



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
- Sandy Cobb, Unincorporated King County
- Susan Vossler, At-large
- Tehmina Ali, Resident
- 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
- Nori Catabay, King County Solid Waste
- Joy Carpine-Cazzanti, King County Solid Waste
- Penny Mabie, Definitely-Mabie Consulting
- Marilee Jolin, EnviroIssues
- Claire Wendle, EnviroIssues
- Jordan Sanabria, EnviroIssues
- Dan Pitzler, Jacobs Engineering
- Melissa Wu, Jacobs Engineering

Welcome

Penny Mabie (Definitely-Mabie Consulting, Facilitator) welcomed members of the Siting Advisory Group (SAG) and introduced the Zoom live captions feature that will be available for use during the remaining SAG meetings. 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:

William (Bill) Louie:

- Only heard back from one respondent who lives in Kirkland, but doesn't live in near identified sites and didn't have much feedback on siting preferences

Nick Harbert:

- Heard from constituents who work as solid waste haulers who collect in the cities of Kirkland, Redmond, and Woodinville
- Preference for the two eastern-most sites (16111 Woodinville-Redmond Rd NE, Woodinville and 11811 Willows Rd NE, Redmond) as they are located closer to the center of the service area
 - Respondents also noted the benefit these sites could have of allowing for shorter travel times for customers who live on the eastern end of the service area

James Randolph:

- Some of the initial comments questioned the need for a new transfer station, which were answered and resolved
- Many not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) comments regarding where to site new transfer station
- Most respondents were more interested in design rather than siting; value a location that allows for modern design
- Preference for modern facilities that are “not an eyesore” – the Fremont station in Seattle referenced as an example

Q: There were a couple letters sent to King County Solid Waste Division from the property representatives of two of the top 4 sites being considered for the new transfer station. Will we be discussing those letters at today's meeting?

A: Discussion of these letters is not a part of tonight's agenda, but we may hear about them during the public comment period should any audience members choose to speak on the subject. We will be forwarding the letters along with other materials to the SAG after this meeting to help inform SAG members about what we're hearing from the community.

Ø **Action item:** *Include letters from site representative in materials shared with SAG after the meeting*

Penny asked the SAG if they had any edits to the summaries for Meetings #2 and #3, to which the members agreed there were none. Penny then reminded SAG members to send in their signed conflict of interest disclosure forms if they had not already.

Criteria Weighting

Penny reminded the SAG that this meeting would be used to continue the process of validating, prioritizing, and weighting the community criteria that the group began at Meeting #3. Penny also shared that a small subgroup of SAG members had been meeting and working on scoring measures for the criteria in the time between Meeting #3 and Meeting #4.

Dan Pitzler (Jacobs Engineering) presented an example of the math used to calculate weighted scores.

Q: In this example, some of the normalized scores are at either end of the range (0 being worst, 100 being best). Is there a reason scores are normalized to the best or worst actual scores for a criterion?

A: How you assign the normalized score endpoints is nuanced and up to the individual. The scale endpoints used for normalization can be outside the range of actual scores if you think those endpoints might be feasible (but just not appearing on the particular sites being evaluated).

Q: Will the spreadsheet you send us have the formulas already set up?

A: Yes.

Dan shared a compilation of the weights that were submitted by SAG members prior to the meeting (not all members had submitted their weights) and gave members a moment to look over the comparisons. Dan then invited members to explain their reasoning behind their weights, looking at the criteria where there were significant differences between the weights assigned by different SAG members. Some comments made during the comparison of weights by different SAG members follows.

Criterion #1

Community criterion: Location has best travel times at most times of the day from within the service area.

Measurable criterion for evaluation: Minimize travel time to recycling & transfer station

Comments:

- Accessibility considered of most importance, gave a weight of 100 based on a gut feeling
 - That's fine, these weights are meant to be based on how important you feel each criterion is in the siting process
- The service area is small enough that travel time doesn't seem of too high importance, so I gave it a lower weight
- Travel times affected by traffic are of higher importance than distance, so I weighted highly

Criterion #8

Community criterion: Site has the most reasonable cost.

Measurable criterion for evaluation: Minimize the cost of site acquisition.

Comments:

- Working in city government, cost is always the top deciding factor for projects; I weighted this highest
- Putting too much weight on the cost of acquiring a site may lead to compromising size and ability of a site to accommodate preferred and innovative design elements
- I weighted this at 100 because the more that can be saved on acquisition costs, the more can be used for design
- Want to avoid facing future challenges that may arise due to selecting a site with minimal cost

- These facilities are built to last decades; the cost of acquisition can be spread out over many years, but operating costs will increase
- Just because a site has the lowest acquisition cost doesn't mean it will serve as an easy place to build; cost should not be of highest weight

Criterion #2

Community criterion: 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

Measurable criterion for evaluation: Ensure even distribution of services (don't site too close to an existing County recycling and transfer station)

Comments:

- The siting of a new transfer station impacts local traffic and the surrounding neighborhood; this should be weighted higher
- Use of the new station and nearby existing stations will eventually even out, so I don't think this is very important
- The weight I submitted for this criterion is actually based more on traffic, which is considered in a different criterion; I'll reconsider my weight for this criterion and send an update

Criterion #9

Community criterion: Site acquisition has least impact on current or future residential or commercial use

Measurable criterion for evaluation: Limit impact on current or future residential or commercial use

Comments:

- This is of highest importance; we should be sure to look at development plans and comprehensive plans and ensure we would not be taking away developable land
- Land that could be used as a future residential area is important to consider

Criterion #7

Community criterion: Site best accommodates sustainable and innovative design

Measurable criterion for evaluation: Accommodate opportunities for sustainable and innovative design

Comments:

- I gave this a high weighting because the new facility should be something that can be seen as an amenity; we've seen this value reflected in community input
- After discussing some of these weighting choices, I want to change my answers
 - These weights are meant to be your own opinions, but if you want to make any revisions you can still send them to the team

Q: What's the process of normalizing everyone's weighting?

A: We'll get the average for each criterion and test the results of the individual weights, checking for what areas are sensitive. We will be able to do this once all SAG members submit their weighting scores.

Q: Could you further explain how the percentages are calculated?

A: Right now, we're just focusing on the weights submitted. We'll look at how to calculate the percentages in the next meeting.

Q: Is everyone using the same rationale to come to these weights?

A: Everyone was given the same instructions with the same rationale provided.

Preliminary Community Survey Results

Penny shared preliminary results of the community survey, which at the time of the meeting had over 1,500 responses. Most responses came from Kirkland, followed by Redmond, then Woodinville. Other respondents identified as residing or working in "Other" cities (largely Bothell and Kenmore), Unincorporated King County, and Sammamish. The preliminary ranking of the community criteria was also shared, noting that "site has lowest potential local community impacts" ranked highest and "underserved and underrepresented community members and employees are able to conveniently access the site" ranked the lowest. Dan noted that the preliminary community prioritization of the criteria looked similar to how the SAG weighted them.

Q: Should we be incorporating community responses into our weighting?

A: Community responses serve as another source of information to consider as you make final determinations as a group. You should feel free to apply information from the community survey as you see fit.

Q: When the survey closes and the results are finalized, will the responses be separated by city?

A: That's an option we can provide. While answering where the respondent worked or lived was not a required question, many respondents answered it.

Ø **Action item:** Share final results of community survey with SAG, divided by city

Q: Will you be providing the raw data of the final results for us to look through?

A: Since there will be so many responses, we are putting together a summary to send to you all. We can also provide the full spreadsheet for those who want to look at it.

Ø **Action item:** Share full spreadsheet of final community survey responses with SAG in addition to the summary

Top 4 Sites

Margaret Bay (King County Solid Waste, Project Manager) presented the top 4 sites, providing information on the size, zoning type, current use, and critical areas for each site, as well as some common comments made about each site from the preliminary community survey results.

Margaret reiterated that while each site has its challenges, they are the best sites available after

multiple rounds of evaluation. Margaret also emphasized that the project still has multiple phases of the siting process left to complete before a final site is selected and that more information will become available further along in the process, including more opportunity for the community to share their input.

Q: Do we have a general idea of how traffic impacts vary by site?

A: We've just completed a preliminary 2040 Design Year Estimate traffic report for the number of trips anticipated to the new station. We've projected 500 self-haul vehicles for peak weekend day, 117 commercial vehicles (large garbage trucks) for peak weekday, and 27 transfer trailers traveling outbound. We'll also send out the projections to the group after this meeting.

Ø **Action item:** *Share the 2040 Design Year traffic projections with the SAG*

Q: Do we have information on the estimated cost of relocation and how likely it is that people who would be affected by relocation would stay close to the area?

A: We don't have that information yet; this is something that would be looked into further in the environmental review process. We do know that Winsome Trading (current owners of the 16111 Redmond-Woodinville Rd NE, Woodinville location) has another location near the area.

Q: What is the brown area shown in the aerial image of the 11724 NE 60th St, Kirkland location?

A: The site includes an older tee-ball field, two newer ball fields, and an unofficial dog walk along the perimeter. The ground itself is graded earth, which is why you see a lot of brown in the image.

Q: Does that mean that site has a large amount of unused space?

A: That site includes a closed landfill which is still generating gas. Other than gas collection equipment and the uses discussed above, there is a reasonable amount of unused space.

Q: If the 11724 NE 60th St, Kirkland site is not ultimately chosen for the new transfer station, what will happen to it?

A: We haven't looked into it at this stage in the siting process.

Q: If the 7024 116th Ave NE, Kirkland site is chosen, how will the transportation services (including the park and ride) that would be displaced be mitigated? This is an issue that needs to be addressed if this site is chosen.

A: Again, we are not at that stage of the siting process yet, so we do not currently have that information. This will be included as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) phase.

Scoring Group Presentation and Discussion

Dan shared the work the scoring small group had done between meetings with the rest of the SAG, noting how consensus was reached for each score.

Q: Not all of the criteria are scored in the same range, will they be adjusted?

A: No, because the scales differ based on the measurable criterion, such as using minutes as a measure for travel time.

Ø **Action item:** *Include spreadsheet created and used to score travel times by SAG member Andreas Kolshorn with materials shared with SAG after the meeting*

Comment:

- For those who were not involved in the small group scoring process, please note that we all had the same instructions and were using the same criteria to inform our scores.

Public Comment

Penny opened the call for public comments. Audience members were asked to electronically raise their hand to indicate they would like to speak. Due to time constraints and number of audience members interested in making public comment, each speaker was given one minute.

Comments:

- **Skot**, representative for Winsome Trading (16111 Redmond-Woodinville Rd NE, Woodinville location), was shocked to hear their property was being considered for the new transfer station. Skot shared that the successful minority-owned business has 120 employees that would be displaced if the site is chosen for the new transfer station, expressing there is no better site for the business to move to.
- **Papp**, employee at Winsome Trading, expressed that relocation of their business is a significant concern, sharing that the business has been in this location for 25 years, that they just completed a \$1 million update, and intend to stay at that property.
- **Walt**, V-P of Operations at Chrysalis School (located across the road from the 16111 Redmond-Woodinville Rd NE, Woodinville location) shared that the school uses a staggered operation for incoming and outgoing traffic as students arrive at different times of the day. Walt was concerned by the potential of additional traffic brought in by a new transfer station combined with the school's existing traffic. Walt was particularly concerned by the projected 117 large garbage trucks travelling in the area during the weekday. Walt also expressed concerns for student driver and pedestrian safety with the increased traffic, as well as the potential for increased litter in the area.
- **Betsy**, resident of Bridle Trails neighborhood, stated that the community had received no prior notice that top sites for the new transfer station were being selected and asked how much longer the survey would be available. Betsy was reminded that questions could not be answered during the public comment period.
- **Courtney Flora**, Counsel for Tri Pointe Homes, the 11811 Willows Rd NE, Redmond site, shared that Tri Pointe Homes was shocked to learn the site was under consideration for a new transfer station, especially because development agreements for new housing units on the site had recently been finalized with the City of Redmond. Courtney requested the letter Tri Pointe Homes sent to King County be shared with the SAG.
- **Alyssa Chow**, resident of Woodinville and member of the family that founded Winsome Trading business, was concerned by the potential impact that acquisition of the site would have to the family legacy and current employees of the warehouse. Alyssa asked

that the human impact of selecting the site for a new transfer station be considered in the final site selection.

- **Deirdre Johnson**, South Rose Hill/Bridle Trails Neighborhood Association, shared that the association felt blindsided by the Park and Ride site making the list, and felt betrayed by King County as the association had been asking for the Houghton transfer station to be relocated for years.
- **Felix Tsoi**, member of the family that founded Winsome Trading business, noted that while the business does have a second property in the area, it is not suited to relocate the employees of the 16111 Redmond-Woodinville Rd NE, Woodinville location.

Penny thanked the speakers for their comments and confirmed they would be recorded in the meeting summary. **Annie Kolb-Nelson** (King County Solid Waste) shared that additional comments are welcome via email to the project address, northeast@kingcounty.gov.

After the public comment period had closed, Margaret clarified that it was not her intent to imply that employees at the 16111 Redmond-Woodinville Rd NE, Woodinville location could be relocated to their other location. The intent was to note that owning a second location nearby indicated that the business owners would likely want to stay in the area.

Next Steps

Penny shared with the SAG that the team is continuing to work on virtual tours of the top 4 sites. Penny also provided a reminder that the community survey would remain open until February 9 and asked SAG members to share it with their communities. Penny announced February 24 as the scheduled date for the next meeting, where the SAG would discuss draft weighting in context of final survey results and adjust as needed, discuss scoring group results, discuss weighted scores, and develop a ranked list of the top 4 sites. Penny also reminded SAG members to submit their weighting scores by the end of Monday, February 8.

Q: Are these top 4 sites definitely the final sites that will be considered for the new station?

A: At this time, yes.

- Ø **Action item:** Include letters from site representative in materials shared with SAG after the meeting
- Ø **Action item:** Share final results of community survey with SAG, divided by city
- Ø **Action item:** Share full spreadsheet of final community survey responses with SAG in addition to the summary
- Ø **Action item:** Share the 2040 Design Year Estimate projections with the SAG
- Ø **Action item:** Include spreadsheet created and used to score travel times by SAG member Andreas Kolshorn with materials shared with SAG after the meeting
- Ø **Action item:** Share Top 4 Sites Virtual Tour with SAG