



SKAGIT COUNTY

SOLID WASTE

MANAGEMENT

PLAN

Preliminary Draft

July November 2016

SKAGIT COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

July November 2016

Prepared for:

Skagit County Public Works Department
1800 Continental Place
Mount Vernon, Washington 98273

Prepared by:

Green Solutions
PO Box 680
South Prairie, WA 98385-0680
(360) 897-9533

with assistance from:

Terrill Chang, B-Town Consulting

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Introduction	ES-1
Goals of the SWMP	ES-1
Overview of Recommendations	ES-2
Waste Reduction Recommendations	ES-2
Recycling Recommendations	ES-3
Organics Recommendations	ES-3
Waste Collection Recommendations	ES-4
Transfer and Disposal Recommendations	ES-4
Special Waste Recommendations	ES-4
Administration and Public Education Recommendations	ES-5
Implementation Details	ES-5

1 Introduction

1.1 Role and Purpose	1-1
1.2 Participating Jurisdictions	1-1
1.3 Required Minimum Contents of Plan	1-2
1.4 Relationship to Other Plans	1-2
1.5 Previous Solid Waste Plans	1-3
1.6 Solid Waste Advisory Committee	1-3
1.7 Process for Updating the SWMP	1-7
1.8 Goals of the SWMP	1-78
1.9 Organization of the SWMP	1-8
1.10 Standard Nomenclature used in the SWMP	1-9

2 Background of the Planning Area

2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Demographics	2-1
2.3 Economy	2-2
2.4 Quantity and Composition of Solid Waste	2-3

3 Waste Reduction

3.1 Preface to the Waste Reduction, Recycling and Organics Chapters	3-1
3.2 Existing Conditions for Waste Reduction	3-3
3.3 Planning Issues for Waste Reduction	3-6
3.4 Alternative Waste Reduction Strategies	3-7
3.5 Evaluation of Waste Reduction Alternatives	3-10
3.6 Waste Reduction Recommendations	3-11

9 Administration and Public Education

9.1	Background for Administration and Public Education	9-1
9.2	Existing Administration and Public Education Programs	9-1
9.3	Planning Issues for Administration and Public Education	9-9
9.4	Alternative Strategies for Administration and Public Education	9-11
9.5	Evaluation of Administration and Public Education Alternatives	9-132
9.6	Administration and Public Education Recommendations	9-14

10 Implementation Plan

10.1	Introduction	10-1
10.2	Waste Reduction Recommendations	10-1
10.3	Recycling Recommendations	10-2
10.4	Organics Recommendations	10-2
10.5	Waste Collection Recommendations	10-3
10.6	Transfer and Disposal Recommendations	10-3
10.7	Special Waste Recommendations	10-4
10.8	Administration and Public Education Recommendations	10-4
10.9	Six-Year Implementation Schedule	10-5
10.10	Implementation Responsibilities	10-5
10.11	Funding Strategy	10-5
10.12	Twenty-Year Implementation Schedule	10-5
10.13	Procedures for Amending the SWMP	10-10

Glossary

Appendices

- A Interlocal Agreements
- B Siting Factors
- C UTC Cost Assessment Questionnaire
- D SEPA Checklist

WASTE COLLECTION RECOMMENDATIONS

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Waste Collection

- WC1) More promotion should be conducted for drop box customers to source-separate recyclable and compostable materials.
- WC2) The cities and Waste Management should consider switching all residential garbage collection services to every-other-week service.

TRANSFER AND DISPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS

High-Priority Recommendations for the Transfer System

- T1) Skagit County and the City of Sedro-Woolley should evaluate the benefits and impacts of [potentially](#) closing the Clear Lake Compactor Site and [possibly](#) moving those operations to the Sedro-Woolley Recycling Facility, and this change may be implemented if mutually agreeable.
- T2) Transfer station customers will be encouraged to bring source-separated materials to other facilities for recycling or composting.

High-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D1) Skagit County will begin preparing a Request for Proposals for a new waste export and disposal contract in 2021~~0~~.

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D2) Any future proposals for waste conversion facilities should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for consistency with this [Solid Waste Management Plan](#) and existing programs; the waste export and disposal agreement then in effect; applicable siting, zoning, environmental and health regulations; and other criteria appropriate to the proposed system.

Low-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D3) Any future proposals for additional inert or limited purpose landfills should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for demonstrated need and benefit to the citizens of Skagit County; consistency with this [Solid Waste Management Plan](#); and applicable siting, zoning, environmental and health regulations.

SPECIAL WASTE RECOMMENDATIONS

High-Priority Recommendations for Special Wastes

- SW1) Increased education should be provided for the proper disposal of sharps.

- SW2) The needle exchange should be continued and possibly expanded.
- SW3) Staging areas will be designated for disaster debris.
- SW4) A disaster debris strategy will be developed.
- SW5) Increased education and technical assistance should be provided for CESQGs.

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Special Wastes

- SW6) Increased enforcement of existing regulations for the proper identification and disposal of asbestos-containing materials is needed, beginning with requiring that all demolition permits include an AHERA inspection or other survey for asbestos.
- SW7) Increased publicity will be provided for the HHW Facility.

ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

High-Priority Recommendation for Administration and Public Education

- A&PE1) Skagit County and the Cities will create a task force to address consistency and accessibility for public education.
- A&PE2) Skagit County will hire a Recycling Coordinator.
- A&PE3) If necessary, Skagit County and ~~the cities~~ and towns may will consider revising and/or adopting applicable flow control enforcement provisions.

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Administration and Public Education

- A&PE4) Rate reviews will be conducted periodically for disposal rates to ensure adequate funds are being collected to support solid waste programs and mandates.
- A&PE5) Consider possible revisions to the Skagit County Code ~~should be updated~~ to potentially exempt recognize that Sinclair Island ~~is exempt~~ from otherwise applicable flow control requirements, and /or to update applicable references ~~remove references to State laws that are no longer relevant~~.

IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Table ES.1 summarizes the implementation responsibilities, schedule and costs for the recommended activities.

Table ES.1. Implementation Schedule and Summary of Costs.				
	Lead Agency ¹	Schedule	Cost	Funding Source
High Priority Recommendations				
WR1) Education program for avoiding food waste.	PW, Cities	Ongoing ²	Up to \$15,000	County/CPG ³
WR2) Publicize volume-based rates.	PW	Ongoing	Existing ⁴	Existing
WR3) Promote clothing reuse and recycling.	PW	Ongoing	Existing	Existing
WR4) Explore collection of reusables at the Transfer Station.	PW	Ongoing	Existing	Existing
WR5) Distribute videos for waste reduction tips.	PW	Ongoing	Existing	Existing
R1) Recycling and composting goal is 65%.	PW	Ongoing	NA ⁵	NA
R2) Adopt ordinance for all waste subscribers to receive curbside recycling.	PW	2019	Uncertain	Rates ⁶
R3) Consider adopting requirements for C&D recycling.	PW, Cities	2019	Uncertain	Rates
R4) Support product stewardship programs as appropriate.	PW	Ongoing	Existing	Existing
O1) More promotion for mixed organics collection.	WM	Ongoing	Up to \$50,000	Rates
T1) Evaluate benefits and impacts of closing Clear Lake and moving the operations to the Sedro-Woolley Facility.	PW, Sedro-Woolley	2017	Existing	Existing
T2) Encourage transfer station customers to bring recyclables elsewhere.	PW	Ongoing	\$5,000 - 10,000	County
D1) Prepare an RFP for a new waste export contract.	PW	2021 0	Existing	Existing
SW1) Increased education should be provided for the proper disposal of sharps.	HD	Ongoing	\$5,000 - 10,000	County
SW2) Needle exchange should be continued and expanded.	HD	Ongoing	Uncertain	County
SW3) Staging areas will be designated for disaster debris.	PW	2017	Existing	Existing
SW4) A disaster debris strategy will be developed.	PW	2018	Existing	Existing
SW5) Increased education and technical assistance for CESQGs.	HD	Ongoing	\$5,000 - 10,000	County
A&PE1) Create a task force to address consistency and accessibility for public education.	PW, Cities	Ongoing	Existing	Existing
A&PE2) Hire a Recycling Coordinator.	PW	2017	\$75,000	County
A&PE3) Skagit County and the cities will <u>should continue to</u> enforce flow control.	PW	Ongoing	Existing	Existing

- Notes:
1. For Lead Agency, PW = Skagit County Public Works, HD = Skagit County Health Department, WM = Waste Management, and Cities may only refer to the cities with municipal collection depending on the specific recommendation (see the appropriate chapter for more details).
 2. "Ongoing" = means this activity is expected to continue through the 6-year life of this SWMP.
 3. "County/CPG" as a funding source indicates some reliance on typical county funding sources (the tipping fee) but also significant contributions from the Coordinated Prevention Grant (CPG) funds administered by Ecology.
 4. "Existing" = existing costs consist primarily of staff time and expenses already budgeted.
 5. NA = Not Applicable. In the case of funding source, indicates that there is no specific cost associated with the recommendation.
 6. "Rates" as a funding source means that additional costs will be paid through user fees.

Table ES.1. Implementation Schedule and Summary of Costs, continued.				
	Lead Agency ¹	Schedule	Cost	Funding Source
Medium Priority Recommendations				
WR6) Consider county-wide ban on yard debris disposal.	PW	2017	Up to \$20,000	County/CPG ²
WR7) Promote smart shopping.	PW	Ongoing ³	Up to \$15,000	County/CPG
WR8) Promote fix-it workshops.	PW	Ongoing	Existing ⁴	Existing
R5) Consider increasing curbside recycling frequency to weekly in all areas.	PW, Cities, WM	2019	Uncertain	Rates ⁵
R6) Consider disposal bans for specific materials.	PW	Ongoing	Up to \$20,000	County/CPG
R7) Washington State should enact a bottle bill to divert glass.	WA State	2018	Uncertain	Private sector
O2) Contaminated commercial setouts should be rejected.	WM	Ongoing	NA ⁶	NA
O3) Do not collect compostable plastics with mixed organics.	WM	Ongoing	Existing	Existing
O4) Promote the use of compost.	PW, Cities	Ongoing	Up to \$25,000	County, Rates
WC1) More promotion for drop box customers to source-separate recyclable and compostable materials.	Cities, WM	Ongoing	Up to \$25,000	Rates
WC2) Consider switching all residential garbage collection to every-other-week.	Cities, WM	Ongoing	Up to \$25,000	Rates
D2) Any future proposals for waste conversion facilities should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.	PW	Ongoing	Existing	Existing
SW6) Increased enforcement of existing regulations for asbestos.	PW, HD, Others	Ongoing	Existing	Existing
SW7) Increased publicity for the HHW Facility.	PW	Ongoing	\$5,000 - 10,000	County/CPG
A&PE4) Conduct disposal rate reviews periodically.	PW	2017 and 2022	\$25,000 - 35,000	County
A&PE5) Potentially update Skagit County Code.	PW	2017	Existing	Existing
Low Priority Recommendations				
R8) Examine mandatory commercial recycling.	PW, Cities	Ongoing	Uncertain	Rates
D3) Any future proposals for additional inert or limited purpose landfills should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.	PW	Ongoing	Existing	Existing

- Notes:
1. For Lead Agency, PW = Skagit County Public Works, HD = Skagit County Health Department, WM = Waste Management, and Cities may only refer to the cities with municipal collection, depending on the specific recommendation (see the appropriate chapter for more details).
 2. "County/CPG" as a funding source indicates some reliance on typical county funding sources (the tipping fee) but also significant contributions from the Coordinated Prevention Grant (CPG) funds administered by Ecology.
 3. "Ongoing" = means this activity is expected to continue through the 6-year life of this SWMP.
 4. "Existing" = existing costs consist primarily of staff time and expenses already budgeted.
 5. "Rates" as a funding source means that additional costs will be paid through user fees.
 6. NA = Not Applicable. In the case of funding source, indicates that there is no specific cost associated with the recommendation.

that must be taken into consideration for solid waste planning include the Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan, the Skagit County 2010 Climate Action Plan, city comprehensive plans, and several other local plans and reports.

1.5. PREVIOUS SOLID WASTE PLANS

Washington State enacted RCW 70.95.080 (requiring counties to develop solid waste plans) in 1969, and Skagit County adopted their first plan in 1973. Subsequent plans were adopted in 1981, 1987, 1994, and 2005, with an amendment to the 2005 plan adopted in 2008. Table 1-1 shows the recommendations from the most recent plan and the status of these recommendations. The current status indicates whether a recommendation has been accomplished or not, or if it is considered to be ongoing. A recommendation is shown as ongoing if it still being conducted (in other words, if it is an ongoing activity instead of a specific milestone or event). A few of the recommendations were determined to be unnecessary and so are shown as “not applicable” in Table 1-1.

1.6. SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The formation, membership makeup, and role of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) are specified by the 2008 Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between Skagit County and Cities and Towns in Skagit County for Solid Waste Management (as amended in 2010):

“12.1. Pursuant to Chapter 70.95.165(3) RCW and Chapter 39.34.030(4) RCW and Skagit County Code 12.18, a Solid Waste Advisory Committee shall continue operating for the purpose of rendering advice to Skagit County and the SWSGB regarding solid and moderate risk waste related issues generally, service levels, disposal rates, and short and long term planning, and especially the administration and implementation of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

12.2. Membership of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee shall be as follows:

- (1) Regular members. The Solid Waste Advisory Committee shall consist of:
 - (a) One member from each Party to this Agreement, to be nominated by the legislative authority for that Municipality and appointed by the County Commissioners.
 - (b) One member from each Municipality in Skagit County which has its own Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, to be nominated by the legislative authority for that Municipality and appointed by the County Commissioners.

As required by State law, the Skagit County SWAC includes individuals representing various interests in solid waste issues. The members represent not only the interests of their respective agencies and businesses, but as residents and members of the community they also represent the public's interest. The SWAC functioned in a review and advisory capacity throughout the plan development process. The membership as of June 2016 and affiliations of the SWAC members are shown in Table 1-2.

A change in State law (signed by the Governor on March 31, 2016) now requires a representative of the agricultural community to be included on solid waste advisory committees, but as of early 2016 this new requirement had not yet been incorporated into the Skagit County SWAC's membership and rules.

1.7. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THE SWMP

The process of updating and adopting this SWMP consisted of the following steps:

- initial meetings were held with the SWAC and the Skagit County Governance Board to discuss the planning approach and the overall direction (vision) for the new plan.
- the chapters of the new plan were prepared and reviewed with the SWAC members and County staff.
- once each of the new chapters had been reviewed with the SWAC, the chapters were compiled into a complete draft for review and comment by the SWAC members and County staff.
- with the addition of a SEPA checklist and a Cost Assessment Questionnaire, this plan became the Preliminary Draft SWMP, which was released for public review by the public.
- coincidental with the public review period, this SWMP was submitted to the Governance Board and the Board of County Commissioners (which included a legal review) for their approval of the plan's submittal for agency review.
- the SWMP was then submitted for agency review (review by Ecology, the UTC and the Department of Agriculture).
- the comments received on the Preliminary Draft will be reviewed with the SWAC and then incorporated into the plan to produce the Final Draft SWMP.
- the Final Draft will be provided to the cities, towns and Skagit County for adoption.
- after adoption, the Final SWMP will be submitted to Ecology for final approval.
- after final approval by Ecology, the process of updating the SWMP will be completed and the implementation period for the new SWMP will begin.

These activities could provide benefits to personal finances as well providing benefits to the local economy (to the extent that local businesses can provide repair and rental services).

Alternative D – Fix-It Workshops

An idea that is gaining in popularity is the use of fix-it workshops, where people can bring items in need of repairs and knowledgeable volunteers show them how to fix the item. Organizing this type of workshop is probably better accomplished by a non-profit group, but the County could help promote the workshops, provide space for the events, and possibly assist in other ways.

Alternative E – Promote Volume-Based Collection Fees

Information on volume-based rates could be more easily accessible and this approach could be more widely promoted as a way to save money by recycling and reducing wastes. The success of this approach could be monitored by the number of people who sign up for lower service levels.

Alternative F – Promote More Clothing Reuse and Recycling

Educational materials could encourage people to bring reusable or recyclable clothing to charities and other collection programs for those. Specific educational materials could be designed for clothing, but it would probably be more cost-effective to include this topic in existing materials and websites. Clothing reuse and recycling could also be a special focus of a newspaper ad, fair booth and other educational opportunity. Additional recycling options could be explored or promoted, although this idea should be approached carefully so as not to undermine existing efforts that are collecting reusable clothing for charitable purposes.

Alternative G – Collect Reusable Materials at Skagit County Transfer Station

One option to divert reusable materials from disposal could be a cooperative effort with Goodwill or another charity to collect reusable materials at the main transfer station. Several counties in Washington are working with charities to divert reusable materials through staffed trailers located prior to the entrance of a landfill or transfer station. This could also take the form of a joint effort or cooperative arrangement with one of the reusable building material operations to collect building materials. One consideration for this approach would be the degree of access to the tipping floor that would be allowed by this arrangement. If employees of the charities were [reasonably](#) allowed [more full](#)-access to the tipping floor to observe materials being dropped off there, rather than depending on customers to voluntarily stop at a trailer, then much more material could be recovered.

Alternative H – Promote Waste Reduction through Videos

Waste reduction lifestyle tips could be encouraged by creation of educational videos that can be viewed through a high traffic website, such as YouTube. Short, informational videos could be created to show people the basic steps to reducing

Alternative D – County to Contract for Curbside Recycling in Unincorporated Areas

The County could [consider contracting](#) for curbside recycling in the unincorporated areas. Clark County does this currently. Contracting for recycling services in the unincorporated areas is one of the few collection activities allowed by Washington State law for a county ([per RCW 36.58.040](#)). Taking this approach would require working out several important details, including financing, processing systems, frequency of collection and other collection methods.

Alternative E – Mandatory Recycling for C&D Wastes

Skagit County could adopt recycling requirements for construction and demolition wastes that are similar to the approach used by Seattle and King County. Seattle rules currently require that construction companies either recycle at construction sites or deliver C&D to facilities that are certified as meeting Seattle’s standards for recovering regulated materials. The processing facilities must recover specific materials, so that their residuals do not contain more than 10% of asphalt paving, bricks, concrete, metal, new gypsum board and wood over 6 inches, and cardboard over 8 inches.

Alternative F – Support New Product Stewardship Programs

Product stewardship is a concept designed to alleviate the burden of end-of-life product management on local governments. Product stewardship programs, or “extended producer responsibility” (EPR), typically address a specific type of product and provide an alternative collection or disposal system. One of the principles that this approach is based on is that the manufacturers of a product should bear the cost of collecting and recycling (or disposing of) that product, and that this will create an incentive for them to reduce the weight and/or toxicity of their products. Retailers, if they are involved in a program, would have an incentive to carry products that are easier (and so less expensive) to collect and recycle.

Developing new product stewardship programs is beyond the scope of a county, but Skagit County could participate in such programs developed by others. Any new product stewardship proposals at the state or federal level could be evaluated and supported as appropriate to the County’s interests. The cost for implementing this alternative would primarily be a small amount of staff time, unless the County would be actively involved in a new collection program (which may require more time and expense, although in theory any expenses for an EPR program would be covered by manufacturers).

Alternative G – Disposal Bans for Specific Materials

Disposal bans have proven effective in some cases, although there would need to be an alternative collection or handling system available for the banned material. Hence, a phased-in approach would be best, providing enough advance notice to allow alternative handling systems to be developed.

One small area of Skagit County, Sinclair Island, [may be](#) serviced by another certificated hauler. Sinclair Island is part of the certificated area for Disposal Services, Inc., which is based in Ferndale, Washington (4916 LaBounty Drive, Ferndale, WA 98248, 360-384-8011). Sinclair Island lies off of the western shore of [mainland](#) Skagit County and is only 1.6 square miles in size. The services provided on Sinclair Island consist solely of weekly pickup of pre-paid 30-gallon bags (at \$10.00 per bag) and 20-yard drop boxes provided on a temporary basis.

Collection Services for Other Jurisdictions

Tribal lands and Federal facilities such as military bases can arrange for refuse collection services independently. The Swinomish Tribal Community and the Samish, Sauk-Suiattle, and Upper Skagit Indian Reservations are located within Waste Management's certificate area but have not chosen to make alternative arrangements.

6.3. PLANNING ISSUES FOR WASTE COLLECTION

Current and Future Capacity

The current collection system does a good job of collecting and removing solid wastes generated by the County's and City's residents and businesses. Future waste quantities have been estimated (see Table 2.9), and the existing collection system is anticipated to be able to handle the projected increase.

Waste Diversion Programs

Some service gaps associated with the current collection system have been noted for recycling and organics, and these are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, respectively.

Climate Action Plan

The [Skagit County Climate Action Plan](#) adopted in 2010 made one recommendation regarding waste collection, which is to "provide garbage vouchers for low-income residents" (Policy D-10). This policy was intended to apply to garbage collection and disposal, as well as recycling.

6.4. ALTERNATIVE WASTE COLLECTION STRATEGIES

The following alternatives were considered for new or expanded waste collection activities. The listing of an alternative in this section does not mean that it is considered feasible or desirable, nor that is recommended (see Section 6.6 for the recommendations).

A System Policy was developed to preserve the System's ability to fulfill its obligations and mandates for solid wastes. The key points of the System Policy are:

- The County-owned transfer station is designated as the only currently-approved municipal solid waste facility in Skagit County, and all municipal solid waste generated in Skagit County must be delivered there (or to one of the two rural drop box sites) unless specifically exempted in the System Policy.
- Other solid waste facilities may be allowed in the future, but only after consulting with the SWAC and then approval by the Skagit County Solid Waste System Governance Board (per the terms of the interlocal agreement dated April 30, 2008 [Skagit County Contract # C20080306, amended in 2010 by #20100124]), and in response to a procurement process conducted by Skagit County. If successful, this process may result in a contract between Skagit County and another entity.
- The Health Department shall continue to require ongoing contract compliance as a condition of annual solid waste facility permit renewal requirements.

Private facilities handling waste from outside the county must comply with the Skagit County Solid Waste Management Plan, the Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan, the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan, and the solid waste management plan and regulations of the jurisdiction in which the waste is generated. Because Skagit County Code (SCC 12.18.040(3)) states that emptying a waste container in Skagit County is defined as waste that is generated in Skagit County, any recycling or other waste handling facilities in the county must use a Skagit County facility for disposal of non-recycled residuals.

7.3. TRANSFER SYSTEM

Existing Activities for Waste Transfer

The transfer system consists of three facilities owned and operated by Skagit County: two drop box sites that collect waste and recyclables in rural locations, and a transfer station near Mount Vernon that receives waste and recyclables from commercial haulers, self-haulers, and drop boxes from the rural sites.

Skagit County Transfer and Recycling Station (TRS): Completed in 2012, the TRS consists of a vehicle scale, scalehouse, recycling drop-off area, tipping building for commercial and self-haul vehicles, and pre-load compactor. It is located at the site of the closed incinerator, approximately five miles west of Mount Vernon at the intersection of Farm-to-Market and Ovenell Roads. The TRS is open 359 days a year for recycling and waste disposal from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

In 2014, the TRS received a total of 99,189 tons of waste, including the wastes brought from the Sauk (1,550 tons) and Clear Lake (136 tons) sites, waste delivered by Waste Management (the certificated collection company in Skagit County), the cities that conduct municipal collections, and waste brought in by businesses and residents (self-haulers). Excluding contributions from the Sauk and Clear Lake sites, the TRS received 97,465 tons, or 98% of the County's total solid waste. A total of 111,842 loads were disposed at the TRS in 2014.

Sauk Transfer Station: The Sauk Transfer Station is located between Concrete and Rockport and is open Thursday through Sunday from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., except for six holidays per year. This facility is operated for the collection of household waste only (i.e., no commercially-collected waste). The site consists of an attendant's trailer, a vehicle scale, six recycling drop boxes of various sizes, and an appliance receiving area. A Z-wall allows customers to drop waste down into the six solid waste drop boxes located on the lower level of the station.

In 2014, 10,660 customers delivered 1,550 tons of solid waste to this facility, or about 1.7% of the County's waste stream. The Sauk Transfer Station also accepts a variety of materials for recycling, including glass, aluminum, cardboard, plastic milk jugs, magazines, and mixed waste paper. Used motor oil, antifreeze and white goods (large appliances) are also accepted. The County hauls full waste containers to the TRS for disposal and recycling containers are brought to Skagit River Steel & Recycling in Burlington for sorting, processing, and marketing. In 2014, 202 tons of recyclables were dropped off at this facility.

Clear Lake Recycling and Compactor Site: The Clear Lake compactor site is located on Howey Road near the intersection of State Highway 9 and South Skagit Highway. As of January 1, 2017, this site is open Friday through Monday, ~~Wednesday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday~~ from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. for the collection of household wastes and recyclables. The site consists of an attendant's building, two stationary compactors, six recycling drop boxes of various sizes, and an appliance receiving area. Because Clear Lake has no scale, customers are charged on the basis of volume. Recyclables accepted include cardboard, mixed waste paper, magazines, newspaper, aluminum cans, plastic containers, glass, scrap metal, used oil and antifreeze.

In 2014, 4,049 customers delivered 136 tons of solid waste to this facility, or about 0.2% of the County's waste stream. Another 238 tons of recyclables were dropped off at this facility in 2014. The County hauls full waste containers to the TRS for disposal and recycling containers are brought to Skagit River Steel.

Planning Issues for Waste Transfer

Cost-Effectiveness of Rural Sites: The Sauk and Clear Lake facilities provide convenience and reduce the driving distance for County residents who do not subscribe to curbside collection service. However, in 2014 Sauk handled only about

1.7% of the County's waste stream, while Clear Lake handled less than 0.2%. At these levels, the cost of operating these sites is relatively high (especially for Clear Lake, at more than \$883 per ton).

Signage for TRS: It has been reported that self-haul customers occasionally miss the entrance to the TRS and end up at one of the nearby recycling or composting facilities. The signage could be reviewed and upgraded, and additional signs installed as appropriate.

Emphasis on Recycling and Coordination between Facilities: It has been suggested that there may be a better way to handle customers with mixed loads, such as a vehicle carrying both solid waste and yard waste/construction debris. It is desirable to divert material away from landfill disposal and direct it instead to recycling or composting facilities. One method would be to have the scale attendants at the transfer station (TRS) encourage customers to preferentially utilize local recycling facilities.

Alternatives for Waste Transfer

Alternative A - Install Waste Transfer Capacity at Sedro-Woolley Site and Close Clear Lake Site: The County's Clear Lake compactor site is located about two miles from Sedro-Woolley's recycling and yard waste facility at 315 Sterling Street. This proximity makes it worthwhile to consider closing the Clear Lake facility and redirecting County customers to the City's facility, whose permit would need to be modified to become a drop box facility and accept solid waste. The Clear Lake compactors could be relocated to the City's facility, or it may be more cost-effective to have self-haulers unload garbage into small dumpsters which can then be emptied into City compactor trucks.

Potential advantages for this alternative include:

- increases the functionality of the current City site by adding solid waste collection.
- potential overall labor savings by operating one facility instead of two. the close proximity of the Sedro-Woolley facility does not significantly increase the driving distance for County self-haul customers.
- increased quantities of recyclables at the City site may increase prices received.

Potential disadvantages for this alternative include:

- traffic considerations and inconvenience to customers from outlying areas.
- need to negotiate [mutually agreeable terms between the County and City.](#)
~~compensation for the City to service County customers.~~
- need to decide who should haul garbage from the City's site to the TRS and recyclables to processing facilities, and for what compensation.
- potential zoning and environmental issues to permit the City's site to accept garbage.

Alternative B – Increased Emphasis on Recycling: A policy could be adopted by Skagit County that states that scalehouse attendants at TRS could inform customers with potentially-recyclable materials about possible cost savings and environmental benefits of taking recyclable or compostable materials to other local facilities. The County could develop updated brochures or handouts listing locations and rates at these alternative facilities that could be provided to these customers. The brochures could be provided at the scalehouse and at the tipping floor. Changing customers' behavior at either of these points could be difficult due to customers' reluctance to change their practices by hauling their material to two facilities (e.g. TRS and a yard waste or construction debris facility). In addition, it may be difficult for scale attendants to clearly see the contents of loads and identify appropriate customers.

These alternatives are evaluated later in this chapter (see Section 7.6), and the resulting recommendations are shown at the end of this chapter (see Section 7.7).

7.4. WASTE IMPORT

Existing Waste Import Activities

Currently only a small amount of solid waste is imported to disposal facilities in Skagit County, although significant amounts of wastes are transported through the county. In addition, various materials flow back and forth across the county line to composting and recycling facilities. Waste import and trans-shipment activities include:

- Solid waste from Orcas, Lopez, and smaller islands in San Juan County is ferried from the Orcas Island Transfer Station and hauled directly to Republic Service's intermodal railhead facility near the TRS.
- Solid waste from San Juan [County Island](#)/Friday Harbor is hauled through Skagit County to a landfill in Cowlitz County.
- Island County waste is either trucked through Skagit County to Everett or to Republic Service's intermodal railhead facility near the TRS and put on trains there.
- Solid waste from the Diablo and Newhalem area (Whatcom County) is hauled by Waste Management to the TRS.
- Some recyclables and feedstocks are imported to recycling and composting facilities in Skagit County.

Planning Issues and Alternatives for Waste Import

There are no specific waste import issues that need to be addressed at this time and so no waste import alternatives are being considered (although see Chapter 9 for a discussion of an interlocal agreement between Skagit and Whatcom Counties).

When the RRF was closed in 1994, it was converted into a transfer station to serve the waste export system. In 2012, the new Transfer and Recycling Station (TRS) constructed at the RRF site began operations. The County hauls containers of compacted waste about one mile to the Republic Services railhead near the TRS. The RRF was converted to a street waste decant facility in 2014 and began taking street sweepings and material from catch basin cleaning.

Small amounts of contaminated soils and sludges are currently exported to other landfills outside of Skagit County. The only other waste export systems in use in the County are for small quantities of special wastes (such as biomedical waste, see Chapter 8) that are sent to special facilities.

Planning Issues for Waste Export and Disposal

Waste Export and Disposal Contract: In 2021¹⁰, the County will need to begin preparing a Request for Proposals for export of solid waste in anticipation of the 2023 expiration of the current contract with Republic Services.

Need for In-County Landfills: It is possible that additional special purpose or inert waste landfills may become desirable in the future. These types of landfills can provide a cost-effective disposal option for local industries or special wastes without excessive environmental impacts. There are a variety of reuse options available for some types of wastes, however, and these options currently limit the need for additional special purpose or inert waste landfills. Inert landfills also require continued oversight as they tend to attract wastes other than inert waste.

Potential Future Options for Disposal: Skagit County is well-served by its current waste export and disposal program, but occasionally there may be some interest in additional methods of reducing the amount of waste being landfilled. The term “conversion technologies” refers to methods for converting organics or other materials into energy or useful products. These methods require inputs of waste and energy and may involve mechanical and/or thermal pretreatment. The outputs can include energy (electricity and/or heat), recyclable materials, inert materials, residuals requiring disposal, and flue gas emissions that require treatment. It should be noted that not all of these technologies are considered disposal methods (especially in the case of anaerobic digestion) and all create residues that would need further processing and/or disposal. The major types of waste conversion are:

- **Pyrolysis:** For this process, waste is broken down thermally in the absence of air, producing oil and synthetic gas that can be burned to generate electricity.
- **Gasification:** This process is similar to pyrolysis, but takes place under low-oxygen conditions (less than necessary for ordinary combustion) to produce a synthetic gas that can be used to generate electricity.

- **Plasma gasification:** This process uses an electrical arc to break down organic parts of waste into elemental gas which can then be burned in a gas turbine or engine to generate electricity.
- **Anaerobic digestion:** This process uses microbes to digest organic wastes and produce methane gas, which then powers turbines or generators to produce electricity. Sometimes the waste heat from the engines is reclaimed to heat the digester. There is currently an operating anaerobic digester in Skagit County that treats food processing waste.
- **Chemical production:** Chemical and/or biological processes can be used to break down the organic portion of solid waste to produce useful chemicals such as ethanol.
- **Conventional energy from waste (EfW, formerly called incineration):** The heat from incineration of waste, typically captured in the form of steam, can be used as an energy source. Most of the steam produced is used to generate electricity, although some European cities use a portion of the steam for district heating of nearby buildings. There are about 2,000 EfW plants worldwide, mostly in Europe and Asia. Scrap metals are typically recovered from EfW plants and in some areas the ash is beneficially reused.

In recent years, conversion technology vendors have proposed various projects, but relatively few facilities have been able to successfully apply these technologies to solid waste in the United States. Because solid waste is such a highly variable mix of materials, it is more difficult to process than more homogenous waste streams such as wood chips, agricultural waste, or certain industrial wastes. Conversion technologies still have a sparse track record of successful full-scale projects with demonstrated long-term economic feasibility from the sale of energy and/or useful byproducts. Conversion technologies need to meet regulatory compliance and environmental protection standards to gain public acceptance. In addition, the possible adverse impact on existing diversion/recycling programs must be weighed against the potential benefits of energy production.

Alternatives for Waste Export and Disposal

Alternative C – Waste Export and Disposal: Waste export via rail and disposal in an out-of-county landfill has worked well for Skagit County for over two decades, and there is no strong case for changing that practice. The current export and disposal agreement expires in 2023, and in order to continue with this system the County would need to begin in 2021⁰ to prepare a Request for Proposals for export and disposal of solid waste.

Alternative D – Conversion Technology: As waste conversion technologies improve and if energy and materials markets become more favorable, it may be worthwhile to consider proposals for conversion technology facilities to process a portion of the County’s solid waste. These could be evaluated on a case-by-case basis

7.7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSFER AND DISPOSAL

High-Priority Recommendations for the Transfer System

- T1) Skagit County and the City of Sedro-Woolley should evaluate the benefits and impacts of potentially closing the Clear Lake Compactor Site and possibly moving those operations to the Sedro-Woolley Recycling Facility, and this change may be implemented if mutually agreeable.
- T2) Transfer station customers will be encouraged to bring source-separated materials to other facilities for recycling or composting.

High-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D1) Skagit County will begin preparing a Request for Proposals for a new waste export and disposal contract in 2021~~0~~.

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D2) Any future proposals for waste conversion facilities should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for consistency with this Solid Waste Management Plan and existing programs; the waste export and disposal agreement then in effect; applicable siting, zoning, environmental and health regulations; and other criteria appropriate to the proposed system.

Low-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D3) Any future proposals for additional inert or limited purpose landfills should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for demonstrated need and benefit to the citizens of Skagit County; consistency with this Solid Waste Management Plan; and applicable siting, zoning, environmental and health regulations.

Overview of Implementation Responsibilities, Costs and Schedule

The lead agency responsible for implementing most of these recommendations will be Skagit County, with assistance from the Cities as appropriate. Recommendation T1 will be implemented by the County and the City of Sedro-Woolley, with input from the Health Department. The County should implement Recommendation T2 with assistance from private recycling and composting facilities. The County will need to implement Recommendation D1 with approval by the Governance Board. Recommendations D2 and D3 will not need to be acted upon until such time as an applicable proposal is received.

The costs to Skagit County for these recommendations will consist primarily of staff time. Recommendation T2 will require the production of additional education materials, at a cost of \$5,000 to \$10,000 (and staff time). Changes in costs brought about by implementation of any of these recommendations may affect costs for waste generators.

Discussions between Skagit County and the City of Sedro-Woolley regarding Recommendation T1 should begin in 2017. Recommendation T2 should be implemented in 2016 if possible. Implementation of Recommendation D1 should begin in 2021~~0~~. Recommendations D2 or D3 cannot be implemented until a proposal for either a waste conversion facility or a landfill is actually received by the County.

More details on the implementation of these and other recommendations are shown in the Implementation Plan (see Chapter 10).

Illegal Dumping

Illegal dumping is an ongoing problem in Skagit County. Illegal dumping is addressed through enforcement of State laws regarding solid waste disposal and Skagit County ordinances concerning solid waste disposal and/or littering.

County Code

~~The Skagit County Code, especially Chapter 12.18, needs to be revised and updated. SCC Chapter 12.18 potentially needs to be revised to provide for ~~reflect the fact that~~ waste from Sinclair Island to be ~~being~~ taken out of county and that ~~(because it may~~ would not be practical to require this waste be brought to the TRS). SCC 12.168 may also need revisions to update applicable references to the Washington Administrative Code. Ch. 12.18 should also be updated to remove outdated references to State laws that are no longer applicable (such as references to WAC 173-304).~~

Flow Control Enforcement

There is evidence that waste is potentially being removed from the County in violation of SCC Chapter 12.18. ~~The Skagit County Code currently lacks a clear enforcement mechanism. If needed, The County and applicable city and town codes could be revised concerning to include enforcement and penalty provisions for flow control. It may also be appropriate for the County and cities and towns to consider better coordination concerning flow control enforcement.~~

County Procurement Practices

The Skagit County Climate Action Plan, adopted in 2010, addresses procurement practices in depth and made several recommendations that could reduce wastes and provide cost savings for the County (see Policies C-1, C-2, C-3 and C-4 of the Climate Action Plan). These recommendations are not being actively pursued at this time due to the lack of a Sustainability Administrator and Sustainability Coordinator.

Long-Term Funding

The County may face the potential for financial constraints due to the reliance on tipping fees to fund some of the recycling programs. Ultimately, should recycling become “too successful,” funding for these programs would diminish due to shrinking waste quantities. Relying on the tipping fee for recycling funds may not be the best long-term strategy.

Regional Opportunities

There may be opportunities for regional efforts involving the neighboring counties (primarily Snohomish, San Juan, Whatcom and Island Counties). Many of these opportunities are in transfer and disposal systems but opportunities may exist for other activities as well. One possibility is an interlocal agreement with Whatcom County for the Diablo and Newhalem area, for Skagit County to take on additional

ease of accessing that information. The task force could include representatives from Skagit County (from the Solid Waste Division and Public Health Department), the four largest cities, Waste Management and, at their option, the four towns. This group could also be a subcommittee of the SWAC.

Alternative C - Periodic Rate Reviews and Adjustments

Reserve funds are currently exhausted and should be restored to a prudent level (10 to 25% of operating expenses) to ensure continued financial stability. A rate review could be conducted to determine the rate needed to restore the reserve funds to an appropriate level, create an equipment replacement fund, and to provide the funds necessary to implement the recommendations of this SWMP. This rate review could be conducted every three to four years to provide the basis for a periodic rate adjustment. The approximate cost of a rate review such as this would be about \$25,000 to \$35,000.

Alternative D - Interlocal Agreement with Whatcom County

Skagit and Whatcom Counties could enter into an interlocal agreement to allow the Diablo and Newhalem area to be included in the Skagit County solid waste system. This area of Whatcom County is isolated from the rest of Whatcom County and can only be accessed through Skagit County. The solid waste from this area is already being taken to Skagit County solid waste facilities by Waste Management and by self-haulers using the Sauk Transfer Station. Taking on more responsibility for this area would, however, create significant costs for Skagit County. Additional costs would be created by the need to manage MRW from this area, provide public education, and address illegal dumping and solid waste permitting needs.

Alternative E - Enforcement of Flow Control

If needed, Skagit County and the four incorporated cities could adopt enforcement mechanisms for flow control as part of their respective county or revise applicable city codes concerning flow control enforcement. It may also be appropriate for the County and cities and towns to consider better coordination concerning flow control enforcement. For example, flow control provisions could also be noted in public bid documents and in permits.

Alternative F - ~~Clean-up~~ County Code

Revisions could be considered made to the Skagit County Code to recognize the unique situation of Sinclair Island (as it relates to flow control) and to potentially update the county code by removing outdated references to State laws.

9.5. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION ALTERNATIVES

Review of Rating Criteria

The above alternatives can be evaluated and rated according to several criteria and a decision made as to whether to pursue an alternative or not based on the overall rating for each. These criteria include:

- consistency with the planning goals shown at the beginning of this chapter and with the goal of diverting more materials from disposal.
- the degree to which an alternative is considered to be technically and politically feasible to implement.
- the cost-effectiveness of an alternative can be assessed based on the presumed total costs of the activity versus its potential benefits and relative to other alternatives or to the existing practices.
- the potential for additional diversion of materials from the waste disposal system (as a percentage of the waste stream).

Consistency with Solid Waste Planning Goals: All of these alternatives are consistent with the planning goals, although Alternative D (the interlocal agreement with Whatcom County) is consistent with only one of the applicable planning goals (common commitment to environmental protection and preservation of quality of life) and Alternative F (updating the County code) is relatively neutral with respect to the goals.

Feasibility: All of these alternatives would be challenging in various ways to implement. Alternative A, hiring a Recycling Coordinator, would require approval for the new position. For Alternative B, a task force on public education, it may be difficult to get representatives involved from the necessary organizations and then implement the ideas that are agreed upon by the task force. The cost of Alternative C, a rate review and adjustment, may be challenging to justify but is necessary. Alternative D, the interlocal agreement with Whatcom County, may be politically challenging, especially if it proves difficult to justify for Skagit County. For Alternative E, enforcement of flow control, it would be challenging to adopt revisions to city ~~and county~~ codes as well as justify enforcement actions against offenders. Alternative F, ~~updating cleaning up~~ the County code, wouldn't be that difficult but would require an investment in staff and commission time.

Cost-Effectiveness: Alternative A, hiring a Recycling Coordinator, could be cost-effective in the sense that recycling leads to disposal cost savings for the participants. Alternative B, a task force on public education, would be cost-effective if it led to more effective approaches. For Alternative C, a rate review and adjustment, the concept of cost-effectiveness is difficult to apply. Alternative D, the interlocal agreement with Whatcom County, would lead to additional costs for Skagit County

without an off-setting benefit. Alternative E, enforcement of flow control, would possibly be cost-effective in the sense that expenses for enforcement activities ~~may~~ would possibly be offset ~~up~~ by increased tipping fees and other revenues. Cost-effectiveness is not a factor for Alternative F, ~~cleaning up the county code~~.

Diversions Potential: Both Alternatives A, hiring a Recycling Coordinator, and B, a task force on public education, could lead to significant additional amounts of waste diversion. For Alternative C, a rate review and adjustment, the concept of diversion potential is difficult to apply. Alternative D, the interlocal agreement with Whatcom County, would not lead to significant additional waste diversion in the affected area. Alternative E, enforcement of flow control, could lead to significant increased diversion potential by providing a greater financial incentive to waste generators. Diversion potential is not a factor for Alternative F, cleaning up the County code.

Rating of Alternatives

The evaluation of the alternatives is summarized in the following table.

Table 9-4. Ratings for the Administration and Public Education Alternatives					
Alternative	Consistency with Goals	Feasibility	Cost-Effective-ness	Diversions Potential	Overall Rating
A, Hire a Recycling Coordinator	H	M	H	H	H
B, Task force for public education	H	M	H	M-H	H
C, Rate review and adjustment	H	M	M	M	M
D, Interlocal agreement with Whatcom County	M	L	L	L	L
E, Enforce flow control	H	M	H	H	H
F, Clean up County Code	M	M	NA	NA	M

Rating Scores: H – High, M – Medium, L – Low, NA – Not Applicable

9.6. ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are being made for administration and public education programs in Skagit County.

High-Priority Recommendations

A&PE1) Skagit County and the Cities will create a task force to address consistency and accessibility for public education.

A&PE2) Skagit County will hire a Recycling Coordinator.

A&PE3) If necessary, Skagit County and the cities and towns may will consider revising and/or adopting applicable flow control enforcement provisions.

Medium-Priority Recommendations

A&PE4) Rate reviews will be conducted periodically for disposal rates to ensure adequate funds are being collected to support solid waste programs and mandates.

A&PE5) Consider possible revisions to tThe Skagit County Code should be updated to potentially exempt recognize that Sinclair Island is exempt from otherwise applicable flow control requirements, and/or to update applicable references remove references to State laws that are no longer relevant.

Overview of Implementation Responsibilities, Costs and Schedule

The lead agency responsible for most of these recommendations is the Skagit County Public Works Department, with assistance from the Health department for Recommendations A&PE4 and A&PE5. For Recommendation A&PE3, the Cities will need to take the lead on revising city codes and disposal activity review for flow control enforcement within their jurisdictions.

The cost for Recommendation A&PE1 will consist largely of staff time, although the production of new public education materials (including changes to websites) may be necessary. The cost for Recommendation A&PE2 will be up to \$75,000 (including benefits and overhead). The estimated cost of the rate review (Recommendation A&PE4) will be about \$25,000 to \$35,000 for each year it is conducted. The costs for Recommendations A&PE3 and A&PE5 will largely consist of staff time.

The implementation of Recommendation A&PE1 should begin in 2016, and Recommendations A&PE2, A&PE3 and A&PE5 should be implemented in 2017. The rate review (Recommendation A&PE4) should be conducted in 2017 and again after the waste export contract has been re-bid (in 2022).

More details on the implementation of these and other recommendations are shown in the Implementation Plan (see Chapter 10).

10.5. WASTE COLLECTION RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are being made for waste collection programs (see Chapter 6 for more details):

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Waste Collection

- WC1) More promotion should be conducted for drop box customers to source-separate recyclable and compostable materials.
- WC2) The cities and Waste Management should consider switching all residential garbage collection services to every-other-week service.

10.6. TRANSFER AND DISPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are being made for transfer and disposal programs (see Chapter 7 for more details):

High-Priority Recommendations for the Transfer System

- T1) Skagit County and the City of Sedro-Woolley should evaluate the benefits and impacts of [potentially](#) closing the Clear Lake Compactor Site and [possibly](#) moving those operations to the Sedro-Woolley Recycling Facility, and this change may be implemented if mutually agreeable.
- T2) Transfer station customers will be encouraged to bring source-separated materials to other facilities for recycling or composting.

High-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D1) Skagit County will begin preparing a Request for Proposals for a new waste export and disposal contract in 2021~~0~~.

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D2) Any future proposals for waste conversion facilities should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for consistency with this [Solid Waste Management Plan](#) and existing programs; the waste export and disposal agreement then in effect; applicable siting, zoning, environmental and health regulations; and other criteria appropriate to the proposed system.

Low-Priority Recommendations for Waste Export and Disposal

- D3) Any future proposals for additional inert or limited purpose landfills should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for demonstrated need and benefit to the citizens of Skagit County; consistency with this [Solid Waste Management Plan](#); and applicable siting, zoning, environmental and health regulations.

10.7. SPECIAL WASTE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are being made for special waste programs (see Chapter 8 for more details):

High-Priority Recommendations for Special Wastes

- SW1) Increased education should be provided for the proper disposal of sharps.
- SW2) The needle exchange should be continued and possibly expanded.
- SW3) Staging areas will be designated for disaster debris.
- SW4) A disaster debris strategy will be developed.
- SW5) Increased education and technical assistance should be provided for CESQGs.

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Special Wastes

- SW6) Increased enforcement of existing regulations for the proper identification and disposal of asbestos-containing materials is needed, beginning with requiring that all demolition permits include an AHERA inspection or other survey for asbestos.
- SW7) Increased publicity will be provided for the HHW Facility.

10.8. ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are being made for administration programs (see Chapter 9 for more details):

High-Priority Recommendation for Administration and Public Education

- A&PE1) Skagit County and the Cities will create a task force to address consistency and accessibility for public education.
- A&PE2) Skagit County will hire a Recycling Coordinator.
- A&PE3) If necessary, Skagit County and ~~the cities~~ and towns may will consider revising and/or adopting applicable flow control enforcement provisions.

Medium-Priority Recommendations for Administration and Public Education

- A&PE4) Rate reviews will be conducted periodically for disposal rates to ensure adequate funds are being collected to support solid waste programs and mandates.
- A&PE5) Consider possible revisions to the Skagit County Code should be updated to potentially exempt recognize that Sinclair Island is exempt from otherwise applicable flow control requirements, and /or to update

applicable references ~~remove references to State laws that are no longer relevant.~~

10.9. SIX-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The proposed implementation schedule is shown in Table 10-1. It should be noted that the recommendations have been abbreviated to fit better into this table.

10.10. IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Skagit County and the cities and towns are primarily responsible for most of the recommendations made in this Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP), but that responsibility is shared with others as appropriate to the nature of the recommended activity. Implementation responsibilities for the recommended activities are summarized in Table 10-2.

10.11. FUNDING STRATEGY

The recommended programs will be funded through garbage rates, tipping fees, other user fees and State grants (CPG funds). A summary of the funding sources for the recommended programs is shown in Table 10-3.

As indicated in Table 10-3, garbage rates will be used to fund solid waste collection, curbside recycling and commercial recycling programs. Tipping fees will be the primary source of funds for waste reduction, transfer, disposal, administration, education and some of the recycling programs. Special user fees will fund some of the recycling and special waste programs. The State coordinated prevention grant funding program (CPG grants) will be used for MRW, enforcement, and recycling and waste reduction education programs, with additional funds contributed from tipping fees. Local source control funds will be used for technical assistance.

Solid waste planning guidelines require that this SWMP include a six-year construction and capital acquisition strategy for recommended activities, but no significant construction or capital acquisition expenses are required for this plan. Recommendation T1, which states that Skagit County and the City of Sedro-Woolley [maywill](#) evaluate the benefits and impacts of [potentially](#) closing the Clear Lake Compactor Site and moving those operations to the Sedro-Woolley Recycling Facility, may eventually lead to construction and capital costs for the Sedro-Woolley site, but the decision to proceed with that approach has not been made yet.

10.12. TWENTY-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

It is anticipated that programs and facilities in Skagit County will generally be able to stay on the course established by this SWMP for the next twenty years. The waste

Table 10-1. Implementation Schedule for Recommendations, continued						
Recommendation	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Waste Collection, continued						
WC2) Consider switching all residential garbage collection to every-other-week.						
Transfer and Disposal						
T1) Evaluate benefits and impacts of closing Clear Lake and moving the operations to the Sedro-Woolley Facility.	X					
T2) Encourage transfer station customers to bring recyclables elsewhere.						
D1) Prepare an RFP for a new waste export contract.				X	X	
D2) Any future proposals for waste conversion facilities should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.						
D3) Any future proposals for additional inert or limited purpose landfills should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.						
Special Wastes						
SW1) Increased education should be provided for the proper disposal of sharps.						
SW2) Needle exchange should be continued and possibly expanded.						
SW3) Staging areas will be designated for disaster debris.	X					
SW4) A disaster debris strategy will be developed.		X				
SW5) Increased education and technical assistance for CESQGs.						
SW6) Increased enforcement of existing regulations for asbestos.						
SW7) Increased publicity for the HHW Facility.						
Administration						
A&PE1) Create a task force to address consistency and accessibility for public education.						
A&PE2) Hire a Recycling Coordinator.	X					
A&PE3) Skagit County and the cities should continue to enforce flow control.						
A&PE4) Conduct disposal rate reviews periodically.	X					X
A&PE5) Potentially U update Skagit County Code.	X					

X – indicates a deadline or a singular event. Shading indicates ongoing activities.

Table 10-2. Implementation Responsibilities for Recommendations, continued

Recommendation	Skagit County	Cities, Towns	Health Dept.	Waste Haulers	Others
Waste Collection, continued					
WC2) Consider switching all residential garbage collection to every-other-week.		1	2	1	
Transfer and Disposal					
T1) Evaluate benefits and impacts of closing Clear Lake and moving the operations to the Sedro-Woolley Facility.	1	1, Sedro-Woolley	2		
T2) Encourage transfer station customers to bring recyclables elsewhere.	1				2, Recycling facilities
D1) Prepare an RFP for a new waste export contract.	1				
D2) Any future proposals for waste conversion facilities should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.	1				
D3) Any future proposals for additional inert or limited purpose landfills should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.	1				
Special Wastes					
SW1) Increased education should be provided for the proper disposal of sharps.	2		1		
SW2) Needle exchange should be continued and possibly expanded.			1		
SW3) Staging areas will be designated for disaster debris.	1	2	2		
SW4) A disaster debris strategy will be developed.	1		2		
SW5) Increased education and technical assistance for CESQGs.	2		1		
SW6) Increased enforcement of existing regulations for asbestos.	1	1			1 (L&I, NWCAA)
SW7) Increased publicity for the HHW Facility.	1				
Administration					
A&PE1) Create a task force to address consistency and accessibility for public education.	1	1		2	
A&PE2) Hire a Recycling Coordinator.	1				
A&PE3) Skagit County and the cities should continue to enforce flow control.	1	1			
A&PE4) Conduct disposal rate reviews periodically.	1		2		
A&PE5) <u>Potentially</u> <u>U</u> update Skagit County Code.	1		2		

GLOSSARY

The following definitions are provided for terms used in this SWMP:

[AHERA: Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act.](#)

Biomedical waste: infectious and injurious waste originating from a medical, veterinary or intermediate care facility, or from home use.

Biosolids: includes sludge from the treatment of sewage at a wastewater treatment plant and semisolid waste pumped from a septic system that have been treated to meet standards for beneficial use (see WAC 173-308).

Buy-back recycling center: a facility that pays people for recyclable materials.

Commercial solid waste: solid waste generated by non-industrial businesses. This includes waste from business activities such as construction; transportation, communications and utilities; wholesale trades; retail trades; finance, insurance and real estate; other services; and government.

Commingled: recyclable materials that have been collected separately from garbage by the generator, but the recyclable materials have been mixed together in the same container (see also single stream).

Composting: the controlled biological decomposition of organic wastes to produce a humus-like final product that can be used as a soil amendment. In this plan, backyard composting means a small-scale activity performed by homeowners on their own property, using yard debris that they generate. Centralized composting refers to either drop-off or processing locations operated by a municipality or a business.

Conditionally-exempt small-quantity generator (CESQG): a non-residential generator of small quantities of hazardous wastes that is exempt from the full regulations for hazardous wastes as long as the wastes are handled properly.

Consistency with planning goals: one of the criteria used to evaluate alternatives discussed in this SWMP, “consistency with planning goals” is a relative measure as to how well an alternative agrees with the goals that are relevant to that aspect of the solid waste system and with the general goal of diverting more materials from the waste stream (if applicable).

Cost-effectiveness: one of the criteria used to evaluate the alternatives discussed in this SWMP, cost-effectiveness is a relative measure as to how costly an alternative is in handling the materials or waste that it is designed to address, generally on a per-ton basis and compared to other potential alternatives and/or to existing practices.

CPG: Coordinated Prevention Grants, a grant program administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology.

APPENDIX C

UTC COST ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

By State law (RCW 70.95.090), solid waste management plans are required to include:

“an assessment of the plan’s impact on the costs of solid waste collection. The assessment shall be prepared in conformance with guidelines established by the Utilities and Transportation Commission. The Commission shall cooperate with the Washington state association of counties and the association of Washington cities in establishing such guidelines.”

The following cost assessment has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines developed by the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC). The purpose of this cost assessment is not only to allow an assessment of the impact of proposed activities on current garbage collection and disposal rates, but to allow projections of future rate impacts as well. The UTC needs this information to review the potential impact of this Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) to the certificated waste haulers that it regulates. For these haulers, UTC is responsible for setting collection rates and approving proposed rate changes. Hence, the UTC will review the following cost assessment to determine if it provides adequate information for rate-setting purposes, and will advise Skagit County as to the possible collection rate impacts of proposed programs. Consistent with this purpose, the cost assessment focuses primarily on those programs with potential rate impacts.

SUMMARY

A significant recommendation in this SWMP is to adopt a minimum service level ordinance that would require all waste collection customers in the certificated areas to also receive recycling service. Due to the current poor state of recycling markets, however, implementation of this recommendation is not being proposed until 2019. Several recommendations, such as the need for a new staff person and increased publicity for specific programs, will lead to an increase in the tipping fee if fully implemented (for an increase as high as \$150,000 per year). Re-bidding the waste export contract in 2021⁰ could either increase or decrease the tipping fee. Operating costs for Waste Management will be increased if they implement this SWMP due to more promotion for the organics collection program. Other recommendations made in the SWMP are primarily refinements to existing programs.