

**SWAC Advisory Committee Meeting**  
 June 21, 2024 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.  
 Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

<b><u>SWAC Members</u></b>	<b><u>King County Staff</u></b>
April Atwood, Marketing and Education	John Walsh, SWD staff
Jay Blazey, Manufacturer	Karen Herndon, SWD staff
Amy Lam, Local Elected Official	Laila McClinton, SWD staff
James Borsum, Teamsters 117	Sylvaine Bucher, SWD staff
Bill Louie, Vice Chair	Nori Catabay, SWD staff
Leah Tischler, Public Interest Group	Nina Olivier, SWD staff
Robin Freeman, Waste Management	Kinley Deller, SWD staff
Heather Trim, Recycling Industry	Katie Jones, DNRP staff
Wendy Weiker, Chair	Hilary Leonard, SWD staff
	Mary O’Hara, SWD staff
	Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director
	Brian Halverson, SWD staff
	<b><u>Guests</u></b>
	Zach Dugovich
	Olivia Kirby
	Jeanette Jurgensen
	Katie Jerauld, Ecology
	Erin Gagnon, DTG Recycle
	Alissa Campbell, Recology King County
	Marty Mudd, Jacobs Engineering
	Andie Parnell, Sound Cities Association

**Call to Order and Introductions**

Chair Weiker called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. Introductions followed.

**Meeting Minutes**

Atwood moved to approve the May minutes. Louie seconded. Minutes passed unanimously.

**Public Comment**

Jerauld commented that Ecology’s [Landfill Methane Emissions Reduction Grants](#) will open for submissions in August. The grants relate to a [new rule around emissions](#) that was adopted in May 2024.

If you are able, please complete [Ecology’s short survey regarding opportunities to recycle plastic and paper carryout bags](#) in your community. Your feedback will inform a report evaluating the impacts of Washington’s Single-use Plastic Bag Ban, to be submitted to Washington’s legislature by December 1, 2024 (Per RCW 70A.530.060). We want to hear from every community in Washington to understand the downstream options for products regulated by this law. Survey closes on Tuesday, July 9th at 11:59 p.m. and is estimated to take 6

minutes to complete. Let Carolyn Bowie (carolyn.bowie@ecy.wa.gov) know if you have any follow-up questions about the survey or report.

There is an excellent funding opportunity for [local governments implementing Organic Management Laws](#). Selected projects will develop and test strategies for planning and implementing municipal compost plans and food waste reduction plans and are part of USDA's broader efforts to support urban agriculture. Applications are due September 4th at 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time and awards are capped at \$400k. You can read the [June 12, 2024 press release](#). If you have further questions, please contact Cullen Naumoff, Ecology Organics Lead, at Cule461@ecy.wa.gov or 564.233.1419.

### **SWD Updates**

McLaughlin provided the SWD update.

### **Puget Sound Clear Air Agency (PSCAA)**

Last November we engaged with PSCAA on how to monitor arsenic emissions at the landfill. They gave us some direction via an Administrative Order. We completed that work and submitted our findings last month. During the process, we were most concerned about the flaring station and were pleased to find that testing showed acceptable emission rates around the flares.

We used a conservative methodology, which assumed all measured gaseous arsenic is arsine. The model indicated there may be some emission issues around our leachate lagoons. However, it may have overestimated the amount of arsine. We're seeking input from PSCAA on further testing and modeling.

We have already completed some environmental mitigation work around the leachate ponds out of an abundance of caution. We're updating the control systems and cover systems, and it looks like that work will continue to be impactful in offsetting any impacts.

### **Fixed Annual Charge (FAC)**

We sent out notice at the end of May to our haulers and cities advising of the release of the draft allocation table for the 2025 FAC. We held office hours for cities and haulers on June 11<sup>th</sup> and June 13<sup>th</sup>. Any feedback on the FAC is due to Lindy Honaker by June 28<sup>th</sup>. An updated draft FAC will be released on July 3<sup>rd</sup>, incorporating feedback received in June, with an additional opportunity to provide feedback until July 31<sup>st</sup>. The final draft will be released on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, with the expectation of adoption by the county council in September 2024.

### **2025 Rate Ordinance and Support Letters**

We transmitted our 2025 rate proposal. The package includes support letters approved by both MSWAC and SWAC. Thank you to everyone that participated in the discussions, provided feedback, and helped craft the message. We have begun briefing county council members and will keep you updated.

### **Long-Term Disposal Decision Sub-Group**

The Long-Term Disposal Decision Sub-Group held a meeting in May and another meeting on June 17<sup>th</sup>. SWD staff are meeting with the consultant, Tetra Tech in the coming weeks to ensure they're properly integrating the feedback and questions raised by stakeholders.

Atwood commented that SWAC members had previously requested that they be included as observers in the Sub-group meetings. They were able to attend the 2<sup>nd</sup> session in May, but were not informed about the meeting on June 17<sup>th</sup>. The recording is also not currently available on the Extranet site. McLaughlin apologized for the oversight and affirmed that SWAC members are welcome to attend the Sub-group meetings as observers. We will rectify our process and make sure

SWAC members are informed and invited to the next meeting, which is not scheduled yet. Walsh added that they will add the recording of the June 17<sup>th</sup> meeting to the Extranet site. Members are welcome to submit comments after viewing the recording.

Weiker underscored the importance of SWD staff ensuring SWAC members are invited to all future Sub-group meetings, and ensuring that information is accessible for transparency around such an important topic. McLaughlin agreed and apologized again for the oversight with the June 17<sup>th</sup> meeting invite.

### **Washington Association of County Solid Waste Managers (WACSWM)**

A few members of SWD leadership attended the WACSWM meeting in Ellensburg last week. The agenda featured a panel discussion on EPR legislation that included folks from across the industry, Adrian Tan, and Helen Trim. It was a very productive session aimed at preparing for the 2025 legislative session.

### **Government Relations Administrator Recruitment Update**

We're close to hiring a new Government Relations Administrator (GRA). We received a significant number of highly qualified candidates, and we are confident that we will secure a great GRA. We hope to make a hiring decision by the end of the month and will share the announcement when a hire is official.

### **Quarterly Hauler Forum**

We are gearing up for the next Hauler Forum with King County and our partner agencies to be held on Monday, June 24<sup>th</sup>. This is an important forum for both the county and the haulers to discuss emerging issues and policy development. We'll provide an update on the meeting at the next SWAC in July.

### **Debris Management Plan**

Jones presented.

There are two components to the Debris Management Plan:

1. Regional Framework (Base Plan)
  - Supports county agencies, cities, tribes, and special purpose districts within King County during large-scale disaster debris-causing incidents.
  - Describes how the County and its regional partners will collect debris, sort it, and transfer it to its final disposition location.
2. Jurisdiction Annexes
  - Support specific jurisdictions during smaller scale incidents that might not warrant the need to activate the larger regional base plan.
  - Operational plans that include the same planning elements as the base plan

SWD is serving as the regional lead on this work because it's part of King County Code under Title 10.

We started this planning initiative in February 2023. We held 9 partner engagement meetings to encourage participation in the work. In April 2023 we had the official kickoff meeting. From May 2023 until March 2024, we held about 50 meetings with planning partners to gather information and start populating the plan. In June 2023 we provided an annex template to partners for them to start creating their plans. In March 2024 we finalized the draft regional framework, known as the base plan, and sent it out for partner review. We then integrated feedback and made final revisions. Last month we presented the proposed plan with a status update to both advisory committees.

As next steps we will be providing technical assistance to jurisdictions who wish to complete their annexes. Those annexes are recommended, but not required. We're sending out a survey soon to gauge partner preferences on the timing of those technical assistance trainings. We anticipate they will take place in early Fall.

Next month we're finalizing the base plan and moving to Council review in Q3/Q4. We'll begin providing training on roles and responsibilities within the plan beginning in Q1 2025.

To collaborate and share materials with our partners we send out a periodic newsletter, host a Microsoft Teams site, and take questions and comments via email or phone.

We respectfully ask for the committee's support for the proposed Debris Management Plan as we move to Council review.

Trim asked if the plan addresses salvaging or reusing materials after a disaster. Jones responded that a significant driver for the plan is being able to salvage and recycle materials instead of landfilling reusable materials. Once debris is collected at a temporary debris management site, we'll sort the materials and coordinate with contractors to take the materials for processing. Those vendor contracts are not yet established, but they're part of our future planning efforts.

Louie asked if the emergency disposal mutual aid agreement between King County and Seattle is related to King County's Debris Management Plan. Jones stated they are related, but separate. The assumption of the Debris Management Plan is Seattle may not have capacity after a large-scale incident to take our debris and we'd likely need to export it outside of the region. The Mutual Aid agreement deals with smaller scale incidences such as fires, strikes, or other incidents at our facilities that would impede our ability to receive waste.

Lam asked when she could get a copy of the base plan. Jones responded that they're planning to share the plan in August once it's transmitted to council. We're also considering hosting informational sessions, if there's demand, to speak to updates since the last partner review period. McLaughlin clarified that a draft version of the plan is available.

Lam asked if the templates for jurisdictions are available. Jones responded that the templates are available, and she can email them to the committee.

Trim requested to see the draft plan and would like an informational session.

Jones suggested that SWD share the draft Base Plan and draft annex with members, then during the July meeting she can address questions and members can consider next steps around expressing support. McLaughlin suggested sharing the updated plan, which has been cleaned up since the draft was shared, to both committees and host an informational session in advance of the next advisory team meetings. At the July or August meeting we'll ask the committees to take a position. Jones agreed to share the materials and explore scheduling an informational session.

### **Long-Term Disposal Decision Options**

Halverson and Walsh presented.

During the Long-Term Disposal Sub-Group meeting in May participants took a deep dive into three of the disposal options being studied. Those options were refused derived fuel (RDF), pyrolysis, and gasification. We also looked at how each option compared to the six major evaluation criteria categories.

RDF is a process that screens out undesirable materials and creates either a pellet or fluff. The pellet or fluff is sold to incineration facilities such as cement plants. It's generally used as a substitute for burning coal. RDF is more commonly made from construction & demolition waste or waste from limited material types. For municipal solid waste (MSW) RDF makes more sense for a low tonnage scenario. Users of RDF want a more consistent product, which would require sophisticated processing technology for MSW that is not typically part of RDF facilities.

The chlorides in our MSW pose a challenge as they are incompatible with the kilns that use RDF. Other challenges are contracts for RDF are typically only one year and we're not aware of any facilities within Washington that take RDF made from MSW, which means that is not a reliable market.

Gasification is the second option we explored. Gasification is a thermal conversion process that creates syngas as its primary product. The undesirable materials are sorted out and the rest of the waste is superheated to create a producer gas, which is then further processed into syngas. Depending on the characterization of the feedstock, the syngas is highly combustible. One downside to this method is it creates tar as a byproduct. There are also no known gasification facilities that could handle King County's tonnage.

Pyrolysis is the final method we discussed. Pyrolysis is also a thermal conversion process. Its primary end products can be gas, liquids or solids depending on the feedstock. Pyrolysis is best suited for wood, coal, or plastics. Materials such as metal and glass are sorted before processing. Pyrolysis has historically been used to make coal out of diesel and doesn't work well with MSW as feedstock. Like gasification, there are no known facilities that could handle King County's tonnage.

In Washington we have a state law known as the Clean Energy Transformation Action (CETA) that aims to fully transition the state to clean, renewable, and non-emitting electricity sources by 2045. That includes eliminating coal-generated power by next year and becoming GHG neutral by 2030. Under CETA solid waste is considered a non-renewable resource which means we would not be able to sell energy from gasification, pyrolysis, or mass burn in the state. There are also questions around whether we would be able to sell RDF made from MSW within the state under CETA.

There are upwards of 30 criteria as part of the study. We've narrowed it down in this presentation to the criteria where there are the most significant differences or points for illustration.

Beginning with economics, building a facility that can handle the mid-range tonnage would cost about \$200 million for RDF, and \$1.2 billion for either gasification or pyrolysis. Due to CETA, the consultants included a risk analysis around finding markets. The disposal cost for RDF would equate to about \$62/ton, but the cost is difficult to predict on a longer timeframe given the one-year RDF contracts. Gasification would cost \$128 per ton and pyrolysis would cost \$159/ton respectively. Without a market to sell to the prices would jump to \$181 for both gasification and pyrolysis. Without a market for RDF, the pellets would go to the landfill.

For the capacity criteria we found that none of these methods have facilities that could process MSW at the scale we would need in King County. The consultants reiterated that the capacity issue with RDF is the lack of markets we could sell to. RDF facilities can handle the range of tonnage scenarios we're studying, but without markets, there's no value in producing RDF. Gasification and pyrolysis facilities are incapable of handling even our low tonnage scenario.

For the social criteria the consultant recommends using the EPA's Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool along with the Washington Environmental Health Disparities Map. These tools rate communities based on environmental quality and existing pollution sources, socioeconomic indicators, and health indicators. In selecting the site, evaluating the social criteria should give additional weight to localized impacts that exacerbate an existing disparity such as particulate emissions or high rates of asthma. The number of truck trips is double for RDF because of end markets and the volume of material going to the end markets. There are no significant impacts to groundwater, but all three options would include impacts to odor and noise primarily from trucks at the facilities. Pyrolysis and gasification also produce air emissions.

For the environmental impact parameters, the consultants used lifecycle analysis definitions and impacts:

- Non-renewable energy demand (Energy Production): measures fossil and nuclear energy from point of extraction. Includes coal, natural gas and oil which exist in limited quantities in nature.

- Water consumption: freshwater that is evaporated, incorporated into products and waste or disposed into the sea. Most of water consumption impacts in LTDOS occur due to processing or energy offsets, particularly energy offsets related to the hydropower portion of grid electricity.
- Eutrophication Potential (Water Quality) – environmental damage caused when bodies of water or soil become overly enriched with nutrients, primarily due to pollutants released into the environment such as nitrogen and phosphorus. Key plant nutrients, are added in large quantities causing rapid growth of algae in water bodies, leading to increase in oxygen which can kill fish and other aquatic life. Can also disrupt natural species balance and reduce ecological diversity.
- Acidification Potential (Air Quality) – environmental damage caused by release of acid-forming compounds into atm sphere, primarily due to burning of fossil fuels and biomass.
- Smog Formation Potential (Air Quality) –process by which certain chemicals in the atmosphere react with sunlight and heat to produce ozone, a major component of smog. Typically occurs when nitrogen oxides and VOCs, which are released during the combustion of fuels like gasoline and diesel, interact under certain conditions. Ozone at ground level is harmful as it can cause respiratory problems and other health issues, as well as damage vegetation.
- Human Health Toxicity –potential dangers to people’s health from release of toxic chemicals into the environment are significant. These chemicals can cause various health problems such as heart disease, kidney failure and reproductive disorders. Can also affect how our brains work and disrupt our hormone systems.
- Global Warming Potential (Climate Change) –potential increase in Earth’s temperature due to GHGs emitted by human activities. Main GHG is carbon dioxide released primarily through burning of fossil fuels like coal, oil, and natural gas. Another significant GHG is methane, which comes from breakdown of organic materials in environments without oxygen such as wetlands or landfills.

Reliable environmental impact data is not available for gasification and pyrolysis because facilities that process MSW are uncommon. As a result, we can’t summarize the environmental impacts compared with other disposal methods.

For RDF the environmental evaluation assumes that it would replace coal extraction and is used in place of coal for incineration. Water consumption for RDF is high because it replaces coal but does not replace grid electricity. The cancer potential for RDF is high due to the combustion of plastics. We submitted three tonnage scenarios to the consultant. The mid-range tonnage is the most likely scenario. Comparing all three scenarios, the high tonnage situation has higher capital and operating expenses for RDF and lower costs per ton. The low tonnage scenario has lower capital and operating expenses with a higher cost per ton. The high tonnage scenario creates the most jobs, truck trips, and more local impacts while the social impacts are lower for the low tonnage scenario. The same dynamic is true for the environmental criteria – they’re higher for the high tonnage scenario and lower for low tonnage.

In summary, RDF is:

- Proven technology at scale capable of processing amount of waste from the 3 tonnage scenarios.
- Cost effective option at \$46 - \$75/per ton if stable markets available. If markets not available, option not viable (landfill disposal would be the alternative).
- Markets for projected quantities of MSW RDF (300,000 to 800,000 tpy) limited due to technical challenges with chloride content and permitting requirements.
- Risky long-term disposal option due to lack of markets to take projected volume of material.

Gasification and Pyrolysis:

- No operating facilities that meet King County’s capacity needs and operation of gasification units still being developed.
- Not currently viable as long-term disposal option based on unproven operating history at scale and for MSW feedstock.

We propose removing these three options from further consideration in the long-term disposal process. This would include:

- They would not be part of the planning level EIS.
- They would not be discussed as options with elected officials and the public. They would be mentioned as options that were studied but the focus would only be on Mass Burn and Export.
- All this information will remain in the LTD Study to show the work and why they were removed from further consideration.

MSWAC reached consensus on removing these three options going forward, with a slight change to the recommendation language around Mass Burn and Export. They requested that second part of the sentence be removed.

Trim noted that the non-cancer environmental impacts were not included in the table and that info should be reflected in the tables, even if the consultant doesn’t have data. Trim also noted that RDF is not better for the environment and moving forward with RDF will bring strong opposition from Zero Waste Washington and likely the public.

Trim recommended that the committee remove the three options and consider moving forward with the other two. Zero Waste Washington is also against Mass Burn.

Lam commented that RDF is a proven technology, and it seems prudent to keep it as an option to compare it with the remaining options. Walsh responded that the main concern with RDF is that it’s usually made with a homogenous feedstock. When it’s made from MSW there’s contamination in the pellets, which lowers the quality of the fluff and makes it less desirable for markets.

Lam asked if it’s possible to considering a mix of options. Walsh explained that Mass Burn would require export, but we have not considered a dual system because there are fixed costs in building the facilities, depending on the option we chose. The Sub-group decided to remove these options now with the idea that we’ll check back in the future to understand if the technology is more viable.

Lam asked about the details for comparing mass burn and export as options. Walsh stated that next month we’ll be presenting on those options.

Louie asked about process and timeline for revisiting the options in the future. Walsh responded that it’ll depend on which technology we choose because that’ll dictate if we’re locked in or not in the future. If we choose mass burn, there’s a long runway for constructing the facility. There’s a shorter runway for waste-to-export.

Atwood asked if there’s any mechanism for regional collaboration and coordination on long-term disposal. McLaughlin responded there is an opportunity to collaborate with other jurisdictions once we have decided on our direction. There are potential benefits to other jurisdictions joining us as they could bring additional volume and experience. Weiker added that with flow control each jurisdiction is responsible for waste in their area. Collaboration between jurisdictions is possible but will require a lot of government relations.

Trim commented that if we do export by rail, like Seattle, that provides flexibility for the future. The challenge with these other options is we're on the hook for providing a set amount of waste to the facility, we can't decrease. In [Honolulu they built a waste-to-energy facility](#), and they were facing massive fines because they couldn't provide the agreed upon tonnage during the pandemic. If we do waste-to-export, we wouldn't be locked in and could easily pivot to a different technology in the future. These projects around pyrolysis aren't new, just renamed.

Blazey commented that he is open to removing these three options and would like the committee to stay open to hearing more about waste-to-rail and waste-to-energy.

Atwood asked about the timeline for the planning level EIS. Walsh responded that we're getting a consultant onboard and should have it wrapped by early 2025. The committees won't make a final decision until the EIS is completed. The current decision is around removing these three non-feasible options now to save time and money.

Atwood suggested the recommendation language should be changed to: *"They would not be discussed as options with elected officials and the public. They would be mentioned as options that were studied."*

SWAC reached consensus on removing the three options from further consideration.

### **Recycling Coordinators Meetings**

Cole presented.

The Recycling Coordinators meetings have been ongoing for over 20 years, except for a pause during the pandemic. Attendees include staff from within King County, the Solid Waste Division, Ecology, and the cities. There are usually about 40 participants per meeting, which are held quarterly and are virtual. We're also considering an in-person meeting once per year.

The goal of the meetings is to collaborate, communicate, and solve problems. Hannah puts together the agendas with input from members. Meeting topics center improving solid waste management programs, updates from SWD projects, and updates from cities on their projects. The first hour of the meeting is focused on a presentation from King County or an outside speaker. The second half of the meeting is conducted as an informal round robin discussion.

During the most recent meeting on June 5th attendees talked about SWD grant opportunities, SWD's school voucher program, and updates on the Bring Your Own Cup (BYOC) campaign. We shared the list of plug-and-play project ideas we've been developing for cities. It includes citywide swap events, repair events, food rescue opportunities, and more. We're planning to share the finalized list with cities this month.

Jose Ochoa shared information about our school voucher program, which we're using to provide funds to schools so they can improve their recycling and waste reduction efforts. Schools can use those funds to purchase bins, signage, reusable dishware, dishwashers, Green Team staffing, and more.

Adrian Tan shared an update on the BYOC campaign, which many cities have been involved in. He also shared information on the Northwest Product Stewardship Council, including which materials are under consideration for future policy development.

Cities also shared information on the programs they're working on. Many cities are focused on summer events that are implementing new techniques to reduce waste.

### **SCRTS Presentation**

Herndon presented.



The SCRTS project is in its second year of construction. During the past year, we've seen the site cleared, the stream realigned, the Iowa Drive culver constructed, and most of the site retaining walls built.

Construction on the North Stormwater Detention Vault began last fall. It's the biggest of three planned stormwater vaults, holding more than 600 gallons of stormwater runoff. The vault is now built and in use. Construction on the South Detention Vault will be completed this summer. It will hold over 350,000 gallons of runoff. The third vault has not been built yet and will hold over 140,000 gallons of water.

The transfer building is also currently under construction. While preparing the site we ran into unsuitable soil from organic materials including trees and peat. We had to remove the materials, which led to considerable schedule and cost impacts.

The compactor bay, which makes up the lower level of the transfer building is now backfilled. Beginning in January 2025, the metal transfer building will be added atop the site. The operations building is also under construction and will eventually join the transfer building.

This summer there will be significant disruption to West Valley Highway South along the site for utilities work. The curb and pavement were removed, and stormwater catch basins installed along the road. Work started in mid-May and is expected to finish in August. We needed to have the City of Algona police department onsite to monitor traffic and help enforce directional lane closures.

The overall project budget is \$199 million, and the construction contract is about \$101 million. The project is currently about 32% complete. The unsuitable soil excavation cost us \$2.6 million in counting, but the project remains on budget and on time for completion in 2026. The finished project will have a large public art display on the major retaining wall by the entrance.

Trim asked about the public art for the project. Herndon responded that the 600-foot retaining wall near the entrance will have 8 ft. tall aluminum medallions from artists within the Muckleshoot tribe. They'll be visible from West Valley Highway. In between each medallion there will be sandblasted images. There will also be a 20-foot cedar totem by the Muckleshoot tribe that will be sources from wood from the site. There is also an artist in residence, Evan Blackwell, who is creating work from waste found during construction.

#### **NERTS update**

O'Hara presented.

Our existing Houghton Transfer Station, built in the 1960s, has outlived its useful life. The 2019 Comp Plan outlined the need for a new facility. We're currently going through the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process and developing a draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS). SEPA is a law that requires local agencies to identify potential environmental impacts of proposed plans through a formal review process.

King County announced three action alternatives and a no action alternative in the summer of 2022. We issued a scoping notice for the EIS and concluded a public comment period in early 2023. We made the decision to remove the Houghton Park and Ride as an option, then we did a second scoping and public comment period to gather feedback on that decision.

There are many environmental elements studied and analyzed within the DEIS. Each one compares SWD's proposed action alternatives and a no action alternative.

During the 62-day DEIS comment period we held 3 public meetings. Our first meeting in Kirkland attracted over 60 attendees, our second meeting held virtually had 50 attendees, and our third meeting in Woodinville had 115 attendees.

By the end of the comment period, we received just over 1800 comments total. The most popular way to submit comments was via email. In addition to our public meetings, we conducted outreach to the community via an online open house, direct mailers, and email. We also conducted an multilingual digital ad campaign that received over 15.5 million views, social media posts, as well as direct emails to community groups, tribes, and other stakeholders.

We are currently in the final stage of the SEPA process. Initially the final EIS was scheduled for Q3 2024. Due to the volume of comments and the time it'll take to review and respond, we're pushing out the final siting decision to the end of 2024. Once the site is selected, we'll move forward with preliminary design in Q1 2025. The draft EIS document is still viewable on our website.

**Member Comment**

Trim commented that Zero Waste Washington has started work on organics. Get in contact if you would like to be invited to the stakeholder meetings, which begin in July. Meetings are topic-specific and will include focus areas such as multi-family, contamination reduction, food waste, air quality and permitting, and more. Contact: [heather@zerowastewashington.org](mailto:heather@zerowastewashington.org)

**Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 11:24 a.m.