

# King County, Washington

## General comments:

- The inclusion of links to relevant sections of the WAC are helpful and appreciated.
- Some sections of this guidance document include extensive excerpts of verbatim rule language. Other sections include limited or no excerpts and, instead, refer readers to the WAC via links. There is no explanation or apparent logic for why Ecology opted for one approach vs. the other on a section-by-section basis. Recommend a consistent approach or include explanation for the range of approaches.
- Formatting in the "questions and answers" sections of this document make it more difficult to quickly navigate/orient than is necessary. In particular, the questions are indented on the page whereas the answers are not. As such, the answers jump out at the reader, but the questions take more effort to locate while visually scanning a page. Recommend revising the formatting to visually emphasize the questions.
- For enhanced clarity, recommend the Question-and-Answer section to specify whether the content addresses common inquiries or anticipated implementation challenges.
- Recommend replacing individual employee's names and contact info with persistent contact info, such as a shared program email address. Doing so minimizes the need to make updates to the guidance document as personnel at Ecology change over time.
- This guidance should address instances of overlap and specify whether local or state rules take precedence. Therefore, to optimize clarity and efficiency in monitoring and reporting processes involving both state and local agencies, additional guidance is required.

## Specific Comments:

- Recommend including specific citations to referenced federal and WAC sections summarized in Table 1.
- If they haven't already, recommend asking EPA to review the summaries provided in the NSPS/EG column in Table 1 for accuracy and interpretation.
- Repeat column headers at the top of each page for tables that span more than one page.
- Change to "% by weight"? (Under Table 1- "NSPS/EG11" column "Enclosed flares" row).
- Recommend using consistent formatting throughout Table 1. For example, "Gas control temperature monitoring" row includes both "+ 1 percent" and "plus or minus one percent".
- Suggest elaborating on the key distinctions between an 'initial performance test' and an 'initial source test'? Adding a paragraph or definitions outlining their respective purposes and key metrics would be helpful.
- refer to the governing regulation for the criteria defining "not in compliance" in source testing (table 1 - "Performance and source testing for control devices" row - "Landfill Methane Rule" column").
- Delete extra ". (table 1 -"Surface Monitoring Requirements" row and "Landfill Methane Rule" column).
- Missing period at end of second paragraph (table 1 under "Surface Monitoring Exceedances" row and "Landfill Methane Rule" column).
- Missing "combustor" from the following "An enclosed .....shall be equipped with a temperature monitoring....." (table 1 - "GCCS Monitoring (excluding wellhead monitoring, which is detailed in the next row of this table)" row and "NSPS/EG11" column).
- Ecology provided a detailed summary comparing WWW to the new LF Methane Rule but then

just included a link to XXX and NESHAP cfr. It is not clear why Ecology did not include the same level of detailed comparison for all three federal regs (WWW, XXX, NESHAP).

- How is Q2 related to 173-408 definitions? The rule doesn't involve permitting and does not define "permit" (page 35).
- Replace "and" with "in" to replace "waste and place" to "waste in place" (Page 41).
- 173-408-170(8)(e) allows owners/operators to implement this exemption if they submit documentation demonstrating specific closure actions were completed prior to implementation of 173-408. If an owner/operator has knowledge the closure actions were taken but cannot locate documentation to demonstrate such, will Ecology accept a signed affidavit in lieu of documentation? (Table 2 – Row < 450,000 tons Column "Further requirements").
- Will the exemption be self-implementing upon submittal of closure notification? Or will Ecology need to review the submitted closure notification and determine it is satisfactory for the exemption to apply? (Table 2: under "< 450,000 tons" row and "Exemption" column).
- A regulatory reference defining GCCS modification would be beneficial (table 6 "MSW landfills with an existing GCCS that needs modifications").
- The information in this column leaves room for confusion. In particular, it could be interpreted to mean notifications are required after each round of corrective action(s) + remonitoring. Whereas, Ecology has shared its intent for the notification to occur at the end of all corrective action(s) + remonitoring. Further, Ecology has also indicated it is acceptable for these notifications to be made on a monitoring-event basis as opposed to separate notifications for each individual exceedance + response.

This guidance document is the appropriate place to memorialize Ecology's intent - please revise this table/section to improve clarity and document previously shared interpretation/guidance (Table 7 under column notification185 ").

- The headers in Table 8 are confusing. Revise for clarity. For example, the information in the column labeled "Exceedance" is more accurately described as "Timeline for corrective action(s)/monitoring upon exceedance".
- Delete "during" from page 64 first bulleted point "...visually inspected during and monitored...".
- Delete "during" from page 64 seventh bulleted point under "Integrated SEM overview": "...visually inspected during and monitored...".
- Recommend revisions to clearly articulate which actions are required vs. suggested (page 64 last line).
- As noted in the comment for this task, the cadence for updates is quarterly. Why, then, is the Timing specified as "Weekly"? (Table 19, column "Timing" Task "Manage grid map").
- This "key factor" is misleading. It implies weather criteria for monitoring may be met in one grid but not another at the same time/on the same day. That is not how precipitation forecasts work, and onsite wind data are not collected per grid. An owner/operator would likely need to make a daily go/no go determination for an entire site, not for a grid (page 66, second bullet).
- An owner/operator can/should take steps to ensure the grid surface will be dry and accessible but there are factors outside the control of an owner/operator that may prevent the desired outcome (e.g., rain). Recommend revising this statement to clarify this refers to circumstances within the owner/operator's control (page 70 under "Grid Preparation").
- What are Ecology's expectations should an owner/operator experience a situation such as the one described below:
  - o Weather check prior to monitoring indicates acceptable conditions
  - o Grid monitoring completed
  - o Weather check post-monitoring indicates weather has changed and criteria are no longer metAre those data valid? Is remonitoring required? What if this happens at the end of a monitoring

period and there is insufficient time to remonitor?

Please expand this section of the guidance document to address the possibility outlined above and other similar foreseeable situations. (Page 70 regarding Weather checks).

- Ecology recognizes not all WA landfills can abide by the weather criteria and still meet monitoring requirements. Referring those landfills to local air agencies is administratively inefficient and could result in disparate levels of effort required on the part of an owner/operator. A more efficient approach would be to include uniform, detailed guidance for affected landfills in this document. It would be even better for Ecology to publish a programmatic Alternative Compliance Measure that landfills could implement to meet monitoring requirements despite weather conditions (page 73 point 7).
- Would like to see Ecology publish a form for ACM requests (Page 75 under "Alternative Compliance Measures (WAC 173-408-130283)").
- Would like to see Ecology post ACM applications and decisions on their website to allow the public to access the information without going through a public records request. If Ecology implements this recommendation, it would be helpful to include a link to that website in this guidance document (Page 75 under "Alternative Compliance Measures (WAC 173-408-130283)").
- A periodic update regarding specific areas where alternatives had been approved along with detailed application for Municipal landfill would be helpful (Page 75 under "Alternative Compliance Measures (WAC 173-408-130283)").