### NRC JULY 26 BOD MEETING

1. Welcome/Introduction/Roll Call - Chair Barry (12:00 p.m.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **In attendance 7-26-19** | **Roll Call Vote on Bottle Bill** | **Roll Call Votes** |
| Anthony, Rick  | X | Y |  |
| Attridge, Susan  | No |  |  |
| Bantillo, Stephen  | X | Y |  |
| Barry, Mick  | X | N/A except if tie |  |
| Butler, Nina  | X |  |  |
| Clarke, Maggie  | X |  |  |
| Collins, Susan  | X | Y |  |
| Dreckmann, George  | X | Y |  |
| Eckstrom, Barb  | Yes (12:44) | Y |  |
| Etienne, MaryEllen  | No |  |  |
| Fryer, Chantal  | No |  |  |
| Gjerde, Wayne  | X | Y |  |
| Gordon, Susie  | X | Y |  |
| Keeling, Dave  | X | N |  |
| Lukacs, Leslie  | X | N |  |
| McLellan, Mary  | X | N |  |
| McPoland, Fran  | X | Y |  |
| O’Brien, Kerrin  | X | N |  |
| Pitt, Charlotte  | X | Y |  |
| Pierpont, Sarah  | X (left call at 1:00) |  |  |
| Rios, Antonio  | No |  |  |
| Rubinstein, Lynn  | X | N |  |
| Stockdale, Justin  | No |  |  |
| Turley, Bill  | X | Y |  |
| Wiener, Robin  | No |  |  |
| **STAFF** |  | TOTAL: 10 Yes; 5 No |  |
| Sarah DeSouza, Executive Director | X |  Motion adopted. |  |
| **GUESTS** |  |  |  |
| Amy Roth, Guest (ROC Chair) | X |  |  |
| Bob Hollis, Guest | X |  |  |
| Mark Lichtenstein, Lifetime Board Member (non-voting) | No |  |  |
| Gary Liss, Lifetime Board Member (non-voting) | X |  |  |
| Bob Gedert | X |  |  |
| Jack DeBell | No |  |  |

* Approval of the Agenda **[Bantillo/Pierpont] AIF -** *Chair Barry (12:02 p.m.)*
* Approval of Minutes**-***Secretary Pierpont (12:03 p.m.)*
	+ [June 28, 2019 Minutes](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/June-28-2019-BOD-Minutes-NRC_Board_Minutes_June28_-2019.pdf) [**Pierpont/McClellan**] AIF
* Treasurer's Update **[Pitt/Bantillo] AIF -** *Treasurer Pitt (12:05 p.m.)*
	+ May 2019 Motion to approve May financials as presented at June meeting by President Keeling **(Pierpont/Gordon) AIF**
	+ [June 2019 Treasurer's Report](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/July-BOD-June-2019-NRC-Treasurer-Report-June-2019-2.pdf)
	+ [June Financial Review](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/July-BOD-June-2019-NRC-Financial-review.xlsx)
* Executive Director's Report - *Executive Director DeSouza (12:10 p.m.)*
	+ [Executive Director's Update](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/July-NRC-Executive-Director-Message-June-2019.pdf)
	+ See report – Board asked to reach out to ROs that are needing to pay their dues if they have a connection with that RO
	+ Reminder that board nominations are votes are upcoming
	+ Reminder that deadline for award nominations is upcoming
	+ Email going out today to members with template for contacts
* President's Report - *President Keeling (12:15 p.m.)*
	+ [President's Message](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/July-2019-NRC-President-Message.pdf)
	+ To Note – we are 30 days out of start of RR Conference, now we are allowed to solicit for sponsors for the workshop, as well as the reception, currently $3k in sponsorship from Pratt, stresses we need board members to reach out to their contacts to attend reception and potentially sponsor – there is a flyer and sponsor sheet available to assist with this (linked onto this agenda)
	+ Discussion – board members need to register to attend RR conference, RR does give one complimentary registration fee for each state RO, board also needs to register for board meeting
	+ Fran – discussion of need to attend retreat and RR conf for NRC board, tell nominees for board that we hope they can attend board mtg plus retreat
	+ Kerrin – noted plan on board retreat taking place each year following RR Conference
	+ Bob Hollis – could provide GoToWebinar for remote live access for board mtg and retreat in Louisiana – Sarah noted need to check internet speed and if possible with AV at hotel
	+ Sarah D – will put out AV request to board to help provide our own AV and reduce costs at conference
	+ Dave – TY to Lynn Rubenstein who reviewed our bylaws and she noted what we do for elections is not what is in our bylaws. Related to the issue of “proxy” - Working to clarify this. Need to define “chair” position on the board
	+ Slate Committee – 6 open seats, Dave and Maggie noted they will run for reelection – let Dave or Sarah know about any possible candidates, they must be NRC members for at least 1 year.
	+ [NRC/SERDC Welcome Reception](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/NRCSERDC-Welcome-Reception-Flyer-Final.pdf)
	+ [NRC Sponsorship Benefits](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/NRC-2019-Sponsorship-Benefits-.pdf)
* Committee Reports *(12:30 p.m.)*
	+ Policy Committee *McPoland/Bantillo/Dreckman)*
		- [July 26, 2019 Committee Report](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/PolCom-NRC-Board-Report-July-26-2019-combined_1.pdf)

Stephen – Board adopted Policy in May. Didn’t announce it. Gave additional time for ROC and ROs to provide comment. Report captured key details for Board. Reviewed existing policy, letters received. Letters received from California Resource Recovery Assn, Iowa Recycling Assn and ROC. CRRA and IRA were both supportive of the policy adopted. ROC proposed changes. When existing policy, don’t want to walk backwards as practice of Board and Policy Committee in its reviews.

Key word for discussion – “vital strategy” in adopted policy. ROC provided options. In report, highlighted ROC options recommended. Dictionary.com reviewed. None strengthened the adopted policy.

Do believe bottle bills are vital strategy. Many things are vital to increasing recycling. Industry is in a crisis. Lots of opportunities out there but none have achieved results of container deposit systems.

Also recognize Board prerogative to amend existing policy.

Not happened overnight or rushed through. Policy conversation started almost a year ago. Long gestation process. Lots of feedback along the way. It was the Policy Committee’s charge to develop this. Pulled it back from a vote, to get more feedback, and considered again in May meeting.

Whatever happens today, hopefully will keep it to something as strong or stronger. Will have policy on the books. We’ll need coordinated strategy on this.

When people ask NRC for support on issue like container deposits, should have scripts developed.

Mick – open for questions

Gary – Concerned about the premise that this is “existing policy” and that the Board should only adopt changes that will strengthen this policy. The Board direction in May was to get more input from ROC and ROs and then to try to find a way that would work from a Policy perspective, as well as address the concerns of the ROC. ROC proposed some good options – one of those should be adopted. ROC and ROs are important to this organization and should be supported. I don’t think the difference between “vital” and some of the options ROC proposed is worth the negative impacts of NRC/ROC and ROs relations.

Mick – received emails from ROC in April. ROs had opportunity before May for input. Fran and Stephen met via phone with the ROC.

Gary – It comes down to whether the direction from the NRC Board in May was followed or not. I thought the Board had asked the Policy Committee to get more input from ROC and ROs, and to try to find some wording that would work for all. The NRC Board did not say find some wording that would strengthen the policy that was adopted in May.

Mick – ROC had input. Policy reviewed its input. Policy Committee came to Board today. You have right to vote yea or nay. You’re giving discussion. Appreciate your comments on the value of the ROC. Process followed was as directed by the Board.

 Gary –Policy Committee was not told to identify language to strengthen the adopted policy.

 Stephen – that’s not the goal, to weaken it.

 Gary – crux is whether this policy must be strengthened or not.

 Dave – clarification – based on what you said, what is process going forward on this call. Vote to maintain current policy? Entertain motions to change the policy?

 Mick – no motion on table yet. Will accept motions of all kinds and vote on them.

 Kerrin – I’d like to make a point. Still feel very new to NRC policy-making process. Understand where ROC and Policy Committee is coming from. Believe Policy Committee did task assigned.

 However, we missed an incredible opportunity to host a comprehensive forum to discuss implications of deposit legislation. What happened in NY is challenge for bottle bills moving forward. Process Policy Committee followed has missed this opportunity. They put the adoption of policy before dialog and discussion.

 Dave K – Policy Committee and Work Group thought it was needed to have a policy prior to having such forums. We want those discussions. Work group wanted policy first.

 Kerrin – I understand that. What I’ve seen from Policy Committee, serves to justify policy put forward. Not seen challenges, cons, which doesn’t further my own understanding. That’s why I think we got it wrong.

 George – we looked at things when we brought in people to study this. Those things were studied in some detail. Not blowing anything off. We’re at cusp – lead, follow, or get out of the way. This organization has been on life support for long time. If we remain wishy washy on policy, will make it that more difficult to play any role in the process.

We don’t have resources to hold meetings to have discussions on bottle bills. I don’t see it coming right now.

We need to have leadership policy to stay out in front along with organizations and companies that are beginning to change their position and stay out in front here. Try to help improve recycling and infrastructure. We have to go forward. I’ve had lot of experience on Board. In dealing with ROC, often expressing their own opinion. What we have as input now is from ROC, and 2 recycling organizations supporting it.

 Amy – Chair of ROC. Not representing my own opinion. Bringing concerns from your ROC. ROC and ROS supporting this organization. You’re at risk.

I’m incredibly frustrated. Thanks Gary for bringing this up. This was passed without consideration. Brought to me by Fran in April. I invited her to come to ROC call. ROC expressed concerns and brought to May Board meeting. Board approved. At that time, Susie Gordon asked to have friendly amendment to be palatable to all the states. The charge was not to strengthen the policy. The challenge is that “vital strategy” is the one and only, because I have ROC members that don’t agree with that.

Huge issue with how you work with the ROC. To say our communications are erroneous is infuriating.

 George- no one said it was erroneous.

 Amy – in Policy Committee report it does.

 Dave K – hold on – you did make the point that comments from the ROC were personal comments

 George – oftentimes

 Rick- I was at all those meetings. Here’s the dichotomy – Board members are policy oriented. ROC members are Executive Directors. Executive Directors are particularly attuned to fundraising and the impacts of policy on fundraising.

 Not all the ROC members felt this is a bad thing. Agree a lot of ROC members feel like Amy. This is a dialog. Don’t know how to handle it.

 Mick – one at a time

 Amy – erroneous is in Policy Committee report. Lot went into ROC report and don’t believe that is reflected in the Policy Committee report.

 Mick – want to hear people say names before speak, and I’ll recognize as I hear you.

 Susie – as author of friendly amendment, wanted ROC input into Policy. Policy Committee met intent. Listening with tremendous admiration of all involved. Appreciate Amy representing her organization well.

 Will vote for word vital. People are acting like this is the end of the world. I don’t agree.

 Lynn – I have to agree with Amy, I was outraged. Found it insulting. Very personal in its tone. Felt ROC had come back with some very solid proposals. Appreciated Gary’s opening comments. Had anticipated we would try to address input from ROC.

 George – to Rick’s point, I can appreciate need for ROs to deal with fundraising. There’s nothing in NRC policy that obligates RO to support a bottle bill. Up to their state. WI not a bottle bill state. I used to be President of the WI RO (AROW). Nothing obligates any state to support a bottle bill.

 Rick – we should sit back a little. Saw press release from American Chemistry Council calling for advanced recovery fee on single-use plastics. Are we going to oppose that?

 Susan Collins – info I’m telling you now is very new. At first one person asked questions, then others. 7 people have asked, including people from existing bottle bill state, national Senate and national House of Representatives. Not asking what are pros and cons for deposit laws; asking **in your experience what is best practice for deposit laws**. 3 are national trade assns. that had not supported deposit laws. In last week, opinion from Nestle Waters General Counsel for all New England states said that they needed to improve bottle bills as they were not world class. Not to mention other 8 states where deposit legislation proposed this year. This will happen whether we say important or vital. Would be good for not being the last one.

 Communication issues need to work on with ROC and ROs.

 Dave K – when the work group was formed, I was very pleased with list of participants. Nice mix of NRC Board, Policy Committee and reps from ROs. May not be Ex. Directors that participate on ROC calls/activities. Was the process what I would like to see? No. The friendly amendment made up for sins there. Do need to look at the process moving forward.

I think that we do need to have a policy. It’s time. I’ll let someone else make motions. Need to consider some of the suggestions ROC made.

 Bill Turley – after 25 years, never heard such an impassioned exchange. Policy Committee came forward with rec. **Bill Move to adopt Policy Committee rec. 2nd by Susie.**

Mick – let Stephen read Policy Statement.

 Stephen – Restated it (a couple of times during continuing discussion).

**Motion to accept Policy Committee Recommendation to keep adopted policy**

“***The NRC supports deposit return systems for container recovery as a vital strategy to***

***increase the collection and reclamation of clean materials for recycling into new materials.”***

***And that the President establish and serve as Chair of a “Container Recovery Task Force” consisting of members from the Fundraising, Markets, Membership, Policy, Communications Committees and ROC. If the President does not serve as Chair, then the President should select an appropriate individual to lead/manage the Task Force****.*

*Mick – Roll-call vote?*

*Dave – Yes.*

*Mick – Discussion.*

*Mary – it would be a good idea to separate those 2 things. To combine them is 2 different topics.*

*Bill – No. Want them both together.*

*Mary – not ready to vote on this. Shooting ourselves in the foot to not properly discuss other options. Clearly lack of clarity of what we intended to do on adopting the last policy. Not because it’s a bad statement.*

*Rick – clarify on procedure. Motion to table precedes motion to go forward. If you wanted more time, but not act now, could table to next meeting.*

*Mick – would need vote to Table*

*Rick – yes.*

*Leslie – feel same sentiment as Mary. Support motion, but not comfortable with relationship with ROC. If we move forward, that will be strained. I’ve been on ROC for many years. They’re very important to NRC. Fine with tabling and reaching out to ROC. Not ready to pass today.*

*Mick – Stephen, Fran, George – one of you address Q if the ROC comments were given full deliberation/consideration?*

*Fran – yes. Did give great deal of thought and conversation amongst us. Want to point out, I have enormous respect for ROC and work Executive Directors do. Mind numbing in complexity. Doesn’t pay well. Clearly this issue demonstrates a problem that the NRC and ROC need to work out irrespective of Policy Committee. We were all told a couple of years ago that the ROC did not want to get involved in NRC policy issues.*

*Kerrin – that’s not accurate description. Can provide it.*

*Fran- that was my impression. ROC felt its issues were those it needed to deal with, and didn’t want to deal with NRC issues. If that’s not the case, we should have a better process. Does ROC have veto power over what NRC does? ROC is a like a Committee of the NRC.*

*Stephen – a Council*

*Fran – we may have misinterpreted how we saw ROC’s role. The committee in the Motion should include reps from state recycling organizations as a friendly amendment. That’s essential*

*Kerrin – ROC Strategic Plan said ROC is not a decision-making body on its own. Can get feedback on policy and other things. Should go back to each state to get a vote on policy. ROC is trying to show process is flawed. Hard for me to take position without full information. Won’t support this – not right way for NRC to move policy initiatives forward. Not taking the opportunity to educate people in this process. Doesn’t do anything to move issue forward.*

*Mick – friendly amendment to add ROC rep. to Container Recovery Task Force.*

*Bill – no problem with adding them in. Their input is important.*

*Susie – OK. Need to call the Question.*

*Mick- Roll Call*

*Vote; 10 Yes; 5 No*

* NRC/RMC Webinar Topics Update

Dave – address next meeting

**Market Committee *(Gjerde/Fryer)***

* [Market Committee Report](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/July-2019-NRC-Communications-Committee-Report.pdf)

Wayne – Fundraise!

**Conference Committee Report**

* [Conference Committee Report](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/July-26-2019-NRC-Conference-Committee-Report-to-NRC-Board-incl.-attachments-7-22-19.pdf)
* [National Zero Waste Conference Program - Editable Document](https://drive.google.com/file/d/17K-veq76mmgq0KLF02eEk40WCm-Yc35Q/view)

Gary – **Most importantly, need input on Program topics/speakers.** Sent link to Board on today’s agenda to get edits on Google doc. Open the document as a Google doc to edit it. NCRA Board and the ZW Conference Advisory Committee both had some concerns about Freight & Salvage. I was asked to explore other venues (e.g. UC Berkeley). I reached out to UC Berkeley yesterday. I’d also like to correct my Committee report – I had said the cost for Freight & Salvage was $4000/day. The correct number is $2000/day. In addition, there’s a charge of $200/day for their projector and screen. The total cost is $4400. I’ve asked Dave and Sarah D to hold off on signing the contract with Freight & Salvage until I confirm how best to proceed on the venue issue.

Gary – We’ll need to resolve insurance issue no matter where we go.

I also wanted to highlight that our Committee has made no progress on KAB Conference, and that Dave needs to talk with the Association of Plastic Recyclers (the new owners of RR Conference) before this year’s conference to discuss how NRC will be involved in 2020 show. Ideally, when they announce the 2020 show, it should include NRC as a partner in their print announcements and verbally.

Dave – Markets Council asked me to reach out to KAB. Will try to have meeting at RR to talk about involvement for KAB Conference in Memphis in February 2020.

**Communications Committee**

Mary – please send us articles. Let us know if you want to write guest articles. We’ll discuss how to address Bottle Bill policy.

***Awards Committee***

Barb Eckstrom – Lisa Skumatz chair of Awards. Received 20 nominations. Nominations close on 8/1. Talking early next week about Conference Committee. Lisa will be attending Conference and presenting awards. All is moving smoothly.

**Membership Committee**

Dave - Aluminum Assn. will be joining as a Trade Association.

All – Great!

**ROC Update**

None provided.

**Other Business**

* [Draft Information Exchange MOU with MORE Recycling and the NRC](http://nrcrecycles.org/mobius/nrcwp-content/uploads/2019/07/DRAFT-Information-Exchange-MOU.pdf) - *Nina Butler*

Dave – MOU proposed with STINA, which dbas as “More Recycling”. Info Exchange. Potential to move to larger Recycled Product Platform. Discussed on Fundraising Call. Revamped. Sent on Friday. Shared with ExCom. Link is actual MOU. We would like to get Motion to approve MOU with understanding that there may be slight modifications based on pending suggestions.

Concerns expressed by ExCom – financial aspects. Committing NRC to about $7K of support to More Recycling for licensing fee to host the platform on NRC website, to address programming, upkeep. As expand to do Recycled Products platform, would be additional $10K. Concerns everyone to be on the hook for that. Nina provided fundraising plan – talking to MacArthur Fund, and others. If unsuccessful in fundraising, then would waive expense for 2019 and re-evaluate moving forward. Put in waiver clause and language that sponsorship funds for this program only would go to More Recycling to cover the $7K or $10K, not fundraising for other programs.

Would like to sign MOU, get branded info exchange prior to RR Conference Markets Workshop. Then could spend time there fundraising. Hope is that expanded recycled products will be up and running by America Recycles Day. Don’t know if enough info to make a motion. Vote by email requires unanimous consent.

Lynn – one of concerns – tool that is visible on the web so far is very crude, not well populated and has mistakes. Where in the agreement does it get fully populated, fixed and usable by end of August?

Dave – that’s for Nina to answer. They’re still working on it. Looking for input like that.

Mick – does anyone feel comfortable to move forward with MOU?

Gary- I think this is a great idea and suggest the Board either approve MOU as presented with authority to President to modify it slightly, or authorize President to negotiate and execute an agreement.

Dave – **Motion: approve ExCom to finalize MOU and for President to execute it.**

Wayne – **I’ll make that motion: Motion: approve ExCom to finalize MOU and for President to sign.**

**Keeling 2nd**

Maggie – what is the content of the MOU? On my phone, tried to look at this but couldn’t access it.

Susan – funding commitment in here. Document not worded clearly at this time. Contract document shouldn’t say funding is $17K – question is who will do what. Who will pay who? Not clear what financial commitment is. Do see term is only 1 year. That’s good. Means not obligating NRC to expenses in perpetuity. **Move to Table issue**. Need to carefully read it. Get sense others haven’t read as carefully.

**Mick – Motion to table by Susan Collins**

**2nd – Lynn**

**Mick - No discussion on tabling, as obvious**

**Any opposed to tabling – Keeling. Gjerde, Dreckmann,**

**Abstained:**

**Rest in favor of motion to table.**

**Motion Tabled.**

Gary – Executive Committee empowered to act between Board meetings

Dave K – tried to avoid contract language. Nina going to Africa tomorrow.

Susan C – know that I may be Treasurer in future, so more sensitive to financial issues. Need to be well cared for. Sorry for monkey wrench…

Mick – understand. ExCom could address.

Stephen – appreciate looking at more careful review of obligations. When does it come back to Board, or ExCom for vote? If Susan participates on review, is there possibility to get terms necessary by earlier date than next Board meeting?

Mary – ask for comment period, then ExCom execute thereafter.

Gary- ExCom has authority to act between Board meetings

Lynn – surprised they have that authority for contracting

Mick – they do.

Susan Collins – written as MOU, not as contract. Doesn’t have standard things that would be included in a contract. CRI has boilerplate contract language. I personally wouldn’t be able to review some of these sentences to understand if they’re legal. For CRI, we do legal review before contracts. Don’t know if we have legal capacity.

Dave – not written to be a contract. There’s a difference between MOU and a contract.

8/16 is next Board call – that would provide enough time to execute prior to RR Conference. That call is to handle things before Conference, so don’t have to have 7:30 am Board meeting at Conference on Monday morning.

**NRC Members and Public Comment - *Chair Barry (1:55 p.m.)***

None.

**Next Meeting Date (August 16, 2019) - *Chair Barry (1:57 p.m.***

**Call for Adjournment**

**[Motion] - Chair Barry (2:00 p.m.)**

* + - **Moved by Gjerde; Bantillo 2nd. Motion unanimous**