

**SWAC Advisory Committee Meeting**  
 May 17, 2024 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.  
 Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

| <b><u>SWAC Members Present</u></b>               |  | <b><u>King County Staff</u></b>                    |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| April Atwood, Marketing and Education            |  | Eberley Barragan, SWD staff                        |  |
| Jay Blazey, Manufacturer                         |  | Kris, Beatty, SWD staff                            |  |
| James Borsum, Labor Representative               |  | Nat Bennett, DNRP staff                            |  |
| Amy Lam, Local Elected Official                  |  | Sylvaine Bucher, SWD staff                         |  |
| Brett Lohrman, Labor Representative              |  | Nori Catabay, SWD staff                            |  |
| Bill Louie, Citizen Representative               |  | Jerome Cruz, Public Health – Seattle & King County |  |
| Leah Tischler, Public Interest Group             |  | Kinley Deller, SWD staff                           |  |
| Heather Trim, Recycling Industry                 |  | Bonnie Fluckinger, King County PSB                 |  |
| Wendy Weiker, Chair, Waste Industry              |  | Brian Halverson, SWD staff                         |  |
|  |  | Lindy Honaker, SWD staff                           |  |
|  |  | Katie Jones, SWD staff                             |  |
|  |  | Patty Liu, SWD staff                               |  |
|  |  | Laila McClinton, SWD staff                         |  |
|  |  | Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director                       |  |
|  |  | Amy Ockerlander, SWD staff                         |  |
|  |  | Andy Smith, SWD staff                              |  |
|  |  | Chris Stubbs, Deputy Director                      |  |
|  |  | John Taylor, DNRP Director                         |  |
|  |  | Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff                       |  |
|  |  | John Walsh, SWD staff                              |  |
| <b><u>Guests</u></b>                             |  |  |  |
| Alissa Campbell, Recology                        |  | Andi Parnell, Sound Cities Association             |  |
| Katie Jerauld, Department of Ecology             |  | Tyler Pichette, Pacific Public Affairs             |  |
| Brad Lovaas, WA Refuse and Recycling Association |  | Rich Vahl, Waste Connections                       |  |
| Madhuri --                                       |  |  |  |

**Call to Order and Introductions**

After introductions, Chair Weiker called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

**Meeting Minutes**

Louie moved to approve the February minutes. Atwood seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**Public Comment**

Jerauld introduced herself as a new member of Ecology’s Solid Waste team and shared that she will be taking over from Wadley in terms of providing these updates. She began by touching on the five-in-one flyer about various laws that will largely impact food service businesses that was shared last month. 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 trackers on plastic bags that were placed at Targets and Walmart's across the nation – none 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](#).

### **SWD Updates**

Subbs 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.

Weiker asked for more information on what the difference is between the interim and the permanent facilities. Stubbs responded that some of the maintenance facilities need to be moved to develop Area 9, so the permanent facilities would be constructed elsewhere, and interim facilities would take their place.

### **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**

Two weeks ago, the posting for the Government Relations Administrator in the Government Relations and Community Engagement group went live. Please share with your networks.

### **NEW DOE Landfill Emissions Rule and Implementation**

This week, the Department of Ecology (DOE) approved a new rule to reduce landfill emissions in Washington State. The new rule is part of a suite of actions being taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 95% below 1990 levels by 2050.

For SWD, this means a significant increase in reporting requirements for the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill. Our FESS and Ops sections are working together to plan for implementation when the rule takes affect this June. Methane is the second largest contributor to climate change (after CO2), with landfills being a significant source of methane emissions. Organic materials are one of the most potent contributors of methane within solid waste - many of the policy goals of the Re+ program which includes reducing or eliminating organic waste from the landfill altogether.

### **SCRTS Certified as Salmon Safe**

We have late breaking news, Lydig construction and the South County and Recycling Transfer Station (SCRTS) project just received word late this week that they have been certified as “salmon-safe”.

This is a big achievement and a strong testament to King County and the Solid Waste Divisions commitment to environmental excellence in all our operations. A huge congratulations to the team!

Atwood said that at the last meeting, Trim requested that the subcommittee notes be shared to SWAC. Ockerlander replied that all of SWAC has been sent information on how to sign up for the County extranet and the minutes are located on there. After you put in the application for the extranet, you will be granted access to the site.

### **MSWAC Update**

No updates.

Taylor introduced himself as the new Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP). Prior to his new role, he was the Deputy Director of the Water and Land Resources Division in DNRP for five years and then served as the inaugural Director of the Department of Local Services for five years until this year when he became the Director of DNRP. Taylor has focused on many different areas of public policy and has a master's in public administration from the University of Vermont. He spent several years working for the city manager of Montpelier, VT and then spent time in the Vermont Governor's office doing policy work – a lot environmental, transportation, housing, and economic development work.

After moving to Washington in 2001, he worked for the City of Seattle Council and then for Seattle Public Utilities. In these roles, he did a lot of environmental work. He spent some time as a consultant and then spent five years working for a startup garbage company called Cleanscape, which won about half of Seattle from Allied Garbage Service – now Republic Services. The company was eventually bought by Recology and Taylor moved over to King County. Taylor shared that he has a lot of experience with the solid waste industry and has a great interest in it, as well as the other areas in DNRP.

Taylor is very interested in the work that SWAC is doing and views all of the regional and labor partners as people we want to be working with. We can't do this without the support of the cities and labor partners. Many people will see over time that Taylor errs on the side of transparency and does not like the dynamic of developing something behind closed doors and then springing it on partners. For example, we will share whatever information members want regarding long-term disposal (LTD). The reality of LTD is that if we can't get the cities to support the policy choice, it is not the right policy choice because the cities are our customers.

He will be very focused on trying to keep the rates down and owned that the delay of the permanent facility work is being mostly driven by Taylor. To Taylor, it does not make sense knock down a facility at the landfill and then rebuild a facility at the landfill when we are probably going to close the landfill in 10-15 years. He asked SWD to go back to the drawing board and come up with a more cost-effective solution. The problem with this is that it drives a lot of costs and a lot of what drives our rates is our capital programs. We need to think about what we need and not what we want. As well as how we get the job done at the least cost for the ratepayer because we will have a big problem if ratepayers get fed up with the rates and don't want to be apart of the system anymore.

Taylor will be attending all of the meetings on LTD and will be very involved in the choice making and wants to make it as open and transparent as possible so everyone can understand what the options are. There has been some really great work done and we are working the Parametrics and are asking questions because some of the alternatives and costs don't make sense intuitively. With analyses like this, the assumptions and inputs drive the outputs. If you don't

understand the inputs from the consultants, you won't understand the outputs, nor will they make sense; and policy choices won't be made on good information.

The committee should expect to see Taylor around more often because he will have a firm hand on SWD as it is an area of great interest for him. If we don't get decisions around LTD, we will have a real problem because whatever it is will take a long time to ramp up for it and we need to get going.

If you want to chat with Taylor, please reach him at [John.Taylor@kingcounty.gov](mailto:John.Taylor@kingcounty.gov). His door is always open.

Weiker asked for clarification on the other three divisions that Taylor is overseeing. Taylor responded that there are four divisions within DNRP:

- The Solid Waste Division (SWD)
- The Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) – runs the three large regional wastewater treatment plants and two small ones (Carnation and Vashon Island.)
- The Parks Division (Parks) – manages a large portfolio of land and all of DNRP's acquisitions. We are always working on acquiring and preserving more open space.
- The Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD) – manages a lot of the lands, does salmon restoration work, runs the agriculture program, the forestry program, the environmental labs and the research vessels. We have a research vessel called the "SoundGuardian" that does a lot of water quality monitoring out in the Puget Sound for the wastewater treatment plants that discharge to the Puget Sound.

There are about 2,000 employees and there is a \$3.5 billion budget with a lot of it tied to capital – SWD and WTD are the two big capital programs.

### **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. You'll be able to see the conversations and get a more in-depth version of this presentation.

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)
  - Said that more study was needed.
- 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 completed (Arcadis Study). This was a one-to-one comparison, and there were some concerns on assumptions made by Arcadis e.g. cost and emissions.

For example - to determine export costs, they used an average from several providers but if they would have used the Seattle rail contract (like we did in the 2019 Comp Plan), then the costs would have been lower. This shows that the assumptions you make can change the results of the analysis.

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
  - We need to make this decision because 2040 is quickly approaching and we want to lock in the decision

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 LTD 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

The full review criteria crosswalk table can be found on the extranet.

We received questions from cities about the social impact. For this, 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 (King County specific) or on 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.
  - This has changed – there is minimal enforcement and assumes people are complying with the law.
- 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.
  - This means that any material with economic value is diverted from the stream.

The takeaway we heard 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. All of this information is on the extranet.

The draft comparative analysis is on the extranet. We've added questions and comments and encourage input from the advisory committees. We will be sending it back to Tetra Tech at the end of the month. The next subcommittee meeting will be on May 20.

Trim said that Zero Waste Washington will oppose anything that is waste-to-energy because we need to be recycling materials and not burning them. She asked for more clarification on the May 20 workshop. Weiker asked if the meeting was public or if the committee can get the notes from the extranet. Ockerlander said she would check with the Chair and Vice Chair because they wanted to keep the meeting small. Trim added that she strongly objects to this or SWAC needs to have their own meeting because she is not ok with the lack of transparency. Ockerlander stated that this was a MSWAC Driven group and not SWD driven.

Taylor chimed in saying that we will meet on this topic. He said he is not in a position to counter anything that MSWAC has had but is for the idea of people being flies on the wall if possible. We will do some internal work and figure this out. It does not make sense to create more subcommittees on this and Taylor is all for transparency.

Weiker pointed to the extranet where there will be robust notes and a recording of the meeting. And any records will be made public per public records laws. SWD will meet on this and come back with more information. She also does not think that a secondary subcommittee would be helpful and maybe there's a way the subcommittees could be combined. If you have any comments on this topic, send them to Ockerlander.

Trim followed up saying that the meeting is quickly approaching and hoped that she could attend and listen in because she doesn't want to listen to a recording.

### **2025 Rates - Recommendation**

Honaker gave this recommendation.

We briefed the Executive earlier this month and will be sharing our updated rate projection.

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. One of the main tactics we have is to lower our rate stabilization balance. The rate stabilization reserve is our flexible pot of money to smooth down the rate. This just means that we wouldn't have anything left in the rate stabilization reserve at the end of the projected timeline. The way we've been able to drop this, mainly, is by the permanent facility implementation shift to 2028. In previous report outs, we had a lot happening in 2025 which was causing a huge spike. This delay 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.

Now we will have two successive waves rather than one giant spike.

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 93c per month. 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.

The fixed annual charge (FAC) will be \$23,337,885. The draft 2025 allocation table will be shared at the end of May. We need the cities and haulers to review and provide feedback by the end of June.

- 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)

Weiker asked if SWD could send a separate email to SWAC staff and an email to haulers to make sure that everyone has this information. Honaker answered that we will send this information out and will also be sending out the information on our office sessions. Weiker added that when in doubt, over communicate.

We briefed the Executive on the construction and demolition (C&D) fee and the committee recommendation is \$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

The draft letter of support has been sent to members.

Lam was curious about the various costs to jurisdictions. Even within Republic, the costs are varied and she wanted some information on the factors that cause the variances. Weiker said the number one factor for cost variance is the age of the



contract. The older contracts tend to be the least expensive ones. Also, there are three different haulers doing the bids and there is the UTC's different disposal component which is where the rate conversation is impacted. This is why the FAC was such a challenge and an opportunity.

Weiker complemented SWD for bringing the rate increase from 12% to 10% and said she is happy to have this conversation with Lam offline. The disposal rates can change every year based on SWD and SWD can update them every year while haulers can only update the rates when the contracts are updated.

Honaker added that the UTC charges all of their customers separately for recycling and organics - most of the cities embed recycling and many embed organics which means that they have one cost versus the UTC where every item is charged separately. Some cities, like Renton and Kirkland, do things differently and pay the hauler directly and use their own rate model to distribute the costs to customers.

Weiker said that maybe we could put together something like a Rate 101 session at a future SWAC.

Walsh wanted to check in on the see support letter and see what the plan is.

Weiker said that herself and Louie will be signing the letter on behalf of the committee. She added that they know rates are challenging and that people don't think it should cost as much, but infrastructure proves otherwise - especially as we look into long term planning.

The letter was shared, and the committee went over the edits.

The committee had no additional edits.

Weiker asked for consensus of the letter. The letter was approved with the already existing edits.

### **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 mattresses and asbestos.

Barragan added asbestos, propane tanks, and biomedical sharps. Mattresses take up air space and create a lot shifting at the landfill. We are authorized by a King County code to codify these policies with the Waste Acceptance Rule. It has been updated five times – the last in 2017. It contains 48 separate parts like burning materials and hazardous waste.

There are items that we accept under limited conditions like tires in limited quantities. People can apply for a waste clearance disposals permit to dispose of some types of waste like dead animals less than 15 lbs.

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 sources of arsenic at the landfill (like contaminated soil and types of food like rice and apples) and cannabis waste. Also, the current version has a lot of ambiguous legal language. We are proposing a cannabis waste policy where people can bring plants rendered unusable by

Ecology in plastic bags.

Some new/updated policies include lead paint debris, safes and radioactive waste.

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

### **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 – Jul 2024
- Council review and action – Sep 2024
- Provide training – Q1 2025

If your jurisdiction would look support in completing your annex, please email your responses to [kajones@kingcounty.gov](mailto: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

Weiker asked if there was a deadline in which jurisdictions need to sign up for the plan. Jones answered that there is no code requirement, so it is all based on the process that King County decides. Long story short, there is no deadline that the jurisdictions need to meet and can up on the annex.

**Member Comment**

No member comment.

**Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 11:08 a.m.