

SWAC Advisory Committee Meeting

Feb. 16, 2024 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

SWAC Members Present		King County Staff	
April Atwood, Marketing and Education		Kalyn Brady, SWD staff	
Jay Blazey, Manufacturer		Sylvaine Bucher, SWD staff	
Amy Lam, Local Elected Official		Nori Catabay, SWD staff	
Brett Lohrman, Labor Representative		Jerome Cruz,	
Bill Louie, Citizen Representative		Kinley Deller, SWD staff	
Laura Mork, Local Elected Official		Brian Halverson, SWD staff	
Leah Tischler,		Patty Liu, SWD staff	
Heather Trim, Recycling Industry		Laila McClinton, SWD staff	
Wendy Weiker, Chair, Waste Industry		Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director	
		Katie Mineo, SWD staff	
		Amy Ockerlander, SWD staff	
		Celine Pastore, SWD staff	
		Yolanda Pon,	
		Hannah Scholes, SWD staff	
		Adrian Tan, SWD staff	
		Theresa Thurlow, SWD staff	
		Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff	
Guests			
Alissa Campbell, Recology		Andi Parnell, Sound Cities Association	
Jeanette Jurgensen, Bin There Consulting		Tyler Pichette, Pacific Public Affairs	
Brad Lovaas, WA Refuse and Recycling Association		Diana Wadley, Department of Ecology	

Call to Order and Introductions

After introductions, Chair Weiker called the meeting to order at 9:39 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Louie moved to approve the agenda. Lam seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Comment

Wadley shared three items beginning with the sharing that the [Single-use Serviceware](#) law reporting portal is now live. If a business is reported, Ecology will reach out and educate the business with the new law because Ecology knows that many businesses don't know about it yet. The next update is about the Washington Center for Sustainable Food Management, and this was created by the 2022 Organics Management Law. From April 1-7, the Sustainable Food Management Center will be launching a [statewide food waste reduction campaign](#), and they will be inviting local governments to partner in this campaign and amplify it. Please join the Ecology Food Center Team at their Local Government Food Waste Reduction Partnership Meet N' Greet on February 26 from 1:15 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. [Register today](#). For questions, you can contact Olivia Carros for the Local Government Partnership Plan at olivia.carros@ecy.wa.gov.

As a reminder, Ecology keeps a public [Planning and Waste Reduction Resource Library](#). There is a lot of good information. If there are suggestions, please let Wadley know. In a different section than the library on Box, there is [information and resources](#) for Local Solid Waste Financial Assistance (LSWFA). In this folder, under “Who Does Similar Work” is a [spreadsheet](#) that shows how LSWFA funds are being spent in King County.

SWD Updates

McLaughlin provided the SWD update.

I'll start with some very exciting news for DNRP. After a nationwide search to replace Christie True, who retired two weeks ago, the Executive announced the appointment of John Taylor as the new Director of DNRP. Most of you already know John through his work as the Director of Local Services. John has a strong background in environmental issues and will carry on the legacy of strong leadership and commitment to the department. We are excited to have him in DNRP and are looking forward to his leadership. He starts on Monday, Feb. 12.

Next, we hired a new Deputy SWD Director, Chris Stubbs. Chris has been with us for almost 3 weeks now and comes to us from Hennepin County Minnesota. He brings a great wealth of experience and knowledge with regional planning. As he gets settled, you will see him more and he will become a great resource for you as well.

It's exciting to see some new faces and names, especially as we have embarked on a busy, exciting time of work for SWAC and the KC Solid Waste Division.

Governor and Executive Tour

We recently hosted Governor Inslee on a tour of our Factoria Transfer Station on Jan. 29. We were pleased to host the Governor, with Executive Constantine to show him our state-of-the-art facility and have a conversation about how the ReWrap Act will impact King County and the environment. The Governor and Executive, along with many cities, signed a letter of support.

Our ops team, led by Cynthia Adams, the Recycling and Environmental Services (RES) team including Adrian Tan and Hannah Scholes, and the Government Relations and Community Engagement (GRCE) team in coordination with the Executive Office and DNRP Public Affairs did a great job planning, executing and sharing key information with the Governor.

Ardagh Update

At our last meeting, it was requested that we provide an update on Ardagh glass recycling as a result of their financial restructure and bankruptcy filing. Our team followed up with Ardagh, who reported that it is business as usual and that they don't expect any sort of business impact as their restructure is underway. Some of you have also requested a tour of their facility, and our team is working with Ardagh to identify possible dates. After we identify some date, we will coordinate them with the committee for possible tours.

Community repair events

We also have some upcoming community repair events on the calendar. At free community repair events, skilled volunteer "fixers" try to repair and mend your small household and personal items. We plan to schedule additional 2024 events. The events season runs March through September. Events will be posted on this [web page](#) as they are scheduled.

- Tuesday, March 19, 3-6 pm, [Des Moines Library](#) | [Facebook event page](#)
- Sunday, April 21, 1:30-4:30 pm, [Burien Library](#) | [Facebook event page](#)
- Saturday, June 8, 1:30-4:30 pm, [Kirkland Library](#) | [Facebook event page](#)
- Saturday, Aug. 10, 1:30-4:30 pm, [Skyway Library](#) | [Facebook event page](#)

ESJ in King County recycling system

On a different note, Hannah Scholes and Adrian Tan are working on a study to better understand equity and social justice (ESJ) issue with our King County recycling system. This work will help us understand what services are available in different areas of the county, the cost and conveniences of the services, impacts on communities and worker experience in the industry. They will be working with a team of consultants over the next few months to learn more and answer these important community questions.

They would like to invite city staff to help guide the project by attending up to five monthly meetings for status updates and discussion. They will be reaching out through the King County Recycling coordinators list, but if you are not on that list and are interested in participating, please let us know.

We will report back to SWAC once the results of the study and work are completed.

NERTS

Finally, as you will hear more about shortly, the DRAFT EIS for the Northeast Recycle and Transfer Station was released on Feb. 7. We are in a 62-day comment period, and this is an important milestone where we share the draft results of the environmental impacts of this project. We are very excited about this progress and look forward to hearing feedback from all of you, and members of your communities on this essential public facility.

Louie wanted to know about the arsenic report. McLaughlin said that members might have seen an investigative report from King 5, and we are happy to share that we have confirmed that there are no arsenic exposures posing risk to our employees and the community at large. This information was confirmed over a 3-week period. We will continue to work with our regulators and make sure we are in good standing with them. We have struggled with high levels of arsenic in the wastewater leachate and that problem has largely gone away while BEW remains shut down. We are continuing to work with our regulators to ensure the safety of our employees and community at large.

Lam asked what the differences are in testing for arsenic. The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) is asking for the air to be tested again and Lam wanted to know how that will be different. McLaughlin answered that we had workers who volunteered to wear air monitors over the course of their workday to measure the arsenic levels. The testing that PSCAA has asked us to do is different because it is taking measures through the flare system, called stack testing, because we have to flare gas due to BEW being shut down. Since there is arsenic at the landfill, PSCAA is asking us to try a different form of testing. This will provide information on what is going through the stacks and what happens to it with the high temperature and time and will help inform if any additional testing or regulations are needed.

Atwood was curious if there were any updates on BEW and what we believe the pros and cons are. McLaughlin responded that we hope they will come back online soon but we don't have any base to predict when that will happen. When they do come back online, the arsenic concern in the wastewater will not return because we have put infrastructure in place so that when their process produces hazardous waste, they will have the ability to divert the hazardous waste and have it sent offsite for disposal rather than dump it into our leachate. We are continuing to develop technology that can retrieve that waste and remove it without having to truck it away.

MSWAC Update

No updates.

2025 Rates/C&D Fee Update

Honaker and Deller provided this update.

Honaker began by saying that the rates and budget are two desperate processes, but they work together. The rates determine the revenue that the division will receive and has to happen before the budget process. The budget processes then determines how we will spend the money that we receive but this is really constrained by the initial financial position.

Our current biennial budget is \$364M.

- \$133M for Salaries and Benefits
- \$98M for Fund Transfers and Debt Service
- \$77M for Supplies and Services
- \$50M for Intergovernmental Services
- \$6M for Capital Expenditures

The current budget we have serves as the baseline for the current budget process.

The rate process will look like:

- Q1/Q2: Rate Proposal Development
 - SWD works with MSWAC, SWAC, DNRP leadership, and Executive to finalize rate proposal
- Q2 to Q3: Legislative Process
 - Council reviews proposal and adopts ordinance
- Q4: Adoption
 - The rate determines the amount of revenue SWD has in 2025

The budget process will kick off in the summer and will look like:

- Q1 to Q2: Budget Assumptions for Rate Model
 - The amount of revenue needed is determined by the amount of money the division expects to spend
- Q2 to Q3 to Budget Development
 - The county budgets by the increment, meaning that only changes to the existing budget are included in the legislative package
- Q3 to Q4: Legislative Process
 - Council typically takes several months to review the budget. It is typically adopted in November.
- Q4: Adoption

We've developed a preliminary list of operating changes:

- Transfer station customer experience and material recovery
 - Potential staffing changes to increase safety and recovery efforts
 - Investments to increase recycling and sustain existing services
- Low-income discount program administration
 - Currently developing a program for UTC-regulated areas
 - Program will be aligned with other county benefit programs and developed so there is potential to collaborate with cities. There will be some administrative costs that will be part of the 2025 budget.
- Other initiatives
 - 5-day hauling/landfilling implementation (Cost Savings initiative)
 - Relaunch destination zero waste (education program for kids)
 - Methane emissions compliance staffing

Capital Budget Changes

- Project managers are updating project cash flows currently

- Reviewing project timing to improve accuracy of the cash flows
- Some projects may need adjustments to appropriation
- New capital projects will be limited
 - Capacity is a limiting factor
 - Considering adding a programmatic project for energy efficiency projects

Lam wanted to know how much coverage the low-income program has compared to the private haulers. Honaker replied that this program includes the unincorporated areas of King County and UTC areas. There are about 10 cities that use the UTC contract, plus annexation areas usually take seven years to transition to the city contracts. Lam followed up asking how many households this program would help. Honaker answered that based on some studies we have contacted, there are about 12,000 households that this program could help. Based on the income distribution area, we expect about 8,000 households to enroll but this number is based on preliminary data.

Mork stated that she is not familiar with the 5-day hauling initiative. Honaker replied that most of our Operations staff work 7 days on and 7 days off either at the landfill or trucking/hauling the waste to Cedar Hills. Based on our current tonnage, we believe that we can take this work week down to 5 days of operation and move away from the 7/10 schedule. This means that operations would only need to work Monday-Friday and it will save us money. Employees have come to like this schedule and enjoy it but it is an expensive schedule. We think it will be more efficient to move to a 5-day schedule and we are working hard to implement it.

Deller began the Construction and Demolition (C&D) fee update with sharing that fee-funded programs could play a key role in meeting zero waste, climate change, and ESJ priorities. As a reminder, they are only collected on materials that go to the landfill. They are divided into the three “C’s” of C&D and could be used to further our goals.

- Community
 - Green jobs support
 - Community funding for deconstruction
 - Demolition community impacts research
 - Expand C&D collection
- Creativity
 - Innovation grants
 - Jobsite collection systems – getting things separated at the site
 - Circular economy business park
 - Increase gypsum diversion for new drywall
- Compliance
 - Direct reporting for scale house – information going directly from scale house to the collection office
 - Regional C&D container tagging system
 - Strengthen deconstruction policy framework

The problem is that the fee level is still consistent with 1990’s needs but not with today’s needs. In 1993, the materials were just being transferred for waste – we weren’t focusing on things like recycling, waste diversion, etc. The mixed solid waste (MSW) fee has increased over time while the C&D rate has remained the same. King County’s is \$4.25/ton, Seattle’s C&D transfer tax is \$13.27/ton, and Portland’s fee is \$30/ton.

Right now, we are really just focusing on what the fees should be for 2025. We have three different options that we have been considering:

- Option 1: Status Quo
 - Fee per ton: \$4.25
 - Current level of service, including:

- Ongoing maintenance of the C&D designated facility system \$200,000 in market development grants
 - Deconstruction training
 - Basic frontline community coordination and program planning
- Option 2: In-between
 - Fee per ton: \$8
 - Option 1 plus:
 - Analysis to increase C&D separation and enforce code compliance
 - Pilot collection of gypsum drywall
 - Provide salvage verifier training to two cohorts of 15 people
 - Development of community program for community-based deconstruction and home restorations
- Option 3: In line with inflation
 - Fee per ton: \$13
 - Option 2 plus:
 - Create an incentive program to increase C&D separation
 - Implement direct reporting from C&D scale houses to existing C&D cloud-based reporting platform
 - Assist establishment of new C&D related Women/Minority Business enterprise (WMBE) businesses
 - Provide performance incentives to drive C&D materials towards highest and best use

Louie asked for clarification on if the status quo of \$4.25 per ton would allow the County to do everything that we are currently doing in addition to what is listed. Deller answered that we are already doing everything that is listed.

Lam wanted to know if there is a concern for smaller businesses and residents when they're bringing in C&D with option 3. Deller responded that there is a two-tiered system, and these fees don't apply to our own King County transfer stations. We don't allow C&D materials at our transfer stations except for certain small loads. We are looking to address this in the next Title X changes. These fees won't apply to smaller customers because these fees aren't applied to the transfer stations. How the fee will impact bigger businesses will be based on how they set up the disposal collection at their job sites. We want to find creative ways for people at job sites to do the sorting to help them save money in the end.

Lam followed up asking if there is a difference with the type of debris and what is being built like lower income housing. Deller responded that the fee is the same, but we do more outreach with the lower income housing communities, and they are doing a better job in separating their materials.

Mork asked if option 1 covers all of the costs. Deller replied that this year we are pulling a little from our reserves, so it is not quite covering our costs. Mork wanted to know if people will even up people more if the rate does not get raised. Deller answered that over the past years, there have been times where we have had above average tonnage, and we are conservative when we set our budgets so there has been some money in reserve and we have been utilizing it to some extent. Mork said she was trying to understand the difference between option 1 and 3 because she did not see option 2 as very useful and wanted to know if option 3 would be incentivizing people to separate their materials. Deller replied that he did not know the answer yet and will come back and let the committee know.

Trim shared that she really liked option 3 and believed that we should go higher than \$13.

Atwood was curious if we could provide any information about the \$200,000 annual for market development. Deller responded that last year, we put \$200,000 in the Re+ Grant program and there were several programs that received funds. There ended up being more than \$200,000 in grants awarded for those dealing with C&D. For example, Earthwise received two grants – one was given to help open up a new salvage location in King County and the other was to purchase some equipment to process lumber. They wanted to be able to deal with the finished lumber. Another example is Dave Bennick who received a grant to do more deconstruction work in the county. There are basic summary reports that we can get out to people.

Atwood wanted to know what the need was for new businesses and support for existing businesses. Deller answered that there is some need for new businesses, and we did a training for this earlier in the year. A couple of the businesses organized with Earthwise, and some partnered with Dave Benick. These are people who want to move forward but need additional help to figure out how everything works and how to get started. We are still providing assistance to existing businesses.

NERTS Draft EIS Update

Brady gave this update.

Brady introduced herself as the Community Engagement lead for the Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station project (NERTS). She provided an updated on the project and the SEPA process. We crossed a major milestone for the project and issued the draft Environmental Impact Statement for public comment.

As a reminder of the purpose of this project, our current Houghton Transfer Station was built in the 1960s and has outlived its useful life. We worked with our regional partners to develop 2019 solid Waste Division Comprehensive Plan and outlined the need for a new transfer station in the northeast county. Enacted in 1971, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) is a law that requires state and local agencies to identify the potential environmental impacts of proposed actions and plans through a formal review process. When potentially significant impacts are anticipated, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required.

Environmental impacts to be analyzed could include such things as noise, odor, surface water, wildlife, human health, transportation, and others relevant to the specific project and location. The SEPA review process is designed to help agency decision-makers and the public understand how a proposed action will affect the environment.

In July 2022, King County announced three alternatives and a no action alternative. Scoping for the EIS began in late 2022 and concluded in early 2023. During that period, we invited community members, Tribes, and public agencies to comment on the range of alternatives, areas to study and possible mitigation measures.

In Q1 2023, we made the decision to remove the Houghton Park and ride as an alternative and initiated a second scoping period and public comment period to receive feedback. We recognize that the people living in these communities know their community best and want to hear their feedback.

Over the last year, the project team has been performing a technical analysis on the two action alternatives and a no action alternative. The two action alternatives are:

- The current Houghton Transfer station property in Kirkland
- A site comprised of six properties in Woodinville off of Woodinville-Redmond Road (SR 202)

The no action alternative is the current Houghton transfer station and assumes that no action is taken and nothing changes.

As previously mentioned, the draft EIS was issued for formal public comment on Wednesday, Feb. 7. That comment period will be open until April 9 and public hearings will be held in March. Our final Siting Advisory group meeting will be held on Feb. 21.

A hard copy DEIS can also be viewed at locations in King County:

- King Street Center: 201 S. Jackson St., Ste. 5701, Seattle
- King County Library System, Bothell: 18215 98th Ave. NE, Bothell
- King County Library System, Kirkland: 308 Kirkland Ave., Kirkland

- Kirkland City Hall: 123 5th Ave. Kirkland
- King County Library System, Redmond: 15990 NE 85th St. Redmond
- King County Library System, Sammamish: 825 228th Ave. SE, Sammamish
- King County Library System, Woodinville: 17105 Avondale Rd. NE, Woodinville
- Woodinville City Hall, 17301 133rd Ave. NE, Woodinville

As part of the public comment period, we will be holding three public hearings in March.

- The first public hearing will be in-person at Lake Washington High School on Wednesday, March 6.
- The second public hearing will be virtual via Zoom on Thursday, March 7. The zoom link is available on our project online open house.
- The third public hearing will be in-person at Woodinville High School on Wednesday, March 13.

There are several ways to comment on the Draft EIS.

1. Interested parties can visit our [online open house](#) that will be available for the duration of the public comment period. The online open house provides information about the project, the SEPA/EIS process, and the ability to make a comment through our online portal.
2. Comments can also be submitted via email at northeast@kingcounty.gov.
3. At our public hearings, a court reporter will be in attendance for dictated comments. Our in-person public hearings will have comment cards for handwritten comments.
4. We accept comments submitted through the mail.

The final EIS will be issued 3rd quarter of 2024, and a final site decision will follow in the 4th quarter of 2024. After a site is selected, the project team will move towards preliminary design efforts in late 2024. We will convene a Design Advisory Committee at this time.

Louie asked if one of the things the EIS studies is a no-action alternative. Brady responded that the study of the no-action alternative is a required part of SEPA. Often, the impacts are greater because there are no updated technologies that reduce air, emissions, noise, etc.

Weiker asked how we are engaging with Kirkland and Woodinville. Brady replied that we meet with the cities once a month and walk them through where the project is at because we are in the middle of the process. We maintain continuous communication and have a subcommittee with each of the city groups and all of the cities in the study area to ensure that we are providing them materials to engage with their community. Our government relations group also has conversations with them.

Landfill Regulation

Thurlow presented on this topic.

KCSWD provides transfer and disposal services for over 800k tons of municipal solid waste each year. The division is subject to many environmental regulations and permits administered by local, state, and federal agencies to protect human health and the environment.

The regulations and permits address:

- Operation of transfer stations, one active landfill, and closed landfill maintenance
- Air quality
- Groundwater quality
- Surface water quality
- Industrial wastewater pretreatment

- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Spill prevention and cleanup
- Dangerous waste management
- And many other actions/systems that contribute to protection of human health and the environment

One of the programs that we have to have in place to comply with these regulations is the Title V Air Operating Program at Cedar Hills.

Requirements specified in:

- Title V Air Operating Permit
 - Issued in 2023 by Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
 - Consolidates applicable local, state, and federal requirements into one air permit
- Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Permit
 - Issued in 2019 (with annual addenda) by Public Health – Seattle & King County with technical assistance from Ecology
 - Authorizes MSW disposal in accordance with WA State Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills and King County Board of Health Solid Waste Regulations
- Administrative Order
 - Issued in 2023 by Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
 - Requires evaluation of arsenic emissions from Cedar Hills

Air programs at Cedar Hills encompass:

- Landfill gas collection & conveyance of gas. There are two possible treatment mechanisms:
 - Collected on site and routed to the North Flare Station
 - Landfill gas-to-energy plant for conversion to pipeline quality natural gas
- Landfill gas fugitive emissions control has oversight of our dust and odor control, as well as provides us with guidelines and requirements for emissions sources
 - We are responsible for staying in compliance with stationary and portable emissions sources such as the fuel station and generators
- Operation and maintenance of systems listed above
- We are required to operate and maintain the systems listed above
- We need to have a compliant response program and have to take corrective actions as needed
- We have robust monitoring, record keeping and reporting requirements and report on greenhouse gases that are mandated on local, state, and federal levels

Air Program Stats (2023 data)

- 31k+ gas well inspections (visual + monitoring) at ~900 gas wellheads
- 3,600+ neighborhood odor checks
- 1,800+ landfill odor checks
- ~150 miles traversed during quarterly SEM
 - 112,881 methane readings during SEM

New Washington Administrative Code WAC: Landfill Methane Emissions

- In 2022, WA State legislature passed House Bill 1663 directing Ecology to establish landfill methane regulations informed by similar regulations promulgated in CA, OR, and by the EPA
- Ecology published draft rule (Chapter 173-408 WAC) and accepted public comment in Q4 2023
- Ecology intends to finalize and adopt Chapter 173-408 WAC in spring 2024
- The purpose of 173-408 is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from landfills in WA by:

- Expanding the number of landfills required to install gas collection and control systems
 - Based on several factors such as age, size, type of landfill, and calculated “heat input capacity”
- Applying additional requirements at landfills already equipped with gas collection and control systems
- Actual impact of new rule on King County unclear until final rule is issued
- New requirements will add to – **not take the place of** – existing requirements
- As proposed, high-level impacts anticipated include:
 - Zero (?) closed landfills in King County will require new gas collection and control systems
 - Cedar Hills already subject to substantively similar federal requirements
 - Draft rule aligns more closely with CA regulations than EPA regulations, which creates small but significant differences between existing requirements and proposed new requirements.

The methane emissions rule states that the Washington State DO proposed regulation intended to reduce methane emissions from landfills. This is based on Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements and rules adopted by California & Oregon. Under the current version, only King County’s Cedar Hill’s Regional Landfill will be impacted. If approved, it will affect King County’s Title IV air permit that was issued by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA).

As currently proposed, the methane emissions rule will:

- Not replace similar requirements in current federal regulations
- Replace provisions that are mostly similar to existing federal regulations
- Increase spacing requirements for emissions monitoring
 - Under existing requirements, we are required to report at greater than 500 parts per million for emissions. At Cedar Hills, we report out and correct out at 100 parts per million.
- Requires reporting within two days of corrective action taken as a result of individual exceedance
 - Our turnaround is corrective actions by the end of the month. Under the proposed requirement, we would have two days of reporting requirements following completion. This would require an administrative increase.

The proposed rule summary changes require increased monitoring and reporting of methane emissions. Right now, we quarterly walk the landfill at a 30-meter interval and the states proposed rule would reduce that to a 25-foot interval. This means that there would be an increase in staffing needs to be in compliance with this rule. Cedar Hills a combination of enclosed and open flares and serve different purposes and pose different challenges in evaluating and demonstrating destruction efficiency of landfill gas. The proposed rule would eliminate the option of using open flares.

There are no changes to the current infrastructure and repair, and maintenance costs are expected to increase. The Cedar Hills active landfill has a very complex system, and we are doing everything we can to meet our requirements.

The next steps will be:

- Ecology will review the comments and make a final decision
- New rule approval estimated in Spring 2024

Trim hoped that we would have mentioned our drone monitoring since the county has done some exploratory monitoring. She would like that to be a part of our regular monitoring so we can find things that we might not see when we are doing our walks and asked for an update. Trim also asked for comment on the partnership with BEW. Thurlow responded that last year we conducted a study and took all of the technologies available to measure emissions and narrowed it down to four that we wanted to look at and then two that we did pilots on. One of the pilots was the drone monitoring and the other pilot was a more stationary technology on the landfill. Each has their pros and cons and we have not yet decided on which option we will be going forward with. Under our EPA requirements, there is only one drone company that is approved for emissions reporting requirements. This is proprietary and we would not be able to fly the drones ourselves. We are purchasing a drone and will be implementing our own drone program later this year. McLaughlin replied to the BEW question saying that he is happy to connect with Trim on the status of BEW.

Weiker asked Ockerlander to set up a tour of the landfill for newer members and other regional players that want to see how the transfer stations play into the landfill. It is fascinating and useful to see this information.

Debris Management Plan

Mineo presented on this topic.

Debris is scattered items or materials either broken or misplaced by a disaster. The types of disaster debris include:

- Vegetative
- Construction & Demolition
- Personal property/household
- Hazardous waste
- Household hazardous waste
- White goods/appliances
- Soil/ mud and sand
- Vehicles & vessels
- Electronic waste
- Putrescent waste

Why plan for debris management?

- To protect human health, reduce injuries, minimize or prevent environmental impacts, and comply with regulations
- Debris management costs account for about 27% of total disaster costs regulations
- Every 1 million cubic yards of debris dumped at the landfill lessens the lifespan of the landfill by one year
- Often overwhelms local capacities
- Communities with debris management plans:
 - Remove more cubic yards per day
 - Recycle almost twice as much of their debris than counties without plans
 - Receive 3.5 times more FEMA Public Assistance than communities without plans

King County Hazards:

- Natural
 - Avalanche
 - Earthquake
 - Tsunami
 - Volcano/lahar
 - Landslide
 - Wildfire
 - Flood
 - Severe weather
- Human-Caused
 - Hazardous materials
 - Health incident
 - Terrorism
 - Civil disturbance
 - Cyber incident

- Dam failure

Planning efforts started in 2023 and SWD is the lead in the King County Code 10.08.020 - System Disposal. The two components of this are:

- Regional base plan
 - Supports county agencies, cities, tribes, and special purpose districts within King County during large-scale incidents
 - Provides guidance to prepare for a respond to a large-scale disaster debris-causing incident, with the goal of preventing health problems, protecting lives and property, and reducing environmental harm
 - Describes how the County and its regional partners will collect debris, sort it, and transfer to its final disposition location
- Jurisdiction annexes
 - Support specific jurisdictions during smaller scale incidents that might not warrant the need to activate the larger regional base plan
 - Operational plans that include the same planning elements as the base plan

We've been in collaboration with regional planning partners. In early 2023, there were nine initial engagement presentations to inform planning partners of the regional planning initiative and encourage their participation. The engagement presentations were accompanied by follow-up emails to notify those not able to attend the meetings. The nine presentations were:

- Quarterly Emergency Managers
- MSWAC
- SWAC
- Emergency Management Advisory Committee
- Emergency Management Coordination Committee
- KCOEM Regional Coordination Call
- Various internal SWD forums

Throughout the process, more than 50 meetings with planning partners occurred to gather and document information.

We've maintained constant communication with Regional Planning partners via:

- Periodic newsletters sent via GovDelivery
 - Share status updates
 - Provide data/information for jurisdiction annexes
 - Seek feedback from partners
- Microsoft Teams as a collaborative platform
 - Allows partners to access past newsletters, meeting materials, sample plan documents, the annex template, post questions, etc.
- Email/phone

A high-level overview of the plan components include:

1. Debris management overview
2. Incidents and assumptions
3. Debris collection and removal
4. Temporary debris management sites and disposal locations
5. Debris removal from private property
6. Force account labor and contracted resources and procurement
7. Monitoring of debris operations
8. Health and safety

9. Regulatory requirements
10. Public information

A preliminary draft plan will be shared with planning partners soon. Partners will be notified via email when it is available and will have about three weeks to review and provide feedback. We will be using the King County Tool to receive feedback and aim to finalize the plan by mid-2024. Afterwards, there will be technical assistance to the jurisdictions to complete their annexes and training and exercising.

State Legislative Update

Scholes and Tan provided this update.

The 2024 legislative session started on Jan. 8 and goes until March 7. This is a shorter session of 60 days. The legislative bills that we have been following is wittling down.

There are several bills that we are still following this session:

- HB 2301 - Organics Management Pt. II
- HB 1185 - Mercury Light Bulbs
- HB 2401 – responsible Management of Refrigerant Gases
- HB 2069/SB 5919 - Biogenic Carbon Dioxide
- HB 2207 - Unlawful Solid Waste Dumping

On Tuesday, Feb. 13, bills had to make it out of their house of origin and these bills did not make it past. A lot of these came down to it being a shorter session.

- HB 2049 - ReWRAP Act. This is the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for packing and paper products
- HB 2144 - Deposit Return System for beverage containers
- HB 1900 – Improving Recycling
- HB 1933 – Right to Repair
- HB 1935 - State Green Schools Program
- SB 5844 - Recreational Vehicle Disposal Program

HB 2301 is part II of the Organics Management Law (HB 1799). It is sponsored by Rep. Dolio. This bill is aimed at reducing methane emissions coming from food and organic decompose in the landfill. There have been some changes from the original text:

1. Provide funding via grants for food waste prevention, food rescue, and organics collections and processing.
2. Require residential and multifamily food and yard waste collection. There are exceptions for some rural areas throughout the state. Most residents in King County would be impacted.
3. Bin color alignment. This would have a phased in approach.
4. Study non-compostable producer stickers. This is one of the biggest contaminants in compost cycle right now.
5. Study food donation by businesses

Light Recycle, launched in 2015, is the statewide EPR program for fluorescent tubes, compact fluorescent lights (CFLs) and high intensity discharge lights (HID)s from households and small quantity generators, and is due to sunset in 2025. This was carried over from the last legislative session and the scope is reduced. There was a public hearing and there is an Executive session planned for Feb. 22. There have been minor changes:

1. Limits the environmental handling fee paid by consumers. We call it EPR, but it is more extended consumer responsibility.
2. Ban most mercury-containing lights by Jan. 1, 2029.

3. Extends the existing product stewardship program for mercury-containing light. The lights already installed will have a collection system when they come to their end of life.

HB 2401 regards the Responsible Management of Refrigerant Gases. Refrigerants are potent greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming. The fluids need to be properly collected and managed to ensure that they are not released into the atmosphere. This bill would:

- Require producers of certain bulk refrigerants and pre-charged equipment such as fridges, freezers and heat pumps to participate in, fund, and implement a refrigerants stewardship program
- Provide financial incentive payment for the recovery of refrigerants

Some other bills that we are still tracking are:

- HB 2207 - Unlawful Solid Waste Dumping. This bill focuses on the type of penalties which can be used to fund clean-up.
- SB 5376 Allowing the sale of cannabis waste

Weiker asked when this legislative session is done. Tan replied March 7.

Lam shared that based on her understanding of the ReWRAP Act, there was a challenge to get it passed last year due to it being combined with the bottle bill and did not understand what the issue was this year as the bottle bill was separated from the ReWRAP Act. Tan answered that it is a complex bill and there would be a lot of change to recycling and the waste industry would like to see things move slower. There were also some other concerns, AMERIPEN (representing major brands and the packaging industry) were in support of the EPR program but not all producers were. A lot of the challenge this year was because it was a short session and other priorities took over.

Lam followed up saying that she thought this was our highest priority. Scholes replied that this bill was our highest priority, but it was competing against other things like housing, which is where the timing and short session came into play.

Atwood wanted to know if there are plans for the division to do further exploration of why this bill didn't move on. This is not the first or second time that this bill has gone to the legislature.

Trim stated that the problem is that this bill is political and is hard to discuss. Atwood said that it gets tiresome that we have to keep that we can't go there and that it would be nice if players could be honest. Trim asked Atwood if she was on Zero Waste Washington's mailing list. Sometimes it is easier to have these discussions separately. Weiker said that maybe there could be a discussion with stakeholders. Tan added that he wanted to remind everyone that it took eight years for PaintCare to pass. We are still working with the Northwest Product Stewardship Council, and we will be doing a debrief.

Ockerlander said that she was in Olympia working with our lobbyists and the tone has changed significantly from last year to this year. The knowledge base has dramatically increased and with a complex bill like this, it shows huge progress that it came as close as it did to a floor vote. She believed that if there was another week or two, the bill would have gotten out of the house. There was a lot of progress made, just not necessarily on our priority bill. There is a lot to be excited about like the Organics Management part II bill. Tan chimed in that it was very helpful that the Governor was in support of it.

Member Comment

No member comment.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

DRAFT