

Tri-County Hazardous Waste & Recycling Program
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
Wasco County Planning Department
2705 E. 2nd Street, The Dalles, OR
September 11, 2019

Voting Committee Members Present

Steve Kramer, Chair (Wasco County); Kevin Liburdy (Vice-Chair, City of Hood River); Cindy Brown (Sherman County); Gordon Zimmerman (Cascade Locks); Pat Bozanich (Mosier); Mike Matthews (Hood River County); Merle Keys (Dufur)

Absent Members

Linda Miller (City of The Dalles); Mike Foreakre (City of Maupin)

Non-Voting Committee Members Present

Bruce Lumper

Staff Members Present

David Skakel, Program Coordinator
Jensi Smith, Planning Coordinator
Angie Brewer, Planning Director

Guests Present

Jim Winterbottom , Waste Connections
Jay Mustard, DEQ

Summary of Actions Taken

Merle Keys motioned to accept Minutes from 6/26/19. Pat Bozanich 2nd. All in Favor	
Vote	6-0-1
Yes	Kevin Liburdy, Cindy Brown, Gordon Zimmerman, Pat Bozanich, Mike Matthews , Merle Keys
No	None
Abstained	Steve Kramer

Gordon Zimmerman motioned to approve grant proposal from the Gorge Rebuild-it Center. Kevin Liburdy seconded it with an amendment to question #4 on the grant application. Gordon approved amendment to his motion.	
Vote	6-1-0
Yes	Kevin Liburdy, Cindy Brown, Gordon Zimmerman, Pat Bozanich, Mike Matthews , Merle Keys
No	Steve Kramer
Abstained	None

Action Item	Chair Kramer and Tyler Stone will update presentation on proposal to move the Tri - County Program to Waste Connections for a public/private partnership. It will be presented to Steering Committee members to review with their councils and boards.
--------------------	--

Action item	David will talk with Nicole in HR to find out how to review our insurance liability regarding Stericycle.
--------------------	--

Welcome

- Meeting began at 8:34. Chair Kramer welcomed everyone to the meeting. Asked for a moment of silence in memory of 9/11/01.

Schedule Future Meetings

- December 11th - confirmed
- March 11th – confirmed

Introductions were made.

Minutes –

➤ 06/26/19 Meeting

Chair Kramer called for discussion. Merle motioned to accept Minutes as submitted, Pat 2nd. All in favor. Motion carried.

Financial Report

• FY2018/19 Year End Budget to Actual

David reviewed budget-to-actuals. He noted the percentages. We came in higher on beginning balance. Staffing levels were less than budgeted for. Grants were less than projected. The car purchase was pushed to the next fiscal year.

• FY2019/20 Year to Date

David reviewed this fiscal year-to-date. We are at approximately 25% on most things. The beginning balance hasn't been finalized yet. We will get that once Finance has reviewed/audited. We did purchase the vehicle in this fiscal year - a Toyota Rav 4 hybrid.

Presentations

Chair Kramer moved the Future of Recycling up on the agenda. He shared a handout with the group (Attachment A), stating Tyler Stone and Jim Winterbottom would present.

• Future of Recycling Program presentation

Tyler Stone: Discussion of the history of the program and current situation with our recycling going to the landfill, noting citizens want something different. Other jurisdictions in our service area have gone with a new surcharge on their recycling services. Wasco County does not want to use that option. Waste Connection was asked into the conversation. How to accomplish this without raising rates? The

conversation included hazardous waste services as well as the recycling side, in coordination with each other. For it to work, we need to have a regional facility to process the materials. One of the issues is the transportation costs. If they are able to bale it differently, they would be able to haul three times as much. The cost difference brings the curve down significantly. In order to do something like this, they would use the land adjacent to the current transfer station. The finances and governance structure would preclude each entity from doing it on their own, but a private and public partnership would make it possible. The facility would serve all the same entities as Tri-County is now serving. We could do this with the current cost model. Those who have added an additional surcharge would be able to roll those increases back, if they chose to. As the lead agency, we are presenting a good product for this region, actually enhances services. The current model of hazardous waste events would continue as is. Additionally, we think we can re-open some of the drop off facilities, with staffing to help monitor the quality of the materials that would be taken to Portland, hopefully at better prices.

The governance piece – one of the things is that the Steering Committee model would stay in place, to work with Waste Connections, with continued oversight. In the short-term, his recommendation would be to modify the HHW agreement to incorporate this language. As each franchise agreement renews, this language would be added, assuring the long term governance and accountability. That would include education and outreach. Waste Connections is willing to take that lead. Wasco County would spin down the program. The joint cost to build the regional facility would include money from Wasco County, Tri-County and Waste Connections. He noted there are adequate reserves to do this. He is proposing the public/private partnership, full service recycling and hazardous waste, with education and outreach program, managed by Waste Connections and monitored by this group. His hope is that the efficiencies will help increase services.

Jim Winterbottom:

There were a lot of questions in the beginning. This would be a baling center where we bale comingled and cardboard. It would be baled and arrange for third party transportation, hoping the higher volumes per load, the number of loads would decrease. He hopes the higher value by volume increases and that would allow brokering better prices. Hood River has been successful since the changes in July. Processors are battling for the material because it is a cleaner product. A couple items have been taken out the program. Cardboard does have value when it is baled, something brokers want. He hopes for expanded service with comingled depots back in Maupin, Tygh Valley/Pine Hollow and Dufur. If there are recommendations for other communities, they could look at this as well. Some communities may have volunteers; others may need help in staffing these.

The acre of land next to our facility we currently rent month-to-month. The property landowner has agreed to a long term lease. We know what the program entails for recycling and hazardous waste. He stated there are a lot of things behind the scenes that they are unaware of at this point. There are a lot of things that still need to be reviewed. The baling facility would not be a customer dropoff site in the beginning. It may be a place where customers could drop off other materials in the future, we never know. The depot at the transfer station would continue to accept materials as it currently does. Jim stated the lease on the property would have to be 20-30 years to make it affordable for them. Gordon noted the bank would be more willing to loan money with a long term lease. Tyler said the public/private partnership brings the level of risk down. The question is at what price point do we do it? He feels that this is going to be a necessity in the future. Jim stated there are those above him that are a little nervous.

Gordon said to summarize – if we go through this program, we would maintain everything that we already do, and enhance what we do as far as recycling the things that we try to recycle now but we can't because it has to go to the landfill because China will not take it anymore. This is one step in moving us back to a more responsible program to handle the waste we generate now. Tyler said there will not be a service degradation - that was must in this discussion. Jim said it would mirror what is going on in Hood River County. We removed the 3-7s, aseptics, gable tops and shredded paper. We will need to do outreach and education which will take a few months. Pat asked if we could do that here now. Jim said that has been talked about but the feedback is that we are taking everything to the landfill now, so they put whatever they want in. Jim said right now no one in Wasco County is paying to take the materials to the processors. Bruce asked what the surcharge is. Kevin stated in the city (Hood River) it is 2.61%. Gordon said it is like .15 per collection. (34:00)

Gordon asked if Waste Connections could renegotiate the franchise agreements and do it all at once so everyone was on the same page. Jim stated that has been discussed, noting Tyler knows more about the IGAs. Jim said to have everyone on the same page would be beneficial from his standpoint. Gordon noted there are two items here. With the IGA, it should be simple but that doesn't get everyone on the same page in regards to the franchise agreements. Tyler stated that had been a request from Waste Connections to renegotiate the franchise agreements for a longer term. He stated he hadn't been completely on board with that. He wants to get it moving, hopefully six to nine months to get this rolling. The IGA is one amendment. The franchise agreements would be more complicated but is the right way to go. Tyler said that he thinks getting everyone on the same page would be ideal.

Cindy stated from a public relations standpoint, this program currently employs two people. She asked if this switch would employ people, create some jobs. Jim said he didn't know, they may be able to do it with the people they already have, they don't know.

Bruce asked how the percentage increase has been working for Hood River County and Cascade Locks. Gordon stated no complaints. His council did not have any problems with it. Jim stated the calculations for surcharge starts in December-January with conversations to determine for recycling rates in April-May with implementation in July. It was already out of date by the time it was implemented in July. That was for 2019. They will have to reassess what the markets are going and may need to come back and ask for a re-adjustment to the 2.61. Bruce asked about the response from citizens. Gordon and Kevin said they didn't think there was much response. Bruce asked why has there been a conclusion reached that this is not tenable to raise rates in the city of The Dalles and Sherman and Wasco counties.

Tyler said his feeling from what he is hearing out there, we have just passed a fire levy, school bond just failed, Norcor bond failed. Chair Kramer said his constituents don't want a raise. Bruce asked how he knows that. Chair Kramer said he has talked to them. He has talked to the South County folks about this and they want to get recycling happening again. Maupin has already put a surcharge of their own and they would have to increase that again. Bruce said he feels that should be tested to see if the citizenry is willing. He noted there are facilities out there that are still unmanned, making him think North Wasco County is the driver in this. He thinks this is a dramatic proposal to shift a whole public program to the private sector, taking a half million dollars a year and funneling it to a private company. He is concerned about the track record of Waste Connections and their expertise to handle this. His concern is about the functioning staff level and expertise in handling hazardous waste. Chair Kramer said we are not looking for a decision to move that program forward today. We are asking for your approval to move forward with negotiations, to get into the details to work out the questions that have been presented.

Bruce stated he is a non-voting member but would 100% encourage the committee to not move this proposal forward. The recycling has always been a controversial aspect of this program. A proposal to move the recycling component at whatever cost it might be, and remove that cost to the program, noting it isn't a major cost for the program. The program was originally sold as a household hazardous and conditionally exempt waste program and to keep that component noting there is absolutely no reason to move that. We have bought facilities with public dollars; do these get transferred at no cost? Tyler stated that the model they are proposing has no impact on the service levels. Waste Connections will manage the same events in the same manner we have been doing them. There is no reason to think that can't happen. His recommendation for Wasco County and to the City of The Dalles is going to be that if we can do it for the same dollars, and get twice the product, that is good stewardship of public funds. Pat asked how are we getting twice the product. Tyler responded that not only are we doing the hazardous waste piece of it, we are also now adding the recycling piece. What we currently don't have the answer to is let's just put another surcharge on our citizens. He doesn't agree with that. Bruce asked if he would essentially agree that this is moving a public program to the private sector with a nominal committee for oversight, to the public sector. That would be the piece that would be left of this program. Those dollars would be moved into the private sector. We have money collected to pay for whatever, that this is going to work out, even be better... Tyler stated it is a public/private partnership, meaning we both have some skin in the game. We made it clear to Waste Connections they will have to account for those public dollars. The vehicle to do that is through the Steering Committee and eventually through the franchise agreement. All the dollars will be reportable to these communities. There will be just as much transparency. Bruce stated he appreciates what Tyler is saying but doesn't have faith that will actually be the case. Tyler asked why Bruce has no faith. Bruce responded Waste Connections is a garbage company, not a recycling company. He said his experience of over 20 years is they will do the absolute minimum, with minimum staffing, and you will pay. This is a for-profit company, with shareholders, a publicly traded company. We will get minimum services for the maximum cost. He finds it hard to believe we are having this conversation. Why is recycling all the sudden so important? He is a true believer, but there is no law that we even have to do recycling. We have to do a technical report if we are not doing some percentage that we set many years ago that we pulled out of a hat. Why are we taking all this money that was taken in good faith effort from our citizens publicly and move it over to the private sector? Tyler stated if by that logic, why don't we just push back the surcharge to our citizens? Bruce said on the recycling side of things, if whatever we can drop, if that was what we are going to do, he would be fully supportive of that versus what is being proposed here, keeping the hazardous waste program.

Tyler asked if Waste Connections is able to bring back something that alleviates those fears, public/private partnership model, would Bruce accept it then. Bruce said he wouldn't call this a public/private partnership, he'd call it privatization, that's the model that is being presented here. Bruce stated he wouldn't accept Waste Connections as the entity to take the program. (55:22)

Pat asked how the public/private partnership would work. What is the public part, other than giving them money? Tyler said the general model of that is having the two entities come together to solve the problem. Each has financial risk. Governance risk. Those kinds of things. Together you achieve the goal that neither could achieve on their own. Pat asked who would be responsible for what. Tyler said this body would be responsible for oversight. Cindy asked if it would have teeth. Chair Kramer said absolutely. We would write that into the contract. Tyler said that at some point, each of the franchise holders would be responsible for the oversight of that program. Essentially we are putting public funds

into the program along with private funds that achieves those goals. We could probably go through and add surcharges and taxes and buy it down, but that is not good governance. Pat asked where the money collected would go. Tyler stated the money would still go through the public agency and be moved to Waste Connections. Cindy noted that is not what the finance page says, noting it says in the presentation (Attachment A) that the surcharge would go directly to Waste Connections. Tyler said it would funnel through us directly to Waste Connections. Cindy said she feels directly would mean they (Waste Connections) would get the check, not Wasco County. Tyler said he could update that. He stated if it could go directly to Waste Connections and cut out budgeting and all those kinds of things out, all that admin overhead, he would certainly want that to happen. Waste Connections has essentially agreed to account for these dollars. We know the revenue coming in and expense – the things it's spent on. They will be accountable and responsible to us.

Mike asked about the other things we are currently doing, the outreach - Master Recyclers, school outreach, the work that David does with legislative things. Would Waste Connections be able to do those kinds of things? Jim stated they have not drilled down into that, but they have their own industry folks that handle these kinds of things for them. We would work on any legislative piece that they can, seeking representation. Pat stated that we would be losing representation with the local public. Tyler noted that Chair Kramer was responsible for the statewide drug takeback program, adding that every public figure here would be part of that responsibility to do that work. We wouldn't necessarily be paying staff to do that. Pat asked what would happen to the staff. Tyler said Wasco County would spend the program down. We would be looking at a net staffing loss in Wasco County. Pat asked if David's position would go to Waste Connections. Tyler stated that if a position opened up, David would have the opportunity to apply for that position at Waste Connections. But he is not going to meddle in the hiring of Waste Connections process. Pat asked if the Steering Committee would have anything to say about how the staffing happens and who might be doing it – the hazardous waste program and the recycling. Tyler said he was sure that Waste Connections would be very forthcoming about all of those things because they do involve public dollars at this point. That is part of the governance process, why this Steering Committee was formed. (55:53)

Mike asked if the grants program would still go through the Steering Committee or would that go away too. Chair Kramer said that would be a choice the Committee would make. Cindy stated it looks like most of the money, the reserves would be plowed into capital improvements and equipment, rather than sitting in reserves like they do now. She doesn't think it's good that we have such a carryover but doesn't see there being any funds, instead it would be going into the facility. Tyler said the dollars would be going into supporting the program, how they should be used. Pat asked if by supporting the program, is he talking about building the facility. Tyler said that is half of it, the initial piece of it. That is something we gain as a region and ongoing operation of that. Pat asked if it would be a mini-MRF (Material Recovery Facility) Jim said no. To start with it, bale comingled materials and cardboard. Pat said there wouldn't be any sorting, taking the same mix we are getting now and baling it. She asked if they are thinking about the franchise agreement between Tri-County program and Waste Connection as being the length of the lease. Tyler said the short term would be just to update the language in the IGA. In the longer term, the franchise agreements would follow, noting Wasco County's are in ten year increments.

Chair Kramer suggested the committee allow the lead agency to negotiate with Waste Connections for a private/public partnership for enhancement of the ultimate goal, to authorize and present back a plan with the findings to move forward for that end. This is a major change in how we do things, for the betterment of the community. He feels this is a win, win. There are causalities but for the greater good.

We need to at least explore the opportunity and move forward. Otherwise, if everyone is dead set against it then we'll drop it and go back to square one. Gordon stated we need to go back to our Boards and Commissions and talk to them about this, to get their approval to move it forward. He wants his council to review it before he comes back to the Steering Committee with their recommendation. Chair Kramer stated they will need an opportunity to update the presentation and get it back to Committee members. Gordon said the presentation could be refined so they can take it to their IGA councils. Pat is interested in the financial part, would like more information about that. Who pays for what? Merle asked if current staffing will continue. Will they be doing what we have been having them do? Tyler said it will continue until this change happens. Pat asked if there would be different staff and it would be overseen by Waste Connections. Tyler said the question is about our current staff and the current program. It will continue like it always has.

Cindy said she would like to have some of the original people who started the program come back in to talk about how this whole thing started. How this was originally sold to the cities and counties. When Chair Kramer first spoke with her about it, her first response was to question if it is even legal. That isn't what this was set up for. Times change, the market changes but how do you make it legal now. Chair Kramer state it was this board that sold it on household hazardous waste removal. Somewhere along the line we decided to add recycling to the mix. With that the bylaws were changed. We approved them last fall.

Mike asked if there was a ballpark of machinery and building costs. We have a big chunk of change now, but it hasn't always been that way. There was a time we were concerned if we were going to survive. We all know that it cycles, it will be headed the other way pretty soon. Jim said in a rough approximation, the building would be around \$400-430K and the bailer \$180-185K. Pat said plus the lease? Jim stated yes.

Chair Kramer stated they will update the proposal for members to take to their boards and commissions, including updates to the financials, setting a goal to review the responses at the December meeting. There was consensus to do that. Kevin said he would like to see a side by side the services that Tri-County currently offers verses what is being proposed. (1:06:26)

David asked to comment. He stated he may be under informed about the full implications of this proposal as he just learned about it yesterday morning. He said he feels that one of his strong points is working cooperative with stakeholders to solve problems. He said he is in full agreement about the strategy of trying to set up a baling operation. David stated he had spoken with Director Brewer and Chair Kramer about looking at balers within the last twelve months but couldn't find a facility to directly or indirectly support. He had proposed to use public dollars to come with a building ourselves that we could lease out. We had some resources to put to it. The more unsettling part of this proposal from his perspective is the concept of giving away the entire program to Waste Connections, to address the perceived risk of adding cost to ratepayers. He is in favor of the baling part. He suggested some of this a year ago. In order to answer some of the questions - what is really at risk, what will be gained and what would be lost. He would prefer a subcommittee of this group to try to get to these issues, rather than the work committee which we normally convene. The work may become mute if this proposal moves forward. He doesn't know that these questions can be answered in siloed isolation, to figure out between Waste Connections and our executive branch. He would like to see more of a group think, but defers to the Committee. He said he was going get into some of the long term financials later and noted there had been some real ups and downs, with carryover and revenue. A couple years ago the thought

was we were in financial straits here, believing we needed to come up with a different funding model. Now it's looking in the other direction. Graphically looking at the full financials of this program, he has a much more comfortable understanding of stability on the revenue side, which helps us figure out what we can and can't do on the expense side. We currently have an uncomfortable overage that can be explained with under staffing, not hiring and so forth. If you take all that away, the revenue we have can support regular, long term staffing of the 2.2 that we are currently budgeted for. We will probably have close to \$500K by the end of this fiscal year. He would like to have joint brainstorming to see if there are other ways to accomplish the goal of keeping the rates low and creating efficiency in the system. One of them would be leveraging a large amount to be determined of that carryover through our large grants program for a public/private investment in such a facility and equipment rather than having the whole program moved over. He has other concerns, like how the hazardous waste events are handled. Stericycle doesn't actually facilitate the 20 hazardous waste events we do each year, they just show up. There is a lot of staff time that going into it on the back end. He isn't sure what you go back to your councils and committees with. If you had a subcommittee of this group, to have others like Tyler, Jim and Chair Kramer and whomever want to sit down and get into more detail.

Gordon said the first thing is share with our committees and councils to see if they want to pursue it, not to ask them to adopt it. This is a huge shift. But if it benefits our citizens, do you want to consider it? There could be lots of questions. He wants to have his council's approval to pursue it.

David stated he understands that but he feels before moving forward, we need to figure out the details. Maybe there are fundamentally alternative ways to get to the same objectives. We haven't had a conversation to figure out if we are asking for the right proposal. He thinks you can get at that with a subcommittee. He doesn't see the problem is with this program. The hazardous waste program has been exemplary. There are fundamental issues with recycling, there are efforts being worked on locally and statewide. There are two dramatically different ways to get at this. One is to shift the whole fund and responsibility over to someone else, and maybe get into pros and cons with a swat analysis on that. The other would be to take a chunk of money on what has initially been framed as creating some real efficiencies through baling comingled and substantially reduce transportation, without changing the governance structure of this program or its funding and oversight. Cindy noted that having been in the private sector, she would recommend keeping the front page test in mind, what it is going to say on the front page of The Chronicle. What are people going to think? It's their money. David thinks that is good reason to have a subcommittee to vet it all out. What happens to the small and big things? How will the hazardous waste events be accomplished without staffing? Pat stated there would be fewer questions and less resistance if we had had any idea that this was happening and been involved. Tyler said the other side of that coin is we are dealing with a corporation that wasn't sure if they could do it. We had to prove that concept. There is the staff. He stated he wouldn't want someone to come to him saying he might lose his job and then say sorry, never mind, we can't do it. Some leg work had to be done ahead of time. That is why they chose to have the conversation with a small group. Chair Kramer stated they had visited with Mayor Burns, Mosier was in the loop. Pat said more back door discussions with things that are happening that the governance committee didn't know about. Chair Kramer stated that is why they were bringing it here today, wanting a thumbs up before presenting it any further. It was within our right to do so. The members will take it back to their communities to see if they approve moving this proposal forward. Gordon asked they bring back info that is balanced, these are the concerns; these are the advantages. Our councils need an objective opportunity to consider this. If they all come back and say no, then that's the answer. If they all come back and say let's pursue the investigation, then that's the next step. Chair Kramer stated that is the initial ask through this presentation, to take a look at it.

Chair Kramer called a break at 9:54am.

Chair Kramer called to order at 10:03am.

- **Long-Term Program Financials (1:28:45)**

David presented a graph showing the long term financial history of the program, noting the revenue side is pretty stable. The CPI adjustment usually goes up. David stated the initial funding agreement has not changed. He noted the staff levels, the building of the facilities, the use of funds to start the recycling program, studies that we funded with DEQ. Cindy noted years of the high expenditures had been large grants that had impacted the carryover. It brought the carryover down, providing the public with better services. David said he visited Dirt Huggers, who now have 15 employees and have doubled the size of their facility. David stated the carryover has been going up because we have been staffed down since 2014. For much of the time it has been just him, then himself and Jensi. We have budgeted for grants, buying a car, staffing but some of it not happening when budgeted. With the growing economy, the surcharge has brought in more than expected. David stated the beginning balance is at \$448K and will likely be larger at the end of this fiscal year. Gordon asked about the dip in 13-14. David stated that was the recession. Chair Kramer said that was when it finally caught us. David noted the expenses went down, as people were let go. Gordon asked when the transition to Wasco County happened. David replied it was 2015. He said the levels have been pretty smooth but we are underspending about \$50K a year plus. David said if we hired the additional staff we would be stable. Right now we are in a position by the end of this year, could potentially be between \$250-400K that could be leveraged toward some substantial project.

Cindy asked if David takes health insurance. David said all county employees have health insurance; he just doesn't cover his family through his insurance. He opts out as he is on his spouse's insurance. Cindy noted that is a huge savings to the program that David does not have to do.

- **HHW Events**

- **Long-Term Hazardous Waste Collection Data**

David reviewed the HHW report for the life of the program, since 2006. He said the cost per pound is critical. It has been knocked almost in half, through efficiencies over time. Quarterly events seem to help in terms of labor costs. David pulls aside things that end up being cost savings – propane canisters, batteries, fire extinguishers. We just shipped out 7,000 pounds of batteries. These diversions help save us money on hazardous waste disposal costs, around \$8K. On the labor side, Stericycle bills PaintCare for the dedicated person that takes care of paint and electronics. At our rural events, there are three Stericycle staff people, but we are only billed for two of them. This saves about \$3K a year in labor costs. David has convinced our Stericycle rep to do this at our large events in Hood River and The Dalles. We do enough volume of paint that it was plausible to dedicate one Stericycle person to PaintCare.

- **Cost Saving Measures**

Chair Kramer asked if the latex paint is counted in these numbers or are they taken out of the hazardous waste numbers. David said the latex paint, program paint – PaintCare paint that is latex or oil based, we estimate are a separate saving about \$35K a year from that EPR from disposal costs. There was discussion about the PaintCare numbers being included in pounds but not cost. David stated the amounts listed are our true costs. Along with this, we started taking electronics at rural events, which

has increased participation. This is attracting more hazardous waste, almost 270K pounds last year. He feels it is working out pretty well.

Pat asked if we have been promoting the events differently. David said each step of the way we learn something new. He noted putting out signs in rural events, attendance almost doubles. Every community is different. David said we are doing Social Media. When we post on our Facebook site it gets pushed out to anyone is streaming national news within our zip codes. Davis said bringing in the electronics and letting people know. Kevin noted last year we introduced the bilingual flier that helped promote the events. (1:44:49)

- **Future of Recycling Program** (above)

Grant Request

- **Gorge Rebuild-it Center**

Their representative wasn't able to attend to present today. David stated it is an established non-profit re-use store for building materials. David shared some of the organizations history. He had financials to see how the business has been run. The program was winding itself down, with the manager no longer making purchases for things to sell and stop advertising, started liquidating assets, lost staff, etc. David feels that they are now there are people involved that are trying to revive it, to keep it going. What they need now is organizational redevelopment. They need someone skilled to help them through that. David believes they have a person to help them do that, noting their resume is attached to proposal. The organization has a new Executive Director, new accountant and has a new tenant renting space, providing regular income. The new Executive Director is a home inspector who has many relationships with regional contractors, which is a critical cornerstone for both donations and sales. A former board member is rejoining the organization.

This proposal is requesting an organizational assistance grant for \$5K to hire Heidi Venture to help build the board, an advisory committee, and volunteers, to work on updating the by-laws, conduct board training, etc. David has inspected the property, noting it needs work. He said they seem positive there, acknowledging it will be a heavy lift. But the right people are coming together to bring in more of the right people to clean it up and getting it reintroduced to the community.

Pat stated she also has history with it, she did the business plan and feasibility study. She thinks it is a great concept and wants it to be revived. She supports it but wants to see how the project's success would be measured. She would like to see records of the number of volunteers, their hours, what's happening now and after the training; evaluations of the training. She would like to see what impact it has and asked this be added to the grant.

David stated the new Executive Director knows the importance of data. David said they can cater to contractors that do regular donations. In an excel file, they can list the retail value as well as half of new value that can be a tax write-off. It drove a lot of donations.

Cindy said she likes that it is for personnel. She would like to have them come back later for capital improvements. David noted they may be looking at DEQ for some funding. Right now it's about how they go through rebuilding their organization, how do they avoid poor management in the future? He would like that posed to the group when they look at their protocols, Board oversight, etc. as they go forward. He doesn't want to be back here in five years.

Chair Kramer stated he doesn't think this organization should be building boards. He can't support this. There are other avenues for board training. David said that if on its own, this was only board training, he would agree. This is also about organizational development. He thinks this is the survival of a used building materials store, which is very much about our mission. Their most important need is organizational development, volunteers, staff, etc.

Gordon stated that if we don't do this we lose a significant recycling program in our communities. He's willing to give them a shot. If they came back for the same thing again, then he wouldn't support it but does want to support this at this time. David mentioned that when he was involved, they sold a lot of insulations that helped folks operate their home with higher efficiency and lower utility costs. Cindy stated she sees this as a project, reading from the program goals for grants.

Gordon motioned to approve the Gorge Re-Build It Center's grant proposal. Kevin seconded, but would like to amend with a recommendation in regards to question #4 to explain the number of volunteers, volunteer hours, and evaluation as recommended by Pat. Gordon said he was okay with that amendment. Gordon said he would like them to come back to do a presentation of what they have done.

Chair Kramer noted the motion and amendment. There was no further discussion. He then called for the vote.

In favor: Kevin Liburdy, Cindy Brown, Gordon Zimmerman, Pat Bozanich, Mike Matthews, Merle Keys.
Opposed: Chair Kramer.

Motion carried. **(2:04:53)**

Policy Discussions

- **Clarify Program spending allowed to support promo/education by other entities**

Clarification on what can be spent on for non-profits and business to assist others who are doing things consistent with our mission. Example – signage for transfer stations for batteries; Mt. Hood Townhall informational signs; Emerald Systems for source separate materials signage.

David said there has been some concern about how we support those other entities. He would like to know the boundaries of it. Is it fast track to approve grant funds, just our ad budget, etc.? Do we want to take promotion money to buy advertising for a company to advertise what they are doing? Gordon wanted clarification. Are these monies that weren't spent out of our grant funds but out of our marketing funds that were made at David's discretion? We are looking for guidelines on what David can do with that funding?

David said our marketing budget could get used up. He suggested allowing the program internally, up to a certain amount, to spend a portion of small grant money, where it could be tracked for these specific needs-printed materials, signage directly connected to recycling and hazardous waste. Gordon asked what is the marketing budget designed to do? David said what comes out of that is pretty spoken for. We have the required twice a year mailers, print ads, radios ads, some contracted work. Gordon said these are for activities we are doing in a certain area. David suggested we are not buying advertising but signage, print materials for activities in our region. Gordon asked if that was for our events. Director

Brewer answered no. David stated activities related to our objectives, for example Mt. Hood Townhall requested more fliers to explain the new recycling standards. Gordon said you have a non-profit that does recycling that need help advertising their projects, verses a private corporation asking for help funding what they are doing. He said non-profits he's okay with not private businesses. Director Brewer said she was uncomfortable with not having a process or direction in place on how we assist local businesses in their daily operations. She stated she doesn't have any strong feelings between commercial and non-profits because non-profits still have to pay themselves. They are still businesses. She would like them to apply for small grants, which we have process available. She doesn't like the Ad Hoc approach in spending public dollars. She would like us to go through the process we have in place.

Jim Winterbottom stated as for the example of Hood River Garbage (HRG) and The Dalles Disposal asking for assistance, he doesn't remember asking for anything from Tri-County. Pat said we had purchased signs for our program facilities. David said he wasn't sure how it came to be, but we had provided signage for both transfer stations for batteries. Jim stated again they had not asked for any signs.

Director Brewer stated there are others that are asking and she would like to be comfortable with how we are spending those public dollars. The small grants are one way to do it proactively. Reactively might be a certain threshold of a certain level of dollars. David said that procedurally, if they had to apply for a grant for \$20 that would dissuade them from doing it. Director Brewer said if they did it proactively, they could request \$500 at the beginning of the year to cover they year's outreach and advertising. She would like to see them be more proactive. She would like guidance from the group. Pat noted she is not comfortable advertising other organizations. David stated he had expressed that is something we wouldn't do. David said it would be more like putting our own print materials up at their sites or signage if needed. David to better understand is it just no for for-profits, or just no. Gordon said he thinks it's just no. He likes moving them into the grant program, to have prior planning. Be ahead on your projects and come to us with what their needs. David said it might complicate providing brochures to TDD & HRG. Is that something different? Pat asked if that is promoting us and our services. David stated it is promoting all the services, equally beneficial. One is a trifold with recycling instructions, with a panel about hazardous waste. He said recently we have been using the newsletter as the catch all. We have also provided the English/Spanish contamination fliers. What category do these fall into – providing a private company printed materials. Or is this different? He would like to know what he can and can't do. Who has the responsibility for requirements for Opportunity to Recycle? With the use of the newsletter, it is even more complex because they (Waste Connections) pay for the postage on half of it. Gordon asked if the program is identified at the bottom of the fliers/brochures. David replied yes. Pat asked if the question is if we are responsible to provide printed materials about recycling services. David said not really about being responsible but hearing the direction the Steering Committee is going in saying no, we should not be spending any money to help private businesses market what they do, even if it benefits our mission. David said he is asking for further clarification if it precludes us from what we have been doing – providing fliers to transfer stations to distribute to customers. Director Brewer said those fliers are on behalf of this organization, carrying forward the best available information, produced by us and shared. **(2:21:20)** It was noted that Mt. Hood Townhall had requested signage for their recycling activities. Director Brewer said the fliers that the program creates and shares with the transfer station for information sharing, for education purposes, doesn't seem as if it is work for a private organization. Chair Kramer noted that we have three partners that are doing something different than the rest are doing. He stated it is now on the table to change the list to get everyone in the tri-county is doing the same thing. Pat inquired as to why it isn't being done as a group. Chair Kramer stated Wasco County,

Dufur and Maupin will all have to change their menus to match what others are doing. It is his recommendation that moving forward, we clean things up. Pat asked who decides what is in the mix. Director Brewer stated the franchise agreements have a lot to do with what is in the mix. We hopefully create a clear and comprehensive message for the region. We currently have some conflicts because of changes to some of those franchise agreements. Jim stated that everything that goes into the Hood River transfer station has the same list. When Wasco County gets back to processing recycling, they would all come to The Dalles transfer station. Mosier, The Dalles, Wasco County, as well as the depots in Sherman County will need to all be on the same list, which are dictated by his processors. Jay stated processors take all kinds of programs throughout the state, it is complicated. Jim said they trans load everything to the transfer station. The marketing of these materials are to a specific list. Pat stated it is about a uniform message, a uniform collection. It was noted that what we currently have regionally is not consistent and our mission is to promote whatever it is that needs to be done to increase recycling. The education and outreach materials should be co-branded and clearly show that it comes from us. Director Brewer stated to be clear: the program materials to help message for outreach and education can be made at the staff level. If others organization have separate messages, not coming from this program but are in line with program goals, we would encourage them to pursue a small grant. The small grants approval process is at the staff level. There was consensus to follow these guidelines.

- **Contractor Safety Declaration**

David stated there have been a couple incidents, not accidents, with Stericycle at HRG at our hazardous waste events. What can we do to make this better? Jim has some safety declarations that they use. David has modified that to a couple pages that includes the contractors will sign on and abide by our DEQ emergency response plans for our two facilities. This declaration piece ties into the larger documents has many specifics about the response plan – who’s authorized to do what. Jim stated they have a generic declaration that they have anyone sign who is working at their facilities. He stated David had updated this to one that is more specific to Stericycle at the HHW events, more extensive guidelines for the contractor. Jim said he just wants to be covered for any damage to their buildings and property. Gordon asked if this has been run past our insurance company. David replied no. Stericycle does provide a certificate of liability. David said if he has permission, he will talk to CIS. Chair Kramer said he should talk to Nicole in Human Resources to start.

- **EPR**

David congratulated Chair Kramer on the medicine program takeback. Chair Kramer stated it will start on July 1, 2021. We are getting there with plastic bags and straws. We didn’t get the big one – hazardous waste, but we did get close.

David said there is some federal EPR proposals for recycling - paper and packaging.

Committees

- **Work Plan Committee**

David said this is the time we typically convene the work plan committee. Do we do that now? Gordon stated it makes sense to update the work plan either way. David said with continual improvement, a lot of time was spent in the past with formatting, etc. This could be shorter time frame, to focus on the substance of the work. Pat volunteered.

- **Budget Committee**

Pat volunteered. Chair Kramer said he would contact others later.

Miscellaneous

- **Local – Recycling Concurrence Update**

Wasco County is the only county with concurrence in the state. Jay stated there is a concurrence letter to The Dalles. Some communities had to landfill materials because markets have fallen apart. The Dalles is the only one left that has not resumed recycling. The Dalles has applied for another concurrence. Basically this is DEQ acknowledging that this is what they are doing. They did not meet the requirements of the concurrence; Waste Connections did not want to notify their customers that their recycling was going to the landfill. Jay stated DEQ did not issue them the concurrence. Jim stated he had not heard this info before. Jay stated he is new to the region and apologized that the message had not been relayed before. Jay stated there is not a concurrence in place. DEQ has no insight into the financials to know whether or not the material is technically not recyclable, by definition. He said DEQ will work with the city of The Dalles and Waste Connections to make this determination. He noted everyone else has either increased their rates or changed their programs. The rate increases have been from 2-4%. He stated there will be a meeting the next day to discuss. Chair Kramer stated he has had no official notification about the concurrence and or the meeting. Jay said he would get that information to him, noting they send it to the wasteshed rep, which is David for Wasco County.

- **Statewide – DEQ's Recycling Steering Committee** (above)
- **Vehicle Purchase** – (above)
- **Call2Recycle** –David shared photos of the batteries and cell phones that were shipped. He FedEx'd 7,500 pounds of batteries.
- **Other**
 - ClearStreams are being utilized, with the help of the new lift gate.
 - David shared some photos from a tour that show a 50% diversion of garbage at the end of the MRF. The machine is adjusted to look for specific things after they have been run through already, then they run it through again. This provides cleaner products. Instead of trying to set these up at every MRF, they are looking at setting these up regionally, potentially three on the west coast. Things would be shipped to these facilities to do the additional sort. They claimed they would revenue share with the MRFs. The hope is the market would be domestic. Jim said they have a facility in LA, with the hopes there would be one in SF, Portland and Seattle.

Adjourned at 11:22 am.

Minutes taken by: Jensi Smith