

Local Hazardous Waste Management Program
Final Approved Management Coordination Committee Meeting Minutes
June 21, 2016
6th Floor King/Chinook Conference Rooms, King Street Center, Seattle, WA
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Attendees:

MCC:

Joan Lee, KCWLRD, MCC Chair

Hank Myers, SCA, City of Redmond, MCC Vice-Chair

Tim Croll, SPU

Jeff Gaisford, KCSWD

Darrell Rodgers, PHSKC

Michell Mouton, LHWMP

Vicky Beaumont, LHWMP

Lauren Cole, KCSWD

Ashley Pederson, KCWLD

Mendy Droke, KCSWD

Taylor Watson, KCWLRD

Linda Van Hooser, PHSKC

Doreen Booth, SCA

Charles Wu, KCWLRD

Aurora Mendoza, SPU

Linda Knight, SCA, City of Renton

Other Attendees:

Lynda Ransley, LHWMP

Ryan Kellogg, LHWMP

Maureen Weisser, LHWMP

Liz Tennant, LHWMP

GENERAL BUSINESS

MCC Minutes

MCC reviewed and approved the May 17, 2016 minutes, with no revisions.

Announcements and Public Comments: None

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Project Overview: Information and Marketing

Michell provided an overview of the Information and Marketing Project, including the LHWMP Strategic Communications Plan. She reported that the Information and Marketing team is focusing on branding, accessibility and growing LHWMP's audience base. Work will be completed in phases over the next five years, and be guided by the Program's recently completed strategic communications plan. The plan will: 1) serve as a key communications resource to support all LHWMP staff and agency partners in the execution of the program's strategic mission, visions and goals, 2) provide a roadmap to improve and coordinate all Program communications over the next five years, and 3) advance program wide and project specific goals.

The plan is designed to:

- directly support the Program's strategic goals,
- better connect communication initiatives with rate payers,
- link strategies with a return on investment, and
- build value in the Program among rate payers, agency partners, and other stakeholders.

The plan will be reviewed and revised each year, to ensure that it remains relevant.

DISCUSSION

- Councilmember Myers inquired about access to technical information. Michell described the range of available sources including online information, social media platforms, customer service lines as well as awareness campaigns.

- Tim asked Michell about her perspective on branding. Michell commented that branding can be important in building trust in the messenger. The brand has to be understandable, accessible, and available.
- Joan asked about how LHWMP's previous communications strategies might be incorporated. Michell commented that LHWMP's partner and community relationships are one of its greatest assets, and can be leveraged in messaging, broadening audience connections and implementing programs.
- Jeff asked about audience research to identify who isn't using our program, to broaden our customer base. Michell mentioned the residential research currently underway, which Kristin Pace is leading.
- Councilmember Myers asked if LHWMP would be linking our website to others who are involved in similar work. Michell said yes, and that we will be working to further enhance our website.
- Lynda mentioned that Michell is also working to improve the Program's internal and stakeholder communications.
- Darrell asked if we participated in the recent Cascade exercise. Michell said no, but the Strategic Plan includes crisis communications, and that Liz has also been working on emergency management and planning for disaster debris.

Hazardous Waste Vendor Issue – LHWMP Management of Mercury-Containing Lights

MCC decided to remove this item from the agenda.

Agency Use of Staff for Non Work Plan Requests

Lynda presented the information, examples, and recommendations developed in response to MCC's request – related to managing agency staff requests that fall outside of the LHWMP work plan. The proposal included a proposed policy, which was developed with Core Team and the Director's Office staff based on MCC input from their March meeting.

DISCUSSION

- Darrell said that he felt the materials captured the key issues, and asked who was involved in development of the proposal. Lynda explained that the proposal incorporated MCC input to-date, and was developed in conjunction with the Core Team. Darrell proposed a work group be formed to include other agency participants.
- Tim didn't think a work group was necessary, as both Core Team and MCC are already structured to reflect agency perspectives.
- Joan expressed understanding for Darrell's concern and suggests we adopt the policy, implement it, and bring it back for later discussion if needed.
- Tim agrees with the language that obligates agencies to provide equivalent backfill.
- Darrell would like the policy to have more flexibility.
- Councilmember Myers agrees that increased structure is helpful, and supports adopting the policy today, with future review. He wants to make sure the Program's work plan gets done.
- Joan wants to make sure we support development opportunities for staff. Lynda noted how the policy allows for this, and doesn't interfere with promotional opportunities, professional development, or special duty assignments.
- Tim suggested adding "except for requests under section III" as a clarification to section II.A.2.

- Lynda noted that the policy aligns with how the Program currently manages work plan adjustments. She also noted that the policy will help clarify staff commitments in future service agreements – ensuring projects have the necessary capacity to complete work, and increasing accountability for staff costs.
- Darrell asked if the “de minimis” threshold could be increased to 80 hours.
- Tim said that he could agree to 80 hours, if there were no other adjustments.
- Darrell said that he thought 80 hours was reasonable, and that he could support it. He would like to check back after a trial period.
- Lynda emphasized successful implementation will require transparency, documentation, and manager support - which rests with Core Team members, supervisors and managers – and the need to support those managers when requests have reached the identified limit, and future requests are denied.
- Joan added that the policy is not intended to increase these types of requests.
- Jeff expressed concern that the policy not encourage more of these types of requests. He agrees that increased transparency will be good.
- Joan felt the policy will help the Program avoid spending funds on non-LHWMP work – for which we are accountable.
- Darrell said that it would be helpful to have more clarity about the LHWMP domain. Lynda responded that LHWMP’s domain is governed by RCW, Board of Health code, and case law related to rate-funded programs. More information could be presented at a future MCC meeting.

DECISION

- MCC approved the policy with the following revisions: 1) increase the “de minimis” limit to 80 hours, 2) clarify that positions described in II.A.2 are not precluded from de minimis assignments, and 3) an intention to review how it is working after 6-12 months of implementation.
- Joan thanked Lynda and the Core team for their hard work. She also asked that the final policy be shared with a cover memo to agency managers. Lynda asked MCC members to help support their Core Team managers and supervisors in implementing this policy.

UPDATES

Policy Update

Ashley Pedersen provided an update on the Toxic Substances Control Act (“TSCA”). TSCA was enacted in 1976. It is estimated there are over 85,000 chemicals on the market available for use, and EPA has used TSCA to restrict only 5 chemicals. TSCA is considered a weak law – for example, in 1989 EPA used TSCA to ban asbestos, only to be overturned by the courts in 1991. So, while asbestos is illegal in more than 50 countries, the US is not among them. Many advocates have called for the overhaul of TSCA.

This spring reform legislation for TSCA passed the House and Senate and is headed for Obama’s signature. This legislation was able to move forward based on a compromise struck between the chemical industry and environmental and health advocates. The industry wanted certainty regarding uniform national regulations, rather than piecemeal legislative landscape due to state’s passing their own legislation. Environmental and health groups wanted EPA to have more power (i.e., fix the asbestos problem).

There are some good aspects of the bill, such as it adds protection of vulnerable populations, it increases the ability of EPA to fund the risk assessments, and it limits manufacturers’ abilities to claim confidential business information. However, the area of most concern to States and local governments is the preemption provisions. Ashley handed out a flowchart which showed how preemption will work under the new TSCA

and discussed when EPA's decisions on a particular chemical would preempt local and state regulations on the same chemical.

DISCUSSION

- Councilmember Myers asked about the waiver provision in the preemption flow chart. Ashley explained that if there is exceptional reason why Washington State believes a chemical should be regulated differently within its borders, the State could apply for a waiver from the EPA's decision.
- Jeff asked whether we should focus our efforts on chemicals that EPA is not reviewing under TSCA. Ashley stated that she spoke with the Department of Ecology; they said they are not anticipating many changes to their work.
- Joan asked about whether existing laws would be affected. Ashley stated that everything prior to April 22, 2016, is grandfathered in and not preempted.

Secure Medicine Return Implementation

The operational date for SMR was last Thursday, June 16; however, the stewardship organization does not yet have collection boxes in place. Taylor is in regular communication with representative of KC Meds to develop a timeline with specific implementation milestones needed to achieve compliance with BOH rules.

DISCUSSION

- Tim commented that it would be good for compliance milestones that tie the number of installed boxes with specific dates. He also recommended some level of assistance to other counties interested with implementing similar programs – to support a strong statewide program if/when that is a possibility.
- Joan asked if the next MCC update could include what we know about activities in other counties.
- Mendy mentioned the possibility of a state-wide pharmaceutical bill. She is meeting with a potential bill sponsor to find out more.
- Jeff asked if residents can find information for services on the website. Ryan responded that the website will be updated as soon as we have more details on planned and available collection sites.

Director's Report and MCC Look-Ahead Calendar

Lynda provided a written report and highlighted items of note, including implementation of recent Line of Business changes. Darrell commented about the need for project managers to work closely and collaboratively with supervisors to identify and address issues in a matrix environment.

Success story: The June success story celebrated Jeff's 20 years of membership on the MCC, and all that he's done for the Program over the past two decades.

Calendar: MCC members agreed to not meet in July and August. Joan suggested that MCC plan to have a fall retreat.

Next Meeting: September 20, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon, 6th Floor King/Chinook Conference Rooms, King Street Center, Seattle, WA.