other Considerations – Needs more explanation.	Text revised.
SWAC	Other Considerations – This paragraph doesn't make sense.	Text revised.
Chapter Six: Intermodal Facility Alternatives – Public Ownership and Operation		
City of Bellevue	Benefit Two – Does not guarantee transport capacity exists.	Comment noted.
City of Bellevue	Benefit Four – This statement is more a Drawback for another option more than a Benefit for this option.	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Clarify the last bullet point: it is ambiguous if it works against or for the county's interests. Versions of this same bullet appear in the two other operations scenarios –and make more sense as stated in these scenarios.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Drawback Three- Wouldn't these capital costs also be reflected in the cost of service?	Yes.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Bellevue	Drawback - Add bullet: County's labor restrictions could preclude any opportunity to privatize the system in the future.	Text revised.
Chapter Six: Intermodal Alternatives – Public Ownership Private Operation		
City of Bellevue	Benefit Five could be worded more positively – the county would benefit from contractor's experience with railroad negotiations.	Text revised.
City of Bellevue	Benefit Six – This is a risk transfer, what about liability?	Risk and liability are negotiated through contract terms.
City of Federal Way	It appears in these scenarios that interfacing with a railroad company is something the County wants to avoid. It is not clear why this is a detriment. Why would the County expect better rail service if a third-party hauler served as the intermediary?	Text revised - The county could benefit from contractors' experiences with railroad negotiations.
City of Federal Way	Ratepayers will be ultimately responsible for the capital cost under any of these three scenarios – why is this a drawback?	Text revised.
City of Federal Way	Couldn't unused capacity at Cedar Hills serve as backup?	Yes.
City of Federal Way	Can labor rules be changed in relationship to operation of a new facility, doing a new line of work not done in the past? Or is the County beholden to the existing rules no matter what, when it comes to operating facilities?	See Chapter Three.
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Why isn't DBO an option?	Design Build Operate is a <u>method</u> for implementing the Public Ownership Private Operation option, not a separate option.
City of Bellevue	Drawback Two – Won't they ultimately be reflected in the cost of service no matter what?	Yes.
City of Bellevue	Drawback Three – Not necessarily with the right bid process and contract.	Public entities will always have some administrative cost of contract management regardless of bid process or contract.
City of Bellevue	Drawback Four- Won't the administrative cost be reduced by outsourcing operations?	Reduced but not eliminated.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Six: Intermodal Alternatives – Private Ownership and Operation		
City of Bellevue	Benefits – wouldn't this free up county debt capacity?	Yes.
City of Bellevue	Benefit Two – rephrase “Private sector could site the facility in a shorter time frame at cheaper cost.”	Not necessarily, as evidenced by haulers’ statements at December 19, 2005 MSWMAC meeting.
City of Bellevue	Benefit Four- this could be significant and given the competition in the region, not fatal to long-term competition.	Comment noted.
City of Bellevue	Couldn't all of these be easily dealt with through contract negotiations and terms? Also frequency of bidding would assure future competition. These drawbacks seem contrived.	KC Solid Waste Division disagrees.
City of Federal Way	It seems this option automatically links intermodal to disposal. Is there a way to keep the two separate? Would there be too many operational conflicts between competing haulers who had different ‘slices of the pie’ (intermodal versus disposal) leading to poorer service/higher rates overall? Or would it help to keep at least two haulers competing in this area?	Yes, but not recommended.
Chapter Six: Summary		
City of Bellevue	Summary- What about the possibility of developing more than one facility?	The necessary number of intermodal facilities has yet to be determined, therefore it is possible.
City of Bellevue	Summary- Where does it show that it would be cost effective to develop an intermodal facility dedicated to the county's needs?	Text revised.
Chapter Seven: Sensitivity Analysis – General Comments		
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Where is the detail? Where is the analysis? We are only provided brief conclusions for each section.	Available on request.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	The text should discuss how Cedar Hills’ rent influences the cost of early export scenarios.	Comment noted.
Jean Garber, MSMWAC Chair	Is there a way to calculate the effect on disposal rates if cities left the system?	Not within the scope of this report.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Why use Snohomish County's export costs?	Text revised.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Clarify the reason a different number for Snohomish County's cost is used here than in chapter 5.	Text revised.
City of Redmond	The City requests analysis of removal of 20% of the waste generated from within the geographic areas serving the City of Bellevue and the City of Federal Way. The use of these geographic areas is for hypothetical purposes only. The City does not assume nor anticipate that the waste from these cities will be withdrawn from the system.	Parameters for the sensitivity analysis were discussed and approved by MSWMAC before the analysis was performed. No further options will be analyzed as part of the sensitivity analysis.
City of Federal Way	If early partial waste export leads to extension of the landfill life, how much additional rent per year will be transferred to the County general fund? How does the continued assessment of rent (beyond 2015) factor into the economic analysis related to partial early waste export?	\$7 million + inflation per year. In the analysis, rent is included in the operating costs.
City of Federal Way	Is there an optimal range or percentage of waste withdrawal or early waste export that would extend the life of Cedar Hills, while allowing variable operating costs to be reduced by an increment that generates real savings to the point where these proposed system improvement costs are offset? Is there a percentage of early waste export that, while extending Cedar Hills operating life, reduces variable operating costs to the point where economic benefits accrue (such as: more time for waste export system modifications and/or substantial operating savings at Cedar Hills)? The idea is to see if looking at a level of early export other than a fixed 20% could be beneficial.	As discussed at Feb 10 MSWMAC, this question can best be answered through a procurement process.

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
City of Bellevue	<p>Bellevue hired a well-regarded economist with experience in solid waste to review the County’s waste export financial model and help clarify the assumptions used in the model. Bellevue’s economist demonstrated that completely withdrawing certain amounts of tonnage from the system had a neutral impact on costs and revenues, not a net loss as the County concludes in the Report. In addition, withdrawal of waste provides a large benefit to the County’s system by extending the life of the landfill and allowing the County more time to plan and construct infrastructure in preparation for waste export. Major issues with the County’s financial analysis raised by Bellevue’s review include:</p> <p>Inconsistent treatment of the cost effects of disposal tonnage increases v. decreases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of consideration of transfer and short haul transport system reconfiguration and downsizing opportunities that would arise from a 20% decrease in disposal tonnage. • Use of upper bound estimates for future inflation rates compared to the historical record. • Use of tipping fee increases substantially greater than the historical record. • Failure to do a sensitivity analysis of the impacts of using a lower estimate for inflation or tipping fee growth. <p>More detail can be found in the economist’s review. <u>Bellevue staff feel strongly that a robust independent analysis is needed regarding the assumptions and sensitivity analysis completed by the County.</u></p>	<p>The Solid Waste Division stands by its analysis and supports an independent analysis of this issue as part of the third party King County Council review of the Report.</p>

Submitted By:	Comment:	Response:
Chapter Eight: General Comments		
City of Bellevue	Paragraph Two -How is there going to be time for this?	Per Ordinance 14971, third party review is the responsibility of King County Council.
January 20, 2006, SWAC	Change "will take place" to "takes place" because it has already begun.	Text revised.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Identify all incomplete tasks called for by Ordinance 14971.	Text revised.
Appendices		
Cities of Bellevue and Redmond	Does not include analysis of alternatives to enable compaction to occur at transfer stations.	Report 2 concluded there is no room at Algona and Houghton is not compatible with surrounding land use. For Factoria, the 1993 EIS coauthored by King County and the City of Bellevue eliminated this option.
City of Redmond	Add Package IA to the Appendix, Project Implementation Schedules	Pending discussions with Bellevue.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Include Responsiveness Summary as an appendix.	Text revised.
February 10, 2006, MSWMAC	Add an appendix on the inputs into the financial model used to calculate rate impacts in Chapter Two.	Text revised.