

King County Solid Waste Division

The following are comments made on behalf of the King County Solid Waste Division by Meg Moorhead, Strategy, Communications and Performance Manager, as part of an Ecology sponsored advisory committee convened to comment on portions of the proposed revised rule:

My advice is to stay with the \$100,000 fixed component. Urban counties are the source of significant revenues to the state and have large populations to serve. King County allocates much of its CPG funding to our partner cities. Some King County partner cities have larger populations than rural counties, with commensurate demand for hazardous and solid waste services. They rely on CPG funds to leverage other funding sources. So given urban counties' contributions to state revenues and large populations to serve, retaining the current fixed/per-capita allocation components make sense.

Of course lower population counties also have important hazardous and solid waste functions that rely on the CPG program. But in that case the funding of essential services with declining state grants seems to be a more fundamental problem than the allocation formula. A more sustainable funding source should be identified to support essential programs.

In terms of the potential penalty for CPG recipients that do not comply with administrative requirements, I'm neutral on that topic. It seems reasonable to ask recipients to meet Ecology's requirements but I don't know enough about other jurisdictions' administrative challenges to make a judgment on whether a penalty is reasonable.

Our work group has not been asked to comment on the Health Departments' allocations, so I will leave that aside.