

Montgomery County
Integrated Waste System Strategic Plan Task Force¹
Conference Call Meeting Notes
May 8, 2019

Attending: Chaz Miller (phone), Lauren Greenberger (phone), Ken Lavish (phone), Keith Levchenko, Sara Bixby, Robin Wiener (phone)

Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)- Division of Solid Waste Services (SWS): Patty Bubar, Marilu Enciso, Willie Wainer

- Montgomery County Staff
 - Adriana Hochberg, County Executive Office (phone)
- Sierra Club: Amy Maron (phone)
- Mike Ewall, Energy Justice Network (phone)
- Lillian Cruz, Staff Council member Gabriel Albornoz
- Speaker: Christine Roarke, HDR (phone)

1. Called to order by Chairman Miller at 5:30 p.m.

Miller amended the agenda to allow Roarke to speak first.

2. Project update from HDR with estimated timeline for remaining tasks and discussion of status of Task Force priorities as voted upon in the March 28 meeting

Roarke reported verbally by phone about HDR's April 23rd meeting with DEP staff to review Task 5 recommendations from the Task Force. She said that most of the Task Force's short listed options were accepted with a few modifications added or clarified based on staff input:

- For multi-family, the process would be expanded to also work with Parks and Planning to collaborate on design guidelines since they are currently in charge of it.
- Revise wording of changes to yard trim collection to include the word "seasonal."
- Remove "special events," since this is already being addressed by the state (County is complying)
- Adding clear and different color bags into the list for evaluating curbside collections and tip floor handling
- A visible retail fee for plastic water bottles
- Ban on all #6 plastics
- Consider promoting TerraCycle's user-mailback programs for select residential recyclables

¹ May 30, 2018 Memorandum from Isiah Leggett, County Executive, to Hans Riemer, President, Montgomery County Council

Related to *PAYT collection*, the discussion reflected the use of a standard trash container for excess trash and review potential concerns from lower-income families.

Food waste collection prioritized the commercial sector and schools.

Staff acknowledged the need for County-controlled collection in both subdistricts (A & B), so programs could be standardized as the new collection approaches (PAYT, food) are added.

[Due to a poor signal, the call was switched from the County's call-in line to HDR's line]

Roarke said, related to expanded County collection services in Subdistrict B, that she understood the County was doing a study on this approach. Levchenko said it was a study being conducted by the Office of Legislative Oversight, that it had begun approximately six weeks prior and would continue another two months. The study is reviewing collection practices in the two subdistricts and considering collection approaches, including County collection and contracted hauling. This study is independent of the HDR work, though team members are aware of the ongoing project.

Roarke said some approaches to recycling and food waste collection work only if the County has a new MRF. There is no room in the current operation.

This also affected Construction & Demolition (C&D) materials, for which the County will need to revisit tip fees, revise ordinances, and/or develop a processing facility.

HDR's next steps are to deliver the draft Task 8 report to the County in the week of May 13 and then to begin on Task 9.

Discussion – Bixby noted the inconsistency between Roarke's comment in her presentation that the current MRF was "woefully undersized" while the HDR executive summary to the Task 8 report did not say that. Miller said it would be accurate to call the MRF obsolete.

Roarke replied that the MRF equipment is old; that the manufacturer is out of business; and that the current MRF building and layout are lacking. She said HDR will proceed from the premise that the MRF is no longer in the current building at Shady Grove.

Roarke said the upcoming task would also consider alternative technologies such as mixed waste processing and gasification.

Q - Wiener asked to clarify what was meant by "mixed waste processing." A- Roarke said it would be like a dirty MRF that handles recyclables and some organics to make a refuse-derived fuel. Wiener clarified that mixed waste processing is an approach that further refines material separation in a plant, rather than changing collection approaches.

Timing: It is likely to be the end of June before County staff sees a draft report for Task 9 (the "what to do with what's left" section). A draft Master Plan is scheduled to be delivered by the end of August with the approach to taking public input to be determined thereafter. It's not clear if that would happen before or after the draft went to the County Council. As there has been a

relatively small turnout for public meetings, it is possible the input could be solicited via an online meeting.

Miller said to summarize the final Task 8 report is expected to the Task Force in May with the draft Task 9 to staff by the end of June.

Q – Greenberger asked to clarify what development of the implementation plan means? Roarke said it is the section in which HDR looks at the sequencing of options, what steps in what order, and the potential effects on the waste stream over the next ten years or so.

3. Approve minutes from the March 28 meeting.

No comments or corrections were received. Lavish moved and Miller seconded to approve the minutes from the March 28 meeting. It was carried unanimously.

4. Revisited

Miller asked Task Force members if they were satisfied with the report from Roarke. Greenberger asked for a clarification on the multi-family collection/recovery comment and why Parks and Planning would be involved as well as DEP/Solid Waste. Wainer is to follow up with an explanation.

5. Task Force meetings through Labor Day

Miller said we need to look at additional meetings in light of a Task 9 draft expected at the end of June.

Peter Ettinger was asked to arrange a presentation on anaerobic digestion, potentially from Patrick Serfoss, and on the Prince Georges County composting operation.

Lauren Greenberger is working to invite Jeffrey Morris to do a presentation on GHG implications between landfills and WTE. This may be a point-counterpoint discussion with someone also presenting about the value of the EPA-used WARM model.

Levchenko asked about Task 8, when it would be available to the Task Force and when it would be discussed. There was discussion about holding a meeting at 5:30 p.m. May 29 to review Task 8, if the report is out by then. Wiener is not available.

The June 12th meeting will be either the GHG modelling discussion or the aerobic/anaerobic digestion presentation.

6. Public Comment

None.

7. Call adjourned by Miller at 6:11 p.m.