Committee Members & CAC Staff | Present? | SPU Staff & Guests | Role
--- | --- | --- | ---
Quinn Apuzzo | Y | Aurora Mendoza | SPU Clean City Program Manager
David Della | Y | Hans VanDusen | Interim Solid Waste Planning Director, Solid Waste Planning and Program Management
Anna Dyer | Y | Vas Duggirala | SPU Principal Economist
Ben Grace | N | Ken Snipes | Deputy Director for Solid Waste
Holly Griffith | Y | ShaQuina Justice | Guest, Solid Waste Support
Katie Kennedy | N | Collin Groark | Guest
Jamie Lee | N | |
Heather Levy | Y | |
Rodney Proctor | N | |
Emily Newcomer | N | CAC Staff |
Joseph Ringold | N | Sego Jackson, Policy Liaison |
Emily Rothenberg | Y | Sheryl Shapiro, Program Manager |
Chris Toman | Y | Natasha Walker, CAC Program Support |

**ACTION ITEMS:**

- Hans to follow up with sector-breakdown of yard and food waste processing increase reported at this meeting.
- A committee member expressed interest in seeing how the 7% rate increase would be messaged to customers.
- Sego/Vas to follow-up on committee member questions regarding the impact of the transfer station construction on the rate increase. Specifically:
  - Why were there cost overruns between the estimated budget in the previous SBP for transfer station(s), and the actual cost?
  - Are any of the activities at the transfer station considered revenue generating?
- Committee members expressed interest in a guest speaker who can talk about changing demographics and impact on our programs, the evolving ton and impact on programs, and implications of these on measurements and goals.
✓ Committee members requested further discussion on the sustainability of certain rate structures; a committee member suggested a guest be brought in to speak on the topic. Vas suggested he could find someone to address this in Economic Services.

Regular Business
Call to order at 5:40 PM
• Meeting notes from June were reviewed and approved.

1. SPU Updates – Personnel Changes, Electronics, & Tonnage Updates
Hans VanDusen, Interim Solid Waste Planning Director provided SPU personnel updates:

• Retirements: SPU Director Ray Hoffman and Tim Croll, Director, Solid Waste Planning and Program Division have retired.
  o Hans noted that this is a big transition for the City because they have been very well established in the City, and Solid Waste specifically.
  o SWAC members have a card thanking Tim for his service.
• Solid Waste Planning and Program Division Director Position is open. Hans will serve as the Interim Planning Director. The Operations Director Position was already open, with the initial closing on 8/8-8/9. Hans said the position has been recruited for nationally, regionally and locally. He encouraged committee members to spread the word as well.
  o Committee member question: Is there anything that could be impacted by having those two positions open?
  o Answer: We hope not. Thankfully, Interim Director Melina Thung is an alumni of solid waste. We want to keep things moving but not precede decisions before the permanent Director comes in.
• New Appointments: Mami Hara from Philadelphia has been chosen to replace Ray Hoffman as the SPU Director. Hans said he was surprised to see the Mayor appoint someone so soon, but that it’s great to have no gap in authority.
  o Ken Snipes, Deputy Director for Solid Waste: Her background is in water, and drainage and wastewater. She has worked a lot with green stormwater infrastructure and is very sharp.
  o Sheryl shared Mami’s statement from Mayor Ed Murray’s announcement of her appointment: “Thank you to Mayor Murray for the opportunity to serve the residents of this region. Seattle Public Utilities is one of the most progressive and respected utilities in the nation and I am honored to join the team,” said Hara. “I look forward to continuing and expanding the City’s traditions of modeling sustainable water management practices; delivering safe, reliable, and affordable utility services; and enhancing quality of life through strategic infrastructure management.”
  o Committee member question: When is the council going to confirm the new director?
  o Answer: 9/17/16
  o Committee member question: And she starts 9/19?
It depends on how the hearing goes, but we assume so.

Sego Jackson, Solid Waste Policy Liaison, provides an update on Electronics recycling from the June 2016 CAC meeting:

- **Background:** Total Reclaim was found to be illicitly exporting LCD television screens to Hong Kong, which made them outside the parameters of E-Steward certification. As a result, they lose that certification for 2 years and then they can reapply. The City requires E-Steward certification by its contractors who handle electronic equipment, which created a scramble for what to do with electronics, as well as CFC refrigerators at transfer stations, and also mercury lighting.

- It also raised the question of whether to use Ecolights for mercury lighting, and/or who could step in and provide this service. Finance & Administration Services (FAS) does the contracting. Even though Ecolights is a “sister company” to Total Reclaim, the City has decided to continue working with them because Ecolights was not involved with the export of LCD televisions.

- This has also affected the City’s battery recycling. The City is going to All Battery Sales and Service in Everett. The contact there is Jack Bradbury, who some may know from his participation in the Washington State Recycling Association (WSRA).

- Sego visited the Friendly Earth recycling facility on 1st Avenue. He noted it was quite small, and it was not clear what they are doing with Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) devices and LCDs because they were previously taking them to Total Reclaim.

- ARCA out of Minnesota handles CFC appliances. They particularly work with utilities. Sego noted that Solid Waste via FAS has been able to piggy back on a City Light contract and they have since picked up a few hundred CFC containing appliances.

- Update on Electronic Recyclers International (ERI), out of Sumner: Part of the issue is they had recently moved locations; part of the E-stewardship certification process required a certified company to be at a specific location for a set amount of time, before that site can be certified. This delayed FAS from working on a contract with ERI. Also, they are charging a higher price than we were used to paying, so that has slowed down the process too.

- In the meantime, Solid Waste has used a Direct Voucher with ERI for television and computer monitors that were accumulating at STS.
  - **Committee member question:** Did you move the appliance recycling away from Total Reclaim because of an issues or were they affected by the certification process?
  - **Answer:** Appliances had nothing to do with the illicit export of LCD televisions documented by the Basel Action Network. But we were having Total Reclaim trucks pick up both appliances and electronics. So just to make sure there was no confusion, the decision was made to seek another vendor for appliances too.

- As a courtesy to Seattle/King County, Basel Network revealed in advance what other WA state businesses were sending electronics to Hong Kong. None of these were E-steward certified companies though. This has helped us be better informed in the selection process for new vendors however.
Hans provides a brief garbage tonnage update:

- We’ve had declining tonnage every year since 2007 on the garbage side. But this year it’s going up. Yard and food waste processing is up 5% (includes both commercial and residential). Hans said they have reports that will break this down by sector, and will share with the SWAC when it’s done.
- He said he wouldn’t be surprised if the garbage growth was commercial. Tonnage with multi-family hasn’t been growing quite as fast as the multi-family units are being built.
- Whether we’re going to hit our goal of 60% this year is still to be determined.
  - **Committee member question:** What % are we at right now?
  - **Answer:** We’re at 58% right now.
- Sego noted that there’s been a question if SWAC would want to see these unpublished numbers every month, or wait for the quarterly report that has been published on the website. He suggested they discuss at the next SWAC officers meeting.
  - **Committee chair:** my sense is to go on a quarterly update. Feelings from the committee?
  - Committee members felt that quarterly reports were fine.

2. **Recycling Report Debrief**

Hans VanDusen reported on the briefing given to City Council, which indicated that SPU would be short of the overall goal to recycle 58% of municipal solid waste.

- The Council focused on multi-family access, which is something SPU focuses on as well. They had a lot of anecdotal questions. He noted that SPU had in their requirements to heavily consider multi-family to ensure that it’s successful. Whether Council comes back to say if we should be doing more to ensure they have access is still to be determined.
- Councilmember Lisa Herbold is a strong advocate for tenant rights, safety and health. She’s been a champion for the Department of Construction and Inspections, visiting multi-family units, and she felt they should be inspecting food waste, recycling, and garbage access. We may partner with them some to make this happen.
- The Council also focused some on waste prevention bans. Mike O’Brien has been on the City Council for a few years and he was a champion of those prevention bans 6-8 years ago, and checked in about those items.
- This intermingled with the bag ban discussion. City Council felt we should look at enforcement of the bag bans more.
- Sego noted that Councilmember Mike O’Brien referenced San Francisco’s recent expanded polystyrene (EPS) ban. He said it was notable that it came up. We’re just going forward to Council with the bag portion of the packaging ordinance revisions now, but by doing that, bags are getting a lot more attention. In San Francisco, they just passed a ban that applies to EPS packing materials, children toys, buoys, etc. He said he imagines other EPS foam products might be brought up when food packaging foam ban ordinance revisions are discussed in the future, so it may be a much bigger conversation than we thought it would be.
SWAC secretary Holly Griffith updated the committee on the status of the SWAC Committee letter. She noted the final round of edits ended 8-7, and she would be sending the letter to SPU today for the mandatory five day review period.

- **Committee member question:** Regarding single family recycling: The tonnage overall, recycling and disposed, continues to decrease. If Tim was here, he’d reference behavior changes as a result of the recession. Single family went down another 1.3%. Single family wouldn’t be impacted by the transfer station being closed, so what gives?
- **Answer (Hans):** Newspaper has dropped significantly over the last decade with declining circulation. Yard waste, we continue to push grass cycling to reduce yard waste tons.
- **Committee member question:** But garbage decreased by 12%?
- **Answer (Hans):** Most of the recent garbage decreases have been food waste diversion.
- **Answer (Sego):** Also, Flexible packaging. New packaging is lighter. I haven’t seen anyone measure the differences, but the packaging has changed substantially in the last several years. It’s lighter, not recyclable, and replacing other stuff. That’s got to have some impact
- **Answer (Ken):** We’re also seeing huge growth in waste prevention.
- **Committee member question:** Talk a little bit more about the self-haul sector; how we’re going to target that sector to increase use?
- **Answer (Ken):** In 2015 we ran a pilot to see what it looks like to have a dedicated staff member pull high valuable materials from the waste stream out. We’re going to look at that again. We’ve also asked the economist to look at high-value metals. Metal doesn’t show up in commercial, but it does show up in self-hauls. I think it’s potentially significant, the impacts. Our plan is essentially to dedicate staff member to pull valuable materials things out, and work harder to divert more at the stations.
- **Committee member question:** So the transfer station will have recycling available there?
- **Answer (Ken):** One of the goals at the north transfer is to have recycling, and at the south station to have more room to have recycling take place. North transfer will have a reuse space, which may capture more of that self-haul stuff
- **Committee member question:** Transcreated signage: Is that something you have done already or are planning to do?
- **Answer (Hans):** I would say effective transcreated material is a spectrum. We’ve made progress and will continue to improve.
- **Committee member question:** That will be edited in the letter.

Chris Toman, SWAC Chair, solicited feedback from the committee on the SWAC Letter process:

- **Committee member question:** There’s not a good lineup with report and us writing the letter. We’re well into the letter by the time the report came out. Don’t know how to solve it without meeting in July.
- **Committee member question:** Did you feel like the messaging changed once Tim shared the report?
- **Committee member question:** I don’t think it did, but the question would be: what if it did? Without a meeting would we be able to change focus?
Committee member question: We went through that in 2015. It’s also a difficult, busier time of year. I know I experienced that; I did read it but you did not get a lot of edits from me.

Committee member question: I like the google doc editing process, but it’s harder to bring up issues that require further discussion.

Committee member question: You end up reviewing less critically because it is harder to flush out those edits.

Committee member question: It may be easier to send out an email with the report to ask if there are any big changes.

Committee member question: This was something new we did this year b/c the last few years we received feedback from SWAC that there wasn’t enough time to ask clarifying questions. It would be nice to be able to ask those questions earlier. This was the first year we pushed for a preview summary in advance. Now that we know we can get those topline messages in advance, we should push for that. You guys are preparing the slide decks in advance of the report, right? We could be having those conversations sooner.

Committee member question: This year we didn’t send it in for Council; did you think that was a missed opportunity?

Answer (Hans): If I were you, I would do that.

Committee consensus: Start letter drafting in April or May in future years.

3. **Clean City / Litter Pilot Program Overview**

   Aurora Mendoza, Clean City Program Manager, provided an overview of the Clean City Programs. Clean City is a portfolio of programs that are an extension of the traditional solid waste program. The goal of the programs are to ensure that litter nuisances are resolved. She gave a brief review the programs:

   - **Illegal Dumping**: Performance metrics is 90% of all reported graffiti is addressed; we exceed that.
   - **Anti-Graffiti**: Education, Graffiti rangers, Enforcement, Business Improvement Areas (BIAs), supplemental funding for managing graffiti and litter.
   - **Litter**: Adopt-a-street, Street Side Litter, Public Place recycling.
   - **Community Clean-up**:
     - Spring Clean (Chinatown, ID district in October).
     - Special Assist for bulky items.
   - **Garbage Collection Service at Unauthorized Homeless Encampments Pilot**: Outreach, support, response to reports on public property, and addressing litter/hazardous materials.

   Aurora went into further detail on the Garbage Collection Service at the Unauthorized Homeless Encampment pilot, part of a partnership with the City of Seattle’s Finance & Administration Services (FAS) team to identify locations in the City with campers. The pilot provides green bags to the encampments and works with outreach consultant to provide support services. They objective was to put green and black disposal bags at a specified area.

   - Aurora noted that the program had not been working well, but they would be continuing to work on it. Mid-July was a major cleanup at King/Jackson, with concerted efforts between
multiple departments and the State. They are continuing to patrol the area to ensure campers don’t return, and keep the trash clear.

- The following pilots have been closed: King Street, Jackson, Dearborn, and Airport Way.
- They are beginning pilots in the following areas: 15th and Emerson, 1st and Spokane, Royal Brougham Way.

  - Committee member question: The old sites, you mentioned it was sort of successful, maybe not. Do you have a verdict? And with the new sites, are you testing the pilot? What was the decision to switch locations?
  - Answer: We were not getting the green and black bags we asked for. So we decided to try other areas. 15th and Emerson we are hopeful that the campers participate in the program. It’s mostly women, and they applied to have garbage services in the area. Our outreach folks visited, and we felt it was worth a shot to test it in other areas.
  - Answer (Ken): I think it’s interesting, the Emerson encampment. It’s clean, neat, very well organized. It illustrates what can be done in an encampment. The residents take pride in their area and asked for the support. Looking at their area compared to other areas, it’s clear they care.

  - Committee member question: Do we know why it didn’t work in the initial sites?
  - Answer (Ken): We have a number of suspicions. For example, King and Jackson is very transient. In that area, there’s a very high instance of mental illness. They may not be able to make those life decisions for themselves. It’s a contributing factor to their homelessness.

  - Committee member question: I think Tim originally said there was a $10k budget and they were just going to do the program until it runs out?
  - Answer: Initially it was $10k, but we felt there was enough justification to provide services in other areas and also because we didn’t learn enough. We’re learning as we’re doing. We think 15th and Emerson is going to be a success. They’re participatory and eager. It’s worth keeping the pilot going. I think we have more than the $10k into the program; I believe it was a number suggested initially but there have been a lot of conversations upping that. If you watch the Council video, they were very supportive of the effort continuing.
  - Answer (Ken): I would just add that there was an initial estimate of $10k, not knowing what it would take. We figured we’d start there. We went beyond that number recently, but we do have more money in the program to expand that work. It’s a very popular program by some of the Electeds, so we decided to look at other areas. There’s a new area by Myers Way, where there are less transient campers. We think it could be successful in that area because 1) It had a lot of support from Electeds and 2) We thought it would have success in other areas.
  - Answer: If we don’t pick up the litter, it becomes a safety issue because the garbage runs through the street, which we have to clean up either way.

  - Committee member question: Initially we discussed Bags, dumpsters and a mix of the two. Has there been a thought of approaching it from a different angle than the bags?
  - Answer (Ken): Yes, we did think about it and it did get a lot of support.
Committee member question: When we first discussed, we talked about incentives for the residents. We should talk about the nature of the outreach and incentives for resident representatives to entice them to organize themselves.

Answer: At Airport Way and Royal Brougham Way, we had these conversations. At first, they said they were willing to organize and pick up after themselves and asked for additional services including cleaning up brush. A week later, it was still disorganized.

Aurora then briefed committee members on the 2016 Litter Pilot, which has identified 3 neighborhoods: Chinatown ID, Little Saigon, and Ballard. The pilot will focus on litter clean up at these sites, pressure washing and as needed services. There are other ideas including expanding a community cleanup day in October that had been discussed but not finalized. Others are increasing outreach with business owners in these areas. Aurora said she is hoping for a sustainable and successful program that addresses litter, and one that complements existing work with Business Improvement Areas (BIAs) as well as work happening in Clean City program, such as Spring Cleaning. She said she also hopes to look at the pilots in these areas and gather lessons learned to be applied to current programs.

Staff question: Can you say more about pressure washing?

Answer: We are working with DWW and Water folks to coordinate pressure washing to make sure it goes in the right system. For King and Jackson, we have approval. The pilot is just getting underway; it started on 7/25.

Committee member question: How are you identifying issues that contribute to litter problems?

Answer (Ken): We have some ideas around that already. One that is relatively new is the homeless problem. The litter cans, unfortunately, become a source of food for the homeless population which results in litter. We have noticed businesses and some of the apartment residents using the litter cans for their trash. We’re working with community partners to address these issues. Another one: Alleyways with grease traps. If you have smelt those before, you know that can be an issue. I did a walk and saw a restaurant with a sign that said “the smell is not from us”. We don’t want customers to assume the restaurant is unclean.

Committee member question: So this is a pilot program. What’s the current status for how SPU deploys resources to deal with litter? How are those sites picked?

Answer (Ken): The Mayor decided to focus on the International District (ID) and Ballard. They were picked for us. We decided to expand to Saigon. Aurora mentioned the BIAs; the ID has one so they have services they provide themselves (clean-up, graffiti removal), so we’re working in concert with them so we’re not duplicating their services. We hope to glean information from that pilot work and scale to fit other communities. The work in the ID is going to look quite different than Ballard. Ballard, for example is lots of shopping carts, where in the ID its lots of litter / trash.

Committee member question: We have an illegal dumping program which touches on Mount Baker, but this litter program is a first. Adopt a Street existed, but it explains why my neighborhood (Mount Baker) isn’t seeing much attention.

Answer: We’re partnering with BIAs and Metropolitan Improvement Districts (MIDs) to learn from their models and apply to the Chinatown pilot.

Answer (Ken): With MIDs, business owners help fund cleaning in the area. Their area is a bit more robust; whereas other areas may not be as robust.
Committee member comment: I live by the Rainier corridor, where businesses aren’t necessarily looking for foot traffic because they have lots of parking. Maybe a clean sidewalk wouldn’t have as much of a financial incentive as somewhere in Ballard. But they’re still very close to residential folks, so addressing litter issues would be nice.

4. SPU Solid Waste Rate Plan: Vas Duggirala, Principal Economist
Vas Duggirala, Principal Economist, gave an overview of the SPU Solid Waste Rate Plan presentation given to City Council the week before. The presentation covered:
- The history of SPU’s Strategic Business Plan (SBP), and SPU’s commitment to the target rate proposal average annual increase
- The 2017-2019 rate proposals
- Changes since the 2014 SBP that have impacted (both decreased and increased) rates
- Provided proposed typical bill impacts and rate billing considerations
  - Committee member question: Why are the rates presented lower than the 7% rate proposal?
  - Answer: The rate is effective April 1st. This is an annual bill. The rate increase only applies to the last ¾ of the year.
  - Committee member question: Why is the overall rate different?
  - Answer: Some rates are not changing; this overall rate is blended.
- Vas reviewed the Solid Waste customer sectors to provide context for the Solid Waste Transfer station improvements and new stations. He explained that since 2011, the transfer stations construction was the primary motivator behind the rate increases. The rate increase will pay for the remainder of CIP. He said he anticipated self-haul doubling in the next few years, because north transfer station will be opening.
  - Committee member question: Why would they make plans for something that was triple what they had budgeted?
  - Answer: When they originally did this SBP, it was just to cap the site. I think there was nothing more than covering it in concrete
  - Committee member question: What is the plan now?
    - Answer: That would be a question for Ken (Ken had left at this point)
  - Committee member question: Are any of those revenue generating?
  - Answer: The re-use facility is supposed to be revenue neutral. We can find out.
  - Staff question: So City Utility tax, that’s what we pay the general fund?
  - Answer: Yes
  - Committee member question: Question about rate structure; as we saw at first graph. Garbage is staying steady but others are increasing. Is that sustainable? Are there alternatives being discussed? I feel like this question was asked when you presented to us last year?
    - Answer: I feel like a lot of the low hanging fruit have been picked. Final goal is to get to 70%. Any revenue lost from folks downsizing their garbage cans has already happened.
Committee member question: It makes sense; you don’t want to discourage recycling. But if you overcharge for waste, people will start recycling more.

Committee member question: There’s a threshold where folks might start putting garbage in their recycling. I think San Francisco has a program where they charge a nominal fee for recycling.

Committee member question: The broader question of if this rate structure is sustainable in the long-term is a good one.

Committee member question: I would be interested in bringing someone in to discuss this.

Committee member comment: Something that just occurred to me, while I was asking Hans about the rate tonnage decreasing, is that every year there is less single family homes so you trade residents with high diversion rates for residents with low diversion rates. It’s going to be a real challenge to get the diversion rate up.

Committee member question: It’s almost like a parallel to “Evolving Ton” presentation by Susan Robinson, the Federal Public Affairs Director for Waste Management. We are having an equivalent conversation around demographics and financing of solid waste programs and measurement. Some way to wrap all that up into a discussion for a future meeting?

Answer: I think we could bring someone from Economic Services. I’ll find someone who can follow up on that stuff.

Committee member comment: It’s a challenge long-term if we continue trying to drive recycling rates up but we’re losing the folks who are doing the highest diversion

Committee member question: Has there been any reaction to a 7% rate increase?

Answer: If we had proposed it ourselves, I think there would be. But most is from the UDP and tax increase.

Committee member comment: it’s all in the messaging. I’ll be interested to see how it’s messaged. There’s nuances in the fiscal year vs blended rates, etc.

Answer: The day we went to Council, there was more interesting controversial items on their agenda so the rate increase did not get much attention. Previously had 20 minutes, but got squeezed in at the end. I think because the two programs that drove the increase are programs they’re already familiar with Part of the reason for doing the Strategic Business Plan (SBP) was make the rate proposals easier to go through, since Council already knows what’s going on.

5. Around the Table

Committee chair Chris Toman solicited interesting updates and events from the committee.

- Ben’s daughter was born; Her name is Vivienne.
- As of Aug 12, Chris Toman is no longer at UW. He accepted a position at Amazon on a new sustainability team: the Global waste minimization team. This team has only existed for 15 months. Also, Chris’ wife is pregnant and due in December.
- Heather is doing a lot of interesting work around the topic of compostable food service packaging and organics contamination reduction working group. Might be fun to provide an
update on that work in the future. She is having the opportunity to work with a number of different stakeholders on this topic and would love to share. Sometime this fall, maybe October meeting.

- Chris Toman provided an update on a SWAC field trip that is being proposed for fall, likely October. It would involve looking at onsite food/organics systems. The committee would be visiting a Wiser unit facility, as well as a brewery that’s part of a different system. The Wiser system is in Redmond. The idea of the field trip is to see the processing plant, and the brewery is in Freemont. There is still the future possibility of a tour of the north transfer station but until it is fully open, we can’t plan that.

- Sego provided a brief update Bag Ban, and noted he would be following up with a more detailed update at the September SWAC meeting. He noted that the brief update to the Council in July attracted a lot of attention. King 5 picked up on it, and Sego was interviewed. He noted that they somehow thought SPU was doing a campaign to keep re-usable bags cleaned. KIRO also called on this topic. He also noted that he has been receiving communication from Councilmembers inquiring about research on paper bag use, and that in California there is a referendum for a State bag ban, which should be in the news soon. He said to expect mounting attention on the topic going into fall.

  - **Committee question:** Where did the dirty bag complaint first originate from?
  - **Answer:** There have been some complaints about it from organizations that don’t particularly like reusable bags when jurisdictions are considering bag bans. But I heard from one retailer organization recently that have some retail store checkers are concerned about how dirty some of the bags are that are coming through. So this is easy for us to help address. The bags really should be cleaned after some number of uses or when there is an obvious problem, like a leaking food package. The reporter who I spoke to today said he hadn’t washed his bag in 9 years.

- Sheryl Shapiro, Program Coordinator, provided a few key committee updates:

  - The next All-CAC meeting has been confirmed for September 28; calendar invites were distributed.
  - The SPU Community Advisory Committees Charter was signed by Ray before leaving, as well as all Division Directors.
  - Sheryl will be distributing the new Member Agreement to the September meeting, to collect signatures.
  - Sheryl is hoping to have RSJ resources available in September.
  - Sheryl said she would query again about Orca card interest for transportation to meeting
  - Committee member names have been submitted to Council/Mayor for the new Customer Review Panel (CRP). She said we will be hearing soon about who was selected to serve on CRP for the strategic business plan.

*Adjourned 7:26PM*