

SWAC Advisory Committee Meeting
 Sept. 20, 2024 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
 Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

SWAC Members Present		King County Staff	
April Atwood, Marketing and Education		Eyasu Ayalew, Public Health – Seattle & King County	
Jay Blazey, Manufacturer		Ali Blum, SWD staff	
James Borsum, Labor Representative		David Bayne, Hazardous Waste staff	
Robin Freedman, Waste Industry		Sylvaine Bucher, SWD staff	
Amy Lam, Local Elected Official		Bonnie Fluckinger, King County PSB	
Bill Louie, Citizen Representative		Erin Hislop, SWD staff	
Laura Mork, local elected official		Wen Huang, SWD staff	
Heather Trim, Recycling Industry		Christine Kim, SWD staff	
Wendy Weiker, Chair, Waste Industry		Patty Liu, SWD staff	
		Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director	
		Nina Olivier, SWD staff	
		David Pierce SWD staff	
		Hannah Scholes, SWD staff	
		Andy Smith, SWD staff	
		Adrian Tan, SWD staff	
		Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff	
		John Walsh, SWD staff	
Guests			
Alissa Campbell, Recology		Katie Jerauld, Dept. of Ecology	
Erin Gagnon, DTG Recycle		Brad Lovaas, WA Refuse and Recycling Association	
Mark Gingrich, Waste Connections		Andi Parnell, Sound Cities Association	
Jeanette Jurgensen, Bin There Consulting		Rich Vahl, Waste Connections	

Call to Order and Introductions

After introductions, Chair Weiker called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

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

Public Comment

Jerauld began by sharing that there are three new grants that may be of interest for members. Ecology is working to improve air quality in Washington communities that are historically overburdened with health, social, and environmental inequities and are highly impacted by criteria air pollution. Ecology will be launching a \$10M grant program that will be open to organizations serving overburdened communities and Tribes participating in Ecology’s initiative to improve air quality in overburdened communities. The grant application period is open Aug. 29, 2024-Oct. 24, 2024. For information, visit [this website](#).

The second grant is [Ecology’s Landfill Methane Emissions Reduction Grant](#) and that will be used to help landfill owners and operators pay for expenses associated with complying with a new [Landfills-Methane-Emissions law](#). There will be \$9.6M in funding available and applications are open through Oct. 1. For future updates, please join the [email list](#).

The third grant is the Waste Not Washington School Awards. The Waste Not Washington School Award promote sustainability and reward school efforts to reduce waste, recycle, and teach environmental curriculum. A budget of \$100,000 per year is available; and each award provides up to \$5,000. A new Organics Management Law passed in 2024 that increases the max award for a single school to \$10,000 starting on Jan. 1, 2026. Application for 2024 funding awards are open from Aug. 1 until 5 p.m. on Oct. 31, 2024. Applicant must be a teacher or a staff member of a K-12 public, private, tribal school or school district applying on behalf of a school or classroom. For more information on eligibility and how to apply, please [visit here](#).

Lastly, Ecology has a new resource page for the counties and cities in Washington that must adopt the Compost Procurement Ordinance (CPO) and submit an annual report on their compost procurement activities as required by the [Organics Management Laws](#). CPOs are a tool for cities, towns, and counties to look for opportunities to buy compost products and use it in their projects. In the future, this will hold the [reporting form](#) that can be utilized. If you want to help test the reporting form in autumn 2024, please contact Michelle.Andrews@ecy.wa.gov.

SWD Updates

McLaughlin provided the SWD update.

Tonnage Update

Tonnage is up 1.44% through July (500K tons) compared to last year at the same time. Transactions have rebounded from a slow January and are now flat compared to last year.

Construction Updates

SWD is undertaking work to replace crane equipment at the Algona Transfer Station and Houghton Transfer Station. We plan to open to commercial haulers at Algona on Oct. 28. The anticipated construction period at Houghton is from Nov. 4 through Dec. 30.

The delays are to ensure the safety of the Operators by implementing modifications to stiffen up the crane bridge. The modifications require additional procurement of steel material, concrete pouring, concrete curing time, welding, installation of steel, touch-up paint, and additional inspections. This extra work was not anticipated, but it is essential to maintain safe working conditions. We are taking our experience from the Algona project to apply to Houghton. We are also conducting a full site evaluation at Houghton to minimize the risk of additional schedule changes.

We have been working internally to evaluate options to support haulers in minimizing business disruptions during the construction at Houghton. We will have more information available in the coming week. Unfortunately, we are not able to extend operating hours at Enumclaw during the last period of construction at Algona. There are multiple challenges, the most significant being the requirement for a 30-day public notice period followed by 10 days for public comments before any changes to our transfer station operating hours can be made. We are able to provide commercial haulers exclusive time at the last three hours of the day.

We are also working with Snohomish County to have a temporary flow control waiver. More information is needed to hash this out. We will be publishing a public notice that announces these changes. We will file it on Monday, Sept.22 and will go into effect 40 days after this. We will keep everyone updated.

Opportunities for LTD Engagement

SWD held its 4th Long Term Disposal Subgroup Meeting on Aug. 26. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss comments and concerns about the long-term disposal study and review information about mass burn and waste export by rail. As a reminder, meeting materials and recordings are available on the LTD Extranet. We appreciate the involvement of everyone.

SWD sent invites for an Open House to provide ILA partners and Advisory Committee members an opportunity to learn what has been accomplished through the LTD study to date, ask questions and provide feedback, and be aware of upcoming opportunities to learn more and provide input.

There will be two virtual Open House options, that cover the same content.

- **Open House option #1**
Monday, Sept. 30 from 5:30-7:30 p.m.
- **Open House option #2**
Wednesday, Oct. 9 from 9-11 a.m.

2025 Rate Update

SWD prepared a final version of the fixed annual charge allocation table that incorporates the feedback received from cities and haulers in July and August and sent it to cities for their review. We are preparing to send out a formal notification about the rate increases to cities and commercial haulers.

CHRL Community Meeting and Public Landfill Tour this Fall

As part of our commitment to ongoing communication with households living near CHRL, we hosted an in-person meeting on Wednesday, Sept. 18, for the public to learn and ask questions about what's going on at CHRL, including current and planned construction projects, environmental monitoring activities, and operational activities.

SWD is also hosting a Public Tour of the Landfill so that the public can see our efforts to manage waste and protect the environment in action. Tour details:

- Saturday, Oct. 5, 9-10:30 a.m. at Cedar Hills Regional Landfill

We shared this information via direct mailing of 4,000 postcards, email notifications, and notices on our website.

Transfer Station Signage Pilot

Next month, SWD will unveil new signage at the Bow Lake Transfer Station. The new signage is a massive improvement that will improve safety and customer wayfinding. It also improves accessibility through visual communication and translations. This is a pilot effort and the first step in creating a more unified customer experience at all our transfer stations.

The designs were based on insight from staff at the Bow Lake facilities, who have a deep understanding of our customer base, issues, and what's needed to solve them. After getting feedback on the pilot period at Bow Lake, we will make tweaks and roll out the new signage in other transfer stations.

Glass Recycling Roundtable

As follow up to the first Glass Recycling Roundtable on Sept. 11, King County and Seattle Public Utilities are convening a second roundtable on Thursday, Sept. 26. The goal of these roundtables is to identify short-term solutions to ensure glass recycling in the region continues.

The four most pressing priority actions identified in the first meeting were creating a contingency plan, developing public messaging, end market development, and supporting finding adequate stockpile locations.

Thank you for your participation and collaboration on this important work.

Request for Haulers to Participate in Glass Study

SWD is conducting a study on glass composition and the quality of outbound glass from MRFs in King County to better understand the regional glass commodity market. This study isn't directly related to the temporary closure of the Ardagh facility.

SWD staff has reached out to haulers to request their participation. We hope haulers will participate so that the data can be used to support stronger market conditions for glass recycling in the region.

SCRTS Update

In July, the contractor discovered utilities running deep under the existing culvert on West Valley Hwy. That discovery led to the postponement of the new culvert installation. The team had been working with the utilities to get new lines in place so the old could be demolished at the new time of the culvert construction, late September, right up against the in-water-work window, or fish window.

We are assessing schedule and cost impacts. If the utilities stay with us this fall and make any necessary repairs, we should not see delays in substantial completion.

Trim wanted to know what the format will be for the LTD Open House. Liu answered that the open houses will be a high-level overview of the LTD process to date. There will also be discussions on why SWD removed three of the LTD options. Trim followed up asking if there will be a PowerPoint and a Q&A. Liu replied that there will be a PowerPoint led by the consultant.

Trim asked what contracts SWD has with unincorporated King County, and specifically, what cities and when they are up for renewal. McLaughlin responded that the county does not hold contracts with the cities for collection. Some cities in the UTC have contracts but for the county's unincorporated areas, the haulers hold G-certificates and it is the role of the county to reach a certain service level. Certain jurisdictions outside UTC-regulated areas have chosen not to establish their own contracts and instead fall under UTC service levels. These jurisdictions include Beaux Arts Village, Black Diamond, Hunts Points, Kenmore, Maple Valley, Medina, Woodinville and Yarrow Point.

Trim followed up asking if there's a formal contract that decides what and when material will be collected, and if there is a period where the county talks with haulers. McLaughlin replied that anytime we identify a need to modify services, we approach the haulers and the UTC to begin the process. The haulers can approach us too. Kim added that the tariffs have all the rates and that we work with the UTC to make sure that King County is working as one team.

Trim asked when the discussion occurs. Weiker replied that she and Freedman can take this conversation offline with Trim. This is a complicated process with the UTC oversight, and these conversations are constantly happening so there is no regular cadence. Freedman added that these contracts are not like a city contract. McLaughlin said that there is no restriction for when the city or haulers can request to modify their contracts.

Atwood asked for an update on the landfill gas situation at Cedar Hills Regional Landfill. McLaughlin stated that the BEW plant remains shut down and we are in litigation. We have a February court date and are hopeful that the date won't be necessary, but we are proceeding through the litigative process. There are pretrial decisions that will be made, and this can often bring the parties back together. In the meantime, we are following our required permit actions and flaring the gas. The BEW plan has been dark for over a year now and ultimately, we will get this gas back to a higher use.

MSWAC Update

No updates.

Disaster Debris Management Framework Support Letter

Blum showed the letter to the committee.

Trim moved to approve it.

Lam commented that the letter seemed vague and wanted to know what the framework included. McLaughlin replied that we can provide more specific highlighted benefits of what this plan provides.

Weiker thought this letter was support for the framework.

This item will be brought to the October meeting.

Chair/Vice Chair Elections

Blum stated that per the bylaws, elections must occur in September.

Blum asked for nominations and received nominations for Weiker for Chair re-election and Louie for Vice Chair re-election.

Louie motioned to re-elect Chair Weiker. Lam seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Weiker motioned to re-elect Vice Chair Louie. Mork seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Long-Term Disposal Decision Study

Liu and Walsh led this update.

Mass Burn Process

- There have been over 2,000 mass burn facilities all over the world – mainly in Asia. Most in the U.S. are on the East Coast because landfill space is limited, and tipping fees are high
 - Few on the West Coast – Spokane and Long Beach, CA (closed earlier this year)
- Can produce 700 kWh/ton of solid waste
- No pre-processing required
- Many proven facilities at size that can meet King County’s processing capacity
- Public has emission concerns even though environmental standards are very stringent. As shown, more than half of the facility is designed for pollution control and energy recovery.
- There’s a high energy recover potential
 - Steam, hot water, electricity, etc.
 - The use of this steam is questionable under CETA
- Removes metals for recycling
- Low residue (ash)
- Historically, communities have shown concern over this and can lead up to 10 years of processing

Waste Export by Rail (WEBR) Process

- Would export compacted mixed solid waste (MSW) in intermodal containers via railroad transportation to an out-of-county landfill.
- WEBR from Washington municipalities is well-established, having been utilized successfully since the 1990’s (City of Seattle, Snohomish County, Kitsap County, Thurston County, Skagit County).
- A specific location for the intermodal yard for the waste export option (as well as the other study disposal options) is not identified, rather a general area for assessing transport distances is being used.
- Freight rail and trucking complement each other for intermodal shipment, and freight rail’s role as a long-distance partner has enabled trucks to leverage their speed and agility for short hauls

Updated Mass Burn and WEBR Cost Assumptions

- Costs associated with emergency/catastrophic failure addresses
- WEBR Transport and disposal costs previously based on most recent contract bids. Update based on latest legacy contract rates for higher tonnage contracts.
 - \$60/ton (2023\$) for Medium and High Tonnage based on Snohomish at 700k+ TPY

- \$65/ton (2023\$) for Low Tonnage based on Kitsap and Thurston counties at 220,000 and 206,000 TPY, respectively.
- WEBR additional equipment costs included labor and transport costs from the mixed waste processing (MWP) facility to intermodal facility (IMF) assumed to be similar between all options.
- Mass Burn property acquisition at \$43.6 million for 25 acres.
- Mass Burn Electricity Revenue reduced to \$0.02/kWhr (2023\$) based on current rate for Spokane WTE facility discounted for potential interconnect costs and transmission costs for interstate sales (the energy can only be used out of the state)
- Mass Burn Ash WEBR Transport and Disposal rate of \$97/ton (2023\$) assumed based on input from Spokane WTE operator and existing WEBR contracts
 - Higher than what was expected
- Mass Burn Metals Recycling Rate reduced per average rate provided by Spokane WTE operator (\$40/ton).
- Cost projections performed for 2040 through 2060 assuming 30-year bond financing, 4% interest, 3.5% inflation rate.

Updated Mass Burn and WEBR Cost Comparison

Economic Subcriteria – Medium Tonnage (2040\$):

	WEBR	Mass Burn
Annualized Capital Costs	\$337,855	\$86,707,211
Annual Operating Costs	\$71,817,560	\$53,863,170
Annual Disposal Costs (Residuals)	\$0	\$23,221,011
Annual Electricity & Metal Recycling Revenue	\$0	(\$9,730,372)
Total Annual Costs^{1, 2}	\$72,155,415	\$154,061,020

¹ WEBR = Equipment + Rail Transport + Disposal Costs.

² Mass Burn = Annualized Capital + Operating Costs + Disposal Costs – Revenue.

Cost Per Ton Comparison Table – Medium Tonnage¹:

	WEBR (Med. Tonnage)	Mass Burn (Med. Tonnage)
Cost per Ton (2040\$)	\$108.19/ton	\$230.99/ton
Cost per Ton (2050\$)	\$152.52/ton	\$247.08/ton
Cost per Ton (2060\$)	\$215.06/ton	\$272.16/ton

¹ Mass Burn has flatter growth rate as the majority of costs are CAPEX which remain constant over 30-year debt service term. Other costs increase with assumed inflation rate.



- With these updates, mass burn is more expensive than WEBR. Mass burn has a higher cost upfront, but WEBR has higher costs as things progress.

Environmental Criteria Evaluation Results – Mid-Range Tonnage

Environmental Factor	Mass Burn	WEBR
Resource Conservation	Creates heat that can be used to generate electricity (to be used out of state)	Landfill gas is converted to electricity or renewable natural gas.
Compatibility with Waste Prevention and Recycling	Metals removed during pre-processing for recycling.	No pre-processing for removal of metals at the landfill.

^[1] This is only a benefit if markets to sell the electricity exist.

- The electricity produced from mass burn can't be used in the state of Washington due to CETA

Life Cycle Impacts and Offsets

- Process
 - Direct impacts of operating the facility, such as water use, fuel combusted onsite, air emissions, wastewater discharges, surface water discharges
 - Upstream impacts of external inputs needed to operate the facility:
 - Grid electricity production (including associated upstream impacts of fossil fuels used to generate electricity)
 - Fossil fuels extraction, transport, and refining
 - Extraction and production of other material inputs and energy sources
- Transport
 - Direct impacts of fossil fuel combustion
 - Upstream impacts of grid electricity production for EV's (including associated upstream impacts of fossil fuels used to generate electricity)
 - Extraction and production of other transportation inputs and energy source
- Offsets
 - Assumes that electricity and RNG sold by the facility will displace other energy generators (likely the highest cost generators). Both facilities sell energy.
 - Therefore, we offset (count as benefits) impacts avoided by reducing this product:
 - Grid electricity production including upstream impacts (e.g., extraction and refining) of fossil fuels used to generate electricity
 - Conventional natural gas production including upstream impacts (extraction and refining)
 - That is, other generators will reduce energy production by the amount WEBR/Mass Burn sell.
 - Mass Burn generates more energy than it consumes. Mass Burn reduces net fossil fuel demand while WEBR increases it.
- Total net impact = Process + transport – offsets

Energy Grid Mix

- Energy Grid Assumptions:
 - The EIA is the only source that provides data projected out to the dates we needed.
 - The EIA's most local projections are for the Pacific region, which includes WA, OR, CA, AK, and HI. Projections excluding AK and HI were not available.
 - To provide some localization, because WA has a high percentage of hydropower, we used the renewable vs. non-renewable split projected for the EIA Pacific region and re-allocated the renewable split following the percentages described in the Study Environmental Impact Factors and Assumptions (Study Memo 5).
 - The final percentages used in modeling are shown in the table on this slide.

Mass Burn generates more energy per ton of waste than WEBR

	High tonnage	Med tonnage	Low tonnage
WEBR: Putrescible tonnage percent in 1 ton	57%	51%	46%
Mass Burn: Putrescible plus plastic percent in 1 ton	72%	70%	63%
Energy per ton from Mass Burn versus WEBR assuming all electricity (no RNG)	11.6 times more	17.0 times more	12.6 times more

- In WEBR, only putrescibles (e.g., food, yard waste, wood, and paper) can decompose into methane, and some of the methane escapes before landfill capping.

- In Mass Burn, both plastics and putrescibles are converted into energy products, so more energy is generated from the same ton of waste.
- To provide a direct comparison of the two, the energy ratios on this slide assume all captured landfill gas is used to generate electricity and none is refined to RNG

Mass Burn vs. WEBR

- Mass Burn produces over 10 times the amount of energy as WEBR for a given ton of waste
 - More energy produced = Higher offset electricity amounts = More fossil fuel use avoided
- Fossil fuel impacts include releasing CO₂ (GHGs), NO_x and VOCs (smog), SO_x (acidification)
 - Impacts include upstream production of fossil fuels (extraction, transportation, refinement), in addition to direct impacts of combustion for energy
- Much higher energy offset amounts in Mass Burn = Better scores on most environmental criteria

Impacts: non-renewable (fossil fuel & nuclear energy) demand (energy production)

- Description: Measures fossil fuel (coal, natural gas, and oil) and nuclear energy from the point of extraction
- Comparison: Counting both energy inputs to process and transport and offsets from energy generated, WEBR increases nonrenewable energy demand while Mass Burn reduces it.
- Primary sources:
 - WEBR: direct use of fossil fuels and electricity in landfill operations and transport (minimal offsets from electricity sold to grid)
 - Mass Burn: use of fossil fuels and electricity during process; offsets from energy sold to the grid

Impacts: water consumption

- Description: Freshwater withdrawals which are evaporated, incorporated into products and waste, transferred to different watersheds, or disposed into the sea after usage.
- Comparison: Both WEBR and Mass Burn reduce water consumption. Mass Burn reduced consumption by nearly 36 times more water than WEBR for the medium tonnage scenario.
- Primary sources: Reduces evaporation from hydropower reservoirs by offsetting grid electricity. Mass Burn generates more energy than WEBR, and all Mass Burn energy is sent to the grid, while half of WEBR LFG is sent to the grid and half is refined into RNG. Also includes water usage at landfill and mass burn facilities.

Liu asked SWAC to consider two things. The first being if the Clean Energy Transportation Act (CETA) were repealed, whether building a mass burn facility would lead to the deconstruction of dams (and thus, less evaporation) and the replacement of hydropower with energy derived from burning MSW. The second comment being if mass burn energy under CETA can't be used in-state, we wouldn't necessarily see better water consumption outcomes in our region.

Impacts: acidification potential (air quality)

- Description: Potential environmental damage (such as acid rain) caused by the release of acid-forming compounds into the atmosphere, primarily due to the burning of fossil fuels.
- Comparison: WEBR increases acidification and Mass Burn reduces it. WEBR creates more than 7 times more acidification potential than the amount that Mass Burn reduces for the medium tonnage scenario.
- Primary sources: burning of fossil fuels and biomass.
 - WEBR: fossil fuels for landfill equipment (on-road diesel)
 - Mass Burn: process combustion (includes emissions scrubbers) and electricity inputs
 - Offsets: fossil fuels for electricity generation
- Notes:
 - Rail transport has a relatively small contribution to acidification because locomotives use 70% low-sulfur diesel and 30% biodiesel.
 - Cedar Hills uses R99 diesel (low sulfur). WEBR acidification potential would be lower if the County required use of low-sulfur diesel.

Impacts: eutrophication potential (water quality)

- Description: Potential environmental damage (such as algae blooms) caused when bodies of water or soil become overly enriched with nutrients like nitrogen and phosphorous.
- Comparison: Both WEBR and Mass Burn increase eutrophication potential, but WEBR creates 3 times more eutrophication potential than Mass Burn for the medium tonnage scenario.
- Primary sources:
 - WEBR: landfill leachate (collected and sent to water treatment plant)
 - Mass Burn: production of lime used as a process input
- Note: While burning fossil fuels contributes to eutrophication, for these scenarios the impacts of leachate and lime production are far higher.

Impacts: global warming potential (climate change)

- Description: Potential increase in the Earth's temperature due to greenhouse gases (GHGs) from human activities. The main greenhouse gas is carbon dioxide (CO₂), which is released primarily through the burning of fossil fuels. Another significant greenhouse gas is methane, which comes from the breakdown of organic materials in environments without oxygen, such as wetlands or landfills.
- Comparison: Both WEBR and Mass Burn increase global warming potential, but WEBR creates more than 3 times more global warming potential than Mass Burn for the medium tonnage scenario.
- Primary sources:
 - WEBR Process: The portion of methane not captured as LFG in collection systems and fossil fuels used in landfill equipment and transport.
 - Mass Burn: combustion of plastics in the facility.
 - Avoided electricity offsets: reduced use of fossil fuels to generate electricity (including impacts of production)
 - Avoided natural gas offsets: avoided production impacts by replacing conventional natural gas with RNG
- Note: Following IPCC standards, CO₂ associated with burning organics is not counted toward global warming potential, and organics that do not decompose in the landfill are counted as a carbon sink

Impacts: Smog formation potential (air quality)

- Description: The process by which certain chemicals (primarily NO_x and VOCs) in the atmosphere react with sunlight and heat to produce ground-level ozone (O₃), a major component of smog.
- Comparison: WEBR increases smog formation potential while Mass Burn reduces it. WEBR creates nearly 2 times more smog formation potential than the amount that Mass Burn reduces for the medium tonnage scenario.
- Primary sources: combustion of fuels like gasoline, diesel, and coal under certain conditions
 - WEBR: diesel used in rail transport
 - Mass Burn: offsets that reduce fossil fuel use to generated grid energy

Impacts: cancer potential (human health)

- Description: The potential dangers to people's health associated with cancer from the release of toxic chemicals into the environment. Cancer potential (CTUh) represent impacts for the total human population per unit mass of chemical emitted.
- Comparison: Mass Burn has the potential to cause 1.4 million times more cases of cancer than WEBR for the medium tonnage scenario because more toxic chemicals associated with cancer are released.
- Primary sources: Combustion of plastics (such as in Mass Burn).

Nest Steps:

- WEBR and Mass Burn Social Impacts, Operating History, Capacity, and logistics criteria
- Decision Timeline
- Open Houses
 - Sept. 30, 5:30-7:30 p.m.
 - Oct. 9, 9-11 a.m.

Louie wanted to know how many mass burn facilities are in operation. Liu replied that there are about 70 operating in the U.S. with most on the East Coast. We have about 10 on the West Coast.

Lam asked if metals and plastics are being removed at the transfer stations (looking at the chart for environmental criteria). Liu replied that these are the leftover materials after Re+ impacts are in effect. We want to emphasize that businesses and residents should properly dispose of these materials before it reaches the waste stream. Hopefully, the waste will go through Mixed Waste Processing. We are not sure what materials will be targeted and what goes into the LTD system would not have additional processing to get the materials out.

Lam wanted clarification on mass burn and the health impact because the numbers are unclear. Liu believed that the numbers are the chance of getting cancer and not the number of cases. It is hard to pinpoint where cancer comes from but there is a stark difference between the numbers. Lam wanted the consultant to clarify this number.

Mork asked what the grant options are and if there will be options that wouldn't be there for WEBR. Liu said this is outside the scope of study and does not have an answer.

Mork wanted to know how likely CETA can be changed for energy production to be counted in Washington. Liu replied that this is a question the team has asked but we can't predict what our legislative body will do. Each of the conversations that we have had around this is that we do not know ourselves. Mork commented that if we are doing something for an environmental reason, she does not see why a legislative body would not consider change. She did not understand why the steam cannot be made into power and asked for the timeframe. Liu said the timeframe is 2040 to 2060.

Mork said that places where landfills can exist are reducing and the analysis is missing things for how it can impact the area. Liu replied that because the Spokane facility was built before CETA, many of the restrictions do not apply. If we had a facility in King County, CETA would apply to it. Walsh added that CETA only impacts the economic aspect and not the environmental aspect. It would bring the costs closer to each other. We have also discussed the idea of a steam plant, and this would make the cost raise significantly.

Mork asked if we have considered energy being sold to the grid. Walsh said we have. Mork commented that over time, getting money for electricity is going to improve the economic aspect. We must have a realistic idea of how this would work.

Trim said it would be helpful if Liu could ask the consultants to include what they did not include at the Open House. Liu replied that the consultants said they were not able to evaluate non-cancer.

In response to Mork, Trim said that there is a facility in Oregon that has Waste-to-Energy.

Trim asked Weiker if after the Open Houses, an agenda item could be added for the consultants to come and present for members to ask questions.

Walsh stated if there are any questions for the Open Houses, we are happy to take them.

Trim said if the Open Houses are high-level, members will have more specific questions and they would like the same opportunity to have these discussions with other committees. Liu added that all the material from the subgroup meetings is available on the extranet. There will be opportunities to ask specific and in-depth questions at the open houses.

Unincorporated King County Service Levels

Kim presented on this topic.

Kim presented on the Minimum Service Level Work Overview for unincorporated areas of King County:

- Planning & Installation
 - Vashon Island Requirements
 - Food Waste Ban
- Operation logistics
 - Service disruption
 - Cart distribution
- End-user services and customer success
 - Wildlife education & outreach
 - Contact list update

Changes to enhance Vashon Island’s composting services:

- Receive same minimum level services as other unincorporated areas of King County
 - Vashon Island currently lacks a facility to properly process organics. King County is collaborating with Zero Waste Vashon to study and identify a third-party operator to expand compost services at the Vashon Transfer Station.
 - With this work, exemption language for Vashon Island in Title 10 will be removed.
- Support the Re+ goal of reaching zero waste by 2030

Food waste ban

- Ban food waste from King County’s SWD system, implementing the King County SCAP commitment to no food waste in landfill by 2030
- Model ordinances by Ecology: “Require businesses and residents to subscribe to food and yard waste collection service, if available, and ban organic materials from trash collection bins.”
 - Must be published by Jan. 1, 2025
- Collection consistency across King County with minimal efforts from each local jurisdiction
- Explore different service frequencies
- Support the Re+ goal of reaching zero waste by 2030

Service disruptions

- Increasing inclement weather events have resulted in repeated missed collections, with some areas experiencing over four consecutive weeks of missed collection
- Expectations through Title 10: Establish clear & well-defined expectations with the haulers on responding to missed collection due to inclement weather
 - Enhanced coordination and communication with hauler services and road closures for each jurisdiction to adapt
 - Clear language on providing credits to affected residents

Cart delivery: detailed requirements around container replacement and a reasonable delivery schedule

- Avoid fees to our residents prior to receiving containers, especially around inventory challenges
- Increased communication to better serve our residents

Contact list update – updated annually and maintained regularly

- Two weeks’ notification to the county of any changes
- Updated contacts list annually with one source of truth for King County service areas

Wildlife Cart – Education & Outreach: promoting more awareness of wildlife carts in unincorporated areas of King County to reduce conflict with wildlife

- Reduce wildlife encounter concerns through education
- Ensure driver safety by preventing potential hazards
- Maintain cleaner, safe community while promoting responsible waste management

We are currently looking at 6 UKC Minimum Service Level Standard Work changes:

- Wildlife cart and education & outreach: update language on promoting awareness to reduce conflict with wildlife when preparing materials.
- Cart distribution: update language for replacement cart delivery time
- Service disruption: Language outlining a process to address missed collection due to inclement weather. There is some language in UKC tariffs, but it is not clear.
- Contact list update: yearly updated organizational contacts list kept updated and maintained regularly.
- Vashon Island requirements: Remove the exemption from the unincorporated service areas requirements to start providing organics service (HB-2301). We want them to be part of HB 2301 and receive services.
- Food waste ban: considering adding a “food waste ban” language to help achieve Re+ goals

If you have any questions, please reach out to Kim at chkim@kingcounty.gov.

2025 Legislation Planning

Scholes and Tan led this.

These are potential bills returning from 2024:

- ReWrap Act – EPR for Packaging & Paper Products
- Deposit Return System for Beverage Containers (to be confirmed)
- Right to Repair
 - Allowing individual repair shops to repair devices
- Electric Vehicle (EV) Battery Recycling
- Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) Refrigerant Gases Recycling

New potential bills are:

- Organics Management (building on 2024 bill)
- Mattress EPR

The process will look like:

- Sept. 19, 2024: Re+ Community Panel legislative recommendations
- Sept. 2024: recommendations for state legislative priorities
- Q3: Plan to engage cities on legislative priorities (e.g. EPR)
- Mov. 2024: KC Council votes on state legislative priorities
- Nov. 8, 2024: Legislative preview to MSWAC
- Nov. 15, 2024: Legislative preview to SWAC

Atwood asked for an update on where we ended on the HFC bill. Trim said the bill did good and made it through the House but did not get a hearing in the Senate Ways and Means. There has been a lot of conversation on this bill in the meantime.

Atwood wanted to know how far the deposit return system has ever gotten. Scholes replied that last year, this bill made it out of the policy committee but did not make it out of the House for a vote. It has been a couple of decades since there has been a big push for this system. Two years ago, this was included in the EPR bill and last year, it was separate and had many conversations.

Mork wondered if the ReWrap Act will be the same. Scholes said that there will be some work. There have been many negotiations on this bill and a lot of progress should be maintained. It is still early in the process to see the bill language, but we expect it to be like last year’s but with improvements.

Member Comment

No member comment.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:58 a.m.