Chair Wright called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
ACTION ITEMS:

1. ECAFs #6216: (Proposed Motion #11-013) and #6217: (Proposed Motion #11-014)
   Confirming appointments of Brandon Jensen and Simon Geerlofs and
   Re-Appointment of Jerry Masters to the Snohomish County Marine Resources
   Advisory Committee
   Originator: Kathleen Herrmann, Surface Water Management

   Brian Goodnight, Sr. Legislative Analyst, provided an overview of the Marine Resources
   Committee and background information for the appointees.

   ACTION: Move to Consent Agenda, General Legislative Session January 26th for action.

2. ECAF #6260: (Proposed Motion #11-015)
   Confirming appointments of Doug Hennick and Gina Gray to the Stillaguamish
   River Clean Water District Advisory Board
   Originator: Sean Edwards, Surface Water Management

   Brian Goodnight, Sr. Legislative Analyst, provided background information for
   Mr. Hennick and Ms. Gray.

   ACTION: Move to Consent Agenda, General Legislative Session January 26th for action.

3. ECAF #6309: (Proposed Motion #11-020) *Pending assignment to committee
   Amendment #4 to agreement with Taylor Associates, Inc. to perform NPDES
   Phase I Stormwater Monitoring
   Originator: Bill Thornton, Surface Water Management

   Brian Goodnight, Sr. Legislative Analyst, provided a summary of previous amendments
   up to this Amendment #4. He explained that Amendment #4 will allow continued
   monitoring from January 31, 2011 through March 31, 2012. He said funding has been
   approved in the 2011 Budget. Mr. Goodnight responded to questions from Committee
   Member Somers.

   ACTION: Move to Consent Agenda, General Legislative Session January 26th for action.
4. ECAF #6221: (Proposed Ordinance 11-001)  
Interlocal Agreement with Alderwood Water & Wastewater District for utility relocation and construction  
Originator: David Lee, Engineering Services

Brian Goodnight, Sr. Legislative Analyst, provided an overview. There were no questions from committee members.

ACTION: Move to Administrative Matters, General Legislative Session January 26th to set time and date for a public hearing.

5. ECAF #6263: (Proposed Motion #11-016)  
Contract with Hendricks Bennett, LLP LLC for condemnation cases  
Originator: Deanna Clark-Willingham

Brian Goodnight, Sr. Legislative Analyst, provided an overview. He stated that costs will not exceed $120,000. Costs have been anticipated and are included in the approved 2011 Annual Construction Program.

ACTION: Move to Consent Agenda, General Legislative Session January 26th for action.

Action Items 6 and 7, ECAFs #6339 and #6338 were discussed together.

6. ECAF #6339: (Proposed Ordinance #11-002) *Pending assignment to committee  
Relating to Solid Waste Management; amending Chapters 7.35 and 7.41 SCC  
Originator: J.R. Meyers, Solid Waste  
(Companion ECAF #6338)

Brian Goodnight, Sr. Legislative Analyst, provided an overview.

Matt Zybas, Solid Waste Director, provided a PowerPoint presentation and spoke in detail about flow control (see attached presentation).

Sego Jackson, Solid Waste, continued the presentation and spoke about issues of solid waste hauling companies and processors. He also spoke about proposed code changes.

Mr. Zybas and Mr. Jackson responded to various questions and concerns from committee members.

Committee Member Gossett requested more information about King County’s flow control system. Mr. Zybas said he would provide that for him.

ACTION: Move to Administrative Matters, General Legislative Session January 26th to set time and date for a public hearing.
7. **ECAF #6338: (Proposed Motion #11-021) *Pending assignment to committee**  
   **Public Works Solid Waste Division Service Fee Schedule for 2011**  
   **Originator:** J.R. Meyers, Solid Waste  
   (Companion ECAF #6339)  
   
   Discussed with ECAF #6339, above.  
   
   **ACTION:** to be considered concurrently with ECAF #6339, Ordinance 11-002  
   
   **DISCUSSION ITEM:**

   **1. Granite Falls Alternate Route Transfer to State**  
   
   Steve Dickson, Public Works Department, referred committee members to the information in their folders (see attached) and spoke in detail about the jurisdictional transfer of the Granite Falls Alternate Route.  
   
   Meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.
Code Amendments

- Flow Control
- Current Issues
- Concerns
- Proposed Changes
- Next Steps
• “Flow Control” refers to a governmental entity’s ability to determine, by ordinance, where the solid waste collected within its boundaries will be taken for disposal

• Contentious issues last 15 plus years

• U.S. Supreme Court ruling in 2007
Flow Control Overview

• Solid Waste Division
  – Created 1973
  – Code updated 1984
  – Revised 2005
  – Proposed revisions

• Participation by cities and towns and solid waste companies

• Council approved additional resources
Why Flow Control?

• Garbage produced in Snohomish County is to be managed through Snohomish County’s Solid Waste System and Facilities
  – Protects public health and safety and environment
  – Provides predictable revenue stream for paying system costs and stabilizes rates for customers
  – Interlocal agreements to manage waste in an environmentally sound and cost effective manner
How Much Diversion is Happening?

• Difficult to state with certainty
• Construction Demolition and Land clearing debris (CDL) Processors acknowledge = 15,000 tons/year
• Possible range = 50,000 – 100,000 tons/year
• Minimum likely gross revenue loss = $1.5 million/year
How Is Diversion Happening?

- CDL waste hauled directly from construction site to rail yard
- CDL waste hauled as recyclables but not recycled
- Non-recyclable waste is in CDL loads going to processors
- Residual waste from processors diverted from Snohomish County's disposal system
- Companies encouraging local businesses and haulers to use non-system disposal sites
- Officers have observed waste leaving the county for disposal
A “Recycling” Container
Processing Facility

CURRENT ISSUES
Processing Facility
Recent Steps Taken

- Coordination with SWAC and communications to relevant parties (contractors etc.)
- 2009 two deputies for surveillance
- Active enforcement postponed to work with processors
- Rule making process began in fall of 2009
- Two public meetings in Dec. 2009
- Decision to amend code
- Series of meetings with processors & haulers
Haulers and Processors

• WUTC certificated and city-contracted haulers of solid waste
  – Such as WM, Allied, Rubatino, Sound Disposal
  – Can legally transport solid waste and recyclables

• Non-certificated haulers of CDL recyclables
  – Can only haul commercially-generated recyclables, not solid waste

• Processors (Reclamation sites)
  – Receive recyclable materials and sort, separate, bale and otherwise prepare to sell
Issues of Certificated Haulers

Certificated Solid Waste Hauling Companies:

– Others are hauling solid waste illegally
  • Not separating solid waste from recyclables
  • Not really recycling “recyclables” (sham recycling)

– Lost revenues, unfair business practices and lack of level playing field
Issues of Non-certificated Haulers

Haulers of “Recyclables” and Processors:

– They can’t compete against cheap disposal if others haul CDL waste to rail yard from construction site

– Certificated haulers can legally haul both solid waste and recyclables and don’t have to identify which is which

  • Customer doesn’t know what is really happening and can be told to put it all together – waste and recyclables

– They can’t haul waste, so this is unfair
Issues of Processors (Reclamation Sites)

Processors of Construction, Demolition and Land clearing Debris (CDL):

- Want to be able to accept all CDL regardless of the amount of non-recyclable waste with it
- Don’t want to take residual processing waste to transfer stations at full cost
- Want to be able to haul their residual waste in intermodal containers to rail yard at a discounted rate
Goals for Changes

✓ Encourage and provide financial incentive for recycling
✓ Ensure recyclables are legitimately recycled
✓ Ensure solid waste is legally hauled and disposed
✓ Ensure that non-recycled waste is disposed within Snohomish County solid waste facilities
✓ Provide level playing field – everyone operating by same rules
Proposed Changes

• Establish new definitions
  – Construction, demolition and land-clearing waste (CDL)
  – Intermodal container and facility
  – Recyclable materials
  – Solid waste disposal system facility
  – Source separation
Proposed Changes

• Prohibits direct haul of intermodal containers from construction/demolition sites to rail yard
  ✓ Eliminates unfair, cheap disposal that competes against recycling
  ✓ Stops by-pass of Snohomish County system
Proposed Changes

- All containers must be marked as solid waste or recycling
  - Generator must separate solid waste from recyclables, if recycling
  - Solid waste containers can only go to Snohomish County facilities
  - Recycling containers must have less than 10% non-recyclable solid waste and can go anywhere
Proposed Changes

✓ Uncontaminated recyclables have higher value and cost less to process

✓ Less non-recyclable waste inbound = lower final disposal costs of residuals for processors

✓ Removes confusion over what is happening to material and who can haul it

✓ Reduces by-pass of Snohomish County system for non-recycled waste
Proposed Changes

• Clarifies that non-recycled waste (residuals) from processing facilities must be taken to Snohomish County Solid Waste System Facilities

• Allows residuals from processors to be direct hauled to rail facility at reduced rate of $82 per ton (vs. $105)
Proposed Changes

✓ Provides motivation for processors to seek “clean” loads of recyclables

✓ Provides discounted rate for direct haul to rail yard ONLY to processors of recyclables, which provides financial incentive for recycling

✓ Removes confusion over what is happening to material

✓ Reduces by-pass of Snohomish County system for non-recycled waste
Pathway Options With Proposed Changes

1. No Source Separation/Disposal as Waste
2. Source Separation of Specific Recyclable CDL

* Containers of recyclables with less than 10% waste
RECYCLING OF WOOD

PROPOSED CHANGES
WOOD ONLY
PROPOSED CHANGES
Pathway Options With Proposed Changes

3. Source Separation of Mixed Recyclable CDL (with less than 10% waste)

* Containers of recyclables with less than 10% waste
Next Steps

• Education and Outreach
  – Processors
  – Haulers
  – Contractors
• Sharing info with local and neighboring jurisdictions
• Three month lead time before full implementation
Jurisdictional Transfer of Granite Falls Alternate Route

Committee: Public Works

Date: January 18, 2011

Briefing Topic: Request transfer of Granite Falls Alternate Route from local to state jurisdiction

Background:
The ribbon-cutting for the Granite Falls Alternate Route (GFAR) took place on November 19, 2010 with Council Chair Gossett and Councilman Koster attending. Public Works and the City of Granite Falls wish to transfer GFAR to WSDOT, as an addition to SR 92, because GFAR:

- Is a logical extension of SR 92 around the city’s downtown
- Functions better as a strategic freight corridor than existing SR 92 into the middle of downtown

The state legislature has directed the transportation commission to receive and evaluate requests for additions to or deletions from the state highway system. A request for a jurisdictional transfer must:

- Be submitted to the commission before February 1st
- Use the criteria in RCW 47.17.001 (Criteria for changes to system) to assess the merits of any proposed changes to the state highway system

The commission must forward any recommended jurisdictional transfers to the legislature by November 15th each year. For the proposed GFAR transfer to occur, the legislature would need to act favorably on a transfer recommendation by the commission.

Proposed Jurisdictional Transfers:

In the attached joint letter to the commission, the county and city are requesting that:

- GFAR be transferred to WSDOT in its entirety
- SR 92 be transferred to local jurisdiction between GFAR and its eastern terminus at Granite Avenue in downtown Granite Falls (see attached figure)

GFAR is 1.9 miles in length, with 1.4 miles inside the city and 0.5 miles in unincorporated county. The sections of SR 92 that would be transferred to the county and city are 0.1 and 0.79 miles in length, respectively. Transferring the 0.79-mile section of SR 92 to the city would facilitate the city’s downtown revitalization efforts by providing local control over the “gateway road” into the city and its downtown.

The letter to the commission will be accompanied by a Route Jurisdiction Transfer Report, which contains the analysis of the criteria in RCW 47.17.001. This analysis supports the proposed transfers. A copy of the executive summary from the report is attached.

Action Requested: This is a discussion item only. No formal action is required by the County Council, as transfer is by action of the state legislature.
January 15, 2011

Washington State Transportation Commission
PO Box 47308
Olympia, WA 98504-7308

Re: Request Route Jurisdiction Transfer of Granite Falls Alternate Route from Snohomish County and City of Granite Falls to WSDOT and part of State Route 92 from WSDOT to Snohomish County and Granite Falls

To Whom It May Concern:

Snohomish County and the City of Granite Falls are requesting the jurisdiction transfer of:

- Granite Falls Alternate Route (named Quarry Road), between SR 92 and the Mountain Loop Highway, from Snohomish County and the City of Granite Falls to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and,
- SR 92, between Granite Falls Alternate Route and the eastern terminus of SR 92, from WSDOT to Snohomish County and the City of Granite Falls.

The reasons for this request are as follows:

- A desire to have SR 92 serve as a strategic freight corridor for the region
- A desire to transform SR 92 through the downtown of Granite Falls into a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly road consistent with the city’s plans to revitalize its downtown.

Granite Falls Alternate Route will function better as a strategic freight corridor than the existing state route because it:

- Bypasses the central business district of Granite Falls
- Is a limited access facility designed to accommodate large trucks
- Can handle higher traffic volumes, and,
• Provides a more direct route and lower travel times for heavy trucks and other regionally orientated through traffic.

Transferring the portion of SR 92 that passes through the city’s downtown to local jurisdiction and control will facilitate the city’s downtown revitalization efforts.

The attached route jurisdiction transfer report verifies that the requested transfers comply with the criteria established by RCW 47.17.001. Snohomish County and the City of Granite Falls request your consideration for endorsement of the requested transfers.

If you have any questions, please contact Steve Dickson of Snohomish County at (425) 388-6442, or Matt Hartman of the City of Granite Falls at (360) 691-6441.

Sincerely,

Steven E. Thomsen, P.E.
Public Works Director
Snohomish County

Sheikh Haroon Saleem
Mayor, City of Granite Falls

Cc: Owen Carter, PE., Snohomish County Engineer
    Steve Dickson, Assistant to the Director of Public Works, Snohomish County
    Peter Camp, Executive Director, Snohomish County
    Bobann Fogard, P.E., Director of Transportation & Environmental Services, Snohomish County
    Doug McCormick, P.E., Engineering Manager, Snohomish County
    Roy Scalf, Director Road Maintenance, Snohomish County
    Ken Birkel, Associate Transportation Specialist, Snohomish County
    Matt Hartman, City Council Member, City of Granite Falls
    Warren Perkins, P.E. City Engineer, City of Granite Falls
    Ramin Pazooki, WSDOT, Local Agency & Development Services Manager
    Lorena Eng., P.E., WSDOT, Regional Administrator
Route Jurisdiction Transfer Report

Granite Falls Alternate Route and SR 92

Executive Summary

This report proposes the transfer of the Granite Falls Alternate Route (GFAR) to WSDOT, as an addition to SR 92. GFAR is a new two-lane road that connects SR 92 and the Mountain Loop Highway (see Figure 1). The report also proposes that part of SR 92 be transferred to local jurisdiction. The analysis of the criteria in RCW 47.17.001 supports the proposed transfers.

GFAR, the proposed addition to SR 92, is predominantly an urban highway route. As part of a revised SR 92, it meets the RCW criteria for urban routes as a spur that serves regionally orientated traffic in an urbanized area. GFAR also meets the RCW criteria as an urban connecting link that functions as needed bypass routing for regionally orientated through traffic. A short section of GFAR is a rural highway route. It meets the criteria for rural routes because it is part of an integrated system of roads connecting population centers of 1,000 or greater.

The part of SR 92 proposed for deletion from the state highway system is an urban highway route. It meets the RCW criteria for urban routes as a spur that serves regionally orientated traffic in an urbanized area.

Both the proposed SR 92 addition and deletion meet the requirements for designation as a state route. Consequently, a comparison of the two routes on the RCW criteria that are considered when there is a choice of two or more routes between population centers is important for deciding which of the two routes should be designated as the state route. As compared to the proposed SR 92 deletion, GFAR:

- Has the ability to handle higher traffic volumes,
- Provides a more direct route and lower travel time for more regionally orientated through trips, and
- Better serves the City of Granite Falls’ comprehensive plan for community development.

GFAR also serves regionally oriented freight traffic much better than the proposed deletion, which is an important consideration for SR 92. The report concludes that GFAR, the proposed SR 92 addition, is a better choice than the proposed SR 92 deletion for designation as a state route.