

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

Sustainable Material Management Plan Key Recommendations

- 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.

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

- SMMP R-9.** Benton County should use an RFP to find consultant(s) for developing a Sustainable Materials Management Plan.
- SMMP R-10.** 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-11.** 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-12.** 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-13.** 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-14.** Members of this BCTT SMMP subcommittee should be offered to participate in subsequent stakeholder group meetings for RFP development and review. Benton County's Advisory Committees related to SMMP work should have an advisory role during the development of the plan.
- SMMP R-15.** 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-16.** 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-17.** The RFP should demonstrate flexibility in allowing further work plan development after applications are reviewed and accepted.
- SMMP R-18.** 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-19.** 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-20.** 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 (SMMP development) and a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to provide more general review. SMMP Sub-Committee members should be included in the CAC. The TAC should include subject matter experts from Oregon State University, and other regional academic institutions. Many of the subject areas of central importance to the SMMP are characterized by fast-moving science, and a SAC could help the SMMP consultant to navigate to the best available data and knowledge.

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

- SMMP R-21.** 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-22.** 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-23.** 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-24.** 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-25.** 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-26.** The county should consider using alternative funding mechanisms, including landfill revenue, to support the SMMP recommendations.
- SMMP R-27.** A complete materials audit is highly recommended as both a benchmark and a way to measure progress. Benton County should initiate a Waste Audit to characterize more precisely what is in the waste stream of Coffin Butte Landfill. The SMMP consultant can use this audit information when formulating this plan, and there is no up-to-date information specific to the landfill currently available. The benchmark audit should be completed as soon as possible, along with recommendations for follow up audits.

Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity Key Recommendations

- LSCL R-1.** The Sustainable Materials Management Plan should further develop scenarios and factors that may impact the landfill lifespan, including detailed analyses of likely projections. The Commissioners and County staff should keep the questions about these factors and their effects in mind when making decisions affecting the landfill.
- LSCL R-2.** Benton County should create and share a plan for the enforcement of all franchise agreements-
- LSCL R-3.** Benton County should contract for an updated Baseline Study to evaluate the impact of the current intake level at Coffin Butte. As with the 2001 Baseline Study stipulated in the 2000 Landfill Franchise Agreement, this study should determine and measure adverse effects, including but not limited to: traffic, soil conditions and contamination levels, air quality, surface and ground water conditions and

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

contamination levels, noise, odor, visual screenings, litter, hours of operation, solid waste control systems and compliance with all solid waste Permits. This baseline study could help inform Benton County in decision making and financial choices regarding how to use the income from the landfill.

- LSCL R-4.** The County should, as soon as possible, consider the public record of the deliberations leading to the execution of the 2020 Landfill Franchise Agreement in order to assess a) which party requested that the 2020 Tonnage Cap be eliminated if expansion was approved, b) if Benton County proposed the elimination of the 2020 Tonnage Cap, determine why this was done, c) determine the County's expectation for the benefit(s) to the County of accepting up to 1.1M Tons of waste per year when the County's reserve portion is approximately 6.8% of that amount, d) interpretation of the "Tonnage Cap", specifically relative to the 2020 Tonnage Cap, and e) expectations of both parties for future landfill site expansion, including any plans for multiple (repeated) future expansions. The county should then use this information to inform landfill-related decision-making. These negotiations were conducted privately (not in public meetings), and there are elements of these discussions that may be proprietary and/or fall under attorney-client privilege.
- LSCL R-5.** Benton County should clarify and document the process for officially establishing Permitted Space, including any and all required Benton County actions and regulatory agency approvals (ODEQ, EPA, etc.).
- LSCL R-6.** The County should clarify when formal approval of Cell 6 as a disposal area was granted.
- LSCL R-7.** The Benton County Solid Waste Advisory Council (SWAC) should review all future Coffin Butte Annual Reports relative to past reports and official approvals, in particular with regard to intake volume, landfill traffic volume (both Municipal Solid Waste and leachate transport), expected Landfill Life and EOL, and total and remaining Permitted Space. SWAC should report these findings to the BOC for consideration.
- LSCL R-8.** Benton County should secure information from Republic Services about the Annual Tonnage figures for presentation to SWAC/DSAC as soon as they are available, and not wait to include them for the first time in the Annual Report.
- LSCL R-9.** The baseline scenarios laid out in this report assume that landfilling will continue as it is doing today for the next 16 years. That expectation should be tempered by signals of factors that can reshape Coffin Butte Landfill's social and regulatory landscape, especially environmental considerations related to the climate crisis. This reshaping is something that Benton County can participate in, on behalf of its citizens, as the landfill's permitted volume is filled.
- LSCL R-10.** Benton County should take steps to acquire better information about the methane emissions of Coffin Butte Landfill, because the landfill's emissions are currently not well-characterized and use this information to guide diversion programs that could limit the amount of organic waste going to the Landfill.
- LSCL R-11.** In its current actions and in concert with its Sustainable Materials Management Plan, the County should be aware of and prepare for changes in Coffin Butte

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

Landfill's social and regulatory landscape, as the future could hold significant opportunities for the County and affiliated organizations to bring waste management closer to the County's goals and values.

- LSCL R-12.** Benton County should keep in mind that the most effective way to curtail a landfill's greenhouse gas emissions is to divert organic material from being landfilled. This can inform County and area-wide decisions regarding recycling, composting, food waste, and other initiatives affecting how the landfill's permitted volume is filled.

Legal Land Use Subcommittee Key Recommendations

- LLU R-1.** A process to allow public input, comment, and feedback on any provisions subject to Section 2 of the collection franchise agreement between Benton County and Allied Waste Services of Corvallis ("Republic Services") could be designed as follows: **After** the parties have begun discussing what specific terms may be amended pursuant to Section 2, but no more than 60 days prior to any amendment being approved by the Board of Commissioners, the County will publish a notice that it is seeking suggestions from the public for negotiation topics generated from the "concepts from the consensus-seeking process." Any input received would be presented to the Board of Commissioners at a work session, at which time the Board would identify those ideas or suggestions that may be included as negotiation topics. Following the work session and as part of the ongoing negotiations, Benton County Staff will discuss with Republic Services the topics and ideas the Board of Commissioners identified. At such time as Benton County and Republic Services reach a tentative agreement on the renegotiated terms, Staff would bring the proposed franchise changes to the board meeting, where consideration of the amended franchise agreement would be conducted in a public hearing pursuant to BCC 23.235, which will include an opportunity for the public to present testimony. The Board could approve the agreement as presented or may direct staff to resume negotiations with Republic Services to include specific topics identified by the Board. The renegotiated collection franchise agreement must be agreed upon, in its entirety, by both Benton County and Republic Services. At such time as the terms have been agreed upon, and the Board is satisfied that public input has been adequately included or addressed in the renewed agreement, the franchise agreement will be the subject of a public hearing and, ultimately, approval by the Board of Commissioners at a regular board meeting.
- LLU R-2.** The County should provide to the public a description of the purpose of the statutory completeness review process, and the scope of the information the county planning official considers at the completeness stage. That description should clearly explain how the administrative "completeness" process fits into the review of a land use application. While the county should not discourage public involvement at all stages of the review process, the public should be informed that the statutory

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

- completeness is a preliminary step that does not include any review of whether an application does or can satisfy the approval criteria; and that the public review and hearing process that follows after the application is complete provides the public an opportunity to provide evidence and arguments to the decision makers on the merits of the application. The information should clearly inform the public that any evidence or testimony submitted at the completeness stage is not part of the “record” that the decision makers will review, and that information would have to be re-submitted during the public hearing process in order for the decision makers to review it.
- LLU R-3.** BCC 77.310 states that “The applicant for a conditional use permit shall provide a narrative which describes: * * * Other information as required by the Planning Official.” [BCC 77.310(1)(e)] The workgroup could make recommendations regarding what “other information” would be helpful in a narrative. However, any committee recommendations would have to be limited to information related to the applicable criteria and could not expand that criteria. “Additional information” required by the Planning Official does not become part of the applicable criteria. BCC 77.310 states only what the applicant’s narrative shall include; it does not identify criteria for SWAC’s review of a CUP application. This absence contributed to the subcommittee’s recommendation in LLU R-2.
- LLU R-4.** BCC 77.310(1) lists the information required for a conditional use application in the landfill site zone and permits the planning official to request that the applicant’s narrative include “additional information.” However, the development code does not specify how or when that information is to be requested. In the past, the Planning Official has used the statutory completeness review process to request additional information. However, in addition to the Planning Official’s review of the information after the application has been submitted, the Board could amend the code to require that the Planning Official conduct a “preapplication conference” with the applicant to discuss the information that is required. It could also require a “neighborhood meeting” before the application is filed that requires the applicant to present its proposal to the public and allow the applicant to obtain more information about the proposal. Public comment during a pre-application neighborhood meeting, as with other public comment submitted before the application is complete and notification is sent, is not part of the formal record of the land use review and cannot be considered by decision-makers. The record includes only public comment submitted after formal notification has been sent to affected parties stating that the comment period is open.
- LLU R-5.** BCC 77.305 directs the Solid Waste Advisory Council (SWAC) to review and make recommendations regarding the Site Development Plan and Narrative submitted on a landfill-expansion CUP; however, the code does not specify what criteria or considerations that recommendation should be based on. Consistent with SWAC’s bylaws and Chapter 23 of the County Code, which require SWAC to “assist the Board of Commissioners (Board) in Planning and implementing solid waste management, pursuant to BCC Chapter 23, the Benton County Solid Waste Management Ordinance”, the Board of Commissioners should more clearly define SWAC’s role by

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

- articulating the scope, manner and timing of SWAC's review. Interpreting the existing County Code is within the Board's purview, but amending that code effects a more permanent solution. As an initial step, the Board could issue an official interpretation of SWAC's role pursuant to Chapter 23. Then, as a subsequent step, the Board could initiate amendments to Chapter 23 and/or Chapter 77, which would then proceed through a public hearings process. (If/when SWAC's overall role shifts to sustainable materials management, instances of the term "solid waste management" above should be replaced with "sustainable materials management.")
- LLU R-6.** Amendments to the Development Code may be needed to create a clear and legally consistent process for SWAC's involvement in reviewing a CUP. Pursuant to the Development Code as written, the only criteria that a CUP decision can be based upon are those of BCC 53.215, and the Planning Commission is the decision-making body. Yet, the code states an ambiguous role for SWAC in that process and seems to imply that other considerations beyond those of BCC 53.215 should go into the decision-making process. This needs clarification.
- LLU R-7.** In addition to the two criteria listed in BCC 53.215(1) and (2), BCC 53.215(3) requires the decision maker to consider whether the "proposed use complies with any additional criteria which may be required for the specific use by this code." Currently Chapter 77 (Landfill Site zone) does not include any additional criteria that must be considered in the review of a conditional use application for the expansion of a landfill in the landfill zone. If there are additional criteria that the Board of Commissioners determines are necessary for the review of a conditional use application in the landfill zone, the Board would have to amend Chapter 77 to specify those additional approval criteria. The Board could also require that compliance with the site plan and reclamation plan (currently required by Chapter 77 to be submitted with the application) be adopted as conditions of approval of any approved conditional use permit.
- LLU R-8.** When the County adopts its SMMP, it should amend BCC chapter 77 to add a criterion under BCC 53.215(3) to require compliance with specific provisions of an adopted SMMP.
- LLU R-9.** BCC 77.405 states, "*Copies of materials submitted to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality as a part of any permit process shall be submitted to the Planning Official. If at any time the Planning Official determines that permit application materials or conditions of DEQ permit are judged to merit public review, a Public Hearing before the Planning Commission shall be scheduled.*" This provision is unclear. (The provision might have been codified before adoption of the current state agency coordination requirements, which now require a land use compatibility statement (LUCS) as part of any application for a state permit in which local land use is implicated.) The subcommittee interprets this section as requiring a review if the use originally approved has been or will be modified due to the DEQ permit. The Planning Official could make such a determination using a formal "Interpretation" pursuant to BCC 51.205(1). Recommend a code amendment to clarify this provision. For example, a code amendment could require that when DEQ issues a landfill permit, the Planning Official shall review the permit and conditions of approval and,

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

if discrepancies with the County's land use approval are noted, determine whether this constitutes a "modification of a conditional use permit" (BCC 53.225) and, if so, require the applicant to submit application for such modification. A workgroup recommendation on how public review of DEQ permit requirements could most benefit the public would also be helpful.

- LLU R-10.** In issuing land use decisions, Benton County decision-makers should:
- a. Draft clear findings and be certain to incorporate into the conditions of approval the items that are intended to be binding.
 - b. State conditions of approval in clear and explicit terms and ensure that what is expected of the applicant in order to comply is clearly stated in the text of the conditions.
- LLU R-11.** Benton County should evaluate its existing system regarding compliance monitoring and enforcement to determine if there are sufficient mechanisms in place to ensure compliance with conditions of approval that the County imposes on land use approvals and, if not, recommend improvements. Elements of such an evaluation could include:
- a. What enforcement mechanisms exist within the County Code?
 - b. Is there a mandamus option or a private right of action option?
 - c. What is missing?
 - d. What provisions and procedures do other counties have, particularly counties that host a privately operated landfill?
 - e. The future cost of such a system, the benefits, and the consequences of not improving the current practices and procedures.

Land Use Applications Key Recommendations:

- CUP R-1.** Maintain the CUP Appendix along with the supporting County and DEQ files as an integral part of the Final WorkGroup Report.
- CUP R-2.** Make the Appendix and supporting comprehensive library of files related to the Coffin Butte landfill electronically and continuously available to the public to increase accessibility and reduce the need for public records requests.
- CUP R-3.** Actively monitor and enforce prior land use decision Conditions of Approval for the landfill or any other land use decision.
- CUP R-4.** Establish and widely advertise a reporting process for receiving, tracking, and resolving complaints, such as odor, noise, hours of operation, not following conditions of approval. This administrative process should include an appeals process. Ensure there is a mechanism for providing reports regarding the nature, number and resolution of complaints to be provided to the Board of County Commissioners in the normal course of its business.
- CUP R-5.** Ensure that all documents involved in a land use application and all documentation required to be submitted by a Condition of Approval are acquired and placed in the County records for that land use application and posted electronically and continuously available to the public.

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

- CUP R-6.** Create a system that tracks receipt of reports that are submitted as required per Conditions of Approval (E.g., copies of water quality and air quality permits, emergency plans, permit submittals, financial assurance statements, etc., and data produced from associated monitoring programs, etc.).
- CUP R-7.** Determine if the Site Plan and Narrative included in the applicant submittals for PC-83-07/L-83-07 are regulatory conditions the landfill is required to follow.
- CUP R-8.** Clarify and communicate to the public what appropriate reclamation will look like to appropriately manage community expectations for the ultimate disposition of the landfill. For example, the county should explain to the public, with DEQ's and Republic's assistance, DEQ's minimum reclamation requirements in the current Worst-Case Closure and Post-Closure Care Plan.
- CUP R-9.** Determine how or if the County's reclamation conditions of approval can be incorporated into DEQ's requirements for Valley Landfill's Worst-Case Closure and Post-Closure Care Plan for the landfill.
- CUP R-10.** Determine the authority of the 2002 Memorandum of Understanding as it relates to pre-2002 Conditions of Approval and broadly communicate the applicability of the 2002 MOU to the public to help manage community expectations.
- CUP R-11.** Clarify the intersecting roles between the County and DEQ in future CUP actions, recognizing the line between "environmental" and "land use" impacts may not be clear and establish a process of reconciliation.
- CUP R-12.** Establish a reporting program for compliance confirmation for facilities contributing to environmental burdens on the County, such as a landfill, industrial-scale composting, or direct dischargers to water bodies within the county, etc.
- CUP R-13.** Consider the impact of leachate from the landfill site on traffic safety, road maintenance, public wastewater treatment plants (Corvallis, Salem), and the Willamette River (water quality, sediments, wildlife, etc.) in future assessments of the impact of landfilling in Benton County.
- CUP R-14.** Evaluate whether acquiring buffer land by landfill-related entities is consistent with Vision 2040 including the impact on housing, forestry, and agricultural land uses. Acquiring buffer land is an action specified in DEQ's 2005 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Corrective Measures Record of Decision for the landfill. "Property purchases as buffer around the landfill." is identified as one of the remedies for groundwater contamination.
- CUP R-15.** Require submittal of a plan for emergency water supplies for fire protection to the Power Generation facility per S-97-58.
- CUP R-16.** Develop a comprehensive emergency preparedness/response plan with neighboring counties, cities and fire districts given the experiences from the nationally reported 1999 landfill fire.
- CUP R-17.** To address public concerns about odor, engage in a dialogue with the community to promptly develop and implement an odor reporting and mitigation plan that is consistent with the community's needs and DEQ requirements and County health and nuisance regulations.
- CUP R-18.** Update the Benton County Code and land use application documents to reflect the conditions of approval that are to be completed before final approval of an

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

application and which conditions are applied to the on-going use of the land. This would improve understanding of the differing conditions of approval for the applicant, public, and decision-making bodies.

Community Education and Public Involvement Key Recommendations

- CEO R-1.** County Development Department and County PIO are responsible for conducting communication and outreach.
- CEO R-2.** The Board should consider changes to these notification recommendations based on the potential impact of other CUP applications.
- CEO R-3.** Notifications for the **BCTT Survey** for public input on the Workgroup Report should include an email blast, website post, and displays or presentations where people already spend time (i.e., Library, community events). Notifications should include a 10-Mile radius from the landfill and should go out ideally a month before the survey closes.
- CEO R-4.** Notifications for the **BCTT Report completion** should include an email blast to the Interested Parties List, Organic Subscribers, those who spoke at the meetings, the Soap Creek Neighbors Group, and other landfill neighbors. Notifications should also include a possible postcard to the entire county with a link to go to and/or scan to get on a list to be informed of further updates and/or have an open house event/public informational meeting. It should be on a weekend during the day so that most people can attend, and the link and email list should be readily available. A 10-Mile radius from the landfill is proposed, and notifications should be sent 72 hours after the report is finished.
- CEO R-5.** Notifications for **Board Hearings on the report** should include a postcard, an email blast, a newspaper notification, and social media posts and advertisements. The postcards should be sent to everyone in a 10- or 15-Mile radius of the landfill, and notifications should be sent 24 hours after the board hearing is scheduled.
- CEO R-6.** The County should notify the public **when Republic first notifies the County** that they plan to file a CUP application. This starts off any pre-filing public involvement. Notifications should include a postcard, email blast, newspaper notification, and social media posts and advertisements. Postcards should be sent to everyone within a 10- or 15-Mile radius of the landfill, and notifications need to begin 24 hours after the County is notified.
- CEO R-7.** Notifications for **CUP filings**, which includes **the application review process**, should consist of a postcard, email blast, newspaper notification, and social media posts and advertisements. Postcards should be sent to everyone within a 10- or 15-Mile radius of the landfill, and notifications need to begin 24 hours after the initiation of a CUP filing. During the “completeness” process, the Planning Official will consider whether the applicant’s documents and information are sufficient for purposes of review of the application. Determining that an application is complete does not mean the information satisfies the approval criteria.
- CEO R-8.** Notification when **County determines the application is complete** will include a postcard, email blast, newspaper notification, and social media posts and

Final Draft Recommendations as of 3-15-23

- advertisements. They should be sent to the entire county and occur 24 hours after completion.
- CEO R-9.** Notifications for **SWAC Meetings** should include website posts and email blasts to interested groups and people already on the existing email list. The notifications should be sent one to two weeks before the meeting.
- CEO R-10.** Notifications of **the SWAC Recommendation** should include website posts and email blasts to interested groups and people already on the existing email list. The notifications should be sent out 24 hours after the recommendation.
- CEO R-11.** Notifications for **Planning Commission Meetings** should include website posts and email blasts to interested groups and people already on the existing email list. The notifications should be sent no later than two weeks before the meeting.
- CEO R-12.** Notifications of the **Planning Commission's decision on the application** should include website posts and email blasts to interested groups and people already on the existing email list. The notifications should be sent out 24 hours after the recommendation.
- CEO R-13.** Notifications of **when the Board is hearing the CUP application for approval** will include a postcard, email blast, newspaper notification, and social media posts and advertisements. They should be sent to everyone within a 10- or 15-Mile radius of the CUP site and occur 24 hours after scheduled.
- CEO R-14.** Notifications of the **Board's decision on the application** will include an email blast, website banner, newspaper notification, and social media posts. The notifications should be sent out 24 hours after the decision.