

Andrea Siegel

There are many ways this plan needs to be bolder and address our waste crisis, but for the sake of space I will highlight two that are most important to my family:

1. The plan mentions "environmental justice," but this plan does not account for the acute health impacts of incinerators and the cumulative impacts of their siting in overburdened communities. The HERC trash burner is less than 2 miles from my child's public school. Our Minneapolis students are exposed to pollution from the HERC trash burner every time they are outside for recess, gym class, and outdoor sports activities. There is no scientific risk assessment in the draft waste management report. How can MPCA claim that landfills are far worse than incineration if there is no risk science or transparency in this report? According to initial responses from MPCA about this, it appears that health impacts are not even considered in MPCA's comparison of landfills and incinerators. Our kids deserve better. Overburdened communities and our most vulnerable citizens deserve better. They should not be at the mercy of the rest of the population's willingness to reduce their trash. If "environmental justice" is going to be more than just rhetoric for the MPCA, this plan must account for the acute health impacts of incinerators and the cumulative impacts of where they are located.

2. The plan needs to address hyperconsumption. The plan needs to be more ambitious than just a 5% waste reduction over 20 years. We are in a waste crisis that drives the climate crisis, and if this plan is meant to actually manage solid waste properly to address this crisis, this goal needs to be increased to a 50% reduction over 20 years in order to be meaningful in any way. Shutting down incinerators and not allowing the trash and incinerators to be profitable businesses in MN will encourage more aggressive action for reducing waste, especially given the strong policies and public awareness around avoiding landfilling.