



Meeting minutes

Meeting: Regional Waste Advisory Committee (RWAC) Meeting
Date: Thursday, November 19, 2020
Time: 8 a.m. to 10 a.m.
Place: Zoom meeting
Purpose: *The purpose of the Regional Waste Advisory Committee is to provide input on certain policies, programs, and projects that implement actions in the 2030 Regional Waste Plan, as well as to provide input on certain legislative and administrative actions that the Metro Council or Chief Operating Officer will consider related to implementation of the 2030 Regional Waste Plan.*

Members in Attendance:

Roy Brower, Metro
Joe Buck, Small business owner
Sharetta Butcher, North by Northeast Community Health Center (NxNE)
Marilou Carrera, Portland Resident
Thomas Egleston, Washington County
Alondra Flores Aviña, Student
Jill Kolek, City of Portland
Shannon Martin, City of Gresham
Christa McDermott, Community Environmental Services, PSU (PSU)
Audrey O'Brien, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Eben Polk, Clackamas County
Jenny Slepian, City of Lake Oswego
Beth Vargas Duncan, Oregon Refuse and Recycling Association (ORRA)

1. CALL TO ORDER & MEETING OVERVIEW

Roy Brower (Metro) brought the virtual meeting to order at 8:03 am.

2. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS

Committee meeting minutes for October 15, 2020 were approved by the committee.

3. COMMITTEE SCHEDULE OF TOPICS

Mr. Brower reviewed the committee schedule of topics for the remainder of 2020 and early 2021 meetings (see attached at the end of the meeting minutes).

4. STRATEGIC PLAN FOR RID PATROL'S WORKFORCE TRANSITION PROGRAM EXPANSION

Stephanie Rawson (Metro) provided a brief background on the RID Patrol program, which provides clean up services on public land throughout the greater Portland area by cleaning up dumped and abandoned garbage on public lands, as well as providing support to public entities who manage public lands and trying to respond to some impacts from people living unsheltered on public lands. The current program is small, consisting of one crew with one Metro staff person and two crew members from community-based organizations. And our partners currently are Constructing Hope and Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center (POIC). Metro is trying to take this model and expand it to provide additional job opportunities and training to individuals who face employment barriers. This aligns with the 2030 Regional Waste Plan goals as well as Metro Council priorities.

Brody Abbott (Metro) started by building a shared understanding of the program's vision and best practices that help guide decision-making for the expansion. In terms of the vision, Metro will provide workforce opportunities to individuals with systemic barriers to employment in the solid waste sector, with a focus on individuals who are disproportionately impacted and suffer higher rates of incarceration. We understand that for folks with felonies on their record, oftentimes, it is harder for them to get jobs and workforce opportunities. Mr. Abbott shared some of the team's foundational best practices which to help guide decision-making.

Mr. Abbott noted that Metro is in a phased approach for the expansion work. There are four phases, with the first phase being the planning and research phase. The planning and research phase has involved hiring a contractor help conduct research to better answer questions about how to add value in the solid waste sector and to understand what other folks are doing in the region so as to not saturate what other folks are already doing, but to add value and bring more opportunities. Phase two, which is the program design phase, and this phase aims to better understand Metro's relationship with law enforcement and the carceral system. From a more tangible perspective of scaling up, a deployment center is necessary. Currently, RID Patrol uses three different locations to provide space for our program, staff, equipment and vehicles. Having a central deployment space would help streamline operations and create a more cohesion and efficiency.

Phase three is the implementation phase, which has many key activities which focus on creating more development opportunities for our crew members. This would include adding more crews, but also increasing partnerships. Phase four is the program evaluation phase, for which Metro is considering how to develop indicators, both from a macro perspective, but also specific to the program participants learning skills on the job that we can quantify as, "is this helping this individual increasing their workforce acumen, or do we need to reevaluate what we're measuring?"

Rob Nathan (Metro) shared that his role is to support the engagement both internally and externally that supports the strategic priorities of the plan. Metro's internal steering committee is comprised of internal stakeholders across multiple departments at Metro, including the Office of Metro Attorney, Parks and Nature and Human Resources. The goal is to work together, identify barriers and opportunities that this plan may face and work across the agency to find solutions. This team feels it is important to build a coalition of understanding across the agency to insure that this program is set up for success and cultivates the support it needs.

The external advisory committee is comprised of representatives from organizations that focus on workforce readiness programs versus workforce programs. Those groups often really understand the skills and resources needed to support people transitioning out of incarceration. A lot of those folks struggle with homelessness, access to childcare and have visible and invisible disabilities. It is important to make sure that Metro is thoughtful about being a space that might be a pathway for individuals supported by these programs. The role of the external advisory committee is to advise Metro, along with planning and implementation at key points along the plan, as well as to establish and maintain long-term relationships with these individuals so they can continue to provide support with the program and provide support with other workforce initiatives and program partners across the department.

Alondra Flores Aviña (Student) noted that due to COVID-19, there have been a lot of dumpsites and that the public and some committee members that she has spoken to lean toward assuming that people who are under-housed or houseless create this dump. And she doesn't believe that is true. There is a stereotype.

Ms. Rawson noted that there is the misunderstanding and interpretation that most of the dumped garbage is coming from under-housed individuals. While they do contribute to that, they are a sector of our community that do not have access to garbage and recycling services. Metro has a system currently set up which is the data dashboard. So if you went to www.oregonmetro.gov/ridpatrol, there's a link to the data dashboard, with a rolling number where

anyone can click on who is being attributed to the source of the dumping. Residential is the largest contributor to illegal dumping. This is part of the reason why Metro created the Metro Bag Program, where Metro works with social service providers to provide labeled bags to try to give under-housed individuals access to garbage.

Mr. Nathan shared that anyone can visit the RID Patrol page and view a video called *Nobody's Trash*. Metro worked with Outside the Frame on the video, and it was intended to shift public perception and stigma around this topic.

Sharetta Butcher (NxNE) noted that one of the barriers that community seems to face is navigating the application process through the human resources webpage. People of color would look for designated jobs that they were looking into the community to hire and get a diverse pool of folks that hire from. That page was confusing to people and hard for them to find where they should apply. Ms. Butcher wondered how Metro planned to develop the webpage to be more accessible.

Mr. Nathan responded that the Metro interface for recruitment can be a huge barrier for some folks. But Metro is working to assure that it will not be a barrier for this work. It is likely that through program partners, folks will be coming through pathways to established relationships, and may not even need to come through the Metro portal.

Ms. Butcher wanted to clarify if those will be the only two pathways that Metro is going to be seeking to recruit people.

Mr. Nathan responded that Metro can't answer that yet.

Ms. Rawson shared that it is to be determined.

Ms. Butcher asked if these individuals will be considered employees of those community programs or will they be actual Metro employees when they get hired.

Ms. Rawson responded that this is also to be determined. Those are conversations Metro is having, trying to weigh between those options, and ask: how does the program participant benefit more?

Mr. Nathan noted that Metro has identified pros and cons to both approaches. Metro will need to continue to explore to see what works best.

Marilou Carrera (Portland Resident) asked two questions: first, she wanted a more clear understanding of what engagement means and if it is across the phases. Second question is what does the outreach look like for the internal steering committee and the external advisory committee?

Mr. Nathan responded that Metro wanted to be thoughtful about folks who were influencers around major key elements of making the plan successful. For internal candidates, that was strategic selection and reaching out to individuals that have that influence. For example, Shane Abma is the attorney who advises the solid waste department. It seemed important to have legal to help advise on liability. The same with human resources and the Parks and Nature department because we do a lot of work in natural areas. We also have Andre Beeler who represents Council President Peterson. This is an initiative that she supports. With the external engagement, Metro leaned on some existing relationships that have been built across the agency, but also brought in some new folks. Metro thought it was important to bring in an expert on trauma informed care (Shilo George). Metro also brought in new representation from the Green Workforce Collaborative with Eco Trust. There is a representative from PIOC that works with juveniles coming out of incarceration as well as someone who is a program participant in a workforce program previously. All of these individuals have experience working with BIPOC (black, Indigenous, and people of color) communities and have similar lived experience as well. Mr. Nathan shared that for the external committee, there was a public posting but Metro had done a preliminary engagement to make sure that the team was recruiting folks instead of just putting out a blanket post. He noted that the team has been engaging

folks since phase one. Metro will be engaging through each phase of the process, and often, as well as trying to utilize them for other workforce initiatives at Metro, so that we can have more of a streamlined approach.

Joe Buck (Small business owner) asked if the program is only for formerly incarcerated members of the community.

Mr. Nathan shared that Metro is designing the program so that it could specifically resource those individuals.

Mr. Buck expressed that this is a great program and a great opportunity. He appreciated Metro advocating for these changes. He noted that perhaps there is a good way to create a continued pathway for folks that would enter into this program. When local governments are looking at their hiring practices, there may be an opportunity to look at folks that are in this program, participants in this program being great potential future employees of the counties or the cities within the county, other public agencies, once they move on. He supported the idea of having public agencies look at folks that are coming through this program as priority hires down the road in other jobs.

Mr. Brower noted that Metro is looking at this more broadly than just within the RID Patrol.

Christa McDermott (PSU) noted that she thinks of the RID Patrol program as having two services: one being the workforce development as its own service, and then dealing with illegal dumping and trash pickup and the bag program as a whole. She asked if there is going to be a separate strategic plan for each of those. And that today's topic is just specific to the workforce development piece.

Ms. Rawson noted that the program as a whole needs a strategic plan. Metro is constantly getting new requests to grow and expand and to do things differently. But this is a very small team. Most of the team's effort has been put into providing the service. There is a need to think about the larger strategic plan for the program as a whole. Metro is also having conversations about partnerships with law enforcement and use of incarcerated labor and how that feeds into Metro values.

Ms. McDermott noted the importance of the Metro bag program that is specific to houseless communities and thinking of how they could be incorporated into this workforce development or some wrap around services.

Mr. Nathan shared that Metro has other partnerships related to the Metro bag program. For example, Trash for Peace and their ground score initiative which is a self-organized waste picker collaborative. Metro will be embarking on a partnership with them with a camp steward program which is also a self-determined, self-organized alternative workforce for folks who have previously experienced homelessness.

Audrey O'Brien (DEQ) asked if Metro is partnering with City of Portland, ODOT or any of the counties or some of the nonprofits like Clackamas County Dumps Stoppers. She asked if there is any interaction with any of the recovery community and the associations like Organ Recovery and their ability to assist with some of the harm reduction and the health decisions.

Ms. Rawson noted that Metro partners with a lot of local jurisdictions with providing clean up services. Metro will be engaging these partners about different workforce opportunities, what additional services folks might be needing, etc.

Beth Vargas Duncan (ORRA) shared that she is excited about this program. She wanted to mention briefly that the Portland haulers have been working for some months as well on programs to train those that may have a challenging background, making it difficult for them to find employment and those of diverse populations to train as garbage truck drivers. So more to come on that when it is ready. She noted that it was her understanding that the City of Portland receives funding and has a funding source to help the unhoused receive garbage collection, which probably involves litter as well, but that just might be something to look into.

Ms. Rawson Noted that Metro works with the City of Portland. There's just such a large need that Metro is trying to keep up with the need.

Jenny Slepian (City of Lake Oswego) wondered if there were opportunities for youth in this program, particularly youth who are already in county diversion programs.

Ms. Rawson noted that youth is defined anywhere from age 13 to 26. One of the things that Metro struggles with is youth under 18 because of some of the work, the protections that need to be in place. One of the things needed is to think about what is needed out of program participants to be able to do the work, and who is best suited to work with? Metro wants to be intentional to make sure that we can support the individuals to be successful.

Mr. Abbott shared that lot of the research has shown that much of the investments around folks that are impacted by incarceration are centered on youth and some of those programs that have deter risk, recidivism. This suggests that maybe Metro shouldn't focus on youth because folks are already doing that work and may be better equipped to do that work. Oftentimes, people give up on adults. There is a mentality around the criminal justice system where once you get past a certain age, if you continue to commit crimes, then you "may never change." For this reason, there is value in working to undo that thinking and provide adults opportunities when they haven't really been supported.

Eben Polk (Clackamas County) noted that in the strategic plan document, there was a component on the enforcement side of things: evaluating enforcement through racial equity lens. The use of detectives in supervising crews seems very different than just assigning a crew supervisor. A detective has a specific skillset. It might be worth explaining a bit more for the committee those choices that we've had historically in managing crews and enforcement.

Ms. Rawson noted that historically, the program was created based on partnerships, working with law enforcement and incarcerated labor, which has carried through until today. Part of reevaluating and rethinking approaches and how Metro does enforcement and how to carry out the program services, the team is looking at why law enforcement is used. What are they needed for? Can the work be done without them? If Metro does decide that it is imperative, it's in the best interest to have these partnerships with law enforcement, what does that look like? What are the impacts to everybody, community, Metro staff and the individuals that we work with? What are the outcomes that we want to achieve?

Mr. Nathan clarified that Metro will not have detectives leading crews and we don't on the existing pilot work transition program with POIC and Constructing Hope. Metro did have correctional officers when utilizing inmate crews to clean up dumped garbage, but Metro is no longer doing that. Until Metro completes reexamining processes, the team will not be going back to the old ways of doing things. Even if Metro does work with inmates again, it's not going to be like before.

5. 2030 REGIONAL WASTE PLAN: REGIONAL WORK PLAN part 2

Holly Stirnkorb (Metro) started with a little background on this topic. Metro and local government partners are currently collaboratively developing a three-year work plan to support implementation of the 2030 Regional Waste Plan (RWP). The work plan will prioritize actions for implementation in years one through three of the plan, identify high level activities to achieve each action and also be looking at estimating resource needs to complete the work. This will help inform Metro and local government budgeting and resource allocation decisions. The role of the Regional Waste Advisory Committee in this process is to review and provide input on the actions and activities that are prioritized for implementation in each of the three year work plans.

The first phase of the project has been to identify the actions for this coming three year work plan, including agency roles and responsibilities for action implementation. On October 30th, the

committee was provided with the list of actions prioritized for implementation by Metro and local governments. Metro staff conducted an online survey and community members of the committee were also offered one-on-one time with staff to answer questions or clarify issues prior to today's committee meeting. The committee is being asked to think about the next three years of the work plan and provide input on what was not included in the list of actions that the committee would like to see implemented in the short term or what was included that should be postponed. Metro also wanted to get a sense of which actions the committee wanted to stay engaged in.

Metro asked committee members to complete an online survey. Seven committee members responded to the survey. Most respondents did not perceive that there are actions missing. There is an exception to that regarding disaster resilience. There were no specific actions identified for removal. There were comments on different actions, but there were none that the committee said shouldn't be worked on. As far as the actions the committees would like to stay engaged in, there was no clear consensus on that. There seemed to be some agreement that equity should remain a focus of the committee and that there was also a suggestion that subcommittees be formed to accommodate the very varying interest of committee members. Touching on the disaster resilience in our work session with local governments to prioritize actions, the need to focus on disaster resilience in this three year work plan was identified. So as a result, Metro will begin working with local governments and the Department of Environmental Quality to identify activities to implement the following three actions: 17.2, which is conducting periodic exercises to test and practice the implementation of disaster debris plans; 18.2, to implement requirements for solid waste system service providers to prepare and maintain emergency operations and continuity of operations plans; and 19.3, to develop agreements and contracts with service providers and partner jurisdictions to ensure rapid mobilization of regional and out of region resources during emergency response operations.

There were a few questions that related to educating consumers on ways to reduce the harmful impacts of products throughout their full life cycle, including how to shift focus from end of life. The goals and actions in the plan really address every stage of product life cycle from design and manufacture to disposal. In many cases, the actions complement each other to accommodate certain goals and they address different issues from different fronts. So in this example, while educating consumers to advocate for changing the choices made available to them is included in many of our existing education programs, the work plan also includes actions that involve legislative efforts and assistance in implementing existing laws focused on influencing product choices available to consumers. These actions include advocating for product stewardship legislation. There are also actions that provide support for implementing existing laws like the Oregon Toxics Free Kids Act, which requires manufacturers of children's products sold in Oregon to report products containing chemicals of concern.

There were also questions about how Metro will evaluate progress toward the vision and goals in the plan. The plan itself includes a measurement framework to evaluate progress. The measurement framework identifies three types of indicators. There are key indicators, goal indicators, and performance indicators. Some of the data to inform the indicators is already available like tons of waste generated and other indicators will require collecting new data. Metro is in the process of developing a concept for an annual Regional Waste Plan report that will track progress toward implementing plan actions and meeting indicators.

Ms. McDermott appreciated Metro addressing the upstream versus downstream issue within prioritized actions. Ms. McDermott shared items that she felt weren't included, but should be the list (mostly things that are more upstream): increasing the reuse and repair, donation through building codes, expanding collection of re-usable materials at the transfer stations (actions 8.3 and 8.4). In action area 16, one through six, were not included as priorities. She asked which of those actions would promote small recycling and reuse depots instead of on the large transfer stations. And if there were any opportunity, particularly in action 15.10 to evaluate the model of funding

waste prevention work to decouple that work from waste collection rates. The other area of the things that were included, but which may be a lower priority: food donation and recovery, increasing knowledge about recycling through education and end user contamination education. These are all high priorities. She believes that these are all channeling a lot of Metro resources into end of life management. Ms. McDermott wanted to see more upstream focus.

Ms. Carrera wanted to advocate that equity is definitely an important aspect of the overall strategic plan and should continue to be a focus for the three-year work plans as well.

Ms. Flores Aviña wanted clarification on the section that says action is new.

Ms. Stirnkorb noted that the RWP includes a lot of work that has been ongoing and then the actions that are new. That's brand new work that we haven't done before. There are three codes:

1. E = Equity
2. N = Brand new work
3. D = Directive (required by state law or Metro code)

Ms. Vargas Duncan shared that she has a hard time separating added value prioritization and divorcing that from cost and the value added with that in mind. During the pandemic and COVID, that is really highlighted. In programs like RID Patrol that help put people to work and other areas that help retain jobs is important. She also appreciates Ms. McDermott's perspective and how looking at upstream versus downstream and more affordable ways to do things using alternative ideas to look at solutions.

Ms. Stirnkorb shared that as Metro moves into the next phase of the project, which is developing the work plan that will be a big part of it where the group is starting to estimate resource needs and see what resources there are and start making those decisions.

5. INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

Dan Blue (Metro) shared that he and his team are present to discuss a potential property acquisition in the City of Cornelius before Metro Council makes a decision on whether to buy the property that is being considered. That decision will be before council. It is not whether to proceed with design and build of a new facility, but to acquire the property or not at this time. Mr. Blue recapped the October presentation before the committee.

Mr. Blue wanted to address a few questions that came up at the October meeting. Regarding Metro's relationship with the tribes, Mr. Blue expressed that the project team is only just scratching the surface on that work. When the work got started and right about when COVID hit, Metro had contracted with Dr. David Lewis of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, who was going to help Metro with research on the ethno-history of the site and the west part of the region. The goal was to have a better understanding of potential properties in these areas and the history of those properties in relation to first nations. Due to the COVID pandemic, Dr. Lewis's access to original research materials has been constrained. Metro has recently hired Katie McDonald to assist with tribal relations for Metro and the project team has met with her. She is going to help guide through the process of a much deeper engagement with tribes. The other questions that came from the committee relate to costs, potential rate impacts and tonnage capacity in the region. Early next year there will be a broader planning process to better address those questions.

Mr. Blue shared that the engagement work on the project falls in three buckets:

1. Immediate community and residential areas around the property. This includes communications with nearby residents, non-profits in the west side of the region, the community advisory group, posts on social media and news articles.

2. Local governments and government functions. Metro has presented to councils, different staff, briefings with certain elected officials and also internal Metro Advisory Groups including this body.
3. Businesses and industry. The focus is on businesses in the neighborhood of the particular parcel of land. Metro also met with industry folks and chambers of commerce. There is an upcoming solid waste industry and local government forum on Tuesday, 11/24/2020.

The team also put out a public opinion survey with great response. There were over 800 respondents who responded to a survey about the question of whether to acquire the property in Cornelius. 400 of those respondents were from the cities of Forest Grove, Cornelius and Hillsboro. The rest were from around the rest of the region. Mr. Blue shared some of the questions and responses.

Mr. Blue also shared some thoughts expressed by the community advisory group members. One example was: "My biggest concern is that people who haven't had access to all the information that we as a community advisory group have had may be opposed to such a facility because they just don't have all the information." That's one of their biggest concerns, and that was repeated by a number of the members. There are some pockets of concern, particularly around rates, where the tonnage would come from, and a tonnage allocation process. But overall feeling good about the level of general support.

Ms. Carrera wanted to note that she assumes that there will be some work done to address the big concerns that were raised by the group around communicating with other community members who were not part of the advisory group.

Ms. Butcher echoed Ms. Carrera's comment.

Ms. Vargas Duncan expressed starting to feel guilty about always being the first one to raise a hand. She wanted to note that it is really important, especially during these times of the pandemic, to be especially sensitive about the need and the capacity in the region that exists and the cost.

Mr. Blue shared that staff are writing a report on the property investigation work and are working on a summary of all the engagement work. They will be posted on the Metro website.

Shannon Martin (City of Gresham) shared that the survey talked about all of the additional services that the transfer station could offer. He wondered if people were thinking about it as a transfer station for garbage or of all the other services that were there, playgrounds and community service area and things like that. He is curious if there is more community engagement, to better understand if these additional services is what's driving interest or the need for self-hall for garbage. He also noted that there's no mention of the millions of dollars this facility will cost. He is curious how the public feels about that.

Mr. Blue responded that survey provided background about the project and did include the information about it being a transfer station with supplemental potential services. If property is purchased, there will be a much deeper dive again on costs, potential rate impacts at the curb, rate impacts at the transfer stations in terms of tip fee. And Metro will go through a whole other process of seeking feedback with much more information being shared with the community around those issues. That will all be incorporated in anything that is presented to Metro council before any decision would be made to do design and construction.

Thomas Egleston (Washington County) asked: assuming the council does agree to move forward with the acquisition of the property, can Metro lay out the timeline before they would then be back

making a decision, whether they're going to improve a design and build? That kind of second phase of engagement where the decision needs to be made, whether we're actually going to go forward and hire engineers to design it? How much time are we thinking that's going to be in that window?

Mr. Brower noted that it depends on how quickly a vaccine is available, how quickly the economy opens up, how quickly everything gets back to a more normal state. Assuming that happens, say 2021, it could be a year from now to be back into the community engagement phase for the design work.

Mr. Blue echoed that there's so much up in the air in terms of the health of the economy, the health of our community, with COVID. Also, staff may be spending some time on South a little bit more intensely over the next year. More to come.

Ms. Carrera asked about Metro hosting an industry webinar or whether that engagement happened already? If yes, how did that go?

Mr. Blue noted that staff met with the Washington County Haulers Association and local government representatives a few months ago and had a good conversation with them. There is an industry webinar scheduled for Tuesday, November 24 in the afternoon. That will include private transfer station operators, other recycling facility operators, and haulers, and as well as local government solid waste staff referred to as regulators.

Mr. Brower wanted to emphasize that this topic is going to a work session with Metro Council on December 8, and that'll be pretty much a discussion among councilors. The Council will make the decision on December 17 of whether or not to purchase the property in Cornelius. **UPDATE NOTE: Those dates have changed to January 19th and February 4th, 2021.** Metro staff will be strongly recommending that the property be acquired, even if it is land banked for some period of time. If for some reason Metro decided not to build a facility there or to build a facility elsewhere on the west side, we know that that is a major need and gap for public services on the west side.

Mr. Egleston expressed being impressed with the engagement team and the work they've done with the community and the engagement process, their partnership with Central Cultural, and their attempt to capture as much input and voice from the communities that are close to the site and will be most impacted by the facility. On the surface of it, it's possible to ask the question about environmental justice with Cornelius being one of the most diverse communities in the region and getting the dump. But I think staff have done a really good job to understand and share what this is. And it's not a dump in what we would put in our minds of seagulls flying around and tractors pushing garbage over heat piles. He gave kudos for the work being done engaging for community input from the committee and in Washington County. Mr. Brower mentioned earlier that there is a service gap. The county fields these calls all the time. A few examples: Washington County fields calls all the time from community members wanting residential organics. And we can't turn on a program of 65,000 residential customers in unincorporated Washington County and direct all that to Nature's Needs because that facility is not designed for it. It's not set up for it. And honestly, for unincorporated areas, we have nowhere else to go to transfer. A west side facility would fill that gap and it would create an opportunity for the community to have access to that program. Some of our smaller communities have programs and they can direct to Nature's Needs. But we can't add several dozen route trucks a day to Nature's Needs. That's a huge gap and a barrier for the county. The other part of it is household hazardous waste (HHW). The community has had limited access to HHW for a long time. The collection events tried to fill that gap, but since they stopped during COVID, there is zero access to HHW drop-off or collection, and the county gets a lot of questions and

concerns or frustration with having to drive down to Metro Central or South to get rid of some HHW.

Mr. Egleston expressed excitement about the prospect of having this facility in Washington County. In terms of staying engaged, it's an important project and it's going to have a lot of implications across the board. He thinks it's an important topic to keep talking about here at the committee.

Mr. Polk wondered if it would be helpful for Metro to clarify the philosophical approach for the use of fees for system-wide regional benefit versus local benefit. In other words, are we all sharing this assumption that we have a similar regional system fee, similar disposal fee across our whole community to support equitable access to services, or not? Metro's new proposed rate sheet separated Metro South rates and Metro Central rates for the first time. It calls out this possibility of differential rates and differential services. He expressed that he doesn't know if Metro wants to go there. It might be helpful to clarify some of those deeper philosophical assumptions and surface them.

Mr. Brower noted that it's probably a bigger discussion for another time. Metro regards some of the services like HHW or self-haul services as being primarily regional services that are provided and should be paid for across all towns whereas, specific services provided at a transfer station should primarily be covered by the customers of that transfer station. The fact that HHW for instance, is co-located at a transfer station, HHW still gets paid for by all towns because that's the only service of that type that's provided anywhere in the region. It's a really good conversation to have and think about our assumptions and how to move forward in the future.

Mr. Martin shared that as somebody who worked at a Transfer Station and Hazardous Waste Facility for nine years, he appreciates Metro's efforts to look at ways to build a facility that has better dust control, better environmental controls, and it's serving the community, but also the people that work there. Also, working in the hazardous waste collection events, seeing a hundred cars in line idling nonstop for three hours. To add those services, to eliminate that, there's definitely a lot of value for those communities on the west side to have something like that.

Mr. Blue recapped some of what was heard today: supporting and appreciative of the engagement work, some concerns and desire for more information about costs and overall rate impacts, how the community will stay informed. Committee expressed general support for the types of services and the types of amenities and the elevation of residents who live in close proximity to any future stations, those voices, acknowledgement of a history of environmental justice issues with Transfer Stations and how they were placed before, an appreciation for the level of engagement work that has taken place to date, despite some of the challenges, but general support for proceeding with property acquisition at this time.

MEETING AJOURNED at 10:00 a.m.

Next meeting

December 17, 2020 8:00 am – 10:00 am (virtual meeting)