

**From:** [Ken Eklund](#)  
**To:** [REDICK Daniel](#); [Brian May](#); [MCGUIRE Sean](#); [John Deuel](#); [Marge Popp](#); [Ryan McAlister](#)  
**Cc:** [Sam Imperati](#); [Amelia Webb](#); [SCHERMER Maren](#); [NICHOLS Darren](#); [Benton County Talks Trash](#)  
**Subject:** Re: BCTT Subcommittee Meeting #12 - C.1. Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP)  
**Date:** Thursday, March 9, 2023 5:23:43 PM  
**Attachments:** [C1-F&R-MP-KE clean.doc](#)  
[C1-F&R-MP-KE clean.docx](#)  
[C1-F&R-MP-KE clean.pdf](#)  
[C1-F&R-MP-KE.doc](#)  
[C1-F&R-MP-KE.docx](#)  
[C1-F&R-MP-KE.pdf](#)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello C-team,

Here is To-Do #1: wordsmithing the F&Rs by Marge and Ken.

I have two sets of documents attached (each in Word docx, Word doc and PDF versions of the same document)

“C1-F&R-MP-KE” has edits I received from Marge plus my own edits, implemented on today’s draft report release (03/09/23) from Daniel. Marge has reviewed and said “good to go”.

“C1-F&R-MP-KE clean” has all the same edits, but they’ve all been accepted, resolved comments removed, etc. so that we have a clean document we can actually read.

For Daniel to implement into the master draft... and for us to review next meeting.

All best,

Ken

Ken Eklund, writerguy

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

On Mar 9, 2023, at 11:16 AM, REDICK Daniel  
<[daniel.redick@bentoncountyor.gov](mailto:daniel.redick@bentoncountyor.gov)> wrote:

Greetings BCTT C.1. Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP) Subcommittee,

I have attached the updated subcommittee draft in PDF and Word format. Here are the to-do's we mentioned:

- Marge and Ken word-smith the Findings and Recommendations
- John a and Sean review and revise Common Terms and Definitions
- Ken smooths out the Introduction
- Daniel adds new recommendation about SMMP recommendation funding mechanisms, including using landfill revenue – Done
- Daniel adds summary of “lessons learned” from other jurisdictions, summarizing feedback from earlier work group meeting
- Everyone reviews the whole document for final revisions

Please send proposed revisions to the whole group to review ahead of the next meeting. Anything I receive by 3pm tomorrow will be incorporated into the document and sent back out to the group to review ahead of the meeting on Monday.

Thank you!

<image001.png>

**Daniel Redick** *he/him*  
Solid Waste & Water Quality Program Coordinator  
Community Development  
  
Phone: 541-766-6819  
Email: [daniel.redick@co.benton.or.us](mailto:daniel.redick@co.benton.or.us)  
  
[www.co.benton.or.us](http://www.co.benton.or.us)

**Community Development has moved to the Kalapuya Building at [4500 SW Research Way, 2nd Floor.](#)**

**Come see the new space; we are officially open for business!**

---

**From:** REDICK Daniel

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 8, 2023 10:37 AM

**To:** [daniel.redick@bentoncountyor.gov](mailto:daniel.redick@bentoncountyor.gov); Brian May <[BMay@co.marion.or.us](mailto:BMay@co.marion.or.us)>; MCGUIRE Sean <[Sean.McGuire@bentoncountyor.gov](mailto:Sean.McGuire@bentoncountyor.gov)>; 'Deuel, John' <[john.deuel@oregonstate.edu](mailto:john.deuel@oregonstate.edu)>; marge popp <[marge@jyo.com](mailto:marge@jyo.com)>; Ken Eklund <[futureeverything@writerguy.com](mailto:futureeverything@writerguy.com)>; ryan mcalister <[ryanm@gerdingbuilders.com](mailto:ryanm@gerdingbuilders.com)>; Sam Imperati <[samimperati@icmresolutions.com](mailto:samimperati@icmresolutions.com)>

**Cc:** Amelia Webb <[AmeliaWebb@icmresolutions.com](mailto:AmeliaWebb@icmresolutions.com)>; SCHERMER Maren <[maren.schermer@bentoncountyor.gov](mailto:maren.schermer@bentoncountyor.gov)>; NICHOLS Darren <[darren.nichols@bentoncountyor.gov](mailto:darren.nichols@bentoncountyor.gov)>; Benton County Talks Trash <[bentoncountytalkstrash@bentoncountyor.gov](mailto:bentoncountytalkstrash@bentoncountyor.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: BCTT Subcommittee Meeting #12 - C.1. Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP)

Hi everyone,

This is a reminder for today's meeting, which started at 10:30am. Hope to see you all soon!

Best,

<image001.png>

**Daniel Redick** *he/him*  
Solid Waste & Water Quality Program Coordinator  
Community Development

Phone: 541-766-6819

Email: [daniel.redick@co.benton.or.us](mailto:daniel.redick@co.benton.or.us)

[www.co.benton.or.us](http://www.co.benton.or.us)

**Community Development has moved to the Kalapuya Building at [4500 SW Research Way, 2nd Floor](#).**

**Come see the new space; we are officially open for business!**

-----Original Appointment-----

**From:** REDICK Daniel **On Behalf Of** REDICK Daniel

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 1, 2023 4:55 PM

**To:** [daniel.redick@bentoncountyor.gov](mailto:daniel.redick@bentoncountyor.gov); Brian May; MCGUIRE Sean; 'Deuel, John'; marge popp; Ken Eklund; ryan mcalister; Sam Imperati

**Cc:** Amelia Webb; SCHERMER Maren; NICHOLS Darren

**Subject:** BCTT Subcommittee Meeting #12 - C.1. Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP)

**When:** Wednesday, March 8, 2023 10:30 AM-12:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).

**Where:** Zoom - Registration Required (Link Below)

Greetings BCTT C.1. Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP) Subcommittee,

Please join our upcoming subcommittee meeting:

- Meeting #12: March 8, 2023 – 10:30am-12:00pm Pacific Time (Zoom Meeting Details below)

More information is available on the [subcommittee webpage](#).

You are invited to a Zoom meeting.

When: Mar 8, 2023 10:30 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Register in advance for this meeting:

[https://us06web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZwsd-2oqzopHdGMmE\\_TVlUgAV\\_u\\_Skh255u](https://us06web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZwsd-2oqzopHdGMmE_TVlUgAV_u_Skh255u)

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

Best,

<image001.png>

**Daniel Redick** *he/him*  
Solid Waste & Water Quality Program Coordinator  
Community Development

Phone: 541-766-6819

Email: [daniel.redick@co.benton.or.us](mailto:daniel.redick@co.benton.or.us)

[www.co.benton.or.us](http://www.co.benton.or.us)

**Community Development has moved to the Kalapuya Building at [4500 SW Research Way, 2nd Floor](#).**

**Come see the new space; we are officially open for business!**

<SMMP Subcommittee Report DRAFT 030923.pdf><SMMP Subcommittee Report DRAFT 030923.docx>

## 1. Table of Findings

### Key Findings:

This subcommittee proposes 8 findings as part of its overall charge. The subcommittee is not in agreement on all findings, and the following findings have **NOT BEEN REVIEWED** by the full subcommittee. These do not represent consensuses of the subcommittee, and they may be revised by the subcommittee further.

[SMMP F-1](#): Many Sustainable Materials Management Plans (SMMPs) and related Requests for Proposal (RFPs) have been formulated, executed, and are in use in Oregon.

[SMMP F-2](#): The charges of the SMMP Subcommittee are intimately related to and should be embodied when scoping the necessary tasks to start a Long-Term Sustainable Materials Management Plan process.

[SMMP F-3](#): Contracting out processes often include a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which vet technical information from a consultant to achieve consensus, and a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), which provides a wider scope of review.

[SMMP F-4](#): The overall length of the project can be heavily impacted and defined by the level of public interaction/engagement included in the project. The consultant would help define the scope of public engagement, including engagement in rural areas of the county and in communities outside the county.

[SMMP F-5](#): There are aspects of the work to be performed that are technical in nature or lend themselves toward extensive research, that the consultant may conduct at the same time as public engagement. In order to expedite the process, certain procedural elements can be done concurrently. The timeline can generally be defined throughout the process.

[SMMP F-6](#) – The SMMP aims to reduce the full lifecycle impacts of materials management practices in Benton County and where other jurisdictions' practices overlap with Benton County. Addressing only materials from Benton County would have limited impacts compared to that of all of the materials from neighboring counties, as Benton County's waste contribution to the landfill is relatively small.

[SMMP F-7](#) - Benton County has limited control over the waste management practices of the counties that emplace 90% of the annual landfill waste intake, and the volume of waste material they haul to Coffin Butte Landfill. Benton County infrastructure is impacted in a nontrivial way by other counties' use of facilities within Benton County (via Coffin Butte Landfill, Pacific Region Compost, and transportation methods through the county).

SMMP F-8 – The 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative identified our communities' Core Values and has been adopted by Benton County government. It is used as a benchmark for initiatives such as the Benton County SMMP.



## 2. Table of Recommendations

### Key Recommendations:

This subcommittee proposes 24 findings as part of its overall charge. The subcommittee is not in agreement on all findings, and the following findings have **NOT BEEN REVIEWED** by the full subcommittee. These do not represent consensus of the subcommittee, and they may be revised by the subcommittee further.

[SMMP R-1](#): Benton County Sustainable Materials Management Plan should be developed within a Sustainable Materials Management framework, reflecting full lifecycle impacts. The development of a Sustainable Materials Management Plan should consider, 1) the 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative and our communities' Core Values, 2) national, State and local goals, vision documents (DEQ's [Materials Management in Oregon 2020 Framework for Action](#)), plans, policies, ordinances, etc. relating to materials management and climate change, 3) examples of values and goals expressed in state and local jurisdiction materials management plans, and 4) long-term strategies (to 2040) with short-term action items (5 years or less).

[SMMP R-2](#) – Benton County should use the 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative as a high-level lens to frame our communities' Core Values in developing the SMMP.

[SMMP R-3](#): The SMMP should not just be about how Benton County can better manage materials, but to also address how to approach inter-county collaboration from a regional perspective. The RFP should indicate the need for researching and exploring opportunities for a regional multi-county approach to achieve the goals of sustainable materials management. RFP firms with experience with Oregon's materials management legislation, policies and other county materials management plans may have the capability to address this need.

[SMMP R-4](#): Counties impacting Benton County through their materials management practices (including by contributing materials to Coffin Butte Landfill) should have an SMMP in place. The SMMP should have a perspective on how to strategize this.

[SMMP R-5](#): SMMP content should incorporate the sustainability of materials management strategies/tactics. The result of the process should give us a method of measuring costs and benefits to evaluate the impact on economic, social, and environmental indicators. Specific goals should be included of how materials in Benton County can fit within a circular economy, cradle-to-cradle, or similar framework.

[SMMP R-6](#): The SMMP should clarify Benefit-Cost perspectives being addressed through an equity analysis, including, 1) financial cost impacts associated with materials management and outcomes, 2) the equity of circular economy, how it engages and impacts consumers, 3) a perspective that goes beyond landfilling, and 4) a "who's at the table" list of stakeholder perspectives.

[SMMP R-7](#): Bring “lessons learned” into the process from other sources, including international examples as well as other counties, lessons from past Benton County experiences, and West Coast states. See full report for more sources.

[SMMP R-8](#): Beyond those in the County, a wide assortment of stakeholders should be brought to the table. Stakeholders include community members, advocacy groups, businesses and industry, local and state government, and resources for innovation. See report for full stakeholder list. The consultant should provide recommendations based on analysis and extensive outreach and engagement with community stakeholders from the “who should be at the table” list. These stakeholders should represent a broader area than Benton County.

[SMMP R-9](#):

[SMMP R-10](#): Benton County should use an RFP to find consultant(s) for developing a Sustainable Materials Management Plan.

[SMMP R-11](#): The SMMP subcommittee researched other jurisdiction’s plans, compared and aggregated a list of subjects, and the SMMP should evaluate and address the subjects listed in the full subcommittee report, answering the 117 questions listed as RFP priorities allow, and include recommended courses of action.

[SMMP R-12](#): Recruitment for the RFP needs to be extensive, and selection of successful proposal should be careful and thorough. Qualities of a successful applicant should include those listed in the full subcommittee report.

[SMMP R-13](#): The scope of work for this project is expected to be broad and comprehensive, with specific goals recommended for the County to consider as milestones.

[SMMP R-14](#): The RFP development process should: 1) provide details about the Workgroup process and its findings to RFP applicants, 2) prioritize topics, adding additional topics that are important to consider, and 3) communicate accurate priorities to applicants.

[SMMP R-15](#): Members of this BCTT SMMP subcommittee should be offered to participate in subsequent stakeholder group meetings for RFP development and review. Benton County’s Solid Waste Advisory Council (SWAC) and Disposal Site Advisory Committee (DSAC) should have an advisory role during the development of the plan.

[SMMP R-16](#): The RFP Release/Announcement should 1) communicate an expectation that this plan can be approached by teams (multiple firms), instead of just single firms, 2) put guidelines on the size/length of proposals and sections of proposals, and 3) be distributed to allow enough time for it to be posted to various trade groups, shared with underrepresented groups, and internationally minded outlets.

[SMMP R-17](#): The County should share the various steps of the process with the public, making updates available, and demonstrating transparency (cross-referencing subcommittee E.1. work).

[SMMP R-18](#): The RFP should demonstrate flexibility in allowing further work plan development after applications are reviewed and accepted.



[SMMP R-19](#): The SMMP timeline should allow for extensive public interaction and engagement. In order to expedite the process, procedural elements should be done concurrently as possible. The timeline should generally be defined throughout the process.

[SMMP R-20](#): Applicants should include various scope/cost options for one year, two years, and three-year timelines. The report should be released in sections, based on timeline and content priorities.

[SMMP R-21](#): It's important that the SMMP process include extensive public outreach and engagement. In addition, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) should vet the consultant's technical work and a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to provide more general review. SMMP Sub-Committee members should be included in the CAC.

[SMMP R-22](#): Proposals contain the following information, with parameters around each of these items in terms of document length. Requested information includes project team experience and qualifications, understanding of the project, approach to the scope of work, cost of the proposal, the project schedule, social/environmental responsibility, and references. Each criteria includes a total set of points the proposal can be awarded. See full report for more information.

[SMMP R-23](#): An evaluation team consisting of County staff and members of the stakeholder group should determine the best proposal deemed most qualified based on the above criteria.

[SMMP R-24](#): The SMMP should emphasize impacts of the results of the RFP on social equity, innovation, to understand and emphasize the upstream aspects of material sustainability, and creative solutions that provide pathways for tangible long-term outcomes.

[SMMP R-25](#): The workplan should include ongoing adaptive management and refinement and include a timeline for completion. The sections of the workplan outline include RFP development and release, a webinar for prospective consultants, a pre-proposal Q&A period, a period for application submittal, and the selection committee to identify shortlisted firms who are given time for additional presentation. The committee then evaluates proposals, selects a consultant, and develops a workplan with selected consultant. See full report for more information.

SMMP R-26: The County should evaluate if it would be in their best interest to have an SMMP in place prior to any major materials management decisions.

SMMP R-27: The county should consider using alternative funding mechanisms, including landfill revenue, to support the SMMP recommendations.

## 1. Table of Findings

### Key Findings:

This subcommittee proposes 78 findings as part of its overall charge. The subcommittee is not in agreement on all findings, and the following findings have **NOT BEEN REVIEWED** by the full subcommittee. These do not represent consensus of the subcommittee, and they may be revised by the subcommittee further.

SMMP F-1: Many ~~SMMP's and related RFP's exist in Oregon and beyond~~ Sustainable Materials Management Plans (SMMPs) and related Requests for Proposal (RFPs) have been formulated, executed, and are in use in Oregon.

SMMP F-2: The charges of the SMMP Subcommittee are intimately related to and should be included within the RFP embodied when scoping the necessary tasks to start a Long-Term Sustainable Materials Management Plan process.

SMMP F-3: Contracting out processes often include a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which vet technical information from a consultant ~~and get to a place of to achieve~~ consensus, and a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), which provide ~~review in the technical experts' areas of disagreements~~ a wider scope of review.

SMMP F-4: ~~Length of overall~~ The overall length of the project can be heavily impacted and defined by the level of public interaction/engagement included in the project. The consultant would help define the scope of public engagement, including engagement in rural areas of the county and in communities outside the county.

SMMP F-5: There are aspects of the work to be performed that are technical in nature or lend themselves toward extensive research, that the consultant may conduct at the same time as public engagement. In order to expedite the process, certain procedural elements can be done concurrently. The timeline can generally be defined throughout the process.

SMMP F-6 – ~~The SMMP is about the landfill, but also bigger than that. While Benton County's waste contribution to the landfill is relatively small,~~ The SMMP aims to reduce the full lifecycle impacts of materials management practices in Benton County and where other jurisdiction's practices overlap with Benton County. Addressing only materials from Benton County would have limited impacts compared to that of all of the materials from neighboring counties, as Benton County's waste contribution to the landfill is relatively small.

SMMP F-7 - Benton County has limited control over ~~what counties do, and how much~~ the waste management practices of the counties that emplace 90% of the annual landfill waste intake, and the volume of waste material they haul to Coffin Butte Landfill. ~~, however, the county is impacted~~ Benton County infrastructure is impacted in a nontrivial way by other counties' waste-

~~streams contributions to~~ use of facilities within Benton County (via Coffin Butte Landfill, Pacific Region Compost, and transportation methods through the county).

SMMP F-8 – The 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative identified our communities' Core Values and has been adopted by Benton County government. It is used as a benchmark for initiatives such as the Benton County SMMP.

## 2. Table of Recommendations

### Key Recommendations:

This subcommittee proposes 24 findings as part of its overall charge. The subcommittee is not in agreement on all findings, and the following findings have **NOT BEEN REVIEWED** by the full subcommittee. These do not represent consensuses of the subcommittee, and they may be revised by the subcommittee further.

[SMMP R-1](#): Benton County Sustainable Materials Management Plan should be developed within a Sustainable Materials Management framework, reflecting full lifecycle impacts. The development of a Sustainable Materials Management Plan should consider, 1) the 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative and our communities' Core Values, 2) national, State and local goals, vision documents (DEQ's [Materials Management in Oregon 2020 Framework for Action](#)), plans, policies, ordinances, etc. relating to materials management and climate change, 3) examples of values and goals expressed in state and local jurisdiction materials management plans, and 4) long-term strategies (to 2040) with short-term action items (5 years or less).

[SMMP R-2](#) – Benton County should use the 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative as a high-level lens to frame our communities' Core Values in developing the SMMP.

[SMMP R-3](#): The SMMP should not just be about how Benton County can better manage materials, but to also address how to approach inter-county collaboration from a regional perspective. **The RFP should indicate the need for researching and exploring opportunities for a regional multi-county approach to achieve the goals of sustainable materials management. RFP firms with experience with Oregon's materials management legislation, policies and other county materials management plans may have the capability to address this need.**

[SMMP R-4](#): Counties impacting Benton County through their materials management practices (including by contributing materials to Coffin Butte Landfill) should have an SMMP in place. **Need larger statewide resources to plan for this. Regional plan process. The SMMP should have a perspective on how to strategize this.**

[SMMP R-5](#): SMMP content should incorporate the sustainability of materials management strategies/tactics. The result of the process should give us a method of measuring costs and benefits to evaluate the impact on economic, social, and environmental indicators. Specific goals should be included of how materials in Benton County can fit within a circular economy, cradle-to-cradle, or similar framework.

[SMMP R-6](#): The SMMP should clarify Benefit-Cost perspectives being addressed through an equity analysis, including, 1) financial cost impacts associated with materials management and outcomes, 2) the equity of circular economy, how it engages and impacts consumers, 3) a

perspective that goes beyond landfilling, and 4) a “who’s at the table” list of stakeholder perspectives.

[SMMP R-7](#): Bring “lessons learned” into the process from other sources, including international examples as well as other counties, lessons from past Benton County experiences, and West Coast states, ~~and~~. See full report for more sources.

[SMMP R-8](#): Beyond those in the County, a wide assortment of stakeholders should be brought to the table. Stakeholders include community members, advocacy groups, businesses and industry, local and state government, and resources for innovation. See report for full stakeholder list. The consultant should provide recommendations based on analysis and extensive outreach and engagement with community stakeholders from the “who should be at the table” list. These stakeholders should represent a broader area than Benton County.

~~[SMMP R-9](#): It is recommended that the RFP indicate the need for researching and exploring opportunities for a regional multi-county approach to achieve the goals of sustainable materials management. RFP firms with experience with Oregon’s materials management legislation, policies and other county materials management plans may have the capability to address this need.~~

[SMMP R-10](#): Benton County should use an RFP to find consultant(s) for developing a Sustainable Materials Management Plan.

[SMMP R-11](#): The SMMP subcommittee researched other jurisdiction’s plans, compared and aggregated a list of subjects, and the SMMP should evaluate and address the subjects listed in the full subcommittee report, answering the 117 questions listed as RFP priorities allow, and include recommended courses of action.

[SMMP R-12](#): Recruitment for the RFP needs to be extensive, and selection of successful proposal should be careful and thorough. Qualities of a successful applicant should include those listed in the full subcommittee report.

[SMMP R-13](#): The scope of work for this project is expected to be broad and comprehensive, with specific goals recommended for the County to consider as milestones.

[SMMP R-14](#): The RFP development process should: 1) provide details about the Workgroup process and its findings to RFP applicants, 2) prioritize topics, adding additional topics that are important to consider, and 3) communicate accurate priorities to applicants.

[SMMP R-15](#): Members of this BCTT SMMP subcommittee should be offered to participate in subsequent stakeholder group meetings for RFP development and review. [SWAC/DSAC Benton County’s Solid Waste Advisory Council \(SWAC\) and Disposal Site Advisory Committee \(DSAC\)](#) should have an advisory role during the development of the plan.

[SMMP R-16](#): The RFP Release/Announcement should 1) communicate an expectation that this plan can be approached by teams (multiple firms), instead of just single firms, 2) put guidelines on the size/length of proposals and sections of proposals, and 3) be distributed to allow enough

time for it to be posted to various trade groups, shared with underrepresented groups, and internationally minded outlets.

[SMMP R-17](#): The County should share the various steps of the process with the public, making updates available, and demonstrating transparency (cCross-referencing subcommittee E.1. work).

[SMMP R-18](#): The RFP should demonstrate flexibility in allowing further work plan development after applications are reviewed and accepted.

[SMMP R-19](#): ~~The length of overall project will depend heavily on the level of public interaction/ stakeholder engagement included in the project, and by requirements from the county. Time should allow~~The SMMP timeline should allow for extensive public interaction and engagement. In order to expedite the process, ~~certain~~ procedural elements should be done concurrently as possible. The timeline should generally be defined throughout the process.

[SMMP R-20](#): Applicants should include various scope/cost options for one year, two years, and three-year timelines. The report should be released in sections, based on timeline and content priorities.

[SMMP R-21](#): ~~It's important that the SMMP process include extensive public outreach and engagement. In addition, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) should vet the consultant's technical work and a a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to provide more general review. Include a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which vet technical information from a consultant and get to a place of consensus. In addition to extensive public outreach and engagement, this process should include a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), which provide review in the technical experts' areas of disagreement and general review.~~ SMMP Sub-Committee members should be included in the CAC.

[SMMP R-22](#): Proposals contain the following information, with parameters around each of these items in terms of document length. Requested information includes project team experience and qualifications, understanding of the project, approach to the scope of work, cost of the proposal, the project schedule, social/environmental responsibility, and references. Each criteria includes a total set of points the proposal can be awarded. See full report for more information.

[SMMP R-23](#): An evaluation team consisting of County staff and members of the stakeholder group should determine the best proposal deemed most qualified based on the above criteria.

[SMMP R-24](#): The SMMP should emphasize impacts of the results of the RFP on social equity, innovation, to understand and emphasize the upstream aspects of material sustainability, and creative solutions that provide pathways for tangible long-term outcomes.

[SMMP R-25](#): The workplan should include ongoing adaptive management and refinement and include a timeline for completion. The sections of the workplan outline include RFP development and release, a webinar for prospective consultants, a pre-proposal Q&A period, a period for application submittal, and the selection committee to identify shortlisted firms who are given time for additional presentation. The committee then evaluates proposals, selects a

consultant, and develops a workplan with selected consultant. See full report for more information.

SMMP R-26: The County should evaluate if it would be in their best interest to have an SMMP in place prior to any major materials management decisions.

SMMP R-27: The county should consider using alternative funding mechanisms, including landfill revenue, to support the SMMP recommendations.