From: Ken Eklund
To: REDICK Daniel; Sam Imperati Oregon Consensus Assessment
Cc: Benton County Talks Trash
Subject: Teeing up the next meeting of the A1 subcommittee
Date: Friday, January 6, 2023 12:06:53 PM
Attachments: writerguy-cube2.png

Hi Daniel, for you to disseminate to the Subcommittee members:

In the A1 Subcommittee's Jan 3 session, Sam asked us to "tee up" our discussion of landfill longevity, and suggested that I start it off.

What's happened is: Republic advanced a baseline scenario about the longevity of the landfill, and I advanced several other scenarios that build upon this baseline, and Republic has asked for these other scenarios to be stricken from the record because they are beyond the scope of the committee's charge, and because they are "speculative." (The material in question is in this document, pages 22-33. Republic's request is in a comment linked to the word "Methane," on page 27.)

Briefly, I'm going to make four statements/observations, to tee up our in-person discussion:

One: you can't find out the truth about future events in the same way that you find out the truth about past events. You have to shift your conceptual framework.

Two: as a subcommittee we are trying to deliver information of value about longevity (operating life) of the landfill as best we can, so that the TrashTalk Workgroup can characterize that longevity as best it can to the Board of Commissioners and the public. The Workgroup specifically requested scenarios when it formed our subcommittee.

Three: Our normal method has been a collaborative process where people freely ask questions, offer ideas and what they know, and we as a group consider the value of these contributions and place them into the document. It's been remarkable seeing how much attention gets paid even to seemingly small bits of the overall picture, with back-and-forth exchanges that zero in on and arrive at information of value. So it's distressing to see that method get abandoned entirely. Where is the helpful back-and-forth on these contributions?

Four: Our normal tenor has been cordial and respectful. So it's distressing to see that tenor also change completely. Just to be clear: when members of our subcommittee say that entire lines of reasoning are to be "stricken from the record," they want it not only to be deleted, but the record itself altered to be as if that material had never been brought forward at all. Where is the respect for an effort to bring the Workgroup something it has specifically requested?

Until Tuesday ~ Ken

Thanks,

Ken

Ken Eklund, writerguy

Creator of
World Without Oil
Ed Zed Omega
FutureCoast
and other storymaking games