



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
- James Randolph, At-large
- Jed Reynolds, Lake Washington School District
- John MacGillivray, City of Kirkland
- Kent Kronenburg, Republic Services
- Leslie Miller, At-large
- Nick Harbert, Waste Management
- Quinn Apuzzo, Recology
- Ronald Kim, At-large
- Susan Vossler, At-large
- Tehmina Ali, Microsoft
- 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
- Annie Kolb-Nelson, King County Solid Waste
- Polly Young, King County Solid Waste
- Penny Mabie, Definitely-Mabie Consulting
- Marilee Jolin, EnviroIssues
- Claire Wendle, EnviroIssues
- Jordan Sanabria, EnviroIssues
- Dan Pitzler, Jacobs Engineering

Welcome

Penny Mabie (Definitely-Mabie Consulting, Facilitator) welcomed members of the Siting Advisory Group (SAG). Three SAG members, who were selected to give a report-out to the rest of the group in advance, shared values and concerns they'd heard from their community:

Susan Vossler:

- Received 6 responses from friends and neighbors, most of whom live in Kirkland
- One respondent who lives near Houghton Station loves the convenience of living near a recycling and transfer station
- One respondent had concerns about a new station being built near their home, suggested building on a site that already has industrial use
- Valued: minimal environmental impact, accessibility to community, ability to accommodate future growth, providing modern recycling services, recognize environmental and social justice when selecting location.

Andreas Kolshorn:

- Received responses from 1 neighbor, works at North Shore School District
- Didn't mind proximity to one of the proposed sites of new station to their home
- Preference for a site in an industrial area
- Concern for increased traffic impacts, particularly if the site is near a school where traffic is already heavy
 - Jed Reynolds added that North Shore School District hauls their own trash, while Lake Washington School District does not

William Su:

- Received 5 responses from friends and colleagues from the immigrant community
- Valued accessibility to site location
- Concern about removing park and ride
- Concern for increased traffic, mainly on local roads
- Concern for impacts to environment, such as odor from site
- Concern regarding cost in constructing the new station and the subsequent cost of service

Finalize Community Criteria and Scoring Measures

Penny led the SAG in reviewing the drafted criteria discussed in the previous meeting, reiterating that the time to discuss scoring measures would come later.

Theme: location and accessibility

Comments:

- We should also consider proximity to another station, perhaps something like "location is within 5-10 miles from existing stations"
 - Agreed, having stations that are spread more evenly throughout the service area would address the concern regarding accessibility
- For the sake of keeping the total number of criteria as low as possible, how can we reword the existing criteria to include proximity to existing stations?

Q: Do we know the center of the service area?

A: We just got a map of the weighted population centroid of the service area. The site closest to the centroid is the Willows Road/NE 124th location.

Q: Are any of the potential sites close to existing stations?

A: It depends on what you mean by "close." If you want to define a criterion based on potential sites within a certain mile radius from an existing station, 10 miles would rule out a bunch of potential sites. A possible alternative could be to measure how close the site is to another station, rather than the radius around a site.

Revised criteria:

- 1) Location has best travel times at most times of the day from within the service area

- 2) Location is within 10 miles from any point in the service area and no closer than 5 miles to any other County recycling and transfer station.

Theme: equity to underserved and underrepresented communities

Comments:

- King County is in communication with local tribes to verify if there's anything tribes would like to have preserved or protected
 - Knowledge of an area's historic use/significance will be harder to find
- If historic use will be difficult to measure, we should just consider current use
- Potential sites that currently have industrial or business use seem to have a lower chance of current indigenous use
- Not all community members have curbside pickup where they live or a car to self-haul – accessibility to the site for these individuals should be considered
 - A third criterion regarding the station could include a service to pick up items for those who cannot self-haul. This idea was discussed but ultimately dropped as it was a matter of service rather than siting

Q: Could King County do a cultural resources assessment to work with tribes now to reduce the chance of being surprised further in the process?

A: That's something that was brought up in our discussions with tribes as an option as well. It may be too early to get anything back, but we could ask to see what we can find at this stage in the siting process.

Ø **Action item:** *Follow up with tribal representatives about possibility of cultural resources assessment earlier in the siting process*

Q: If we can't find information about current indigenous use of a site, does that mean that potential site is eliminated?

A: That's up to you as the SAG and how you'd like to use the measure.

Q: Has King County found historical data in conducting studies of these potential sites?

A: That kind of assessment doesn't occur until further in the process when we've narrowed down the potential sites we're considering.

Revised criteria:

- 1) Are there disproportionate impacts to historically and currently underserved and underrepresented communities? (includes people of color, immigrants, refugees, and low-income)
- 2) Underserved and underrepresented community members and employees are able to conveniently access site
- 3) Site has lowest current use by indigenous peoples

Theme: environmental and community impacts

Comments:

- Suggestion to specify fewest impact to aquifers that provide drinking water
- Suggestion to change “site is not a *barrier* to sustainable and innovative design” to alternative language (such as “accommodates,” “site lends itself to...,” “provides an opportunity for....”)

Q: Are we considering these criteria for the building itself or the entire site for a full-service center?

A: One of the proposed scoring measures was that the site has the space needed for additional functions. Think of how you want to address that in the wording of the criterion.

Revised criteria:

- 1) Site has fewest impacts to sensitive areas and avoids environmental red flags (e.g., landslide potential, wetlands, earthquake faults, aquifers that provide drinking water, etc.)
- 2) Site has fewest potential local community impacts (e.g., odor, noise, visual, traffic)
- 3) Site best accommodates sustainable and innovative design

Theme: cost

Comments:

- Should consider potential cost of relocating existing businesses to acquire a site
- Should consider proximity to population if move for haulers impacts ratepayer cost
 - This seems to be covered in previous criteria regarding convenience – keep this in mind for scoring measures

Revised criteria:

- 1) Site has most reasonable cost

Theme: current or future use

Comments:

- Listing current development or development plans could be a way to measure this
- Perhaps this should be reframed to relate to community economic development and potential impact installation of the facility to the surrounding community (such as relocation for sites that are currently being used)
- To avoid having too many criteria, should the word “community” be added to combine this criterion with one of the community impact criteria?
 - The difference of economic community impact and environmental community impact seems significant enough to keep those as separate criteria

Revised criteria:

- 1) Site acquisition has least impact on current or future residential or commercial use

Once the proposed criteria were discussed and edited to consensus, Penny asked the SAG if there were any remaining concerns that the community expressed in responses to the outreach survey that the SAG felt was not yet represented by the criteria.

Comments:

- Might need to be more specific about traffic impacts, such as proximity to schools or hospitals and how traffic may be impacted by the siting of the new station, but this doesn't need to be a separate criterion

Scoring Measures

Penny led the SAG in reviewing possible scoring measures for the agreed upon criteria and asked for any edits or comments SAG members wanted to share.

Comments:

- Language should have more specificity, such as changing "travel time at morning, noon, and evening" to "during open hours" and including the centroid when discussing proximity
 - A small group of SAG volunteers to go through and make measures more specific could be an option if needed
- Measure for current use by indigenous peoples is what King County is working with tribal representative to find

Q: Is there a chance any of the potential sites have no impact to sensitive areas and/or avoids environmental red flags?

A: It depends on the definition of an impact. Some sites are paved, some have streams along the side of a site. Whether or not these are considered impacts will be something this group will have to decide.

Q: Wouldn't questions regarding impacts to sensitive areas have been answered when selecting these potential sites?

A: We're not at that point of the site selection process yet. We need to know which sites are our top sites before we can begin a more thorough investigation.

Due to time constraints, Penny cut the conversation short to move onto the criteria weighting section of the meeting. Discussion and edits for scoring measures will be continued via email.

Ø **Action item:** Continue work revising scoring measures via email before next meeting

Introduction to Criteria Weighting

Dan Pitzler (Jacobs Engineering) led the SAG through the process of weighting criteria, explaining how weighting is used to calculate overall attractiveness of a potential site.

Q: How does this differ to scoring measures?

A: Scoring measures define what is being measured to meet the listed criteria. Criteria weighting is about how important each of those criteria are to evaluating the applicability of each site.

- ∅ **Action item:** *Send criteria weighting example and form to SAG to complete before next meeting*

January 2021 Community Outreach Strategies

Due to time constraints, this was not discussed in the meeting.

- ∅ **Action item:** *Send information regarding January outreach to SAG via email along with PowerPoint*

Public Comment

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

Next Steps

Penny announced January 27, 2021 as the scheduled date for the next meeting and asked for volunteers to help with scoring the top 5 sites; Amrit Bhuie, Diana Hart and Tehmina Ali volunteered to do so. Penny also asked SAG members to help promote the upcoming public survey that will launch in January, and is hoping to see 1,500 responses.

- ∅ **Action item:** *Follow up with tribal representatives about possibility of cultural resources assessment earlier in the siting process*
- ∅ **Action item:** *Send information regarding January outreach to SAG via email along with PowerPoint*
- ∅ **Action item:** *Continue revising scoring measures via email before next meeting*
- ∅ **Action item:** *Top 5 sites interactive tour will be sent after Top 5 are announced*
- ∅ **Action item:** *Send criteria weighting example and form to SAG to complete before next meeting*