



Contract No. JC0726-2022-069

Tasks 1.3 and 1.4

Solid Waste Facility Replacement Planning Project

FINAL CHARTER AND WORK PLAN REVIEW AND ADOPTION WORKSHOP NOTES

January 6, 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 Jefferson County Solid Waste Replacement Planning Project	
Task 1.0 - Project Management	Subtasks 1.3 Integrated Project Team Charter 1.4 Project Management Plan/Work Plan
Date and Time December 15, 2022; 1 - 3 p.m.	Location Hybrid Meeting on ZOOM, and Jefferson County Public Works Office, 623 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend, WA

Purpose

To review, update, agree and adopt the draft Integrated Project Team Charter and the Work Plan.

Attendees

Solid Waste Facilities Task Force or SWFTF (Virtual Attendees)			
Name - Present	Name - Absent	Affiliation	Area of Expertise
Lisa Crosby		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		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 Fera-Mingo(virtual)	Jefferson County Public Health	Permit requirements/other County functions
Nick Lawler		[represented Pinky Mingo]	
David Wayne - Johnson		Department of Community Development	GMA/zoning/permitting requirements
Will O'Donnell		Public Utility District	Infrastructure
	Derek Rockett	Department of Ecology	Facility design/requirements
	Bridgett Gregg)	WSU Extension	Agriculture community
	Steve Gilmore	Republic Services -	Transfer station and landfill



Solid Waste Facilities Task Force or SWFTF (Virtual Attendees)

Name - Present	Name - Absent	Affiliation	Area of Expertise
		Roosevelt Regional Landfill	operations
	Chad Young	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
Miranda Nash		D.A.S.H./Jefferson Transit	Customer mobility/access
Willie Bence		Department of Emergency Management	Disaster debris management

Attendees (contd.)

Jefferson County Staff		
Name	Affiliation	Role
Al Cairns	Jefferson County Department of Public Works	Project Manager (Solid Waste Division Manager)
Justin Miskell	Jefferson County Department of Public Works	Transfer Station Operations Supervisor (Solid Waste Division)
Laura Tucker	Public Health Department	Solid Waste Education

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
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



Workshop Notes

Welcome and Introductions:

Victor O. Okereke and Penny Mabie welcomed everyone to the Workshop. All attendees introduced themselves. The request to record the meeting was accepted by the attendees.

Background:

Victor noted that:

Feedback the Vikek Team received during the Kick-off meeting, Chartering Workshop, and Stakeholder Needs Assessment interviews shows that the following four key elements are required:

- A shared vision of the project,
- Completing a robust facility needs assessment,
- Exploring all other alternatives besides relocating to a different site, and
- Ensuring consistent transparency throughout the project to foster trust within the community.

The desired outcomes at the end of the workshop were for the team to have:

- Understood the project planning process,
- Adopted the Integrated Project Team Charter and Work Plan, and
- Achieved a shared vision of the project.

Solid Waste Facility Planning Framework:

Victor provided an overview of the general solid waste infrastructure planning framework that the project team will be using to complete the project, and indicated that it involved the following three major steps:

1. **CURRENT STATE** – the team must first understand the current conditions of the facilities and the needs of the community.
2. **FUTURE STATE** – the team should then articulate its future facility needs, including the related challenges, and prioritize these needs and challenges before moving to the third step,
3. **HOW** – the team will then determine and evaluate the types of facilities to address the needs determined in step two, and develop funding plans for these facility alternatives.

He indicated that in order for the team to successfully complete these main steps, it would strive to answer the following SIX questions over the next year:

- 1) **What kind** of facility is needed?
- 2) **How much capacity** is required to match demand? (determine the gap between what the facility needs, compared to what it currently has)



Workshop Notes

- 3) **What facilities** are needed and **How** they should be arranged [Layout]?
- 4) **Where** the facilities should be located [Location]?
- 5) What is the **life cycle cost** of the facility alternatives?[Comparative Cost], and
- 6) What is the **best funding strategy**?

- ✚ He further described how the current planning process relates to the forthcoming solid waste planning the County will be undertaking starting in 2024:
 - The output from the current planning process, the preferred solid waste facility, will inform the 2024 comprehensive solid waste management plan (CSMP or Plan) which, will update the existing 2016 plan.
 - The updated CSMP would inform future master facility planning for the department of public works, which will identify the facilities to be funded, and
 - Also inform the design, construction and commissioning of any such future facilities .

Integrated Project Team Charter Overview:

- ✚ Victor thanked SWFTF members for providing valuable constructive feedback regarding the Integrated Project Team (IPT) Charter. He clarified that SWFTF is fully embedded with Vikek to form one integrated project team (IPT).
- ✚ He described changes made in response to SWFTF's feedback to include [a] deleting the word, "replacement" from the vision, goal and objective statements, [2] replacing "facility" with "facilities" and "site" with "site(s)" to ensure that team deliverables include a broad range of facility alternatives.
- ✚ He provided an overview of the following main components of the Integrated Project Team (IPT) Charter and noted where changes were made in response to feedback received from SWFTF:
 1. **Updated Project Vision**– Solid waste ~~replacement facility~~ facilities located at optimal site(s), adequately funded, accepted by the community, and meet current and future needs of the citizens of Jefferson County while complying with all regulatory requirements.
 2. **Our Mission**– Develop and present to the BoCC recommended solid waste facility alternative(s) that are fiscally sustainable, reflect current data and analysis, respond to stakeholder and community input, and prepares the Jefferson County solid waste system for the next 40 years of service.
 3. **Team Guiding Principles** – He requested that by the end of the meeting the team would agree on the guiding principles of the Charter or to modifications.
 4. **Updated Project Goal**– To achieve an optimal conceptual design, site(s), and financing plan for solid waste ~~replacement~~ facilities by January 2024
 5. **Modified Decision-Making Process** – The IPT will only make decisions related to recommendations it provides to the Sponsor.
 6. **Updated Project Objectives** – By November 2023, achieve public acceptance of the



Workshop Notes

recommended replacement solid waste facilities, site(s), and financing method(s), and by December 2023 recommend replacement solid waste facilities, site(s) and a funding plan to the Board of County Commissioners and Port Townsend City Council.

7. **Scope and Boundaries** – Victor described the Solid Waste services and related facilities currently included in the project scope, which include the transfer station, drop boxes, reuse and recycling facilities, as well as those for organics and moderate risk waste. He noted that the scope of the County’s Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan update in 2024 will consider all elements of the Solid Waste System, including those which are not included in the current project, such as waste collection, transportation and disposal.
8. **Milestone Schedule** – The milestone schedule has not changed, although the timing of end dates may change during project execution.
9. **Project Guiding Principles** – These are the County’s perspectives or requirements that the solid waste alternatives considered should meet.
10. **Risk Element** – An aspect of a project that could prevent its successful completion, without appropriate control measures.
11. **Success Criteria** – Standards that key project deliverables must meet for the project to be successful.
12. **Integrated Project Team** – Victor indicated that the team should strive in this workshop to define specific areas of the project that each team member desires to provide support. This information will be used to update the draft team organization chart.

Project Work Plan Overview:

- ✚ Victor indicated that a summary of all the planned workshops and meetings were provided to SWFTF in the workshop guide and in the Work Plan. In summary, there are nine additional Workshops, two public meetings, one practice presentation and two external presentations to the board of County Commissioners and the Port Townsend City Council.
- ✚ He further provided an overview of the project’s workflow and encouraged the team to also review the detailed flow chart at the back of the work plan and provide feedback as necessary.

Public Comment Session:

- ✚ Penny facilitated this session and indicated that the session was an opportunity for public comment and encouraged active participation. No comments were received during this session.

Pause – The workshop stopped for a 5-minute break

Workshop Session – Integrated Project Team Charter and Work Plan Review and Adoption

- ✚ Penny facilitated this session. She reminded the Team of the updates made to the Charter and asked if anyone had questions or comments about those changes. No hands came up.



Workshop Notes

Penny indicated she will assume that there are no concerns, and that the terms were accepted as modified. Questions and/or concerns discussed during the workshop session are summarized hereafter.

- ✚ **Comment** – Regarding the statements in the IPT Charter on how the 2016 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (CSMP) is the driver for this project. The implication that the 2016 CSMP laid the groundwork for the current project is questionable, as recommendations are only related to the Quilcene transfer station.

Response – Victor stated that a major reason we are having this session today is that while the 2016 Comp Plan’s “High-Priority Recommendation for Transfer and Disposal, T & D1” refers only to the Quilcene Drop Box, its “Medium-Priority Recommendations for Transfer and Disposal, T & D2” require improvements be made to the County’s solid waste disposal facility based on assessment options and the solid waste master plan update. He asked AI whether this interpretation was correct.

AI/Comment – He will review the 2016 CSMP recommendations and provide feedback to the IPT with his findings.

- ✚ **Team Guiding Principles** – no questions or comments

- ✚ **Decision Making Authority** – Penny stated that the IPT will aim to have all its work products and recommendations move forward smoothly. It would hope to achieve an acceptance and support for its recommendations. There is no requirement to achieve a consensus, but the IPT hopes to have one.

Question – Whether the Project Manager and the Sponsor refer to AI?

Victor/Response –AI is representing the Solid Waste Division, Department of Public Works, as the Sponsor and Victor is the Project Manager referenced in the IPT Charter.

Question – Will there ever be a time when the Sponsor already knows what it wants, i.e. what Public Works wants in a facility, regardless of what the community says? It would be wrong for the team to go through its detailed processes and come up with a recommendation if the Sponsor has already decided on a solution.

AI/Response – He is part of the IPT, representing Public Works, and is deeply involved in this project. Any recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners or BoCC will be the IPT’s work. There will be no room for surprises as everyone will be involved at each step. The final product will be fully produced by this team. Public Works wants a facility that meets all the needs of its customers over a 40-year horizon that it can afford. Public Works , Vikek and SWFTF will be working collectively to develop what that is. It is the Public Works, Vikek and SWFTF’s joint work that will be presented to the BoCC.

Victor/Response – There will be ongoing communication with the Sponsor, so there will be no surprises at the end.



Workshop Notes

Project Vision

Comment – Add the 40-year horizon to the project vision. SWFTF agreed with this change.

Comment– The word, “optimal” is used. Is there a definition of that?

Victor and Al/Response – This will be determined as we discuss the needs of the transfer system and other services, and we will collectively define “optimal” as we develop project criteria.


Project Scope

Comment – Regarding the scope of this current project, which does not address the entire waste management system:

- It seems that ideally you would look at the whole system first, and after having developed a broad vision, then develop a strategy to achieve it that would include several considerations like transfer facilities. However, it is understood that such an approach has challenges, which the County is working under, and therefore we should live with the current planning framework as proposed.
- It seemed odd how in this project there will be little or no discussion about hauling, transport to Roosevelt landfill, or whether garbage should be handled within the County instead of on a long-hauled basis, and that such broader items will only be addressed in the forthcoming new Comp Plan, even though it seems out of order to determine the facilities issue first.

AL/Response – Regardless of how we manage the ultimate destination of our waste – whether it gets sent out of county, to a new landfill or to a waste-to-energy facility within the county, we will still need the transfer services facilities. So, this project planning framework is not out of order.

Question Is there an option to host the waste in the county instead of transporting it elsewhere?

 AL/Response - He stated that this will be tackled as part of the CSMP (he believes there is an element of this in the management plan from 2008) which will look at it as part of a larger planning process. In any case, there will likely be improvements to the transfer capacity the County now has, and possibly a new location(s), which would serve virtually any longer-term disposal option which might be adopted in the future, while providing substantial utility in the interim of any such decision.

Project Guiding Principles

Question –There used to be a State mandate to reduce waste and this is an overarching goal that is constrained by the limitations of the solid waste enterprise fund structure, I do not know



Workshop Notes

how articulated that is here (especially with reference to the new organics regulatory requirements).

Penny/Victor Comment –Should the Waste Diversion Guidelines be edited to address requirements that the solid waste facility support the highest cost-effectively feasible waste reduction and diversion program, within the constraints of the facility selection assessment criteria? Should the edited version be specific to organics or could it be general, e.g. support optimal waste reduction overall?.

AL/Response – He agreed that the edited Waste Diversion Guidelines could include something like: “...encourages and allows for the highest rate of landfill diversion feasible.”

SWFTF – Agreed with the suggested edit.

Question –Regarding the *Environmental Excellence* bullet point: Why does it include indoor air specifically and not all air, and the County’s carbon footprint overall, given the previous discussion on scope. I just want to make sure that transportation to and from the facility is still included in the scope, regarding the carbon footprint not just the activity at the facility itself.

Victor/Response - The transportation to and from the facility informs the decision regarding where the facility is located. The carbon footprint language will be adjusted to include transportation to and from the facility as well as at the facility itself.

SWFTF – Agreed with the proposed modification.

Question – Regarding “*Service Equity*”: Can we address accessibility of the facility? Equity is an all-encompassing term but I think we should take into consideration accessibility and barriers so that it is on the forefront when it comes to talking about what this facility will look like.

Victor/Response: Accessibility will be a Site Selection Criteria and included as part of the Project Guiding Principles.

SWFTF –Agrees with the proposed modification.

Comment – Edit the Success Criteria and add “consistent with the guiding principles”

SWFTF – Is okay with the “Milestones and Deliverables.”

Comment – Each team member was given the opportunity to fine tune what role each wants to play based on experience, whether it is just providing feedback on work products and process or also take on a role specifically based on interest and expertise?

Question – Whether the Pre-workshop requested feedback would be considered when the Charter and Work Plan are updated.

Response - Yes



Workshop Notes

SWFTF – Greg Brotherton provided pre-workshop feedback and indicated that he will support Public Involvement. No additional roles were proposed by others at the Workshop.

Workshop Session – Project Work Plan

The Vikek team is open to receiving any further comments through the end of 2022, and that these would be addressed when the Charter and Work Plan are updated.

AI – The team should not ask for consensus on the final version of the work plan and Charter until the next scheduled meeting.

Penny – Asked the Task Force if they agreed, at a conceptual level, with the Charter and Work Plan, as amended by the comments. She noted that silence would be interpreted as agreement with the proposed changes. Since there were no questions she concluded that there was conceptual consensus on the amended documents. She also noted that the revised versions would be provided to the SWFTF for review and that final consensus would be sought at the next workshop, to be scheduled sometime between January and March 2023.

Next Steps and Action Items

- Vikek will update the IPT Charter and Work Plan by the first quarter of 2023, informed by feedback received from SWFTF.
- AI will provide feedback on questions surrounding the provisions of the 2016 County's Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan and how the recommendations on Solid Waste Transfer and Disposal relate to the current project.
- Vikek will schedule the next workshop in the first quarter of 2023, which will include a presentation of the Charter and Work Plan updates and a discussion regarding their adoption.

The Workshop ended at 3.00 PM.