

Diana Wadley

Response to Ecology comments. October 10, 2013

Subject: Ecology comments: Town of Friday Harbor Solid and Moderate Risk Waste Plan, Draft April 18, 2013.

Thank you for your detailed comments to improve and bring the draft Town of Friday Harbor Solid and Moderate Risk Waste Plan, dated April 18, 2013, into compliance with all state health regulations. The Town of Friday Harbor has edited and modified the draft in response to your comments. Those changes are noted individually in the following responses.

Below are Ecology's comments for your consideration. The first section focuses on the Solid Waste Plan. The second section focuses on the Moderate Risk Waste plan (included as Chapter 7 of the Solid Waste Plan).

Solid Waste Plan:

REQUIRED ELEMENTS TO ADDRESS FOR THE FINAL DRAFT

SWR1) Clarify to what facilities items go, and ensure those facilities are in compliance.

Please clarify to what facilities your various streams of solid waste go, and state that the facilities must be in compliance with all applicable regulations and rules. Two waste streams in particular are highlighted below.

C&D: Section 2.2 notes that "A private hauler provides roll-off collection service for asphalt, concrete, construction, demolition, and land-clearing debris." Because the paragraph in Section 2.2 is under the header "Diversion" and discusses a diversion rate, I wondered if there was a private hauler operating in the Town that is recycling the above listed items, and to what facility(ies) are they delivered. After researching this with the County Health and Community Services Department and Town, it appears there is no private hauler collecting/recycling the above items in Friday Harbor. Please remove this inaccurate reference from the plan.

TFH response: This paragraph apparently was intended to refer to recycling for services for businesses within the Town and on-call services for construction and demolition, which are provided by San Juan Sanitation. The corrected paragraph for Section 2.2 page #18 reads:

Other recycling collection

San Juan Sanitation Company, the certificated hauler for San Juan County, provides commingled recycling one and two-yard dumpsters for business use within the Town. These recyclable materials are delivered to the transfer station on Orcas Island or taken directly to Tri County Recycling in Mount Vernon, Washington for processing, baling and marketing. When the collected recyclables are delivered to Orcas Island Transfer Station¹, they are loaded into a transfer trailer and hauled by Lautenbach Industries to Tri County Recycling. The total amounts of recyclable materials collected in this manner would be captured under the system used by Orcas Island Transfer Station.

San Juan Sanitation also provides on-call roll-off box collection service for construction and demolition debris and asphalt, concrete, and land-clearing debris.

TFH response: Information about a private hauler for businesses' recyclables is also updated/corrected in Section 3.3 page 29:

Curbside Recyclables Collection

The Town of Friday Harbor offers curbside recycling service for single family and multi-family residents. Friday Harbor's curbside recycling is collected once a month, and it is taken to Tri County Recycling in Burlington, Washington.

San Juan Sanitation Company, Inc. (the state-certificated hauler for San Juan County) provides boxes for commingled recycling service to commercial and large multi-family properties within the Town. San Juan Sanitation delivers its collected recyclable materials to the Orcas Island Transfer Station, where it is consolidated with other commingled recyclables and transported to Tri County Recycling in Burlington, Washington.

Yard Waste: Section 3.4 says the Town collects yard waste curbside on a subscription basis and those materials are shredded at an out-of-town location by a private contractor. Discussions have revealed that the facility to which the yard waste is going is Mike Carlson Enterprises, Inc.'s gravel pit. This facility does not currently have a permit or permit exemption that would allow them to accept yard waste. A solid waste management plan must plan for sending material to facilities that meet all applicable rules and regulations. The health department is working with the site operator to bring it into compliance. For the final draft solid waste management plan, the Town will need to either ensure its yard waste is going to a facility in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations, or, it could discuss within the plan that Mike Carlson Enterprises, Inc. is a facility operator working to meet rules and the Town is utilizing them only on a temporary basis (please give a time limit; six months would be more than reasonable) until requirements are met. The other option is to suspend yard waste services until a compliant facility can be found. If the facility is not compliant as of the time of plan completion, it should be prominent within the plan that it is as yet non-compliant, so as to clearly alert future readers of the plan that they would need to check the status of the facility before sending such materials there. Ecology cannot approve a plan for solid waste management that does not comply with laws and regulations (RCW 70.95.090 (3)(a)). Note also that section 3.4 "Needs and Issues" starts

¹ Orcas Island Transfer Station Operations Plan, July 29, 2013, Section 5.4.2, pg 22

by saying yard waste collection programs are required where there are adequate markets to consume the material collected. At this time, based on limited knowledge of the area, the State would not require the Town to have a yard waste collection program, though we would like to see further discussion of markets for the material. Note that recommendations found throughout the plan, such as Table 9 may need to be adjusted if the existing yard waste collection program is found to be illegal.

TFH response. A location to deliver Town yard waste on-island is basic to provision of the service. The bulky yard waste is collected at the minimal charge of one dollar per bag, which would not cover the cost of transport if it were to be taken off-island. The service provider, Mike Carlson Enterprises, is in the process of applying for a permit exemption (Mark Tompkins, San Juan County Environmental Health Coordinator) and Section 3.4 pg 35, has been adjusted to address compliance with health regulations as follows:

Curbside Collection of Yard Waste

In Friday Harbor, subscribers to regular refuse service receive curbside yard waste disposal services for a fee of \$1.00 per can, bag, or bundle. State requirements for yard waste collection programs do not apply to towns with populations as small as Friday Harbor's. However, it is a service the Town chooses to provide and curbside yard waste is collected once each month. Yard waste is delivered to Mike Carlson Enterprises, Inc., 2165 West Valley Road, and it is composted at the company's gravel pit on Trevethan Hollow Road. Carlson Enterprises does not currently have a permit or permit exemption that would allow accepting yard waste in accordance with RCW Section 70.95.090(3)(a)², but has applied with the County Health Department for a composting facility permit exemption. The Town will continue to use the Carlson site on a temporary basis and expects that Carlson Enterprises will have the necessary permit or permit exemption within a period of six months from the date of this draft (before April 15, 2014). This date is set to ensure time for processing the application and that requirements are met.

Further TFH response: Similarly, Page 36, Recommended Actions for Organics Management WRCC.COMP.2. Storm damage pickup and the same item in Table 9, page 77, have been modified to specify a permitted facility for composting, as follows:

Continue collecting private and public debris generated by storms and deliver it to a legally permitted facility for composting.

Further TFH response: Section 3.4 Needs and issues has been clarified to state that the Town, while exempt from composted yard waste regulations, holds similar values to increase recycling of organic materials. See page 35.

The planning guidelines require yard waste collection programs where there are "adequate markets or capacity for composted yard waste within or near the service area to consume the majority of the material collected." Friday Harbor is exempt, due to its small size and

² A program for the orderly development of solid waste handling facilities in a manner consistent with the plans for the entire county which shall: (a) Meet the minimum functional standards for solid waste handling adopted by the department and all laws and regulations relating to air and water pollution, fire prevention, flood control, and protection of public health;

the relatively small amount generated. The State has established a goal to eliminate yard debris from disposal by 2012 and the Town holds similar values.

SWR2) Service area boundaries and UGA Please ensure clear language is used regarding the Town's solid waste services and boundaries thereof. A map would be great. The Town services of residential recycling and garbage, and commercial garbage, should not include the Urban Growth Area, which falls under the g-certificate held by San Juan Sanitation (part of Section 3.3 seems to include the UGA). The Town's Comprehensive Plan gives a good synopsis of services, and notes the exclusion of the UGA on page 19 of Chapter 6. Feel free to contact myself or the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission for details about what Town solid waste services may or may not be allowed in the UGA.

TFH response: the Town Public Works department only collects within the Town's boundaries, not within the UGA. The 2002 (& 2009) urban growth area map was amended again (effective 9-21-2011) adding two former urban growth areas to the incorporated area of Friday Harbor. A map of the Town boundaries has been added to page 12.

Page 28 has also been amended, and Urban/Rural Service Areas is placed under Current Conditions:

Urban/Rural Service Areas

Section 70.95.090 (7)(b) RCW has differing requirements for urban and rural areas regarding collection of source-separated materials. In urban areas, programs for collection of recyclable materials from both single and multiple-family residences must be available, unless the department of Ecology approves an alternative program. Rural areas are only required to have drop-off recycling or buy-back centers.

In accordance with the density and service criteria of the state Growth Management Act, Chapter 36.70a RCW, the Town maintains urban levels of service within its boundaries.

SWR3) Consistency of population projections, solid waste capacity Section 2.3 contains population and waste stream projections. Section 4.6 also discusses population growth and capacity. Interestingly, each section gives a different number for the estimated population in 2015. Additionally, as noted in SWS3, below, the tons/person/year figure differs between this Plan and the Town's Comprehensive Plan. Different population growth rates are also discussed/used. Please achieve consistency and explain when there are discrepancies, or perhaps give a range.

TFH Response: Population estimates in section 2.3 have been corrected to match the planning commission estimate of 1.2% per year, starting with the 2010 US Census count, and carried through 2035, as is now found on pages 18-19, and excerpted below.

Table 2.2, below, reflects the total projected waste generation over the planning period.

To project this estimated waste stream, the 2005-2010 average annual generation rate of 0.86 tons per person was used (0.86 t/person/yr). However, successful waste reduction methods may revise annual per capita waste generation figures downward. Population estimates are derived from the planning commissions estimate of 1.2% growth per year. This may prove to be the high end of projected population growth. See Chapter 4, Table 4.2 for a range of estimated population growth.

Table 2.2. Friday Harbor Waste Generation Projections

Year	Population	Projected Waste Generation (tons)
2015	2,302	1,978
2020	2,443	2,100
2025	2,598	2,234
2030	2,757	2,371
2035	2,961	2,546

Further TFH Response: Population figures have been given a range. Please see section 4.6, page 42:

For planning purposes, however, the Friday Harbor Planning Commission uses an annual growth rate of 1.2% to estimate future population growth for Friday Harbor. Applying this growth rate to the Town, the 2030 population is projected to reach 2,822 by 2035. Table 4.2 shows population estimates in 5-year increments using the U.S. Census 2010 population count as a base with the 1.2% growth rate and with the 0.8% actual growth countywide in recent years. The range of estimated growth should augment observations from monthly or yearly incoming operations data and prepare the Town for annual budgeting projections.

Table 4.2 Friday Harbor growth rate estimates

Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
1.2% planning commission estimate	2,248	2,275	2,302	2,330	2,358	2,386
0.8% county-wide 2009-2011 actual	2,220	2,238	2,256	2,274	2,292	2,310

SWR4) Population density Please include the population density of the Town (would likely fit in section 1.7)? There is a figure given in 7.1, but it is unclear (as stated in HWG1, below).

TFH Response: In accordance with data from the Office of Economic Development, the area of the Town in 2013 is 2.13 square miles with a population of 2,185 and a population density of 1,029.9 persons per square mile. These figures are reported in Section 7.1, page 57.

The 2010 US Census determined the Town population was 2,162 persons. The Town is 2.13 square miles in area. The State Office of Financial Management (OFM) estimates the population of Friday harbor to be 2,185 in 2103, giving it a population density of 1,029.9

persons per square mile³. The Town's Planning Commission uses a 1.2% growth rate and that growth rate results in an estimated population of 2,823 in the year 2033. For the purposes of this plan, a growth rate 1.2% is used, but a range of range of 0.8% to 1.2% may be considered.

SWR5) Procedural items SEPA review will need to be completed prior to submittal of a final draft to Ecology for review. Adoption by the Town should also take place before submittal. Please also include a list of the comments within this document and how each one has been addressed.

TFH Response: The Town SEPA official made a Determination of Non-significance (DNS) following review of the environmental checklist for the plan. It was published on May 8, 2013. No public comments were received in response to circulation of the DNS. Both the DNS and the SEPA checklist are included as appendix D to this document.

The Town Council adopted the plan on [redacted] and the list of comments and how each has been addressed is completed and returned with this letter.

Procedural compliance is noted on page 3:

The Preliminary Draft Plan was submitted for review and comment to the public, the Town, the County, and the State Department of Ecology on May 22, 2013. Comments received by this process were incorporated into a Final Draft Plan. The Final Draft Plan was then adopted through resolution by the Town Council on [date] and submitted to the Department of Ecology for final approval.

The plan will be evaluated at five-year intervals in accordance with RCW 70.95.110.

HIGHLY SUGGESTED TO ADDRESS BEFORE THE FINAL DRAFT

SWS1) SWAC insufficient for CPG In the Executive Summary, the plan notes that the Council members are serving as the SWAC. As stated in Diana Wadley's 6/15/11 e-mail to Michelle Nicholls, use of only City Council members to make up the city's "SWAC" does not represent balanced enough interests to satisfy Ecology's interpretation of a "SWAC-like entity" for the purposes of securing Coordinated Prevention Grant (CPG) funding. A SWAC diverse enough to meet our needs would include a least one member from general citizenry, a public interest group, a business, and an elected official. Use of the Council and public meetings to supply input to the Solid and Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan as a whole, however, does satisfy the need for public participation in the plan. It is up to the Town to decide if it wishes to broaden its SWAC to make itself eligible to CPG funding.

TFH response: The Town remains open to creating a SWAC, although it is not doing so at this time. Review by the Planning Commission and the Town Council will serve to meet the public

³ <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/popden/default.asp>

participation requirements for adoption of this Solid and Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan.

However, the plan has retained some references to SWAC, usually adjacent to references to review by Planning Commission and Town Council, in the in the event that the Town chooses to create a Solid Waste Advisory Committee that meets Ecology and statutory standards.

Page 2 has been revised to clarify the Town's current position on establishing a solid waste advisory committee.

The Town has an established public participation process through the appointed Planning Commission and elected Town Council. Accordingly, for the purposes of this Plan, review and adoption of this plan and any changes to it will be the responsibility of the Planning Commission and the Town Council. The Town may establish a SWAC in accordance with Washington State Department of Ecology standards in the future.

An example of keeping the Town aware of how SWAC inclusion would operate is found near the bottom of page 30.

Proposed changes to the designated recyclables list must be made to the Town Administrator and presented to the Planning Commission or Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) for review. The Planning Commission or SWAC may then recommend modification(s) to the list for the Town Council's review. If the Council approves the modification, the updated list will be submitted to Ecology and appended to the plan. This process should not be considered a plan amendment and does not require other action to adopt the modified list.

SWS2) Expenses table Please see the Track Changes in the electronic draft plan for questions regarding Table ES.2.

TFH Response: The recommended changes have been entered, more specifically identifying services and costs for them. Please see page 5.

The projected expenses in Table ES.2 are based on continuing to haul refuse to Skagit County. In 2014 the anticipated fee will be \$95 per ton. The interlocal agreement provides the option to tip at Skagit, not a mandate. The Town still has an option to haul to Orcas Transfer Station, now in operation by Orcas Recycling Services, a private not-for-profit organization. Additionally, Lautenbach Industries is in contract negotiations for operation of the Sutton Road facility. It will continue current operations and has expressed an intent to establish a permitted tipping floor there, improving both the Town and County properties at that location. Presence of an on-island tipping floor could change the Town's delivery choices. Therefore, budget projections may change, based on conditions that currently show signs of remaining in flux within the planning period.

SWS3) Town's Comprehensive Plan, Level of Service, and relation to 1996 Plan Section 1.5 (and subsequent sections) refer to the Town's Comprehensive Plan, which covers 2002-2022. This Solid Waste Management Plan should include more discussion of the content of the Comprehensive Plan and the Level of Service for solid waste. Items to discuss include:

1. CFE-72 gives standards for evaluating solid waste facility improvements. Please compare/contrast with the figures used in this plan (such as section 2.3, which states 1.1 ton/person/year in contrast to the 0.86 ton/person/year in the Comprehensive Plan).
2. CFE-74 notes that one way to increase solid waste system capacity is by “conditioning permits for new development to provide for facilities that are lacking.” Is this a strategy that could be taken in relation to the Sutton Road site? I do not see discussion of such conditioning of permits within the Solid Waste plan.
3. CFE-75 says to proceed with implementation of system improvements in 1996 Solid Waste Management Plan (of which the Town was a signatory). Often, a solid waste management plan will discuss the goals/recommended actions of its predecessor and show which items have been achieved, discarded, or continued. While the 1996 plan is very outdated and a detailed review is not needed, it would be good to address or reconcile the recommendation given in CFE-75.

TFH Response: these sections have are discussed in accordance with the comments. Please see Section 1.5, page 10.

Town’s Comprehensive Plan, Level of Service, and relation to 1996 Plan

1. CFE-72 gives standards for evaluating solid waste facility improvements. The Friday Harbor Comprehensive Plan estimates solid waste generation at 6.2 pounds per person per day or 1.1 tons per person per year. The Town is able to supply adequate levels of service for garbage and recycling by increasing the number of dates routes are serviced and, if necessary, increasing the number of collection trucks to service the routes. The destinations of the collection vehicles in Skagit county have more than adequate capacity for the Town’s waste collections and are legally able to accept them, as documented elsewhere in this plan.
2. CFE-74 notes that one way to increase solid waste system capacity is by “conditioning permits for new development to provide for facilities that are lacking.” However, under the Growth Management Act, the Town’s expansion will be orderly, and given the location, moderate. With these circumstances, permit conditions are not likely to yield substantial funds. On the other hand, CFE-66 recommends that each new development permit should demonstrate adequate solid waste management capacity for the proposed use.
3. CFE-75 says to proceed with implementation of system improvements in 1996 Solid Waste Management Plan (of which the Town was a signatory). It is appropriate to update this section to refer to the current plan implementation, as, once adopted, it supersedes the 1996 plan.

SWS4) Deleted sentence Just below Figure 2.2, I deleted a sentence regarding the source of data for the waste characterization study. Please see Tracked Changes.

TFH Response: Correction made. Thank you.

SWS5) Dropbox Facility All references to the present solid waste facility at Sutton Road should call it a Dropbox Facility, not a Transfer Station. It ceased to be permitted as a transfer station in 2010.

TFH Response: Changes have been made to correct this error throughout the document.

SWS6) Current Costs When shifting from delivering waste to the Sutton Road site to direct delivery to Skagit County, the Town did a cost assessment. Could that analysis of costs be included here? That would help guide future decisions such as what tipping fee would make it cost effective to revert back to using the local site.

TFH Response: A more current cost analysis has been entered under Section 5.3, Needs and Issues, See pages 48 & 49 with text as follows.

Deliver Garbage and recycling to Mount Vernon and Burlington.

The \$95 per ton charge at the Skagit Transfer Station is the major part of the total cost of waste export. An additional \$66 per ton for personnel, equipment, fuel and ferry costs brings the total cost to the Town to \$161 per ton in 2013.

Recycling costs \$30 per ton at Tri County Recycling Inc., and the additional costs to get it there (personnel, equipment, fuel, and ferry) brings the cost to an average of \$140 per ton.

This compares favorably with the charges of delivering to the Orcas Island Transfer Station, the only closer facility, where the tipping fee is \$300 and significant personnel time and ground and ferry travel remain additional costs.

Capacity at the out-of-county facilities does not appear to be an issue. The Skagit County Recycling and Transfer Station can handle one thousand tons of garbage each day, and Friday Harbor generates less than two thousand tons each year. TriCounty Recycling, Incorporated, Burlington, is a legally authorized private company that accepts commingled recyclables, including cardboard, mixed paper, tin, aluminum, and glass. It can handle all the Town's commingled recyclables, which are currently collected at curbside during one week of each month.

SWS7) Materials Routed to Gasification Plant Section 5.3 notes the potential gasification plant might need more feedstock to operate. Please discuss what the Town would want to consider if the materials that currently have a goal of landfill diversion (and resource recovery!) were suddenly desired by the incinerator. Additionally, note also that SJCC 8.12.020 (A)(2) prohibits acceptance of waste generated/collected outside the County.

TFH Response – Gasification is subject to approval by the Town and the County. The Town retains the right to deny the gasification plant construction on its Sutton Road property. Language to that effect is inserted on page 48:

If the gasification plant is built, the energy production process could require fifteen to thirty tons of garbage per day and would be likely to consume all the garbage the Town and the County produce. If the plant requires more than thirty tons of garbage a day, it may become necessary to import more for feedstock. However, SJCC 8.12.020 (A)(2) prohibits acceptance of waste generated/collected outside the County.

The Town of Friday Harbor is aware that the Kentec firm is interested in building a gasification plant on San Juan Island. There is insufficient information to allow the Town to authorize such a plant at this time. The property in question is not zoned for such a use. There is currently insufficient solid waste produced on the island to make such a facility feasible. The Town has no intention of allowing such a plant unless its operation is feasible, and once feasible, intends no diversion of otherwise recyclable waste to be used to supplement operations.

The pending contract between San Juan County and Kentec and Lautenbach Industries for operation of the Sutton Road site specifies that the operators will continue the current solid waste services locally.

SWS8) Expenses Exceed Revenues In comparison of Table 8.3 and 8.4, it appears there is a funding gap for a few of the years. Please explain how the Town intends to account for the difference.

TFH Response: In addition to the current delivery to Skagit county, **the Town has options where rates are not yet established or may change. The Town also will adjust rates if necessary to cover the cost of collection service for residents. Language to clarify the recent and upcoming changes, as far as they are known at this time has been added to pages 69 &70, under Expenses:**

Projected expenses are based on the Town's continuing to haul refuse to Skagit County. In 2014 the anticipated fee will be ninety-five dollars per ton. The interlocal agreement provides an option but not a mandate to tip at the Skagit County transfer station.

The Town still has an option to haul to Orcas Transfer Station, now in operation by Orcas Recycling Services, a private not-for-profit organization. Presence of an on-island tipping floor could change the Town's delivery choices. Therefore, budget projections may change based on options that show signs of remaining in flux within the planning period.

Operations of the Orcas island facility are now under contract with Orcas Recycling Services, a private not-for-profit organization that could possibly adjust tipping fees to a level that the Town may find practical. Additionally, Lautenbach Industries is in contract negotiations for operation of the Sutton Road facility. It will continue current operations and has expressed intent to establish a permitted tipping floor there, improving both the Town and County properties at that location. Presence of an on-island tipping floor could change the Town's collection system to delivery on-island, reducing the need for hauling off-island and for purchase of additional packer trucks to accommodate population growth.

SWS9) See Tracked Changes Please review my other Tracked Changes and comments within the draft text.

TFH Response: Thank you for your detailed comments and corrections and occasional praise. They have been entered or addressed and a more clear and precise document has resulted.

GENERAL COMMENTS

SWG1) Section 3.2.: Recycling Education and Outreach is discussed, but what staff person(s) at the Town are responsible for this? The discussion of staffing in 8.5 could be expanded to address this. I fear many of the goals are unrealistic if there is insufficient staff to implement them.

TFH Response: At this time the County has taken the initiative on outreach and education. The Town distributes waste reduction and recycling information on its website and at with promotional material the reception area of the administrative office. The Town would have to expand staff numbers or responsibilities to take on outreach that would include backyard composting and school presentations. While funding is not allocated at this time, keeping the goals is important to remind the town to find resources for programs, especially if the County stops offering them. No changes made.

SWG2) Section 3.3, Existing Conditions could use more straightforward/clear language. For example, the town collects recyclables with its own trucks, right? How many staff? Where do the recyclables go?

Additionally, the sentence, “The Town intends to develop a multi-family and commercial collection service in the future.” is found in the paragraph under “Existing Conditions,” but it is stated in the text under “Curbside Recyclables Collection” that the Town offers curbside recycling for single AND multi-family residents. It also notes that a private contractor (please just say San Juan Sanitation) provides commingled recycling for commercial and large multifamily accounts. Does the Town truly intend to develop a [large] multi-family and commercial recycling service in the future? If so, this Plan might help think through that process (in a section other than Existing Conditions).

TFH Response: The service is provided by regular staff with a packer truck. When the truck is full, one staff person drives the truck to TriCounty Recycling services in Burlington where the recyclable materials are sorted and baled for commodities markets. Under Curbside Recycling Collection, on page 29, further details on the recyclable collection systems within the Town are found:

The Town of Friday Harbor offers curbside recycling service for single-family residents. Friday Harbor’s curbside recycling is collected once a month. The Town Public Works Department uses a packer truck to haul recyclable materials to the facility operated by Tri County Recycling, Inc., 382 Gilkey Road, Burlington, Washington, 98233 where the materials are processed and baled for transport to marketing agents.

San Juan Sanitation Company, Inc., the state-certificated hauler for San Juan County, provides dumpsters for commingled recycling service to commercial and multi-family

properties within the Town. San Juan Sanitation delivers the collected recyclable materials to the Orcas Island Transfer Station, where they are consolidated with other commingled recyclables and transported to Tri County Recycling in Burlington, Washington. San Juan Sanitation sometimes delivers directly to Tri County, when it is efficient to take the truck to the mainland for maintenance or other reasons.

San Juan Sanitation handles the multi-family and commercial recyclables accounts within the Town, but the Town would like to offer recycling services to all town residents and businesses.

Section 3.3, Needs and Issues, Recycling incentives, on page 31, has been revised as follows:

San Juan Sanitation Inc. currently offers multi-family and commercial recyclable collection service within the Town and in the County. The Town intends to offer these services in the future as the feasibility of destination and collection system for this relatively new Town service develops.

SWG3) Section 3.3.3 discusses the idea of doing away with imbedded utility rates in an effort to incentivize recycling. If I understand correctly, it sounds like residents currently pay one rate that covers both trash and recycling, regardless of their use of either? Often, communities go to this included rate in order to increase recycling, theorizing that if they must pay for it anyway, they'll use it. (Or they say the rate is for trash, with "free" recycling.) I wonder/fear that if recycling services are broken out, perhaps some residents would want to drop the recycling portion altogether.

TFH Response: Currently there is a base charge and a per can charge for garbage collection. If there is a separate charge for recycling collection, it will remain at a lower cost than garbage collection, which should work as an incentive. Here is the revised text found on page 31: (Additionally, Section number 3.3.3 has been corrected to read Section 3.3)

Recycling incentives

Since July 2, 2012, the Town has offered commingled recyclable materials collection at curbside for single-family residences once a month with a packer truck and delivers it to TriCounty Recycling in Burlington. The service is offered at no separate cost to garbage collection customers, but customers must sign up for the recyclable collection service. Eventually it may become necessary to charge for the real cost of collecting and transporting recyclables. However, any fee for recyclables collection will remain lower than the fee for garbage collection.

Keeping any charges for recyclables services lower than the charge for garbage collection could encourage residents to separate the maximum amount of recyclables from their waste. Offering the service more often than the current once monthly could also make it more convenient and attractive to residents to source-separate their waste and place it in separate containers.

SWG4) "Re-use" is spelled "reuse."

TFH response: The spelling is corrected to "reuse" throughout the document.

TFH Note: Additional updates have been made to section 5.1 describing the current conditions and options for transfer and disposal in accordance with privatization development of San Juan County Facilities on Orcas and San Juan islands.

Moderate Risk Waste Plan:

Thank you for including a Moderate Risk Waste Plan in conjunction with the Solid Waste Management Plan for the Town of Friday Harbor. By having a current MRW plan, the Town not only prepares itself to mitigate the effects of these harmful items, but positions itself to be able to receive Coordinated Prevention Grant Funds for MRW work discussed in the plan, provided all other elements of eligibility (including SWAC diversity) are met. Below are Ecology's comments for your consideration.

REQUIRED ELEMENTS TO ADDRESS FOR THE FINAL DRAFT

HWR1) CESQGs Please expand your discussion of Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators in the Town (currently touched on in 7.3). Items to include would be:

- A basic listing of the main CESQGs in town (a starting point can be found in the County's SW + HW Plan on page 119) and the major waste streams of each
- The current outlets for their hazardous wastes and the current fee schedule via the County's collection events (posted on the County's website)
- This would also be a good place to mention the local source control specialist and the services provided (though yes, he's mentioned elsewhere)

TFH Response: The discussion on CESQGs has been expanded to include the list of the main CESQGs and the materials they bring. Please see Section 7.3, page 59, which is excerpted below:

Records from MRW collection events document medical /dental offices, school districts automobile/marine repair and body shops, local government offices and operations base yards, and contractors who perform building, painting and electrical services. The CESQG's who typically bring in the greatest quantity from Friday Harbor are Jensen's shipyard (1-2 drums boat wash trailings) ; Benz Painting (~ 70 gallons of paint thinner); Town of Friday Harbor (~ 70 gallons paint); Larry's Auto Body (~ 40 gallons thinner) Luxel, inc (~ 25 gallons of assorted laboratory chemicals). They each typically generate or accumulate less than 220 pounds of hazardous waste per month and meet the criteria for small quantity generators (CESQG), which makes them conditionally exempt from full hazardous waste regulation under WAC 173-303-070.

TFH Response: the discussion on the County's hazardous waste collection events and fee schedule has been expanded in Section 7.3, pages 59 and 60, as follows:

The County provides a hazardous waste collection event at the San Juan Island Drop box facility once each year. A hazardous waste disposal company, Clean Harbors Environmental Services, uses a portion of the Sutton Road drop-box facility to sort, package, and label

materials for transport and disposal. The County lacks storage for many types of moderate risk wastes, and the collected HHW and MRW must be removed immediately. Hazardous material transport is highly restricted on the passenger ferries. Most of it leaves the island on a private transport barge. Both residents and businesses can use this one-day event to dispose of their accumulated products containing toxic materials, but businesses (CESQGs) must pre-register with the Public Works Department in order to participate.

Businesses are currently charged \$5 per gallon or \$270 per 55-gallon drum. CESQG's receive notice of collection dates by phone, news releases and this web page. Households are charged a minimum fee of \$12.00 for up to 200 pounds of hazardous waste (the equivalent of about 25 gallons); quantities over 200 pounds cost \$.06/pound.

TFH Response: the discussion Section 7.3, page 60, has been expanded to include the local source control specialist as follows:

Local source control specialist

The County employs a pollution prevention specialist, who provides free technical assistance and information to help businesses navigate the network of state and local environmental rules, regulations, and responsibilities and improve their effectiveness at protecting the health of people and the environment. The pollution prevention program provides a local resource for businesses that have questions about waste disposal and activities that generate potential pollutants.

HWR2) Hazardous Waste Inventory A Hazardous Waste Inventory is required by RCW 70.105.220(1)(c). Please incorporate the data that Ecology has provided to you for dangerous waste generators, remedial action sites, transporters and zone designations into your Plan. The data has been inserted via Track Changes to section 7.3 of the draft.

TFH Response: Thank you for the data. It has been inserted in section 7.3, page 61.

HWR3) Safety and Enforcement by Town crews Please expand upon the training and safety considerations that the Town takes to protect its solid waste workers and to enforce against moderate risk waste in Town resident/business trash cans.

TFH Response: The Town provides annual safety training for garbage workers, including how to recognize and handle hazardous waste. The training materials come from various sources. the US Risk Management Services Agency and the US Department of Labor Occupational Safety & Health Administration. The next training is scheduled for November 29, 2013. The Town also conducts safety-training meetings for all staff on the second Friday of each month. Cross training includes awareness of hazardous materials, protection, and appropriate handling for all departments. Toxic materials training is also required for insurance by the Association of Washington Cities, and the Town uses the educational material that AWC provides.

Please see *Town Authority*, page 59:

To protect solid waste workers and citizens, the Town Public Works Department annually conducts training for any staff handling garbage to recognize, protect and appropriately contain hazardous waste that may have been discarded for their collection. The Town also conducts monthly safety meetings, which frequently feature toxic materials awareness and management or handling. The Town uses curricula and training videos provided by the State Department of Labor and Industries, the Association of Washington Cities, the US Risk Management Services Agency, and the US Department of Labor Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA).

HIGHLY SUGGESTED TO ADDRESS BEFORE THE FINAL DRAFT

HWS1) Plan replacement In 7.1 it states this plan replaces the 1998 San Juan County Hazardous Waste Plan, but I have no documentation that the 1998 plan was adopted by the Town. I also have no documentation that the 1998 Plan was approved by Ecology as a stand-alone Plan or Update to the 1991 plan. It could very well be that my files are simply incomplete. Do you have such documentation? In lieu of such documentation supporting the 1998 plan, I would suggest rewording the sentence to something like, “This moderate risk waste plan replaces the previous hazardous waste plan, which was prepared by San Juan County and adopted by the Town in 1998¹ and unofficially updated in 1998.”

TFH Response: Correction to section 7.1 is completed as follows. (page 57)

The 2013 Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan for the Town of Friday Harbor is incorporated into the Solid Waste Plan in this chapter. It replaces the previous hazardous waste plan, which was prepared by San Juan County and adopted by the Town in 1991 and unofficially updated in 1998. Any future revisions to the solid waste management plan must incorporate the moderate risk waste management plan, regardless of whether plans or existing conditions for moderate risk waste management are affected, revised, or remain unchanged.

HWS2) Inventory of Existing Streams In 7.3, Existing Conditions, it would be beneficial to have a basic showing of what materials were collected at the last Hazardous Waste Roundup on San Juan Island (since most of that material would logically be from Town residents/businesses). Such a table is found in the County’s SW + HW Plan on page 119, and could likely be updated from the County manifests of the most recent Roundup. This kind of “waste characterization study” could help guide focus for future waste reduction outreach and meet the need to discuss quantities, types, and fates of MRW within the Plan.

TFH Response: Records of hazardous waste generated specifically by Town residents are not kept at the County hazardous waste collection events. There are records of businesses and a paragraph addressing this has been added on page 59:

Records from past collection events document MRW deliveries from medical /dental offices, school districts automobile/marine repair and body shops, local government offices and operations base yards, and contractors who perform building, painting and electrical

services. The CESQG's who typically bring in the greatest quantity from Friday Harbor are Benz Painting (~ 70 gallons of paint thinner); Town of Friday Harbor (~ 70 gallons paint); Larry's Auto Body (~ 40 gallons thinner) Luxel, Inc. (~ 25 gallons of assorted laboratory chemicals).

County records from the San Juan Island collection in 2011 provide an inventory of materials adding up to 12,160 pounds.

Materials and (pounds) included acids (75), ammonia (50), bases (75), flammable liquids (3,600), mercury-florescent tubes and CFLs (500), elemental mercury (10), oil-based paint (4,600), PCB-containing ballasts (100), liquid pesticide/poison (1200), solid pesticide/poison (1700), and reactives (200).

HWS3) Issues Section 7.6 does well at addressing issues with the current program, but please also discuss the issues that your residents and CESQGs are facing as a result of the current program. Is there illegal dumping of MRW occurring? Is there much public outcry or feedback related to desired MRW programming? The 1991 plan notes that "...the practice of turning used oil over to building contractors for slash burning is still a common occurrence here, especially by auto repair businesses that may be reluctant to pay for transporting drums to the County collection tanks." (pg. 41). Is this (or similar foul practices) an issue within the Town? Probably would be good to discuss with the Health and Community Services Department.

TFH Response: The County Health Department enforces any illegal dumping, which typically would occur outside of the incorporated town boundaries. Used oil is collected at auto shops within town by draining it directly into transport vehicles by ORROCO (Oil ReRefining Company, Portland, Oregon) for recycling when they send a collection vehicle to San Juan Island. Additionally, the County shops are using the publically collected used oil to burn as fuel for the County shop heaters.

Most residents and businesses appreciate the annual collection events, and would like to have more frequent opportunities to safely discard MRW.

Please see *Materials accepted locally*, page 61.

At this time, uncontaminated used motor oil and vehicle or marine batteries are accepted at the San Juan Island drop-box facility for a fee of fifteen cents a gallon; antifreeze is accepted at no charge. Vehicle batteries are accepted at the county facility for five dollars. Some of the used motor oil is burned as heating fuel at the county shop on Guard Street. Recycling companies from the mainland periodically visit to collect and transport the commodity that is their specialty. Additionally, businesses selling or providing vehicle maintenance service hold those same used motor oil, antifreeze and batteries for collection when the recycling companies visit the island.

Used motor oil is collected at auto shops within town by drianing it directly into transport vehicles for recycling. ORROCO (Oil ReRefining Company, Portland, Oregon) is currently the company that serves town and county businesses.

HWS4) Fixed MRW Facility In Sections 7.6 and 7.8, the Town has identified that either more frequent or more permanent MRW collection options may be needed. Please be aware that an MRW “containment or holding facility” at the County Transfer Facility would most likely require a Fixed MRW Facility permit and would be subject to the requirements of WAC 173-350-360. When exploring this option versus additional collection events, please consider the budget impacts, County coordination and regulatory requirements related to building upgrades, permitting and staffing.

TFH Response: Both the Town and the County are dependent upon current funding for legal removal of MRW. Once again, transport across water drives waste management costs geometrically beyond those incurred on the mainland. Covering MRW removal costs without the grant funding would probably require local legislative action to generate adequate funding. Education is a pro-active method to reduce the quantities of toxic waste generated on the island. Section 7.6 Issues, page 62 and 63, has been modified in part as follows:

Toxic wastes generated within the town could be isolated and collected separately to ensure proper disposal. However, the costs of containment and removal of toxic wastes includes expert handling, training and personal protection for handlers, safe and legal containment, and immediate removal once collected. The County has been able to provide this costly service with revenues based on grant funding from the Department of Ecology. The Town government, residents, and businesses participate in the collection events on San Juan Island and the amount of grant funding is based on the total population of the county, including the Town.

While the County is pursuing system privatization in 2013, the County government has stated its intent to continue conducting annual hazardous waste collection events. The County government also is requiring any private contract for solid waste facility operation to include continuing the regular services currently provided.

If the annual collection events were no longer funded, both the County and the Town would find it very difficult to continue MRW removal programs. Alternatives to annual collection events could result more frequent collection events may encourage greater participation in sorting and disposing of small quantities of toxic waste. However, unless there is a permitted fixed Moderate Risk Waste facility on the island, more frequent collection trips by a specialized company would be necessary, and services from the specialized company are extremely costly. As noted above, many toxic substances are illegal to transport on the state ferry system. Additionally, any local MRW containment or holding facility would need a Fixed MRW Facility permit subject to the requirements of WAC 173-350-360, and meeting the standards for a fixed MRW facility would also be extremely expensive.

The State Department of Ecology has identified the most sustainable approach to management is prevention and increased reduction of wastes by attention to reuse and recycling. The Town can support a program that would raise public awareness of the hazards of even small amounts of toxic wastes and would encourage residents, businesses, and public institutions to find alternatives to products with toxic elements that are likely

enter the waste stream (or marine or ground water). Education may be the most economical and effective approach to MRW reduction.

Section 7.8, page 64, has been modified by removing:

MRW.6. Explore more frequent or more permanent MRW disposal options

~~The Town and County should consider more frequent collection events and if there may be an improved and more convenient collection, storage, and consolidation facility for used oil, batteries, and antifreeze.~~

HWS5) The Town's own waste Section 7.4 touches on the Town waste, but please expand upon the waste generated by Town operations and how it manages that waste and pays for its proper disposal. (Also see the comment in Track Changes.)

TFH Response: Please see clarification in section 7.4, page 62, as follows:

The MRW that the Town generates is brought to the annual MRW collection event. Limited MRW, including batteries, antifreeze and used oil are brought to the County transfer station. The Town refers residents and businesses to do the same. The Town pays for disposal fees out of the enterprise fund for waste management.

HWS6) Used Oil In 7.6, Issues, it is noted that if the San Juan facility no longer provides drop-off for used oil and antifreeze, new locations for such collection would need to be found. However, it seems from the last sentence in the "Materials accepted locally" subsection of 7.3 that automotive shops accept such items (and do they take batteries?). I would like to see more discussion of the private local options for moderate risk waste collection, and the fate of the collected oil (doesn't Public Works use much of it in their shop as fuel for their heater?). This would do particularly well to help fulfill RCW 70.95I regarding used oil. FYI, San Juan reported 12,410 lbs of used oil collected at the Sutton Road site in 2011 (we did not receive a report for 2012, likely due to the staff turnover).

TFH Response: *Materials accepted locally, page 61*

At this time, uncontaminated used motor oil and vehicle or marine batteries are accepted at the San Juan Island drop-box facility for a fee of fifteen cents a gallon; antifreeze is accepted at no charge. Vehicle batteries are accepted at the county facility for five dollars. Some of the used motor oil is burned as heating fuel at the county shop on Guard Street. Recycling companies from the mainland periodically visit to collect and transport the commodity that is their specialty. Additionally, businesses selling or providing vehicle maintenance service hold those same used motor oil, antifreeze and batteries for collection when the recycling companies visit the island.

Used motor oil is collected at auto shops within town by drianing it directly into transport vehicles for recycling. ORROCO (Oil ReRefining Company, Portland, Oregon) is currently the company that serves town and county businesses.

GENERAL COMMENTS

HWG1) In 7.1, the population density is given as 1,092 people per square mile. Please clarify, however, if this is for the Town itself, or the Town plus the UGA, (noting that the UGA should be outside the scope of this Plan, correct?)? Additionally, please ensure the growth rate figure matches the SW portion of the plan. I also put some edits towards the end of the related paragraph in the draft text, with the intent of aligning the SW and HW plans. (The SW plan states that it will use the 1.2% growth rate.)

TFH Response: In 2011 the Town code and land use map (shown on page 12) were amended to incorporate the UGAs, effective on September 21, 2011. (On the Town website, the 2009 maps showing the UGA has been superseded by the 2011 zoning map.) The population figures have been corrected and match the SW portion of the plan. Please see 7.1 Introduction and Background, page 57:

The 2010 US Census determined the Town population was 2,162 persons. The Town is 2.13 square miles in area. The State Office of Financial Management (OFM) estimates the population of Friday harbor to be 2,185 in 2103, giving it a population density of 1,029.9 persons per square mile⁴. The Town's Planning Commission uses a 1.2% growth rate and that growth rate results in an estimated population of 2,823 in the year 2033. For the purposes of this plan, a growth rate 1.2% is used, but a range of range of 0.8% to 1.2% may be considered.

HWG2) Please use the term "Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator" or "CESQG" whenever referring to these entities. It is more technically correct.

TFH Response: The term has been corrected in multiple locations.

HWG3) In 7.2, change "Chapter 70.951" to Chapter 70.951" (the letter "l" like "iguana").

TFH Response: Done

HWG4) As noted in Track Changes in section 7.2, the implementation of the legislation regarding mercury-containing lights has been delayed.

TFH Response: Reference to that legislation has been removed.

HWG5) Please see my Track Changes notes under 7.2, County Authority. I think it's important to note that Town residents are still allowed to participate in the County collection events, and I clarified the sentence about County Code Section 8.12.020 so it no longer sounds like MRW is accepted at most any SW facility (the code itself says "designated facility").

⁴ <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/popden/default.asp>

TFH Response: Track changes in 7.2 have been accepted and incorporated in Section 7.2, page 58 and 59.

County Authority

Local governments are required by the state to address moderate risk waste management in their jurisdictions and local governments have specific authority to adopt ordinances and regulations under RCW 70.95.160 to manage MRW. The powers and duties of jurisdictional health districts and of the local health officer are found in Sections 70.05.060 and 70.05.070 RCW.

The County Board of Health adopts the local solid waste handling requirements and the County Department of Health and Community Services and the Environmental Health manager are responsible to see that those requirements are met. The County Hazardous Waste Program, administered by its Public Works Department, promotes proper disposal of residual household and conditionally exempt small quantity generator (CESQG) hazardous wastes. The County also obtains grant funding for and employs a local source-control specialist who provides outreach and education to local businesses. The County intends to continue to operate MRW/HHW programs and will continue to encourage the Town and its residents to participate⁵. If questions of responsibility ever seem likely to arise, the Town may wish to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the County regarding management, costs, and removal of MRW.

The San Juan County Code Section 8.12.020 prohibits delivery of hazardous waste to waste facilities in the county for disposal, but states that moderate risk waste will be accepted at designated facilities. At this time there are no designated Moderate Risk Waste facilities in San Juan County, but moderate risk wastes are accepted at annual collection events where they are immediately sealed and removed by private barge by Clean Harbors Environmental Services for disposal.

HWG6) Please review my other Tracked Changes and comments within the draft text.

TFH Response: Thank you for the detailed review with recommended changes and comments. You will find them incorporated into the revised text.

TFH NOTES TO ECOLOGY: Additional changes have been made in several places, especially in Chapter 5 to bring the draft current with the commencement of operations by the Orcas Recycling Company on September 3, 2013 and the pending contract with Lautenbach Industries for operation of the San Juan Island facility.

“Existing Conditions” has been changed to “Current Conditions” throughout the headings. “Existing” is not particularly time-specific; “Current” refers to at the time of writing/final revisions, i.e., October 2013

⁵ SJC Solid & Hazardous Waste Management Plan September 2012, p. 117