

Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
October 31, 2014

MSWMAC members present	
Alison Bennett	Bellevue
Stephanie Schwenger	Bellevue
Chris Searcy	Enumclaw
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way
John MacGillivray	Kirkland
Mary Jane Goss	Lake Forest Park
Nina Rivkin	Redmond
Jerallyn Roetemeyer	Redmond
Linda Knight	Renton
Scott MacColl	Shoreline
Paula Waters	Woodinville
SWAC members present	
Jean Garber – Chair	
Keith Livingston	

King County staff present
Linda Bremer
Neil Fujii
Beth Humphreys
Mike Huddleston, Council staff
Kevin Kiernan
Mike Reed, Council staff
Thea Severn
Diane Yates
Others present
Julie Blakeslee, URS
Doreen Booth, Sound Cities Association
Kassi Leingang, TranspoGroup
Mike Swenson, TranspoGroup

Jean Garber, SWAC Chair, convened the meeting.

Review of September 26, 2014 Meeting Summary

There was no discussion of the meeting summary.

Traffic and Service Time Study

Thea Severn, Planning and Communications Manager, began by explaining the handout [Working Concepts for Transfer Plan Review Part II](#).

Questions:

Q: Alison Bennett asked if under Concept 1 when it states “direct commercial haulers” does it mean to transfer stations and to Cedar Hills?

A: It means direct commercial haulers to transfer stations.

Next, Julie Blakeslee from URS gave an introduction to the Traffic and Time Service study, stating that the consultants began work in September and will complete their work in January, 2015. The intent of the presentation is to give committee members a preview of what has been done and what analysis is being done. She told the committee that the [presentation](#) will also be given at the November 17 Workshop, so the division is also looking for feedback on it. Mike Swenson from Transpo gave the remainder of the presentation.

Questions:

Q: Scott MacColl: On the Trip Generation slide, is the 3-hour window the average for the week?

A: Placed pneumatic tubes at each site for a little over a week. There was a pretty consistent 3-hour window each day. At Shoreline it is 11:45 – 2:45 each day. Even if it is shifted, it does not change much.

Q: MacColl: Is the 3-hour window broken down by self-haul and commercial traffic?

A: It's a total. It is showing when the worst case for traffic would be.

Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
October 31, 2014

Q: Bennett: When the demand management strategies are applied, will the different types of customers be separated?

A: Yes.

Q: Citing a recent traffic study that was done for the new Factoria Transfer Station, Mike Reed asked if the current study's methodology is consistent with that study and are the numbers the same?

A: Transpo is using the new data that has been collected and the more recent forecasts, but will compare the two studies for consistency.

Q: Stephanie Schwenger: Is seasonality a factor to consider?

A: Yes, we are using the 90th percentile, which has about 20 – 30 percent variability when seasonality is factored in.

Q: Bennett: How will you take the real-time data collected at the existing Factoria and model the new facility?

A: We will look at similar facilities such as Bow Lake and Shoreline to model the flows at the new Factoria.

Q: Rob Van Orsow: How will we model Concept 1 for a Saturday, since commercial haulers don't operate on weekends?

A: Commercial haulers do operate on weekends, just not that many trucks. There is a difference between Concepts 0 and 1, just not that big a difference on weekends.

Q: Keith Livingston: Traffic flow is one thing, but does tonnage throughput slow down the traffic?

A: It's hard to get that information from a traffic study, but operational capacity still has to be considered. Once it has been flushed out which concepts that we will pursue, through the modeling that we do, we will see if there are bottlenecks. Right now traffic is our focus, tonnage is not an issue so far.

Q: Livingston asked about the customer experience (i.e. travel time) - is it from where I live?

A: Travel time is referring to time in the station.

Q: Livingston: Could we get more information on customer experience by having a dialogue with customers on-site?

A: We will be doing a customer survey asking customers about their transfer station experiences both now and in the future.

Q: Chris Searcy asked about calculating greenhouse gas – is it internal to the site or is it off-site as well?

A: We are calculating greenhouse gas internal to the site.

Q: Searcy followed up with a question about the greenhouse gas impacts of customers driving farther to a different transfer station.

A: We are talking about how we will account for that. For example, if we are directing commercial trucks to Shoreline, what are the impacts?

Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
October 31, 2014

Q: Reed: Will the customer survey show to what extent customers that are coming to the stations could have used curbside?

A: There are questions on the customer survey that will address that. Also, the last customer survey that was done in 2011 also had relevant questions.

Q: Linda Knight: Have the affected jurisdictions been contacted about the intersections that will be studied for off-site impacts?

A: Transpo has reached out to some of the jurisdictions, but has not contacted all of them yet.

Q: Nina Rivkin: Are you using the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) data?

A: Yes, using PSRC data, but also other traffic studies, and background growth information from cities. For example, Bellevue has a concurrency model that they want us to use that incorporates the PSRC data.

Q: Mary Jane Goss stated that Lake Forest Park has concerns about traffic. How will this study address where the trucks will travel? There are peak periods where there are traffic issues.

A: The division is talking with the haulers about what they would do if Houghton and Renton were closed. In addition, the city of Kirkland is doing a waste sort at Shoreline and we will get data from the hauler about what route they used to go from Kirkland to Shoreline

Garber stated that if any jurisdictions have input on the intersections, they should contact Diane Yates.

Q: Rivkin: What is the timeline for the study?

A: The draft report will need to be done around the end of January to meet the March 31 due date. The final report is due on June 30.

Q: Rivkin: When will the analysis be ready?

A: It will be an iterative process. By December we should have a good understanding of which of the concepts are the most viable. Analysis will need to be complete by mid-January.

Comments:

- Bennett stated that she was struggling with the assumptions that were going into the traffic study and wanted to see more.
- Livingston stated that stations still have a tonnage capacity that needs to be taken into account.
- John MacGillivray said that looking at the slide, he couldn't tell if the station is reaching its tonnage capacity or not. Will need more information to figure that out.
- Livingston stated that the customer travel time should include the time for the whole trip – not just on-site.

November 17, 2014 Workshop Planning

Severn discussed the handout Annotated Draft Agenda for the Transfer Plan Review Workshop scheduled for November 17, 2014 from 10 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. She stated that she was looking for input from the group on the content and focus of the meeting.

Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
October 31, 2014

Questions:

Q: Van Orsow: Will the Division distribute materials in advance of the workshop?

A: It is always a challenge but we will certainly provide the things that are ready in advance.

Q: Rivkin: What is the purpose of the workshop?

A: The purpose of the workshop is to give people that haven't been a part of these advisory committee meetings a chance to hear what the study is looking at and what data we are collecting.

Q: Garber: How will the workshop be advertised?

A: Members of SWAC, MSWMAC, and other stakeholders will receive invitations. It will also be posted on our webpage.

Q: Rivkin: Will demand strategies be discussed at the workshop?

A: Demand management strategies are mentioned on the [Concept handout](#). We will put more emphasis on them when we discuss all of the Concepts.

There was a discussion about whether or not it was too early to have a workshop in November. Some members felt that there was not enough to discuss and that attendees would be expecting to see more of the results of the study. Severn stated that she wants to have the workshop so we can get feedback about whether we are on the right track. It was agreed that the workshop would be held on November 17th, but that another workshop would be held in January. The invitation to the workshop will be explicit about what it will and will not cover. The January workshop will cover results of the analysis.

Comments:

- Rivkin stated that she is very concerned about showing specific data that is not complete. People have perceptions and they jump to conclusions. If the incomplete data is presented, it needs to be in context.
- Goss stated that the presentation doesn't have to be at the very basic level since people already have an understanding, but we need to give people an idea of what information that we have and where we are going with it.
- Rivkin said that the order of the items on the agenda should be changed and that the census maps and ESJ discussion should be moved up and given more time. She also said that the Traffic Study has too much time on the agenda since it isn't complete yet.
- Goss stated that from the standpoint of a small city, traffic is important and the discussion needs to be included.
- Doreen Booth stated that the invitation needs to be specific about what will and won't be addressed at the workshop. She thought that the workshop was going to be different, so others would too. She thought it was going to be the results of the study.

Wrap Up

Garber stated that she appreciated all of the suggestions.