

Carolyn Edmonds, *Board of Health Chair*

BOH Members:

Richard Conlin
Dow Constantine
George W. Counts
Jan Drago
Carolyn Edmonds
Ava Frisinger
Larry Gossett
David Hutchinson
David Irons
Kathy Lambert
Frank T. Manning
Bud Nicola
Margaret Pageler
Alonzo Plough

BOH Staff:

Maggie Moran

**KING COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH
MEETING PROCEEDINGS**

**June 15, 2001
9:30 AM to 12:00 PM
King County Council Chambers**

Roll call

- Richard Conlin
- David Irons
- Greg Nickels
- Joseph Pizzorno
- Kent Pullen
- Dan Sherman
- Les Thomas
- Alvin Thompson
- Karen Van Dusen
- Anita Geving for Alonzo Plough

Call to order

Chair Greg Nickels called the meeting to order at 9:37 AM.

Announcement of Alternates

Chair Nickels indicated that Anita Geving, Chief Operating Officer of the Health Department, would be sitting in for Dr. Plough.

Adoption of the Minutes

Chair Nickels noted that a quorum had been achieved and called for a motion to adopt the minutes of the May 18th meeting. Minutes were moved and seconded. Chair Nickels called for additions and corrections to the meeting minutes. There were none. The minutes were approved without correction.

Chair Nickels commenced the Chair's Report with Board correspondence. He directed Board member's attention to a copy of an e-mail, from Dr. Ward Hines to staff, regarding the planned local board of health workshop scheduled for October 25th and 26th in SeaTac. Chair Nickels indicated that staff would forward additional details about the workshop as it became available.

Chair Nickels also directed the Board's attention to an e-mail Chair Nickels had received from SKCAC Industries, (South King County Activities Council) in regards to a Mr. Tom Richardson and his son.

Chair Nickels also noted that there were copies of two letters from the Board in the board packets. One letter was directed to David Matteson regarding the Board's support of the relationship centered caring forum and the second letter to members of the State Senate from King County in regards to public health funding.

Chair Nickels noted that the final piece of correspondence was from Board Member Conlin and included excerpts from the City of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. Chair Nickels noted that this information was provided in light of the discussion about family planning. Chair Nickels thanked Board Member Conlin.

Future Agenda Items

Chair Nickels directed the Board's attention to the outline of agenda items for the next six months. He noted that staff would provide an overview of the priority setting process to be used in the development of the 2002 work plan at the July 20th meeting. He stated that part of the process included meetings between Ms. Moran and each Board Member, followed by interviews of external folks who were involved in public health issues.

Chair Nickels stated that there were a number of follow-up items that had been tentatively scheduled. Specifically, he noted that drug abuse as a public health issue vs. a public safety approach was scheduled for October, followed by an update on alcohol impact areas in November. In addition he noted that in December the Board would hear a panel presentation on the laws, regulations and decision making related to involuntary commitment. He emphasized that the assigned dates were dependent upon the availability of presenters.

Chair Nickels turned the agenda over to Anita Geving for the Director's Report.

Director's Report

Ms. Geving, indicated that there were a number of follow up items from the May meeting. She stated that staff would be responding to requests for information via separate correspondence.

Ms. Geving noted that the second agenda item under the Director's Report related to Chair Nickels' request that the Department provide the Board with information related to budget development for 2002, with particular focus on the Executive Office's budget direction and guidance. Ms. Geving introduced Kathy Uhlorn, Chief Financial Officer, who provided the budget process briefing.

Ms. Uhlorn commenced the briefing by stating that in early 2001 all King County Departments received information that indicated that the 2002 budget would be very difficult to balance. She directed the Board's attention to their board packets that contained copies of a series of communications from County Executive Sims.

Ms. Uhlorn reviewed the content of several documents. In the first document dated February 12th and addressed to King County Council Chair Pete von Reichbauer, County Executive Ron Sims informed the Council and King County staff of a projected \$36 million imbalance between ongoing revenues and ongoing basic expenditures in the year 2002. Additionally

the document stated that in subsequent years a \$20 million dollar deficit was projected. In this document Sims identified several reasons for the imbalance, most notably increases in criminal justice system costs, which increased 27% between 1998 and 2001.

Ms. Uhlorn stated that in the next document, dated February 13, 2001, County Executive Sims alerted King County staff of potential staff reductions and his desire to work with individuals and bargaining units to reduce the impacts on the King County workforce.

Ms. Uhlorn stated that in the document dated March 27, County Executive Sims provided additional information regarding the 2002 budget situation and also indicated that department consolidations were planned.

Ms. Uhlorn stated that in the document dated May 15, County Executive Sims notified County employees that the ordinance directing a reorganization had been transmitted to the King County Council. In this communication County Executive Sims listed 10 major changes the County would implement however he noted that those changes would not completely close the gap. Executive Sims, in this same communication, informed county employees that current expense would be reduced in agencies not involved in the reorganization. Ms. Uhlorn stated that Public Health had been notified of a \$1 million CX reduction for the 2002 budget.

Ms. Uhlorn stated that on June 14th Executive Sims communicated to King County employees that the first round of lay-off notices would be delivered to employees that same day. Executive Sims stated that most lay-offs would not be effective until the 31st of December.

Ms. Uhlorn indicated that Public Health was now in the process of developing the 2002 budget. She stated that they were again challenged by class comp settlements, increased benefit costs, lease costs, energy costs, and pharmaceutical costs and wellness CX reduction. She stated that the Department would be submitting the budget to the Executive July 11, and that the Executive would review Department budgets throughout the summer, with transmission of budgets to the Council in October. She added that she would brief the Board in October about the Department's 2002 budget.

Chair Nickels invited questions from the Board.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Van Dusen.

Board Member Karen Van Dusen referenced Ms. Uhlorn's mention of a \$1 million deficit or reduction that the Department had to deal with and that the budget was to be submitted by July 11. Ms. Van Dusen asked if Ms. Uhlorn could share with the Board what the Department was considering in that the Board would not meet again before the budget was submitted. Ms. Van Dusen noted that she was particularly interested in the policy implications of these decisions.

Ms. Uhlorn responded that they were still in the process of determining what the reductions would be. She stated that the CX reduction was \$1 million but the Department had a larger imbalance in the Public Health budget due to fees not keeping pace with inflationary costs or revenue projections not keeping pace with the costs of running the programs. Ms. Uhlorn stated that they had their challenges and that she did not have any policy decisions she could share with the Board at that time.

Chair Nickels asked Ms. Uhlorn to tell them more about the fees not keeping up with inflation.

Ms. Uhlorn responded that due to 695 legislation and action taken by the Board of Health, fees had not increased in last year's budget. She stated that this year they had experienced inflationary pressures against programs that were predominantly fee supported.

Chair Nickels indicated that he took issue with Ms. Uhlorn's statement because the Board had increased fees when 695 was passed. He further stated that when those dollars were restored, a couple of those fees were rolled back to reflect that, but not all of them. Given the restoration of dollars from the Legislature and the fee revenue provided by the Board after 695, he argued that the Department was made whole. Chair Nickels stated that the Department and the Executive had made other decisions to reduce current expense support for the Department that in fact had caused reduction in the services. He stated that he believed it was very important to be clear about what had taken place. He added that it was not because the fees hadn't kept up with inflation.

Ms. Uhlorn stated that the Department had been made whole in 2000 but for 2002 they faced challenges.

Chair Nickels concurred that there were challenges however he stated that it was important to accurately characterize the challenges. He further stated that if fees needed to be adjusted then the Department needed to bring their recommendation to the Board for consideration.

Chair Nickels indicated that the Board had been very aggressive and very responsible in their review of fees after 695.

Ms. Uhlorn stated that because of the Board's action the Department was able to keep programs whole in the year 2000 budget. Ms. Uhlorn thanked the Board for their actions in light of 695.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Pizzorno.

Board Member Joseph Pizzorno asked what percentage of the Department's budget came from County funds.

Ms. Uhlorn responded that approximately 8% came from the County.

Board Member Pizzorno stated that he was not aware of all the political issues. He indicated that they continued to look to the County to provide funding and that the County was providing a lot of services for the surrounding cities. Further it did not appear, at least not directly, that those surrounding cities were paying for services. He asked how they were going to resolve this. He added that they kept hitting against this time after time and the County was getting smaller and couldn't afford to fund those services.

Chair Nickels recollected that a number of years ago the Health Department had received funding from the Suburban Cities through contracts. He recalled that those contracts raised between \$3 and \$5 million dollars a year and created double figures worth of ill will. He stated that it was a system guaranteed to cause a great deal of conflict and that it had not worked well.

He further recalled that the cities and the County went to the Legislature together and the Legislature agreed to provide motor vehicle excess tax funding to replace local contributions.

The City of Seattle chose to continue to give general fund dollars. Chair Nickels stated that when Initiative 695 passed it took away the ongoing funding and put them in a position where they had to scramble year after year to try and fill the gap.

Chair Nickels stated that the issue raised by Board Member Pizzorno's was a very important one because the whole basis of that agreement and the personal health services provided within the Suburban Cities under that agreement no longer existed. He stated that they would have to talk about how to replace the funding on a long-term basis.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Sherman.

Board Member Dan Sherman: [statement made by Board Member Sherman was not picked up on audio tape]

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Alvin Thompson said that he recognized the significant impact of the criminal justice system on the budget and the involvement of health matters in the criminal justice system. He asked if there was any recommendation or advocacy envisioned to correct the imbalance.

Ms. Geving said that she thought there were a number of initiatives going on in the County that were aimed at trying to understand all the contributing factors to the criminal justice costs. She added that they were looking at ways to really reduce those costs to the extent that it was feasible. She went on to say that there were a substantial number of costs associated with the criminal justice system, including housing of inmates in jails, attorneys and other legal resources. She said that there was a strong sense that King County needed to manage and control those costs. She emphasized the impact to social service agencies by stating that every additional dollar that needed to be spent on criminal justice meant a reduction in potential dollars to the Department. She indicated that both the Executive's Office and the County Council were trying to find the right balance.

Chair Nickels stated that there had been a couple of pretty remarkable efforts to do just that. He mentioned one that had been implemented in the juvenile justice system after a very intense review of the juvenile justice system. The effort was very much based on prevention and diversion of kids out of the juvenile criminal justice system and it had significantly reduced the number of kids in detention. Chair Nickels also noted that a similar effort was now underway with the adult system. The Superior Court, the District Court, the prosecutor, law enforcement, adult detention and others were coming up with a systems approach for how to get people into treatment when there was a substance abuse or alcohol issue. He added that when there was a mental health issue the objective would be to get them into the appropriate system rather than using jail as the default.

Chair Nickels added that the County Council expected to receive and adopt the plan leading to changes in the way the system would be funded. Chair Nickels expressed his optimism based on the various parties coming together and talking about changes to the entire system.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson referenced the Richardson letter and a movement spearheaded by the King County Bar Association and the King County Medical Association for treatment

of drug addiction rather than criminalization and incarceration. He asked if there were any particular initiatives proposed that would address those issues.

Chair Nickels responded that those issues were a matter of considerable debate and discussion over the last several years as the County's budget had been driven by the cost of the criminal justice system and by those initiatives and referendums that were ramping down the resources that were available. He stated that in the current legislative session the County had advocated a position that the County Prosecutor put forward which was to reduce the penalties on fairly minor drug offenses and then take the savings in the prison system and invest those in a treatment system. Chair Nickels noted that the County had set up a drug court specifically for people who faced relatively minor charges and whose main problem was addiction. He stated that drug court had worked very well. He added that that was the reason that the prosecutor became confident that they could in fact achieve savings in the prison system, put it into treatment and they would have a much more effective system. Chair Nickels stated that the proposed legislation did not pass, however he felt that the door was now open for a conversation statewide.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Conlin.

Board Member Richard Conlin stated that the City was also concerned about this issue. He stated that they had received funding that allowed them to explore the connection between programs that provided constructive alternatives for youth and the costs of the prison and criminal justice system. He added that the goal of the program was to establish more linkages so that they could make the case to both Congress and to other funding entities that they should spend more money on prevention programs and that savings could be documented in the criminal justice system. Board Member Conlin stated that former Council Member Jim Street had joined the City to coordinate that program. He added that Council Member Street had a long history of concern about youth issues and a strong ability to do the type of fiscal analysis that was necessary in order to document that nexus. He added that while they may know this connection existed, they needed to be able to prove to the people who were providing funding that they could actually and concretely make that connection.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Van Dusen.

Board Member Van Dusen commented that there were so many needs and so few dollars, and the more they could move towards prevention, the better. She expressed a concern, that as they talked about budget and the accountability and responsibility of the Board of Health, that they understood that the Board was accountable to make sure that the Public Health regulations in the County were implemented and enforced. She stated her belief that it was important for the Board to understand and to know about the fundamental regulatory issues that they oversaw and how the proposed budget reduction impacted regulatory compliance activities. She questioned whether or not the Board could take a look at this at the July meeting given the fact they the Board was accountable.

Chair Nickels clarified that the Board would have an opportunity to comment on the budget before it was adopted and finalized. He stated that the County Executive had the authority and responsibility under State law and the County Charter to present a budget in the middle of October. He added that the County Council, which had to ultimately adopt a budget, nor the Board of Health, would have an opportunity to see the budget until the middle of October.

Board Member Van Dusen asked if the Board would have an opportunity to see the Public Health issues that were impacted?

Chair Nickels responded that the Executive had the prerogative to make those decisions and did hold public meetings, however he had no requirement or obligation to come to the Board ahead of time.

Board Member Van Dusen stated that she knew that and was not presuming that they had budget authority. She added that as a Board, they were charged with assuring that certain public health programs were in place. She stated that she was curious that as they continued to have to deal with budget issues which of those programs that addressed the most fundamental regulatory issues were most vulnerable. She added that the sooner they had an opportunity to know this information, the better. Board Member Van Dusen stated that she understood that they could not determine the budget, but that they could work with the Department to prioritize programs that were regulatory in nature.

Chair Nickels responded that it seemed to him that the October meeting would be the opportunity to get some information, however the analysis would not have been completed. He added that at the November meeting they should have the opportunity to take a look at the budget in more detail.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Pizzorno.

Board Member Pizzorno stated that he thought the differentiation that Dr. Plough did a few years ago with the budget, broken down between the core services and the enhancements, had been very good. He added that to look at core services and the budget was what they had responsibility for and funding those functions was critical. He added that if they got to a place where they could not do those things, then something was going to have to budge.

Chair Nickels thanked Board Members for the discussion and invited Ms. Geving to continue the Director's Report.

Ms. Geving stated that the next agenda item related to the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program. She stated that the presentation was a continuation of a discussion that the Board had had in March. Ms. Geving introduced Ms. Kathy Keolker-Wheeler, Chair of the Management Coordination Committee.

Ms. Keolker-Wheeler thanked the Board for the opportunity to present an overview of the Local Hazardous Waste Program in King County. Ms. Keolker-Wheeler stated that she was a member of the Renton City Council and had been on the Council for 18 years. She also stated that she was the Chair of the Management Coordination Committee, and described the committee as the overseer of the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program. She stated that she had been involved with the program since its creation in the late '80's, early '90's. She added that she had worked on the interlocal agreements which governed the program.

Ms. Keolker-Wheeler stated that the Board would hear from staff members who would provide an overview of the program. She stated that hazardous waste was something that could threaten local neighborhoods and habitats. She added that each year King County businesses and residents produced some 36,000 tons of hazardous waste that were roughly equivalent to 12 new jumbo class Washington State ferries. She stated that those wastes that were toxic, corrosive, ignitable and reactive might be packaged in small containers such as cans containing poisonous and reactive chemicals, or in drums and large tanks. She

stated that hazardous waste didn't just come from large factories but from small businesses and households that generated about 25% of the hazardous waste produced. She added that although businesses and households produced smaller amounts of waste than the big factories, their collective impact was quite significant.

Ms. Keolker-Wheeler pointed out that there were many potential costs associated with the improper handling or disposal of hazardous materials. When spilled, carelessly handled or mismanaged, she stated that those wastes threatened public health, worker safety and the environment. Ms. Keolker-Wheeler stated that according to the Department of Ecology, there were approximately 500 known and suspected contaminated sites in King County, some of which posed a public health threat to very vulnerable members of the community. She mentioned several contaminated sites in Seattle that had polluted the sediments of the Duwamish River where many tribal and low-income people came to fish. She added that clean up was very costly and mentioned that the City of Seattle spent \$94 million in remediation and landfill closures costs at the Midway and Kent Highlands landfills. Ms. Keolker-Wheeler also mentioned a snowboard company in a neighboring county was recently convicted and fined for illegally dumping hazardous waste into a nearby creek. She added that this illegal dumping resulted in damage to local habitat, dozens of fish killed, risk posed to residents in the area and clean up costs borne by local government. She indicated that this was exactly the type of activity the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program sought to prevent in King County.

Ms. Keolker-Wheeler stated that the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP) was an award-winning, collaborative program that brought together resources from four local government entities and 38 suburban cities in a regional partnership to protect and enhance public health and environmental quality. She stated that the program worked with area residents and more than 50,000 King County business owners to help them reduce their impact on the environment and human health, by helping them reduce their use of hazardous products, use up their existing hazardous materials in a safe manner, recycle what they could not use and properly dispose and store their hazardous waste.

Ms. Keolker-Wheeler stated that the LHWMP was comprised of staff from the 38 suburban cities within King County, King County Water and Land Resources Division, Public Health Seattle/King County, Seattle Public Utilities, and the King County Solid Waste Division. She added that program oversight was provided by the Management Coordination Committee comprised of senior representatives from each of the partners with operational coordination provided by the Program Administrator.

Ms. Keolker-Wheeler announced that several of the managers had joined her for the presentation. She introduced Nick Pealy from Seattle Public Utilities, Jeff Gaisford from King County Solid Waste Division. She added that Ngozi Oleru from Public Health and Nancy Hansen-Ahern from King County Water and Land were not able to join them. She also introduced Ken Armstrong, the Program Administrator, and Liz Tenant, Mr. Armstrong's assistant.

Ms. Keolker-Wheeler introduced Jeff Neuner of Seattle Public Utilities and invited him to take over the next part of the presentation.

Mr. Neuner stated that he had been involved in the local plan since 1995. He stated that his particular area of responsibility was the management of the two fixed collection facilities. He stated that intent of the program was to provide convenient or reasonably convenient disposal options and opportunity for education to reduce hazardous materials whenever possible. Mr. Neuner stated that over the past 10 years they had collected 4,000 tons of

waste from over 428,000 residents. Mr. Neuner stated that the two fixed facilities, located in North Seattle and South Seattle, were opened three days a week, 52 weeks a year. He stated that the range of materials collected included anything one could have purchased or taken home from work in the last 50 years. He described some of the more interesting things they had received which included one latex can full of silver coins that was redirected to the Department of Finance.

He remarked that they collected what they referred to as "grandpa loads" or materials that had been stored for 10, 20, 30 years. He stated that those loads were usually large, expensive to handle and sometimes interesting.

Mr. Neuner indicated that last year the fixed facilities collected nearly 500 tons of material from over 13,000 customers. He stated that the program operated a mobile collection facility called the "Wastemobile", that traveled throughout the County, suburban cities and unincorporated areas. He added that last year the Wastemobile visited 26 locations and operated for three days a week for two weeks at each location. He stated that the Wastemobile accepted the same range of materials as the fixed facilities and last year 1,000 tons of material were collected from 23,000 customers.

Chair Nickels inquired if there was sufficient capacity to meet the demand.

Mr. Neuner responded that the Wastemobile could adjust the staffing depending on the demand and location. He added that Bellevue and some of the more popular events generated a lot of visits. He commented that overall he thought they met the demand. He stated that he believed the problem lay with the fixed facilities that filled a different niche. He stated that if someone was moving, they might not want to wait for the Wastemobile whereas the fixed facilities were a good option for them.

Mr. Neuner continued his presentation by stating that the program also worked with suburban cities to sponsor local collection events that targeted special wastes such as motor oil, oil filters, antifreeze and car batteries. He added that most of the events were funded through grants to the interested suburban cities and often scheduled in tandem with recycling events. He stated that last year there were 36 of those events that collected 360 tons of waste from 15,000 residents. He added that over the past 10 years the suburban cities had sponsored 260 events and collected 2,300 tons of material from over 100,000 customers.

Mr. Neuner went on to describe specific strategies that were used to promote reuse and recycling. These strategies included the development of a network of businesses that accepted and recycled used motor oil and a reuse store where reasonable materials were pulled out of the waste stream. He added that the reuse store had three main product lines: automotive supplies, household cleaners, and latex paint. He stated that last year 66 tons of materials were given away to residents for reuse, the bulk of which was latex paint. He noted that they had diverted about 29,000 gallons of latex paint to a facility in the mid-west where the paint was reprocessed, some going back into paint and what was not usable as paint was turned into additives and adhesives.

Mr. Neuner concluded his part of the presentation by stating that all of those aforementioned strategies helped to reduce operating costs and impacts on the environment, as well as provided real tangible benefit to King County residents.

Mr. Neuner introduced Lauren Cole from King County Solid Waste.

Ms. Cole stated that for the past 8 years she had worked on programs that creatively managed used motor oil, latex paint and mercury. She indicated that her part of the presentation would focus on their education programs. She stated that two of their key goals were to reduce the risk to human health and the environment by encouraging the use of fewer and less toxic materials, and reduce the risk posed to human health and the environment by encouraging proper storage and disposal of household toxic materials. She stated that they did this by employing a variety of programs that provided information to King County residents of all ages, including focused messages about priority household toxics that they defined as pesticides, automotive supplies and strong cleaners. She added that advertising campaigns targeted heavy consumers and users of household toxics, underserved community groups, new parents, new home buyers and others, and one message that combined the two.

Ms. Cole mentioned Bert the Salmon, a popular character known through his TV and radio spots. She noted that Bert had proven to be an excellent way to reach their target audience of male homeowners between the ages 25 through 54. Ms. Cole stated that they offered workshops and provided educational materials to gardeners and landscape professionals to promote green gardening. She added that they also continued to provide training to grounds management staff for the City of Seattle, King County and some suburban cities. She noted that in the past couple of years they had worked with the Washington Association of Landscape Professionals to implement a natural lawn care certification program. She added that the Associated Landscape Contractors of America recently approved their program and it had become a national model. Ms. Cole showed the Board a sample of post cards designed, printed and mailed to single family residents in participating cities.

Ms. Cole stated that there was evidence that their efforts were paying off. She cited a survey that indicated that one-third of those residents randomly surveyed had seen or heard of Bert the Salmon, and that 73% of them were able to identify messages they had learned from Bert. She commented that people were decreasing their use of weed and feed products on their lawns and were increasingly aware that lawn care practices negatively affected the local environment. She added that 61% of the respondents indicated that they were very concerned about the use of pesticides and the risk they posed to their children's health.

Ms. Cole stated that they also helped residents make informed choices about the household cleaners they bought and used. She stated that some of their ongoing programs included distributing Green Cleaning Kits and recipe cards through school programs and new parent workshops that helped people learn how to make their homes safer for their children by using alternative cleaning products and limiting the use of hazardous materials. Ms. Cole stated that they provided general education materials and services that could be used by all King County residents, including brochures and handbooks, a Web site, and their Household Hazards Line that residents could call for information and assistance. She added that last year more than 18,000 people had their questions answered by their staff.

Ms. Cole concluded her presentation by noting that they undertook targeted outreach. She noted for example their work with underserved groups in the community through environmental justice projects and in conjunction with community partners. She added that they also supported the efforts of organizations that trained community volunteers to conduct home environmental hazard assessments and produced several educational materials and programs for kids and youth.

Ms. Cole introduced her colleague Dave Waddell of King County Water and Land Resources Division.

Mr. Waddell stated that he had worked with the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program since 1991 and that he currently managed the Rehab the Lab Project. He stated that he was also the lead environmental investigator for the Onsite Consultation Program. Mr. Waddell indicated that he would provide a description of services provided to schools in King County. He stated that their program worked with schools to teach children and teachers about ways to reduce their use of hazardous materials, to properly manage hazardous materials and to make the schools safer. He stated that they worked with teachers and students in fourth grade through high school to raise awareness about which household products were hazardous, how to read labels, why it was important to dispose of household hazardous waste, and practical ways to use safer products. He added that over the past seven years they had reached more than 39,000 kids and their teachers through classroom presentations.

Mr. Waddell indicated that in the past year they produced "Hazards on the Home Front" teacher guides, held workshops for teachers to help them facilitate their use of the guides, provided classroom presentations and helped teachers organize fairs and projects.

Mr. Waddell described the hands-on training they provided to more than 300 student teachers through mini-workshops at local universities. He stated that they had conducted over 240 classroom presentations to 8,000 students and 200 teachers where they learned how to read and understand the hierarchy of warning words on labels, from the less hazardous "Caution" and "Warning" to the more hazardous "Danger" and "Poison." He added that participants learned how household products could directly affect personal health and how they traveled out from the home and the environment.

Mr. Waddell stated that according to their follow-up assessments, more than 70% of the students were able to identify all of the key signal words and that two-thirds of the students or their families tried safe cleaning alternative products at home. He added that almost all of the teachers reported making at least one positive behavior change after the presentation, such as choosing not to buy products labeled "Danger" or "Poison," reading the labels or using safer products. In addition he said that eighty-eight percent of the teachers said that it was important or very important to provide students with classroom presentations about household hazardous waste.

Mr. Waddell mentioned that their efforts lead to their school and youth program being awarded the Year 2000 Community Catalyst Award from the Environmental Education Association of Washington.

Mr. Waddell described the Rehab the Lab Program where they worked with the schools on a time limited campaign to remove their stockpiles of old and potentially dangerous laboratory chemicals, and worked with school principals, administrators and teachers to implement pollution prevention practices.

He described the Rehab the Lab campaign as having four basic parts: identification and removal of old and unstable hazardous laboratory chemicals, assisting all of the hazardous waste related activities throughout the school, and instituting at least four practices that increased safety and reduced pollution at each school. He added that they also set school-wide hazardous material policies and practices by conducting technical assistant visits to the entire school, including art and photo classes, and auto shop. He stated that before they would pay for the disposal of stockpiled laboratory chemicals, the school had to agree to take steps to remedy current problems and avoid future problems. He stated that this was achieved through a Pollution Prevention Pledge, signed by a district representative, the school principal and a science teacher that required the school to properly dispose of their

hazardous waste, improve chemical safety practices and take steps to prevent pollution in future stockpiles.

Mr. Waddell stated that since the program started in 1999, they had made 260 technical assistant visits to 152 schools, removed 24 tons of hazardous chemicals from schools, and stabilized and shipped potential explosive chemicals from 30 local schools. He mentioned that they found one container that contained white phosphorous, a compound that could spontaneously ignite if it became dry. He noted that the jar had a rusty cap and the water level was right at the top of the phosphorous. He added that if the water level had moved down another quarter inch the phosphorous would have become dry and ignited.

Mr. Waddell stated that they had removed over 3,000 pounds of high-risk chemicals from schools in King County in the last couple of years. He cited another situation at his daughter's school involving a container of ether. He stated that it had cost them several thousand dollars to stabilize the compound and have it safely shipped away. He concluded his remarks by stating that they were convinced that this program had substantially increased the safety of schools and that the schools were very happy with the service they provided.

Mr. Waddell introduced his colleague Bill Lawrence from Public Health - Seattle and King County.

Mr. Lawrence stated that he had been with the program before it had the name Local Hazardous Waste Management Program. He stated that he was a Senior Environmental Health Specialist, and coordinated the industrial materials exchange (IMAX) and was also the lead staff of one of the field teams that provided outreach to businesses. Mr. Lawrence stated that similar to the mandate for households, they provided services to businesses that reduced risk to human health and environment by using fewer and/or less toxic materials and by properly storing and disposing of hazardous wastes. Mr. Lawrence stated that the industrial materials exchange had been up and running for 12 years. He stated that they provided the service in two ways - one through a bi-monthly catalog and more recently through their Web site.

Mr. Lawrence shared with the Board one of his favorite IMAX exchanges that took place 8 or 9 years ago between two businesses. He stated that one business was a high tech business that used isopropynol to clean parts. In the process the isopropynol became slightly contaminated with water and debris. He added that they encouraged this business to list the by-product on the exchange. He stated that the business filled out the forms and then the listing was posted in the catalog. Mr. Lawrence stated that about a month later they received a phone call from a foundry, located about 10 miles away. He stated that the foundry took a sample of the isopropynol, made sure it wasn't contaminated with anything else and deemed it usable as a solvent that they could use to clean castings. Mr. Lawrence stated that both businesses saved about \$12,000 a year on disposal cost and purchase cost.

Mr. Lawrence stated that since the inception of the program, IMAX had saved about 8,000 tons of material from going to disposal or to a landfill at an approximate savings of about \$9 million for the participating businesses.

Mr. Lawrence then reviewed the Voucher Incentive Program that was designed to encourage businesses to manage their hazardous waste. He stated that in King County if a business generated small quantities of waste, typically under 220 pounds a month, they received a technical visit from one of their field staff. He added that if the business followed the staff recommendations they were reimbursed them 50% or up to \$500 for the cost of

material disposal or any environmental improvement that they made to improve health and safety. Mr. Lawrence indicated that since the voucher program was instituted in 1994, businesses had been reimbursed close to \$550,000. He added that this money had diverted 400 tons of hazardous waste from improper disposal and purchased equipment that would better protect workers.

Mr. Lawrence described the EnviroStars Incentive Program, a business recognition program that encouraged businesses to adopt pollution prevention practices through recognition of their efforts. He stated that recognition was through promotion on the radio, bus ads, and newspaper inserts. He added that currently there were over 200 EnviroStars businesses, some of which were extremely active in promoting pollution prevention among their professional peers. These businesses ranged from dentists to muffler shops such as Walt's and Midas here in the County. Mr. Lawrence stated that in 1999, the EnviroStars Program received the Governor's Award for Outstanding Achievement in Pollution Prevention.

Mr. Lawrence stated that the primary means for reaching out to the business community was by working directly with them through their field teams and meeting face-to-face with owners, managers and staff. He stated that specialists, educated business owners and staff, about waste management, regulatory responsibilities and provided practical suggestions for reducing their use of toxic and hazardous materials, and properly managing wastes. Mr. Lawrence indicated that the four field teams reached out to businesses by focusing on specific industries, providing technical assistance upon request or through the Department of Ecology, doing outreach by geographic area and responding to complaints involving illegal dumping, hazardous material spills, and noxious odors.

Mr. Lawrence indicated that last year the teams made over 3,800 visits to King County businesses. He described specific examples of how they worked with businesses. He noted one biotech company that had been generating nearly 20,000 gallons of toxic or corrosive waste water per year that had been disposed of through the sanitary sewer and was dissolving the sewer lines and threatening to disrupt the sewage facility's operations. He stated that they were able to get the company to switch to a non-toxic disinfectant and to install an in-line treatment system that neutralized the PH of the wastewater. He added that the company was then linked to King County industrial waste management for permitting and ongoing monitoring. He noted that just the act of switching to a less toxic material saved the company \$20,000 annually.

Mr. Lawrence described how different parts of the overall program worked together on different issues. He cited an example that involved a metal fabrication firm in South King County that had serious problems with how they handled and stored hazardous materials. He mentioned that the situation posed a real threat to worker safety and the surrounding environment. He stated that with technical assistance the company remediated the site and made significant improvements to their storage facilities and hazardous materials handling practices. He stated that in the long run, the company avoided costly fines, worker health issues and potential litigation.

Mr. Lawrence concluded his remarks by stating that they also operated a Business Waste Line whereby businesses could call anonymously five days a week for help with their hazardous waste questions. He stated that they also coordinated and staffed the Interagency Regulatory Analysis Committee, referred to as IRAC, which consisted of representatives from federal, state and local government agencies who worked together to resolve regulatory conflict and contradictions.

Mr. Lawrence introduced Ken Armstrong, staff to the LHWMP.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Van Dusen.

Board Member Van Dusen made the observation that there had been a considerable number of comments about the reduction of costs on some of these programs. She asked if they could put the discussion in perspective by stating the difference between what it cost to dispose of solid waste versus hazardous waste.

Mr. Neuner responded that the cost associated with a standard 100 pound load from a customer at a household hazardous waste facility could range from \$20 if it were very simple materials up into the \$1,000 range.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Pullen.

Board Member Pullen expressed his thanks for the excellent presentation. He stated his agreement that they needed to work harder to control toxic waste. He added that their work dealing with laboratory chemicals, paints, pesticides was commendable. He stated that he kept waiting to hear something about mercury but it was not mentioned and yet he believed it to be a problem. Board Member Pullen stated that Dr. Alonzo Plough, the Director King County's Department of Health, in a presentation before a County Council Committee, had said that the Health Department had discontinued putting silver amalgams, which was a mercury filling, in the mouths of children because it was dangerous. Board Member Pullen argued that if Dr. Plough, the head of the Department of Health, had curtailed putting amalgam fillings in the mouths of low-income children, then that raised a number of questions. He asked why then had they continued to encourage or accept putting mercury in the mouths of adults, including mothers who were going to become pregnant. He added that mercury did transfer very readily to a fetus causing fetal development problems, lower IQ and many other problems. He referenced a study that showed that people with amalgam fillings had ten times as much mercury in their body as people without amalgam fillings. He added that when the FDA suggested to pregnant mothers that they not eat tuna and swordfish, he considered that to be a small factor compared to the mercury that was coming right out of their mouths. Board Member Pullen stated that dentists who use amalgam fillings were encouraged under a policy that King County had adopted to put in collection devices for mercury. He added that Metro was involved in this some years ago and had been concerned about mercury going into Puget Sound which then got into fish and ultimately into people. He stated that the policy Metro eventually adopted was to recommend that dentists install collection traps to take out mercury and dispose of it as a hazardous waste. However, he added, because it was only a recommendation, less than one percent of the dentists had done installed traps.

Board Member Pullen stated that if they were going to have a really good hazardous waste collection and disposal program, then the first step was to do some education about mercury. He commented that if children were asked whether mercury was a toxic the answer would be "yes". He then asked, why they then allowed dentists to put it into their mouths, into their teeth, why did they allow dentists to simply dispose of mercury in ways that were less than environmentally sound than what Metro and others originally wanted to do. Board Member Pullen invited the panelists to respond.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Ms. Keolker- Wheeler.

Ms. Keolker-Wheeler responded that Mr. Armstrong would be addressing the issue and that Dave Galvin would be able to respond as well.

Mr. Armstrong stated that he was the Program Administrator for the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program. He stated that in response to Board Member Pullen's remarks he would state that they had been involved in a strategic planning process within the program. He noted that one of the highest risks or biggest priorities they had identified was mercury.

Mr. Armstrong indicated that he had been with the program for a year. He added that he came to the program after a long and diverse career in the Coast Guard, and was attracted to the job because of its programs, reputation and the collaborative approach. He stated that he continues to be very impressed with the staff and the excellent work that they provide. He noted that Mr. Lawrence had been too modest to mention that the IMAX program was the recipient of several different environmental awards that he believed was a real testament to Mr. Lawrence's dedication and efforts. Mr. Armstrong noted that the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program had received nearly 20 State and national awards over the past 10 years, that reflected well on the staff's creativity and effort as well as the program's management.

Mr. Armstrong summarized the Program's future plans. He stated that the program would continue to be responsive, flexible and forward thinking organization. He indicated that they had just finished their comprehensive review of the program that would identify areas where they could improve services and/or reduce them. He added that the Management Coordination Committee was engaged in a strategic planning process and that he expected that those efforts would help them to be more effective and efficient, and would allow them to design and implement strategies that better protected public health and enhanced environmental quality.

Mr. Armstrong also stated that they were already making some changes in program services. He noted that they were revising Wastemobile collection events in parts of the County to better serve King County communities, would be opening a household hazardous waste collection facility at the Factoria transfer station, and were exploring the possibility of directly collecting hazardous materials from homebound residents. He added that they also planned to further enhance the services provided to schools by working with them to reduce pesticide use through the adoption of integrated pest management techniques.

Mr. Armstrong indicated that they would continue their membership in the Northwest Products Stewardship Council. Mr. Armstrong described the role and goals of the Council. Mr. Armstrong stated that the issue of mercury was going to be one of the issues that the Northwest Products Stewardship Council started to aggressively address and would be number one on their list to address. He stated his belief that by working with businesses and manufacturers they could have the fastest, most immediate and most significant impact on reducing the mercury in circulation.

Mr. Armstrong stated that they would also work more closely with the Board of Health and other legislative bodies to address problem materials that could be easily eliminated and for which acceptable substitutes were available. He cited the ban on the sale of mercury-containing thermometers as one example. He added that other products and materials that they would look to pursue, or at least explore, included pesticides. Mr. Armstrong stated that the region had an excellent record and reputation for protecting the environment and public health.

Mr. Armstrong thanked the Board for the opportunity to address the Board. He deferred to Dave Galvin to address the dental amalgam issues raised by Board Member Pullen.

Mr. Galvin stated that he worked in the King County Department of Natural Resources, Water and Land Resources Division. He stated that the mercury issue was highly controversial. He stated that they had worked with the dental community in the King County area for more than 10 years on this particular issue. Mr. Galvin explained that amalgam fillings were about 50% mercury, and when they're placed in, or drilled out, of the teeth, the fine particles and dust ended up going down the drain and were in fact a source of mercury in the waste water system. Mr. Galvin stated that they had been working with manufacturers to find ways to capture the particles so that it did not get into King County's waste water system. He added that they had also been working with dentists and with the Seattle-King County Dental Society in a voluntary program to address this and other dental waste stream issues. Mr. Galvin stated that recently they had come to the conclusion that the voluntary approach had not had the desired results. He stated that they were now in the process of notifying all of the dental offices in King County that they should install separators to capture the mercury.

Mr. Galvin acknowledged that a number of adults walk around with amalgam fillings. He stated that dentists, including the American Dental Association, are adamant that amalgam has been a historical contributor to public health in terms of dental issues. He added that some dentists would also debate whether in fact it was a concern either to public health or the environment. He stated that in King County they had come to the conclusion that the mercury in amalgams was in fact an issue to be dealt with locally.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Pullen.

Board Member Pullen thanked Mr. Galvin for his leadership and for their movement towards capturing the toxic waste. He also acknowledged those few dentists who voluntarily installed separators. He acknowledged and stated his agreement with what had been said about the Dental Association actively debating this issue. He indicated that he had been in a number of debates and had won every one of them, and would look forward to future debates on the subject. Board Member Pullen suggested that they were in the same position on cigarettes a number of years ago, wherein the cigarette manufacturers insisted that cigarettes were not really a danger to health and that there was no tangible proof that cigarettes were a threat to health. He stated that that was similar to what the Dental Association was saying about mercury in the teeth. He suggested that it would take a major product liability lawsuit before that issue was settled.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Irons.

Board Member Irons stated that he had absolutely no doubt that Council Member Pullen won every debate. He then inquired about the cost of installing a separator.

Mr. Galvin responded that the current market for separators included three or four manufacturers and that they ranged in price from \$500 to a few thousand dollars to purchase and install.

Board Member Irons inquired about the locality of the manufacturers.

Mr. Galvin responded that initially the manufacturers were not readily available and that was why they did not require the installation five years ago. He stated that now there were additional manufacturers who produced units that worked and were relatively inexpensive compared with other equipment and materials.

Board Member Irons advocated that the local suppliers be kept in the loop of what was being planned so that they could have a supply on hand.

Mr. Galvin responded that they had been in regular contact with vendors. He stated that they were giving local dental offices two years to come into full compliance.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Van Dusen.

Board Member Van Dusen asked if the mercury traps would require cleaning and if so were people geared up to safely handle mercury waste and make sure that it was disposed of properly.

Mr. Galvin responded that a few years ago there were not locally available services to handle cleaning out these separators and dealing with the leftover waste. He indicated that they now had various vendors that were interested in the market and were providing services to the small number of dental offices that had the separators in place.

Board Member Van Dusen asked where the vendors disposed of the mercury.

Mr. Galvin responded that the mercury collected by the separators came out in the form of a fine sludge that was then shipped to a mercury facility in another part of the country. He stated that as a dentist replaced an old amalgam filling, some of the filling came out in chunks that were either big enough to capture with tweezers or by a simple screen. He added that those chunks were worth money to the dental office and were recycled.

Board Member Van Dusen asked if it was known what percentage of the mercury waste in King County was mercury amalgam versus other kinds of mercury sources?

Mr. Galvin responded that he didn't know what the total mercury inflow and outflow by type was within King County. He stated that they estimated that dental offices contributed approximately 40% of all the mercury they saw coming into the system. Mr. Galvin added that mercury was spread out in very tiny amounts in a number of different sources, including some medications. He added that other sources of mercury beyond wastewater in the larger picture included things like old thermometers that were broken and contained elemental mercury.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Pizzorno.

Board Member Pizzorno stated that he thought that the subject of hazardous waste management was one of the most important activities they could engage in as the Department of Public Health. He stated that twenty-three years ago he had taught his first course in health effects of environmental toxicants at Seattle Central Community College. He added that he had become ever more convinced since then that this was one of the most unrecognized, significant contributors to ill health in our community that they had to get a handle on.

Board Member Pizzorno commented that there appeared to be a lag time between action to be taken and enforcement of the action. He acknowledged the need to make sure equipment was there before enforcement began. He asked if there was a general policy in the Department about when to move from voluntary to mandatory action?

Ms. Geving responded that she did not believe that the Department had a definitive policy. She stated that they try to gauge how serious the situation was before moving to the next

step. She added that they also factored in contributing factors as noted by Mr. Galvin, such as vendor and equipment availability. Ms. Geving added that it was a good idea to ask the question as to whether or not they should have something a little bit more aggressive in terms of the timetable.

Board Member Pizzorno stated that the issue of mercury amalgams was clearly controversial and that he thought there was cause for concern about putting a known toxin in people's bodies. He added that King County was known for being on the cutting edge of health promotion activities. He asked what it would take for the Board to establish a policy recommendation against the use of mercury amalgams in King County. He also asked what kind of process would they have to go through in order to be able to make such a recommendation. He stated that he thought it would be a good idea to do so but he would want to do it in a responsible manner.

Chair Nickels summarized that it appeared Board Member Pizzorno was not looking for an answer that day but seeking to have a discussion at another time. Board Member Pizzorno indicated that that was correct.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson thanked the panel for their presentation. He stated that with respect to the mercury in dental use he would concur that there were people of good faith on both sides of the issue. He added that he thought it was highly appropriate that there be a panel to present both sides of the issue. Board Member Thompson stated that to him the mercury problem sounded a little like the asbestos issue in that it was a very useful material used in good faith at one time. He stated that you really didn't want to disturb the material unless you had to and if you had to you wanted to be assured that it was disposed of appropriately. He asked if the panelists had any idea as to what extent mercury amalgams had been supplanted by newer technology in King County.

Mr. Galvin indicated that this line of inquiry was outside his area of expertise. Although he did state that he understood that there were other types of composites and other materials that were now much more readily available as an alternative to the traditional amalgam.

Board Member Thompson asked to the extent that they were in the business of solving problems that it was appropriate to determine the magnitude of the problem by knowing how frequently new newer technologies were being used.

Mr. Galvin indicated that they could find the information and get back to the Board.

Chair Nickels observed that they had recently uncovered that the King County benefits package for employees provided dental insurance coverage, however the insurance covered 100% of the cost of replacing amalgam with amalgam, but only 50% of the cost for replacing amalgam with something else.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Conlin.

Board Member Conlin noted that having been involved in some of the early stages of the program, that it was wonderful to see how great it was developing and moving forward. He stated that when they first began working on the program, they hypothesized that eventually they would get some older collections of hazardous materials out of the materials waste stream and that over time the composition of what was collected would change. He asked if they had seen any sign of that happening and whether there was any evidence that they had

finally removed from the waste stream those materials that had been stored in garages and basements for 50 or 100 years.

Ms. Cole responded that they were unfortunately still seeing really old materials come into both the fixed mobile facilities. She added that they still got old latex paint and lead containing paint.

Board Member Conlin asked if there was any evidence of a change in personal habits regarding use of less toxic materials.

Ms. Cole responded that the Seattle reuse store spoke to that. She stated that they did receive a large number of materials that were unopened and perfectly usable.

Board Member Conlin asked if there was any information on sales of hazardous materials that showed that the education programs were working.

Mr. Armstrong responded that the sales information was proprietary information for most of the retailers. He stated that they could access trend data but it with the growth in the County's population and a number of other factors, it was a little hard to get a clear picture about the relative sales volume. He stated that they knew how many customers or households were served over time with the two fixed facilities and the Wastemobile in the suburban cities' events. He added that they did not know for sure how many of those users were repeat customers. He stated that his best guess was somewhere between 30 and 40%.

Board Member Conlin asked if they had seen a reduction in the purchase of Weed and Feed and similar products.

Mr. Armstrong indicated that they had information based on surveys. He added that the information was self-reported but that there was clearly an indication that people were using less Weed and Feed type products.

Mr. Neuner added that with respect to any change in the waste material that came in, he thought that one thing they had seen over the years was the amount of mercury in the waste latex. He added that it had shown some reduction of what used to be a fairly common fungicide that was added particularly to exterior paints. He also added that concentrations of bulk unusable latex had decreased.

Chair Nickels stated that he had heard a couple of different philosophies in regard to reuse of materials. He stated that on one hand the hazardous waste disposal program took materials and separated them from the waste stream and then offered them to people to use, for example the industrial exchange. He added that he had heard in the school presentation that they discouraged the schools from accepting donated chemicals. He asked them to comment on his observations.

Mr. Waddell responded that most of the donated chemicals found in schools had come from bankrupt laboratories who were looking to dispose of old chemicals that they didn't want to keep around and pay for disposal. He added that universities and military institutions donated glassware and often found amongst the glassware boxes of chemicals. He noted that the Lake Washington School District received boxes of laboratory glassware and with every shipment they also got a case of mercury thermometers, 20% of which were broken. He added that the Lake Washington School District stopped using mercury three years before that shipment arrived. He stated that because the originating laboratory was bankrupt

the school was unable to return the donated thermometers so they sat around, unopened until discovered by their team. Mr. Waddell stated that their concern about donated chemicals was that quite often what schools received was either stuff that other people couldn't use or in amounts that were more than they could possibly use. He stated for example that a school might need a half a pound of cooper sulfate that would be sufficient to last them 10 years, but what they got was five 5 gallon pails from an industrial supplier. He added that the school thought they got a great deal because they got it for free and the industrial supplier was very happy because he donated the material and didn't have to pay for disposal.

Mr. Waddell stated that they were trying to get the stockpiles in the schools reduced and that once they had reached a reasonable inventory of chemicals they planned to work with the schools at the local and regional level to develop a materials exchange.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Van Dusen

Board Member Van Dusen stated that she agreed wholeheartedly that schools should not accept donated chemicals. She added that in her other role they had a big issue with people who wanted to give the University all kinds of freebies. She added that it amounted to picking up somebody else's waste and it ended up going into their waste stream and was very costly to get rid of. She added that they were also trying to limit the quantity used in the laboratories because they did not need nearly as much given the way experiments were done today as compared to 10, 15, 20 years ago.

Mr. Waddell commented that a big emphasis in their program was to get schools to shrink the scale of their laboratories and thereby reduce the risk to the kids.

Board Member Van Dusen commented on how fortunate they had been that no incidents had occurred because cost and the issue around trying to stabilize and get rid of those kinds of potentially explosive products was a big, big issue. She expressed curiosity about the cooperative effort that the program represented between several different agencies. She recollected that there had been a school sanitation program where staff from the Health Department went out to the schools to look at certain safety hazards as well as food sanitation. She asked if there was some kind of linkage between those two programs.

Mr. Waddell responded that Public Health and Water and Land Resources Division in King County were partners in this project. He stated that the Public Health Department focused on the rest of the school. He added that the Division of Water and Land Resources had several people with strong chemistry backgrounds who focused on the laboratories. He added that they also partnered with the Health and Safety folks in Public Health because they were a good access point for them to get into the schools. Mr. Waddell stated that they were hesitant to go into some school labs and try to figure out which ones were at higher risk than others. He added that in one school there were 7,200 containers of laboratory chemicals. He stated that it sometimes was bewildering to try to deal with that kind of volume when you had a time limited campaign, thus they had to partner as much as they could. He noted that they had partnered with the Washington State Science Teachers Association, the State Department of Health, and contributed towards the State Guidelines for Safer Schools that had just been released.

Board Member Van Dusen reflected on the media coverage of Universities such as MIT and the University of Hawaii that had received fines from the EPA for hazardous waste issues,

noting that the local examples were far worse than what had been found in many of those institutions.

She added that the fines were enormous and the issues around better management had been very significant. She stated that whatever they could do to help schools in this area would be very significant.

Chair Nickels acknowledged Board Member Pullen.

Board Member Pullen commented that there was one reason there was some confusion about the toxicity of dental amalgams and that was that different people excreted mercury from their bodies in different ways and at different levels. He noted that about 40% of citizens were really good at excreting mercury, for whatever reason their bodies and internal biochemistry tended to remove it from the system. He added that that didn't mean that it wasn't doing some damage along the way, but at least its' cumulative buildup was slowed. He stated that the other 60% of the population was hurt by mercury from amalgams and they were split into about three equal categories with 20% damaged in a minor way, another 20% received moderate damage and the final 20% were significantly damaged. Board Member Pullen stated that health problems might show up down the road - 10, 15, 20 years down the road - and for that reason problems were not always associated immediately with mercury from the fillings. He stated that he thought that was one of the reasons there had been some confusion and why certain professionals had perhaps underestimated the danger. He added that he thought the evidence was building. He stated that if they got a panel set up, which he thought was a good idea, they would have one of the more interesting and lively Board of Health meetings they had ever had. He encouraged, in accordance with Dr. Pizzorno's suggestion and others, that a panel presentation be developed.

Chair Nickels thanked the presenters for their presentation. He added that he thought the message of regional cooperation came through loud and clear.

Ms. Geving stated that the Director's Report was concluded.

Chair Nickels called for any additional items. He noted that he had not called for general public comments because he understood no one had signed up. He asked if there was anyone who wanted to address the Board. Noting no response, he acknowledged Board Member Van Dusen.

Board Member Van Dusen stated that she had observed that the list of future agenda items did not include any of the environmental health programs, other than the food inspection web site briefing. She indicated that she would like to hear more about what the County is doing in this area. She noted that earlier in the meeting she had referenced several programs relative to budget and policy concerns. She added that there was an awful lot of effort given 5 years ago around water programs and on-site wastewater programs, and she understood that there were some proposed changes in both of those arenas. She wanted to assure that the Board had met its operation and maintenance requirements and also wondered what the programs looked like.

Chair Nickels indicated that they would bring those areas back before the Board. He reminded the Board to complete the meeting evaluations and thanked everyone for their participation.

Chair Nickels adjourned the meeting.

KING COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH

s/Greg Nickels/s