

5-14-18 Landfill Criteria Matrix Meeting (Operational Safety, Community Impact, and Social Equity)

Susan Shultz: This is scheduled to be our last meeting and so we're going to get through at least 3 and 4. We will start with 3 and 4 this morning and also I wanted to make sure that you all have a copy of the landfill criteria matrix, the latest one. As we talked about last time, on the very far left column, it indicates whether or not this group has reached consensus on the language. We're going to go through the scoring this morning, so don't worry about that but, as far as the language is concerned, so where it indicates that there is a consensus. Just want to remind you that what that means, basically, is that that's something that you're willing to live with based on the discussion that you all have had for the past meetings, and that you agree not to oppose it. So we fully understand and I fully understand when we talk about consensus that perhaps if you had had 100% your way that this would not look like this, but given your participation, given the discussion, that you feel that this is something that you can live with and not oppose. If that's not the case, then we want to correct that. So we will go through 3 and 4 in particular, and then we'll go back to 1, because I know you've done some work on that last week. Then we'll make sure that the language is still something that you all can live with. Okay, my name is Susan Shultz. I think most of you have been here before, and I'm your facilitator. We're just going to go around the room so that you can just state your name and who you're with and then we'll go on with the agenda.

Adam Gregory: I'm Adam Gregory with Texas Disposal Systems.

Ryan Hobbs: Ryan Hobbs, Texas Disposal Systems.

Alfonso Sifuentes: Alfonso Sifuentes, Green Group Holdings.

Andy Andradi: Andy Andradi, Central Texas Refuse.

Gerry Acuna: Gerry Acuna, Zero Waste Advisory Commission.

Andrew Dobbs: Andrew Dobbs, Texas Campaign for the Environment.

Donna Gosh: Donna Gosh, Organics by Gosh.

Chris Thomas: Chris Thomas, Waste Connections.

Bubba Smith: Bubba Smith, Waste Management.

Daniel Rumsey: Daniel Rumsey, Waste Management.

Gary Gauci: Gary Gauci, Republic Services.

Gary Newton: Gary Newton, Texas Disposal Systems.

Rajiv Patel: Rajiv Patel with GreenThink Consulting and TDS.

Bob Kier: Bob Kier, Robert S. Kier Consulting.

Bob Gregory: Bob Gregory with TDS.

Gena McKinley: Gena McKinley with Austin Resource Recovery.

Woody Raine: Woody Raine, Austin Resource Recovery.

Richard McHale: Richard McHale, Austin Resource Recovery.

Amber Williamson: Amber Williamson, Austin Resource Recovery.

Tina Bui: Tina Bui, Austin Resource Recovery.

Elisabeth Flores: Elisabeth Flores, Austin Resource Recovery.

Emlea Chanslor: Emlea Chanslor, Austin Resource Recovery.

Jason McCombs: Jason McCombs, Austin Resource Recovery.

Adam Gregory: And that's Dr. Masino.

Susan Shultz: Okay, thank you. I know you all have had a chance to read over the meeting notes from last...well from the May 2nd meeting, I should say. Are there any corrections, any mistakes that you saw in those notes that we need to make? Okay.

Adam Gregory: I haven't had a chance. I'm sorry, I haven't read the notes so I mean we'll carry on, but...

Susan Shultz: You reserve judgment.

Adam Gregory: Yes ma'am.

Susan Shultz: All right. And some of you did some work last week, and Woody, would you like to say a few words about that?

Woody Raine: Okay. I'll come up here so I can make it into a show and tell a little bit. So a large cross section of this group met last Tuesday or last Monday...

Ryan Hobbs: Monday.

Woody Raine: ...to talk about the landfill, the Carbon Footprint aspects of this and I wanted to basically brief y'all on what the changes were in the interim since your May 2nd meeting based on the meeting a week ago. And what you see in yellow here... or what we did was, in red you'll see a lot of the descriptions and the measures noted 'May 2nd changes', and then some of these also say 'May 14th.' It gives you an idea of what was discussed at the previous meeting and then what has been proposed for this meeting. Those that are in yellow are the ones that were particularly focused on in that meeting last week and it looks a lot like on 1B, it looks like 'Hey, the language in yellow, the description and the measure, pretty much matches what was in red above those track-change versions,' and that's largely because it was generally accepted that the language that was proposed for that is now our current accepted proposal on that.

Adam Gregory: Hey Woody?

Woody Raine: Yeah?

Adam Gregory: I just wanted to let everyone know we're handing out the same handout we brought to that last meeting with the information on the various deals for everyone's information. We handed it out at the last meeting and we wanted to make sure everybody here got it.

Woody Raine: Yeah. One of the big changes on this was that what was 2C or 2B, had been moved to 1C because it's also part of a measure of the carbon footprint so you'll see that in highlighted and some scratched out stuff and I wanted to make sure that there wasn't any questions about that. The other main measure that changed was 1A. Where instead of looking at the percent, or the collection efficiency, which is a fraction or a percentage, it's now a measure that's based on the amount of emissions divided by the amount of waste in place.

Adam Gregory: Woody did we... on that divisor on waste in place, I think we left it that we were gonna, each one of us was going to test it out, see what it looked like. And I don't know, did we decide that that... I don't think we determined that that was the appropriate way. Did we?

Chris Thomas: Not yet. I mean I think it was, we need to all kind of get together and look at that.

Ryan Hobbs: Yeah. That was our understanding though, that it was proposed and this is reflective of something that's final.

Woody Raine: Yeah, and we can all come back and compare all that. My understanding about how this meeting will run is that we're going to focus on Items 3 and 4 and then at the end of the meeting if there's still some time we might get back into that.

Susan Shultz: Yep. Adam, if you don't... make sure that you raise that issue again.

Adam Gregory: Yes ma'am.

Susan Shultz: All right. So on, May 2nd, we went through 1 and 2 and we wanted to make sure that we came back and did the same for 3 and 4 as far as the scoring. I think the language wasn't so much an issue but we will double check that as far as whether we have consensus on the language. So let's start with 3, Operational Safety. The intent here is to minimize the safety risk to the landfill's employees and others on sight. Okay, any concerns with 3A? I don't think there's any change in the language of the description and no change in the language of the measures. Can you all live with the language of the measures? Measure 1 and 2? Any concerns?

Adam Gregory: I have some general concerns about 3. The category total, not with necessarily the wording, just the basic concept that, and I want to assure everyone that I'm not trying to downplay the importance of safety in our operations, it's one of the most important things we can do. However, when safety has 25 points in its category with the various subcategories it kind of, and you've got to split those 25 points up between all these different things but then compare those categories to other categories with the amount of points that they have, it seems not consistent in that some of these categories will create point situations that outweigh typically much more visible and impactful to the environment activities. So, I will reserve any commitment on any of the points but I want to get it on record that while safety is incredibly important, I don't know that weighting its category equal to carbon footprint or operational things or even community serves this purpose.

Susan Shultz: Okay. So from a scoring standpoint, you don't think, or your suggestion is that it should be weighed less than the other three categories, in general?

Adam Gregory: In general yes, or there may be, safety might should be included with community as one category or something. I'm not positive. I'm not suggesting anything. I'm just pointing out that just for example there's 7 points for having no fatalities. Well there's also, I think it's listed as 7 points, for not having large amounts of hazardous waste.

Daniel Rumsey: Four. We actually didn't agree on 7, it's 4, so. And I thought we already agreed it was 25 per...

Adam Gregory: I haven't agreed to anything on points-wise. But I'm just saying that, the fact that, if we're trying to be consistent with past Council policies which is the whole, which is the prefatory statement of why we're here, to say just because no one's died at your landfill for the past five years in a points scoring system, that should not fully outweigh what is dozens of years and hundreds of pages of legal lawsuits against your company that are part of the Council's past priorities.

Bubba Smith: Those that haven't killed anybody though. I mean, like, our number one goal is safety.

Andrew Dobbs: I mean we don't have to get into... we can pick another one. We can pick a totally different one. The general point I think is well taken that this section is pretty, I mean like I think that from everything I know everybody that operates landfills in this town is pretty good on these measures, right? Or, I haven't heard of anything, any problems on these measures. And so, it makes me think that you're right...

Adam Gregory: It waters the rest of them down.

Andrew Dobbs: Right, I mean like, I think that you know the thing is that there are five points sections here. So, the good news is that if we reduce this by any multiple of five, like if we were to take it down to 20 points overall or 15 we could just take 1 or 2 or however many points from each of them, keep the same proportions within this section but then make this section a little bit less impactful so that we can redistribute those points in places where maybe it is a little bit more relevant to what the purpose of this document is.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Chris Thomas: I'll just disagree with that. It needs to be at least as important as all the other categories, safety itself. If we're not being safe, regardless if they're safe or not, if we're not being safe then you shouldn't be using a landfill so, that's my statement and I'll argue that.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Gerry Acuna: Our last meeting, not the technical meeting, the last one, correct me if I'm wrong but I thought we agreed on the category values.

Daniel Rumsey: We did. Everybody agreed on it.

Andrew Dobbs: I mean, I never quite, I suggested it but I wasn't a 100% sure on that but you know I'm...

Adam Gregory: I reserve the right to disagree with anything we come up with. I'm not... there's a problem also in going piece by piece by piece because as you agree on things, you're affecting what you can do down the line. So, I think this consensus category should at least be very clear that it's limited to the language because... and even then, it's with the way you put it, agreeing not to oppose anything. I will reserve the right to, no matter what happens, to oppose in part or the whole, any part or the whole of this depending on what the final product looks like. Because we still, while we're doing a lot of red lines and stuff, we still haven't gotten... this has to be translated into an ordinance or a resolution or something like that and as we've all learned and should all know, "the devil's in the details" so I'm not going to give up my right to disagree with anything until there's actual final language.

Susan Shultz: Right. I think what we would ask of you, though, and everybody here, is that as it currently stands as far as the language is concerned, if you have concerns about the language or the categories or you think that there should be additional categories. That's the point, I think, of going through this exercise is that you all, with your expertise and your background, given what the mission is as far as coming up with criteria that the City can use, then this is the time to say, you know, 'we don't think this is the right criteria or we don't think it should be worded this way.' There is a concern with this or that, as you have done in past meetings which is great. So this is really to inform the City as far as what you as industry participants and experts can offer to the City to say you know, 'We're not doing this in a vacuum. We're doing this as our industry and our participation in the process has shown this is what we think is the most practical and the most efficient way to evaluate a landfill.' So, you know, it's one thing to say I'm going to reserve as far as what I see from coming out of the City, certainly, but as far as what comes out of this group, we hope that this is something that you all can be proud of and live with. Yes.

Josh Blaine: I just want to make a comment that this group is not intended to be industry. This group is meant to be stakeholders. So we have a lot of industry here but there are a lot of stakeholders who are represented by Texas Campaign for the Environment, by constituents of District 1 and other districts and a lot who aren't here and I would actually agree that this seems to be an area where there isn't a lot of concern from the community because I think the practices are generally followed. There are other accountability measures that are in place that seem to be functioning. So in terms of what our purpose here is, I think I will agree that this is an area where we could bump this down and actually have a little bit more teeth in the things that we are trying to accomplish.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Josh Blaine: I'd appreciate that.

Chris Thomas: I'd just say it doesn't make it less important whether we're doing it now or whether...

Josh Blaine: Not less important but less important to the purposes of why we're... why we're in this room.

Chris Thomas: It's part of landfill operation, so.

Andrew Dobbs: I think the basic point here is, I think that we can debate the big picture over whether this should have more or fewer points as a category. Within the category, the way I'm looking at it, I think that each of these measures is fine, as far as I can tell. I mean, I may need to look at it a little bit more, but it seems fine and it seems like the points, like the proportion within it, seems fine to me. I reserve the right to change my mind also, but you know, always, but as far as I can tell if we can get some sort of consensus or alignment, I like the term alignment more on that, just because you don't have to agree on everything but you're willing to live with it.

Susan Shultz: Yes.

Andrew Dobbs: If we can align on those questions then I think we could either answer the bigger question here and then move on, or we could move on and come back to it, either way.

Susan Shultz: Okay. Okay. Yes.

Bob Gregory: I have a point for clarification or a question for clarification. In our last meeting we discussed the need to identify what it was within the landfill...

Susan Shultz: Yes.

Bob Gregory: ...that we were speaking of.

Susan Shultz: Yes.

Bob Gregory: And it is not uncommon for the City staff to talk about the landfill to be what is done within that landfill permit boundary. So, the City I believe, the City staff, and ZWAC and Council have encouraged composting, recycling, you know, diversion in multiple ways. Are we speaking here, when we say 'the landfill' and particularly the measures on 3A, are we speaking with everything that goes on within a property even if it's hundreds of employees or are we talking about the working face area? The disposal...

Kaiba White: The landfill operation.

Bob Gregory: ...portion, area of the landfill? I think it would be appropriate to identify, somehow describe that, so that while we had the discussion and I think we pretty much agreed, I don't know, of course everybody's agreement should be subject to change when they see the final document, but I think we were headed towards the landfill disposal portion of the facility rather than everything that goes on, if it's composting, recycling, all that kind of stuff. So if that is the case, if it's the case, then I suggest we be more specific on what the landfill will be credited. The landfill where the injury occurred. Where the safety... we all agree that safety is extremely important but when it comes down to scoring, if something happened on an industrial park that's part of what they call 'the landfill,' that would be a different situation. That would actually work to discourage working environments that divert material from landfill disposal.

Susan Shultz: Is that a correct terminology, 'the landfill disposal site'?

Bob Gregory: I think so. Well, 'landfill disposal', I don't know. Let people decide on whether it's disposal portion or the working face. I'm not exactly sure.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Bob Gregory: But something different than 'the landfill.'

Susan Shultz: Okay. First, any concerns or any objections to what was just said?

Amanda Masino: Question for clarification. How is that different from the way things get reported to OSHA? These severe injury reports? Would they be flagged as to whether it's the site, the landfill portion, the composting portion, right?

Adam Gregory: It's my understanding they're generally done by address.

Chris Thomas: Yeah. It's done by your, you know, your site. So if you guys have multiple stuff, you're probably just one site you're reporting for everybody.

Adam Gregory: Yeah.

Susan Shultz: Okay. So...

Bob Gregory: And therein lies the real point because if the City is evaluating it based on address and it's 600 employees where another facility has 6 employees, and the one that has 600 may have 14, say, on the landfill working face area, how do you differentiate...

Susan Shultz: Okay. So...

Bob Gregory: ...if OSHA doesn't differentiate?

Susan Shultz: So what is the intent to capture here? What the landfill operations, or however you want to characterize it, is that what you're looking at as opposed to...

Andrew Dobbs: I mean, I think we talked about this last time because, I mean, we want some sort of rate so that we equalize, but like if an operation has a ton of injuries, if it's the same company that's running it and the same management over the facility and they have a ton of injuries over like, you know, like a disproportionate number of injuries over in another section of their operations, I don't think that we should sit there and say oh well, it doesn't count because it wasn't on the landfill. I think that we should take the total like universe of workers on that, like in that, you know...

Amanda Masino: How is this reported to OSHA?

Andrew Dobbs: ...into account. Yeah.

Chris Thomas: The rate's calculated and equalized by, it gives you a number per 100 employees. So whether you have 4 or you have 1,000, it's still going to give you an incident rate per 100.

Susan Shultz: And that's how you report to OSHA?

Chris Thomas: That's how we report and come up with that incident rate, equivalent incident rate. So, it does equalize out if you're just looking for a rate. Now, the point is that if you have more, you know, you have more of a chance to have you know an injury, if you're, especially if you have a high incident rate, if you have 600 you're probably more likely on the percentage basis, to have, you know, a serious incident but...

Adam Gregory: Well just think if you're operating 4 pieces of equipment versus 50 pieces, 100 pieces of equipment. Even if it's the same amount of employees the nature of the activities could lead to reportable incidents.

Andrew Dobbs: I get it. The other thing here is that like, is this doesn't talk about a rate. If you look at like...

Adam Gregory: It doesn't.

Andrew Dobbs: ...at 3A, 2, it says if you haven't had any, you get all the points, I guess. Which doesn't really seem to be very flexible because like...

Daniel Rumsey: Well, it doesn't matter how many employees you have, if you have a fatality, that's a problem.

Susan Shultz: One.

Andrew Dobbs: Right. No. Is that fatality?

Amanda Masino: That's, well, it's severe workplace.

Andrew Dobbs: It's severe workplace related injuries. And I think you're right about the fatality. I think that fatality should be an all or nothing but like when it comes to these injuries I mean, I don't know what's severe. I'm sure there's a formal definition and we could probably get somebody to clarify.

Chris Thomas: Maybe we can...maybe we can look at that...

Adam Gregory: It is.

Chris Thomas: ...and combine 1 and 2 and just have an actual incident rate would be the measure because that is equalized per 100 employees, instead of, you know...

Susan Shultz: So what do y'all think about that?

Chris Thomas: ...detailed planning and training.

Amanda Masino: I would not eliminate the planning element. I mean, we made a point of making a distinction between knowing that you have a certain set of procedures and here's the actual rate and we did that also with hazards and also with unexpected incidents. So, why collapse away the training and practices for safety?

Adam Gregory: None of the training...

Chris Thomas: Yeah, just as long as we have a rate, a measurement in there and I think the incident rate, reportable incident rate is a good one and...

Susan Shultz: So what you're proposing is that Measure 2 mention incident rate?

Chris Thomas: Yeah, just OSHA reportable incident rate.

Andrew Dobbs: And like, but now how do we...

Chris Thomas: Instead of lost time rate.

Andrew Dobbs: ...how do we rack up the points based on that injury rate?

Chris Thomas: Well, you have to stack them and that's something that we haven't talked about, is, how are we gonna give the points to each company in each category? There's three landfills or two landfills competing. The one that has the best incident rate gets the most points and then a percentage. I mean, I think we...

Adam Gregory: I want to correct that just that, the statement, it's been made a few times and it was kind of echoed in the article that came out about this process. I don't know if all of you know but we made the papers. But, the idea that there's only two landfills that ought to be considered under this or competing for City waste is not the case. I mean this...there are two landfills very, very close to the City, however, Austin is blessed with far closer facilities than almost any other major city, so the idea is, in a reasonable distance if you look at nationally how far people or cities are traveling with waste, there's many landfills in the area that could be eligible to receive City waste. So, the idea that it's just two, doesn't serve this purpose, I don't think.

Susan Shultz: Okay. Back to Measure 2. There was a proposal that incident rate should be mentioned. Any objections to that?

Chris Thomas: That's a Measure...that's Measure 2, right?

Andrew Dobbs: Measure 2, yeah.

Susan Shultz: Measure 2.

Andrew Dobbs: We'll just need to figure out how, like I said, how to make that work but I think that's a good idea.

Chris Thomas: And if you need specifics, it's probably the OSHA recorded ones that are right.

Susan Shultz: So, how you report to OSHA?

Chris Thomas: Yep.

Susan Shultz: Okay. Would it already include the incident rate?

Chris Thomas: We don't actually send it to OSHA. We post it on the wall every February 1st.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Chris Thomas: Or whenever we post it. February 1st.

Susan Shultz: Okay. Any other changes, proposed changes in 3A as far as language is concerned? I know you all are...

Amanda Masino: Well, I think on that measure, if we were discussing making it the rate also, you're not gonna get credit. Right now it says 'will be credited for not having any severe work-related injuries' and we want to make sure this isn't an all or nothing. Right? It's not that you get that 7 points for 0 per 100 and then no points for any rate. We need to change that.

Adam Gregory: Yeah. Yes.

Chris Thomas: Yeah, I'd say take the, like you said, the severe work-related injuries is actually covered down in 3D.

Amanda Masino: So this will be, yeah, just re-write this somehow. It's just about the injury rate only.

Adam Gregory: Yes. Points will be allocated based on the rate. Yeah.

Unknown Speaker: It's proportional.

Susan Shultz: Okay. Okay, 3B. Landfill will be credited for having detailed procedures to handle unexpected incidents. It's pretty straightforward. Any concerns there? Okay. 3C, the landfill will receive credit for its efforts to reduce exposure onsite or to toxics or other hazards.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah. I mean, I've been looking at this and there were several things that were included on here, I don't know if we're considering those having been dealt with somewhere else, but it talks about odors, groundwater migration, noise, lights, vectors, and that seems like a lot more than just toxics. And, I mean, I don't know if that counts as operational safety or if that should be somewhere else but I'm curious as to why those were struck.

Unknown Speaker: I think we moved it on to the community.

Andrew Dobbs: Is that what happened?

Unknown Speaker: Yeah.

Andrew Dobbs: Where is that? Yeah, I mean...

Unknown Speaker: Yeah, under 2D there.

Andrew Dobbs: 2D. It's environmental. See regulations or permit requirements. Okay.

Donna Gosh: So it went under the under the environmental stuff... *(inaudible)*

Andrew Dobbs: Controlled odors. All right.

Donna Gosh: Since it wasn't really dealing with... *(inaudible)*. I think that we all talked about that *(inaudible)*.

Susan Shultz: Okay. All right, questions. No. Okay. So you're okay on 3C?

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah.

Susan Shultz: Okay, 3D. Landfill would be credited for having no fatalities or catastrophes for the past 5 years.

Andrew Dobbs: And that just makes sense as a good all or nothing measure.

Susan Shultz: Okay, so, what I'm hearing is that you're okay on the language. Now, do you want to talk generally about the scoring or do you want to move on to 4 as far as the language at then take up 3 and 4, or take up the scoring more generally after you go through 4?

Andrew Dobbs: Why don't we go through 4?

Amanda Masino: We have not spent much time on 4. Let's...

Andrew Dobbs: Let's go through 4.

Donna Gosh: Can I just make one general comment? I mean, right now you have 25 points, you have 5 items. I don't understand why one would be weighted higher than another one on these 'cause these all seem to be

pretty much equally important as far as safety. So, why not give all of these, you know, equal rating under the safety?

Andrew Dobbs: I would actually disagree to a certain extent. I think that actually, whether or not people are actually being injured or killed, is more important than whether or not you have policies or training. So I think that...

Donna Gosh: Which is the two that have 7?

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah. I mean, and if you look at the others they're like a little bit lower, so I think that we should, you know... (*inaudible*).

Donna Gosh: Okay, that makes sense.

Adam Gregory: I've one quick question on 3D. Is catastrophes a defined term somewhere?

Woody Raine: It is.

Chris Thomas: Catastrophes are severe injuries.

Susan Shultz: Woody, you're saying yes?

Woody Raine: OSHA defines it in respect that it would have to do with hospitalization. Injuries that result in hospitalization.

Adam Gregory: But we have up here severe work-related injuries. Severe...

Donna Gosh: We took that out.

Chris Thomas: We struck that out.

Adam Gregory: Oh, okay.

Chris Thomas: And moved it because it was kind of covered down below and I don't know if we want to change that. It's a defined term, or we can put severe injuries down at the bottom too.

Adam Gregory: I'm just, because I know what the definition for severe work-related injuries is, but I'm not sure but for catastrophes, but all severe work-related injuries would certainly involve hospitalization and if catastrophes is merely hospitalization...

Donna Gosh: Shouldn't that be an all or nothing?

Woody Raine: I think what that is is more than three, if more than three employees or people that go to the hospital.

Adam Gregory: Oh, okay, it's a, that's catastrophes, affecting more than, three or more, or? Okay.

Chris Thomas: Yeah, I'm prone to say that that needs to be severe injuries instead of catastrophes.

Adam Gregory: Well if the idea is that we're trying to equate a single fatality with a big event that injures three or more people, hospitalized, that makes more sense to keep them together. I guess.

Chris Thomas: Well I mean there's a whole case of in between of, you know, amputations...

Adam Gregory: That's severe injury.

Chris Thomas: You'd still get points in this category if you had an amputation because it's, just because three people didn't get amputated, you know, an amputation, you'd still be okay.

Susan Shultz: So, what I'm hearing though is that...

Andrew Dobbs: So basically we're saying one arm is worth three people?

Donna Gosh: Well, wait a minute guys. No, no, no, no don't even think about it...

Chris Thomas: I wouldn't even add severe injuries to it.

Donna Gosh: ...because it's dangerous.

Chris Thomas: Fatality, catastrophe and severe injuries.

Susan Shultz: What I'm hearing is that the severe injuries would be whether it happens to an individual, to one individual, whereas a catastrophe is a question of whether it happens to a number of people. So it's severe that has effected more than three people. Is that right Woody?

Woody Raine: I think so. I'm looking it up. I'm not that fast.

Alfonso Sifuentes: So we're saying that a catastrophe does not necessarily equate to a severe injury. It could be 3 but...

Chris Thomas: You have to have three severe injuries.

Alfonso Sifuentes: For it to be a catastrophe?

Donna Gosh: In one event.

Chris Thomas: In one event.

Donna Gosh: In one event though.

Alfonso Sifuentes: Well it would have to be severe injuries to be a catastrophe.

Adam Gregory: I don't know. He said it was three hospitalizations.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, because severe injuries have to do with like losing...

Chris Thomas: Why don't we just put severe injury on there?

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah why don't we like, I mean like, like why not add it?

Susan Shultz: Wait, wait...Woody just looked it up.

Woody Raine: It's a, I haven't looked it up yet, but it's a separate OSHA reported item on their site. One can do a search and find out who has had to report that. That's separate from severe injuries so those are two separate things.

Susan Shultz: Two separate measures.

Andrew Dobbs: Why don't we throw, I mean like, is there a reason not to put severe injuries in here with them?

Chris Thomas: Or catastrophes. Just have all three of them.

Andrew Dobbs: So it's like fatalities. Yes, fatalities, severe injuries or catastrophes?

Susan Shultz: So you'd like to combine 3A, Measure 2 with...

Andrew Dobbs: No, we still want that injury rate. Remember we changed it...

Adam Gregory: We changed that just to the incident rate and now since we took severe out of the... I'm fine with putting that down in the bottom.

Kaiba White: So in the 3D before fatalities add the word 'severe injuries'.

Susan Shultz: Severe work-related injuries?

Adam Gregory: Mmhmm.

Kaiba White: Yes.

Andrew Dobbs: And this should be, like I mean, one thing I'm thinking about here though is, this is, I mean like I made the argument a minute ago that I think that all the like onsite operations would make sense and I'll stand by

that, but like what about drivers like offsite? This wouldn't cover them if there's like driving injuries, right? I mean like I think that that's important but like I mean, but I don't think that we should necessarily cross this....

Adam Gregory: It's not about the landfill operation.

Donna Gosh: I think in one of the early meetings we discussed the hauling was not part of the landfill operations.

Chris Thomas: But we wouldn't put it on that site's OSHA record anyway.

Andrew Dobbs: Okay.

Chris Thomas: So if you're looking at the actual OSHA...

Andrew Dobbs: Okay.

Chris Thomas: ...you know, you guys would be... if we had an issue we wouldn't put you know, one of the Andy's drivers on there if they got injured or something on our site. It wouldn't be on our OSHA logs so.

Andrew Dobbs: Okay.

Chris Thomas: It'd be on his OSHA log.

Andrew Dobbs: Okay, and for the folks that are both haulers and...

Chris Thomas: Yeah. Separate. Separate.

Andrew Dobbs: Cause y'all do that too?

Chris Thomas: Yeah we have hauling and...

Andrew Dobbs: You pick up from my place.

Adam Gregory: You throw away trash, Dobbs?

Andrew Dobbs: A little bit. I don't have any, I don't have any composting. Maybe when you get the compost...
(inaudible)

Susan Shultz: Okay, we're gonna move on to 4 now?

Bob Gregory: Can I make another comment? I encourage the staff to identify any defined term where they have things that are capitalized here. I'm sure this would come in the rules or some interpretation to follow but as has already been said, "The devil's in the details".

Susan Shultz: It is.

Bob Gregory: So while we're using defined terms or areas where reporting is required and they're gonna rely on that reporting, I think it's good for certainly this group and even ZWAC and the Council to understand what that reporting entails. Like we talked about earlier, whether it's by the entire facility, whether it's by the company, whether it's the address, whether it's the type of operation. So I think staff should identify for this group, what those defined terms, and what the understanding is so that we will know what we're doing here.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Bob Gregory: And that that should occur before a vote on the document occurs.

Susan Shultz: Okay. 4? Measure 1, well, 4A was deleted.

Amanda Masino: Yeah 4A, why was 4A deleted? Because to me, this is an incredibly important measure. We've talked about it several times and it just sort of vanished.

Donna Gosh: Was it written into one of the other ones? Legal and...

Ryan Hobbs: It says here the Purchasing Department.

Amanda Masino: Yeah, recommended deletion they explained it went from Purchasing. Can anyone from staff clarify about what happened there?

Andrew Dobbs: Purchasing Department strikes again.

Adam Gregory: They're great, aren't they?

Tina Bui: In talking about Purchasing and other departments, this is just one that, from a solicitation standpoint they recommended we delete. They didn't go into a lot of detail yet, we're still working with them to refine their recommendation but they recommended that we delete this one.

Donna Gosh: And that was from Legal and where?

Tina Bui: Yeah.

Andrew Dobbs: And what was the reason?

Amanda Masino: Yeah, do they have a legal reason? Do they have a just we don't want to measure this and we're not going to provide a reason?

Tina Bui: They did have some legal concerns about it and this will be an unsatisfactory response. I think it's the kind of thing that they don't share. They've asked us to kind of continue to talk to them and work on it and think about the whole matrix together and how it will be used. But they are not comfortable with us sharing all of their legal concerns at this time.

Adam Gregory: I say we ignore Purchasing's opinion until they...

Emlea Chanslor: That is the Council and staff and so that...it's uncomfortable.

Adam Gregory: I say we ignore Purchasing and Legal until they can provide actual reasoning. That's always my opinion.

Susan Shultz: It seems that some of the comments that were made in past meetings though is that there was some difficulty in reporting the racial and gender breakdown. First of all some of the turnovers as far as the timing of when that would be reported and also whether or not you even ask that of your employees anymore.

Amanda Masino: This is interesting to me because this has come up many, many times as if this is something that's very difficult. From what I understand, most companies have to report this to EEOC, is that not true?

Adam Gregory: From my perspective, this was never the thing I thought was difficult. I didn't know about the area stuff and census tracks and things. I've learned more and now I'm with you on all this stuff. So, let's do it.

Andrew Dobbs: I get it. You do have to report that study or your demographics to EEOC anyways right?

Chris Thomas: You report it when you get an audit. So when they send you a letter, then you report that stuff to EEOC.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah. Is it one of those things that...

Chris Thomas: You generally just get audited and I mean, we seem to get audited at least in half of Texas once or twice a year at different facilities and then you've got to submit the data so...

Adam Gregory: I think it's fine to certify what it is at the moment you turn it in and...

Andrew Dobbs: So the point is, is that, this is something that is collectable, that there are procedures for collecting and that we know what it means, right?

Chris Thomas: Just in general, but the issue is then, how do you measure it? How do you measure what you submit against, you know...

Andrew Dobbs: Setting that aside, like getting some sort of raw data is like the idea that this is just not, it's not something we can ask people or that we can ever collect?

Chris Thomas: You generally have it. It's easier to do, obviously it's easier to do gender than it is to do race, and so we have the majority of the information but then how do you measure it against, you know what's TDS against Waste Management or Green Group? How do you measure?

Amanda Masino: Typically what you do when you're measuring diversity for a company is you get the demographic breakdown, whatever it is, and then you look at the overall population and you see how much your company profile diverges from the overall population. So, if we're 50/50 more or less male/female and your company is 60/40 then you diverge by this many percentage points versus another company that maybe has 52. So that's typically how you do it. That way you keep to, you have one set of percentages and you're comparing to the overall population. That's...

Susan Shultz: So is that captured in the demographic part then in 4, 4F?

Chris Thomas: It's a lot of information and there's only one word in here, it's only one sentence in there, so.

Andrew Dobbs: The demographic, real quick, the demographic information on 4, whatever it is now, F, I guess, is not about, it's about the demographics of the neighbors of the facility, not the actual workforce. So this is about, and like, the idea that we also have is being able to compare it to, like, like the opportunities for advancement which is something that is also, I mean...

Amanda Masino: Right. I think that one is a little more complicated and I can understand that one because you have to look at tiers of employees and how things shift but as a very basic... we wanted this in here because we know that historically lower income and African American and Hispanic communities have lived near hazardous sites and it has been a problem for them in terms of property value, quality of life, whatever. This measure was included to show, for companies to be able to show that well, look at what we are doing in this other area in our hiring and practices to actually address diversity and assist the communities that in the past have been hurt by the fact that they've lived near these sites. So, if you're just looking at who you hire, that is one way to show that you are having a positive impact on the community that normally would not have a good impact from the presence of your business.

Andrew Dobbs: Well, but, then...

Amanda Masino: And that, I mean, I understand what you're saying, and you want to also see advancement but as a starting point, I think just having the racial breakdown of employees compared to what's going on in Austin, it's...

Andrew Dobbs: But again, if you've got like, the \$12 an hour, you know, like, low unskilled jobs are all going to, you know there's a ton of those and they're all going to African American folks and then everything that requires, that actually has benefits and good pay and everything else is going to white dudes...

Amanda Masino: Right.

Andrew Dobbs: I think that's like, I mean, that won't be, that will skew that number. It's gonna be like, oh, well we've got, you know, this really diverse workforce.

Amanda Masino: So you have to report in tiers to, unless, again, I'm understanding the website incorrectly, but I believe the EEOC report does have...

Andrew Dobbs: Income tiers.

Amanda Masino: ...tiers. So you can see that...

Chris Thomas: Right. It's got the job description.

Amanda Masino:job description. Yeah. So you could see okay...

Susan Shultz: Yeah, what we previously had was staff, management and executive staff.

Amanda Masino: Right, so it's the same thing. Overall, you're 50 percent/50 percent, female/male but you know what, if we break it down to the janitorial staff versus the executives, it becomes 80/20.

Andrew Dobbs: Okay.

Susan Shultz: So, you've heard the concerns with the City's legal department that's one thing, as far as the stakeholders...

Adam Gregory: No, we haven't heard those concerns.

Andrew Dobbs: That sounds like nonsense. I mean let's make sure that...

Susan Shultz: Well as far as the participants here today, around this table, are you all proposing then to put that back in?

Andrew Dobbs: I support putting it back in.

Amanda Masino: I want it back in.

Susan Shultz: Yes? Any concerns with putting it back in?

Chris Thomas: Concerns about just how it's going to be measured across facilities and the other thing I'll put on there like there's probably three or four more things within this matrix. The landfills that have generally been around for a long time, with the exception of yours which hasn't been around, it's like negative years, but landfills have zero control over who moves in around them and you know, the population changes and it happens. You have complaints and we have a lot of things within this matrix that are completely out of the landfill's control. Demographics is one of them. The landfills have no, have no control over when cities or counties change the zoning around to jam more people in a tight area. I've operated landfills that have been out in the country and then five years later, they'll have developments all the way around them and then all of sudden we start getting complaints. We start getting issues, so.

Andrew Dobbs: Well, let's...let's talk about that when we get that. I think it's...

Chris Thomas: This is still an issue here in, versus that, the makeup of a population changes you know based on things that are completely out of the control of these guys that operate these landfills and typically they have long term employees so you're gonna see that shift and that takes years to do. So, a point in time look is really not gonna show you a whole lot about the facility and that would be my concern, is how we measure it and how we look at it because these things change. They're pretty fluid about who moves in and out of neighborhoods so.

Andrew Dobbs: We're not talking about the neighborhood, we're talking about the workforce.

Amanda Masino: As far as talking about the racial...

Alfonso Sifuentes: Chris can take it back to that, too. How the neighborhood and the workforce are...

Adam Gregory: But we did talk about the workforce compared to, you mentioned Austin. Would it be more appropriate to compare the workforce with the actual, the area? The census tract that we're talking about measuring in the other thing? Because...

Donna Gosh: But then you're not, then you're measuring everybody against different variables rather than the same variables.

Chris Thomas: It should be the local community, right, that the facilities are in? If you're gonna measure it against something, not, 'cause you know...

Amanda Masino: Cause that's your hiring group, essentially.

Chris Thomas: I guess you're hiring from, you know around that area.

Bubba Smith: And the landfill is on the east side of Austin, all these landfills are on the east side of 35 because, not because of who lived there.

Chris Thomas: Because there was nothing there.

Bubba Smith: It's because of geology. They weren't built on the best places because it was rock, you know, and the aquifers were there. They were built on the east side because of the clays. That's true.

Andrew Dobbs: I mean, that's true but I mean there's similar forces that led to the settlement of people on the east side and I mean like we could, if we wanted to have a really long in-depth discussion of like the political economy of Austin's development, I'm pretty sure that we could. But like, I mean, the point being, I think that, I mean, I wouldn't mind comparing it against Travis County because it's not like everybody that works at every landfill lives in the census tract there. People drive to work. I think that like, Travis County would be like a demographic and I wondered what you'd think about that. I think it's something that is like is a fair basis for comparison, you know?

Adam Gregory: Rather than...

Amanda Masino: I think that this is, but we're all learning how to make this a reflective measure...

Susan Shultz: Right.

Amanda Masino: ...and it struck me with the carbon footprint. You have like two ways to calculate and then you can kind of pick your better. Isn't that, am I boiling that down more or less, right? You pick your, you could look at this compared to your census tract and to Travis County both and see how they...

Adam Gregory: Or you're, the county you're in.

Amanda Masino: The county you're in, I'm sorry.

Susan Shultz: Are we still talking about, are we still talking about 4A or did we...?

Amanda Masino: We are talking about 4A still. Right.

Susan Shultz: So 4A would be, you would still want a breakdown of the racial and gender of the staff, management, executive staff as compared, and then as far as the points that you would get, would it be measured against demographics of Travis County or...

Andrew Dobbs: Or the county that you're operating in because Green Group will be in Caldwell. And we may want to be able to like, you know, if we're looking at the Williamson County landfill or something like that.

Susan Shultz: And then the measure would be... Would it be similar to 4F where you would receive credit if your breakdowns...?

Amanda Masino: ...If your breakdowns reflect your county of operation, right? Are you reflecting county or census tract? Again, we can look at if you happen to be in a tract that's not reflective of your overall county that wouldn't be fair.

Chris Thomas: I guess it'd be a correlation maybe, between, between the local demographic, or whatever measure you're using against your actual. It'd be a correlation and then you'd have to score the landfills against each other in that time to see who gets the most points and who gets the least. I guess.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, I mean, I won't deny that it's tough but I mean, I think that finding some way, and I think that, finding some way to reflect this is important.

Amanda Masino: Yeah, and these reports...

Donna Gosh: How would you compare it to Austin's demographics?

Andrew Dobbs: That's what we're saying. We just said county to county.

Amanda Masino: Yeah.

Andrew Dobbs: I think that's the last time's, right?

Donna Gosh: No, this is this time.

Andrew Dobbs: 4A is on the top of the page.

Donna Gosh: Oh...but this one is saying Austin on the....

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah. We're talking about 4A.

Susan Shultz: Okay, so 4A, you would still have the report of the breakdown by gender and race and then the measure would be points awarded if the breakdown reflects demographics of Travis County or the county where the landfill operates. Is that how you wanted to capture that?

Andrew Dobbs: We can try to strike, sorry. I was gonna say, you could strike Travis County because we don't want to create confusion that they get to pick which one they use. It's the county where they operate.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Kaiba White: So, initially, well, maybe not initially, but last time we talked about this measure it seemed like it could include staff for some companies that is elsewhere, right? In terms of executive staff?

Andrew Dobbs: Mmhhh, yeah, I mean, it seemed like it kind of is a little different to me.

Donna Gosh: We said by the facility, is what we said before.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah and we did talk about that and I think we're changing this. We're shifting, we're shifting our...

Donna Gosh: He's talking about the facility, is what we said before. Not overall.

Kaiba White: Okay. So it won't include...

Donna Gosh: But it just depends on what county they operate in because Travis County is like ginormous and other counties aren't as big. So I don't really think that any county they operate in is necessarily a fair, I don't know how equitable that is.

Andrew Dobbs: We're talking about the percent, but we're talking about the racial demographics. We're not talking about their size. So, if a county is predominantly Latino and all of your like new, and everybody that you're hiring or whatever it is Anglo, right, then that would show the disproportionality in that...

Donna Gosh: But I'm just saying because you have Austin in the middle of Travis County, Austin has a very, very different demographic than a lot of counties in Texas. And so, I'm just not sure how equitable that is.

Andrew Dobbs: But it's about like, but it's about where you're operating so, it's about like are you, are you drawing fairly from your population or does it appear that somehow you know whether consciously or unconsciously...

Donna Gosh: Are you understanding what I'm saying? Because I see you're saying, you know...

Kaiba White: But are you saying that the more rural company may have to draw....

Donna Gosh: It's going to have a totally different demographic than you have in a capital of the state.

Adam Gregory: Yeah. That's why we, that's why you choose, that's why you compare them to their home county because it's about your relation to the place you are, right?

Donna Gosh: But this is about relation to City of Austin. Travis County...

Andrew Dobbs: No. No it's not.

Andrew Dobbs: You're getting these two mixed up. We're right here.

Susan Shultz: No, the county, the county where you operate.

Donna Gosh: No I'm talking about this entire matrix has to do with City of Austin which is in Travis County. That's what I'm saying. This doesn't have to do with other counties in the state of Texas. This has to do with City of Austin which is in Travis County.

Andrew Dobbs: It has to do with the landfills and the landfills...

Susan Shultz: Landfills, where they operate.

Ryan Hobbs: They're not all in Travis County.

Kaiba White: May I make a suggestion? I wonder if this is a little bit of a different idea, but if you compared not to the population at large, but actually compared to the other employees, to the employees at large at the facility, if we're looking at this as a measure of advancement...

Andrew Dobbs: I think we just changed it.

Susan Shultz: Yeah.

Andrew Dobbs: We haven't talked about this in a while. We've changed all this. Which I think we should talk about advancement but if we're saying that that's like difficult to measure...

Kaiba White: Are we talking about 1A?

Andrew Dobbs: 4A.

Susan Shultz: Yes...4A.

Kaiba White: 4A?

Susan Shultz: Yes.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, we kind of changed like what we were...

Kaiba White: Oh, I thought we were just talking about advancement.

Susan Shultz: It's one thing to report the racial and gender breakdown which I think people are doing whether it's on a regular basis or by audit but we were also trying to see then, how would you award points. And one suggestion was to award the points based on how your breakdown reflects the demographics of the county where the landfill operates.

Amanda Masino: Right. Presumably cause that's your workforce.

Susan Shultz: Right. Comments on that?

Andy Andradi: I just think, to clarify what Donna was saying, that ultimately this could apply to landfills way beyond our region. So, we need to take that into account.

Susan Shultz: Right, so they would...

Andrew Dobbs: So they would count by their county.

Susan Shultz: It would still be by their county, where they operate. So if you operate in Williamson County you would look at there, if you operate in Hays County you would look at the demographic of this county.

Bob Gregory: I know that 4A was struck and now it's being put back, some form of it is being put back in, it relates to proposer of what was struck. I'm not sure what your language is going back in. All the rest of them it appears to me to relate to the landfill so I reassert my question earlier and even expand it, when you're talking about a landfill, whether it's in Travis County – well in Travis County they're all privately owned. You get outside Travis County and I think you need to be specific when you get into the landfill on whether it's the operator of the

landfill or the owner of the landfill. Because when you get into a number of the other facilities, the owner and operator are two different entities. So, to just use the term 'the landfill', particularly an un-capitalized "l", landfill, it begs the question, what is it? And when it comes down to the reporting, it leaves a lot of variable for argument and people to turn in what they want. I don't know how you would ever rely on the data without being specific.

Woody Raine: Bobby Are you suggesting, are you suggesting landfill operator then, wherever it would say landfill, it should say landfill operator?

Bob Gregory: I don't, first of all, I'm throwing it out for the group to discuss. I can probably pick it apart with any one of them after you think about it, and that's not my goal to pick it apart. I think the goal of this is to have something that will actually work.

Susan Shultz: Right, so what does make sense?

Bob Gregory: And so to put out the language of the landfill and then, I know we're trying to finalize this. I'm not picking at you, ma'am, but to say okay, what do we have against it or speak now or hold your peace kind of deal, there's a lot of details here that can make this go to pot, to make it non-usable at all. Like that. Because I think you can argue that it should be weighed regarding a larger than a census tract or a, one of them down here says a two-mile radius. You can argue for any one of those but there's opportunity for gerrymandering in any of them because in say a one-mile radius, I don't know who is gonna go and check that. If it's a census tract or a, I don't know zip code, whatever the other deal is, that may be a reportable number to verify, to check. So, the devil's in the details and I think those details need to be identified and I think the staff needs to give, since they're the ones proposing the language, right before we have these meetings, I think they need to specify the significance of the details so that this group can have their discussion and, you know.

Susan Shultz: But as far as your input, what makes sense? From your perspective, when we talk about landfill and let's just take the example of the responsibility to report. Does it come from the landfill operator or does it come from the landfill owner?

Adam Gregory: I think that...

Bob Gregory: I would say it comes from the operator.

Adam Gregory: Yes.

Bob Gregory: If it were anyone, it would be the operator. But again, is that just for that landfill, only and not an operator who operates other facilities within 50 miles?

Adam Gregory: It should be the op... it should be tied... done by the operator for a specific facility.

Chris Thomas: Let's propose it and see if they take it away.

Bob Gregory: I can see that could, that would make sense.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, I mean, because if it's...

Chris Thomas: And I think that's the intent.

Adam Gregory: I know that that's the intent but intent can often not amount to a hill of beans.

Susan Shultz: Let's just clarify and make sure that you all have a common understanding of what, what the words mean. So, it's certainly worth clarifying that and having that discussion.

Andrew Dobbs: And I want to reiterate that, a lot of these things, especially on the demographics and racial disproportionality, and things like that, these are not, like, novel things that we're doing here. These are very common measures that are very well established. That are done all the time, every day by all kinds of different entities in order to measure these things. And these aren't you know, like, you know wild and crazy ideas that we're just coming up with here in the room. They're very well-established demographic and sociological principles. So, I mean, we're just wanting to make sure that we use those best practices in answering the question

before us which is: Is this facility contributing to racial injustice or not? Right? And one way of doing that is answering the question, are they hiring people that look like the community – are they hiring the people in the community that they operate in, in pretty general numbers, or are they in some way disproportionately shifting their employment away from the people that live near them? That's a pretty, that's a pretty standard idea that's easy to answer.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Bob Gregory: I don't have objection to any of that. I'm just trying to get down to the specifics of who it is that's doing the reporting because you can have a landfill facility where one entity operates the landfill working face area, you know the disposal part of it. Another company operates the gas collection and they're totally separate, a different company.

Susan Shultz: So, any concerns about using 'landfill operator' as the responsible party?

Adam Gregory: No.

Susan Shultz: Others? No? Okay, great. Thank you for that clarification.

Woody Raine: And quickly, in support of what Bobby was saying, you know as much as possible in the descriptions we've tried to be clear – that's our intent – to show where the data comes from, we site websites and that sort of thing, so we appreciate whatever other feedback you've got and we really want to make sure that that definitely is clear where the data comes from.

Susan Shultz: To be specific. Yeah.

Bob Gregory: I think it's great if you were, like the two-mile radius, with that, thinking through it, would that be something that whoever came up with an answer to that, how would anybody ever check it? If there is nothing....

Woody Raine: I'll tell you how that all came about.

Bob Gregory: Okay. Okay.

Andy Andrasi: So on the allocation of points for this, is it based on the deviation from the City's demographics versus the workforce demographics?

Susan Shultz: The county...county. County where you operate, is what the proposal was so there's...

Andy Andrasi: I'm just trying to understand how the...

Susan Shultz: Yes. It's based on the county demographics of where you operate.

Andy Andrasi: But it's the deviation from... okay, so...

Susan Shultz: How reflective you are of the county demographics. Is that...?

Amanda Masino: Essentially, yeah. And, I don't know what the final language we ended up with...

Susan Shultz: Well, right now it just says, 'reflects demographics', 'if breakdown reflects demographics of county where landfill operates.'

Amanda Masino: So, to some extent, the language that was there originally is pretty good with the added piece that we are comparing to the county, right?

Susan Shultz: Right.

Amanda Masino: That that's your basis for comparison so...

Susan Shultz: Right.

Andrew Dobbs: And we're not talking about the executive staff anymore so we're not even gonna look at...

Susan Shultz: You have a description and you have a measure as to how you're gonna award points.

Amanda Masino: Right. So the measure would be that... the deviation, right? Between your demographic, right, your, I'm sorry, your diversity breakdown and the breakdown in your county, right? And if staff is investigating this, perhaps the way that this is all calculated on these EEO reports would be a very good place to model things since you know that companies have to do that anyway.

Andrew Dobbs: And if Legal has some, if Legal or Purchasing have some specific objections that they can outline for us, you know, that would be good to bring, but in the absence of any kind of specific objection, we just obviously, if it's not specific then it's obviously not gonna do.

Kaiba White: And hopefully legal in nature.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, exactly, and not just like, yeah, exactly, if there's like some sort of like legal obstacle to doing this. Which there's not.

Susan Shultz: But from this perspective, this is what you're proposing.

Amanda Masino: Yes. But before, a real quick note for staff, just to be really clear that when those of us who were talking about this environmental justice piece talked about this being in here, this is not the same as woman owned or minority owned business. Right? This is about, again, the practices of the company, of the landfill operating company at that site and how they might promote diversity. So it's not to... I know before in some of the discussion that got kind of conflated with minority and women owned, which is a separate part of this and I understand that, but we intended this to be different.

Susan Shultz: Okay. 4B.

Chris Thomas: I don't really have an issue with Measure 1. Measure 2, I stated it last time, unless you're a city or a publicly owned agency, the fact that you have a labor or a collective bargaining agreement is a result of poor management and leadership. So that's my statement. I don't think it needs to be in there.

Adam Gregory: I have a different point but it has to do with Measure 2. To me, it seems like the wording of Measure 2, 'the landfill will receive credit for allowing labor and collective bargaining'. Isn't it the case that the law allows...

Chris Thomas: They allow it, they're just not there to...

Adam Gregory: In the case that, let me finish, that the law will, the law allows labor and collective bargaining? And how do you measure if there's never been an instance where, I don't know how a company disallows it if the law allows it and if there's never been an effort or a request or an action by the company to encourage or discourage or anything, if there's a status quo that's going on where no one, where there's never been an allow...the only...it's certainly allowed by law, it's never been disallowed by the company, how do you, how do you score that?

Andrew Dobbs: I think that there's two different ways of doing this, and we can include both of these in there and clarify them. One is, if you have a collective bargaining agreement in place then you would get you points. And I disagree with the idea that this is universally because of bad management. Actually there's tons of facilities all over the world with collective bargaining agreements because that's just the way that they do things there, because workers need a seat at the table when decisions are being made about their livelihoods. Number two is that you can have what's known as a labor peace agreement which basically means that you will accept a card check union, that you'll accept union cards as allowing for collective bargaining and you won't require and it'll already be an election. And so if you were to say, I mean like, I think it's going to be one of those things that everybody's gonna get a goose egg on this right now. But I think we could say 'the landfill will receive credit for having a collective bargaining agreement – a collective bargaining agreement or labor peace agreement.'

Chris Thomas: Okay, I'll just disagree with that, again, and in the private world that we work in, maybe not in the world that you're used to dealing with, if you have a union or a union comes there it's because you don't, you're not prop, you don't have leadership at the site and you don't allow employees to have a voice, so that's why you

end up with a union, 100% of the time. That's not a wage issue, it's not anything else, it's 100% a leadership issue and that's just, that's 25 years in the business that I've seen across the country and that's just the way is, so.

Alfonso Sifuentes: My vote is that the way it's worded is just redundant and I think we ought to just remove it.

Andrew Dobbs: Management doesn't like unions. Newsflash. Okay. You know, I think that that's...

Alfonso Sifuentes: I think Adam's point is saying the way it's worded, the law already allows for that.

Adam Gregory: I don't think we should just...

Andrew Dobbs: So that's why I said it differently. That's why I said different words.

Chris Thomas: I think it should be...

Andrew Dobbs: Exactly, if the words aren't right. So I'd say that anyone that has a collective bargaining or labor peace agreement makes a lot more sense if you get the three points...

Susan Shultz: Or having labor or collective bargaining or a labor peace agreement?

Andrew Dobbs: You know, I'd just say a collective bargaining or a labor peace agreement. You don't need to repeat the word 'labor' in there.

Susan Shultz: And does a labor peace agreement also require a union?

Andrew Dobbs: No, I mean, what it does is, basically it's on both labor and on management that says that as long as management agrees to like, recognize a union without an election, and then the union won't strike.

Susan Shultz: Right, but so, if you don't have a union in your place, in your operation, then this wouldn't apply.

Andrew Dobbs: You could have a, no, you could have a labor union and that's what I'm saying, like a formal policy that says that 'if we get fifty percent plus one of our, of a labor union, of a work union in our shop, right, if we get fifty percent plus one that bring us cards that we will recognize them as a collective bargaining unit...

Susan Shultz: Oh, okay.

Andrew Dobbs: ...and we'll certify them and we'll collectively bargain with them. We will not require them to take the additional step of going to a national labor relations board.

Adam Gregory: So if we proactively agree to give up our rights?

Chris Thomas: Yeah, so nobody in the private industry will ever do that, for one.

Bubba Smith: Treat your employees fair and...

Andrew Dobbs: So everybody gets a maximum of 97 points.

Chris Thomas: Yeah, well it's just a ridiculous measure and nobody's going to do it.

Susan Shultz: Well, remember that it's...

Donna Gosh: I suggest we just take the measure out.

Andrew Dobbs: No. And I'll tell you this, I talked with AFSCME this morning, and I can talk to all the other unions in town and I can get CLC out on this and I will tell you that a majority of our city council got elected with union support. So we want the unions out there on this. They will come, and they will probably push for more than...

Susan Shultz: Okay, we understand that there's no consensus on this. We also remember that since you put 4A back we're gonna have to award some points to 4A as well.

Andrew Dobbs: Right, and I would think that we could go back to 3 like we were talking about...

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Andrew Dobbs: ...take some points from there and move it over to 4A.

Susan Shultz: All right. Okay.

Andrew Dobbs: I mean, that's my point on this and...

Bubba Smith: I don't...

Andrew Dobbs: I mean industry is going to oppose it and I agree.

Josh Blaine: From the perspective of industry how are we supposed to hold you accountable to treating employees well? You're basically asking us to trust you. But if we're not hearing from the employees through a labor agreement, for example, then...

Chris Thomas: One, there isn't any, at any of the facilities that I'm aware of that we have union representation and there probably won't be.

Josh Blaine: Right, but so you're saying that that means you're doing things well but that's still an assumption that you're asking me to make.

Chris Thomas: I'd say you take a look at, you know, you look at the safety. That's a good indication of how you treat your employees.

Josh Blaine: Okay, that's one thing.

Donna Gosh: And Measure 1 has, on here, about the benefits and...

Unknown Speaker: Living wage.

(inaudible discussion)

Andrew Dobbs: ...management giving something to employees. I'm saying at what point do we give workers an organized, like a legitimate voice in the process?

Chris Thomas: And if you run a proper operation and have good leadership in place, they have that voice.

Andrew Dobbs: But it still isn't a...

Josh Blaine: But how would we know that as much as...

Andrew Dobbs: Hey, you know what, again, management is not going to agree to this. Everybody knows that. I'm gonna insist upon it and if we want to put this at a no consensus point, that's fine.

Susan Shultz: Yes.

Andrew Dobbs: You know, I think that when it comes to the final decision makers, which is our elected officials, I think that we will see where they land on the question of whether or not they side with unions.

Susan Shultz: Right. I think the question was a good one too. Are there other ways to show that management is listening to their employees?

Andrew Dobbs: That's not what I'm asking here. I'm asking if they have a collective bargaining agreement.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Andrew Dobbs: Which is a different question than if they're listening to their employees. It's do their employees have actual, legitimate power to effect decisions that affect their lives? Where they are sitting at the table with legal protection of a collective bargaining agreement?

Kaiba White: Can we please, we're not all gonna agree on this, like...

Adam Gregory: I tell you right now, I'd sooner it be in there than make an issue of it.

Kaiba White: Our time would be better spent moving on.

Susan Shultz: Right, yes. We're gonna move on.

Donna Gosh: What did you say Adam?

Adam Gregory: I'd sooner have it be in here than make an issue of it.

Susan Shultz: Yep.

Unknown Speaker: Okay.

Susan Shultz: Okay, 4C.

Andrew Dobbs: I think this is good so far. I think this is a good way of doing this.

Chris Thomas: I think the complaints one is still not gonna work for us.

Bubba Smith: Yep, agreed.

Susan Shultz: Measure 2?

Chris Thomas: Yeah. It's just the fact that there's a complaint is not...

Susan Shultz: Yep.

Chris Thomas: ...a valid issue.

Susan Shultz: Okay. Okay. Is there consensus on Measure 1?

Kaiba White: I guess I would say that I think these are equally subjective and you know, and if you're going to have one, you should have the other. They, I think, could balance each other.

Andrew Dobbs: They're actually both objective. They don't have like, things that you can measure.

Kaiba White: Well sure, but I could write a letter of support for whatever reason I felt like and I could also file a complaint, and if it's valid or not valid, like....

Donna Gosh: I still think this is supposed to be an objective measure and both of those things are very subjective, so.

Bubba Smith: Yes.

Donna Gosh: I disagree for either one of them to be included because the whole point of this matrix is for it to be objective and neither, none of that is objective because you can go and get anybody to write, just like you said, anybody to write letters of support and you could get anybody to file complaints.

Unknown Speaker: I would say...

Donna Gosh: And that doesn't mean they're valid and it doesn't mean they're substantiated and so...

Susan Shultz: Okay, so are there other measures by which you could show community support?

Chris Thomas: I mean, we have to do that and anybody who's had to put together bids for tons or for work, especially if you're bidding at a municipality, you generally put letters of support from other customers or local... I'm not seeing that that's really that big a deal, the first one. You know, if you can... one, you have to have a good enough relationship with the local community to even ask them for a letter.

Bubba Smith: Mmhmm.

Chris Thomas: And so, I'm not horribly opposed to Measure 1.

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Chris Thomas: It's a little subjective and you can, you know, do some things to help persuade people to write letters of support. By, you know, being nice, throwing a barbecue in there for them, but that's all part of community relations. So I'm not actually that horribly opposed to it. It's just the, you know, the complaint one is, that's a really difficult one because you've got to be able to figure out, is it just a complaint because somebody

decided to start speed dialing your facility or, because they don't like it, or is it an actual complaint that actually has merit?

Andrew Dobbs: We've gone over this ground a million times.

Susan Shultz: Yes. So does the group want to change the weight of this, of the points on this?

Alfonso Sifuentes: I have a problem with that second sentence, 'letters of operation will offset support letters.' Maybe it can be worded a little different. Because I don't see that same weight. If you have a letter of support from a municipality that can be offset by just a simple template letter signed by somebody. So I have an issue with that.

Bubba Smith: Agreed.

Amanda Masino: One thing, as everyone is talking about the letters, that occurs to me and that don't, not to add complications to what staff has to do, but I wonder if it would be helpful in the interest of defining things better to actually lay out what a letter of support or a letter of complaint needs to include, right? We do this with grants, for example. Like, it's not really helpful to say, like, 'I like this project', signed Amanda. You have to, in the letter actually state, I am committing to doing this, this, and that. So, in the letter, your community supporter would say well this is my relationship with the company, I am someone who lives on the site or I am a specific group that's impacted, here's what they have done for my community, boom, boom, boom and you know, our group is a hundred people that are impacted by this site. And so, you have at least those numbers, so if you have a letter of support from a hundred people, essentially, or an organization that you benefited a hundred people and then you get one complaint letter from a single individual who lives on their site, you know, then maybe that helps with measuring the support letters versus the opposition letters.

Susan Shultz: Well remember we're also using opposition, opposition as opposed to complaint. Complaint is a measure too.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, she's just using...

Amanda Masino: Opposition, okay, so a support letter versus an opposition letter.

Alfonso Sifuentes: There's different degrees too. I mean, one that lives right across a facility versus one that lives on the other side of town right? I mean so, how do you weigh that?

Amanda Masino: So maybe, so maybe the letter has your relationship, where you are, how many people, what actually the benefit or the negative thing, the impact is that that you're opposing, so that you can at least, at least staff, when they're looking at these side by side, can compare the letters.

Alfonso Sifuentes: And are you a....

Amanda Masino: As opposed to, I'm Joe Smith, I don't like you. I'm Amanda, I like you. And there's no way to know what...

Alfonso Sifuentes: And also are you a political sub-division? Are you a legislator or are you a private...?

Amanda Masino: Sure that can be on there.

Alfonso Sifuentes: I mean are you a company. I'd make it clear so... the gambit just runs.

Chris Thomas: But I... last time we talked about it...

Amanda Masino: Well I think the more information in the letter, the better. Then, it's not just some random person.

Alfonso Sifuentes: But they shouldn't just weigh everyone equally, I guess is what I'm saying.

Chris Thomas: Complaints and that, I mean, I said it last time. It's more of a factor of how many people decided to move in around your landfill. You're going to have more opposition and you're going to have more complaints and the landfills don't have any control over who moves in around them, so.

Amanda Masino: Unique complaints?

Chris Thomas: Hmmm?

Amanda Masino: Unique complaints, when you speak of complaints?

Chris Thomas: Yeah.

Amanda Masino: So that it's not the same person calling over and over?

Chris Thomas: Could be the whole neighborhood decided to start to complain. And, it could be they start complaining because they don't like the fact that they bought near the landfill and the realtor didn't tell them...

Susan Shultz: And that's been noted certainly as far as the no consensus on Measure 2. In the spirit of trying to make Measure 1 reflective of your comments, so would 'letters of opposition *could* offset support letters'? Or how would you...

Chris Thomas: What, are we gonna ask for letters of opposition?

Susan Shultz: No, but...

Adam Gregory: And that's the deal. If it's only in the context of this process, then that leaves other motivated people to go around and ask other people to write letters of opposition and who do they send them to? I mean...

Chris Thomas: This morning they called in a complaint.

Alfonso Sifuentes: Why don't we put in a statement that says 'letters of opposition and letters of support will be taken into consideration' and let the City take...

Susan Shultz: How do you award points?

Adam Gregory: Well then that's totally subjective up to staff, and I don't like that.

Susan Shultz: Yeah.

Kaiba White: I just want to point out this item only has two points attached to it, so...

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, I mean...

Susan Shultz: I know but we're trying to make it so it's not confusing.

Andrew Dobbs: I mean one thing that we talked about early on... sorry, Bobby, did you want to...

Bob Gregory: No, go ahead.

Andrew Dobbs: ...that's not being reflected now is that we talked about it being like neighborhood associations or civic organizations that write these letters, right? So they can't just be every Joe Schmo on the block writing something, although I wouldn't mind that because frankly I work for an organization that's really good at getting people to write letters, but what I would say is that I think it makes more sense for this to be civic organizations, or you know, neighborhood associations. Like that sort of thing, right, like formal organizations that have some sort of established presence in the community. I think that makes a lot more sense here because that way you can sit there...

Andy Andradi: It's the same dynamic.

Andrew Dobbs: What?

Andy Andradi: It's the same dynamic.

Andrew Dobbs: I mean I think it's a lot harder for me to go and convince, like, the thing is, if the facility is not screwing up, right, the facility is not bad to live around, okay, and there are plenty of facilities out there that people live near that they don't complain about. Hell, y'all claim that nobody complains about y'all other than if it's some kind of nefarious thing. If that's the case then you should be really easy to go to the neighborhood association and say, 'Hey, you know what, can you write a letter for us?' And it should be difficult to get them to write something that's not true in a letter.

Bubba Smith: True.

Chris Thomas: Usually the letters of opposition are gonna come from the competitors. They're gonna come from... who's get those letters. So when we go through this bidding process...

Andrew Dobbs: It's two points. How much effort are these companies going to put into getting those two points.

Chris Thomas: Again, just like we talked about with the last time, well nobody's gonna get it, so it's not even worth it. So we do have these on here?

Susan Shultz: So do letters of opposition, though, equate to complaints?

Andrew Dobbs: No. These are a different ball game.

Susan Shultz: All right.

Bob Gregory: I encourage you to do something different with Measure 2, if not take it out. Just this last week it was big news about computers now can fool the recipient of a robocall and they actually believe it's a person but it's really a computer, and showed how it works. Well if that's the case, I would imagine someone could engineer 700 complaint calls to a certain facility in one day just because they said uh huh, or the computer handled it right. It is, something needs to be allowed for weighting even though I know staff is notorious for weighting the way they want it weighed, but landfills can receive credit if they offer a school district a large amount of money, or no reason other than to get letters of support. I mean, those things happen.

Susan Shultz: Right, so how would you...

Bob Gregory: You can buy support, and you can generate opposition. So I think it needs to be weighed in such a way that it's fairer. And it's not just a matter of two points when you start looking at some other things there's some two or three pointers in other areas that are pretty dang important that could be offset by getting one fabricated complaint.

Donna Gosh: I think the most objective thing right here is TCEQ. TCEQ documents complaints and after so many on certain grades then it goes to a violation, and if everybody has the same...

Bob Gregory: It doesn't work that way. They do document the complaints and if anyone called in on any one of our facilities that they were driving by and observed something, that's in the record and you can go look it up on the computer on their website. Now you can get a thousand of those that won't necessarily be a complaint because they rightly go investigate that, and they've got to go through a process.

Susan Shultz: Okay, so we're not going to agree on 4C as far as (*inaudible*) is concerned. We'll go back to the scoring in a second.

Andrew Dobbs: The thing is I think that dealing with TCEQ complaints is an issue that's not going to be resolved and we've said this. I think that there's a way to find some sort of consensus on having communications from the community count. I mean if it's two points, it just seems like there's got to be a way for us to say this issue is important. Do your neighbors hate your guts or not, is the question here, right? If you're getting a bunch of letters or communications that are like 'we hate these guys' then we should take that into account. If you're getting a lot of letters saying 'hey, you know what? They're great. They've been great neighbors, I was worried about living next to landfill, they've been wonderful, it smells like roses all the time,' you know, it's just fan-freaking-tastic, you know, if we had that, I want that to be weighed in there, too.

Bob Gregory: Well, it does matter, I agree, and it should get a lot more than two points.

Adam Gregory: Maybe the way that you would accomplish it is actually have a questionnaire that is exactly the same that goes, that you have to give to your host, to the community, or to people around and that way you attempt to get the answers to the same questions. Does that make more sense? Rather than going out and soliciting for just a glowing letter of praise.

Susan Shultz: I think it goes back to requesting to have a, more specific as to what a letter of support would look like. It may be a questionnaire...

Andrew Dobbs: Something Mark said that was interesting which dawned on me just now, was that we have valid petition processes where only certain people in a certain area actually count towards a valid petition. I guess you could do that. I'm trying not to, what we're doing is we're making this thing really kinda complicated for what the level of influence is. Maybe we move on and mark all of these things and let staff come back, and we see what happens.

Donna Gosh: I heard a suggestion to take out Measure 2 is what I was hearing.

Bubba Smith: That's my recommendation.

Donna Gosh: Yeah, I think everybody consents on that.

Alfonso Sifuentes: Just simplify the language.

Andrew Dobbs: I mean, I support it. I think it's a good thing to have there. I think that far more than invalid complaints being lodged with TCEQ, far more happens that valid complaints are lodged and TCEQ does nothing about them and so I would like for them... I know this because I was just talking with the people...

Susan Shultz: Okay, without arguing, again, about the TCEQ process...

Andrew Dobbs: I will say that, no, I think it's important. TCEQ complaints are not always federally dealt with so that's not going to be reflected in the compliance history. It's not gonna come up anywhere else that the facility is operating in a way that is destructive to the people in their community. It's not gonna show up anywhere else. The one place it'll show up is in the complaints. And so I would like to capture that...

Susan Shultz: One complaint per year?

Josh Blaine: What if instead of one complaint per year is...

Andrew Dobbs: I don't necessarily... I'm fine with working on that.

Donna Gosh: The consensus of most people here is take it out.

Bubba Smith: I think the consensus is...

Kaiba White: I'm wondering there's a middle ground where it could be normalized based on the population, like, in the surrounding census tract.

Bubba Smith: The problem I've got is just like Bobby said, one person could generate 7... and that's been done before, I don't know if they were made by a computer but people encouraged to complain.

Kaiba White: I think there was also a suggestion that complaints from unique individuals. I think there's ways...

Bubba Smith: It's been campaigns that go through the neighborhoods and say 'hey call this number.' Door to door to door.

Chris Thomas: There's websites that are set up to easily to actually purchase. All you have to do is put your name on it and the complaint is pre-written. So it's...

Donna Gosh: It's just not realistic, unfortunately.

Gerry Acuna: There's 13 people sitting around this table. Yea or nay?

Adam Gregory: No.

Andrew Dobbs: That's not how this works. Because I represent 50,000 people in Austin that support us. So I'll put my 50,000 versus...

(inaudible discussion)

Josh Blaine: ...thousands of people, like, industry seems to agree but I don't think the rest of us here are...

Bubba Smith: Well let me make one important comment here. What you just said, you know, yeah, we want you here and we want everybody at this table here, but it sure is discouraging when you read in the newspaper that a person puts on there that this, what we're trying to do here, he has no problem with a system that works against Waste Management and the problem that he's suggesting that the matrix was simply a way of accomplishing that.

Andrew Dobbs: That's not a fair representation...

Bubba Smith: It's fake news.

Andrew Dobbs: I mean like where, were you under the impression I wanted Waste Management to get business? That I'm in favor of Waste Management getting business?

Chris Thomas: No, we're clear on that.

Susan Shultz: We're not going to argue politics, that's not going to be helpful to get into that argument. Okay, so, many of you would like Measure 2 to be deleted and we can reflect that in the comments.

Amanda Masino: Since so many seem to not like Measure 2 compared to Measure 1 could we consider flipping the points on those? It's 5 points in the 4C total. We could do 3:2 instead of 2:3.

Andrew Dobbs: I think they're both too small already.

Susan Shultz: 3 for Measure 1, and 2 for Measure 2. Any concerns with that?

Andrew Dobbs: I mean I think they're both too small but I'm not going to fight on that.

Amanda Masino: We don't have points in 4A, sorry, I forgot.

Susan Shultz: Right, but that can come from 3. Anyway, for now, Measure 1, 3, Measure 2, 2.

Josh Blaine: I agree that this feels small because I hear what you're saying it feels, I don't know, like they're being attacked or something but at the same time, District 1 as represented, again, as representing a lot of people not a Josh Blaine. There is a strong history of the community not being thrilled about the practices of that landfill. Right? Like that's not something that I think is up for debate, right? And so I think that this process is honoring that history and there's also a really strong history of landfills being a classic case of environmental injustice. Yes, you can't control who moves there but there's a really strong body of evidence that shows that these things are zoned and placed in underserved and underrepresented communities. That is also not negotiable, in my opinion. Those things are well documented. So, this process is honoring all of that. So it's not we – Andrew Dobbs as an individual, Josh Blaine as an individual – doesn't like Waste Management or are out to get you, but we are trying to represent this history and this matrix here is supposed to reflect that. That's I think why we're at the table.

Bubba Smith: Okay. I was just making a point.

Susan Shultz: Okay. 4D.

Chris Thomas: Real quick. I gotta run. The next one I really didn't have an issue with 4D. My two cents on 4E before I run is that I think that's something that doesn't need to be in the matrix. I think it's just a tricky way of hiding something that needs, a decision that needs to be made out in public. If they don't want to do business with Waste Management they should actually say we don't want to do business with Waste Management and not hide it in a matrix document. So that's my two cents. Bye.

Andrew Dobbs: I will say real quick that if we eliminate everything that the industry doesn't want in this section, if we eliminate everything that they don't like in here, we're left with wasteshed. I mean we're literally left with nothing if we got rid of everything the industry...

Adam Gregory: I don't like wasteshed.

Andrew Dobbs: So there you go. So we would just eliminate this entire thing. So Community Impact and Social Equity would not be a factor in our decision making even though Council specifically asked for that sort of thing to be taken into consideration.

Susan Shultz: So far it's still in there.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, I know, the point being that we can just sit there and say that this is an area where industry doesn't like to be graded on their social impact, on their community impact or their commitment to social equity.

Susan Shultz: No, but I think the point of this exercise would be to say, 'okay, if you value this, the community impact and social equity, how should it be reflected and how should it be measured?' Are there more efficient and more maybe measurable ways for that to be measured? And I think that's the purpose of this exercise, not that you all are going to agree as to whether or not some of these should be in there, but if they are going to be in there, are there better ways of measuring them?

Rajiv Patel: I agree with that.

Andrew Dobbs: What are those better ways?

Bob Gregory: Well I would hope, as we started out at the first of this discussion, I think it's futile to try to do this too quick. This is a process that we're changing sections, we're changing suggestions for points, we're changing the language in one section that affects another section. I think we need to see another version of this entire thing. We need to have an understanding of what the defined terms mean. I think we ought to then weigh, as a group, weigh the meaning of all these things along with the weighting of all these things. And don't get caught up with just trying to stick with City staff's proposed Measure 1 or Measure 2. There may be a different way to skin this cat, to accomplish it, and so rather than get complete crossed swords in some areas because it's all centered around the specific wording of Measure 1 and 2, when seen as a proposed whole, even better, when seen in a proposed ordinance, it would go to ZWAC in June if that's even possible, or July or whenever and go to Council, that's when people start, I believe, start weighing one against the other and see the impact. Because if the effective impact of this entire thing is to make it to where every single landfill that applies is going to be between 81 points and 99 points, and they all pass regardless, well is that really what people are thinking of to accomplish? I think that's what staff wants to do, but I think all of that weight should weigh in to a final consideration of this. And I don't think it's humanly possible to do it from the draft we have right now.

Susan Shultz: Well...

Kaiba White: But this is not supposed to be a pass or fail matrix. I just want to put that out there again.

Susan Shultz: Right.

Adam Gregory: That's what we've discussed...

Bob Gregory: The scoring is not leading to that.

Andy Andrasi: We're still going to be graded so there's still going to be...

Kaiba White: But no one gets eliminated if you get a 50...

Andy Andrasi: So what is the point of the grade?

Kaiba White: To compare each other.

Andrew Dobbs: Right, and to be a factor in your bidding. So you've got a bid and you got points. Right? It's like, hey, who's the cheapest, and then there will be whatever else is in there, and then it'll be like what was their score on the landfill matrix? And it's like, okay, well this one got this many, this one got this many, and this one got this many, and then that gets figured into your calculation also.

Andy Andradi: So the scoring matrix is part of the evaluation matrix...

Andrew Dobbs: That's what I understood it to be. Yes, that's what we've always intended it to be.

Adam Gregory: That's not what we've always understood, that's what we've been discussing in these meetings and that's what I've been advocating for is something like that. What staff came with originally was not that, and that's part of what I'm reserving judgment on because we've supposedly come up with some form of consensus on some of these things from time to time, however we've still just been using this little spreadsheet matrix deal, we haven't seen the form this is going to take. Like we've said, I don't know that staff agrees with what we're talking about here. So that's why we're withholding judgment until we can actually see something that could be voted on. You couldn't take this, even if you finished it and took away the redlines, you couldn't take this to ZWAC and say vote on this. This isn't anything to vote on. The Council couldn't vote on this. It has to be in the form of an ordinance or a resolution and the language in that will dictate how this is used. So, I think it's the exact same thing you were saying, I think we need to have these conversations, finish this discussion, then let staff decide whether they agree with what we assume is the consensus, do a final version of this and the ordinance or resolution language that they are going to propose to ZWAC for recommendation and Council for approval, and my hope would be that we would actually get together again and look and discuss *that*, because I do not think it will be appropriate for it to be posted as backup to ZWAC a couple days before the ZWAC meeting.

Bob Gregory: As the first time we saw it.

Adam Gregory: As the first time we see this. So I think we should have, I think after this meeting, staff ought to finalize what they envision being voted on and then we should discuss that. I do think we should continue...

Susan Shultz: Yes...

Adam Gregory: ...finishing this discussion.

Bob Gregory: Oh, yes.

Donna Gosh: So the ordinance or resolution would have some kind of scoring matrix attached to it that would say this should be used in evaluation...

Adam Gregory: There's a million ways that they could create the vehicle for this ride on and so I do not know how they intend to do that. I'm looking forward to seeing that and to see if that language reflects supposedly what we've come to a consensus on, like on the not being a pass/fail thing. That was their original intention – for it to be pass/fail.

Donna Gosh: We all agree that that would not be...

Adam Gregory: Yeah, but we can agree all day long. Staff's not sitting at this table for a reason. They're reserving their right to ignore or accept anything we come up with.

Susan Shultz: Okay, so let's continue the discussion because before you come to a final, what this is going to look like, you do have to go through sort of the details of it and give it your best input. Give your best input as far as from your perspective whether it makes sense or doesn't make sense. So, we're on 4D. Landfill will receive credit for not receiving waste from outside the CAPCOG region.

Adam Gregory: Why is this in there?

Josh Blaine: This seems carbon footprint related more so.

Andrew Dobbs: It doesn't seem even that, because it's not their hauling. If somebody else is hauling to them from outside the region, I mean, like why did we include this?

Susan Shultz: Okay, does anybody believe that it should be in here?

Josh Blaine: Is there someone that can speak to this, either staff or...?

Donna Gosh: I think that CAPCOG guy, when he was here in one of the meetings. But I don't, two or three meetings ago, but Josh I don't...

Adam Gregory: Can anyone provide a reason why it ought to be in there?

Donna Gosh: If anything I agree that it should be in the Carbon Footprint because then if you're hauling...

Adam Gregory: We're not evaluating our hauling company.

Susan Shultz: Okay so does anybody think this should be in there?

Ryan Hobbs: No.

Bubba Smith: Okay, hold on.

Bob Gregory: I have a question. Staff, Richard, I'm talking about you, staff made a comment that they don't want their landfill capacity consumed with waste coming from outside Travis County. That's a flow control type issue. You think union raises the hair on the back of your neck as a landfill operator, flow control is the ultimate insult. If that's the staff's position, we really, really need to know that. Because if we're viewing this as a Carbon Footprint and they're viewing it as they own the capacity and they're gonna control the way it's scored, then, wow, that is off the charts different.

Richard McHale: Well, let me clarify that because that's not what I said. When the measure came up, the issue was, we put that in there because we felt that by material coming from outside the area we were filling up landfills within this region which would require new landfills to be built in this area. So that was the opposition, not flow control, nothing like that. It was strictly more waste that came from outside the area, more landfills that would have to be built in the area.

Bob Gregory: Well I think we need to have the discussion because in the last meeting Waste Management provided a document concerning the volume of, reported to TCEQ, it was fair game, you were totally justified and okay to present that, but it was the waste coming into the TDS landfill from transfer stations that haul to the TDS landfill, and that's fine. Those are facts, and actually haven't even read the document yet, but it was a big deal and Richard made sure that everybody knew and was aware of it, and it was available to everyone as we were walking out, in the last meeting. That's fine. Let's have the discussion of the weighting and what the importance of it is because that goes to whether... to the extent that it goes to how they score a response and evaluate a response or whether they evaluate whether a landfill would be acceptable by Council, which is I thought where this whole thing started, then that's a huge issue. So whether it comes in or it goes out, I think we really ought to take into consideration what staff's intent and level of weighting and concern that is.

Bubba Smith: I guess the letter that was sent by Steve is, the way we were looking at it, we were looking at it more of a carbon footprint type deal. With carbon footprint being at the top we think that's an important factor. I know we're not judging hauling companies, but the waste is coming to the landfill and we were just making the point that there's a tremendous amount of trucks coming into the county from outside the county which is increasing the county and the city's carbon footprint. That's the way we were looking at it. Another thing is, and I kind of raised my voice every time Adam brings up the past sins, but another thing we were looking at is it's very difficult when you're talking about emissions to manage organics. We're not coming from a transfer station cause you can't really open every bag and, so that's what...

Andrew Dobbs: I get that point. I don't think it's a huge... I don't see anybody saying this is a really big deal. What I would propose is maybe we can eliminate waste shed and put those points back into 4A since we're looking for points for that.

Adam Gregory: I'll agree with that.

Susan Shultz: Concerns? Comments on that?

Bubba Smith: Again, our stance is just the carbon footprint part.

Susan Shultz: Is it covered in the carbon footprint?

Bubba Smith: No.

Andrew Dobbs: No, but I mean...

Adam Gregory: It's covered to the extent that... excuse me?

Kaiba White: Does the landfill have control over this?

Josh Blaine: Yeah, what would a landfill do?

Adam Gregory: To some extent you can, I mean, to some extent absolutely not. You're accepting waste from all sorts of haulers. You ask 'em what it is, even if you asked every one where does this come from, they don't know. They collected it from half in Travis, half somewhere else and they won't tell you anyway, so...

Bubba Smith: What we were talking about, not to interrupt, but the point that Steve was trying to make, was we were just counting the transfer trucks that y'all haul. That's all it was.

Adam Gregory: Yes, he's just trying to point out that TDS operates transfer stations and Waste Management doesn't because they have lots and lots of landfills.

Bubba Smith: We will take anybody's trash, I mean...

Adam Gregory: Yeah, they'll take anybody's trash. So and to some extent we have contracts and we provide service and we transfer waste to our facility. That's absolutely normal. They accept, other landfills accept waste from other folks transferring in and from various sheds of counties so it is not 100% something... you can't control it.

Kaiba White: So you're operating those transfer stations?

Adam Gregory: Yes.

Kaiba White: Are you gonna report those emissions as part of 1B?

Adam Gregory: Not the transportation emissions because we've specifically limited transportation emissions out of that. The volume going in certainly is reflected in those emissions numbers.

Kaiba White: Well what we were trying to eliminate was the hauler's transportation emissions. I do see that as different than what sounds kind of like an arm of the facility.

Andrew Dobbs: Should we count the hauling into all of Waste Management's other landfills? I mean like or Waste Connections' other facilities? Like the difference is that if Waste Management or Waste Connections are collecting out in the hinterlands, right, they're taking it to a different landfill. And with TDS they're taking it to a transfer station and the transfer station is bringing it here.

Kaiba White: Right and one of those has greater emissions related to it.

Adam Gregory: Not necessarily, it depends on where the material ends up.

(inaudible discussion)

Susan Shultz: Hold on, hold on, hold on. Is the concern for this landfill matrix about what happens at the landfill?

Andrew Dobbs: But real quick...

Adam Gregory: Yes.

Andrew Dobbs: ...the transportation, like a footprint may be larger or smaller than the associated footprint at this landfill over here, so now in order to equalize this, we're going to have to take into account the emissions at every Waste Management landfill in the region?

Adam Gregory: What I'm saying is it's potentially much better emissions-wise to transfer than go to a bad landfill. It can be. No question. It depends on the length of the transfer and the type of the landfill. So it's not a ridiculous statement. It's not a ridiculous statement, what I just said.

Bubba Smith: It's not a ridiculous, but I don't know if I agree totally...

Kaiba White: I think we should keep this item and move on.

Andrew Dobbs: F*** it. Fine. Excuse my language.

Susan Shultz: You want to leave 1 point there and move 2 points to 4A? As far as the scoring, the proposal was to change that to 1 point and move 2 points to 4A at this point.

Alfonso Sifuentes: Well, if I'm understanding that measure now that the landfill will receive credit for not receiving – it seems to me, like every landfill is not gonna get that credit. Because every landfill's gonna take in...

Bubba Smith: Not outside of CAPCOG.

Daniel Rumsey: Not outside of... yeah.

Adam Gregory: The only thing you'll be rewarding is major public companies that own and operate lots and lots of landfills. That's the only effect that this will have.

Daniel Rumsey: Which is the same reason you're opposing the points on the other section?

Alfonso Sifuentes: What if there's a natural disaster or ...

Daniel Rumsey: Companies are gonna benefit from...

Adam Gregory: From what?

Daniel Rumsey: From increasing the points on the industrial waste that you've...

Adam Gregory: Well yeah, that's y'all's deal.

Josh Blaine: The conversation about the waste shed...

Daniel Rumsey: You're the only benefactor of increasing the points...

Adam Gregory: No, the City benefits from that. Everybody benefits from that.

Daniel Rumsey: You're the only one suggesting that.

Susan Shultz: Okay guys.

Adam Gregory: No, that's everybody suggesting...

Bob Gregory: I think...

Adam Gregory: The City Council has insisted upon it.

Bob Gregory: I think we're not ready for that discussion. We're having a discussion that goes into assumptions that need to be had after we see further refinement. This is not ready for prime time. It's not. It's nowhere near it. And I think we can have those carbon footprint discussions. It's just really hard to do it when we're arguing. It just takes a process. This process takes longer than what was allowed. Unless we just rubber stamp the staff's recommendation.

Kaiba White: It sounds like we're not gonna have enough time.

Bob Gregory: I don't think we're...

Adam Gregory: The amount of time is irrelevant.

Susan Shultz: Okay, would you all agree that 4D has more to do with carbon footprint?

Bubba Smith: In my opinion. It depends on which way you look at it and we were looking at it as a carbon footprint issue, so...

Susan Shultz: Okay.

Kaiba White: I think that's not the only issue so...

Susan Shultz: Okay, all right.

Andy Andradi: I mean that wasn't what the intent was.

Susan Shultz: 4E?

Adam Gregory: I think it should be many more points.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, this is one of those that everybody's gonna knock heads on.

Adam Gregory: It has to be.

Amanda Masino: I have a question.

Susan Shultz: Yes?

Amanda Masino: This is very specific to Austin City Council opposition. I'm wondering why this isn't opposition by, I don't know, government bodies or government action. What if there was County action? It just, it seems very specific to Council and so I'm wondering about that language and maybe it should be government opposition or government action, something...

Susan Shultz: And what is the purpose of this measure? What do you want captured here?

Bob Gregory: Are you asking the staff?

Susan Shultz: I'm asking everybody.

Alfonso Sifuentes: I thought that was under 4C where we would capture that.

Bob Gregory: Let me just state if the goal of staff is to come up with a scoring, with a criteria allowing a scoring system that all landfills are gonna pass, I think the reaction...

Adam Gregory: It's not pass/fail.

Bob Gregory: ...if that is the, 'cause I don't think it's determined that it's just pass/fail, I think the reaction of this group will be totally different than if it is a pass/fail situation, and I'm not so sure that Waste Connections' recommendation at our last meeting is not going to turn out to be a point of discussion of whether hazardous waste, and that past opposition particularly to the toxic waste, is something that shouldn't even be in the criteria, that should be the ultimate pass/fail for that facility. It's beside the point on this criteria. But we need to find out what the real goal of the criteria is. Is it really a pass/fail? And then this two points and three points, I'm not even sure what this document is intended to address. So I think we need to hear from City staff on that. What their intent is, how the scoring will be done, whether it's pass/fail, whether it's intended to address the issue of qualifying or absolutely disqualifying a landfill that has that history in the presence of that waste.

Kaiba White: Is it possible for somebody from staff to like join the discussion?

Gena McKinley: I was just gonna say, we're nearing the end of our time and I think everybody should have a copy of this paper. So what staff is attempting to do is to fulfill the Council recommendation and direction to staff,

which is to answer their question: 'should materials be directed to or away from certain landfills in future solicitations,' their answer was 'yes, materials should be directed to or away from certain landfills through the use of a landfill criteria matrix that reflects Council's environmental priorities.' So that's what we've been assembled here to do. As far as next steps what our hope was today was to finalize this process to continue and finalize the discussion of this matrix, and then as staff we have a lot of work to go back to do after hearing all the discussion. We have a lot of City departments we need to coordinate with. The Legal department, the Purchasing department, the Equity Office, and a whole slew of other City departments, and at that point then we will return to you with a cleaned-up copy. I did redlining and presenting the spreadsheet to you as it is now, just so you can see we're trying to document where we've moved things based on what we're hearing in these meetings. So that is the next step. Our goal was to take it to ZWAC in June. Given the amount of work that needs to be done, I think we'll probably be looking at July and hoping to go to Council in August and what we can commit to do is to, once we get this cleaned up and once we get staff's final recommendation, get those out to you all with a significant amount of time to give us feedback.

Bob Gregory: Could I ask a question of staff? Does it seem reasonable that this group would work to finalize it today only, with the schedule that you just laid out, that the staff would come back with another version that we would evaluate and discuss? It seems to me very confusing that we would finalize it only for it to be open for discussion unless the intent was you can't make any significant changes to it. There could be very significant changes depending on what comes back, particularly if it's in the form of a resolution that would go to ZWAC and Council and the intended use. That could be dramatically different. So, would it be acceptable to staff to not finalize it today but take the discussion that's had, have these discussions that you have, go to the Sustainability department and get their acceptance on the air emissions. They're the ones who came up with the recommendations in the big exposé. We've not heard from them.

Gena McKinley: Finalize is probably not the right term.

Bob Gregory: Okay.

Gena McKinley: I'll just wrap up the stakeholder meeting so that staff can get to work based on everything we've heard from you all. Because I'm hearing that there's a desire to see the final: What does this all turn into? How is it used? And we'd like to get to that.

Bob Gregory: That goes to my point. Not 'wrap up' the work because we're not, I don't think this group is ready to wrap up. I don't think they've got a document to wrap up.

Gena McKinley: And there are other opportunities including ZWAC, including Council. This isn't the last of the discussion. It's just moving into getting rid of the redlines. But what I can commit to is that we have our notes from the meetings and when the matrix moves along with process, we will make sure that the stakeholder discussions, the stakeholder recommendations, all of that transfers along. So there may be some areas where staff has a different recommendation but we'll make sure to include what the recommendation of the stakeholders are.

Bob Gregory: What I'm hearing is an allowance that you'll keep us informed of what you're going to do with the work product that the group does today. I'm encouraging the staff, and you may not be in a position to even give that commitment at all even if you wanted to, but I'm encouraging the staff to keep this group alive and well, working, awaiting the next document to work from and not use the term or the phrase or the insinuation that they're completing their work, because I think it'll be terribly frustrating for people to do what Adam was just talking about, where the first thing that we see is what's posted the Friday before the Wednesday ZWAC meeting whether it's June or July followed by the very next day it's on the Council. Wow.

Gena McKinley: And I'm committing to this group that that's not how it's going to work. There will be an opportunity to review and provide comment on the final documents and the final recommendations prior to the ZWAC posting.

Bob Gregory: Can we keep this group alive and this not be in anyone's expectation, the final meeting of the group?

Gena McKinley: We'll have to confer with staff...

Ryan Hobbs: The process you're talking about was what was done prior to the formation of the stakeholders and that didn't work. You received a lot of comments and you did nothing with them, and so I agree with Bobby that we should reserve the right to continue to meet and discuss what your next draft is.

Sam Angoori: So guys, let me say this, that, you know, we didn't just start this. You all know this. We've been talking about this internally since last August and you all have been commenting on it since November. So, it's not just, we started 12 hours ago. Okay. So at some point we have to stop. At some point I have to go to ZWAC. At some point I have to go to Council because I have to respond to the Working Group. And it's not the whole Council. The whole Council did not get together and say 'well let's look at landfills' and things like that. It was the Working Group and then they made a recommendation to staff and now we have to take all this information back to ZWAC and back to the Council as a whole, to determine what they want to do. So, I kept hearing a couple things about Council and that Council did this. Well Council did not. The entire 11-member Council did not do this, did not ask us to go and get this done. So, again, at some point we have to come to an end and take it to somebody to make a decision. So what Gena was talking about is after today, this is the last one for today. I don't know where we are... at the end of 4G, I'm not sure. And so we've made all these revisions with all the comments you all have on this, but as Adam was saying earlier, I don't know if I agree with everything you all have talked about. You know, that's 12 hours you all have talked and I've sat here for most of it. I got to know a lot more about landfills. I got to learn more about you all, maybe more than what I wanted to. But, so, we may come up with a whole new recommendation... and as you know, as I have mentioned I have to take this to Purchasing to see if any of this is even possible. For the most part, maybe, but maybe some of them not. It has to go to Legal. Even if ZWAC passed a resolution, all those resolutions have to go to Legal department to see if it's okay, if it's gonna put the City in any kind of jeopardy. You all know this. So it's not just you finished talking about this and came up with some ideas and it's a go. It's not gonna happen like that. And you all know this. We gave you enough time to look at the final that you have come up with and what the staff recommendation is going to be. You have enough time to do that, a couple of weeks or so, to look at it and comment on it. I don't think we're gonna have another six more meetings like this. I don't think that's gonna happen.

Adam Gregory: If you guys don't want to have any more meetings, then we will... please just... I hope you'll get your response basically to this stakeholder process to us as quickly as possible so we can evaluate it and either support it or gear up for confrontation in front of ZWAC and Council like we always do.

Sam Angoori: So, again, and you all know this. You all understand how the City works. So everything that you all have talked about here and sent recommendations, it has to go through certain departments and it has to go through the City Manager's office and after all that then... I don't know if it's gonna take two days, three days, or a week. I don't know. And I agree with Gena so... *(inaudible)*

Susan Shultz: Okay, in the two minutes that we have left, 4F. Are there any comments on 4F?

Andrew Dobbs: The new 4F?

Susan Shultz: The new 4F.

Andrew Dobbs: I think Amanda may have some.

Adam Gregory: Woody was gonna tell us something about the difference between two miles and census tracts.

Woody Raine: Let me first tell you about the demographic index. We found on the EPA site, this environmental justice screening tool, which is very handy GIS based program. I guess this issue probably is one we've spent more time on researching and gathering geographic data on than any of the others but we've got by census tract from 2010 census, and zip codes, four census tracts around every one of the landfills, we've got lots of data on that.

And then from the 2016 American Community Survey we got similar information with all the zip codes for all the areas. So we've got lots of data, did not know really how to digest that down and look at how's the landfill; which numbers do you look at, do you look at all the numbers, the racial, the ethnic, the low income... (inaudible) ...but this environmental justice tool looks at a radius. You can draw a buffer around an area, or pinpoint an area and do any radius out and put that data into a census block, which is the census tract which is made up of all the blocks, so that you can get all of the information from that area that you prescribed and we've also developed this demographic index which is an average of three values, the racial, and the low income...

Amanda Masino: Socioeconomic and education, I think is the other one.

Woody Raine: Yeah, it brings all those numbers together so you can compare just a single number for all the rest. So the two miles was just kind of a placeholder. It was something that we weren't too sure about. How you look at (inaudible). But let me tell you a, certain unintended consequences to this that we realized as we were looking at that is landfills don't have a lot of control over who moves into their neighborhood. But if they did have control, what would they want to do to improve their demographic in that? So if they wanted to be whiter than what they look like right now to the City of Austin, they'd basically redline the neighborhood and say 'sorry, whites only.' So I feel like this is not a measure that's appropriate and I'm coming out a little bit here, I didn't get permission from my bosses to tell you this, but I feel like this is not an appropriate measure. For an existing landfill it would be very valuable, I think from all this research, I think it ought to be incorporated into the City whenever they're looking at zoning issues and looking at okaying a new permitted facility, but for an existing facility it's really pretty tough because of that... so that's my thoughts.

Bob Gregory: If I may, just one real short statement. There is one way that a landfill can affect the demographics around its landfill, and it's certainly not by redlining and saying white people only or something like that, and it's buying the land. TDS started with 343 acres. It now has over 2,000 acres. It puts that land to good use for the things that we do out there and people know it. But it's a huge investment, a massive investment to do it. It's not so that we can be bad on our land but there is a way to do it. It requires investment and it also allows for acceptance of the then surrounding neighborhood so I would just encourage that to be something that the staff would consider to encourage others to do, rather than buy the minimum site, permit it, knowing that all good reason that people are gonna build all the way around it. They will build all around ours but it'll be like 2500 acres they're building up around, not 343.

Susan Shultz: So what are your thoughts as far as the measure as it currently stands, as it is currently written? Does it make sense?

Adam Gregory: I don't think any of us know what to think about it, because Woody just said it didn't make sense, so...

Bob Gregory: We have studied it enough and I have one comment on that, particularly since the City staff has studied it so much. Give us the impact, since you've studied it to evaluate it. I used the term 'gerrymandering' earlier. The census tract gives very different readings around our facility than other ways, depending on where the white folks are in Onion Creek. So, you can do it to where you can make the numbers pretty much be whatever you want. I think it just needs to be something that you can verify and not something that's so specific that someone has to do a tremendous amount of research to verify whether the applicant is reporting correct numbers or not.

Susan Shultz: But again I think as far as a basic question, does it make sense in evaluating current landfills, as Woody said, to have this in this matrix?

Andrew Dobbs: I mean, I do. I think that... I get the concern, but I think that if... yes, people move in around landfills but I think that, I've said it before, if it's all people of color that are moving in around your landfill, that needs to be noted and that needs to be taken into consideration. The point here is that we don't want the City of Austin, to the extent that it's possible, to be dumping on communities of color. Let's find a way to measure that. I

mean, Amanda, I think has some interesting insights into this as someone who has done a lot of this sort of thing professionally. What do you see in here?

Amanda Masino: I mean, to be honest, I don't think the two landfills that we're currently talking about the most are going to look very different in this regard. I still think it's important to have the measure here because we are going to be at some point in the future evaluating landfills outside of these two. I think it's also important to have something in here that reflects our concern. Our concern that we're not dumping on a low income community exclusively. So maybe we could talk about the point allocation changing, but this tool, I mean you want to talk about a complicated question in an objective way, there's an EPA tool specifically for this question. So it's simplifies...

Andrew Dobbs: You literally just did it while you're sitting there...

Amanda Masino: Yeah, while I'm sitting here I pulled up the EJ screen, I typed in the address for HT just to see, and you can pull up everything, as Woody was saying. The percentage of high school educated, minority population, low income, you can overlay it with hazardous waste sites. I mean everything you would want to see, to evaluate the site.

Josh Blaine: I gotta run but I will echo that this is important to keep in there, whether the specifics remain the same, maybe they won't, but I think the intention is super important in this process.

Susan Shultz: Okay, thirty seconds or less. Final comments?

Andy Andradi: So does density play a role?

Amanda Masino: Mhmm. They have that overlaid and everything, yeah.

Andrew Dobbs: Less dense census tracts are bigger because every tract has the same population. So southeast Austin would be huge, but like downtown they're like real small.

Susan Shultz: Okay, final comments from people around the table?

Andy Andradi: Okay, so an X radius, does the density come into play?

Susan Shultz: Aspirational?

Adam Gregory: Aspirational?

Susan Shultz: Aspirational.

Adam Gregory: I look forward to seeing staff's version and I reserve all rights to support or oppose the whole or any part.

Susan Shultz: Okay. Moving around the table?

Ryan Hobbs: I agree with what Adam just said.

Alfonso Sifuentes: Something aspirational...

Susan Shultz: Alfonso?

Alfonso Sifuentes: Being fairly new to this particular part of the waste industry, it's very optimistic when we can have all the industry leaders and stakeholders sit at the same table and have productive discussions.

Andy Andradi: I hope that as an independent hauler that the process doesn't inadvertently keep us out of the process of being able to work with the City of Austin.

Kaiba White: I think this was good, productive overall, a bit difficult, and I just encourage everybody to move this discussion into the public realm. You know, there's a lot of people that are not able to make these daytime stakeholder meetings here that are certainly stakeholders. So hopefully the rest of this discussion will be made at ZWAC and at Council.

Gerry Acuna: Thanks, staff for the hard work. You guys did a great job. I appreciate this. It's not fun being at times the point of attack. Nevertheless thank you for the hard work.

Amanda Masino: Thank you all for the hard work. I think the document's stronger from this process and so I look forward to seeing the final, or the next version. Not the final.

Andrew Dobbs: Yeah, a heck of a lot stronger, thanks and gratitude to staff for the work that they've put into it. The vision here is a world without waste. Not having waste in the City of Austin and not having landfills in the City of Austin. And so I think that we need to keep that in mind throughout this process.

Donna Gosh: I have to say thanks to staff and thanks to our moderator. This is probably not the easiest group to take care of and you kept pulling us back onto track and keeping the drama away and focusing on the issues. So nice job.

Susan Shultz: Thank you.

Donna Gosh: It's been healthy. I think it's been very healthy.

Bubba Smith: Great discussion, good group. Wish I could say I enjoyed every minute of it but... no, it's all good. Appreciate staff putting up with all these trashy people around.

Daniel Rumsey: Yeah, I'm the same. Appreciate everybody's time. Good stuff.

Susan Shultz: Great. Thank you for your patience and thank you for your attention. Next steps.