

SECTION C: Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP)

Introduction:

Key Findings:

- 1) Contracting out;
 - a. Some contracting processes include Technical Advisory Committees (TAC), which Vet technical information from consultant, get to a place of consensus, and Community Advisory Committee (CAC), which Review in areas of disagreement for technical experts.
- 2) Subjects to be covered;
 - a. The charges of the total work group are intimately related, and are included within this RFP.
 - b. There are many best practices and model SMMP's in Oregon and beyond.
- 3) (Moved from Common Understandings) Benefit-Cost Topics are only Outlined
 - a.
- 4) (New) Add in Vision 2040 and related County documents with similar from other counties referenced
 - a.
- 5) Who needs to be at the table beyond those in the County;
 - a.
- 6) A workplan outline with a timeline for completion;
 - a. Length of overall project can be heavily impacted and defined by the level of public interaction/engagement included in the project.
 - b. The research and development of the plan can occur in the background, not using as much time as outreach.
- 7) Topics covered in recent similar planning efforts across the state; and
 - a.
- 8) What "lessons learned" should be brought forward in this process.
 - a.

Key Recommendations:

- 1) Contracting out;
 - a. Benton County should use an RFP to find consultant(s) for developing a Sustainable Materials Management Plan.
 - b. Recruitment needs to be extensive, and selection of successful proposal should be careful and thorough.
 - c. The scope of work for this project is is expected to be broad and comprehensive, with specific goals recommended for the County to consider as reaching for as milestones.
 - d. Qualities of a successful applicant should include those listed in the **full subcommittee report**.

- e. The RFP development process should:
 - i. Provide details about Workgroup process and its findings to RFP applicants
 - ii. Prioritize topics, adding additional topics that are important to consider
 - iii. Communicate accurate priorities to applicants
 - iv. Members of this BCTT SMMP subcommittee should be offered to participate in subsequent stakeholder group meetings for RFP development and review
 - v. SWAC/DSAC should have an advisory role during the development of the plan
 - vi. 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
 - 3. Be distributed to allow enough time for it to be posted to various trade groups, equity-minded sharing to underrepresented groups, internationally minded outlets
 - vii. The county should share with the public the various steps of the process, making updates available, and demonstrating transparency (Cross-referencing subcommittee E.1. work)
 - viii. The RFP should demonstrate flexibility through allowing further work plan development after applications are reviewed and accepted
 - ix. Length of overall project:
 - 1. Can be heavily impacted and defined by the level of public interaction/stakeholder engagement included in the project, and by requirements from the county
 - 2. R&D from consultant can occur in the background
 - 3. Applicants should include various scope/cost options for 1 year, 2 years, and 3 year timelines.
 - 4. The report should be released in sections, based on timeline and content priorities.
 - x. Include Technical Advisory Committees (TAC), which Vet technical information from consultant, get to a place of consensus, and Community Advisory Committee (CAC), which Review in areas of disagreement for technical experts.
 - 1. SMMP Sub-Committee members should be included in the CAC.
- f. Proposals contain the following information, with parameters around each of these items in terms of document length:
 - i. Cover Letter (P/F).
 - ii. Project Team Experience and Qualifications.
 - 1. Experience, Capabilities and Resources of the Proposer. 25 points.
 - 2. Experience of project team members. 25 points.
 - 3. Experiences with other SMMP in the last 5 years
 - iii. Understanding of Project.

- iv. Approach to the Scope of Work. 25 points
 1. Fully and completely address all of the questions listed
 - v. Cost Proposal (based on cost matrix)
 1. Reasonableness of the Cost Proposal. 15 points
 2. Various options based on timeline and scope
 3. Review committee is not given the cost information until initial review is complete
 4. Important consideration, but not the most important consideration
 - vi. Project Schedule. 10 points
 - vii. Social/environmental responsibility
 - viii. References.
 - ix. Interview/presentation (how important compared to other criteria?)
 1. Separate scoring criteria/process for the interview
- g. An evaluation team consisting of County staff and members of the stakeholders group should determine the best proposal deemed most qualified based on the above criteria.
- 2) Subjects to be covered;
- a. 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.
 - b. The SMMP should address the subjects listed in the full subcommittee report, answering the questions listed as RFP priorities allow.
- 3) (Moved from Common Understandings) Benefit-Cost Topics are only Outlined
- a. SMMP content should include cost-benefit analyses in the evaluation and recommendations of major topics.
 - b. Circular economy costs/benefits should be addressed in the SMMP.
 - c. The SMMP should clarify Benefit-Cost perspectives being addressed through an equity analysis, including:
 - i. Financial cost impacts associated with materials management and outcomes
 - ii. A perspective that goes beyond landfilling
 - iii. Equity of circular economy, how it engages and impacts consumers (product/material oriented)
 - iv. "who's at the table" list of stakeholder perspectives
- 4) (New) Add in Vision 2040 and related County documents with similar from other counties referenced
- The Benton County Sustainable Materials Management Plan should be developed within a Sustainable Materials Management framework, reflecting full lifecycle impacts. The following information should be considered during the development of a Sustainable Materials Management Plan:
 1. 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative and our communities' Core Values

2. National, State and local goals, vision documents, 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
 4. Long-term strategies (to 2040) with short-term action items (5 years or less)
- 5) Who needs to be at the table* beyond those in the County**;
- a. DEQ
 - b. Economic Development Office County/Corvallis
 - c. Small Cities
 - d. Neighboring counties
 - e. Community Members
 - f. Waste generation sources (jurisdictions)
 - g. Local Advocacy groups (Willamette valley) – (sustainability coalition, river keepers, watershed councils, etc)
 - h. National Advocacy groups
 - i. Equity, Diversity, Inclusion coordinator
 - j. Low-income populations, multi-family residents
 - k. Larger industry groups
 - l. Large waste generators
 - m. Building industry - USGBC
 - n. Architecture (AIA) American Institute of Architects
 - o. Designers – various materials, products, etc
 - p. OSU – Business/Administration
 - q. OSU – Innovation, science around materials
 - r. *at the table - meaning who to be consulted for feedback through the development of this plan, discuss regional coalitions/partnerships/collaboration
 - s. **County government/staff
- 6) A workplan outline with a timeline for completion;
- a. The plan should include ongoing adaptive management and refinement
 - b. The workplan outline and timeline should include:
 - i. RFP Development
 1. RFP Development feedback opportunity from Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) and Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
 - ii. RFP Release/Announcement
 1. Distribution to allow time for it to be posted to various trade groups, equity-minded sharing to underrepresented groups, international-minded
 - iii. Webinar – interact *live*, field questions, make presentation
 - iv. Pre-proposal/bid/RFP Q&A opportunity for prospective applicants – possible to make this element required/mandatory
 1. Early in the RFP release period

- v. Opportunity for respondents to express interest as primary or sub-contractors
 - vi. RFP Response Due Date
 - 1. At least 4 weeks time that the RFP is available prior to application dead line.
 - vii. Review committee to shortlist firms
 - 1. 2 weeks
 - viii. Shortlisted firms awarded additional time for presentation with optional funding for expected presentation/deliverables
 - 1. Additional month (within 1 week if no work product/report is due, just an interview).
 - ix. Evaluation and Selection Timeline
 - 1. Evaluation team review period
 - a. Including Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) and Community Advisory Committee (CAC) review opportunity
 - 2. Presentations/Interviews
 - x. Develop work plan further with contractor selected
 - xi. Length of overall project
 - xii. Plan Development
 - 1. Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) - Vet technical information from consultant, get to a place of consensus
 - 2. Community Advisory Committee (CAC) - Review in areas of disagreement for technical experts
 - 3. SWAC/DSAC advisory role during the development of the plan
 - xiii. General public meetings – number of meetings
- 7) Topics covered in recent similar planning efforts across the state;
- a. The SMMP should consider the topics covered in the following recent similar planning efforts across the state:
 - b. [Materials Management in Oregon 2020 Framework for Action](#)
 - c. [Materials Management in Oregon 2050 Vision and Framework for Action \(2012\)](#)
 - d. [Deschutes County Solid Waste Management Plan \(2019\)](#)
 - e. [Lane County Solid Waste Management Plan \(2019\)](#)
 - f. [Lincoln County Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan \(2004\)](#)
 - g. Marion County
 - i. [Marion County, Oregon Solid Waste Management Plan Update \(2009\)](#)
 - ii. [Marion County Solid Waste System Assessment Report \(2016\)](#)
 - iii. [Marion County, Oregon Solid Waste and Energy Final Report \(2017\)](#)
 - h. Metro:
 - i. [Metro 2030 Regional Waste Plan \(2019\)](#)
 - ii. [Waste Prevention & Environmental Services Regional Waste Plan Progress Report \(January 2022\)](#)

- i. [Tillamook County Comprehensive Materials and Solid Waste Management Plan \(2012\)](#)

- 8) What “lessons learned” should be brought forward in this process.
 - a. Feedback from other counties who have developed materials management plans
 - b. International examples of landfill alternatives (such as Germany, Finland, Sweden, and South Korea)
 - c. Examples from California and Washington
 - d. Lessons from past Benton County experiences with contracts with Republic, engagement,
 - e. Lessons from individual processes vs. integrated systems
 - f. Workgroup process and its findings

Additional Information:

-
-
- The full Subcommittees Report can be found [here.](#)