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11. Emergency Planning and Hazard Mitigation

Hazardous materials are widely used by businesses and residents throughout King County. They are routinely transported into and through King County by land, sea, and rail. They are stored in bulk and in smaller amounts at facilities and businesses throughout King County, as well as in the garages, closets and basements in most homes. According to King County’s Hazards Identification and Vulnerability Analysis, “The geographic and economic characteristics of King County make it likely that hazardous materials releases will occur. Our diverse industrial facilities and transportation routes share space with numerous bodies of waters, wetlands, environmentally sensitive areas, and a multitude of densely populated centers, creating areas of great potential risk for a hazardous materials release.”¹ The Vulnerability Analysis concludes that there is a high probability of a release with moderate impact.

This chapter summarizes emergency planning requirements, responsibilities and plans as they relate to hazardous materials. It also describes the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program’s role in hazard mitigation and our role and recommendations regarding the management of disaster-generated moderate risk wastes (MRW), commonly known as hazardous waste from households (HHW) and in small quantities from businesses/institutions (SQGs).

11.1. Emergency Planning Requirements, Roles and Responsibilities

Several federal laws and regulations establish requirements for emergency planning and preparedness with respect to hazardous materials. These form the basis for state and local requirements, plans, and programs that govern hazardous materials assessment, planning, mitigation and response.


Hazardous materials emergency planning is most directly driven by the Federal Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) which was passed as part of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986. EPCRA, also known as SARA Title III, establishes requirements for federal, tribal, state and local governments and industry regarding emergency planning and “community right-to-know” reporting on hazardous and toxic chemicals. EPCRA requires state and tribal governments to set up emergency response commissions (SERCs/TERCs) to coordinate certain

¹ King County, King County Hazards Identification and Vulnerability Analysis (HIVA), (Seattle: King County Department of Emergency Services, 2005), p. 5-50, available on line at: www.kingcounty.gov/safety/prepare/EmergencyManagementProfessionals/PlansandPrograms/HazardIdentificationVulnerabilityAnalysis.aspx
emergency response activities and to appoint local emergency planning committees (LEPCs). EPCRA also establishes requirements related to emergency planning notification, emergency release notification, and reporting of chemical inventories and releases (40 CFR Parts 350-372). SARA Title III provides funding for training in emergency planning, preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery capabilities associated with hazardous chemicals.²

The Federal government also has refined and further developed its overall emergency planning and response programs and requirements. In February of 2003, Homeland Security Presidential Directive Five directed the Department of Homeland Security to develop the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the National Response Plan (NRP) to provide a consistent national approach for federal, state, and local governments to work effectively and efficiently during a domestic incident response. In March 2008, the NRP was revised and reissued as the National Response Framework (NRF). The NRF improves on the NRP by systematically incorporating all levels of government, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) into a coordinated response effort. The NRF also emphasizes the importance of personal preparedness by individuals and households. Hazardous materials emergency planning and response, and disaster debris management are incorporated in these comprehensive plans.³ Other relevant statutes and regulations include: 40 CFR Part 300; 355; 370; 44 CFR Part 302.2(p); 29 CFR Part 1910.120; and US Code and Title 42, Chapter 116 Section 11003 a-g.⁴

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provides guidelines, requirements and funding to help states, tribes and local jurisdictions to assess vulnerabilities and to develop emergency response plans and systems.⁵

11.1.2. Washington State and Local Emergency Response Planning

The Washington State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) was established in response to the federal requirements. Washington's SERC is comprised of a broad array of members, some of whom represent fire chiefs, the state patrol, private industry, local emergency managers, the military, state agencies (Ecology, Transportation, Labor and Industries, and Health), local emergency planning committee representatives, tribal representatives, and the transportation industry.⁶ The SERC oversees implementation of the Community Right-to-Know reporting requirements and other provisions of

---

² EPCRA, or SARA Title III, was enacted as Public Law 99-499. For additional information see www.epa.gov/oem/content/lawsregs/epcraover.htm.

³ Visit www.fema.gov/emergency/nrf/ for additional information on the National Response Framework.

⁴ King County, “Emergency Support Function (ESF) 10, Oil & Hazardous Materials,” King County Revised Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, (Seattle: King County, December, 2008), p. 2/19. Cited hereafter as King County ESF 10.

⁵ FEMA guidelines, requirements and agreements are available on-line at: www.fema.gov/government/grant/sara.shtm.

⁶ The Department of Ecology, Washington State Patrol and Emergency Management Division of the Military Department have specific responsibilities under WAC 118-40.
EPCRA. It designates and oversees Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs), and facilitates preparation and implementation of emergency planning and preparedness. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) serves as the repository for most of the reports required under EPCRA. Ecology provides technical and regulatory assistance, maintains information on storage and releases of hazardous substances at facilities statewide, and tracks business compliance on behalf of the Washington State Emergency Response Commission.  

King County has three LEPCs: one in the City of Kent, one in the City of Seattle, and one for the rest of King County. According to EPCRA, the role of the LEPC is to develop an emergency response plan, review it at least annually, and provide information about chemicals in the community to citizens. LEPCs are required to develop plans with stakeholder participation. LEPC membership must include, at a minimum, state and local officials, law enforcement, fire, public health professionals, environment, transportation and hospital officials, facility representatives, and representatives from community groups and the media. The LEPC is responsible for collecting the information submitted by industry and making it available to the public.

During the past several years Washington’s SERC and LEPCs have worked with their respective local emergency management offices to identify hazards, analyze vulnerabilities and risks, set priorities, take steps to reduce hazards, and prepare plans for public education, contingency planning, effective response and recovery. Publicly available reports include the Washington State Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment (2001), Washington State’s Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (2003), Washington State’s Hazard Mitigation Plan (Revised 2008), King County’s Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis (updated 2005), King County’s Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan (2005), King County’s Regional Disaster Plan (2006), King County’s Revised Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (2008), the City of Kent’s Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis and Comprehensive Emergency Response Plan (second edition, 2004), the City of Seattle’s Disaster Readiness and Response Plan (Volumes 1 and 2, revised 2007), and the City of Seattle’s All Hazards Mitigation Plan (2009). A summary report on chemicals in Washington State (2007) is also available from the Washington State Emergency Response Commission.

---

7 A list of Washington SERC members and additional information may be obtained on-line at: www.ecy.wa.gov/epcra/serc.html.

8 For more information on LEPC and local emergency planning requirements, see EPCRA sections 301-303 (42 USC 116) or 40 CFR part 355.

9 See the Washington State Emergency Response Commission’s list of LEPCs and their contact information online at: www.ecy.wa.gov/lepclist.html.

King County’s Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan applies to all county departments and agencies and to the unincorporated areas of King County. King County government is responsible for providing emergency management services to its executive, legislative and judicial branches and to unincorporated King County. City and tribal jurisdictions are responsible for emergency management services within their jurisdictional and tribal land boundaries, as required by RCW 38.52.070. At the same time, King County is working to promote a coordinated regional response if it is needed during a region-wide emergency.

King County’s Regional Disaster Plan (RDP) was developed to provide a framework for a systematic, coordinated and effective response to multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional emergencies and disasters that occur within the geographic boundaries of King County. The RDP addresses response activities in those events where normal emergency response processes and capabilities become overtaxed or where there is need for regional coordination of response operations due to the complexity or duration of events. The RDP divides King County into three fire/emergency coordination zones which are responsible for resource coordination functions.

As Figure 11-1 shows, Emergency Coordination Zone 1 covers incorporated and unincorporated jurisdictions in north and east King County. It includes the following jurisdictions: Beaux Arts Village, Bellevue, Bothell, Carnation, Clyde Hill, Duvall, Hunts Point, Issaquah, Kenmore, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Medina, Mercer Island, Newcastle, North Bend, Redmond, Sammamish, Shoreline, Skykomish, Snoqualmie, Woodinville and Yarrow Point. It also includes the Snoqualmie Tribal Nation. Emergency Coordination Zone 3 covers unincorporated and incorporated jurisdictions in south King County. It includes Vashon Island and the cities of Auburn, Black Diamond, Burien, Covington, Des Moines, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Kent, Maple Valley, Milton, Pacific, Renton, SeaTac, and Tukwila. Emergency Coordination Zone 5 covers the City of Seattle.

---


12 King County, *Regional Disaster Plan for Public and Private Organizations in King County*, (Seattle: Regional Disaster Planning Task Force, 2006), p. 1. Cited hereafter as King County RDP. The zone descriptions list those jurisdictions that have officially signed the RDP. The basic plan and its appendices can be accessed at: [www.kingcounty.gov/safety/prepare/EmergencyManagementProfessionals/PlansandPrograms/RegionalDisasterPlan.aspx](http://www.kingcounty.gov/safety/prepare/EmergencyManagementProfessionals/PlansandPrograms/RegionalDisasterPlan.aspx).
King County’s RDP defines common assumptions and policies, establishes a shared concept of operations, and pre-assigns functional responsibilities to appropriate disciplines, private and non-profit organizations. The plan describes the responsibilities of the three fire/emergency coordination zones both within their zone and with King County’s Emergency Coordination Center. The RDP is a voluntary, cooperative agreement among public and private organizations and, as such, no single agency or organization has control or authority over other participants, except where stated elsewhere in federal, state or local laws. As of March 2008, 145 cities, fire districts, tribal nations, school districts, sewer and water districts, hospitals, non-profit agencies, businesses and others had signed on to the regional plan.

---

13 See King County RDP, Appendix 1, Direction and Coordination, August, 2007.
14 See King County RDP, Basic Plan, page 4.
11.1.3. Disaster Debris Planning Requirements

Natural and human-caused disasters have the potential to create large volumes of debris that can complicate disaster response and recovery following such disasters. During the past several years it has become evident that hazardous materials are released during floods, earthquakes, hurricanes, and other disasters. Residents and first responders can face risks from hazardous household materials that are improperly stored, have spilled, or have become unstable. Hazardous materials may be directly released into the community through spills, fires, explosions and flooding, or they can mix with and contaminate other debris generated during a disaster. This section examines federal, state, and local requirements and plans that address disaster debris management.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is encouraging state, local and tribal governments and private non-profit organizations to take a proactive approach to address debris removal as part of their overall emergency management plans. FEMA provides technical support and grants to help local jurisdictions to develop a comprehensive debris management plan that incorporates best management practices and provides a blueprint for assembling an effective response for the entire debris management cycle. Local plans must also address how they will satisfy FEMA’s criteria to be eligible for financial assistance from their Public Assistance Program. FEMA encourages local officials to review their community’s vulnerability to a disaster and to consider how to manage large-scale debris clearance, removal, and disposal operations should the need arise.\(^\text{16}\) FEMA encourages broader regional coordination in disaster debris management and other emergency planning and preparedness throughout the federal Urban-Area Security Initiative Regions. The Seattle-Urban Area Security Initiative Region (Seattle UASI Region) includes King, Pierce and Snohomish Counties and the core cities of Seattle and Bellevue.\(^\text{17}\)

King County, Snohomish County, Pierce County, and the City of Seattle have been working to establish a coordinated approach to disaster debris management in the Seattle UASI Region. This regional planning effort has resulted in The Seattle UASI Disaster Debris Management Plan, first published in May, 2008. This regional guidance document provides a framework for King County and other jurisdictions throughout the UASI region to follow in developing their own plans. It describes how Disaster Debris Planning aligns with and fits in with the state and national emergency frameworks, and defines the roles and responsibilities of the disaster management agencies and external agencies. It also defines operational steps and addresses contract management, public notification and communications, and funding considerations. The Plan was developed with broad stakeholder input. Its implementation and future plan updates are the responsibilities of the solid waste agencies in the Seattle UASI region that maintain comprehensive solid waste plans. Those agencies include King

--

\(^{16}\) For additional information and an electronic version of FEMA's Disaster Debris Guidance documents, see: [www.fema.gov/government/grant/pa/demagde.shtm#1](http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/pa/demagde.shtm#1).


---
County Solid Waste Division, Snohomish County Solid Waste Division, Pierce County Public Works and Utilities, and Seattle Public Utilities.  

The City of Seattle published its Disaster Debris Management Plan (DDMP) in 2007 “…because Seattle Public Utilities recognizes the importance of maintaining public health and safety by planning for efficient removal of debris caused by unanticipated disaster events.”¹⁹ The purpose of the DDMP is to ensure that Seattle Public Utilities and the City of Seattle have the ability to address debris generated from residential or public properties in a timely manner; ensuring that recyclable debris and prohibited materials, such as hazardous wastes, are diverted from the solid waste stream following a debris-generating event; instituting a plan to address debris generated on commercial and private property following a significant debris-generating event; and maintaining clear and concise documentation of activities eligible for FEMA reimbursement. The DDMP describes the volume and mix of debris that might be generated under various disaster scenarios, and defines roles and responsibilities for responding to two types of disaster debris-generating scenarios. Scenario 1 is low probability with high consequences. Scenario 2 is high probability with low to medium consequences. ²⁰

King County Solid Waste Division is in the process of updating its 2002-2003 disaster debris management plan. The update is expected to be finalized at the end of 2009 or in early 2010. This Plan will apply to unincorporated areas of King County. Cities and Tribal Governments are responsible for developing their own plans, using the framework developed through the UASI process. King County is providing a template to assist in this process. Municipal governments will be eligible for funding to assist them in this process.

11.1.4. Business Contingency and Emergency Planning and Preparedness

Businesses play a crucial role in hazardous materials related emergency planning. Federal and state laws require businesses and institutions to properly use, store, and dispose of toxic and hazardous materials, and to report annually on chemical storage, chemical releases, and waste disposal. Despite the widespread distribution of chemicals in businesses and institutions, emergency planning and preparedness are not required of all businesses. Requirements are triggered by the quantity of hazardous materials and/or hazardous wastes on site, as seen in Table 11-1. While businesses with large quantities of hazardous materials must have more fully developed emergency response plans, all businesses must meet basic safety requirements and respond to and promptly report spills of oil and hazardous materials. Every business owner is liable for contamination stemming from the business and for ensuring that hazardous substances do not migrate off site.

¹⁸ Responsibilities for administering, maintaining and updating the Seattle UASI Plan are described in Chapter 2. The plan has been updated twice since May 2008. According to Joe Brentin, Critigen, the plan was last updated in March of 2009 (Personal communication, November 30, 2009).


²⁰ Disaster debris-generating incidents and their potential are described in Chapter 2 of the Seattle Disaster Debris Plan.
Table 11-1: Hazardous Materials Emergency Planning and Reporting Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>LAW/Code</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Thresholda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Release Planning – Notification of Extremely Hazardous Substances (EHS)</td>
<td>EPCRA</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Applies to facilities with listed extremely hazardous substance(s) above threshold (1 to 10,000 lbs depending on substance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Release Planning - Businesses with EHS</td>
<td>EPCRA</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Owner or operator of facility with EHS shall designate a facility representative who will participate in the local planning process as a facility emergency response coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Chemical Reporting</td>
<td>EPCRA</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Submit MSDS or MSDS list to SERC and LEPC for EHS in excess of threshold planning quantity or 500 lbs, whichever is less, and hazardous substances at or in excess of 10,000 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 - Emergency and Hazardous Chemical Inventory Reporting</td>
<td>EPCRA</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Provide specific information about chemicals stored on site if have threshold planning quantity or 500 lbs at any one time of EHS, and 10,000 lbs at any one time of hazardous substances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop written emergency (contingency) plan that describes arrangements with local responders, designates on-scene coordinators, lists equipment, evacuation plans, etc. Can be part of other spill prevention or emergency response plan.</td>
<td>WAC 173-303</td>
<td>200(1,3) 340 350 360</td>
<td>Applies to large quantity generators (generate 2,200 or more pounds of hazardous waste per month).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency maintains a list of the Threshold Planning Quantities (TPQs) and Reportable Quantities (RQs) of approximately 700 hazardous substances. The Washington SERC is available to help businesses determine their TPC and RQ. For further information visit the SERC Web site www.ecy.wa.gov/epcra/serc.html or contact by e-mail: epcra@ecy.wa.gov
Table 11-1: Hazardous Materials Emergency Planning and Reporting Requirements (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>LAW/Code</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have on-scene emergency coordinator, plans; familiarize emergency responders with facilities and wastes handled.</td>
<td>WAC 173-303</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Applies to medium quantity generators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have spill response plan and spill response kit.</td>
<td>WAC 173-303</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended best management practice but not required of conditionally exempt small quantity generators (generate less than 220 pounds of hazardous waste per month).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other federal and state laws require development of spill prevention plans.</td>
<td>40 CFR 112, RCW 90.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified transportation and non-transportation related facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Release Reporting</td>
<td>EPCRA</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>A release of a substance in excess of its reportable quantity outside the facility site must be reported immediately to the appropriate SERC, TERC, and LEPC that may be potentially affected by the release. A written follow-up must be submitted to these entities within 14 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Release Reporting</td>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Release of a hazardous substance in an amount equal to or greater than the reportable quantity is required to report the release immediately to the National Response Center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ecology also requires that business’ emergency plans address underground fuel tanks that may be on the property. Ecology has prepared guidance on steps that businesses near the Green River should take to reduce damage and the likelihood of spills from fuel storage tanks during a flood.21

---

11.1.5. Household Emergency Planning and Preparedness

Residents play an important role in preventing hazardous household products and hazardous wastes from being released during a flood, earthquake or other disaster. Most homes have chemicals or materials that might be released during a disaster, contaminating the environment and posing a hazard to families and property. Both residents, and businesses, are ultimately responsible for cleaning up disaster-generated debris on their property, so they should inventory their hazardous products and store them safely (so that they won’t be released during an earthquake or flood). If excess or unneeded hazardous products exist, residents should reduce their stockpiles by taking them to the Program’s HHW collection facilities for proper disposal. Residents should also reduce the risks posed by their home heating oil.\(^\text{22}\) Taking preventative measures and planning ahead are particularly important because public emergency plans assume that families may have to be self sufficient for up to three days following a major emergency.

11.2. Assessment of Emergency Planning with respect to Hazardous Materials

In spite of the many plans that have been published it is difficult to tell how well prepared jurisdictions in King County are to respond to major hazardous materials emergencies. The larger hazardous materials handlers appear to be submitting Tier II Chemical Storage data annually to the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC), their Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) and to their local fire department. Table 11-2 summarises the number of facilities that submitted Tier II reports to King County LEPCs in 2007.\(^\text{23}\) The extent to which these facilities are monitored is unclear, as is the extent to which this data is used in refining hazards assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEPC</th>
<th>Number of Reporting Facilities</th>
<th>Number of Chemicals Reported</th>
<th>Number of Facilities with Extremely Hazardous Substances</th>
<th>Number of Extremely Hazardous Chemicals Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Of Kent</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KC Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>783</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,925</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
<td><strong>581</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The cities of Seattle and Kent have Comprehensive Emergency Response Plans that describe agency roles in responding to hazardous materials emergencies that may occur in their jurisdictions.\textsuperscript{24} In addition King County’s Comprehensive Emergency Plan (CEMP) defines agency roles in responding to hazardous materials emergencies that affect unincorporated King County and County facilities. King County’s CEMP also includes a framework for coordinated response to oil and hazardous materials emergencies by King County, federal, state, and local agencies, local hospitals, utility districts, and non-governmental organizations, King County’s LEPC and private sector facilities.\textsuperscript{25} The coordinated response assumes that the local fire agency in conjunction with the local Hazardous Materials (HazMat) Team will be the lead on-scene agency.\textsuperscript{26} Local jurisdictions are responsible for developing their own hazardous materials emergency response plans and procedures. The extent to which municipalities have prepared for hazardous materials emergencies is unclear.

The recently completed Seattle UASI Regional Disaster Debris Plan provides the general framework for disaster debris planning in Pierce, Snohomish and King Counties. King County Solid Waste Division and many municipal governments in King County are engaged in--or intend to start-- disaster debris planning. These planning efforts offer an opportunity to ensure that hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are adequately addressed and to engage Program services to prevent future problems.

Hazardous materials may be accidently released into the environment as the result of a hazardous materials transportation accident, an accident at a fixed facility, or as the result of some other type of emergency. Urban areas with large concentrations of businesses that produce, store, or transport hazardous materials are particularly at risk. However, hazardous materials transportation accidents can occur anywhere that hazardous materials are transported, stored and used. In addition, hazardous materials may be released as the result of other types of emergencies. Reports from Seattle, Kent and King County indicate that the following incidents would be likely to result in the release of hazardous materials: aircraft accidents, earthquakes, fires, floods, HazMat incidents, landslides, pipeline incidents, terrorism, tornados, transportation accidents, tsunamis/seiches and volcanic eruptions. The magnitude and impact of the release may range from minor to major, depending on the location, materials involved, and the scope of the event. However, as the City of Kent’s Hazards and Vulnerability analysis notes, “Any incident in which hazardous materials are involved has the potential for escalation from a minor incident to a full scale disaster.”\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} \textit{King County CEMP}. Overall roles are described in the Basic Plan. Details are provided in the Emergency Support Annexes, especially in \textit{King County CEMP ESF-10}, pages 171-189.
\item \textsuperscript{26} \textit{King County CEMP ESF-10}, p. 3/19.
\item \textsuperscript{27} City of Kent, “Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis,” in \textit{Kent CEMP}.
\end{itemize}
Several years ago the Portland-Metro (Oregon) Household Hazardous Waste Program developed standard operating procedures for anticipating the volumes and types of HHW potentially generated by various disasters. Their analysis recommends collection service options under various scenarios as well as recommendations about the types of service potentially needed. Table 11-3 lists Portland-Metro’s recommendations.

Portland’s analysis suggests that some natural disasters, such as severe windstorms, ice storms, and snow storms, are unlikely to result in hazardous materials releases or to generate moderate risk wastes. Other events, like floods and earthquakes, may have a significant impact.

Table 11-3: Disaster Types, Expected Generation Rates and Recommended Service Options from Portland Metro HHW Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of disaster</th>
<th>Expected hazardous waste generation per affected home</th>
<th>Portland-Metro Recommended service options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ice storm</td>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>• Promote existing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windstorm</td>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>• Promote existing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Moderate - 50 pounds</td>
<td>• Collection sites near affected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe 50-100 pounds</td>
<td>• Collection sites near affected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If resources available:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Door-to-door/curbside collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• House-to-house sweeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>Minimal to 100 pounds depending on severity</td>
<td>• Promote existing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If minor</td>
<td>• Collection sites near affected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If moderate</td>
<td>• Collection sites near affected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If severe</td>
<td>• If resources available:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Door-to-door/curbside collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• House-to-house sweeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>100 pounds</td>
<td>• House-to-house sweeps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Metro SOP #34, page 7.

11.3. Our Program’s Role in Hazard Mitigation and Emergency Planning

Our Program mitigates regional hazards by working to reduce the production and use of hazardous materials, by promoting their proper use and storage, and by offering disposal services at our collection facilities. In addition to providing on-going programs that support these goals, our Program addresses hazards reduction in areas that are faced with potential emergencies, such as floods. For example, in 2009, staff from our Program collaborated with Public Health and other King County agencies to develop coordinated messages regarding preparing for potentially serious flooding of the Green River Valley due to structural problems with the Howard Hanson Dam. Our Program is encouraging residents and businesses to reduce their hazardous materials inventories, to properly store remaining hazardous materials, and to properly dispose of hazardous wastes at the Auburn SuperMall collection site or at one of the other HHW/SQG collection facilities or Wastemobile sites. In addition, the Program staff are providing technical assistance to businesses in the Auburn/Kent/Renton/Tukwila area, attending public meetings, and otherwise marketing the Program’s services.

Our Program also plays a support role, through our Partner agencies, during the recovery phase when disaster-generated debris must be managed. In many cases we promote the use of the HHW/SQG collection facilities and services by residents and eligible businesses/institutions. During the past several years our Program has also assisted in post-flood cleanups in the cities of Snoqualmie, Pacific and in south King County. We are working with our suburban city and Program partners to establish ways to coordinate collection and to establish a reasonable way to address hazardous materials in the wake of a flood or other disaster. Our Program has been, and will continue, providing input into the regional and local disaster debris management plans.

11.4. Future Direction

Our Program’s HHW/SQG collection facilities and services are operated by two of our agency partners, Seattle Public Utilities and King County Solid Waste Division. Those agencies also have a primary role in disaster debris planning. It will be important for our Program to work closely with those responsible operating agencies to address HHW and SQG wastes in disaster-debris planning, and to ensure that procedures are in place for an appropriate response. For example, if temporary collection sites are established, they should be staffed by employees with expertise in screening for and managing HHW and SQG wastes.

Our Program will continue to focus on getting our issues represented in those implementing agencies’ plans at the outset. Those issues include separate handling and collection of hazardous waste and ensuring that systems are in place to have trained personnel involved with handling HHW and SQG
waste at any temporary collection sites. We will focus on mitigating hazards through the pursuit of our regular mission, which is working to reduce purchase and inventories, promote proper storage, and promote disposal at one of our collection sites before the flood season or other likely emergency events. We will not focus on responding during an event; our Program Partner agencies have that role.

Our Program will continue to provide regular disposal services during clean-up after an event, unless additional services are required and reimbursed through the disaster debris implementing agencies. We will also encourage implementing agencies to ensure that the broader hazardous materials and hazardous waste issues are adequately addressed in their plans.