

Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee

Meeting Summary

Date: Feb. 21, 2019

Location: 700 NE Multnomah St., Portland, Oregon 97232

List of attendees

On Call – Brian Stafki (BS), Loretta Pickerell (LP), Pam Peck (PP), Timm Schimke (TS), Laura Leebrick (LL), Amy Roth (AR)

COMMUNICATION GOALS FOR TALKING POINTS

What are our key goals?

DEQ has developed talking points for their leadership team, other working groups, media, legislature and will share what has already been developed with the group which can be modified for needs of the steering committee.

The PESub identified education and the need to keep the topic relevant with key stakeholder as being top priorities for talking points.

Loretta pointed out that the PESub needs to look at what kind of public engagement is needed and what talking points will meet those needs, and recognize that those talking points will likely change based on activities of the Steering Committee.

Pam noted that while that is true for talking points/goals for the Recycling Steering Committee, the PESub, has been asked to address issues in the short term; we should go through each stakeholder group individually and dig down into what each of those need to assure them and engage them with what they need. Not going to do all that today.

PESub agreed that the goal of committee is to communicate opportunities for engagement, and keep issues in the forefront of our stakeholders.

Brian also identified the need to answer three key questions about the Recycling Steering Committee (what is it, who is it, and the outcome is the committee is trying to achieve).

Pam noted that information is in the group charter (DEQ document)

PESub discussed various revisions (noted to consider revising the lead-in as “leadership” of 16 individuals be more framed as representatives of those organizations, and might not be inclusive of all stakeholders, most notably representation from environmental groups). PESub felt it is important to highlight that this group is comprised of public/private sector representatives involved in the industry and all working in a collaborative partnership

PESub agreed on developing three talking points with supporting bullets for each. Discussions of talking points included:

- how Recycling Steering Committee was formed (timing, who selected, etc.) and should include why they were selected, and include the role of Oregon Consensus and history of how formed, and where we are today.
 - Supporting bullet could be how we are involving the public/private partnership with as much info as possible, research, industry guidance
- high level message about protecting Oregon environment



State of Oregon
Department of
Environmental
Quality

Materials Management

700 NE Multnomah St.,
Suite 600
Portland, OR 97232
Phone: 503-229-5696
800-452-4011
Fax: 503-229-6762
Contact: Brian Stafki

www.oregon.gov/DEQ

*DEQ is a leader in
restoring, maintaining and
enhancing the quality of
Oregon's air, land and
water.*

- outcomes include looking at implementation, education, clarification of what we mean by updating our recycling system
 - second bullet addresses that, rephrase to be more action oriented.
 - recommend changes to structure, governance and implementation plan, which is key to our stakeholders
 - identify vulnerabilities in system (language is important here)
 - making more resilient, flexible
 - modernizing to meet needs of today's waste stream, but more importantly, need to be looking at the future, tie to 2050 vision, not just today's stream
- the question of why are we meeting needs to be clear
 - committee brought about due to crisis of national sword but goal to create sustainable system for future that aligns with the 2050 vision
 - doing this out of necessity but golden opportunity to modernize and strengthen for next 30 years
- what messages around how we are going to engage them? We need to be checking in with the groups we represent and bring that message back to the SC.
 - engaging partners on committee and developing broader plan to engage public over the next 16 months (placeholder language); might mention something about SC role and other involved in that work in future
 - SC provide additional opportunities in the process
 - who they are, engaging others in subcommittee work, and others representing related organizations
 - introduces ideas that there are subcommittee's and opportunities to support
 - way to talk about the subcommittees in interesting way
 - should be a high level reference
 - good to mention on how to get engaged (they are public meetings with public comment)
 - we need to figure out the pathway to getting involved mapped out before making those announcements of opportunities for involvement
 - agreed once we get the groups formed, we want to limit the coming/going of members; use Brian's doc

NEXT STEPS:

1. **DEQ will get this document to group tomorrow (in editable form); DONE**
2. **Amy will work on minutes done by Friday (Monday); DONE**
3. **Pam will work on talking points to final to committee prior to meeting on 8th; first draft to DEQ by 27th, with feedback to us by 6th [IN PROGRESS, TIMELINE HAS SHIFTED SLIGHTLY]**

HOW TO GET INVOLVED

Protocol to serve on subcommittee if not on SC

1) *What should be the protocol for getting to serve on a subcommittee if you are a non-SC member: through invitation from a SC member, anyone with interest who contacts the subcommittee chair to get on the list, or something else? Is approval needed to allow a non-*

SC member to serve on the subcommittee? If so, from

whom? Group discussed the following:

- representation for all sectors represented on committee and subcommittee invitation?
- Should we have a percentage of seats reserved for the subcommittee public?
- open subcommittees, but have core folks, and allow others to participate
- all sectors on SC be on subcommittee, plus others who are not on SC, such as environmental groups, citizen tax payer; but have concerns about bogging down the meeting
 - with input from public at large, identify orgs that represent public and ask them to serve on the committee, perhaps master recyclers have demonstrated commitment
 - we need to set a core group.
 - Do we want to consider an application process, call working group(?) to demonstrate the need for work on this, not just weighing in?
 - we may want to limit general public involvement to those committees based on expertise level
 - Oregon Consensus clearly states we need to engage with those that bring expertise to the table to inform our SC.
 - differentiate between adding to the subcommittee vs. inviting to specific discussions
 - have a mailing list to keep them informed when topics of interest come up for discussion and then they are invited?
 - how to address the criticism that public isn't engaged?
 - we have website with subcommittee meeting schedule online, with some general topics outlined, but that invites more work for us. Easiest to have them sign up through .gov distribution list, with contact for more info
 - DEQ is preparing for the Steering Committee and the subcommittee each have own page; will be a bit cleaner, close to completion now.
 - All sectors represented on subcommittee with additional sectors represented as appropriate, and space allotted for those in public sector, and Steering Committee would help identify who those should be.
 - Meetings open for members of public who could listen and weigh in at end; with interest in committee, need interested form/application, and have some kind of interested party list to support that the subcommittees are open
 - Will need to identify what experience/skill is relevant to that subcommittee, as each will have different time commitments/needs
 - we need to be nimble and able to react/act quickly, can't be too cumbersome. Have purpose/expectations clear. Need to be actively looking/inviting and keep open and set tight deadlines.
- **who will make the decision as to who will be on the subcommittee?**
 - the core subcommittee
 - identify who is missing from subcommittees and the core group of subcommittee will decide.

Summary: Hearing a balanced, nimble group, should be thinking about maximum number of people who can sit on it to keep it working and not bogged down. Keep the focus as giving opportunity to have public comment period in meetings, and stay with that as input outlet, not necessarily be ON the subcommittee.

- core group has ability to identify where they are weak and need more representation.
- look at Steering Committee and use that as a guide as needed
- this is also an opportunity to slim down the subcommittees as, many on the committee have multiple people representing their sectors
- Public is not the 6th sector, but will serve as appropriate; all meetings will be open to public to attend and provide comment.

Recommendation: 6 sectors, 2 people from each, that makes 12, and allows for tag-teaming as well [note: define the 6 sectors]

2) What should be the protocol for posting information about the SC on your website? Does

it need approval before posting, and if so, what should the oversight look like for managing content? (i.e. what is the role of the public/stakeholder engagement subcommittee in overseeing this, vs. the role of DEQ, vs. the role of the full SC)

- DEQ needs to be the central point of communication; however, DEQ is not allowed to post on web unless manager and IPO approve. DEQ website will have pages on website and ask that others to link back to the DEQ, not create their own discreet pages. DEQ will provide talking point blurbs, people link back to DEQ, subcommittees to ask others through their communication channels to push info out to public.
- Will the public engagement committee give them the blurb, that the other subcommittees provide and share? Will the PESub also provide DEQ with feedback on additional communications needed.
 - subcommittees can develop content that DEQ approves

summary: DEQ will take direction from subcommittees, and will notify public about meetings; will look to subcommittees to provide/update content for website and DEQ will approve to get on webpage; if others want to have info on their own website, then they need to link to DEQ

AOR MARKETS FORUM

Group discussed how best to utilize the afternoon of the AOR forum to benefit the work of the Steering and subcommittees.

- might be good to look at Steering Committee process with preliminary presentation; morning of the forum is looking at where we were, afternoon to look at where we are going;
- opportunity to reframe recycling in terms of the 2050 vision (presentation by David and Minal) and lifecycle, and how recycling not get us where we need to be; let's recycle

effectively, as its value is use in feedstock, produce a recycling system to provide materials for markets, landfill good option for some materials. Sets up expectations for future.

- may not have questions yet, big picture feedback could be good.
- anything we could pull from that sticky note exercise? Could we get those ranked?
- is there interest/value to pose questions, more deeply, what is most valued/important?
 - David can tell us what's in the plan, and then have group discussion for opportunities/fears - present 2050 briefly and how it guides system and the need to focus more upstream
 - money comes from downstream, how do we address this? Overwhelming for some people to think about where their jobs might be in 5 years, and how could they get it done? Lack of resources, lack of understanding, lack of knowledge is a big concern.
 - Appreciate that feedback and what it means for traditional programs, and can illustrate that in the recycling framework. There will still need to be recycling; goal is not to keep material out of landfill, but to provide high value commodities, and that it is cohesive with other parts of the LC.
 - take this context for recycling, understand where it fits and its importance. Recycling has a place in 2050 vision, very clearly. We are reframing recycling, work may shift focus, describe some of the work we are already doing. Brings people to the point to ask the hard questions.
 - important to get this out there and get people thinking about this.
 - Might good for someone else, not from DEQ, let's reframe recycling, opportunity to get a system that allows us to be more efficient, free up money to do other things, etc., that would be a really good; 2050 vision was a collaborative effort – need to think about who would present that?
- Table discussions: do we have “voting” with polleverywhere? do we have group discussions and have them talk about what is their concerns, thoughts, excitement?
 - need to have more than one person sharing their ideas/thoughts
 - question could be how do we integrate LC into EOL management, focus on other parts such as shared prosperity
 - high level overview of the vision, and what that means for Oregonians
 - concerned that the people in the rural communities, eastern Oregon, move away from chasing tons and think of LCA, will be difficult to throw out there and get buy in. folks out here aren't far enough along.
 - good input, and tend to agree; southern Oregon is already incorporating into conversations, especially when focus is on overall environmental outcomes
 - DEQ talked about the difference of all the environmental impacts; coastal communities may have different values (ocean plastics/toxics) than metro (concern on climate impacts) and need to pull in those views from around the state.

- when we did the multifamily focus groups, had rich discussion in Pendleton about chasing tons, and environmental goals, and large rural frustration with chasing tons; ready to move on from that.

Summary:

1. Overview of Recycling Steering committee with a refresh on 2050 presented by David and Minal
2. small group discussion with report out after each question with facilitator and note taker at each table. Ask Steering Committee members to facilitate at each table
 - a. need to identify who will be there and where gaps are needed, and who will fill those.
 - b. Questions will be: What excites them and what opportunities exist? And what are their fears/concerns/challenges
 - c. Put back to the Steering Committee for third question (or more) and format.

NEXT STEPS:

Amy will summarize and send to Robin/Amy to send to Steering Committee for feedback prior to the 3/15 meeting so decisions can be made at that meeting as the third questions.

Core group meeting in 2 weeks, plan to make plan.

Alternative formats

DEQ can provide documents in an alternate format or in a language other than English upon request. Call DEQ at 800-452-4011 or email deqinfo@deq.state.or.us.