

Leslie Morgan

I am making this comment as a citizen that fully realizes the implications of existing weak rules and regulations governing our landfills.

1.) RCW 70A540.050 3.a) needs clarification and a specific description of "working face". The working face should be defined as only that area which is currently receiving daily waste. This clarification is necessary due to the practice at Cedar Hills Landfill using intermediate cover verses final cover on areas that were no longer receiving garbage in order to categorize them as "active areas" therefore exempting them from methane monitoring. This practice was discovered in the discovery phase of the most recent citizen lawsuit.

2.) Size and period of time a working face can be open; Cedar Hills is looking at returning to former pits and top filling them to heights as high as 830'. This could lead to a working face being expansive in size, and active for an extended time, resulting in large amount of GHG's, noxious odors and VOC's being released into the surrounding communities, while falling into the exception category. An example of this practice was area 4 of Cedar Hills Landfill. Area 4 was kept as a working face for years even though they were aware of the environmental risks of having an active pit open for such a long period. Discovery during the class action lawsuit in the early 2000's uncovered exceedances of known VOC's, some more than 33x the acceptable levels, high levels of methane gas, as well as extremely strong noxious odors. With this example I believe there is a need to included strict size and length of time parameters for any working face to remain open.

3.) The working face should not have an exception; It would be beneficial to include this area in monitoring for methane to assess if the type of daily cover is best practices. Cedar Hills now uses tarps rather than 6" of soil for daily cover. This should be tested to make sure that tarps are as good or better than soil to mitigate methane, VOC's and noxious odors and assure that they are in compliance in meeting the EPA standards of best practices.

4.) Monitoring requirements; Updating the type of monitoring systems that the DOE requires for monitoring methane. The best available technology in achieving the largest net area of surface monitoring and accurate data technology should be required for each individual Landfill. The EPA now excepts drone technology as a method of measuring methane. The current monitoring method at Cedar Hills verses the drone monitoring results by Pergam Technical Services in 2021 demonstrates the need for updated technology requirements for landfills. The drone technology was far superior in identifying methane levels and leakage while covering a much greater surface area and cannot be manipulated.

5.) Strict adherence to new regulations; The importance of an industry to be in compliance of environmental standards and regulations is imperative to the health and safety of all. Landfills must meet regulatory standards, must show a history of consistently operate in compliance of their operating permits, should not be given exceptions, and must have stringent oversight in order to meet the environmental goals of Washington State in GHG reduction. This is especially important for an industry that ranks #3 in GHG emissions.

6.) Regulations that bring about change for Environmental Justice; As a citizen that has lived in a community that has been marginalized for years from the constant environmental impacts of the operations at Cedar Hills it is my sincere hope that there can be meaningful protections for our community through these new regulations. Our families and school children matter, we are not inconsequential.