

South County Recycling and Transfer Station Siting Siting Advisory Committee Meeting Notes Auburn Parks Arts & Recreation Administration Building August 15, 2012

Attendees:

Jody Armstrong, Washington National Estates
Marc Davis, Waste Management
Terry Davis, Auburn Area Chamber of Commerce
Councilmember Dini Duclos, City of Federal Way
Mayor Dave Hill, City of Algona
Bryon Hiller, Auburn Area Chamber of Commerce
Karen Meador, Neely Mansion Association
Patricia Mullen, Federal Way Chamber of Commerce
Gladys Paulus, White River Valley Citizens Corps Council
Diana Quinn, City of Algona
Jodi Riker, White River Valley Citizen Corps Council
J.B. Rupert, Auburn Area Chamber of Commerce
Mike Sears, Interested Citizen
Jody Snyder, Waste Connections, Inc.
John Taylor, CleanScapes
Rob Van Orsow, City of Federal Way
Gary Venn, Auburn Area Chamber of Commerce
Scott Weide, Auburn School District
Nicholas Wells, Soos Creek Area Response
Nancy Wyatt, Auburn Area Chamber of Commerce
Jerry Yap, White River Valley Citizens Corps Council and Microsoft Consultant

Agency Staff:

Lisa Williams, Project Manager, King County Solid Waste Division
Eric Richarddt, Project Manager, King County Solid Waste Division
Polly Young, Planning and Communications, King County Solid Waste Division
Kathy Hashagen, Planning and Communications, King County Solid Waste Division

Consultants:

Marcia Wagoner, Read Wagoner (facilitator)
Michael Read, Read Wagoner
Terrill Chang, URS
Julie Blakeslee, URS

A. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Polly Young welcomed Siting Advisory Committee (SAC) members and provided an overview of the process and the role of the SAC. She thanked those in attendance for their participation. She also disclosed that King County has purchased a site adjacent to the existing Algona station, explaining that this fact in no way precludes equal consideration of other potential sites. Further, this site will undergo the same rigorous screening and evaluation process as all other potential sites.

Marcia Wagoner described her neutral facilitation role, reviewed the evening's agenda and roles and responsibilities, then invited members to introduce themselves and describe their interest in the project.

B. PROGRAM OVERVIEW: WHY IS KING COUNTY SITING A NEW TRANSFER STATION?

Eric Richardt explained the current recycling and transfer system. Focusing on south King County, he described the service area, location of the Algona Transfer Station and the reasons why King County is siting a new recycling and transfer station. In summary, the existing Algona Station is outdated and it lacks adequate space for on-site queuing, for installation of large waste compactors, recycling services and for waste storage in the event of a regional disaster.

Eric explained that the site selection process began in May 2012. The Solid Waste Division (SWD) will utilize a six-step process to identify a range of sites and narrow it down to a preferred site. The six steps of the site evaluation process are: potential site identification, broad screening, focused screening, comparative evaluation, State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review, and ultimately a decision.

In response to questions, Solid Waste Division staff provided the following information:

- Information about the project's schedule will be presented later in the meeting.
- A question was asked about what the zoning was for the Shoreline and Bow Lake transfer stations. SWD staff indicated those sites were zoned commercial and that King County obtained conditional use permits for solid waste handling at those locations from the host cities.

Correction about zoning for the Shoreline and Bow Lake stations:

- The zoning for the Bow Lake station was a special district/zone called "Tukwila Valley South." It was set up for the large Tukwila South development. SWD obtained an Unclassified Use Permit for Bow Lake, not a Conditional Use permit as stated at the meeting.
- The zoning for the Shoreline station was R-6 and the Shoreline City Council approved a Master Plan permit for the new transfer station.

C. TRANSFER STATION 101

Terrill Chang described the function and appearance of the transfer stations built in the 1960's in contrast to the newly constructed stations at Shoreline and Bow Lake.

The new stations have compaction equipment that consolidates materials into high-density payloads resulting in fewer truck trips and greater efficiency. New stations have enclosed buildings that are more attractive and are better able to control dust, odor, noise and pests. They also improve safety by providing separate traffic patterns for small and large vehicles.

New transfer stations include a building to collect materials, scales and scale houses, trailer parking, staff facilities, buffers and a flexible design to respond to changes in future needs. The objective of a transfer station is to receive and prepare solid waste for transport; provide safe, effective, economical and environmentally sound operations; comply with federal, state and local regulations and provide an appropriate level of service.

In response to questions, Solid Waste Division staff provided the following information:

- The County owns the trucks and trailers that transport waste to the landfill. Compactors are currently in use at four transfer stations so new trailers would not be needed.
Correction about whether new trailers would be needed for compacted loads from a new transfer station:
 - When a new station is built to replace the Algona Transfer Station, we will replace the old “top load” style trailers with new containers or trailers that can accommodate compacted loads. Compactors are currently in use at four transfer stations, so the trailers that would be purchased for the new station would be interchangeable with the trailers in use at those sites.
- The size of the existing Algona Transfer Station site is about five acres.

D. SELECTION CRITERIA

Polly Young explained the three types of selection criteria—Pass/Fail, Functional and Community—and how they would be applied to evaluate potential sites. She outlined the SAC’s role in developing the community criteria.

Eric Richardt explained that the Pass/Fail criteria are based on the mission, vision and values of King County. They are identified by King County staff and establish minimum standards that must be met for a site to qualify for consideration.

The Pass/Fail criteria are:

- 1.1 Site is within the service area
- 1.2 Site is within the contiguous Urban Growth Area
- 1.3 Site is located outside of a FEMA-defined 100-year flood plain
- 1.4 Site is free of historical, archaeological, or cultural designations
- 1.5 Site is not designated as farmland preservation, park or open space

Functional criteria are used to evaluate the desired engineering, operating, and transportation conditions for each site and are identified by King County Staff. It is unlikely that any site will meet all functional criteria. Rather, each criterion’s relative importance must be considered in order to identify the best site.

The Functional criteria are:

- 2.1 Site is appropriately zoned and consistent with local area land use plans
- 2.2 Surrounding land uses and zoning designations are compatible
- 2.3 Active area would be approximately 100 feet or more from the nearest residence
- 2.4 Site is located approximately 1000 feet or more from parks and schools
- 2.5 Site maintains an equitable distribution of county solid waste facilities (i.e. less than 30 minutes travel time for 90% of all users)
- 2.6 Site provides equitable distribution of environmental impacts so that no racial, cultural or socio-economic group is unduly impacted
- 2.7 Site can be developed without impact to identified critical wildlife habitat
- 2.8 Site contains a manageable amount of critical areas
- 2.9 Potential traffic impacts of facility operation can be minimized and/or mitigated
- 2.10 Roadways near the site have the capacity to handle increased truck traffic; quality and nature of the access route is compatible
- 2.11 Site is within approximately 1/2-mile of a major arterial or freeway/state highway (I-5, State Routes 18, 161, 164, 167)
- 2.12 Site has potential access to a rail line
- 2.13 Shape of site is conducive to the typical layout of a transfer station
- 2.14 Site is approximately 15-20 acres (not necessarily a single parcel)
- 2.15 Topography on the developable area of the site is flat or gently sloping
- 2.16 Utilities are readily accessible
- 2.17 Water table beneath the site is conducive to the use (i.e. deeper as opposed to shallow)
- 2.18 Site would not require extensive/expensive effort related to current tenant and/or business relocation
- 2.19 Site is not a key component of a city's or communities' economic development plan(s)

In response to questions, Solid Waste Division staff provided the following information:

- The Pass/Fail and Functional criteria for this siting study are similar to those used for other transfer stations but are not word for word. With each new facility, SWD applies the lessons learned to subsequent projects and the criteria changes.

Correction about site selection criteria used for other transfer stations:

- The Bow Lake and Shoreline transfer stations were rebuilt at their existing locations so a siting process wasn't necessary. Thus, site selection criteria were not created for those projects. The last time SWD went through a siting process for an urban area station was for the Factoria Transfer Station in 1991. The site selection criteria for that process are available in the *Site Selection Process Report for the Factoria Transfer Station*, dated September 1991.
- The "not in the 100-year flood plain" criterion does not necessarily exclude sites adjacent to rail lines. SWD staff will prepare a map showing the application of both flood plain and rail criteria.
- SWD welcomes suggestions from the SAC on potential sites for the new transfer station.
- King County's Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and real estate professionals assisted in the search for sites. The initial GIS query yielded over 130 sites in the study area that were 15 or more acres in size. SWD intends to narrow the list of potential sites down to 2 or 3 for the environmental review step of the site selection process.

- While it is possible that the County could use eminent domain to secure a site, the County would prefer to not use that method.
- SWD staff will gather information about the economic impact of a transfer station on surrounding properties from real estate experts and others and provide that to the SAC.
- Sufficient infrastructure capacity is important in selecting a site. One of the functional criteria for site selection directly addresses that issue.
- SWD is just starting the process of looking at potential sites and has not identified a particular number of sites to consider.
- Other than the site adjacent to the Algona Transfer Station, no specific site has been identified.
- Potential sites do not necessarily have to be vacant. However, relocation and demolition can be very expensive so one of the functional criteria addresses that issue.
- The current transfer station was built in the 1960s and has lasted about fifty years. We expect the new facility will have a similar lifespan.
- The new facility will be designed using tonnage projections for 2030. SWD doesn't have specific figures about the projected population group for the service area for the facility beyond the official 20-year projections provided by Washington State. SWD can extrapolate from those projections to get 30, 40, and 50-year growth estimates.

E. COMMUNITY CRITERIA

Marcia Wagoner explained the process for gathering the SAC's community criteria, which involved giving each person multiple opportunities to identify criteria. The criteria will be used by King County SWD in their screening process to identify potential sites and select a recommended site. Some examples of community criteria were offered such as "neighborhood character not being affected by the proposed station" or "not siting too closely to schools and community facilities." It was also noted that it was fine to have the same criterion on both the list of functional criteria and on the list of community criteria; duplication is okay. In round-robin fashion, the SAC members produced a list of criteria that were transcribed onto large sheets of paper.

F. WEIGHTING COMMUNITY CRITERIA

Marcia Wagoner asked SAC members to place dots adjacent to the transcribed criteria to indicate their highest priority criteria. Each member was given three dots and instructed they were free to place more than one dot on a single criterion if desired. This exercise revealed the committee's aggregate ranking of the criteria as shown below. (The numbers adjacent to each criterion represent the number of dots each received.)

Votes	Community Criteria
12	Economic vitality of community is not adversely affected
12	Where arterial roadways are designated as good (not poor) in terms of condition and level of service in transportation plans
6	Easily connections to rail (for fifty year life span of facility)
6	Where trucks would not have to pass through school or hospital zones (focus on transportation impacts)
5	Access route can be maintained long-term
4	Creates benefit to host city
3	Where surrounding property values would not be adversely affected
2	Away from areas of high truck traffic
2	Where accessible from all directions (so traffic is dispersed, not concentrated)
2	Away from parks, schools and churches
1	Consider population centroid movement (future projections)
1	Away from locations where housing could be built in the future (review zoning and comprehensive plans
1	Use Pass/Fail criteria for a fast initial screen
1	Located and designed so community uses–user-friendly access and operations
1	What's the closure plan for existing Algona facility?
1	Adequate size to accommodate fully landscaped buffer
1	Where local community is not already burdened with impacts from existing facilities like the speedway
0	Protect rural areas
0	Support Pass/Fail criteria 1.2, 1.3, 1.4
0	Consider transportation mitigation fees
0	Where efficient operation scan reduce impacts to community
0	1000 feet tram a school
0	Locate on existing truck routes (designated in Auburn)
0	Where 24-hour operation would be feasible
0	Where lighting, noise and odor concerns would be minimized and impacts easily mitigated

G. NEXT STEPS

Polly Young described the siting process schedule:

July/Aug 2012: Potential Site Identification
Aug/Sept 2012: Broad Area Site Screening
Sept/Oct 2012: Focused Site Screening
Oct 2012: Comparative Evaluation
Nov 2012: Begin Environmental Review
2013: Complete Environmental Review and Decision

Upcoming dates for SAC meetings and public meetings were provided as follows:

Wed., Aug. 29: **SAC Meeting #2:** Tour Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station.
Thurs., Sept. 13: **SAC Meeting #3:** Review potential sites and application of criteria.
Thurs., Sept. 27: **Open House/Public Meeting:** Inform wider community of the project. Present site selection criteria and potential sites. Obtain feedback.
Wed., Oct. 10: **SAC Meeting #4:** Conduct focused site screening and comparative evaluation. Review public feedback. Evaluate sites to determine the best two or three with the goal of selecting a preferred site.
Wed., Nov. 14: **Public Meeting-Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Scoping:** Begin environmental review process.

H. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Handouts Distributed:

- Meeting agenda
- Roles and Responsibilities (Siting Advisory Committee, Facilitator and King County Solid Waste Division)
- Siting Criteria – Pass/Fail Criteria and Functional Criteria
- Tentative Schedule of Siting Advisory Committee and Public Meetings
- Draft Fact Sheet: Siting Study for a new South County Recycling & Transfer Station
- Brochure: “Your Guide to King County Solid Waste Recycling and Transfer Facilities”
- PowerPoint Presentation to Siting Advisory Committee