



Jefferson County Solid Waste Solid Waste Facilities Task Force Meeting #6, October 9, 2024

Meeting Summary

Attendees – Task Force Members

Name	Affiliation
Don Rhoden	District 2 Citizen
Steven Chappius	District 2 Citizen
Tim Deverin	District 3 Citizen
Greg Brotherton	Board of County Commissioners
Owen Rowe	Port Townsend City Council
Steve King	Port Townsend Public Works
Janet Welch	Local 2020 – Beyond Waste Action Group
Alisa Hasbrouck	Jefferson County Public Health
David Wayne-Johnson	Jefferson County Department of Community Development
Will O’Donnell	Public Utility District
Derek Rockett	Department of Ecology
Amit Sharma	WSU Extension
Steve Gilmore	Republic Services – Roosevelt Regional Landfill
Joey Deese	Waste Connections – WUTC G-Certificate Hauler
Alysa Thomas	Skookum Contract Services – Recycling Contractor

Attendees – Staff and Consultants

Name	Affiliation
Al Cairns	Jefferson County Department of Public Works
Peter Battuello	Perteet
Penny Mabie	Definitely-Mabie Consultants, LLC

Meeting #6 of the Solid Waste Facilities Task Force (Task Force) was held from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm in a combined virtual / in-person format. Penny Mabie, facilitator, convened the meeting, welcomed the group and led introductions. Al Cairns, Jefferson County Department of Public Works, Solid Waste, reviewed the meeting agenda and goals. The primary purposes for the meeting were to:

- Re-orient the Task Force on its purpose and goals and its work to date (Phase 1 Review)
- Inform the Task Force of staff work accomplished since the last Task Force meeting (Phase 2 Review)
- Share Phase 3 Review process
- Conduct general area screening exercise
- Reach agreement on where (relative location) within modified study area to focus on deeper site analysis

Al reminded the group of the Task Force’s purpose and scope. Acting in consultation with and as part of the Jefferson County and consultant planning team, the Task Force’s mission is:



Jefferson County Solid Waste Solid Waste Facilities Task Force Meeting #6, October 9, 2024

“To develop a recommendation for the Board of County Commissioners for improvements to the Jefferson County Solid Waste Facility that is fiscally sustainable, reflects current data and analysis, responds to stakeholder and community input and prepares the Jefferson County solid waste system for the next 40 years of service.”

Specifically, the Task Force was asked to help the County:

- Develop a conceptual design for modified or replacement solid waste facilities
- Identify the best location for the facilities
- Identify how to finance the project

Al then proceeded to share a review of the phases of the work (Phases 1 and 2) that have occurred to date and the work to be done in Phase 3. He referred the Task Force members to the Primer that was sent to them prior to the meeting, which reviewed the previous phases.

In Phase 1 a Team Charter was created. A current condition assessment was performed on the exiting transfer station. The results of the assessment showed the station to be marginally adequate to meet service demand. A replacement value, in 2022 dollars, was also developed, which showed a high estimate of \$8.2 million. The Task Force, in consultation with the County and consultant planning team, determined the future level of service (between medium and high), which referred to items such as the level of fee for service, diversion options, wait time and drive time to the facility.

Additionally, in Phase 2, the Task Force discussed other functions that could be added to a new transfer station. A public survey, completed by 319 people, identified preferred services, input on current operations, and feedback on if and where a new transfer station might be located. Staff also visited the Gray's Harbor Transfer Station, a newer station, to learn from their siting process. Traffic studies on County-owned properties under considerations were done, and staff met with the Jefferson County Climate Action Committee to examine greenhouse gas emissions of various aspects of the solid waste system to inform further choices. The consultant led the Task Force through the initial site screening process that used eight screening criteria to bring over 6,000 potential properties down to 11 candidate sites.

Task Force Questions and Comments

- Who did the Current State Report Card? *Response:* the consultant team.
- In the winnowing down, one of the criteria was a minimum of 20 acres. For parcels under that size, did you consider if adjacent properties could be combined to make up the difference?
Response: Yes, we did.
- Where did the criteria to winnow the short list come from? The criteria were developed by staff and the consultant.
- When was the greenhouse gas emissions work done? *Response:* No
- Are the properties you were looking at when winnowing, are they currently on the market?
Response: No.



Jefferson County Solid Waste Solid Waste Facilities Task Force Meeting #6, October 9, 2024

In Phase 2, while the Task Force was dormant, County staff conducted additional work to further refine the site selection process. County staff identified two Mean Population Centers, one looking at residents living north of Highway 104 and a second looking at where the center of population in the study area (East Jefferson County service area) was, in order to further inform service equity issues such as distance from the transfer station.

Public works staff conducted a customer survey at the transfer station to consider effects of minimum fee increases on self-haul trips and to gain insights into where customers were coming from. Staff also conducted other siting exercises, including developing criteria to assess the Task Force's aspirational list of other possible facility functions. Staff also modified the siting criteria used during the initial site screening in Phase 1. The modifications enlarged the siting area slightly and included residential properties, which had been excluded in the Phase 1 work. Applying the modified criteria resulted in an additional 15 potential properties, bringing the total number of candidate properties to 26. Staff then applied fatal flaw, pass/fail criteria to the 26 properties. Staff contacted owners of any residential properties on the list to determine willingness to sell. Five owners were willing to sell. This work resulted in a short list of 14 properties, which were run through an additional list of considerations. From there, staff selected four sites for more detailed analysis.

Moving away from individual properties, staff decided to take a different look at the siting question. Using the guiding principles from the Team Charter, staff conducted a whiteboard exercise to consider three general areas. These areas were called North, Central and South.

Task Force Questions and Comments

- Was Port Townsend excluded from the Mean Population Center calculations because they have mandatory collection? *Response:* No
- Why consider a Mean Population Center that only includes north of Highway 104? *Response:* We were curious as to whether it would change anything.
- Why not include the western part of the county? *Response:* There is a completely different solid waste system and facilities there.
- Did you include resource lands? *Response:* Yes.
- Was there any potential of having two locations – by splitting services or uses between the two sites (current site and Cape George site)? *Response:* No. The objective is to consolidate County solid waste services.
- Is the biosolids and green waste facility staying where it is? *Response:* Yes, it is the City of Port Townsend's operation, not the County's.
- Comment: Many people are asking what is wrong with the current site. If it failed criteria, you need to make that clear to people.
- Isn't there an 80-acre parcel adjacent to the current site? *Response:* Yes. It is not visible from the current site due to trees blocking the view. It is the Cape George location that was one of four County parcels identified as a new transfer station possibility.
- The criteria you used to get to the short list of 13 or 14 considerations – was there overlap with the guiding principles? *Response:* No – these were entirely new criteria.



Jefferson County Solid Waste Solid Waste Facilities Task Force Meeting #6, October 9, 2024

Al introduced Phase 3. In this phase, the Task Force and community will be asked to look at the three regions of the siting area and apply criteria based on the Task Force's Guiding Principles, to find out if there is one region that stands out from the other two. Al noted this would be challenging to look generally, as the data developed for each criterion was based on the candidate site(s) from each area. He asked the Task Force, to the extent they could, to consider the data and try to apply it to the entire region, not just the candidate site the data came from. Al introduced Peter Battuello, Perteeet, to lead the Task Force through the general location scorecard. Peter noted that he would walk quickly through the data, and then he and Al would walk the Task Force through each criterion and its corresponding data, and then members would assess the three regions on that data. Task Force members were provided with the scorecard and red, yellow and green crayons to mark each area for each criterion.

Task Force Questions and Comments

- Is the idea to have one green, one yellow and one red square for each criterion? *Response:* Yes.
- I have some concerns with the scorecard. You're asking us to be general, but you're only giving us four sites' data. Why not put all four sites in the matrix, rather than the areas? *Response:* These are representative sites. We may find other possible locations. And further investigation may rule sites out, but knowing the area will help with further candidate site identification.
- Why do you have two locations in the south area? Will we split up south into the two properties? *Response:* No, we are using one property just as an example.
- What factors have to be dropped off other sites to possibly bring other sites back into consideration? *Response:* Further investigation may cause sites to be reconsidered. If so, we would move on and go to the next best site. No factors would be removed.
- Looking at this matrix, we're just thinking generally, correct? Would the site right off Highway 104 be considered a central site? *Response:* No, it would be considered south based on the siting area.
- How is this exercise related to the site selection process? If one area emerges as a strong preference, will siting then be confined only to sites within that preferred area? *Response:* Staff will reconsider all locations within that area that may still meet the requirements. For the north area there is only one alternative available (Cape George). However, other locations in central and south may be reconsidered.
- I don't see political reactions as one of the criteria. Is that included anywhere? *Response:* Political viability was considered in Phase 2.
- Was the airport considered? *Response:* Yes, two private properties adjacent to the airport that could be combined were considered. Even combined, the site was too small. Also, aviation considerations (especially presence of birds) were not positive for the site.
- In the matrix, only carbon footprint was included as an environmental consideration. Are you sure that is adequate? *Response:* Could you hold that questions until after we share the information? I think your question will be answered in that presentation.



Jefferson County Solid Waste Solid Waste Facilities Task Force Meeting #6, October 9, 2024

Peter proceeded to share data about each criterion. Questions about each criterion and its data are below.

Flexibility

The population distribution slide is general. The other slides (regarding wetlands, etc.) are difficult to generalize. *Response:* Yes, just try to use the sites as representative of the region.

Service Equity

- I'd like to have some simplification. There are a lot of numbers. Can you suggest which are most equitable? How do you interpret the table? Do these numbers drop off those with curbside collection? *Response:* When looking at the numbers, look for where the numbers are closest to each other. That's where there is the most balance in the numbers. The numbers do include those with curbside collection.
- Are we wanting to change customers' behaviors? Do we want more customers using curbside instead of making the trip to the transfer station? If so, then the equity lens might be looked at differently, right? *Response:* Yes, that would change the interpretation. Grays Harbor used that interpretation, which pushed people to use more curbside and less self-hauling.

Staff suggested that there may not be time for the level of discussion that was occurring. Members were asked to ask clarifying questions only so as to ensure making it through the exercise.

Environmental Excellence

- Comment: It seems like there's some additional information to add. How far are the certificated haulers traveling? How many trees will be cut down at the new site?

Noise

- Do the population numbers show clusters of people? Do you add them all up? *Response:* When we look at the maps, we're looking for roads to understand density.

Cost Benefit

- Does hauling (by certificated or contracted haulers) cost differently depending on where the facility is located? *Response:* No.
- Does this then mean that we don't want service equity, if we're designing to reduce self-hauling? Doesn't this criteria lose its value then? *Response:* Public Works *hasn't* said reducing self-haul is our goal. But all the data said increasing efficiency is best done by reducing self-haul.
- Could you explain how the cost-benefit chart works? *Response:* The graph provides a qualitative comparison of Capital Costs (shown in blue) with changes in operational costs (depicted in orange). The chart is intended to show that as capital investment is deferred, operational costs increase. It is further intended to show that as capital investments are made, the annual operating cost typically grows a lower annual rate. Overall this chart is attempting to show that operational efficiency improves with capital investments that improve site operations.



Jefferson County Solid Waste Solid Waste Facilities Task Force Meeting #6, October 9, 2024

- So, location doesn't have much impact on cost benefit? *Response:* No, it does have impact. The closer in the location is, the more you'll have to lean on fee-structure to drive down self-hauling. We provide very hands-on service, helping people position their vehicle, etc. Grays Harbor doesn't provide staff assistance to self-haulers backing and dumping, so their staff requirements are lower.
- For self-hauling, are you just looking at Port Townsend self-haulers? *Response:* No, there is a lot of potential to incentivize Port Ludlow to do curbside collection.
- Comment: Operational efficiency can be translated into savings for customers.
- Say we did decrease the number of self-haulers. Would you say the Central District still looks best? *Response:* The numbers are based on data from the census and pounds of waste per person. They are not impacted by self-haul or not.
- Could you sum the columns to see which area has the most impact on wear and tear on the roads? *Response:* No, the data is not broken down to miles per trip yet.
- It seems like looking at ton-miles to the Hood Canal Bridge makes sense. Are we going to do that? *Response:* We can capture that in in cumulative drive time.
- Curbside mandates sound great in theory. Is there information on whether or not it leads to more garbage left on properties? Does it basically disincentivize property owners to clean up? *Response:* No data has been found that supports that. It seems to be a bit of a red herring and is always mentioned when rate increases are discussed.
- Did Grays Harbor measure illegal dumping before and after they moved their transfer station? *Response:* Yes, they did. They found no significant increase in illegal dumping.
- Comment: Environmental Health's experience is that many property owners are "hoarding" garbage on their property. Providing curbside collection service reduces the hoarding.

Next Steps

Al asked all SWFTF members to complete their scorecards and return them to him via the provided pre-stamped and addressed envelope. He asked for scorecards to be mailed by Wednesday, October 17, 2024. He encouraged any Task Force members to call him if they had questions while they were completing their scorecards. He noted the PowerPoint presentation with all the data will be posted on the project website and he will also send it out to members. Once he receives the scorecards, staff will compile the results.

A Task Force member asked if Food Waste Diversion is being considered. *Response:* Yes, it was, as a means of identifying needed acreage.

Al noted planning is beginning for a public open house in November or December. He is considering either the Chimacum Grange or the East Jefferson County Fire and Rescue facility for the location.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.