

Minutes for 8/31/22 Stakeholder Group

Group agreed that Agency to complete report, minutes, and agency staff to facilitate but not a chair person. There will no chair person.

Tom G- need agency staff to gather information, literature and data on the topic

Josh mentioned media campaign on clean compost

Ben described work under P2 grant- ask Ben to fill in summary

Sampling for this work happening in 2023

Josh mentioned waste comp study out for RFP and the carve out for where food scraps are going since not all are going to certified facilities.

Dan G- thinks participant pool should be broad but just need to figure out to work if there are topics that need to be voted on that might affect the outcome/decision

Josh- discussion on how to include other participants besides the 7 listed in statute.

Hard part is figuring out what is included in recommendations. All comments can be noted but what is included in the recommendations of the report.

Mike Casella recommended adding UVM.

Tom G – group needs more independent science.

Kim - invite participants to present

Tom G- make up of decision making body matters. Consider having an eco-toxicologist, someone who understands fate and transport of toxins, etc.

Openness to independent subject matter experts.

Mike Casella- should include science but Don't think they necessarily need to be on the committee.

Tom G- thinks we have to tackle the issues of contaminants and their impacts.

Dan G- would like to have report and all research done prior to having report but we won't so let's not ignore what we do know

Ben G- P2 research- ask Ben for this comment again

Josh- seems like all are open to external stakeholders comment and adding input and any experts-speaker recommendations

Tom G- recommend to vote to add an additional seat for someone to come in and add an eco-toxicologist for human and environmental health

Tom suggested UVM might have some candidates including Radju B, a fellow from Germany who has been working on this topic.

Josh discussing how the group would like proceed with decision making. Consensus as a way of proceeding with decisions

Paul- Approach Based on consent not consensus. Get paramount objection out there for all to consider. Based on nature....

Caroline- asking what the objections are - paramount objections could hinder group moving forward

Otherwise group considers if those with objections could stand aside

Paul- clarifying

Having a paramount objection

Can we find a way that the paramount objection can be addressed

Group members can still consent and not totally agree

Caroline- everyone gets a voice on each topic. Hear a concern and discuss it. if nobody further raises a concern then you move on to agreement. If concern comes up again – then discussion is opened up again.

Erin- concerned that group only has 2 month period to get through a lot and sometimes might just need to call it and move forward

Paul K.- Can get big issues out on the table- consent decision making eliminates winners and losers that you have in voting

Steven – short timeframe, report can note objections

Raise the concern, acknowledging/recognizing the differences in the report

Paramount concern framework and a participant can call a vote if there is trouble moving forward.

Group can adjust and change as it goes

Tom G- Are there any paramount objections to moving forward with the paramount concern framework and a vote of supermajority on any decision that can't move forward? Supermajority would mean about 70%.

5 to 2 with 7 people listed as participants

Group all agree on the process.

Tom said we should consider carving out some space for third party scientific members. Specifically, requesting one seat for a toxicologist as a member of participants.

Steve- leans away from changing the number of participants bc odd number is good and keeping with legislative charge. Also, not sure that the toxicologist presenting versus being on the committee really has a different impact

Erin agreeing with above. Mike Casella too

Billy saying we could consider adding an ecotoxicologist and a human health toxicologist to present but not necessarily as a member of the committee

Dan bringing in as much outside voice as possible

Tom hears the group wanting to move forward without adding a seat for a toxicologist or other scientific expert and will not block the decision, but wants to register the paramount concern that the group has a majority of members representing the de-packaging side. Adding an additional member of science could help to balance that.

Tom- timeline is short and we aren't going to be able to gather enough information. One thing that would be really helpful to the group would be to adopt a framework approach. In recognition of that would be to establish what that framework looks like. Because of the glaring lack of data we need a framework for how we approach issues where the risks aren't clear or established.

Precautionary principle- when there is not enough data how to move forward with having the least impact/ do no harm policy. About moving ahead without creating further damage.

Jenna- hesitant to apply precautionary principle since when it comes to environmental health all could harm health

Mike- also not sure about applying a precautionary principle. Could have a domino effect and not allow anything

Tom to share precautionary principle

What is the outline that we need to meet the 3 points? Get the hot topics out for discussion

To talk at the next meeting about the group's charge and what the group does to meet it

Breaking out each topic, who are the players, identify the issues at next meeting

Bring experts in for future meetings.. wait on expert until after next meeting or combine expert with going over the main hot topics and background.

ANR to share information and background on topics

How many meetings does the group want?

Next meeting in September

Aiming for 6 meetings- 2 hours each

Use doodle to schedule meetings

Keep the meeting hybrid

Next meeting as a planning meeting and setting up framework and understanding issues and background

3 meetings after that to invite experts

Next 2 or 3 meetings after that to digest and work on report

Should we add link to Dec 2019 UR stakeholder meeting to the Depack page?

All documents will be public facing.

Mailing list for meetings-

Draft for agenda for next meeting- worked on amongst just the 7 participants, correct?

and then posted on the website and shared with the entire list?

Doodle for September meeting or When to Meet

Share entire participant list with 7 participants

Oct and November dates to be decided before (facilitated by ANR staff) and if needed at next meeting