



Jefferson County
Washington

Contract No. JC0726-2022-069

Task 1.1

Solid Waste Facility Replacement Planning Project

KICKOFF MEETING AND CHARTERING WORKSHOP NOTES

November 3, 2022

Prepared By



23309 100th Avenue West
Edmonds, Washington 98050-5075
(206) 629 - 5935

In Association With



21610 SE 273rd PL
Maple Valley, Washington 98038
(206) 715-4342

Meeting Project Information

Project Information	
Project Jefferson County Solid Waste Replacement Planning Project	Task 1.0 - Project Management
Subtask 1.1 - Kickoff Meeting/Chartering Workshop	Date/Time September 27, 2022; 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.

Purpose

To address various elements of the project and begin to develop relationships with key stakeholders and enable a shared understanding of the objectives, project requirements, stakeholders, and expectations.

Attendees

Solid Waste Facilities Task Force		
Name	Affiliation	Area of Expertise
Lisa Crosby (virtual)	District 1 Citizen	Solid Waste Management Plan
Jenifer Taylor	District 2 Citizen	Solid Waste Management Plan
Tim Deverin	District 3 Citizen	Solid Waste Management Plan
Greg Brotherton	Board of County Commissioners	County goals
Owen Rowe	Port Townsend City Council	City goals
Steve King	Port Townsend Public Works	City operations
Carol Cummins(virtual)	Local 2020 - Beyond Waste Action Group	Solid waste reduction
Tracy Grisman	Arts Community	Arts Community
Cindy Jayne	Climate Action Committee	Green House Gas reduction and energy efficiencies
Pinky Feria-Mingo(virtual)	Jefferson County Public Health	Permit requirements/other County functions
David Wayne -Johnson	Department of Community Development	GMA/zoning/permitting requirements
Will O'Donnell	Public Utility District	Infrastructure
Derek Rockett (virtual)	Department of Ecology	Facility design/requirements
Bridgett Gregg(virtual)	WSU Extension	Agriculture community
Steve Gilmore(virtual)	Republic Services - Roosevelt Regional Landfill	Transfer station and landfill operations
Chad Young(virtual)	Waste Connections - WUTC G-Certificate Hauler	MSW (Municipal Solid Waste) collection and transfer station operations
Alysa Thomas	Skookum Contract Services - Recycling Contractor	Recycling collection and recycle center operations

Attendees (contd.)

Jefferson County Staff		
Name	Affiliation	Role
Al Cairns	Jefferson County Department of Public Works	Project Manager (Solid Waste Division Manager)

Consultant - Vikek Environmental Engineers, LLC Team		
Name	Affiliation	Role
Victor O. Okereke, Ph.D., P.E., DEE, CLSSS	Vikek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Project Manager/Team Leader
Tom Karston, Ph.D.	Vikek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Lead – Financial Analysis and Financial Planning
Gary Arndt, P.E. (virtual)	Vikek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Lead – Quality Assurance Reviews
Sally Hanley	Vikek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Project Support Professional
Penny Mabie	Definitely-Mabie Consulting, LLC	Lead – Public Involvement
Peter Battuello, LG, LHG	Perteet Incorporated	Lead – Site Selection
Sarah Fischer, NCARB, LEED AP	BLRB Architects	Lead – Conceptual Facility Design
Karamjit (Karam) Singh, P.E.	SCS Engineers, Inc.	Organics Management Analysis
Shiloh Schroeder (virtual)	Fusion Creative Works	Web Site and Page Design

Meeting Notes

Welcome and Introductions:

Al Cairns, Jefferson County's Solid Waste Division Manager welcomed everyone to the project's kick-off meeting with the Solid Waste Facilities Task Force (Task Force). He shared the significance of this opportunity and the magnitude of this project, as solid waste facilities and issues touch everyone. He noted that for a solid waste manager in a rural area, redoing or replacing a transfer station is a once in a lifetime project. Al introduced project partner Vikek Environmental Engineers, noting that the Vikek team has an incredible depth of knowledge, and very experienced team members. The following Vikek Team members introduced themselves:

- Sarah Fischer, Subconsultant with BLRB architects
- Peter Battuello, Subconsultant with Perteet Inc.
- Tom Karston, with Vikek
- Gary Arndt with Vikek (virtual attendee)
- Penny Mabie, Subconsultant with Definitely Mabie
- Sally Hanley with Vikek
- Karam Singh, Subconsultant with SCS Engineers

Overview of Current Solid Waste Program:

Al reviewed the status of the closed landfill that is at the same location as the transfer station. The County has been monitoring groundwater around the closed landfill since 1987, and there has never been an issue with the groundwater. Additionally, the methane production from the closed landfill is so small that the County will be moving to a passive methane collection system. The closed landfill is close to stable. The main transfer station, which was built in 1992, is moving all the solid waste and recycling materials from the County. There is a rural drop box in Quilcene and a recycling center which was established in 1985.

The entirety of the County's solid waste system is comprised of the closed landfill, the main transfer station, the rural drop box, a recycling center, recycling drop off sites, and a moderate risk waste (MRW) facility. The MRW facility is due to close this Friday (September 30). Staffing issues hastened this timeline. The County will move to remote collection events throughout the year due to staffing. There is also a biosolids facility which turns yard waste to high grade compost owned by the City of Port Townsend, co-located at the site of the transfer station and recycling center.

The transfer station accepts commercial and residential solid waste. At the station it is transferred into large transfer trailers and delivered to Renton by truck. From there it goes to the Roosevelt Regional Landfill in Klickitat County. The transfer process is expensive; this is a major factor in the County's high solid waste rates.

Washington state requires the solid waste system to be managed as an enterprise fund (like a state-run business). This means that the system must be paid for by fees or charges, rather than by taxes. The challenge with this is that solid waste rates must pay for recycling, which, by design, is meant to reduce the amount of solid waste being brought to the facility. Al used a hotel metaphor to describe this situation. He asked the Task Force to imagine they run a high-end hotel in which the guests provide the revenue (solid waste fees). However, the management approach is to encourage customers to go to a different hotel (recycling) where you can stay for free instead because we'll pay for it. In the long run, having solid waste tipping fees (the fees paid to drop off solid waste at the transfer station) funding garbage, recycling and MRW is not financially sustainable.

Meeting Notes

He reviewed the County's solid waste system budget. 99.6% of the system's revenue comes from tipping fees. The rest is from grants. The budgeted expenses is divided up as follows: 36% to long haul costs; 38% to recycling, 7% to capital replacement of old equipment; 135 for recycling, 5% to moderate risk waste (a lot of that money is spent managing household hazardous waste); and 1% goes to clean up and education.

He discussed the challenges at the transfer station and the rationale for making a capital investment in a new transfer station. The Solid Waste Division (SWD) considered just updating rather than replacing the current station. They questioned if the system was too old and outdated based on its age and expected growth of the County's solid waste stream to justify the capital investment for just updating. The County's Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan forecasts continuous growth in the County's population, up to 32% growth by 2040. This would result in growing waste volumes. SWD's management wants to get ahead of this looming capacity issue, as that growth could result in exceeding the transfer station's capacity by 77%. The current transfer station is a 29-years-old that needs capital investment now. The growing tonnage being brought to the transfer station, including construction materials, makes it hard to keep transfer load under mandated weight constraints. The growth in number of customers is causing long wait times and increased user traffic. There is currently only one lane each for ingress/egress. The County also needs a hazardous waste facility, but we have no space for it.

He noted there are big ticket items slated for replacement in 5-10 years. This again brings up the question of whether to reinvest in the existing facility or build a whole new facility. Al suggested that his big dream is to end up with an optimal site and optimal facility, at a good price.

Project Definition:

Al introduced Victor Okereke, President of Vikek Environmental Engineers (Vikek), and Project Manager. Victor noted that Vikek has the responsibility to take the County's and Al's vision and get to where they need to be.

Victor gave an overview of the six areas of the project needing shared understanding by all involved in the project delivery. Those areas are project goal statement, objectives, scope and schedule, planning process, work products and project team. He shared a draft project goal: To recommend to the Board of County Commissioners an optimal conceptual design, site, and financing plan for a solid waste replacement facility by January 2024, and specific project objective from Vikek's perspective were to, achieve public acceptance of the recommended replacement solid waste conceptual facility, site, and financing by November 2023.

He reviewed the project scope at a high level. He noted the project team will conduct data collection and analysis, a site selection process, produce a conceptual facility design, and conduct financial analysis and develop a funding plan. For the data collection, Victor noted that historical data may be enough, but the team may also need to create data to inform decisions. The data to be reviewed and/or developed will include Geographical Information System (GIS) mapping, utilities, environmental elements, equity, noise/traffic, economics, and waste types and composition. Public involvement will be done throughout the project, including engaging the Task Force in approximately ten workshops Victor noted that engagement is key with all stakeholders and with the project management team.

He explained that workshops will be the primary mechanism for working with the Task Force. Additionally, public input will influence the entire process and help determine the path forward.

Meeting Notes

The key steps for the work are as follows:

- Initial project and Task Force chartering and development of a public involvement plan.
- Define potential sites and develop evaluation process and criteria.
- Evaluate the initial list of potential sites and narrow to approximately 10 potential sites.
- Develop a conceptual design and a short list of sites. This could be as few as 1 – 2 sites.
- Evaluate the short list of potential sites.
- Conduct financial analysis of short-listed sites and develop funding options.
- Develop recommendation for preferred site alternatives. Preferred site emerges and is recommended to the county along with the other short list options.
- Present recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

Victor noted there would be public meetings held to solicit input on the long list of potential sites and the evaluation criteria and again to solicit input on the conceptual design and the short list of sites. Victor presented a high-level schedule which shows when each key milestone is projected to be completed.

- Data analysis and collection by March 2023.
- Initial site screening by May 2023.
- Conceptual design and final site screening by July 2023.
- Comparative alternative site evaluation by September 2023.
- Financial assessment by November 2023.
- Preferred site identified by December 2023.

Public Involvement:

Victor noted that Shiloh Schroeder (virtual attendee), Subconsultant with Fusion Creative Works, is orchestrating the website design for a new Solid Waste website and a project webpage. He introduced Penny Mabie, who will lead the public involvement work. He pointed out that Penny has more than 20 years of experience in public involvement. She will facilitate and direct public engagement and has direct experience in solid waste management projects. She will lead public involvement planning to get accurate information out there and infuse informed feedback into the planning process.

Penny gave an overview of the public involvement work. She will be working on determining what people are thinking about relative to the existing transfer station and the project; and what their concerns and aspirations are. The public involvement plan will detail how engagement will be conducted. It will include specific public involvement goals and objectives, so the work is deliberate, targeted, and reflective of the communities' needs and interests.

Penny also discussed the new Solid Waste website and project page. The project page will be a dynamic page, reflecting how the project moves forward, capturing input from the community, and serving as a resource for information. Penny noted that the project will also reach out to folks who don't use the internet for their input. In person meetings will be mirrored on the website to increase accessibility. The project site will also help provide transparency for the Task Force's work. It will serve as a repository for Task Force agendas, meeting summaries and meeting materials. The Solid Waste website is currently under construction. A project page has been launched with minimal information. It will be built out in the coming weeks. The Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the project page is

Meeting Notes

JeffersonCountyFacilityReplacement.com. Penny noted she will be doing an assessment to better understand the community, how they prefer to receive information and to participate. She asked Task Force members to share with her who she needs to talk to about this project for it to be successful. She noted she wants to ensure all the members of the community have the opportunity and feel welcomed to participate in the project.

Question and answer session:

Q. When will the closed landfill be considered stable?

A. Al said it will likely be within 3 - 5 years.

Q. Will you do a detailed facility design, to inform the parameters you will look for in prospective sites?

A. Victor responded that the project is not designing the facility. Rather, we are identifying potential sites and developing criteria for selecting the optimal sites. The sites will receive a pass or fail based on the first screening. Then additional criteria will be applied. These will include criteria like geotechnical and hydrogeologic feasibility, etc. Conceptual facility designs will be used to inform the final short-listed sites that will undergo a more rigorous analysis before a final site recommendation.

Sarah Fischer added that the siting process will involve data collection, to assess what do county has now and what they need. General parameters such as approximate size, access needs, etc. will be developed. The assessment will look out past 2040 needs and up 50 years in the future. These general parameters will be established from research.

Q. Are the 10 potential sites only to be those that are within the county purview now, or could they be any 10 sites the county might purchase?

A. Al replied the targeted 10 sites could include sites already purchased by the County, but the Task Force and County could nominate additional sites to purchase. 10 sites will be evaluated equally regardless of county ownership. The County currently owns five properties. Al noted they don't want to artificially limit the sites to just ones the county owns.

David Wayne Johnson, County Planner, added that about siting a transfer station, there could be an overlay of where they are sited that could be rezoned to include essential public facilities.

Q. Will the old site be a contender?

A. Al replied yes.

Q. Will the plan still include drop boxes?

A. Al replied yes.

Q. How can we produce a site design without considering the parameters? What are the best general criteria for starting the process?

A. Victor replied they will look to the Task Force and the public to provide input on criteria for the sites. Solid Waste types to be handled at the site is an example of what will be considered.

Q. Is the County only doing a transfer station and not considering a new landfill? Is there possibility a landfill could be an energy generator from methane gas extraction?

A. Al replied and indicated that the cost of managing and the liability for a landfill is not something we want to do again.

Comment: Republic operates the landfill in Klickitat County. It is capturing 95% of the methane and

Meeting Notes

turning it into natural gas. That is enough natural gas to power thirty-five thousand homes or eighteen thousand trucks throughout the country.

Q. Will a compost facility and biosolids composting be included?

A. Al noted that House Bill 1799 requires, at a minimum, studying the feasibility for food waste composting. However, the plan will not include a biosolids facility. Al believes that the City of Port Townsend, which owns the current composting facility, is investigating adjunct food waste composting for Jefferson County. Port Townsend is currently working with Port Hadlock to determine if the city could take biosolids from Port Hadlock. Considering whether there is enough septic capacity and whether a new composting facility would be considered as part of this new facility, Al noted it could be considered at a conceptual level. The planning process would look at the needs and resources for this service. Looking for grants of bonds could bring down the cost of property. He noted that in this process, we imagine everything we want and then evaluate the resources to accomplish the wish list, including site constraints and costs, and then we reevaluate what we really need coupled with what we can afford.

Q. Is traffic engineering being done by the consultant team?

A. Al indicated that Traffic engineering is being done internally, and that four sites have already been evaluated. Victor asked Peter to provide more details. Peter Battuello indicated that there are adequate capabilities within the Vikek team to address both public use as well as more commercial users. The team will be reviewing the traffic studies completed by the county and determine if additional data is required to support the project.

Q. Will greenhouse gas emissions be modeled and considered?

A. Peter responded that the greenhouse gas will be part of the environmental analysis completed by the Vikek team later in the project process.

Q. Will the Task Force and community help create criteria for decisions?

A. Victor said, Yes.

Al reiterated that the process starts with our dream. He said we can think big! Facility elements such as a reuse store where people can bring durable goods, washers etc., for resale could be a good model for financing, to generate the largest public good. He reiterated that the solid waste system is funded by tipping fees coupled with small grants, so expansion of services to get more money would be valuable. Victor added that financial aspects of the project will be evaluated during the financial analysis workshops.

Q. Are we working with Clallam and other neighboring Counties and considering collaborating with them?

A. Al is having conversations with neighboring counties about combining services. A challenge is that the distance makes some collaboration impractical, but he is continuing the conversations.

Q. Are alternative funding mechanisms being considered?

A. Al indicated that Taxing will be part of the consideration, and we will discuss that with the community.

Q. Are we considering flow control?

A. Al said that flow control is tangential to this effort. It will likely be introduced to the county commissioners when we are considering probable costs. It will be obvious why it is important to keep that in mind. Flow control is a means that makes it unlawful to move solid waste outside the community.

Meeting Notes

It was a controversial issue, but the Supreme Court decided that a municipality charged with solid waste management has a right to protect that investment.

Public Involvement Workshop:

Penny Mabie introduced public involvement and asked for the task force's participation. She noted the public involvement plan is informed by public interest. The purpose of public involvement is to achieve community acceptance of the recommendations. She noted that effective public involvement results in no surprises for the community or the decision makers. She introduced the need to understand who key stakeholders are and what their issues and aspirations might be. She will be conducting a needs assessment to learn this. She asked the Task Force members for their suggestions about stakeholders and issues.

Suggestions included:

- Plants and animals, air quality, etc.
- Marine trades and their generation of hazardous waste.
- The Climate Action Committee would be concerned about greenhouse gas emissions.
- Schools and traffic.
- Beyond Waste Action group is concerned with diversion from the landfill.
- Festivals and the community picnic will need help with identifying requirements to separate wastes. Small quantity generators, concerned about moderate hazardous waste. Asbestos disposal is not available here in the county. This affects homeowners and contractors. Users and generators of waste who must go out of the county to dispose of certain wastes, Co-location of facilities, high throughput, and adjacent landowners., Need easy access to disposal to reduce Illegal dumping, curbside collection changes could impact cost of service if the location is farther out. Remote communities get short shrift on disposal locations, Weight based disposal further south.
- Social services, food waste.
- Employees at the station will have concerns and ideas.
- Elected officials will want to be knowledgeable about the project.
- Agriculture community. We should factor in a desire for a food hub and have acreage in mind.

Q. Is there going to be only one site in Jefferson County? We have an existing facility and could add a new facility. Would two sites be useful?

A. Yes, the group is open to alternative plans.

Penny asked Task Force members to take a photo of the stakeholders and issues they jotted down and send it to her. She then introduced the notion of correlation of stakeholders and issues and asked people to refer to a correlation worksheet she supplied. She asked members to complete that worksheet and send that to her as well. Al clarified that members should send to him, and he will share with Penny. Penny will compile and include the results in the draft public involvement plan. The team's goal is to make sure every voice is heard. The deadline for returning the worksheet is October 11.

Penny discussed how informational materials are part of the public involvement plan. We will need fact sheets about the process and the facility. We need to make the right information available to stakeholders.

Meeting Notes

Penny explained that planning for public involvement also requires knowing about how communities prefer to be involved and what their past experiences have been. She said that in addition to knowing what people think about the project, this is where there can be vast differences in approaches to public involvement. For instance, are you an active community? How do people like to engage? Where do people work? Are there differences in work hours. We want to involve everyone. That may mean providing remote access to public involvement for those who can't attend in-person meetings and might need after-hours access. Or some may not have access to technology, so other means may be needed. She opened the topic to the Task Force for discussion.

Comments:

- Be sure to communicate consequences of not taking any actions.
- Include access via a cell phone as well as a computer.

Penny asked, if people listed groups to reach out to, to include how to contact the group, where and when they are scheduling meetings.

- Social media is hit or miss, must include all types of methods to reach stakeholders.
- Chambers of commerce mailing list, city newsletter, Public Utility District are the best way to get it out there.

Penny asked if and how Covid has changed communications?

- Department of Community Development (DCD) has done public outreach with surveys and story boards and a needs assessment.

How much do community members expect of a public process – how much influence do they expect to have?

- People don't expect their opinions go very far. They don't feel heard and think communication is inadequate.
- Use the local radio station – a lot of people listen to it.

Al asked how south end county members get their information?

- Social media, community center.

Al noted he will share a list of community bulletin boards.

Penny asked if there was any news about the project out in the community yet. Al responded no, and Penny noted that meant there was an opportunity to present *accurate information*.

- The rumor mill is strong, and a strong and concise message is important.

Penny asked folks if they had any thoughts about what folks might want in a new facility and what challenges there might be.

- People want to drop off place for things to be reused and not deposited into a landfill.
- Several members noted there are concerns in the community about cost. Scoping and meeting expectations might be challenging. Imagining the dream facility and then dealing with reality and then the cost. Ranking the priorities and trying to cover all the wish list and the cost.
- There are strong aspirations for recycling in contrast to the market conditions. Hard truths that come in this process.

Meeting Notes

- Trying to plan for what we don't know.
- Meeting the requirements in the food waste composting legislation.

Penny - What is critical to success?

- Understanding there will be change and help work through the transition.
- Transparency is key, let the public know at the right time.
- Farmers Market and having information there as a touchpoint for the community.
- Education is critical.
- Is the new transfer station going to happen with or without public support? If so, we'll need to sell the need. Al replied that the County may go through the entire process and end up rehabilitating the current facility. We must go through the process to figure that out.

Public Involvement Goals

Penny explained that public involvement is meaningful when done to achieve specific goals. She shared draft public involvement goals and asked for input.

Draft public involvement goals:

- The community's and key stakeholders' interests, issues and aspirations will be sought out and fully considered during the Solid Waste Facility Siting Process and in the decision.
- All members of the community will be invited and welcomed to provide input on the siting process.
- The community will be informed about how their input was considered and was reflected in the siting decision.

Comments:

- I aspire to have more input and want to do more than just the siting. Where the facility is will inform what will be included.
- In the project goal, the financing aspect is a big piece of the public impact
- The public will want to know all the details of the site so that they can provide informed input.
- I'm a citizen and a stakeholder. What are the needs in the community? Data generation includes all members. Public input when it is informed is the best input. Hope there would be benefit tapping into the resources from this group.
- Public education should be a goal.
- I want the public and this group to learn about this process.
- Housing providers, seeing the day-to-day struggles and get input.
- Lots of folks are busy and we must be deliberate on how to reach them. Be concise.

The group asked questions about what information is needed to be able to evaluate sites, what would be included in the conceptual design and if there are models available for solid waste facilities and appropriate sizes.

A. The community and the Task Force will provide input into criteria, which will include what activities are to be included in the replacement facility. Vikek will be a resource to help make recommendations.

Meeting Notes

Victor noted a needs assessment will be done for the facility and size will be part of the criteria.

Penny noted that another part of the public involvement planning process is aligning public involvement activities with the technical process. It is critical to understand what interim choices and decisions people can and cannot and when their input is needed to inform decisions. This section of the plan will include how we will get community input and how it will be used. Penny identified where in the overarching process people's input will be solicited:

- Information gathering phase - Information will be provided to the community.
- Site search phase - community input will be sought.
- Narrow site options community input will be sought.
- Short list of sites – information will be shared.
- Financial assessment and funding plan for preferred site – information will be shared.
- Select preferred site alternative – information will be shared.

Al noted the project website went live today. In addition to the project site, Solid Waste Division is also having their main site rebuilt. They were unable to update the current site due to issues with the platform, so a sub-standard site was temporarily launched. A new site is under construction. The project site will be the portal for information on the process. The project site will be modeled after a Kittitas County site that was very useful. Dynamic information on the website. Follow and participate in the process.

Penny asked the group who do people trust to get their information from. She noted that can be difficult to determine and yet is critical for success.

Comments:

- We don't do a lot of surveys.
- Farmer's Markets are perfect for getting the pulse of the community. For equity it will be important to present the information in a palatable form. Penny responded that this is a primary objective.

Sarah Fischer noted that public participation is a reciprocal process. We can revisit any topics that are unclear, e.g., acronyms. When thinking about how we can help get the message out - verbal communication is the fastest way to pass information. The Task Force will need to be champions of the process; to stay involved and informed and participate in the process.

Sharing Information

Penny noted the first step of the process is informing people. How many people know how solid waste works in this community? We will support communication from trusted sources by providing them with accurate information and key messages. For example: People will need to know that we could build the Taj Mahal of a facility, but it will cost. People don't understand that recycling doesn't pay for itself.

- While people are at the Transfer Station, they can learn about the process with a Quick Response (QR) code. Al noted that they have had a QR code at the Transfer Station and were pleasantly surprised to hear feedback from the community.
- Could consider an elevator pitch for why we need this.
- The community needs to be informed about the current situation to garner support. We need to

Meeting Notes

craft a message to gain support

- Initial information on why replacement is on the website and can be referenced.
- All transfer station personnel should be informed so they can provide accurate information when asked.
- We are spending lots of money and plan to spend more to keep the facility going. We need to hear from the community on, “is it a wise investment or should we move to other options”?
- When sharing information, use examples of a neighboring (or similarly sized) county and don’t show big city projects or people.

Penny suggested the members check out the project website to see bullet points on the situation and what is being proposed. She noted it is always wise to lead with the problems; in this case, they are Growth, Limits and Outdated facilities and Equipment.

Record keeping and public meetings act

Al noted that the county is carefully following requirements in the state’s Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA). He said that while the Task Force is not a decision-making body, the department still intends to follow the spirit of OPMA because it is good business. Therefore, all comments that are made on the project will be posted for the public and will automatically get posted to this group. Task Force members will be blind cc’d to maintain privacy. He asked the members to avoid forming a quorum and deliberating on this work. Al also noted these are open public meetings. He offered to send the link to a virtual training on the OPMA if folks are interested.

Decision-making and trust

A Task Force member commented that he sees a lot of folks who don’t trust the experts. He suggested that presenting the credentials of the team would go a long way to reassuring the public that this Task Force is in good hands and will lead us to a good outcome.

Al reiterated that this group is not making any decisions. Only the Board of County Commissioners is the decision maker. The Port Townsend city council is also involved.

Q. Can we map out the decision makers for the team selection?

A. Sarah noted the consultants were selected through a public process and were selected based on qualifications. Al will develop a description of the process used for selecting Vikek. He pointed out the most compelling element of the process was Vikek’s position that the “public process is instrumental in the success of this project”.

Tom Karston noted that the community is spending a lot of money. The journey that the waste takes is expensive, around \$1.5-2 million per year. Over 50 years that is a lot of money. He noted it will be \$26-27 million over the course of time. That amount could have considerable impact on the County’s budget. Victor added that financial assessment will be foundational to decisions made on this project.

Public Comment

Penny noted time on the agenda for public comment. No public comments were made.

Meeting Notes

Discussion:

- The OPMA does not dictate when public comment needs to be gathered. It was suggested that this should be at the beginning of the meeting and not after the discussion. Penny replied that this is the plan for future meetings.

Additional Q & A

Q. Is there real estate in our current solid waste transfer facility location to do what needs to be done for the future?

A. Al replied that the County is weighing the options, short-term or long-term objectives and the dilemma (cost benefit analysis). The County knows that the community will want to know the answer as to whether the current site is viable for the needs.

Q. Is the space that we have adequate for 20 years but not for 40 years? How much growth can we handle?

A. Al replied that data from the Office of Financial Management used in the Solid Waste Management Plan is the basis we use to make projections. There is some complexity to the formula as in 2006 we hit historic peak tonnage, then due to the economy, it dropped off and it took years to come back to that level. More disposable income for people equals more waste generated. If you build a facility that is just big enough to accommodate those fluctuations, you are smart, and no one thanks you. Victor- added that an optimal site where the 20-year horizon can be accommodated requires *flexibility* to be able to scale to accommodate future needs.

Q. Are there many folks looking at the website yet?

A. Al responded we needed this workshop to get the website built out and moving. We've gotten great information from this group that we will use to communicate with the public. The Local 202 does weekly event announcements. We can use this to spread the word. We had a catchphrase/logo, but we tabled it due to copyright infringement.

Q. Can we get a picture of useable landfill space to get a feel for what facilities could be on site?

A. Al noted this is a good idea, and it will demonstrate how constrained the current site is.

Q. I'm curious what it means that the closed landfill is potentially stable.

A. We will get information back to you on that.

Victor and Al closed the meeting. Victor noted that the Vikek Team:

- Digest and collate the information received today and define the outcomes of this kick off meeting/workshop.
- Develop an integrated project team charter that will guide the working relationship with the Task Force. This is not a typical relationship between an advisory committee and a team – this will be an integrated project team with the Task Force and the Vikek Team fully embedded as one team.

He noted that Penny has talked in depth about public involvement for about an hour and will be including the Task Force's input into a draft public involvement plan, and that the schedule for the public engagement will be discussed in the future. He Thanked the group for helping the Vikek team understand how it can make this project successful.

Al asked if the group would like to provide feedback on key messaging. The group said, yes.

Meeting Notes

Penny reminded members to send AI the work from today as well as information about all the communication pathways that are out there.

AI thanked everyone for their time and hope that the team will make future workshops as productive as possible.

Next Steps and Action Items

- Task Force members will send information about audiences, issues, and communications methods to AI.
- AI will provide a map of the current site with useable space delineated to the Task Force.
- The Vikek Team will provide a brief description of its Qualifications on the project website.
- AI will provide information about the Consultant selection process to the Task Force.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.