



SAG Meeting #1 Summary

Siting Advisory Group

Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station

SAG Members in Attendance:

- Aaron Moldver, City of Redmond
- Amrit Bhuie, AR Environmental Consulting
- Andreas Kolshorn, At-large
- Chuck Price, City of Woodinville
- Dave Juarez, City of Redmond
- Diana Hart, City of Woodinville
- Jed Reynolds, Lake Washington School District
- James Randolph, At-large
- John MacGillivray, City of Kirkland
- Kent Kronenburg, Republic Services
- Kristina Hudson, OneRedmond
- Leslie Miller, At-large
- Nick Harbert, Waste Management
- Ronald Kim, At-large
- Sandy Cobb, Unincorporated King County
- Susan Vossler, At-large
- Tom Vaughn, DTG Recycling Services
- Tracey Dunlap, City of Kirkland
- William Louie, At-large
- William Su, Resident

Staff Members in Attendance

- Margaret Bay, King County Solid Waste
- Karen Herndon, King County Solid Waste
- Polly Young, King County Solid Waste
- Annie Kolb-Nelson, King County Solid Waste
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
- Marilee Jolin, EnviroIssues
- Claire Wendle, EnviroIssues
- Melissa Wu, Jacobs Engineering
- Dan Pitzler, Jacobs Engineering

Welcome

Penny Mabie (EnviroIssues, Facilitator) welcomed members of the Siting Advisory Group (SAG). **Margaret Bay** (King County Solid Waste, Project Manager) explained the renaming of the Siting Advisory Committee to Siting Advisory Group, available compensation for SAG members, and the disclosure form that SAG members will be asked to sign.

Q: What is the nature of the other disclosures we will be asked?

A: There are a number of questions on the form, which is being reviewed by the King County Prosecuting Attorney.

Q: What is the liability SAG members carry as members of the group, and are we protected from those liabilities?

A: King County does not foresee any liabilities but will follow up with the Prosecuting Attorney with that question.

Q: There are four Equity and Social Justice seats left to be filled on the SAG. How will those seats be filled? I have reached out to Centro Cultural Mexicano and can put them into contact with the County.

A: King County has reached out to the group before but has not had success in scheduling an interview. The County will connect with the member to speak with the group again.

As they introduced themselves, SAG members shared what surprised or stayed with them from the Kick-Off Meeting.

Takeaways from SAG Kick-Off Meeting

- There was a variety of voices and wide community representation.
- The diversity of information shared by the County and by members of the group.
- The difference in priorities.
- Impressed by the members and respectfulness of the group.
- The level of interest and depth of information.
- The movement toward modernization and commitment from the community
- The number of members not involved in the waste industry.
- The successful use of Zoom to gather the group.
- The project timeline, and curiosity about the group's role over the course of the ten SAG meetings.

The SAG approved the charter, given there will be opportunities later to revise the charter if needed. The Charter will be posted on the County website.

Recycling and Transfer Station Overview

Penny shared observed takeaways from the tours of the Factoria Transfer Station, which included questions about the size and services offered, the flat floor plan at the station, the volume of garbage taken to Cedar Hills Regional Landfill, the Household Hazardous Waste facility, the items visitors are recycling, and comparisons between the Factoria Recycling Transfer Station and the North Transfer Station in Seattle.

Penny asked for any additional observations and thoughts.

- The facility was in a good location
- There were not many opportunities for reuse.
- There were not as many community features as Seattle's North Transfer Station, which may be due to the Seattle station's location in a residential area.
- The noise and smell were noticeable.
- The facility was 80,000 square feet and it was mentioned that it is 15-20,000 square feet too small.
- The visible safety hazard was unexpected. There were large bulldozers and self-haul vehicles very close to one another on the floor.
- Hope to see more staff to help with recycling and sorting to ensure visitors were sorting waste correctly.

Q: Will the eight-acre criteria in the site screening process accommodate an expanded station?

A: That will be discussed when we share the potential sites, which is the next portion of the presentation.

Penny noted that many of the observations were about the design of the facility and reminded the group their focus will be on the siting process.

Screening Process and Site Selection

Dan Pitzler (Jacobs Engineering) explained the non-site-specific layout, which showed the elements that a site for the recycling and transfer station would ideally hold. This generic layout suggests a site size ranging from 9-15 acres would be adequate, but sizing is highly dependent on the site shape and amenities provided. The more space a site has, the more features it will be able to hold.

Dan reviewed the six-step site selection process that will be used to identify the preferred site and the role of the SAG in the decision-making process. Dan also reviewed how the screening process and SAG meeting timelines will align through March 2021.

Dan explained the Pass/Fail criteria that was used for initial site selection, the GIS Parcel Search used to identify 100+ 8-acre sites in the siting area and the criteria used in that search, the GIS Parcel Cluster Search, and the identification of the top 15 sites for further evaluation.

Committee questions:

Q: What is the significance of the 10-mile radii on the GIS Parcel Search figure?

A: They identify where sites are in relation to the two closest stations, the Shoreline and Factoria transfer stations.

Q: Why are we not considering the areas in white, where urban growth will eventually move towards? There are already a lot of houses and developments there.

A: That area is outside of the urban growth boundary. The County, in part due to the population density, screened out sites outside the boundary.

Q: Does the siting boundary need to follow the boundary of the cities? The Redmond boundary is cut off right outside of Costco and that area is still easily accessible. Can that boundary be expanded, even if it is not part of the original screening criteria? How was that boundary set?

A: That boundary outlines the contiguous Urban Growth Area, which was decided with the cities to use as a screening criterion. The boundary is not a set rule, and if no sites are identified within the boundary the County will look outside the boundary.

Q: Understanding that design will be separate from the siting process, how do we accommodate innovation in the facility and the design through the siting process? The Seattle facility had a smaller area to work with and were creative with the space.

A: The Seattle site was very expensive to construct, and there were no other viable sites. We can look at smaller sites, but found it was a reasonable approach to look for larger areas to accommodate a larger site.

Top 15 Sites Review

Dan reviewed each of the 15 sites, including the size, the zoning, the current site use, and the critical areas. There were five sites in Kirkland, eight sites in Redmond, and two in Woodinville.

Committee questions:

Q: I'm surprised by the site that combines the Houghton Park and Ride and the existing transfer station site. The City of Kirkland thought the new transfer site would be a standalone facility at the Park and Ride site and would not want two transfer stations in Kirkland. This split site approach was not shared with the City.

A: We looked at a lot of different ideas in the initial screening. We looked at the acreage of the park and ride site compared to the City of Seattle. We are looking independently at the Houghton transfer site and we are looking at options to combine them. This is the very first look at potential sites, not the set plans. This is just a high level of what is possible, not probable or likely. There will be a lot of factors moving forward to determine what is possible

Q: Is there more information about the Redmond aquifer? Someone mentioned this was a concern. It would also be helpful to send the sites ahead of time for SAG members to review.

A: We can share the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA) superimposed on the siting area. This is something that has been an ongoing discussion with the cities and we recognize it is a concern. If, as we narrow the list of possible sites, we are left with sites only in the CARA, we'll have a discussion with Redmond and other cities. We chose to share the sites with everyone during the meeting to ensure everyone received the information and explanation at the same time. We will share the top 5 sites afterwards.

Q: Park and ride sites are a very valuable resource. Will there be mitigation if it's removed?

A: There were initial conversations about the Park and Ride, and Metro's plans for that site. It is somewhat underutilized, and we are looking at the effect it would have on transit options. For now, these are just ideas and suggestions.

Comment: When you're looking at just the truck traffic, those trucks will be going through a lot of high and slow traffic areas. I'd like to eventually get on to how many trucks and traffic we're looking at for each area. Road infrastructure is an issue. On Site 9, there is a lot of residential development on the hill above the site. The existing recycle center in Woodinville has the same situation. All the residents at the top of the hill can hear the noise so noise mitigation will be an important topic.

Comment: I'm familiar with the area and traffic pattern of Site 2. The path to get back to the freeway goes past two schools and four or five traffic lights. There is about a one

mile backup as cars ingress and egress out of the schools. The site seems incongruous with the neighboring area.

Comment: One of Redmond's concerns is the impact to groundwater supply, and we should take impact and development on the CARA into consideration. There is a development currently planned that will soon start construction on Willows and 24th. Redmond development is not slowing, and in fact is growing exponentially.

Response: We're going through further review and we're checking to see if development currently in process is under consideration.

Ø **Action item:** Share graphics of CARA superimposed on siting area.

Broad Area Site Screening (BASS) Process Overview

Dan shared that he was not surprised by the comments about the initial top 15 sites and that finding a site in the region would be challenging. He reviewed the process to evaluate each site against BASS criteria in the next step of screening. The draft screening results will be presented at the next SAG meeting.

Dan reviewed the criteria that will be used for the Broad Area Site Screening process. Penny let the group know the SAG 1 PowerPoint would be shared after the meeting. She prompted the group to share if they felt the County had missed anything during their initial screening, or if there were any other sites they should study. The group was encouraged to follow up by email over the next few days if anything came to mind.

Committee questions:

Comment: I have a site suggestion for the area of Woodinville just off of SR 522 near the Costco and the Woodinville Recycling Center. It's an industrial area.

Q: There is an area right next to sites 5 and 14. Based on the other comments noting characteristics, there is one giant unforested flat area that's undeveloped. Why is that area not being considered? It's even further from Evans Creek than the two sites.

A: Evans Creek is going to be relocated through that area. Although it does look like an ideal siting area, it is a wetland and wetland buffer and it's not in the contiguous Urban Growth Area.

Q: Will the County and the consultant be a part of applying the Equity and Social Justice lens as part of the criteria.

A: We're working with consultants who specialize in this field to apply that criteria.

Q: Will those criteria be shared with the SAG members?

A: Yes.

Q: In the BASS, I didn't see traffic called out specifically. I'd like to see more information about traffic impacts when we get down to the top 5 sites.

A: We are taking a general look at traffic for all the sites, and we'll have more information at the next meeting.

Q: Have you reached out to each of the cities for traffic data?

A: We work with a traffic data specialist firm and we have data for the entire region.

Q: Did you mention cost or how much we have to work with?

A: We used cost to screen out the top 130 sites. There is a reasonableness threshold and we have the assessed value for each of these sites. The County believes they can work with anything that is on the list of the top 15 sites. Some sites would cost more than others to acquire, and some sites would be more challenging to build on.

Q: We'd like to know more depth and details as we move forward. Has the County already come to some sort of conclusion for the top five sites?

A: We've done some evaluation for the sites and it's still being reviewed. We are hopeful that we can get that information to the SAG prior to the next meeting in November.

Comment: I liked Site 11 to expand the current Houghton Transfer Station.

Q: Whatever sites we decide, will there be a community survey?

A: Yes, there will be a survey coming up soon to identify community criteria, and more outreach once the top five sites have been identified.

Penny summarized the community survey for the group and emphasized that the work the SAG will do becomes more and more valuable as the number of sites are narrowed down.

Public Comment

Penny opened the call for public comments. There were no public comments.

Committee Questions:

Q: What is public comment for?

A: Any comments from the public (non-SAG members) to the Siting Advisory Group.

Next Steps

The next SAG meeting will be on November 18, 2020 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

- Ø **Action item:** Send the disclosure form to SAG members.
- Ø **Action item:** Check on the liability of SAG members, if any.
- Ø **Action item:** Finalize and post Kick-off Meeting summary to County website.
- Ø **Action item:** Post SAG Charter to County website.
- Ø **Action item:** Send links to the Bow Lake and Shoreline Transfer Station tours to SAG members.
- Ø **Action item:** Compile and distribute notes and photos SAG members took on Factoria Transfer Station tours to the rest of the SAG.
- Ø **Action item:** Share CARA boundaries superimposed on siting area.

- Ø **Action item:** Share general community survey with SAG members once translations are complete and the links are live.
- Ø **Action item:** Share Top 5 sites with SAG members to review prior to SAG Meeting #2.
- Ø **Action item:** Share summary of Meeting #1 for review and approval.

Ø