



Jefferson County  
*Washington*

Solid Waste Management  
*Solid Waste Facilities Task Force*

Contract No. JC0726-2022-069

Task 4.1.

Solid Waste Facility Replacement Planning Project

# SOLID WASTE FACILITY INITIAL ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING CRITERIA REVIEW WORKSHOP FINAL NOTES

April 28, 2023

Prepared By:



23309 100<sup>th</sup> AVE W  
Edmonds, WA 98050  
(206) 629-5935

In association with:



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

**BLRB** architects

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



**Workshop #4 Meeting Summary**

<b>Project:</b> Jefferson County Solid Waste Replacement Planning Project	
<b>Task</b> 4.0 – Conceptual Facility Design	<b>Subtasks</b> 4.1. Facility Design Criteria and Functional Requirements or Programming/ Solid Waste Facility Initial Alternatives Development and Screening Criteria Review
<b>Date and Time</b> April 28, 2023; 1 – 3 p.m.	<b>Location</b> Hybrid Meeting on ZOOM, and Jefferson County Public Works Office, 623 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend, WA

**Purpose**

To review and achieve the following goals:

- Share Information and receive Input on the SWF improvement objectives, and initial SWF alternatives (i.e., modification options of existing SWF, rebuild, upgrade OR replacement, etc.) that meet the community’s priority SWF needs.
- Share and receive input on the criteria that will be used to screen the initial SWF alternatives.

**Attendees**

<b>Solid Waste Facilities Task Force or SWFTF</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Present/ Absent</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Area of Expertise</b>
Lisa Crosby	x	District 1 Citizen	Solid Waste Management Plan
Tim Deverin	x	District 3 Citizen	Solid Waste Management Plan
Greg Brotherton	x	Board of County Commissioners	County goals
Owen Rowe	x	Port Townsend City Council	City goals
Steve King	Absent	Port Townsend Public Works	City operations
Carol Cummins	X	Local 2020 - Beyond Waste Action Group	Solid waste reduction
Tracy Grisman	X	Arts Community	Arts Community
Cindy Jayne	X	Climate Action Committee	Green House Gas reduction & energy efficiencies
Pinky Feria-Mingo	X	Jefferson County Public Health	Permitting/various County functions
David Wayne-Johnson	Absent	Department of Community Development	GMA/zoning/permitting requirements
Will O'Donnell	X	Public Utility District	Infrastructure
Derek Rockett	X	Department of Ecology	Facility design/requirements
Joey Deese	X	Olympic Disposal	
Bridgett Gregg	Absent	WSU Extension	Agriculture community
Steve Gilmore	X	Republic Services – Roosevelt Regional Landfill	Transfer station and landfill operations
Alysa Thomas	Absent	Skookum Contract Services - Recycling Contractor	Recycling collection and recycle center operations
Miranda Nash	X	D.A.S.H./Jefferson Transit	Customer mobility/access
Willie Bence	Absent	Department of Emergency Management	Disaster debris management
Joel Napoli	X		Internet troll (removed from meeting)
Gerald Joseph	X		Internet troll (removed from meeting)



**Hosts**

Jefferson County Staff		
Name	Affiliation	Role
Al Cairns	Jefferson County Department of Public Works	Solid Waste Division Manager
Vitek Environmental Engineers, LLC Project Team		
Victor O. Okereke, Ph.D., P.E., DEE, CLSSS	Vitek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Project Manager
Penny Mabie	Definitely-Mabie Consultants LLC	Lead – Public Involvement & Facilitator
Sarah Fischer, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP	BLRB Architects	Lead – Facility Design
Sally Hanley	Vitek Environmental Engineers, LLC	Workshop Support

**Workshop Notes**

**Welcome and Introductions**

Victor Okereke, Penny Mabie and Al Cairns welcomed everyone to the workshop. The meeting started on time and a recording of the meeting was accepted and initiated. Introductions of participants followed the initiation of the meeting. Suspected hackers entered the meeting space and projected explicit images in their videos. They were removed from the meeting.

**Project Status Overview and Workshop Objectives**

**Project Roadmap and Status Overview**

Victor reviewed the Project roadmap showing progress relative to where the team plans to go and indicated that preplanning has been completed. The team is now starting the main Solid Waste Facility (SWF) planning activities, beginning with the Facility Improvement Alternatives Evaluation activities. He then provided further detailed description of the *Facility Improvement Alternatives Evaluation* steps as follows:

- Step 1** - Initial Review of SWF Improvement Alternatives at today’s Workshop #4. At this stage, the process does not include any potential sites review. The objective is to reach a shared understanding with the community about the facilities that should be provided and what functions they should perform to best serve the current and future needs of the community while also meeting the County’s statutory solid waste management responsibilities.
- Step 2** - Initial Screening of the SWF alternatives. After agreement is reached on the Initial SWF improvement alternatives, they will be screened to reduce the number to the top 2 to 3 improvement alternatives.
- Step 3** - Broad Area Sites Screening (BASS). After the top SWF improvement alternatives are identified, the initial site screening will be completed following a similar process as in step 1 to reduce the number of sites that will be subjected to detailed evaluation to less than ten (10).
- Step 4** - Focused Sites Screening. A detailed sites screening will be completed that will be informed by the short-listed 2 to 3 SWF improvement alternatives. This focused screening step will result in 2 to 3 viable sites.
- Step 5** - Comparative SWF Alternatives Assessment - The short-listed sites and SWF improvement alternatives from Step 1 and 4 respectively, will be combined to produce a matrix of SWF Alternatives that will be subjected to a detailed Comparative Assessment - resulting in a preferred SWF Alternative.

Task Force and Public Input – At each step, feedback will be solicited from the Task Force and the community at large. All feedback received will be addressed and communicated to all stakeholders before the next step begins.

**Workshop Objectives**

Victor stated that the desired outcomes by the end of the workshop were to achieve a shared understanding of the:

- SWF improvement objectives and feedback received,
- Initial SWF improvement alternatives and feedback received, and
- Screening criteria and indicators, and related feedback received.



## + Community Input Plan

Penny described the plan for community engagement and key milestones: She indicated the purpose of the plan was to:

- Outline activities and products needed to conduct outreach to the community regarding the current project milestone.

She identified the Current Milestone as follows:

- Develop screening criteria and initial alternatives for solid waste facility improvements.

She indicated that the community participation objectives are to:

- Inform the community about this project and the planning process,
- Understand community values and concerns about the current solid waste transfer and recycling facility (TRF),
- Understand what is important about necessary improvements to the current solid waste TRF, and
- Ensure the community knows their input will help shape the recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

She noted that key messages are 1) the County's main transfer and recycling facility is facing serious challenges that must be addressed, 2) the County will be asking for input and suggestions, and 3) that this will be the first of several opportunities for the community to provide input to this solid waste facility replacement planning process.

There will be several community outreach opportunities and related information will be communicated using:

- Flyer distributed with a Public Utilities District (PUD) billing mailing,
- Online survey that will also be available by hard copy, and
- Updated web text.

The community input plan for Milestone #1 starts now and will be completed by approximately June 9, 2023.

## + Public Comments

Penny asked for public comment:

**Comment:** I submitted comments on the Workshop #4 Guide. A lot of the folks will **not** get the flyer from PUD because many of them pay online. Better to use email. Thank you.

**Penny/response:** Thank you Tom, your comments were distributed yesterday to the SWFTF.

**Comment:** Appreciated Tom's comments. I pay online and still get flyers. It might be worth checking with the PUD to see how those are distributed.

Will O'Donnell of the PUD responded that the online statement would include the flyer. .

Penny closed the comment period.

## + Solid Waste Facility Improvement Objectives

Victor indicated that the purpose of this session was to, 1) share the Facility Improvement Objectives, and 2) receive feedback.

He provided the following definitions:

- SWF gaps and improvement opportunities: A combination of the facility planning goals, stakeholder needs, and the existing facility condition gaps described in Workshop #3.
- SWF Improvement Objectives: The desired condition(s) or targets that shall be achieved to address the existing facility gaps and improvement opportunities.

He indicated that it is important to always link the gaps and improvement opportunities, the improvement objectives, and the solutions proposed to address them. By linking these three aspects, the project team and the



community can “see” how the project is delivering the desired vision.

Victor presented the improvement objectives that need to be achieved to address the existing facility gaps and stakeholder needs as summarized in the table below:

Gaps and Needs	Improvement Objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ineffective Queuing (to scales <i>and on site</i>) and Traffic Circulation (<i>on-site</i>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve safe and adequate access to the site.</li> <li>Minimize customer wait time and queuing along site access road and on-site.</li> <li>Achieve full accessibility for all customers to ensure compatibility and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).</li> <li>Improve commercial and self-haul traffic loop.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of Adequate Waste, Vehicle, and recycling Capacity to meet SWF Needs for the next 40 years.</li> <li>Lack of Flexibility for Appropriate Expansion at the Current Site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve facility capacity to adequately and safely handle County’s projected solid waste and recyclable materials for the present and future.</li> <li>Improve major facility buildings and other infrastructure to extend their service life to a minimum 30 years.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of Appropriately Sized Vehicle Scales.</li> <li>Lack of ADA-Compliant Scale house.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve scale length to accommodate larger trucks and trailer combinations.</li> <li>Improve the location of scales to reduce operational delays.</li> <li>Assure ADA compliance for Scale house.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate tipping floor capacity.</li> <li>Long cycle time for waste receiving and loading operations.</li> <li>Old Transfer Building Roof.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase tipping floor capacity to accommodate increased refuse tonnage and expanded material recovery types and volumes.</li> <li>Improve Waste loading cycle time and payloads.</li> <li>Improve waste compaction equipment efficiency and effectiveness.</li> <li>Improve roof of transfer building to ensure longer life.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate size of collection processing building.</li> <li>Inadequate capacity to accommodate expanded material recycling needs for present and future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand material diversion and recycling capacity and services to provide reuse services – 1) a “drop and take” drop-off spot for items to be reused rather than landfilled, 2) for partner-driven efforts to support additional recycling or reuse, e.g., Styrofoam recycling operation; 3) for diversion of edible food; 4) recycle agricultural plastics to meet the changing needs of County residents.</li> <li>Improve and expand the recycling area to accommodate the handling of increased types of materials that could be kept from going to the landfill. Most of the property is occupied by a closed landfill area which cannot be redeveloped for industrial use.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some buildings are near the end of life and are high maintenance.</li> <li>Lack of ADA compliant rest rooms in some employee buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve Employee Facilities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of public facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve Onsite Public Facilities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited Waste Diversion Partnerships.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish meaningful and useful Partnerships (e.g., Clallam County and other waste diversion and recycling organizations and businesses) to enhance material diversion and recycling.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suboptimal Air Pollution Control Strategies.</li> <li>Mitigation of Solid Waste Transfer and Transportation Activities on Greenhouse Gas Emissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce the carbon footprint.</li> <li>Improve air Quality.</li> <li>Achieve statutory regulatory and permit compliance.</li> </ul>





- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exponentially rising operations and maintenance costs for aging facilities.</li> <li>• Balancing Benefits of Environmental Improvement Actions with Cost Impacts.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve Operations and Maintenance cost effectiveness (Compactors at the Quilcene drop box).</li> <li>• Minimize rising repairs costs to the loading dock and asphalt around the recycling area.</li> <li>• Achieve optimal facility costs based on environmental.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

### Taskforce Questions and Dialogue

**Comment:** Requested to specifically mention yard waste at the facility and noted the use of the term Styrofoam (term is trademarked regarding your documents).

**Question:** Is food waste diversion included (I think it would be a gap) even though it is not to be addressed at this point?

**Victor/response:** This is included under the expansion of material diversion and recycling capacity objective.

**Comment:** I would like it to specifically say food waste diversion.

**AI/response:** Part of this plan is to address food waste diversion. We are looking at what the footprint will be and considering that footprint in the plan.

**Question:** Is this just a partial list and is there a more comprehensive list of gaps elsewhere?

**Victor/response:** This presentation is intended to summarize the feedback we received regarding your needs and the facility conditions gaps, and the improvements needed to address them, to make sure we are in alignment. This is the ultimate gap list.

**Comment:** Regarding growth and capacity, do we know what our capacity is in this area? Will there be a cap in the population? How much can we grow? If we are planning because we are busting at the seams now, is future growth in the area taken into consideration?

**Comment:** The County and the City are calculating growth, assuming a rate of 1-2% growth for decades and where that growth is happening- e.g., Port Hadlock. With the new sewer service available there, we will see an uptick in growth there.

**Comment:** Appreciate that information very much, thank you.

**AI/Response:** Most of the planning around population growth is done by the Department of Community Development. Population growth projections are typically drawn from the WA State Office of Financial Management.

Population growth projections have been overly optimistic, historically, but it does allow you some margin of error.

**Comment:** What climate decision tool is agreed upon for use in this process? We have a tool that looks at climate impacts and projections, heat, precipitation, flooding etc. I am wondering if these details could be included.

**AI/response:** As we move into site consideration and selection, certainly the tool you provided will factor into the siting criteria in response to climate change.

**Victor/response:** The current improvement objectives are broadly defined and can be refined to include specific environmental objectives as requested.

**Comment:** Environmental consideration is very broad, so calling it out specifically is a good idea.

### Initial Solid Waste Facility Alternatives

Sarah indicated the purpose of this session is to 1) share the feedback received, and 2) share initial facility alternatives intended to address the feedback and the existing facility condition gaps identified in our previous investigations.

She provided the following clarifications about common terms that would be used to describe recycling and transfer



facility Level of Service:

- **Queue time:** Expressed in minutes, performance metric for efficiency of individual customer wait times to point of destination. Lower number = higher level of service.
- **Discharge time:** Expressed in minutes, approximate average time customers will spend discharging materials at each destination. Varies based upon individual customer efficiency, not necessarily higher level of service.
- **Operational downtime:** Any time the tipping and/or receiving functions are not available to customers. This includes time for operations to clear the floor, fill the container, change the container, and re-open the floor. Lower number = higher level of services.
- **Customers per hour or total minutes per customer:** The time customers or commercial haulers are on-site from point of entry to point of exit. Less time = higher efficiency.

She described the following Levels of Service (LOS) that would represent the five (5) initial SWF alternatives being presented for discussion and feedback:

- **Basic (Alternative 1)** starting level of service. The service level will not be less than this.
- **Medium (Alternative 2)** provides a greater level of service.
- **High (Alternative 3)** provides an exceptional level of service.
- **Current (Alternative 4)** shows what the transfer station offers today.
- **Management Strategies (Alternative 5)** includes operational actions that may improve each level of service.

The SWF functional criteria or standards associated with these levels of services are aligned with the gaps and improvement objectives described earlier by Victor and were as follows:

- Overall Facility Capacity
- Facility Service Life, Buildings, and Infrastructure
- Queuing and Traffic Circulation to Scales
- Scales and Scale House
- Waste Receiving and Loading Operations
- Drop-Off Recycling
- Waste Diversion, HHW
- Waste Diversion, Construction and Demolition (C&D) Diversion
- Transfer Vehicle Operation
- Operation Employee Facilities
- Public Facilities
- Partnerships
- Environmental Quality

Sarah described details (*these details are documented in Workshop #4 PowerPoint presentation*) of the facility functions associated with the criteria for each alternative and asked for feedback.

### Taskforce Questions and Dialogue

**Comment:** How are things determined whether they are objectives versus alternatives?

**Victor/response:** Alternatives are options that help to meet the improvement objectives. Objectives are what we need to achieve to address the stakeholder needs and existing SWF condition gaps described earlier.

**Sarah/response:** Not all the alternatives will meet all the objectives. The technical team does not select the alternatives, the group, and the public influence the alternative selection.

**AI/response:** Management strategies would have a pronounced effect on the size, tipping floor, line space, queuing, in terms of limiting the expanded facility we need. They would vastly reduce the pressure on the facility.

**Question:** Alternative 1 (Basic LOS) or 2 (Medium LOS) can be used in concert with Alt 5?

**Sarah/response:** Yes, the preferred alternative at the completion of selection may have elements from multiple LOS options.

**Question:** Alternative 2, shows facility capacity as expandable, my understanding is that it could be expanded.

**Sarah/response:** Yes, when you look at the overall facility capacity, that is the entire site. The timelines are the



expected functional lifespan of buildings and infrastructure. It does not mean it is done if we pass that mark, but it is good to consider this when making decisions.

**Sarah on "Queuing":** The question is, how long are you willing to wait in line as a LOS criterion?

**AI/response:** 150 customers in 105 minutes. Very fast.

**Question:** Is this where customers are waiting in line for the scales, but some want to get to the recycling?

**Sarah/response:** Yes, the queue listed is the site access entry point.

**Sarah on "Waste receiving and waste loading"** - basic is what you have now or better (can increase tipping stalls, can increase scales, reducing facility down time). Most of the items are under basic. Medium has more customer convenience with more floor space for operations and more stalls for customers.

**Question:** One benefit of having a larger floor and separating the floor is that it allows loads to be heavier. With a compactor and curbside perspective.

**Sarah/response:** The goal of the trailer loading is high-capacity consistent loads because more efficient, by hauling full trailers, fewer trips, less fuel, less operator time.

**AI/response:** Can reduce Carbon Footprint as well. Moving more material for the cost. A lot of these initiatives can provide benefit across several parameters.

**Sarah/response:** Drop off recycling, current state - is a high LOS and AI wants to keep it high. We will address the fit and access. Basic LOS- moderate wait times. Customers see times, but there are also operational considerations. The operations occurring to transfer recycling from the customer drop-off to larger containers are over capacity.

**Question:** For Medium LOS - materials as the commodities change or single stream I wonder if additional materials high, reorient our facility to separate things to a higher level.

**Sarah/response:** Customer self-separation at the source increases diversion, for mixed source separation and diversion, a large floor area is needed as in the High LOS Alternative.

**Comment:** I saw an enterprise partner like a habitat store at another facility.

**Sarah/response:** C&D is listed as a potential alternative. Currently the Transfer Station does not offer this service. The alternatives are listed to determine how much C&D capacity should be considered.

**Question:** Do they have a demolition certificate?

**AI/response:** Yes, absolutely.

**Sarah/response:** Vehicles that transfer materials, ecologically important to take care of the size of the overall facility, including future hauling projections, and emergency capacity.

**Comment:** Current onsite storage means all on the site?

**Sarah/response:** Yes, it is all on site.

**AI/response:** Management strategy, type of trailers could be part of our inventory and that will add to storage capacity, sometimes significantly.

**Sarah/response:** County's hauling contract rates go up with more trips.

**Public facilities:** Options were discussed in a previous workshop.

**Comment:** It does not cost anything except for the volunteer service, hard hats, or space.

**Sarah/response:** Goal is not to remove existing amenities. Organics composting is under medium and high LOS alternatives. Environmental quality- basic LOS means it meets code. Should be looking at medium and high LOS.

**Comment:** Can you refresh my memory on what that means, environmental quality I think of the air that I breathe or





is this more regulatory.

**Sarah/response:** It is going to be basic LOS for regulations and medium and high LOS are better than meeting the regulations. This includes at a minimum: land, air, water, wastewater, habitat, carbon emissions, type of energy sourced.

**Question:** What point in the process does ROI and cost benefit analysis come into play. Which ones are going to have the most bang for the buck?

**Sarah/response:** Make the objective now and then make the measurement later, when in formal design for metrics on the benefits. A reasonable payback can be 15 years, but a great plan could be 10 years.

**Question:** We are in a position looking at all electric vehicles in Thurston County in 2 years.

**Sarah/response:** All can be electric now, though currently many haulers use natural gas for fuel. No fossil fuel could be a future design objective.

**Sarah/response:** The medium one is achievable, measurable. The high one would set you (the County) apart in water consumption and water quality.

### Initial Solid Waste Alternatives Screening Criteria

Victor indicated that the purpose of this session was to, 1) share the Facility Alternatives Screening Criteria, and 2) receive feedback.

He defined "Criteria" and "Indicators" as follows:

**Criteria:** Standards or different lenses or perspectives through which the effectiveness of the SWF improvement actions can be viewed and evaluated - *they are not measurable.*

**Indicators:** Are specific measurements (quantitative or qualitative) used to indicate performance of each SWF alternative relative to the required improvement area.

He further stated that:

- Feedback is sought from the SWFTF on the priority of each criterion.
- These criteria and indicators will be applied to provide a "Yes" or "No" response as to whether a SWF alternative meets each required standard.
- The group would need to agree on whether each alternative should have a 100% or 80% pass result to be moved on to the next level of the planning process.
- Feedback will also be requested from the community. Then the Vikek team, will refine the SWF alternative recommendations.
- The refined alternatives will then be evaluated using the adopted screening criteria, to generate a short list of 2-3 alternatives.

### Taskforce Questions and Dialogue

**Question/Comment:** When you use the word alternatives, are these functional alternatives and not site alternatives? If we reject things, we are not rejecting the site, right? Will we have more opportunities to hear from each other? I have learned a lot based on AI's comments and the workshops but not from the other SWFTF members.

**Victor/response:** Yes, this is about the functional alternatives. Regarding knowledge sharing among team members, SWFTF members have been invited to participate outside the workshop setting. We do meet on an ongoing basis, and SWFTF are invited to participate.

**AI/response:** When we imagined the task force, we tried to imagine any site and what areas of expertise we would like to invite. Some of these areas of expertise will not be drawn upon until site selection activities begin. AI indicated that he brings shared information to the group (from colleagues from around the state) which is very helpful to have access to the depth of knowledge and experience.



**Comment:** I would argue for 80% as consensus for passing SWF alternatives through the initial screening stage.

**Penny/response:** If you think 80% is a good metric for approval of a SWF Alternative, please show a hand. 100%? Less than 80%? looks like the result is coalescing around 80% but some members have not weighed in.

**Comment:** We could have different criteria for critical issues.

**Victor/response:** We could have high, medium, and low with different thresholds for acceptance, but the intent is to keep the process less complicated while meeting the needs of the group.

### Public Comments

**Comment:** Thank you. Clarifying the PUD flyers, some of us use paperless and those are the people I was worried about. I appreciate the information and am looking forward to what is to come. There will not be mandatory curbside (do not spend a second with that on the list). The notion of separating the commercial from the rest is a great strategy. Backing into stalls is not great because backing up is challenging especially with a trailer. Side discharge would be a possibility. Queue lengths, one way to do demand management, how long is the queue currently is to put a camera on the site. You can also put it in an app. You can track how long it takes for throughput. It will give you an accurate time for the process.

**Sarah/response:** The side dump is a great option and safer.

**Penny/response:** The public comment session is still open, and responses are not made during the session. I will respond to public comments later.

**Al/response:** Perhaps we need a discussion with the task force on the comment period. We will be moving into a more public phase and might we want to extend the time to allow for a response.

**Victor/comment:** I believe we are planning to respond and publish comments on the website.

**Al/response:** We have not determined that yet. Thank you, Tom, for your feedback and I appreciate your passion for the subject.

### Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Victor stated that the key next steps will be as follows:

- The Vikek team will solicit community input around all the topics covered in Workshops 3 and 4.
- The feedback received from the community and SWFTF will be used to refine the initial SWF alternatives and screening criteria.
- The adapted SWF screening criteria will then be used to evaluate and reduce the number of the SWF alternatives to 2-3.
- The next workshop will be on reviewing potential sites and criteria that will be used to screen them.

**Question:** Can we share links of successful model programs so we can do research on the side? Also, could we have a shared site where we could share files with each other?

**Penny/response:** We will look into providing a shared site. Thank you everyone.

**Victor/comment:** Thank you for your time. Apologies again for the Zoom bomb experience.

### Action Items:

- Penny will contact the Public Utilities Department (PUD) and obtain information on how fliers are distributed to their customers.
- Al will consider whether the public comment process should be adjusted.