

MSWAC Advisory Committee Meeting

Aug. 9, 2024 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:15 p.m.

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

<u>MSWAC Members</u>		<u>King County Staff</u>
Troy Linnell	Algona	Eyasu Ayalew, Public Health Seattle/King County
Joan Nelson	Auburn	Ali Blum, SWD staff
Jon Gire	Bellevue	Sylvaine Bucher, SWD staff
Ella Williams	Bellevue	Lauren Cole, SWD staff
Emily Warnock	Bothell	Jerome Cruz, Public Health Seattle/King County
Shellie Bates	Covington	Bonnie Fluckinger, King County PSB staff
Chris Searcy	Enumclaw	Ryan Kellogg, Public Health Seattle/King County
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way	Christine Kim, SWD staff
Sam Tarvin	Issaquah	Patty Liu, SWD staff
Tony Donati	Kent	Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director
Jenna McInnis	Kirkland	Amy Ockerlander, SWD staff
Penny Sweet	Kirkland	Nina Olivier, SWD staff
Amy Shaw	Maple Valley	Terra Rose, King County Council
Alana DeRogatis	Mercer Island	Hannah Scholes, SWD staff
Jeff Brauns	Newcastle	Andy Smith, SWD staff
Aaron Moldver	Redmond	Adrian Tan, SWD staff
Meara Heubach	Renton	Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff
Linda Knight	Renton	John Walsh, SWD staff
Genevieve Rubinelli	Sammamish	
Mason Giem	SeaTac	
Sarah Bruemmer	Shoreline	<u>Guests</u>
Jared Hill	Woodinville	David Bayne, Hazardous Waste Management Program
		Zach Dugovich, Pacific Public Affairs
		Katie Jerauld, Dept. of Ecology
		Jeanette Jurgensen, Bin There Consulting
		Mark Mazzola, Parametrix
		Marty Mudd, Jacobs Engineering
		Eric Perry, City of Renton
		Rick Vahl, Washington State Recycling Association
		Kaylie Wallin, Republic Services
		Wendy Weiker, Republic Services

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Sweet called the meeting to order at 11:22 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Hill moved to approve the July minutes. Knight seconded. Minutes passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Jerauld shared a few items beginning with sharing that Ecology recently completed their Recycling and Organics Characterization Study for 2022-2023. The four-season study evaluated comingled inbound and outbound recycling and inbound organics from a representative selection of facilities throughout the state. The report findings will allow Ecology, local governments, and others to assess trends over time and across geographic areas, generator types, and materials to support data-driven decision-making. Ecology has created two PowerPoints summarizing the study, which can be found in [this folder](#). If you want Ecology to present a summary specific to your county, the study authors are available, and Jerauld can provide contact information.

Secondly, the Waste Not Washington School Award applications are now open through 5 p.m. on Oct. 31. The applicant must be a teacher or a staff member of a K-12 public, private, tribal school or a school district applying on behalf of a school or a classroom. These awards promote sustainability and reward school efforts to reduce waste, recycle and teach environmental curriculum. A budget of \$100,000 per year is available and each award provides \$5,000. For more information on eligibility and how to apply, please visit [this website](#).

Finally, Ecology has prepared a summary of the organics management funding opportunities funding for local governments and communities including new opportunities under the 2022 and 2024 Organics Management Laws. The summary is available on [Box](#). Two funding opportunities that may be of particular interest to local governments and communities are the [WSDA Compost Reimbursement Program](#) and the [USDA Composting and Food Reduction Cooperative Agreements](#). The deadline is Sept. 4, and Ecology Organics Lead Cullen Naumoff is available to advise on your application at 564-233-1419 or cule461@ecy.wa.gov.

SWD Updates

Mclaughlin provided the SWD update.

Council Updates

1. Long-Term Disposal Presentation at RPC
 - a. On July 31, Pat Mclaughlin and Patty Liu provided a briefing to the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) on long-term disposal options and our engagement and decision-making process. The briefing was well-received by RPC members. The RPC has representation from Seattle, and we received questions following the presentation about Seattle's role in the LTD process given they are not an ILA member of our solid waste system. The King County Executive, King County Council, and the 37 ILA member cities of our solid waste system will weigh in on the long-term disposal decision.
2. Rate proposal on the King County August 20 agenda
 - a. On July 24, the Council's Budget and Fiscal Management Committee unanimously voted SWD's 2025 rate proposal out of committee. It is on the consent agenda for the next King County Council meeting on August 20. The package included support letters approved by both MSWAC and SWAC – thank you to everyone who participated in the discussions, provided feedback, and helped craft the message.
3. Aviation Fuel Report Briefing at TrEE Committee
 - a. On August 22, Morgan John from SWD and Stephanie Meyn from the Port of Seattle will present to the Transportation, Economy, and Environment (TrEE) Committee on the Aviation Fuel Report. The presentation summarizes the available technologies, required feedstock, siting options, and financing/risk mitigation. The report indicates that Municipal Solid Waste to Aviation Fuels is not viable at this time. SWD will continue to monitor the technology as it evolves. All of the links are available on the council's website.

Transfer Station Updates

1. Shoreline Reuse Area Pilot

- a. Beginning Aug. 2, SWD is partnering with Second Use to launch a reuse pilot project in the old recycling area located before the scale house. This pilot will initially operate on Fridays and Saturdays from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. This initiative aims to divert reusable building materials from our waste stream, targeting the reduction of over 60,000 tons of clean wood currently landfilled each year. Customers who wish to drop off reusable materials will be directed by signs and handouts to visit the Reuse Pilot Area where they can drop-off accepted materials, such as lumber, doors, windows, tools, and lighting, free of charge. Accepted items will be reused or resold through Second Use's Seattle and Tacoma stores or via reuse partnerships.
2. Bow Lake Pallet Pilot
 - a. Beginning in September, SWD will pilot a project to connect Bow Lake customers to money-saving reuse options for their wood pallets. Clean wood pallets make up a significant portion of the wood collected at Bow Lake, according to SWD's 2021 wood sampling study. This takes up significant space and requires additional staff time to compact items for transport.
3. Construction at Algona and Houghton
 - a. On Aug. 5, SWD began work to replace crane equipment at the Algona Transfer Station. The project is scheduled to take two and a half weeks to complete. Starting Sept. 3, SWD will also work to replace crane equipment at the Houghton Transfer Station. The project is scheduled to end late-September. During both construction periods, commercial trucks will be detoured to neighboring stations. The stations will remain open to the public with a reduction in service lanes. Significant outreach is taking place to residents and businesses in both areas, including signage in advance of the closures to alert repeat customers to potential longer waits. Scale operators have flyers to identify alternative transfer station locations. Government Relations staff have been communicating with elected officials and staff in the impacted communities. The benefit in both cases is that we are going to be improving our reliability because the new equipment going in is newer and designed better than previous equipment.

PSCAA Story on King 5 and Follow-up

On July 24, KING 5 shared a follow-up story on airborne arsenic levels at the landfill, reporting that predicted arsenic emissions in a small area along the border of the landfill may exceed PSCAA Acceptable Source Impact Level (ASIL) limits. SWD used a conservative methodology, which assumed all measured gaseous arsenic is arsine, which may have overestimated the amount of arsine emitted from the lagoons. Modeling of emissions from other areas of the landfill are well below the Acceptable Source Impact Levels.

SWD's Government Relations and Community Engagement (GRCE) team has been working to be responsive to neighbors who have contacted the county with concerns after seeing the news story. ASILs do NOT predict potential exposure for workers. You may remember that potential exposure to airborne arsenic was measured last December from 3 weeks of air quality monitoring at SWD facilities. Results concluded that employees were not exposed to concerning levels of airborne arsenic during their routine daily work tasks. We met and exceeded the requirements and there were suggestions to do additional testing around the leachate ponds and we are continuing to do that. We will keep everyone away of this as we move forward.

King County Receives EPA Grant Award

In late July, Executive Constantine announced a \$50 million [Climate Pollution Reduction Grant](#) from the Environmental Protection Agency to lower greenhouse gas emissions from buildings and construction throughout the region. The grant includes \$3.4 million to advance Solid Waste Division work promoting innovation in salvaged lumber. The grant funds will support new approaches to reuse wood removed from old buildings, helping support the division's Re+ goal of keeping valuable materials in the economy and out of landfills.

Deconstruction Field Tour with Executive Constantine

On Aug. 6, SWD provided a field tour for Executive Constantine to visit sites near Cedar Hills Regional Landfill to see how SWD's new training program is helping the local construction industry transition from demolition to deconstruction. Deconstruction is a modern approach that dramatically reduces the amount of material that ends up in the landfill by putting materials like lumber, fixtures, doors, windows, and cabinets back into the economy.

The tour included multiple structures – homes, a large three-door standalone garage, horse stables, and sheds – showing different approaches to deconstruction. Here is a [4-minute explainer video](#) on the deconstruction training program. We are really excited with how this program is unfolding.

Waste Reduction and Recycling (WRR) Grant LOI period open

The call for letters of intent for the 2025 WRR Grant program, SWD's allocation-based grant program for cities, is open now through Sept. 6. This just says that cities intend to apply. The full and formal applications are due Nov. 6. SWD developed a list of waste reduction and recycling project plans that cities can use when applying for their WRR grant.

King County Recycling Study underway soon

The second week of August, SWD will reach out to MRFs for their collaboration on two studies to collect data on our recycling system. One study is the recycling equity and social justice baseline study, which will be an analysis of the recycling industry through an ESJ lens, focusing on working conditions, compensation, benefits, and growth opportunities for workers at MRFs. The other study focuses on glass composition and quality of outbound glass from MRFs in King County to better understand the regional glass commodity market. This study isn't directly related to the temporary closure of the Ardagh facility, but we hope that the data it generates can help us support stronger market conditions for glass recycling in the region.

Ardagh/SMI Update

Ardagh Glass Packaging halted production of their Seattle glass manufacturing plant in July following market conditions – in particular, pressure from low-priced imports from China, Chile and Mexico. Strategic Materials Inc. (SMI) cleans and sorts the recycled glass from curbside programs and transfer stations in King County and Seattle. It had sold most of its product to Ardagh. SMI is doing everything that they can to continue to operate despite the curtailment of Ardagh's glass production, but they are struggling. They are working to find alternatives to storage of the glass.

Sweet said that the RPC performs an important strategic and political role. The more she has thought about taking the LTD decision to them, the more she has thought about the City of Seattle's contract coming to an end. We need to incorporate and understand what is happening in Seattle and the impact that will have on our LTD decision. Sweet would not expect the RPC members from Seattle to be as up to speed as the cities are, but we all need to understand the long-term vision for the region.

Van Orsow shared that he got an email from the Jason Shea, the District Manager of Pacific Northwest South Sound, and was told that they are impacted by the closure and lack of access from Algona's closure. They are up 200+ hours and have made a request to have Enumclaw open for broader hours. There's a request for McLaughlin to see if there's a way to reduce the traffic at Bow Lake and extend Enumclaw's hours. McLaughlin said if there's a way that SWD can help, we will. Jason's contact information is jshea1@wm.com or 253-455-0486.

SWAC Update

No update.

Long-Term Disposal Decision Update

Liu led this update.

McLaughlin and John Taylor met with Tetra Tech to discuss concerns about the draft comparative analysis. We had a good conversation and feel that we found a good path to move forward to have the most confidence in the study that we will be presenting to cities and Council. SWD has met with representatives from Puget Sound Energy and our prosecuting attorney's office looking at the Clean Energy Transportation Act (CETA) and waste to energy (WTE) sales feasibility and prices. The consultants are updating their assumptions behind what can happen with the energy from the mass burn plant, and these are being incorporated in the comparative matrices and draft report.

We were provided waste export by rail (WEBR) memos from the consultant team and those are currently available on the extranet site and are available to everyone on this committee. The documents went over the assumptions and calculations behind the numbers that were presented, and we had a lot of questions with the comparative matrices over where some of the numbers came from. Many of these questions were addressed in the memos and the memos still brought up further questions, and we are currently working on getting all of this answered by the consultant. Some of the changes made include adjustments to the WEBR cost per ton.

We've had several meetings about the environmental criteria as well as several meetings on operations, social impacts, economics, etc. We are currently getting the list of concerns from our last meeting addressed and because not a lot of context was provided regarding the environmental criteria and the comparative matrices, Tetra Tech is working with their subconsultants to create a presentation to explain what those numbers mean, how they compare and what scales they are looking at. We are hoping to be able to present something in the fourth subgroup meeting.

Next Steps:

- Aug. 2024: Updated Comparative Analysis.
 - Liu will work on getting this update on the extranet so everyone can review it and make sure that the consultants are addressing the concerns that were brought up.
- Aug. 26, 2024: Draft report and subgroup Meeting #4.
 - If you want to attend this meeting, please reach out to Ockerlander or Blum.
- Sept. 2024: Open House #1 and Draft Report comments due.
 - Invites have not been sent out yet.
- Oct. 2024: Open House #2 and Final Report.
- Q1 2025: Begin city and SCA presentations.
- Q2-Q3 2025: Final Environmental Impact Statement complete
- Q3 2025: Advisory committee recommendation and transmit Comp Plan to the Executive Office.

Sweet asked if Liu could define the expectations for the open house. Liu replied that originally, we were hoping to use these meetings as an opportunity like the subgroup for city partners and haulers to provide feedback and concerns for us to incorporate some of the feedback into the study. But by the time the first open house will occur, we will likely have the draft report already and by the second open house, we will have the final report. We will probably not be able to incorporate as much feedback as we had hoped but are still hoping that we can do some of that work. There is a slight change to the open house format – at first, we wanted to do something like the subgroups and speak on different topics at each open house, but Liu believes we are switching to focusing on getting as many people involved as possible meaning we will be going over the same topics at each open house. If someone can't attend the first open house, they can attend the second and not miss information.

Sweet followed up asking if we anticipate presenting data as options for consideration. Liu replied yes – we've narrowed it down to mass burn and export by rail. We will also be providing background on why we eliminated the other three. Sweet wanted to know if there will be cost projections and other things for people to take into consideration. Liu answered yes and that we will be having conversations later for which criteria we should we be focusing on the most and we will bring it to this committee when the time comes.

Knight shared her concerns over the open houses that were originally planned to educate those that aren't in these meetings, and who have large stakes in the outcome of the reports and decisions that will be made for the region. Knight worried that it will seem like we are just giving lip service and not being inclusive of the comments and questions. She is concerned that what was originally part of the plan is going to be seen as the county already headed in the direction of what they want out of the report and the direction of LTD. Knight wanted to know if there was another way for people to share their concerns. Sweet added that people will feel jammed, and Knight agreed. Knight said that this might lead to tougher conversations in the end and leaving people feeling manipulated by the process. Knight wanted the county to consider that perspective when approaching the open houses.

Liu replied that we are not making any conclusions in the report, and we are not saying that we are going to go one way or the other. This report is simply to have the information and options to compare, and we will be presenting these options at the open houses. Liu understands that some people will feel jammed, but we still have at least a year to go before we reach a conclusion on what our final disposal method will be. Through this process, we plan on holding eight public outreach events - six will be in-person and two will be virtual. We hope that this will provide adequate opportunity for people and businesses to come forward and let us know what they think.

Knight commented that this should really be outlined – maybe even in speaking points that city staff can take to their elected officials. This can help with understanding that this is the study that examines the options and the issues surrounding the options, and that the real decision and conversations will happen in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which will take time in the future. Those who have been through a process like the EIS before might understand this, but others may not and speaking points can help prime decision makers. These workshops and open houses aren't the only places for perspectives to be heard and are more to look at the study and show why we chose to study mass burn and waste export by rail. People might start hearing things and come to their own conclusions about what is happening and how the county is making decisions. Liu thanked Knight for the feedback and said that we will incorporate this in the next steps.

Walsh added that this isn't about a decision being made but about presenting the results of the study. We have received a lot of good feedback from the subgroups and internally about the assumptions that have been used. The open house is a place where we want to hear the feedback on the information presented, and have a conversation about the numbers and what is concerning about the numbers. At the next subgroup, you'll see numbers that people are probably more thinking about.

Van Orsow shared his confusion about the timing of the final EIS and development of the Comp Plan, and wanted to know when the Comp Plan will be done. Liu replied that the LTD decision will be made in the Comp Plan but all the other policy changes and things that would need to go through State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process are being handled separately by each of the SME's. This EIS for Q2/Q3 is just for the LTD. Once the EIS is finalized, we will be going to the cities and presenting the results. There will still be a bit of a process in concluding on what the recommendation should be for the next LTD. We will start inputting all the LTD information into the Comp Plan once we get the letter of recommendations from MSWAC and SWAC. This will probably take a couple months to do. There might be a bit of a lag and this timeline is subject to change depending on when the EIS is finished.

Van Orsow clarified that SWD is currently working on the Comp Plan. Liu replied yes.

Gire thanked SWD for working with the consultant and pushing them to a higher quality level. Gire asked when the committee will see the report on mixed waste processing (MWP?). Walsh responded that there is a work order contract for the MWP report, and we are still early in the process. We might come back soon to talk about the criteria and the scope of the work.

Unincorporated King County Service Levels

Kim provided this presentation.

We want to use the King County Code to set expectations for Haulers' collection in unincorporated King County (UKC). We are responding to customer's feedback, raising up the voice of residents, driving Re+ action on food waste, and exploring collection consistency across King County.

Today, we will preview the upcoming work and discussion in which MSWAC and SWAC will be invited to provide feedback.

We are currently looking at 6 UKC Minimum Service Level Standard Work changes:

- Wildlife cart and education & Outreach: update language on promoting awareness to reduce conflict with wildlife when preparing materials.
- Cart distribution: update language for replacement cart delivery time
- Service disruption: Language outlining a process to address missed collection due to inclement weather. There is some language in UKC tariffs, but it is not clear.
- Contact List Update: yearly updated organizational contacts list kept updated and maintained regularly.
- Vashon Island Requirements: Remove the exemption from the unincorporated service areas requirements to start providing organics service (HB-2301). We want them to be part of HB 2301 and receive services.
- Food Waste Ban: Considering adding a "Food Waste Ban" language to Title 10 to help achieve Re+ goals to diverting all food waste by 2030. We will be doing a deeper dive next month.

Gire thought that this was a very important topic because there is a huge chunk of people who are in the UKC. He wanted to know if the UKC allows embedded organics service and if not, would the county pursue it. Kim replied that there is no language that allows this, but we are looking into including this in the upcoming UKC changes.

Heubach was curious if the county is considering every other week garbage service for the UKC and if so, where would it be. Kim answered that we are discussing this with the haulers and the Utility Transportation Committee (UTC) on how to make this work because it must line up with recycling and organics service. We will keep everyone informed as we move along with this conversation.

2025 Legislation Planning

Scholes and Tan led this planning effort.

There are several 2025 potential bills – some returning and some new. This is a tentative list and can change, especially with the elections in November.

Returning from 2024:

- ReWRAP Act – Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for Packaging & Paper Products
- Deposit Return System (DRS) for Beverage Containers (to be confirmed)
- Right to Repair
- Electric Vehicle (EV) Battery Recycling
- Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) Refrigerant Gases Recycling

New:

- Organics Management (building on 2024 bill)
 - Heather Trim and Rep. Dolio has convened a group to talk about this. Let Scholes/Tan know if you'd like to be involved in these meetings.

- Mattress EPR
- Construction & demolition (C&D)

The process will look like

- Sept. 19, 2024: Re+ Community Panel legislative recommendations. We will be talking with them about our legislative priorities and get their feedback.
- Sept. 2024: Recommendations for state legislative priorities
- Q3: Plan to engage cities on legislative priorities (e.g., EPR)
- Nov. 2024: KC Council votes on state legislative priorities
- Nov. 8, 2024: Legislative Preview to MSWAC
- Nov. 15, 2024: Legislative Preview to SWAC. We will be able to tack the bills as they go through sessions.

Knight was curious on the Organics Management Act and wanted to know what people are talking about for the potential topics to consider with an updated Organics Management bill. Scholes answered that some of them are things that were discussed in HB 2301 but didn't end up getting passed like multifamily source separation, adjustments to how schools operate to reduce food waste, food date labeling, bin colors, banning pesticides, etc. There is a website for that [work group](#) that will have the recordings and you can see the full list there.

Knight asked if there have been conversations of the cities being able to contract for those services. Sweet replied that there have not been any granular discussions. At the first meeting, there was just a preview. There are a lot of cities on this call and advised everyone to look at the website. Knight added that she is just looking for some tools.

Van Orsow wanted to know why the ReWrap Act didn't get anywhere, what the impediments were and what would make it successful in 2025. Scholes answered that she would not characterize it as not getting anywhere because each year there are improvements and progress made to the bill. It is still positive compared to previous years. This is a complex topic and there are stakeholders weighing in to make the best system that we have. She is positive that Rep. Berry is continuing to have these conversations and all the support from the cities is helpful.

Tan added that for the legislative session in general, it came down to a time crunch where there's a limited time for how many bills can be discussed on the floor and the legislature chose other issues to focus on. There was a lot of meetings with the waste management industry and there was a lot of progress. Van Orsow asked if Tan would characterize the meetings as productive with them being in favor of the bill or if there will be continued opposition to it. Tan replied that there is some movement but does not know what their final decision is.

Smith added that we had a lot of constructive dialogue and significant progress on the technical issues carried forward. We are looking forward to continued engagement and we will be talking about how we can do that and hold space for dialogue and discussion; and that whatever legislation comes forward in the future represents the interests of King County residents.

Debris Management Framework – Debris Storage

Jones led this.

As part of our debris management planning efforts, we identified some temporary debris management sites where disaster debris can be stored, sorted, and processed before further treatment or disposal. These sites are not intended to be used for final disposal or to be permanent. The criteria we used to identify these sites included ownership (preferably owned by a government entity), slope (flat, less than 15%), surface condition (preferably paved/impervious with large open areas – not forested), size (preferably at least five acres), environmental conditions (not near potable water wells, areas with high groundwater, areas with surface water), etc.

Our preliminary analysis did not return many results county-wide (please refer to the web map of potential sites [here](#)). This is significant because after a disaster, roads may be damaged, and communities may become isolated from the rest of the county. Communities will still need to be able to clear roads and remove debris, so having pre-identified sites in each community is imperative for efficient debris removal and to facilitate recovery efforts.

Jones asked everyone to review the web map with the identified preliminary sites and see if they are good and if there are any other sites that can be identified. Please submit feedback to Jones or Blum.

Heubach noticed that there were no sites identified in most cities. The map only included publicly owned properties. Jones said that if anyone is aware of other sites, please identify them. Heubach believed that we should open the locations up to private entities and said that while Jones mentioned slope and pavement, it is not listed as criteria in the map or city annexes and would like some guidance on what criteria are more flexible because this will help us identify more sites. Jones replied that we can provide guidance and we are happy to open up the possibility of private sites and will refer to the cities on that. On the county side, we may be unwilling to engage in a long-term lease with private entities and in a disaster, these sites will likely go to the highest bidder which may not be the county.

Moldver agreed with Heubach and has been looking at Redmond's annex. He has identified a few sites like 60 Acres and Marymoor Park and is looking at the best options for the community. He has identified a few sites but needs to see if they are really viable.

Jones said that we will be hosting workshops in October to provide technical assistance to help cities create their debris annex. This is for cities to come and work with consultants and ask questions about your plan. [Sign up](#).

Sweet asked if we can assume that the county is working with the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC). Jones answered that we have been engaging with them throughout the process.

Van Orsow stated that Federal Way has been working on a draft debris management plan for years and siting locations have always been a problem. We have been looking at temporary storage in the right of way and there are areas that are very dense, so this might be an option. He asked Jones if the approach that was initially given was to plan for a huge regional disaster or if they should be planning for a local disaster. Van Orsow wanted clarification if the cities should be looking at this regionally and planning to help each other out like mutual aid. Jones replied that cities should be planning for both. The original intent of the debris management plan annex was to have a plan for the smaller scale disasters but if there is a large regional disaster, cities will need to have sites identified for that too since cities will still need to be able to manage their debris internally.

Debris Management Plan Support Letter

Ockerlander presented on this topic.

Ockerlander shared her screen and showed the updates. Because of the way the framework is laid out, we will not need to take it to Council, but we still want to include letters from both advisory committees. Ockerlander asked for feedback.

Heubach motioned to approve the letter. Seconded by McInnis. Motion carried unanimously.

Survey Results Discussion

Ockerlander led this discussion.

Last month, Ockerlander sent out a survey for a new time for MSWAC. The three most popular times were Tuesday 8-10, Tuesday 10-12 and Wednesday 12-2.

Another survey will be sent out to get a more narrowed-down response.

Member Comment

No member comment.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.