

Montgomery County Integrated Solid Waste System
Strategic Plan Task Force
July 18, 2018
6th floor EOB

Called to order at 5:10 pm by Chairman Chaz Miller.

Roll call:

Attending in person: Chaz Miller, Lauren Greenberger, Keith Levchenko, Sara Bixby, and Marilu Enciso

Attending via conference call: Caroline Taylor, Peter Ettinger, and Ken Lavish

Guests: Chris Skaggs, Kitty McIlroy, and Mike Ewall

#1. The minutes of the July 5, 2018 were approved

#2. Sara Bixby volunteer to be the Secretary for the meeting

#3. Discuss Stakeholders: The group again discussed the role of stakeholders in the process and it was reiterated as including those who would be notified of meetings and with a stake in the outcome of the Plan. Some additional names and groups were proposed to be added and C. Miller said they should be sent to M. Enciso to be added to the list and distributed.

The stakeholder list has 300 plus names at this point. K. Levchenko noted that the correspondence should be sent more than just the County Council President, as it may not be distributed to everyone after that. L. Greenberger asked if all schools should be contacted but M. Enciso responded that just contacting the school coordinator(s) on sustainability would be enough since they represent entire districts. S. Bixby added that she would add the SWAC contact.

#4. Stakeholders, Citizens and Expert Engagement Plan: C. Miller asked if anyone knew of other, similar baseline or stakeholder surveys?

- C. Taylor's group (Montgomery Countryside Alliance) is doing a stakeholder survey of three questions to about 10,000 boosters within the County. The Countryside survey will be sent by the end of the week with a clear closing date and be clearly identified as being something other than the Task Force survey, which the Montgomery Countryside Alliance will also distribute to their stakeholders if allowed.
- K. Levchenko said the Office of Legislative Oversight will be looking at trash and hauling issues in the Subdistricts A and B of the County and would be surveying on costs and operating issues. Willie Wainer is aware of this survey and the information gathered will be shared and is useful to the overall study.

For the TF/County survey, it was asked if multiple choice is a good metric to measure feedback. It was mentioned that survey would be sent through email, be online, social media, and be referenced at community meetings.

Input on time and location of community meetings: There will be two sets of public meetings. Members agreed the first set should be held at regional service centers in Bethesda and Germantown, probably in September (scheduled near an HDR deliverable and to avoid vacations, as much as possible), and in the evening (7 – 9 p.m.). The second set is likely to be held early in 2019 and was also recommended to use regional service centers, with at least one meeting held in the eastern part of the County.

#5: HDR scope task 4 branding. Miller said specific ideas for logos and catchphrases (taglines) are expected next week. There was discussion about the purpose of branding as a means of identifying the project and the need to understand the core purpose of the project in order to successfully brand it. M. Enciso will forward the two finalists options for logos and branding by the end of the next week. The idea is each Task Force members will pick a favorite. After receiving that input, the County will make the decision.

#6: Improvements to current system – Task 5

Goals: Task force members discussed their individual expectations for the project, as a means of helping to identify goals for its outcomes. Answers ranged from zero burn/zero landfill to lowest carbon footprint to sustainable materials management that also looks at transportation, GHG effects, and financial performance as well as environmental protection. C. Taylor referenced (and later sent) the US Conference of Mayors resolution on zero waste. Others referenced EPA's SMM goals. K. Levchenko spoke about the need to avoid creating impossible goals, that will turn into impossible, unfunded mandates. The County's goal of 80% reduction of carbon emissions was also brought up as an example of an ambitious goal that may or may not be possible to achieve (and how this goal better aligns with the SMM framework in terms of reducing overall footprint).

M. Enciso asked the task force members if there are any other options related to reduce, reuse, recycle, or recover describe in pages 16 to 21 of the proposal that HDR should add to the current list, or if is there any that the Task Force considers should not be considered. After a discussion no, additional programs were added or deleted.

It was agreed that overall the Task Force and the County should be requesting a framework/plan from HDR that it is progressive but also can afford to implement. For Task 5 it was discussed to look at other programs and see what has worked well and what hasn't. It was noted that the benchmarking is due in September and that it will direct the County to move forward and be able to choose options with better context.

L. Greenberg identified (and later provided) emissions measures related to air and water pollution, which she proposes as evaluation factors (HDR task 5). S. Bixby said she wanted the report to provide discussion around reduction and the policy efforts (e.g., Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), manufacturing standards) that would result in less waste generation and thus less need for management at the County level.

C. Miller established an expectation to receive “real performance data” for the benchmark communities identified earlier by the Task Force. He also spoke about seeking the lowest environmental footprint, which may not always be recycling

The group also clarified that discussions of “what’s left” focus on the waste stream after all other efforts, which is covered in Task 8.

#7: Recycling presentation. M. Enciso explained that the presentation will be an on-demand webinar by County staff. The production is currently being edited but should be available in the coming week.

#8: Date for next meeting: Decided to wait until closer to the public meetings (Sept. 11 to Sept. 13) and when we have a specific Task 2 delivery date from HDR to set the meeting date. C. Miller proposed arranging some webinars on a variety of industry topics to help “educate ourselves” in the meantime.

#9: Public comment. Skaggs explained the “What’s Left” task as HDR being charged with developing options for collection and disposal of materials that are left despite of the efforts.

Adjourned 6:43 p.m.

Recording, Sara Bixby