

MSWAC Advisory Committee Meeting

March 10, 2023 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:15 p.m.

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

<u>MSWAC Members</u>	
Joan Nelson	Auburn
Jon Gire	Bellevue
Cheryl Paston	Bellevue
Robin Tischmak	Burien
Chris Searcy	Enumclaw
Steve Friedman	Clyde Hill
Shellie Bates	Covington
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way
Tony Donati	Kent
Jenna McInnis	Kirkland
Penny Sweet, Chair	Kirkland
Phillippa Kassover, Vice Chair	Lake Forest Park
Jeff Brauns	Newcastle
Robert Clark	Newcastle
Sheri Healey	Normandy Park
Aaron Moldver	Redmond
Amy Tsai	Redmond
Meara Huebach	Renton
Amy Lam	Sammamish
Genevieve Rubinelli	Sammamish
Mason Giem	SeaTac
Sarah Bruemmer	Shoreline
Cameron Reed	Shoreline
Rachel Best-Campbell	Woodinville

<u>King County Staff</u>
Ali Blum, SWD staff
Joy Carpine-Cazzanti, King County Hazardous Waste staff
Brian Halverson, SWD staff
Lindy Honaker, SWD staff
Eliza Kruszynski, SWD staff
Patty Liu, SWD staff
Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director
Katie Mineo, SWD staff
Linda Morales, King County Hazardous Waste staff
Amy Ockerlander, SWD staff
Terra Rose, King County Council staff
Hannah Scholes, SWD staff
Andy Smith, SWD staff
Adrian Tan, SWD staff
Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff
Dorian Waller, SWD staff
John Walsh, SWD staff
<u>Guests</u>
Lacie Adkins
Phil Allen
Elizabeth Court, Washington State Dept. of Ecology
Erin Gagnon, Ridwell
Peter Guttchen, Washington State Dept. of Ecology
Mary Harrington
Jeanette Jurgensen, Epicenter Services
Heather Kelly, City of Kirkland
Alli Kingfisher, Washington State Dept. of Ecology
Han Kirkland, Waste Management
Laura Moser, Waste Management
Fanny Silverio Gonzalez
Doug van Gelder
Diana Wadley, Washington State Dept. of Ecology
Wendy Weiker, Republic Services

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Sweet called the meeting to order at 11:19 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Agenda approved unanimously.

Van Orsow had two edits to the February minutes. Kasover moved to approve the February meeting minutes with the two edits being made. Best Campbell seconded. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Comment

Wadley shared several comments beginning with noting that the state SWAC is on March 15. There will be a presentation on a financing study that was required by 1799 and some of the topics that will be shared today. Next, the applications to the Precycle Innovation Washington Challenge close on March 13. This is different than the NextCycle Washington Pitch Showcase which is happening on March 23. You can attend in in-person in Seattle or online. This showcase is for nonprofits, entrepreneurs, etc. with cutting edge programs, and will be doing their pitches on both upstream (in the morning) and downstream (in the afternoon) tracks. Lastly, the application period for Public Participation Grants – more for community members – opens next month.

Wadley dropped several things in the chat. The [State SWAC](#) on March 15, 2023, at 9:30 a.m. will have presentations on a financing study, Organics Management Law, etc. Visit [Precycle WA Innovation Challenge](#) or contact Sydney Porter at sydney@seattlegood.org for more information. The NextCycle WA Pitch Showcase on March 23, 2023 will be held in-person at UW Seattle with a virtual option. The upstream track is in the morning and the downstream is in the afternoon, with awards at 5 p.m. [Registration](#) is free. Visit the [Public Participation Grants](#) to learn more.

SWD Updates

McLaughlin provided the SWD update.

Monthly tonnage

As shared in January, overall tonnage for 2022 was down by 1% compared to 2021. The tonnage received is continuing to decline, with tonnage from Jan. 2023 down 14% compared to Jan. 2022. At this time of the year, inclement weather can account for such variances and can mess with month-to-month tonnage. We anticipate it is on a slight decline and will see how this plays out.

As we await the full February tonnage report later next week, we have identified that tonnage is down roughly 3% in comparison to February 2022. However, we wanted to expand on January's report – in 2023, we anticipate receiving less tonnage compared to 2022. For 2023, we expect about 850,000 tons is about a 2% drop compared to 2022. We anticipate high interest rates will probably cause a recession later in the year and this will reduce consumption and garbage generation. The January 2023 tonnage percentage drop was the result of high tonnage numbers in January 2022 when snow disrupted garbage collection in December 2021 which pushed about 10,000 tons into January 2022.

Revised NERTS Scoping Notice

Earlier this week, SWD removed the Houghton Park & Ride property from consideration as a potential alternative for analysis in an environmental review under SEPA due to receiving new information from WSDOT about planned development on a portion of the Houghton Park and Ride property. Because of this change to the alternatives to be studied, SWD will soon invite the public to comment on the revised scope of its environmental impact statement for NERTS and will be re-issuing the scoping notice. The comment period will run for an additional 21-days from March 20 to April 10. We remain confident that we have two feasible alternatives to study in this process. The two alternatives being studied in the EIS are a [12.9-acre site in the 15000 block of Woodinville-Redmond Rd. NE](#) in Woodinville and the current [Houghton Transfer Station Property](#) in Kirkland. A no-action alternative will be studied as well.

Avian Flu-contaminated waste

In response to disposal needs associated with the outbreak of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) among poultry, SWD has coordinated with the WA Department of Ecology, Public Health – Seattle & King County, and the Washington

State Department of Agriculture to develop safe and compliant procedures for the acceptance and receiving of HPAI waste at Cedar Hills Regional Landfill. There are not many large poultry flocks in the area, but we are prepared to handle it and respond to the need like other biomedical waste.

The waste approved for disposal consists of bird carcass and eggs from backyard flocks in King County and contaminated personal protective equipment used by WSDA staff when cleaning up an infected site. As of 3/2/23, no loads of HPAI waste have been received.

Pending SWD ILA agreement with the City of Seattle

The purpose of this agreement is to foster cooperation between SWD and the City of Seattle, and would allow for the legal, efficient, and equitable disposition of residual materials sorted from source-separated recyclables from King County's Solid Waste Jurisdiction and processed at Material Recovery Facilities within the City of Seattle.

The ILA agreement would establish the methodology and timing for payments to be made by Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) to the County for Residuals covered under this agreement. The agreement does not apply to Construction and Demolition Waste or Construction and Demolition materials. Both City of Seattle and King County will develop legislative action. We anticipate legislation will be approved by both the city and county during Q2/Q3.

Re+ City Grants

SWD is launching the request for applications for Re+ City Grant Program in Q2. This competitive funding opportunity is intended to help further the Re+ zero waste of resources goal by supporting cities in delivering projects that create a more circular economy. Cities that have signed the Re+ pledge are eligible to apply. Joint proposals are encouraged. There is about \$300k available for the 2023-24 biennium. We hope cities take advantage of this funding opportunity and plan to provide a more thorough presentation next month.

Braun commented that the Newcastle City Council passed a resolution this week to sign to the Re+ Pledge.

Van Orsow asked if the ILA agreement is related to the disposal of residuals from the Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and if the lawsuit was resolved. McLaughlin replied that the agreement is related to the residuals from the MRF, and that the lawsuit was resolved.

Moldver wanted to know how long the Re+ grants will be open and what the application time frame is. Ockerlander did not have the specific dates on hand but stated that it will be launching in Q2. The application will be open a decent amount of time to get those grants in. Moldver followed up noting that Redmond plans to take the Re+ presentation to council in June so Redmond will not have signed anything yet.

Ockerlander added that out of 37 city presentation, there are 13 presentations left to give by the goal date of June 30, 2023. The cities of Carnation and Newcastle were just added to the list of cities that have approved the Re+ Pledge making the total number now 6. There are four staff presentations on Re+ the week of March 13, 2023. Not that the strategic plan has launched, we are making a lot of progress.

Smith said in chat that the Re+ city grants are tentatively scheduled to run April 5-June 1. We will confirm those dates at next month's MSWAC. We will accept applications from cities who commit to passing the pledge (along with a timeline – for example, by June 30.)

SWAC Update

Sweet and Kasover both commented that SWAC was like MSWAC but there were different conversations.

Organics Survey

Kruszynski provided section.

There are a few policy options that have worked elsewhere that we would like to explore with the community. The first piece is requiring all households with garbage service to subscribe to curbside organics, which would create new subscribers. The second option would be to reduce garbage collection to every-other-week, including embedding the rate in the contract. The third option would be to implement a food waste disposal ban. The second and third option would encourage the utilization of the service.

First however, we need to understand current behaviors, potential barriers, and community perspectives. We are engaging the public via a survey that went live on Feb. 22. There will be focus groups and an open house later. Based on feedback received last month from advisory groups, our timeline for the survey has adapted to extend the survey period and accommodate a longer recruitment period for focus groups. The survey period was extended from the original three-week period to a 10-week period, with it being open until April 30. There was a concern that it wasn't open long enough to spread the word and reach people. There was also a call to emphasize greenhouse gas emissions as benefit of diverting food waste from the landfill which we have done in our press release, social media messaging, and in the social media toolkit messaging that went out to local leadership and partners.

We've also narrowed the targeted recruitment audience for the focus groups. We plan to have four groups with representatives from historically underrepresented communities, rural areas, low subscription rate areas, and residents in King County cities who have already implemented food waste policies. The first three will help us understand current and potential challenges to increasing the use of organics service from the policies we are looking at. The fourth group will allow us to hear from residents about their experiences integrating these types of strategies into their everyday life. For example, the City of Renton has had every other week garbage pickup since 2008 and in 2015, the City of Seattle implemented a food waste ban in curbside garbage.

In terms of the outreach, King County has shared a social media toolkit with councilmembers and city leadership and have also put out a press release. This survey has been advertised in many press/other outlets and on many social media accounts/platforms. We are very pleased to have many online newspapers pickup the stories and have cities work with us to share via their own social media outlets. As of March 10, we've had 2000+ respondents – notably with good participation from Federal Way and Auburn which are areas of potential areas of interest for the focus groups as they have lower curbside subscription rates throughout the county. Renton is also an area of interest since they have trash pickup every other week.

McInnis and Reed added in the chat that their respective cities will be sharing the survey on social media soon.

One challenge we are facing is that many respondents preferred not to answer demographic questions, making it harder to ascertain whether we've reached our full audience. However, leaving these questions optional is preferred and helps us sooth any concerns participants may have about privacy and potentially not finishing the survey because of that. With the demographics we do have, respondents are currently weighted towards 35+ in age, females, and are property owners vs. renters. About half of respondents identified as white or Caucasian against the King County Census estimate of 64%; and 12% identified as Black, Indigenous or People of Color versus the King County census proportions of 36%. There were 7% that identified speaking another language at home besides English, with the top response being Spanish and followed by German, French and Mandarin. Again, there is a very large grey area of 38% of respondents choosing not to answer demographic questions. This is an early indication that we would still like to reach a more diverse audience and we will be running another ad campaign with a focus on some of these groups. This will take place around the halfway mark of the survey period and will be informed by another review like this one.

Van Orsow mentioned a discussion about service level ordinance, or a disposal ban related to organics and wanted to know if Sweet or Kassoover had any more information on that. Neither remembered that discussion. Kruszynski added that Van Orsow might be thinking of one of the policies that we are asking respondents about on the survey, which is their thoughts on a disposal ban of food waste in garbage.

Reed wanted to know more about how we are geographically targeting people across the county e.g., if we are trying to market it in certain areas or it is more countywide; and what the possibility is for sharing data with cities that is broken out by residents. Kruszynski replied that we are looking at targeting rural areas besides the county-at-large, as well as Spanish speaking audiences with a specific part of the ad campaign. We would be happy to share out some of the data once the survey is done.

HB 1799 Update

Kingfisher presented this update.

In the 2022 Legislative session, Washington State passed the Organics Management Law - formerly known as HB 1799 - with the primary goal to reduce methane emissions by diverting organics from landfills. This occurs when organic material decomposes in the landfill. This bill utilizes several strategies to divert organic materials from landfills.

The strategies in the law are designed to help us work toward the new organic material rescue and diversion goals. Two goals, based on 2015 disposal levels, are to rescue 20% of previously disposed of edible food for human consumption by 2025; as well as divert 75% of previously disposed organic materials from landfills by 2030. This law established/amended 20+ RCWs, is divided into nine parts, and impacts state and local governments, businesses, and residents. This law addresses four key strategies needed to manage organic materials including actions that fall under prevention, collection, processing, and markets. Together, all these strategies must work together to achieve the purpose and goals of the law.

- Prevention
 - Good Samaritan Laws
 - Washington Sustainable Food Center
- Collection
 - Business collection
 - Residential and non-residential collection
- Processing
 - Recycled organics facility siting
 - Product degradability standards
- Markets
 - Compost procurement and reporting
 - Agricultural organic material purchases

Of the major action items, four directly impact local governments – business collection requirements, residential and non-residential components, the recycled organics facility siting, and the compost procurement and reporting. Starting in January 2023, if local governments fall under certain conditions, they are required to adopt a Compost Procurement ordinance (CPO). This is a market driven strategy, being designed to close the loop on not just creating more compost but to increase the market demand for that compost in the local area. This law requires jurisdictions that meet specific population or service level requirements to adopt a CPO.

CPO's should have been adopted by Jan. 1, 2023 by counties and cities with a population of more than 25,000; or counties with a population of 25,000 or less that contract to provide, or require the UTC-franchised hauler(s) in their county to provide residential curbside organic material collection services; or cities and towns with a population with less than

25,000 that directly provide, contract to provide or require UTC-franchised hauler(s) in their jurisdiction to provide residential curbside organic material collection services (as of July 2022). This revised interpretation will relieve the burden on adopting an ordinance and the reporting requirements of that on some of the smaller towns with populations of less than 25,000 – if they have curbside organics provided by the County and because of an action taken by that town.

Ecology created a draft determination document that highlights which local governments must comply with the elements of the organics management law. Kingfisher asked everyone to work with their Ecology planner to verify that the information in the document is correct. To date, Ecology knows of 15 jurisdictions that have adopted a CPO and we anticipate that there are approximately 104 jurisdictions that are required to adopt a CPO. In terms of options for adopting a CPO, jurisdictions can create their own unique ordinance or if they already have a recycling product procurement ordinance, they can amend it to include compost. Jurisdictions can also lift or mirror an ordinance that's been adopted by another jurisdiction. Ecology's lead planner, Peter Guttchen, set up a BOX account to help jurisdictions find resources.

If jurisdictions are required to adopt a CPO, they're also required to report it. This includes the total tons of organic material diverted each year, the volume of compost purchased this year, and the source from where that compost is purchased.

Regarding organic material diverted from disposal, **cities and towns** must report the following:

- Total tons of organic material collected by **all curbside programs** they directly provide, or contract with a hauler to provide.
- Total tons of organic material collected at **drop-off sites** they operate, or contract with a third-party to operate.
- Total tons of organic material collected by residential curbside programs they require the **UTC-franchised hauler(s)** to provide in their jurisdiction.

Counties must report the following:

- Total tons of organic material collected at **drop-off sites** they operate, or contract with a third-party to operate.
- Total tons collected by residential curbside programs they **contract with a hauler** to provide, or they require the **UTC-franchised hauler(s)** to provide in their county.

These reporting requirements are revised guidance that directly reflects Ecology's understanding of the intent of the law. They made these revisions in response to many of the questions received from local governments. This statute simply says that the jurisdictions need to report organic material diverted from disposal.

Cities and counties also need to report compost that they directly purchased, and compost purchased by contractors they hire. This includes the source or sources of the compost purchased each year, and the volume and cost of compost purchased each year from each source. As a reminder, cities and counties that enter into collective purchasing agreements for compost should only report the volume and cost of the compost they purchased under those agreements by their own jurisdiction.

The first report due to Ecology is due by Dec. 31, 2024, for 2023 data. The following reports will be on even-numbered years – 2026, 2028, 2030 – for the previous two years of data. The reports will be submitted in an Ecology online portal, which is scheduled to be live in Q3 of 2024.

One additional requirement is developing a plan for using the compost and informing the residents about the value of compost and how the jurisdiction uses compost in its operations. It is Ecology's role to tell you of the requirements and develop the online portal. For more information, visit the [resource page](#) for local governments. You can subscribe to the Organics Management email news [here](#).

Guttchen provided several links in the chat: [general organic management resources](#), [OM law resources](#), and specific [information](#) on procurement and sample ordinances.

McInnis asked in chat if there was a template for tracking the reporting. Guttchen responded that Ecology has not developed a template yet. They are working with both Municipal Research and Service Center (MRSC) and Department of Enterprise Services (DES), and with other contacts in California to develop a template. This [portal](#) is where jurisdictions can upload their procurement ordinances.

Huebach wanted to confirm that cities do not need to report material collected by non-contracted haulers, like Cedar Grove, that collect from businesses. Kingfisher responded that they do not need to report it.

For additional questions, please reach out to Kingfisher at Alli.Kingfisher@ecy.wa.gov or (509) 960-1290.

Smith added a reminder to cities in the chat that under the [CompostWise](#) program, SWD has a universal compost contract that cities can piggyback. Please reach out if interested.

LSWFA grant process

Wadley provided this section.

The Local Solid Waste Financial Assistance (LSWFA) has an application period running from April 11 – May 9. You can go on to the LSWFA website and join the email list. The state budget will not be done, so it is our best estimate. There is \$24 million available statewide like last cycle.

There are two types of LSWFA's. One is used by Public Health – Seattle & King County for enforcing solid waste rules and regulations. The other type supports planning and implementation of those plans like 2019 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management plan (Comp Plan) and the 2021 Hazardous Waste Management Plan. The Ecology guidelines are in the process of being updated for the Comp Plan. The approach to planning might be slightly modified, so if anyone is interested in joining that team reach out to Wadley.

Ecology will see the money they have for supporting plans and implementation and will put out a statewide allocation table showing money available to Counties. There are also three independent cities, like Seattle, that have their own solid waste management plan who will get a separate chunk of money, based only on their population.

In King County, King County and Seattle get together and share their funds. They also turn to partner cities and ask if they'd like to share too. So, Seattle and King County will first start with the money, and then they join forces and fund a chunk of the Hazardous Waste Program. King County will do things on its own with the money, and in the current cycle, 19 different cities did things with the funds because of partnership with the County.

In the current cycle, 14 out of 19 cities use LSWFA for collection events. LSWFA is normally used for waste reduction, recycling, composting, and hazardous waste, but recently it is being used for homeless encampments response. An example of this can be seen in the City of Kent at the McSorley Wetlands for an encampment clean up. Another example of LSWFA is City of SeaTac doing contamination reduction work with their haulers. To see more examples of work, there is a BOX folder on [LSWFA resources](#). For more support, the LSWFA Grant Managers are Diana Wadley (425-429-4369 or diana.wadley@ecy.wa.gov) and Olivia Carros (360-477-3980 or Olivia.carros@ecy.wa.gov). The King County LSWFA contact is Alexander Rist (206-477-5253 or Alexander.Rist@kingcounty.gov).

Wadley added a link to see [what others are doing with LSWFA](#) under the "Who Does Similar Work" folder.

Guttchen noted in the chat that multi-family properties are considered residential under the provisions in the Organics Management Law. The business collection requirements that start to be phased in in 2024 do not apply to them. Kingfisher added on that multi-family is included in RCW 70A.205.540 Organic solid waste collection services that begin in 2027.

2023 Legislative Updates

Tan and Scholes provided the 2023 legislative update.

There were certain bills that did not make it past their respective chambers this week. Most notably, the Washington Recycling and Packaging (WRAP) Act did not pass. The other bills that we've talked about that did not pass include HB 1164 EPR for appliances containing refrigerants, HB 1185 Mercury Light Bulbs & EPR for lighting products, HB 1264 Encouraging equitable solid waste collection rates, HB 1422 Exempting certain reusable packing materials from sales and use tax, SB 5376 Allowing the sale of cannabis waste, and SB 5484 technical assistance to farmers and food processors in support of improved voluntary environmental stewardship.

SB 5144 EPR for Batteries is still active. This bill would establish a Battery Stewardship Program for batteries that requires battery producers to fund and organize the collection and recycling of batteries in Washington. The Senate bill is now in the House and there will be a Senate hearing on Tuesday, March 14.

The next bill is the Right to Repair Bill (HB 1392/SB 5464). This bill would require manufacturers of digital electronic products (i.e., those with a screen) to provide owners and independent repair businesses with access to parts, tools, and specifications. It is still moving and passed through the House along party lines and is moving on to the Senate. There is no hearing scheduled yet and there are still negotiations taking place.

Another bill we are still tracking is HB 1033 Work Group on Compostable Products. It would establish a stakeholder committee force to make recommendations on the development of standards for managing compostable (plastic) products by organic management facilities. This bill is advancing and is in the Senate. There was a public hearing the morning of Friday, March 10.

HB 1085 on Plastic Pollution Reduction is still alive. This bill would require refill stations wherever drinking fountains are required in new buildings, phase out mini toiletries at hotels, and ban foam-filled docks and floats. It passed out of the House unanimously and had hearing the morning of Friday, March 10. There was a lot of positive commentary at the hearing.

Lastly, SB 5287 concerning the study in the recycling of wind turbine blades passed out of the House.

Kassover wanted for more information on what happened with the WRAP Act. Tan replied that there was a lot of activity going into the WRAP Act and almost all lobbyists in Olympia have been engaged in some way or another. This is a very big and complicated bill. There were 23 amendments to the bill to be put forth on to the floor and there just was not enough votes to get it through with the short timeframe. Sweet asked what the vote count was. Tan responded that it did not even make it to the floor. With all the amendments, people probably did not think it was feasible.

Kassover noted that sometimes these bills take a while but there must be a great understanding of what the issues are and how to deal with them. Tan stated that there must be more stakeholder engagement because there is not alignment. McLaughlin expressed his disappointment but believed that a lot of progress was made and that the efforts were not wasted. We have a more educated legislature on these issues, and he knows that some of the MSWAC members spent a lot of time giving testimony, even in-person testimony, to help inform and persuade; and any in SWD leaned hard into this work. As a regional solid waste system, we showed out in force, and he believes that we can do even more with cities

participating in the process. Mclaughlin expressed his gratitude for those who invested time and effort into this. We made good progress, and the key is to not wait until next year but to keep working at this. King County is committed to do that and we hope that others will continue to expand those efforts too.

Tan noted that the [Seattle Channel](#) did a 30-minute piece on the WRAP Act with views from producers and environmental groups.

Smith added [WasteDive](#) on WRAP not moving forward in the chat.

Debris Management Plan Updates

Mineo presented the Debris Management Plan.

Debris defined as scattered items or materials by disaster. Many remember the SR 530 flooding and mudslide in 2014 and the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, which are examples and reminders why debris management and recovery planning is important here too – we are prone to and at risk for a number of disasters which can create a significant amount of debris.

Some members might be familiar with the preparedness cycle, which is the continuous process designed to prevent, respond to, and protect the public from disasters. The phase we are talking about today is the planning phase, which identifies what emergency operations plans organizations should include. Contingency plans and disasters create debris management. Here in King County, there's a 20% that a major earthquake will strike in the next 35 years. About 30% of population are prone to shaking and nearly 50% of buildings were built to pre or low-code standards. At least minor flooding occurs every winter and major floods occur on average every two-to-five years. Landslides occur during almost all major storms and earthquakes in King County. This is an estimated 9.8 billion dollars in disposed exposed value in the King County. And fish and wildlife habitats are impacted when landslides and storms occur.

Each of these hazards have the potential to generate a lot of damage and debris like Construction and Demolition (C&D) debris, personal property items, hazardous waste, etc. Because relatively common events like seasonal flooding and major events like earthquakes can create such large amounts of debris, it's important to identify policies and roles to manage it.

It's important to properly manage disaster debris to minimize or prevent public health, environmental, and economic impacts. Debris management facilitates community response and recovery activities and the quicker return to normalcy. A debris management plan aids in complying with local, state, and federal regulations. It also ensures that procedures are in place for coordination at the various level of governments, the private sector, and other bodies of work, as well ensures effective coordination of resources as there are many priorities that agencies must manage.

Additional, debris management conserves disposal capacity. Counties with plans will remove cubic yards and recycle 47% of their total debris. This is substantial because one million cubic yards of debris dumped at the landfill lessens the lifespan of the landfill by one year. Debris management also increases the likelihood for federal reimbursement. Communities with a plan typically receive 3.5 times more Public Assistance which is significant because debris management accounts for about 27% of the total of disaster costs.

The plan is being updated for several reasons – 1) because the existing plan is outdated. It was last reviewed in 2010. 2) There also many new partners in the area. 3) FEMA has released a new template on guidance regarding debris planning and we want to adopt best practices. 4) There were several lessons learned from the SR 530 Flooding and Mudslide.

The reason why King County is leading this effort is because title 10 of the King County code states that, " ... A system is hereby established for disposal of all solid waste either **generated**, collected or disposed, in unincorporated King County [and] this system shall include all solid waste either **generated** or collected...in any other jurisdictions with which a solid

waste interlocal agreement exists." The key point here is that in addition to our day-to-day functions, we are also responsible for waste that's generated in King County and that includes debris that's generated after a disaster.

We are asking our planning partners to help develop an updated Debris Management Plan. The purpose of the plan is to ensure that it is a regional, comprehensive, realistic and actionable plan with stakeholder input. This is a regional plan and there are many moving pieces. Debris management often overwhelms local capacities and jurisdictions, and it would be hard to do it alone. The regional approach to planning is critical for coordinated response to manage jurisdictional aspects for emergencies in King County. At the end of the planning process, everyone will have a base plan which will support county agencies, cities, tribes, and special districts within King County, as well as a variety of situational, jurisdictional, and support annexes.

We can expect several things from this process. One, to learn about a topic that may be new some and build stronger working relationships with colleagues across the County. Everyone will also be contributing to a significant regional initiative and can expect to participate in a collaborative planning process. There more moving parts to the plan but we can talk about that later.

An outline of the plan includes these following sections:

- Debris Management Overview
- Incidents and Assumptions
- Debris Collection and Removal
- Temporary Debris Management Sites and Disposal Locations
- Debris Removal from Private Property
- Personnel
- Monitoring of Debris Operations
- Health and Safety Requirements
- Other Regulatory Requirements and Environmental Considerations
- Public Information

Some of the things that make this plan and process complex is that we need to identify and permit debris management site, as well as train staff in how to manage and operate these sites. We need to do habitat conservation and all aspects of debris management. We will need to separate out recyclable debris and track it, and we'll need to qualify contractors.

A tentative planning process and timeline:

- Q1 2023: Engagement Meetings
- April 11, 2023: Kickoff meeting with all stakeholders
- Q2-Q4 2023: Stakeholder meetings and workshops
- Q1-Q2, 2024: Compile, review, and finalize base plan
- Q3 2024: Develop Annexes
- Q4 2024: Training and exercising

At the end of the process, we will have a comprehensive and operational plan with trainings.

SWD will convene meetings and workshops with stakeholder and look at targeted input to develop content. We will be using an iterative process for this where SWD will send a drop down and this will continue along the way as we continue to develop the plan. We've identified stakeholder for each chapter based on subject matter expertise. The meeting invitations will be sent to those stakeholders and all meetings will be virtual unless otherwise indicated.

This is going to be a collaborative process that will take all of us to develop a comprehensive, accurate and functional plan. We have identified 25+ disciplines that will be engaged in the process. Keep in mind that the disciplines are exponential

across the jurisdictions. There are many stakeholders involved in the process and your level of involvement will vary depending on agency and discipline.

The cost of not having a debris management plan is high. Communities with a debris management plan are better prepared to restore public services, and ensure public safety in a natural disaster, and are better positioned to receive the full level of public assistance available from FEMA. Debris management is a valuable and collaborative process, and an effective debris management plan takes all of us.

The immediate next step is to complete a survey that will be sent out soon. There are two purposes to this survey – 1) Identify whether additional partners should be involved in the development of each plan component and 2) provide contact information for representatives within your agency. The next step will be to attend the kickoff meeting. Meeting invitations will go out soon to all stakeholders. Lastly, participate in stakeholder meetings and workshops where you can provide input to develop the various plan components.

Sweet wanted to know what degree the train disaster in Plainville will change policy and may impact outcomes in this work. Mineo replied that she does not know of the impact of that situation at this point. Sweet commented that their disposal process was flawed and maybe something could be learned from that. Since the rules are already there for the plan, let's make sure we don't miss any updates.

Kassover asked if SWD will be prioritizing the engagement with County various entities according to the risk factors that the different areas face e.g., areas built on steep slopes, and what the effect of an earthquake would be. Mineo responded that our engagement process will be iterative process and holistic. In certain elements of the plan, more in-depth conversations might be required from the stakeholders and even one-on-one conversations to really dig into the issues. Other sections might be simpler and only require a couple meetings. As we go forward, we will figure out that piece and we're hoping that stakeholders continue to bring these issues to light.

Nelson stated that the City of Auburn has their own plan due to previous work when the Howard Hansen Dam was at risk or bursting. King County worked closely with the city due to issues previously mentioned, like space issues for sorting debris materials. Right now, Enumclaw was the site that everyone was able to use. Nelson wanted to know if the purpose of this plan is to make it so cities don't need to have their individual plan and will be part of this plan. Mineo replied that the base plan will cover the higher-level ideas that apply to the county, but annexes are at the jurisdictional level. Prior to the launch, there will be a more operational plan that will identify debris management within jurisdictions. Content will vary depending on jurisdictions so we want to make it operational so that it can be picked up and implemented.

Van Orsow asked how to get the right staff on the list of stakeholders. Mineo said that she will coordinate with Waller to get the distribution list of this committee and then push the survey out. Please forward to colleagues and any other folks you think should be involved. When the survey is pushed out, there will be a recording included for background information for those who haven't been able to attend engagement meetings.

Juno Mixed Waste Processing Project

John provided this section.

We've been looking into innovative ways to handle our waste as CHRLF nears capacity and after it reaches its capacity.

SWD is partnering with Georgia Pacific Corporation to test a new and innovative resource project. Juno takes in Mixed Solid Waste (MSW) and separates valuable materials for re-use. This pilot project has been running for about two years and has consistently diverted over 50% of MSW by weight to recovery.

Two weeks ago, SWD started shipping 1,000 tons of MSW to Juno and this will span over 10~ weeks. The MSW is unloaded and visually inspected for obvious hazards or non-processible materials. It's then shredded and baled before processed. Juno uses high pressure, steam, and more shredding equipment to separate paper pulp from other materials that can be used for cardboard and paper at the adjacent cardboard mill. During this process, water is also pulled out. The residuals will come back to Cedar Hills.

Juno is just one example of MSW processing, which includes various approaches to sorting MSW and pulling out resources. Juno targets paper and other companies target other materials, like organics. In California, they're building a "dirty" MRF, which is something we will keep an eye on. This processing makes a huge dent in MSW tonnage. Again, this is a short-term test run. It is about a 600-mile roundtrip and would be quite an effort and impact to shift our waste to the Oregon coast.

We are also doing a customized waste characterization, so we know what is going into Juno, versus what is getting diverted.

We will have a pretty good idea of what we are shipping down to Oregon, and then can look at Georgia Pacific's report to see what is being pulled out. Even though Georgia Pacific tries to pull out as much water as possible, it is still wet. Doing anything with wet MSW is challenging.

SWD is organizing a tour in May so we and other stakeholders can see resource recovery in action. Attendees will include staff from SWD and DNRP, as well as other partners from King County. SWD is evaluating Juno and other MSW processing options. After this pilot is over, we will be looking at other MSW options and hiring consultants to see how Juno can fit into the King County system or how another MSW system can. This will be worked into our Comp Plan update, and we will work with all of you to see how this can be worked into the Comp Plan update.

Moldver mentioned a previous Juno presentation with a 9-10% residual rate. He noted his surprise with this number to the 50% previously mentioned. John replied that the 9-10% number might be from when Georgia Pacific approached SWD with commercial only waste. This waste has a greater paper content.

Sweet asked when the tour is. John responded that is the first week of May. Since it is 600-miles roundtrip, we are planning a three-day long trip.

Comp Plan Update

Liu provided the Comp Plan update.

Waller sent out an excel sheet of the Comp Plan updates. There are many suggestions that will be included, as well as many that won't be.

In chapter four, there were a few that were too specific to include as an update in the Comp Plan but could fall under the broader headings of explore options to increase recycling and resource recovery through innovative methods and technology. The County supports these projects, but we just would not be taking them on ourselves. But we could support them through our various grant programs. Those suggestions were:

- Create a county run and operated refill shops and create a county run and operated container system for bulk shopping
- Run a pilot project for neighborhood composting sites and a pilot project for neighborhood waste centers for stop-and-go and the amount of time collection trucks are out

In both chapter five and six, we will not be discussing further the suggestion of strengthening language related to climate change, mitigation and adaption. This is because it will be included in chapter 4.

In chapter six, there are several suggestions we will not be including in the update. The first being the potential for a cooperative siting process involving local cities and counties, meaning that the new Comp Plan will suggest exploring working with a county/counties east of the Cascades that would host a landfill, providing mutual benefits. Due to the previous Comp Plan, we are saying no as this plan does not consider the option of redeveloping a replacement landfill either in King County or another. Next, we will also not be including the suggestion of changing how trash is captured, making it like recycle. This is due to several health and environmental concerns with collecting trash loosely, such as increased roadside litter, increased odor and mold issues in people's homes, etc. Lastly, we will not be including the suggestion of cities creating their own mini landfills as a next step to Cedar Hills because the plan does not consider the option of developing a replacement landfill in King County or another.

In chapter seven, we will not be moving forward with two suggestions. The first being describing “how KCSWD will dedicate resources to educate ratepayers about rate restructure elements that support KCSWD’s fixed administrative costs independent of increased waste diversion resulting from Re+ programs and other waste reduction and recycling initiatives.” This lack of inclusion is mostly due to a timing issue. Halverson added that we have already committed to providing language that haulers and cities can include in their billing statement when they send them out that describes why we needed the rate restructure, how the FAC works, etc. We will continue to commit to provide information like that if people need to put it in upcoming communications.

Walsh commented that by the time the Comp Plan is updated, the rate restructure will already be in place, so this is where the timing issue comes in. We will be providing some of this education material, but it is late to include at this point since the educational component is this year and not in 2026.

Lastly, to the comment of if any of this will be impacted if the WRAP Act passes, reduced tonnage has already been put into consideration for the rate restructure. We’ve decided not to include this because this is also application to future EPR bills, and we are already considering a decline in tonnage as part of this restructure. Walsh added that we want to discuss with the committee creating an amendment process for minor updates to the Comp Plan in between bigger updates. This is a broader statement and the yes/no in the excel sheet are about further discussion this year and next year. These are things we want to talk about with MSWAC/SWAC and the community about their inclusion in the Comp Plan.

Wadley noted in the chat that Ecology supports locals defining an amendment process, and they see it come in handy in jurisdictions that have it.

McInnis wanted to know if SWD shared what the whole amendment process is and if cities need to bring these to councils. Walsh replied that we need to figure out a more streamlined approval process. We want to explore the different options and decide as a group what makes the most sense.

Wadley commented that it’s important to have a locally defined amendment process because doing the traditional revision is a big lift. And if everyone adopted the document with all the revisions, the smaller processes have already been defined because they were approved with the bigger lift. This means that the smaller processes have already been approved.

Member Comment

Van Orsow commented that we almost touched on the topic of the rate restructure, and when the committee hears from the County on the rate restructure, it should be via a formal process like MSWAC or letter-on-letterhead. Walsh stated that we received an email from Jeannette Jurgensen, the Epicenter Consultant, talking about the formal structure of reporting. He was not sure where it came from, but Jurgensen said that through the process of working with her, some cities were asking if a volume fee was an option. SWD has not heard of a formal proposal to shift to a volume fee. Her report said

something different than what we had heard at MSWAC meetings, so there might be informal discussions about this shift. If this is a formal request, then it might come up at MSWAC.

Van Orsow wanted to know what the procedural process is for city representative's on MSWAC to suggest agenda items because he'd like to move this forward for the April agenda. Sweet and Waller replied that Van Orsow just moved it forward. Sweet asked for the title of the presentation. Van Orsow replied with "options for modifying rate restructure."

Waller reminded everyone that the email sent out for a counter-hold forum and received feedback that was contrary to the initial legislature, so that was canceled. Since things must keep moving forward, Waller wanted to give a heads up that he's going to check in on how cities are doing and see if people want to revisit having a forum. This is something that is ongoing until action is taken per city. A forum was something that people initially wanted.

Moldver noted that he sent a few responses to Waller about the idea of a forum and believes that a forum with all the haulers and cities in one room would not be productive. A forum is a good idea once each hauler has their specific plan worked out with contract amendments and are closer to being done. The City of Redmond had a meeting with Waste Management with additional cities joining and have heard from smaller cities that the simpler approach is preferred - this is the composite Commercial Rate Calculation (CRC) approach. The current structure can still facilitate that because we can calculate the composite commercial rate just by having the Fixed Annual Charge (FAC) provided by the County. The issue that has come up is the data that is being used for tonnage by the County is being reported by the haulers. It is not County data and there are discrepancies being reported. This needs to be sorted out before moving on. Redmond is ready to do something because they have been working on it for a while, but smaller cities have not and may be coming into this not knowing what to do. The issue with the simplified approach is that there is less transparency with the reconciliation aspect, and the FAC approach can just be a line item on a bill so the haulers can do an adjustment at the end of the year.

Waller wanted clarification on which smaller cities Moldver was referring to so he could follow up with them. Moldver stated Newcastle, Normandy Park and Snoqualmie.

Nelson added that we are all working on this but there are still concerns for the smaller cities. It has taken a long time for the hauler to come up with a workable method and the City of Auburn will probably follow something like Redmond, but there is not anything official from the hauler yet. It has felt like some of the correspondence from the County has been along the lines of, "this is the road we are going" and "changes can't be made." But at the same time, no one knew how difficult this was going to be until the consultant spent months trying to figure out the best way to make this happen. As Moldver touched on, there is concern over the tonnage and there are cities that don't have clean routes, so things are almost estimates. Nelson would appreciate having a more open discussion on issues that have come up with the realization that nobody has signed anything yet, and the cities that have been working with the consultant are finally getting something ready. There are some cities that have not even started and don't have the staff to support this.

Waller wanted clarification on which smaller cities Nelson was referring to so he could follow up with them. Nelson replied that she was at the same meeting with Moldver but is concerned about the cities that are not at the table and are going to be expected to do this. Auburn, a bigger city, does not have anything from their hauler and there might be cities not even aware that this might be happening and what it entails. The haulers may try to charge unfair admin fees. Waller responded that the citizens he has interacted with are aware, but it is often a matter of staffing and time.

Kassover commented that on behalf of small cities with small staffs, there are two people in her city's public works department and this falls to them. They are currently dealing with issues with Sound Transit, WSDOT, and now Debris Management Planning. This makes it hard for smaller cities to keep up and it is complicated and hard to explain to cities. Lake Forest Park is yet to hear from their hauler.

Braun echoed everyone's comments, especially that of having little staff. One of the problems with having small staffs is the complication of this process and the lack of knowledge of how things are going to work out. The haulers are going to be required to pay a fixed amount based on tonnage reports that may not be accurate. The timing and accuracy of the data is another big concern in these calculations.

Donati stated that the City of Kent just had a meeting with their hauler, Republic Services, and the rate restructure was brought up. Kent had been working with Jurgensen, but they have stopped, and there has been no updates. They just received an update that they are working on something that should be ready by the end of March or mid-April. This could be a template for all Republic Cities, but all contracts are a little different.

Walsh noted that from these comments, he's gathered that next month's meeting should include a discussion about the tonnage and the CCR approach. SWD is aware of the discrepancies, and we are thinking about different approaches. Walsh wanted to know if there was anything else that committee members want to discuss at next month's meeting.

Gire echoed Donati's comments on the Republic Side as they too have been hearing "TBD" and that maybe there will be an approach later in the month. He hopes that at next month's MSWAC they can hear more about what the County is planning to provide with this new rate restructure. Late last year, a revenue requirement came out with 1% forecasted out into the next five years and wanted to know if that will be provided with the overall percentage fees of the disposal fees rising. The other topic he would like to discuss is how this will show up on the bill for residents and what the impacts will be for customers. As well as how do we educate people and is the committee okay with having different approaches across the county. If you're looking at an equitable approach, we probably want to work towards a consistency on how this is being communicated with residents.

Nelson asked if SWD can show how the hazardous waste fee is done because it is consistent across the County and every hauler does it the same way. As it seems now with this process, everyone will be doing something different. As Gire mentioned, it deviates from the goal of consistency and transparency.

Van Orsow emailed Waller 10 items that could be discussed at a future meeting.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 1:13 p.m.