



Contract No. JC0726-2022-069

Tasks 2.4, 2.10 and 4.1

Solid Waste Facility Replacement Planning Project

FACILITY CURRENT STATE, STAKEHOLDER NEEDS and LEVEL OF SERVICE WORKSHOP NOTES

March 10, 2023

Prepared By:

In association with:



23309 100th AVE W
Edmonds, WA 98050
(206) 629-5935



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

BLRB architects

1250 Pacific AVE, STE 700
Tacoma, WA 98402
(253) 627-5599



Workshop #3 Meeting Information

Project: Jefferson County Solid Waste Replacement Planning Project	
Task 2.0 - Discovery, Analysis and Data Acquisition	Subtasks 2.4. Data Acquisition, Current State 2.10. Public Outreach Needs Study 4.1. Facility Design Criteria and Functional Requirements or Programming Workshop
Date and Time March 10, 2023; 1 – 3 p.m.	Location Hybrid Meeting on ZOOM, and Jefferson County Public Works Office, 623 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend, WA
Note – results of the polls completed during the workshop are included at the end of these Notes	

Purpose

To achieve a shared of understanding of several things, including:

- The current state of the existing Solid Waste Facilities (SWF),
- The stakeholder’s current and future facility needs,
- The associated levels of service (i.e., service types and scope, facility refuse handling capacity, recycling operations, space, traffic, safety, compaction, etc.), and
- If time allows, begin a discussion on the stakeholder functional requirements for solid waste facilities which will establish the preliminary basis for identifying facility alternatives. This will help us move forward with soliciting more feedback from the larger community.

Attendees

Solid Waste Facilities Task Force or SWFTF			
Name - Present	Name - Absent	Affiliation	Area of Expertise
Lisa Crosby		District 1 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 Feria-Mingo		Jefferson County Public Health	Permit requirements/other County functions



Solid Waste Facilities Task Force or SWFTF			
Name - Present	Name - Absent	Affiliation	Area of Expertise
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 - Roosevelt Regional Landfill	Transfer station and landfill 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

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

Consultant - Vitek Environmental Engineers, LLC Team		
Name	Affiliation	Role
Victor O. Okereke, Ph.D., P.E., DEE, CLSSS	Vitek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Project Manager/Team Leader
Tom Karston, Ph.D.	Vitek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Lead – Financial Analysis and Financial Planning
Sally Hanley	Vitek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Project Support Professional/ Note Taker
Penny Mabie	Definitely-Mabie Consulting, LLC	Lead – Public Involvement
Sarah Fischer, NCARB, LEED AP	BLRB Architects	Lead – Conceptual Facility Design



Workshop Notes

Welcome and Introductions

Victor Okereke and Penny Mabie welcomed everyone to the Workshop. The meeting started on time and a recording of the meeting was accepted and initiated. Introductions of speakers and participants followed the initiation of the meeting.

Workshop Goals and Overview of Project Status

Victor stated that the desired outcomes by the end of the workshop were as follows:

- Adopted Integrated Project Charter and Workplan.
- Shared understanding of the existing Solid Waste Facility's Physical and Functional condition.
- Shared understanding of Stakeholder Vision and Aspirations.
- Shared understanding of Stakeholder Solid Waste Facility Functional Requirements to address the Vision and Aspirations, and (time-permitting).
- Shared understanding of the Solid Waste Priority Functional Requirements.

He reviewed the Project Roadmap showing progress relative to where the team plans to go, and indicated that for a successful outcome, it is essential to understand where we started, where we want to go and how to get there.

Regarding discussion about the Vision for the solid waste facility – he stated that it was important to determine what that means in terms of the functions the facility will perform, and time permitting, there will be an open discussion of the facility functions and their relative importance, at the end of the meeting.

Public Comments, Integrated Project Team Charter, and Workplan Adoption

Penny asked if there were any comments from the public or if a public member had any comments. Having received no comments, the workshop proceeded.

Penny noted the SWFTF still needed to finalize and adopt the Charter and project Workplan. A final draft version was provided to the SWFTF for consideration. Penny asked if the SWFTF was ready for adoption of the revised charter.

Question: It appears that food waste composting is not included in the Charter. While there has been a past conversation about food waste composting not being economically feasible, it seems a serious discussion of food waste composting along with the potential for a facility should be included in the project scope of work.

Victor/Response- The Charter was updated, and the project principles did generally include that topic.

Penny/Response- That topic is in Table 1, Project Milestones and Deliverables 2.0 within the Project Charter as, "Organics Management Study" although it does not specifically state food waste



Workshop Notes

composting.

Victor/Response- We will add food waste to the appropriate section (indicating that this topic will be addressed). AI indicated we will look for optimal opportunities for waste diversion to address the concern.

AI/Response- He noted as follows:

- The scope of the work with Vitek was developed while House Bill (HB) 1799 was still in development, and that the precise requirements of the final bill was unknown at the time.
- The State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) staff recently addressed the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) about the planned requirements of HB 1799. Knowing that more fully and with some preliminary data on cost, the County has decided to place that element of the project scope of work on hold.
- The County was working on identifying where a food waste management facility might be hosted. The project team will evaluate the footprint of such a facility and make a recommendation of its location should a decision be made to build one.
- The project team's scope of work is limited to identifying a potential food waste composting facility location and no further analysis is required.

Question: Does this pertain to other things, any additions like a drop-off location for reuse- is it a given that there is a "no" on everything?

AI/response- He noted as follows:

- The County 's decision on suspending further organics management study , is specific to a compost facility.
- There are no, "nos" yet and the County is not saying "no" to a compost facility; it is just a matter of where the team is at in the ongoing planning process.
- The County is using the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) food waste management hierarchy as a guide. Per that guidance, the County will first redirect food waste to food banks,, and then to further divert to agricultural use, and then to consider anaerobic digesters. This work is already underway. When the County has determined how much food waste remains in the solid waste stream after its diversion efforts and whether enough is remaining to make anaerobic digesters feasible, it will be able to scale a composting facility appropriately if one is necessary. Getting to that point will take 4 – 5 years.

Comment: Last meeting we agreed to strike "Indoor" air quality and just indicate "air quality."

Victor/Response: Yes, we missed that edit. The Charter will be updated accordingly.

Comment: Request to add food waste to the diversion section.

Victor/Response: Yes, food waste will be added to the "waste diversion" bullet under the "project principles" section of the Charter.

Comment: The language in the Charter just says that organics management strategies will be



Workshop Notes

recommended. I am assuming that would be what AI previously mentioned, although it was hard to find in the Charter.

AI/Response: Yes, that is precisely what that was intended to note.

Penny asked the SWFTF if there were any objections to approval of the Charter with the additions noted from the meeting today incorporated herein. She noted that hearing no objections would be interpreted as there was consensus to approve and adopt the Charter. There were no objections to the amended Charter.

Penny asked if there were concerns or objections to the Workplan. Victor mentioned that the number of workshops has been reduced from 11 to ten.

Penny confirmed there were no objections to the Workplan and it was therefore adopted. The Charter and Work Plan will be finalized and posted on the project website.

Victor indicated that the adopted Charter and Workplan can be amended in the future as needed.

Solid Waste Facility Current Condition Assessment

Victor presented the result of the facility current condition assessment completed by the Vitek team. He noted that Quilcene was not included in the assessment and the results are specific to the main facility at Port Townsend.

He noted that in her interviews, Penny had heard several stakeholder concerns about the transfer station. He summarizes those concerns as follows:

- Traffic congestion.
- Facility size and expandability- the facility has not kept up with growth in terms of capacity and several stakeholders also suggested looking at time horizons of 20 and 40 years.
- Air quality- impact on employees at the site.
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) - lack of ADA accessibility at site.
- Optimal facility location- consider convenience for customers.
- Cost considerations should be tied to environmental benefits.

These concerns are aligned with those identified by the project team's facility evaluation.

He presented a "Level of Detail Determination" Chart used to determine the appropriate level of condition assessments in practice. He noted that the Current Condition Assessment was completed at a high-level that is equivalent to a Concept Level or Due Diligence Assessment. As the planning process progresses, additional detailed assessment may be necessary.

He explained the rating scale that was used: Scores of "3" mean the element, with some improvements, can meet the current service level. Scores above "3" mean the element can meet current and future service levels. Scores less than "3" mean the element is performing below required current service level. He noted that a "Solid Waste Facility Condition Report Card" summarizing the



Workshop Notes

assessment was provided to the SWFTF ahead of the meeting. He then reviewed the scores for the different elements of the station:

- **Capacity - Emergency Storage, Buffer Expandability:** Level 2. It was previously scored at Level 3, but it was downgraded after additional evaluation. The site is constrained physically by the existing closed landfill, the biosolids operations, gun club, and wetland, leaving less than 15 acres of developable area.
- **Capacity – Tonnage and Vehicle Capacity:** Level 2. It has exceeded capacity for 12 of the last 17 years.
- **Site Access –** Level 2. Site access is constrained (only one lane and no bypass lanes).
- **Scales and Scale House –** Level 2. Platform vehicle scale length is not optimal at 25-ft long for a site of this capacity and the scale house has no ADA features.
- **Recyclables collection and processing area -** Level 2 due to bin sizes, debris, and safety.
- **Transfer Building and Operations -** Level 3. Tipping floor capacity relative to vehicular demand is suboptimal and there is no back-up capacity if there are any repairs needed.
- **Waste loading operations -** Level 3. Required payload is achieved but it takes too long.
- **Employee facilities -** Level 3. Recently modified.
- **Public Facilities –** Level 2. No public facilities at the site.
- **Queuing and traffic circulation -** Level 2. Queuing is suboptimal.
- **Transfer building and recycling structure -** Level 3, Roof height is suboptimal. Recycling building is not in adequate condition and requires detailed structural and electrical system assessments. The buildings are serving the current state functions fairly.
- **Operating equipment -** Level 3. Operating Equipment are in fair to good condition.
- **Facility management costs –** Level 3. Operations and Maintenance costs increased by 44% from 2014 to 2022. Capital spending was variable. Compared to replacement costs, the Operations and Maintenance costs are rated fair.
- **Statutory Compliance Risk-** Level 3. Facility is in compliance with requirements in general. Age of buildings suggests electrical systems near end of life. Customers standing at tipping floor to dispose waste; operator and customer vehicles not separated; recycling and stored goods are near roof trusses. Open sided transfer building allows noise to exit building.
- **Facility social significance-** Level 4. Facility is important to the community.
- **Impact of the Facility on the Environment -** not a significant risk based on assessments. Older buildings, however, are not energy efficient.

How does our assessment align with your thoughts?

Comment: Appreciated the solid waste facility report card. Agree on all assessments but had a couple questions. The transfer building was assessed as a 3 but seemed suboptimal. For facility management cost, the report card indicates a 2 but now it is a 3 in the slide show today.

Victor/Response- We agree the costs are a little higher than expected but this is relative to the cost for replacing the facility. The report card will be updated to a 3 for facility management cost.

Question: Regarding the recycling center, ingress and egress is difficult when the site is being heavily



Workshop Notes

used and people are pulling in and out impatiently.

AI/Response- Yes, it was scored as a 2 because of that. AI mentioned he was almost killed by a car out there. It is a major safety concern.

Stakeholders' Solid Waste Facility Vision and Aspirations and Functional Requirements

Penny introduced the next agenda item regarding what she learned from stakeholder interviews. She noted in the assessment report a laundry list of the findings/concerns she heard was included. She shared that the findings are consistent with the team's concerns and aspirations. In this next section, the discussion will involve two general categories: "Must Haves" and "Wants."

Sarah Fischer, BLRB, presented to the SWFTF and provided some basic terms and definitions:

- Transfer station is a location for waste disposal, which is then transferred to one or more locations.
- Waste, all kinds, is measured in weight/volume.
- Time refers to how long it takes to complete the process. To be discussed more later. Customer surveys will help determine how much time the community is willing to take to complete their transfer station activities.
- Queuing length- the number of cars in a line.
- # Tipping stalls- number of car spaces available to tip or offload their waste.
- Storage- Stockpile, but emergency storage is not adequate.

Sarah shared what are considered "must haves" for an ideal updated transfer station, including the transfer station/building, admin, locker room, scales, recycling, unenclosed programs (to store materials containers and other items), maintenance, fire suppression, and limited household hazardous waste (paints, aerosols, propane tanks). Sarah provided example photos of other sites and facilities.

- Transfer station/building: Enclosed facility, prevents litter vectors (birds), air cleaning, keeps dust down, supports moving waste from A to B.
- Administrative building: Offices, break room, shower, lockers, restrooms (small site impact but big need).
- Queuing: Currently, customers cannot get into the recycling yard without waiting for those who are dumping.
- Attendant building: Needs ventilation.
- Recyclables: Should handle commercial and residential recycling and limited household waste. Could share one roof so they are bundled together for the purposes of this discussion. Need adaptability.
- Accessibility, particularly in the recycling area, is critical. There should be no ladders or stairs required to access bins.
- Unenclosed programs for emergency storage, debris, etc.



Workshop Notes

Comment: The recycling center is hard to get “into” regarding the road and traffic, but no ladders are needed to use the bins.

Sarah/Response- The site currently has small bins, but more could be recycled with larger bins (which may not be accessible to all).

Sarah also noted functional requirements that are needed- including fire suppression and a small maintenance facility for vehicles.

Sarah indicated the SWFTF’s feedback was heard and that the technical team is on the same page. She and Penny then discussed the SWFTF’s “wants.” They included:

- Expanded and additional recycling services
- Co-location with other community services
- Community public facilities location
- Other ideas– Organics will come up later because it is a want

Penny presented a chart of the SWFTF’s “wants” for the transfer station. She noted the items are numbered for convenience and are not based on priority. She also noted the items were combined into similar groups:

- #1-6 are recycling activities
- #7-9 are waste diversion activities
- #10-17 are about gathering and social use of space
- #18-20 are specialty items

Sarah provided an overview of most of the “wants” and how they could be implemented and what functionality and/or space would be required.

Repair café: A place where people can bring items in for repair, such as small electronics and household items. She noted Jefferson County already has a mobile hotspot repair café in the community. Sarah noted the facility would be designed to accommodate all ages and abilities.

Organics – Food scraps: Sarah noted this could be accomplished by aerated piles, composting, or collection bins. A study is needed to determine what would work and to answer the question of whether the County should do organic food scraps recycling and what it would take to get there.

Drop and take (Waste not want not) – This is a space where people could either drop off or shop for reusable materials such as: Salvaged materials, doors, windows, etc. This falls under the category of waste diversion. This would be run by another entity, not the county. This facility would require space that does not currently exist at the site.

Specialty recycling – This activity typically requires special equipment. Construction and demolition debris recycling or asbestos could be considered. This facility would have to be operated by someone else.



Workshop Notes

Community space: This should be co-located in a repair café but we are not yet combining wants at this stage. This could include things suggested by SWFTF members, such as educational opportunities, or artist exhibitions. Another function Sarah suggested could include a community emergency hub (added by Sarah). She noted it would be nice to have a hub in rural counties.

Comments: How did we (SWFTF) do, and did we miss something?

Penny asked if she captured what she heard accurately? Did we represent your needs? What does it take functionally to bring these to life?

Comment: It is a great list. The Department of Emergency management might need to be consulted for the emergency hub.

Penny and AI/Response: Willie is the emergency management representative. Sarah added that it is great to have someone on the team who has the knowledge and expertise to address this niche topic.

Penny asked the SWFTF: How would you prioritize the wants? What types of criteria might you use? Cost, practicality, equitable, etc.? Penny then noted she was going to have three polls for the participants to provide feedback on the highest priority “Wants” for immediate consideration, which “wants” to do they want to be sure to provide future flexibility for, and overall, what are SWFTF members’ highest priority “wants?”

Comment: A participant acknowledged that the facility has been operating over-capacity for years. They noted that if food waste were removed from the waste stream, it could take 16% off the tonnage. Some of the other waste items will not reduce the tonnage as much. If you split out food waste composting, you create more space for other waste. Should it be a priority to expand capacity if composting can reduce the required tonnage?

Penny/response- We are not trying to come up with common metrics, this is a poll to get a feel for how SWFTF members value the “Wants” list.

Comment: You need to “right” size, not over build the transfer station. Smaller facilities tend to be more dangerous, and do not work as well. They are also responsible for more greenhouse gas production due to more trips. I agree about not over-building but “right” size the facility.

Victor/Response: Regarding facility alternatives and how best to address the needs, this will be discussed in the next workshop. We want to determine what the facility will do before we discuss what type of facility we are going to provide.

Penny launched a poll requesting the top 5 most immediate priorities from the “Wants” list.

Sarah defined limited household hazardous waste- aerosols, paints, residentially used products (partially determined by the processing required).

Comment: A lot of these items can be done in one space (multi use facility).

Penny/Response-We do not want to get into combining at this point. We want the feedback to be



Workshop Notes

more specific. We want to know the functions you would really like to see and then we can look at how to incorporate them.

Question: Is the construction debris drop and recycle- doors, windows, sinks? Is this the same as “waste not want not”?

Sarah/Response- Sarah clarified that the waste not want not is more like the drop and take. Construction debris is stuff that is not going to be reused, e.g., concrete chunks.

Penny noted that for anyone who could not access the poll, they could enter their options in the chat, or just call them out and Penny would include them in the responses.

Question: How consequential is this poll as I am already wanting to change my answers?

Penny/Response- This is not decisional but important in that it can influence priorities.

The poll was closed, and results were presented on the screen share.

Penny noted # 1 is high on the list. She noted the shared poll results will be compiled and results will be published later.

Penny launched a 2nd poll for priorities for the future:

Question: Could these be the same things as we answered in the 1st poll? Can you clarify what the second poll priority indicates- wouldn't we answer this poll the same way as the first poll?

Penny/Response- Absolutely, these could be the same items you previously selected. However, if you think of these as wish lists for the future, they could be different, based on your sense of urgency.

Question: What is the difference between #4 and #5?

Penny/ AI / Sarah response- Commercial scale composting does not necessarily include food scraps. This was based on feedback that we got from the agricultural community. We could have called it a soil amendment facility for differentiation. Sarah noted that a commercial composting facility would likely handle a different waste stream than a soil amendment facility. Penny noted that commercial compost for the agricultural world must undergo more testing in terms of whether it is useable in agricultural production.

Question: For this 2nd poll, can we assume that previous votes, when favored by the group, would already be assumed “a given” and that we could get our secondary choices here?

Penny/Response- You can make any assumption you want. Remember these are about your individual wants, but I do not want to guarantee anything in terms of assumptions.

Question: Wouldn't we answer this the same way? I do not understand how I would answer this any differently.



Workshop Notes

Penny/Response- Well, what if you wanted 10 items but you want 5 considered now and 5 could come later.

Al noted that this feedback will inform the larger public process.

Penny shared the results of the second poll and noted that the 2nd poll indicated a larger spread of interests.

Penny launched Poll #3 - What are the 3 most important “wants” for your transfer station?

Question: Will all the data from the different polls be considered discreetly? I agree that it might make sense to look at them collectively (Polls # 1 and 2) as our top 10 so as to not diminish votes for selected “Wants.”

Penny/Response- This is not a scientific poll by any means, it is taking the temperature of folks’ priorities. It will help the team evaluate SWFTT priorities. We will have a look at the data and see how it makes sense to report it out. If there is a comparison that makes sense, then we will include this.

Comment: To follow up with the concerns - there are flaws with straw polls. How will these be used in future iterations? I have been victim of straw poll before. What can we expect from the report out?

Penny/Response- This is a list of wants from you, our key stakeholders, and we want to ask the community some of the same questions. Since they will not likely be as informed as you are, we would like to share your feedback with the community to help them understand what you, who are looking more closely at things, find as your priorities. We are working on how to take these questions out to the community and will be sure you are aware of our plans before we do so.

Question: Will the community get the scrubbed list?

Penny/Response- It is not going to be a scrubbed list. We need to do some education and informing. If I put this list of 20 items out to the community as is, they are not going to know what I am asking them. We have to try and find the best way to get meaningful input from the community.

Comment: Thanked Penny and acknowledged the challenges with so many options and appreciates her diligence.

Penny shared the results of the 3rd poll and noted she sees some common interests. She indicated the goal is to understand what is most important to the SWFTF. She noted we are not going to report this as, “This is what the task force said.” That is exactly *not* what we are going to do. We are going to compile the results in a way that makes sense - without ascribing anything to you that you did not say or without saying this is a definitive survey. We want to survey the community to find out what they think is most important on top of the absolute “needs” of the transfer station. Your input and community feedback will inform the next steps to plan what is needed and what “Wants” are a general priority from the list of 20 items.

Comment: I feel a little uncomfortable with what we did because I don’t feel it was clear we were supposed to know more about this than the public. On certain topics, I do not feel particularly



Workshop Notes

informed.

Penny/Response- I did not mean to set you up and infer that by your participation in these meetings you are much more informed. However, just by being on the SWFTF and participating in the workshops you are more informed. E.g., because of Sarah's information presented today.

Comment: I still feel uncomfortable. I did not know the difference in things. I would have liked to have more discussion ahead of time to understand the list before the vote. I do not mean to criticize I am just letting you know.

Comment: It would have been helpful to see the lists prior to the meeting.

Penny/Response- It was in the information that was sent out.

Comment: Single points of data are less important than the aggregation of the data. That is what the polling was for to aggregate a sensation that was common between the polls.

Question: When we are considering everything- is there a sweet spot? Someone is profiting from a lot of waste, and we are trying to divert waste. Where is the sweet spot for being better stewards for our land?

Victor/Response- We will have discussions about the alternative facility options and their costs and benefits in subsequent workshops and take into consideration that the community wants. Which options should actually move forward? The more you expand it the more you pay. We will be talking more about this as we move forward. We are trying to get information on where you want to go and then determine how we get there.

AI/Response- In addition to the cost and benefits of facility alternatives, we need to keep the price point in mind so that we have inclusivity (we cannot add too much so that we become unaffordable). We will explore all of this in depth later in the process.

Comment: AI makes a good point. In California they are rolling out the organics legislation and there are communities that have seen a 100% increase in their curbside rates, which has priced out less fortunate folks. You can get what you want but how much are you willing to pay for it?

Penny opened the public comment period and asked if there were any who wished to make public comments to the task force? There were no public comments.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Victor -Thanked everyone for their time and their feedback. We will publish the meeting notes on the project website. Today is the start of facility planning (we have been doing pre-planning). We will develop facility alternatives that will help to bridge the gap between what you want and what you currently have. These alternatives fall into the following three main categories:

- Continue the services provided by the facility at the existing level
- Enhance existing services



Workshop Notes

- No facility changes but implementing management changes

We will develop a list (which will likely be a combination of these), and at the next workshop, modify and prioritize them.

Penny will make the agreed upon edits to the charter and workplan. The final, approved documents will be posted to the project website. Victor will send updated report cards and we will send out the outcomes from the polling.



Poll 1 raw results:

1 C&D Rec	11
2 Asphalt Shingle Recycling	3
3 Agricultural Plastics Recycling	1
4 Commercial scale Composting	7
5 Organics/ food Recycling	12
6 Specialty Recycling (e.g., Styro)	4
7 Repair Café	2
8 Drop and Take Spot	8
9 Edible food diversion space	2
10 Volunteers space	0
11 Classroom	0
12 Community meeting/use space	2
13 Artist in residence	1
14 Viewing area	0
15 Artists exhibit space	0
16 Viewing area working floor	0
17 Showcase workers	0
18 Asbestos facility	2
19 Limited household hazardous waste	8
20 Disaster debris	2

Poll 2 raw results

1 C&D Rec	7
2 Asphalt Shingle Recycling	2
3 Agricultural Plastics Recycling	1
4 Commercial scale Composting	6
5 Organics/ food Recycling	5
6 Specialty Recycling (e.g., Styro)	7
7 Repair Café	3
8 Drop and Take Spot	7
9 Edible food diversion space	4
10 Volunteers space	1
11 Classroom	2
12 Community meeting/use space	3
13 Artist in residence	2
14 Viewing area	0
15 Artists exhibit space	0
16 Viewing area working floor	0
17 Showcase workers	0



18 Asbestos facility	2
19 Limited household hazardous waste	6
20 Disaster debris	4

Poll 3 raw results

1 C&D Rec	6
2 Asphalt Shingle Recycling	0
3 Agricultural Plastics Recycling	1
4 Commercial scale Composting	5
5 Organics/ food Recycling	6
6 Specialty Recycling (e.g., Styro)	2
7 Repair Café	2
8 Drop and Take Spot	4
9 Edible food diversion space	2
10 Volunteers space	0
11 Classroom	0
12 Community meeting/use space	2
13 Artist in residence	0
14 Viewing area	0
15 Artists exhibit space	0
16 Viewing area working floor	0
17 Showcase workers	0
18 Asbestos facility	0
19 Limited household hazardous waste	8
20 Disaster debris	0