

MSWAC Advisory Committee Meeting

May 10, 2024 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:15 p.m.

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

<u>MSWAC Members</u>		<u>King County Staff</u>	
Troy Linnell	Algona	Eyasu Ayalew, Public Health Seattle/King County	
Joan Nelson	Auburn	Monica Ayers, King County Hazardous Waste staff	
Jon Gire	Bellevue	Eberley Barragan, SWD staff	
Tami Deady	Black Diamond	Kris Beatty, SWD staff	
Jenne Alderks	Bothell	Sylvaine Bucher, SWD staff	
Emily Warnock	Bothell	Nori Catabay, SWD staff	
Brian Spindor	Enumclaw	Kinley Deller, SWD staff	
Rebecca Kovar	Federal Way	Bonnie Fluckinger, King County PSB staff	
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way	Brian Halverson, SWD staff	
Tony Donati	Kent	Lindy Honaker, SWD staff	
Jenna McInnis	Kirkland	Katie Jones, SWD staff	
Alana DeRogatis	Mercer Island	Christine Kim, SWD staff	
Jake Jacobson	Mercer Island	Amy Ockerlander, SWD staff	
Jeff Brauns	Newcastle	Terra Rose, King County Council	
Sheri Healey	Normandy Park	Andy Smith, SWD staff	
Micah Bonkowski	Redmond	Christopher Stubbs, SWD Deputy Director	
Aaron Moldver	Redmond	Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff	
Amy Tsai	Redmond	John Walsh, SWD staff	
Meara Heubach	Renton		
Linda Knight, Vice Chair	Renton	<u>Guests</u>	
Genevieve Rubinelli	Sammamish	Han Kirkland, Waste Management	
Paige Scheid	Shoreline	Sean Michael	
Colleen Minion	Tukwila	Laura Moser, Waste Management	
		Hans Van Dusen, City of Seattle	
		Diana Wadley, Dept. of Ecology	

Call to Order and Introductions

Vice Chair Knight called the meeting to order at 11:24 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Heubach moved to approve the April minutes with corrections to subgroup members titles. McInnis seconded. Minutes passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Wadley thanked Ockerlander for sharing the five-in-one flyer about various laws that will largely impact food service businesses. One of those laws went into effect on May 1 was related to PFAS and another law related to EPS will go into effect on June 1. This [news article](#) provides a fun way to learn about both the EPS and PFAS ban.

You might recall that there was a news article last year related to plastic bags that were placed at Targets and Walmart's across the nation – not in the PNW – and they did not meet great ends in getting recycled. If you'd like to check out chapter of this ABC investigation, [click here](#).

Next, the [Business Organics Management Area \(BOMA\) map](#) must be updated every July 1 by Ecology. Ecology's Organic's Management Team is working hard on updating it and a lot of King County is already in the mapped area but there are some areas – like Snoqualmie, Enumclaw, Duvall – that aren't on the current map. If you have added food waste to your collection, please let Ecology know so they can update their map accordingly.

- Please reach out to Ecology's Organics team at organics@ecy.wa.gov by May 15, 2024 if you are 1) a local government that now offers curbside organics material collection services including food to businesses, OR 2) a local government in a BOMA area with changes to your service areas since the 2024 BOMA was established on July 1, 2023.

The Ecology Organics Management Team has also developed a [guide](#) and video to support local governments in developing a list of businesses that may be impacted by the first two phases of the business requirements portion of the 2022 Organics Management Law. They show how to identify businesses via the Data Axle Reference Solutions database, which is accessible via public library websites. This helps you check out the businesses in your area and how you might want to target education around the OML and getting businesses on board. These resources are unaffected by HB2301.

Lastly, Wadley shared that she has taken a new position on within Ecology, and she will now be the Statewide Lead Local Planner and will not be the Regional Planner assigned to King County anymore. Wadley's replacement starts on Monday. She will still be around and able to help with stuff.

In relation to today's agenda, Wadley wanted to raise awareness around the criteria for the long-term disposal options and how important Cedar Hills is for accepting waste. This is the northernmost MSW landfill west of the mountains and when thinking regionally about a natural disaster, we might want to consider neighboring counties and where their waste will flow. Also, the designated recyclables list was mentioned at the statewide recycling coordinator meeting where they talked about maybe adding how solid waste management plans can be used as a tool for harmonization into the new guidelines. If you want to be apart of this conversation, reach out to Wadley at Diana.Wadley@ecy.wa.gov.

Wadley in chat: In the Planning and Waste Reduction Resource [Library folder](#) called "MRF-Shed, Contract-Shed, MSW Flow Maps, UTC Franchise Areas," we see the Active MSW Landfills Serving WA in 2018. Related, the [MSW Flow Maps](#) shows Cedar Hills Regional Landfill as second only to Roosevelt Regional Landfill in tons of MSW accepted in 2021.

Knight thanked Wadley for her participation at these meetings and for the updates. Knight asked Wadley if moving forward, she will continue to attend these meetings and what the committee can expect from Ecology in the future. Wadley replied that her replacement will be briefed and there is a shared document that all Regional Planners use so all updates statewide should be similar. The committee will not be seeing Wadley as often, but she will drop in every now and then so she can still be apart of this group. Also, her new position is like a second pair of eyes on each of submissions for all the solid waste management plans come that come to Ecology and she will be reviewing and providing comments.

SWD Updates

Stubbs provided the SWD update.

April Tonnage Update

The total tonnage increased in April 2024 by 2,500 tons (+4%) compared to April 2023 and 5,300 tons compared to the forecast for April 2024 (+ 8%). The total tons grew by almost 1,000 tons (1.9%) and Regional Direct tons grew by almost 700 tons (+114%) compared to March 2023.

Commercially hauled tons went up by 1,700 tons (+3%) and self-haul tons increased by almost 800 tons (6%). Currently, we are about 11,500 tons above the forecast for the year (Jan - April). The largest difference stems from significantly higher commercially collected waste tonnage over the past 4 month (+9,000 tons).

Cedar Hills Facilities Relocation Project

To replace outdated facilities and expand recycling and waste disposal services in southeast and northeast King County, the Solid Waste Division will incur significant major capital expenditures from 2025-2029 due to construction on several different transfer station and landfill projects.

To support King County's commitment to financial stewardship, and goal for rate stability and predictability, SWD will temporarily delay construction on the permanent facilities planned as part of the Cedar Hills Site Relocation and Development Project. Delaying the construction on the permanent facilities planned as part of the Cedar Hills Site Development and Relocation Project would enable the division to defer the bulk of construction costs to future years, relieving pressure on the disposal rate between 2025-29, and avoiding rate spikes that would not meet our goals for financial stewardship, and rate stability and predictability.

Recent project cost estimates are significantly above the established budget, suggesting a design review is needed. Given there will be significant capital spending over the next few years on transfer station and landfill projects, this delay will help smooth the regional rate path while design options are revisited.

We have been working diligently to secure and prepare interim facilities for employees to report to that will enable construction on Area 9. Employees scheduled to relocate from Cedar Hills will still move from the landfill beginning in Summer 2024, pending local agency occupancy permits, and remain at those worksites until the permanent facilities are complete (2029 at the earliest).

Meanwhile, design of the permanent facilities will continue as planned to 90%, with construction set to begin in 2028. The pause will have the advantage of allowing the project team to explore design changes and potential cost-saving measures that could offset escalation costs associated with the delay.

Prior plans to temporarily relocate Cedar Hills employees to interim facilities will continue as scheduled. Employees will continue to report to the interim locations until permanent facilities are complete.

Ardagh/SMI Tour

SWD and Seattle Public Utilities leadership toured two facilities that are integral to recycling glass in Washington State - Ardagh Group's bottle packaging facility and Strategic Materials Inc (SMI) glass recovery and sorting facility.

Both facilities are located in the Georgetown neighborhood of Seattle and are responsible for turning recycled glass from King County, most of Western Washington, and B.C. into new glass wine bottles. We discussed challenges facing our glass recycling system, such as contamination in the glass stream.

SMI previously filed for bankruptcy in December but was acquired by Sibelco, a European glass recycler, and appears to be on stable financial footing. Ardagh informed us that they were in compliance with the air emissions and storm water regulations, which had been a concern in previous years.

Overall, these facilities, and regional glass recycling is crucial to meet our Zero Waste of Resources, Re+, and climate objectives.

Long-term disposal decision sub-committee

As you will hear more about later on this morning, the LTD sub committee held its first meeting on April 24. The conversation was robust, with County staff providing information on LTD options and criteria and members sharing excellent feedback and asking great questions

We are excited about the work ahead and are very appreciative of the dedication and participation of our city partner.

RE+ Grants

As a reminder, the application period for the Re+ Circular Economy grants opened on April 10 and closes on May 29, with \$2.2 million available for the 2024-25 grant cycle.

Nonprofits, fiscally sponsored organizations, businesses, self-employed individual, tribal governments and universities/colleges are eligible to apply.

Enumclaw EV and Transfer Station Tour

In mid-April, we had the pleasure of hosting City Administrator Searcy and several City of Enumclaw staff at the Enumclaw transfer station to view our electric truck and vehicles and had a great discussion on the impact of utilizing this new technology.

Government Relations Administrator Recruitment Update

Last week, the posting for the Government Relations Administrator in the Government Relations and Community Engagement group went live.

Please feel free to share with your networks – the person that fills this position will be supporting the work of this committee and much of the important policy work ahead.

Heubach asked for a link for the job and was curious on the tonnage is being considered in terms of rates and there are any patterns being seen. She was also unclear on the tonnage because in previous updates, SWD had said that tonnage was down. Walsh replied that for the rates, we always do a forecast in February to try and figure out what it will be for the future. This is then plugged into the rate model. Based on actuals to the mode (?), we are up in tonnage. But compared to the 2024-2024 forecast, we are down. When we talk about the rates and revenue being down, we compare the current to the forecast rates from two years ago.

SWAC Update

Ockerlander said that the committee asked questions about participating in the subgroup committee. We let them know that this meeting is only for MSWAC members, but they will have access to the minutes, and we will keep them updated as we move along in the process.

Long-term disposal decision & sub-group update

Walsh provided this update.

We have an extranet site with materials and video of the subgroup committee meetings.

There were two consultant studies that were used to inform long-term disposal discussion during the 2019 Comp Plan.

- 2007 - comparative evaluation of waste export and conversion technologies disposal options (RW Beck)
- 2017 – waste-to-energy (WTE) options and solid waste export considerations (Normandeau Associates)
 - Mass burn is most appropriate for WTE
 - Has high GHG but can also process the waste
 - Waste export has risk in terms of capacity in 2028.

Very soon after the Comp Plan was adopted, another study just focused on WTE vs Waste Export was also completed (Arcadis Study). There were some concerns on assumptions made by Arcadis e.g. cost and emissions.

These studies were shared with consultants as a starting point for evaluating options for the current Comp Plan Update.

For long-term disposal (LTD) in the 2019 comp plan, we considered 3 options.

- Waste export
- WTE/mass burn
- Maximization of the landfill
 - This option was selected and approved in the 2019 comp plan
- The next disposal option after Cedar Hills closes was not chosen at this time

In addition to mass burn and waste export, we are also considering the future technologies of:

- Gasification
- Pyrolysis
- Plasma arc gasification
- Anaerobic digestion

There is a huge list of criteria (38) to screen long-term disposal options. The six major categories are:

- Environmental
- Economic
- Operating History
- Availability
- Social
- Contract and Operational Requirements

38 sub-categories were listed.

The long-term disposal options are:

- Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF): Mixed solid waste (MSW) processing using shredders, screens, magnets, and eddy current separators to produce a combustible feedstock that could replace fossil fuels in industrial settings
- Gasification: Thermal conversion process that transforms MSW into a synthetic gas (syngas) that can be used as a fuel, or made into industrial chemicals such as ammonia and methanol, fertilizer, etc.
- Pyrolysis: Thermal conversion process under high pressure conditions that transforms MSW into usable products – typically oils, solid carbon/char and other chemicals.
- Mass Burn: Combustion of MSW to create heat that can be made into superheated steam for industrial processing, generating electricity and/or district heating.
- Waste Export by Rail (WEBR): Transporting MSW by train to a regional landfill outside the County for burial and landfill gas collection.

For the evaluation criteria, there are six categories:

- Logistics
- Economics
- Capacity
- Operating history
- Social impact
- Environmental impact

For the social impact, we are asking ourselves if this method will impact livability e.g. how will it impact local job creation, local traffic impacts, and other potential impacts (noise, odor, etc.).

The takeaway from the subgroup meeting is to identify where ESJ intersects with other criteria e.g. are air impacts localized or a global measure. Please note - siting for LTD is outside the scope of this study. More in-depth environmental justice, equity and social justice impacts will be studied in a future site analysis.

Halverson said that we have three scenarios for how tonnage can be handled in 2040.

- High (about 1 million tons/year): this assumes the status quo and assumes commercial organics is passed (HB1799) and enforcement is in place.
- Medium (about 670,000 tons/year): this assumes Re+ is fully implemented and a small (0.5%) increase in diversion due to new tech/EPR
- Low (about 330,000 tons/year): this assumes Zero Waste of Resources is achieved by 2030 and a small (2%) increase in diversion due to new tech/EPR

The takeaway is that we need to keep pursuing legislation but there are concerns about enforcement (costs, negative reaction, etc.) The focus comparison is on the medium scenario, but we will identify where things materially change in the high and low scenarios.

Gire gave a shoutout to the SWD team for thought out process and having the materials and timelines available online. Gire shared that he was looking forward to having direct conversations with the consultants.

Knight said that this is a team effort and is happy that SWD staff are willing to work with MSWAC members and is looking forward to hearing more about the committee's work.

Tsai echoed everyone's comments and thanked SWD and the co-chairs for all the work put in to get to these conversations. Tsai was curious about the conversations around the high, medium, and low tonnage and didn't know if it's the dichotomy of buckets but is more interested on the high and medium side. Even if we are achieving best practices, it will be important to handle the high tonnage. When talking about equity on the criteria crosswalk, it is hard to talk about siting and they do not have interest on a specific site but wants to make sure that the consultants look at the siting with King County lens, so it is specific and tailored to King County. For example, how different land might be sited. Also, one of the criteria are about compatibility with recycling and wanted to make sure that the consultant isn't just doing a technical analysis and that the technology fits the social justice and equity aspect too. She added that it has to physically work and incentive recycling behavior.

Walsh stated that the next meeting is on May 20 and the consultant will be there. The plan is to go more in-depth with gasification and pyrolysis SWD will bring back information and if you're available, please join.

Knight echoed Tsai's comment about the social justice aspect and compatibility with recycling in King County. As well as the siting issue – which ultimately gets decided by King County. She stated that it would be unfortunate if the siting decision that is brought to the forefront is not supported and wanted to make sure that King County and the region is well positioned to embrace the decision that comes for LTD.

2025 Rates - Recommendation

Honaker gave this recommendation.

There will be a 10% increase in proposed solid waste rates. By 2029, we are projecting that it will be down by a couple million dollars. This is why we have that reserve – to smooth down the rate. The way we've been able to drop this, mainly, is by the permanent facility implementation shift to 2028. This allows us to balance our capital improvement project (CIP)

resources and spread it out so there is not a huge spike. It will also allow us to think more of the project and work more on alternatives for scoping.

Please note that spending does not include accomplishment rate adjustments.

The curbside impact will vary by jurisdiction and can size. The average account will have a projected 93c per month increase. We looked a sample of contracts and were able to determine that on average the amount attributable to disposal out of the monthly cost was 24%. We were able to obtain container counts from a sample of jurisdictions and found that the majority of customers have a 32-gallon can size. The monthly cost of service varies based on jurisdictions.

The estimated monthly impact by can is:

- 20 gallon - \$0.44. About 14% of residents have this can size.
- 32 gallon - \$0.71. About 50% of residents have this can size.
- 64 gallon - \$1.34. About 28% of residents have this can size.
- 96 gallon - \$1.98. About 8% of residents have this can size.

Gire wanted to know if we have done a commercial/multi family impact study such as with the cost of 4-yard dumpster with weekly service to show how the disposal fee impacts rates for those sectors. Honaker answered that we have not, and we can take a look at putting that together. We are excited to start building off of this data set. There is a lot of work we can do to expand this data set and make it more useful.

The fixed annual charge (FAC) will be \$23,337,885. The draft 2025 allocation will be shared on 5/31. We need the cities and haulers to review and provide feedback.

- Need City/Hauler Feedback by 6/28
- Two office hour sessions: 6/11 @ 3 pm and 6/20 @ 10 am
- SWD releases revised table 7/3
- Cities/Haulers complete final review 7/31
- SWD releases final FAC table 8/2 (won't be official until council adopts)

It's important for us to note any annexes that cities might have as it pertains to this allocation or anything in the future.

We briefed the Executive on the construction and demolition (C&D) fee - the committee recommendation is to increase the rate from \$4.25 to \$13.

The remaining rate proposal timeline:

- Executive briefing – May 6, 2024
- MSWAC & SWAC: Letter of support discussion – May 10 & 17, 2024
- Transmit to Executive – May 16, 2024
- Transmittal to Council – June 13, 2024
- Council adoption – Sept. 2024

Knight stated that she knows the support letter is available here for members consideration and asked what the drop-dead date is that the letter needs to be transmitted to the council. Honaker responded that we are scheduled to send over the letter on June 13. Ockerlander or Walsh might be able to give a more accurate date.

McInnis asked is if the current recommendation of 10% for 2025-26 is also projected out for 10% in 2027-28. Honaker replied yes.

Knight reminded everyone that the letter of support is only for the 2025 rate.

Gire asked if it would be possible to add a blurb on the back and if tactics that we've deployed to help soften the rate increase and cost control could be listed – to show that we are actively taking measures to control the rate increase. Gire also shared that it was a huge accomplishment for SWD with the MRF residuals and getting money from Seattle.

Knight said that the draft letter of support ~~has been~~ was sent to members. The committee will review and discuss during ~~the May~~ this meeting.

Heubach said that we can see the monthly reconciliation when calculating the FAC and the tonnage number. Based on a quick analysis, King County would understand that there were an extra 292 tons coming from Renton when there actually weren't (the extra tonnage is coming from Unincorporated King County). Every year, there tends to be extra tons attributed to Renton, and she is curious if that is the same trend with other cities and reconciliation. She also asked if it balances out in the end and what the thoughts are on true ups. Honaker replied that we start with the first allocations that are in our scale houses. Renton is unique because it has its own account and Kirkland has also just started doing the same thing. As Kirkland was transitioning, they found that they were having to do an after the fact reconciliation of the invoiced tonnage with the hauler.

We depend on haulers telling us that they restated a certain month and depend on people filling us in. Honaker would like to set some time together to make sure that King County has the correct tonnage for Renton. Other cities can also flag things that are different because you know your cities. As we continue, the FAC might reduce those errors over time. Since we are allocating proportionately, and as long as the overstatement is happening equally amongst the cities, there shouldn't be a big difference over time. But we do want to make it as accurate as possible and want to continue to work on how we can get good data.

Knight asked for clarification that SWD will work with the cities that directly pay [disposal fees] to the county. She added that a letter of support ~~has been~~ was sent to members for the recommended increase and was curious if there is any opposition.

Van Orsow stated that Gire made good points and would like to see the draft amended to include the recommendations. He asked how important the letter of recommendation is since MSWAC does not meet again until after the package is transmitted. Ockerlander answered that in the past, if there were a few items that people wanted to change, the committee would defer to the chair and vice chair to finalize the letter with the staff. This letter carries weight with the Executive and Council because it shows the engagement with the advisory committees.

Moldver echoed Van Orsow's comments and said that he is not sure if Redmond is ready to sign on to the letter yet. One thing that stood out to him is how the rate stabilization is being used and asked if there was a way to use it and keep the costs down.

Knight added to Moldver's comments and shared her concern of using the rate stabilization fund now than in out years. One of the strategies is to delay the facility relocation projection and look for alternatives but there's still no guarantee that those costs are going to come down. King County is delaying this project but sometimes delays end up costing more because of loss of revenue. Knight is reticent to tap into the fund and draw the rate down earlier when we may need some of that fund for the out years to temper the rate increases. There is a lot of capital work that will be done, and we've already acknowledged that rate increases are going to be steeper than we've experienced in the past. These increases are a burden on everyone as cities have their own issues and contracts to look at which will elevate their own rates.

Knight shared her appreciation for Moldver's comments and believed that it is fine to delay the letter and deal with this issue through the modification of the letter and then a resend to the committee members. People can weigh-in individually and Sweet and Knight can make the decision ~~on~~ if it is worth signing the letter and having it in a packet.

Jacobsen stated that he is very supportive of the comments made by fellow members because the City of Mercer Island is concerned with rate increases coming from all directions. As City Council, they are careful about what they endorse and believes it is a good idea to delay the letter until there is information.

Walsh said that the more rate stabilization that is used now, the less there is available in the future. This means that all rate increases could go up significantly depending on the cash flow. Walsh is happy to set up a meeting and talk through this with Moldver, and any other cities that want to meet.

Moldver wanted to know if the rate stabilization fund has been used in the past or if it has just been sitting and growing. Walsh replied that we have been using the fund for the past several rates and if you look at SWD's financial statements, you'll see that expenditures have exceeded revenues for a while. That's only available because we filled the gaps with the rate stabilization fund. This is true for the out years too. Depending on how things work out, this could be a save now but pay more later situation.

Moldver said that Redmond has not had a project that they've delayed that hasn't cost more so this logic makes sense. Moldver was curious what it would look like if the county was able to spread it and use it sooner. Walsh replied that he would have to see what the model shows. Knight wanted to remind the committee that as a whole, there were comments in many meetings that the committee would prefer to have smoother rate increases over a period of time rather than try and lower rates and have these spikes. Knight's concern is when we eat into the rate stabilization fund and there are all these capital projects that are ongoing with potential cost overrun, there is a potential for rates needing to spike to recover that revenue.

Van Orsow stated that another potential impact could be the Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station (NERTS) siting process and avoiding the cost of potentially buying land. ~~When this kicks in, -which~~ will hopefully benefit the ratepayers. Another thing that relates to the permanent facilities is the useful of life that will be required if the buildings will only be in use for a decade or less because the landfill is closing. ~~There is some~~ Valued engineering ~~that~~ could reduce the costs ~~going forward~~.

Honaker re-reviewed the capital project slide and said that when we moved out the permanent facilities, we did add some escalation. This is more inline with our typical escalation estimate of about 3% per year and noted that one of the reasons this project has become so expensive is because we just lived through a very large increase in construction costs. It is always a vulnerability that if we push it off to the future and have another one of these periods, it could be more than forecasted. We did build in some escalation and the smooth rate includes this. We also included the additional time that we would have to lease the temporary facilities and put this in as a baseline. We are very hopeful that there are alternatives out there that may bring the total cost of that project down. It is harder to see this, but we are hopefully that this will come true. We have built in a baseline of escalation.

Honaker mentioned Van Orsow's comment on the NERTS siting and said that we will make the siting decision in Q3 of 2024 this could move things out. However, we also note that the alternative Houghton site is a closed landfill site and one of the options is to keep this site open and active during construction and those things would probably add a lot of site costs that would sit in that \$30M and get moved out into that implementation phase potentially. We put some money aside and this will be a relief in 2025 if we don't end up making the site purchase but if we do, the money is there and ready. Either way, we are covered but the \$30M has the potential to swing that cash flow.

Walsh reminded the committee that we are predicted to spend about \$800M in the next six years, and we are in the thick of the growth program when it comes to the CIP. If we implement all of the things from the comp plan – SCRTS, NERTS, the landfill – the rates are likely to be high because of the capital investments that are being made. It would be hard to not invest in those things and keep the rate at a sub 10% increase. Walsh wanted to remind everyone that we are in a period of high capital growth that is driving the rate increases.

Knight asked Ockerlander to have SWD update the letter of support. Once the suggested items are in the letter, please redistribute it to the committee and Sweet and Knight will work together to see the interest of members and to get the letter in with the packet, delay it to a later date, or not submit at all.

McInnis added in the chat that if Houghton is selected for the Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station project, they expect that the property purchase budget will still need to be reallocated to use on the existing Houghton landfill site ~~on~~ still on for mitigation.

Waste Acceptance Rules

Barragan provided this update.

Barragan posed to the group a question of what items are difficult to handle at the landfill. Responses were combustibles, batteries, livestock, hot coals, and single use plastics.

Barragan added asbestos, propane tanks, biomedical sharps and mattresses. Mattresses take up air space and create a lot shifting at the landfill. We are authorized by a KC code to codify these policies. It has been updated five times – the last in 2017. It contains 48 separate parts.

There are items that we accept under limited conditions like tires in limited quantities. People can apply for a waste disposal permit to dispose of some types of waste.

Barragan asked members to say what items they know they can't dispose of. Members answered cardboard, scrap metal, and yard waste.

This rule is really about ensuring the garbage disposal integrity system. Our staff enforce it and waste inspectors who move around through the stations and issue citations when its violated. This is a progressive process starting with a warning.

This a rule that is updated ad hoc. Some reasons for the recent update include arsenic and cannabis waste. Also, the current version has a lot of ambiguous legal language.

Update timeline

- King County internal review – Q2 & Q3 2024
- External Stakeholder review (like MSWAC and SWAC) – Q3 2024
- Public comment period – Q3 & Q4 2024
- Final Rule – Q1 2025

Heubach asked if they could review which items will be banned. Barragan answered yes, and the items are arsenic-containing waste above a certain threshold; lead paint debris from residential demolition projects; lead paint chips and radioactive waste.

Heubach followed up saying that cannabis waste was mentioned and wondered if the work on that is being tabled until the related state bills about cannabis disposal are worked through. Barragan shared the draft cannabis policy – cannabis waste that that does not meet the definition of Dangerous Waste under chapter 173-303 WAC and is rendered unusable following the methods in WAC 314-55-097(5) is accepted only at the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill and must be accompanied by a Waste Clearance Disposal Permit. This waste must contain little or no water and be bagged in clear plastic.

Moldver asked if the Polychlorinated biphenyls in building materials are banned. Barragan replied that any changes resulting from the related state bills will be reflected in our subsequent update. She was not sure and will get back to the

committee.

Debris Management Plan Update

Jones gave this update.

Debris is scattered items or materials either broken or misplaced by a disaster.

The objectives of our current planning initiative has two components:

1. Regional Framework (Base Plan)
 - a. Supports county agencies, cities, tribes, and special purpose districts within King County during large-scale disaster debris-causing incidents
 - b. Describes how the County and its regional partners will collect debris, sort it, and transfer it to its final disposition location
2. Jurisdiction Annexes
 - a. Support specific jurisdictions during smaller scale incidents that might not warrant the need to activate the larger regional base plan
 - b. Operational plans that include the same planning elements as the base plan

SWD is the lead per King County Code 10.08.020 - System of disposal

- Under the authority provided by the King County Charter and RCW 36.58.040, a system is hereby established for disposal of all solid waste either generated, collected or disposed, in unincorporated King County. Additionally, this system shall include all solid waste either generated or collected, or both, in any other jurisdictions with which a solid waste interlocal agreement exists.

A few notes about annexes:

- The regional framework applies to any entity within King County responsible for debris management activities, unless otherwise stated or superseded by a local entity plan
- Local jurisdictions may choose to annex onto the King County plan (can use the template provided) or can use the plan as a framework for developing their own plan
- An advantage of annexing onto the King County plan is that SEPA would already be done for you as the King County plan fulfills the SEPA requirement

Our progress to date:

- Feb.-Mar 2023: Partner Engagement Meetings
- April 2023: Project kickoff meeting
- March 2023-March 2024: Partner meetings
- June 2023: Annex template provided to partners
- March 2024: Draft Regional Framework (Base plan) finalized
- March – April 2024: Partner review period (for draft framework)

Our current activities include:

- Integrating feedback from partners into the draft framework
- Updating the draft SEPA checklist
- Finalizing the formatting/design

Debris management is very complex so we won't be able to address everything this time but will keep a list and it will be integrated at some point in the future.

Regional framework components:

- Debris Management Overview
- Incidents and Assumptions
- Debris Collection and Removal
- Temporary Debris Management Sites and Disposal Locations
- Debris Removal from Private Property
- Force Account Labor and Contracted Resources and Procurement
- Monitoring of Debris Operations
- Health and Safety
- Regulatory Requirements
- Public Information

Our current activities include:

- Integrating feedback from partners into the draft framework (thank you to those who submitted feedback!)
- Debris management planning is very complex and prolonged, and we will not be able to address all elements in our current planning efforts; we are tracking which items will need to be completed in future planning efforts
- Updating the draft SEPA checklist
- Finalizing the formatting/design

The next steps are:

- Conduct State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review – May-Jun 2024
- This will be another opportunity for partners to review and provide comment on the draft plan
- Provide technical assistance to jurisdictions to complete the annexes – Jun-Aug 2024
 - Following completion of the regional framework, SWD will provide technical assistance to the cities, tribes, and special purpose districts who have opted to develop a debris management annex
 - We have asked partners to let us know the following:
 - Whether your jurisdiction is interested in receiving technical assistance to complete your debris management annex
 - If interested, please specify which planning elements you need help with
- Finalize the regional framework – July 2024
- Council review and action – Sept. 2024
- Provide training – Q1 2025

If your jurisdiction would look support in completing your annex, please email your responses to kajones@kingcounty.gov by Friday, May 17.

Communication with regional planning partners entail:

- Periodic newsletters sent via Gov Delivery
 - Share status updates
 - Provide data/information for jurisdiction annexes (e.g., plan template, debris forecast data, etc.)
 - Seek feedback from partners (e.g., on potential temporary debris management sites)
 - Sign up [here!](#)
- Microsoft Teams as a collaborative platform
 - Allows partners to access past newsletters, meeting materials, sample plan documents, the annex template, etc.
- Email/phone

Heubach has been involved with the annex on the City of Renton. She commented on the general plan and noticed that the use of the word curbside collection (waste collected and sorted at the curb) kept coming up and the other piece of regular curbside collection. She noticed that Jones mentioned training and the question came up of what that means on

working with the haulers and the assumption that we can't rely on haulers with debris management. She wanted to know what it would look like for training with haulers and how often it would be. Jones replied that she will follow up with the answer.

Member Comment

Knight wanted to thank all the members and appreciated the contributions provided. She also thanked King County for coming to these meetings prepared.

Heubach shared information on a City of Renton collection [event](#).

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 1:09 p.m.