

SAG Members in Attendance:

- Aaron Moldver, City of Redmond
- Amrit Bhuie, AR Environmental Consulting
- Andreas Kolshorn, At-large
- 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
- Leslie Miller, At-large
- Nick Harbert, Waste Management
- Ronald Kim, At-large
- 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
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
- Marilee Jolin, EnviroIssues
- Claire Wendle, EnviroIssues
- Jordan Sanabria, EnviroIssues
- Melissa Wu, Jacobs Engineering
- Dan Pitzler, Jacobs Engineering

Welcome

Penny Mabie (EnviroIssues, Facilitator) welcomed members of the Siting Advisory Group (SAG). Penny encouraged the group to continue to listen to what members of their communities are discussing to share with the SAG. **Margaret Bay** (King County Solid Waste, Project Manager) responded to concerns regarding liability of participation in the SAG and shared an update to the schedule of upcoming meetings. Margaret reminded SAG members to sign the disclosure form and return to the project team.

Q: How close are we to getting down to the top five sites?

A: No specific date we can share but hoping to be able to share at our next SAG meeting.

Ø **Action item:** Create and share an email template for SAG members to use in community outreach

Functional Criteria Overview

Dan Pitzler (Jacobs Engineering) defined and explained the 6 categories of functional criteria that will be used to evaluate the top 5 sites: i) site shape, size and characteristics, ii) city

economic impact/zoning, iii) location does not impact sensitive off-site receptors, iv) equitable distribution of facilities, v) transportation, vi) cost and utilities.

Q: Will large hauler trucks getting to the new facility always take freeways or could they use local routes?

A: We can't yet answer specifically for this new site, but the County likes to keep routes away from smaller roads.

Q: Is there a summary or list of what is considered a negative impact and which we can expect?

A: Typical impacts include bright lights, back up beepers, and noise. Odor and dust have been other common negative impacts, but these are both controlled in building modern facilities.

Q: For active areas, what do you mean by "relatively few residents" within 1,000 feet? How is that measured?

A: It's a relative measure, such as number of residents in an area and looking at zoning in housing developments. There are tradeoffs in every site, so we'll look at what's within 1,000 feet and make relative comparisons between sites. No one site meets all criteria perfectly.

Q: Can you speak to what kind of accommodations this station would have?

A: It's hard to give a specific answer at this point; some of those decisions have not been made yet. It's possible some accommodations can be made, but there are must-haves for a site that are prioritized higher.

Q: What are the anticipated operating hours?

A: All stations are open seven days a week, and that is the plan for this station as well, though exact hours are still to be determined. We don't know about off-hours yet, but that's something to consider as we look at possible sites.

Q: How are these criteria ranked? How does the screening turn into a score?

A: We'll get into that further looking at community criteria.

Develop Community Criteria

Penny explained the process and schedule for community criteria, highlighting that for this meeting the SAG would be asked to turn values identified in the preliminary community survey results into community criteria. Similar values were grouped together, and the SAG were asked to identify the criterion for each theme.

Q: What does "conveniently located" mean here? Where did the input come from?

A: Input came from more than 700 people who took the community survey. We didn't ask for specifics such as zip code, but that's something to look at to see where the comments are coming from.

Q: How did people find the survey?

A: It was sent through city newsletters, social media, and through community groups. Most respondents answered they found the survey via social media.

Q: You presented an example of community criteria from a site screening study in Kittitas County. Why not share the community criteria from the station in the south end of the region?

A: We chose not to share that example because there were over 20 criteria identified. In our experience that's too many criteria, which dilutes the differentiators between sites. It is available online for those who are curious, and we can send it out to you as well.

Ø **Action item:** *Send community criteria used in screening for South County Recycling and Transfer Station.*

The SAG proceeded to have a conversation considering the community values identified in the survey. The discussion included the following comments:

Theme: location and accessibility

- Maybe we could define "conveniently located" within a radius of a number of miles, such as within 5 miles of a central location.
- It's difficult to accommodate the value of pedestrian accessibility as these facilities typically are not meant for pedestrians but could be something to explore.
- We could measure convenience using travel time to consider traffic in addition to distance.
 - This may fit better as a category of "convenience" rather than "distance"
- If travel time is valued higher than physical distance, perhaps we should also consider proximity to highways.
- It can be dangerous to have pedestrians in the same space as large hauler trucks. If we want to accommodate for pedestrian access it needs to be separate from the main area of the facility.
 - This is leaning into design, let's refocus to identifying criteria for siting.
- Since "ease of accessibility" is subjective, we could go with what the majority of respondents are saying.

Theme: equity to underserved and underrepresented communities

- We want to be aware of disproportional impacts to certain communities. Perhaps we can look at demographics to see socioeconomic status and racial makeup of residents around the sites considered.
- Perhaps using average household income can be a measurement in identifying socioeconomic status of communities.
- I know King County has maps we may want to look at to consider community impacts.
 - You as SAG members don't have to come up with the measurement, just identifying if something is measurable. The County will then look into how to measure what you have identified as measurable.
- We should consider immigrant communities as well as race and socioeconomic status in our definition of "underrepresented and underserved communities."

- Current use of land as well as previous use of land should be considered in order to respect the use of land by indigenous communities. Unsure how to make this measurable.
 - Significant cultural association is a part of the pass/fail siting process, so all the potential sites have been screened for that. However, a lot of this knowledge is not available in maps, so there are things we wouldn't know about until later in the process, for example during the environmental review.

Theme: environmental and community impacts

- These values seem like they could be split into two criteria: one for environmental impacts and one for community impacts
 - Environmental concerns were more often mentioned in the survey results.
- We could consider any red flags to measure, such as impacts to property value.

Theme: benefits

- A lot of the suggestions from the community would require the right space. In defining measurable criteria, we could consider if the site provides enough square footage to allow for these suggestions.

Anything missing?

- Cost was mentioned as a concern from the survey, that could be another criterion to consider, depending on how often it comes up in the final survey results.
 - Important to keep in mind that more expensive sites may have fewer issues than a less expensive site. At this point it's hard to get too specific with cost.
- Consider estimated acquisition and development costs to compare with other criteria, such as availability for innovation and benefits.
- Off-site improvements also need to be considered including relocation costs, roads, utilities etc.

Penny concluded the discussion on community criteria by informing members that their efforts would be combined into a draft community criteria document that will be sent to them for review, edits, and comments in advance of the next meeting on December 16, 2020.

∅ **Action item:** *Send community criteria used in screening for South County Recycling and Transfer Station.*

Public Comment

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

Next Steps

The next SAG meeting will be on December 16, 2020 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Penny also discussed upcoming community outreach in January and requested SAG members to help spread the word to their communities.

∅ **Action item:** *Create and share an email template for SAG members to use in community outreach*

- Ø **Action item:** *Send final community values survey results*
- Ø **Action item:** *SAG members to review draft community criteria and respond to Penny with edits and comments*
- Ø
- Ø **Action item:** *Top 5 sites interactive tour will be sent after Top 5 are announced*