

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

Subcommittee Report to Work Group - Working Document

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Charge | 2 |
| Members..... | 2 |
| Meeting #1 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 10/27/22 | 3 |
| Meeting #2 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/7/22 | 6 |
| Meeting #3 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/14/22 | 9 |
| Meeting #4 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/28/22 | 13 |
| Meeting #5 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 12/12/22 | 16 |
| Meeting #6 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/5/23 | 18 |
| Meeting #7 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/12/23 | 21 |
| Meeting #8 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/18/23 | 25 |
| Meeting #9 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/1/23 | 28 |
| Meeting #10 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/15/23 | 31 |
| Meeting #11 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 3/1/23 | 37 |

Charge

Charge C: Long Term Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP) tasks

- 1) Contracting out;
- 2) Subjects to be covered;
- 3) (Moved from Common Understandings) Benefit-Cost Topics are only Outlined
- 4) (New) Add in Vision 2040 and related County documents with similar from other counties referenced
- 5) Who needs to be at the table beyond those in the County;
- 6) A workplan outline with a timeline for completion;
- 7) Topics covered in recent similar planning efforts across the state; and
- 8) What “lessons learned” should be brought forward in this process.

Includes necessary foundational “common understandings” and protocols needed before beginning the actual planning process.

NOTE: This charge does not include completing the plan. It only includes a discussion of the preliminary scoping to start that planning process.

Possible Amendment for BOC Consideration: If there is sufficient time to complete the original Charge and the following activities, subcommittee to provide recommendations on:

1. the most important topics/subjects from the draft of the SWMP Table of Contents;
2. the brainstormed options for those topics/subjects; and
3. the reasoning, both pro and con, for their selection.

Members

| |
|----------------------------------|
| Brian May |
| Sean McGuire |
| John Deuel |
| Joel Geier |
| Marge Popp |
| Ken Eklund |
| Daniel Redick |
| Ryan McAlister |
| Staff: Daniel Redick |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati |

Meeting #1 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 10/27/22

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Brian May | X |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | X |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | X |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann | X |
| Debi Gile | X |
| Camile Hall | X |
| Jen Brown | X |
| Tom Hughes | X |

SMMP Values and Goals to be explored:

1. 2040 Thriving Communities
2. State and Local Goals related to materials and climate
3. Examples from other jurisdictions using values and goals in materials management planning

SMMP Table of Contents (Major Skeletal Concepts)

1. PREFACE
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
3. INTRODUCTION
4. BACKGROUND AND WASTE STREAM ANALYSIS
5. WASTE PREVENTION/REDUCTION/ REUSE AND RECYCLING ANALYSIS
6. RECYCLING AND MATERIALS PROCESSING
7. WASTE COLLECTION AND TRANSFER
8. ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL
9. LANDFILL DISPOSAL OPTIONS

- 10. ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT
- 11. CONCLUSION
- 12. RESOURCES

Request feedback from the work group

- What other aspects of values and goals would the work group members like the subcommittee to explore?
- What questions should the SMMP aim to answer?
- What Key Topics in the SMMP Table of Contents would the work group members like the subcommittee to explore?
- What is the purpose of these major topics, and what should be included in each?

Recording:

- [Recording](#)

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Values and Goals Discussion
- Table of Contents – Major Topics and their purpose

Next Meeting:

- Meeting #2: November 7, 2022 – 1:00m-2:30pm
- Meeting #3: November 14, 2022 – 1:00m-2:30pm

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [DRAFT Values and Goals to be considered during SMMP planning process](#)
- [SWMP Combined Table of Contents from Various Oregon Jurisdictions - 10/24/22 Update](#)

- [SWMP Combined Table of Contents from Various Oregon Jurisdictions](#)
- [2040 Thriving Communities Initiative](#)
- [Materials Management in Oregon 2020 Framework for Action \(Oregon DEQ\)](#)
- [Deschutes County Solid Waste Management Plan \(2019\)](#)
- [Lane County Solid Waste Management Plan \(2019\)](#)
- [Lincoln County Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan \(2004\)](#)
- [Marion County, Oregon Solid Waste Management Plan Update \(2009\)](#)
- [Marion County Solid Waste System Assessment Report \(2016\)](#)
- [Marion County, Oregon Solid Waste and Energy Final Report \(2017\)](#)
- [Metro 2030 Regional Waste Plan \(2019\)](#)
- [Waste Prevention & Environmental Services Regional Waste Plan Progress Report \(January 2022\)](#)
- [Tillamook County Comprehensive Materials and Solid Waste Management Plan \(2012\)](#)

DRAFT

Meeting #2 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/7/22

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Brian May | X |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | X |
| Daniel Redick | X |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | X |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann | X |
| Debbie Palmer | X |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. SMMP Values and Goals to be explored:
 - a. 2040 Thriving Communities
 - b. State and Local Goals related to materials and climate
 - c. Examples from other jurisdictions using values and goals in materials management planning

Notes:

- Decide how aggressive this scope needs to be
- Guide contractors on what to include in the scope
- Full lifecycle of materials
- Maintain quality services while meeting these important goals – balance

- The way 2040 goals should be introduced, right at the beginning. Be aware that the county has these values, the planning should be within framework.
- Prioritize quicker wins than 2040, shorter term solutions. Construction waste management, how to quickly change behaviors.
- What can we do today to accomplish long term goals, quickly.
- 2040 on the forefront of the document,
- Consultant recommendations should be required to check-off the 2040 values
- Should the 2040 values document be included on the SMMP scoping
- Tie-in concepts from SMMP – bridge from 2040 to lifecycle analysis
- EPA document – lifecycle materials management
- RFP language - successful application will provide a work plan that show 2040 values are incorporated into the plan

2. SMMP Table of Contents (Major Skeletal Concepts)

- a. Preface
- b. Executive Summary
- c. Introduction
- d. Full lifecycle analysis of materials
 - i. Where we've been, and where we need to go – going into a different direction
 - ii. Look at these opportunities that we have, ripples into county and region introductory language to include
 - iii. Determine which materials are most impactful
- e. Background And Waste Stream Analysis
 - i. Shift people from end of life, waste studies from DEQ
- f. Waste Prevention/Reduction/ Reuse And Recycling Analysis
 - i. Reuse containers in Corvallis
 - ii. What would happen if these were enacted? EPA WARM tool, and others
 - 1. What does this mean for Benton County? How well does it need to be carried out to be effective?
 - 2. Consider recommendations from SWAC work group
 - iii. Include what Benton County does today, and rate their value
 - 1. What do we need in addition in order to meet recovery goals
- g. Recycling And Materials Processing
- h. Waste Collection And Transfer
- i. Alternative Technologies And Solid Waste Disposal
- j. Landfill Disposal Options
- k. Administration And Enforcement
- l. Conclusion
- m. Resources

SMMP topic notes:

- Post-closure – planning
- Long term goals, and know how to get there
- Include in RFP considerations – outside of the Table of Contents
- Future of solid waste in Benton County – in the RFP, not necessarily in the product
- Community Engagement

Recording:

- [Recording](#)

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Confirm Values/Goals suggested subcommittee recommendations
- Continue with Table of Contents Review (with added detail in each section for guidance):
 - Recycling And Materials Processing
 - Waste Collection And Transfer
 - Alternative Technologies And Solid Waste Disposal
 - Landfill Disposal Options
 - Administration And Enforcement

Next Meeting:

- Meeting #3: November 14, 2022 – 1:00pm-2:30pm

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [SMMP Subcommittee Work Group Report - Meeting 1 - 10/27/22](#)
- [DRAFT Values and Goals to be considered during SMMP planning process](#)

Meeting #3 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/14/22

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Brian May | X |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | X |
| Daniel Redick | X |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann | X |
| Debbie Palmer | X |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. SMMP Draft Subcommittee Recommendation: Subcommittee agreed to present the following draft recommendation to the Work Group

“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:

- a. 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative Values
- b. State and local goals relating to materials management and climate change
- c. Examples of values and goals expressed in state and local jurisdiction materials management plans
- d. Long-term strategies (to 2040) with short-term action items (5 years or less)”

Notes:

- Ripple effect of other full lifecycle impacts – including community, environmental, social, and economic.
 - remove “of materials” in draft recommendation
- Things that should be started now, vs. things longer into the future
- General language can be overlooked
- Should consider short term solutions, as well as long term goals

2. SMMP Table of Contents sections

- n. Recycling And Materials Processing
 - i. Include Food Waste
 - ii. Organics
 - 1. Animal Carcasses? How can waste materials with special considerations be incorporated into this document?
 - iii. Deconstruction, building materials to be addressed in “Needs and Opportunities” section
 - iv. Sorting technologies under “alternatives”
 - v. Want clarity as far as proven vs. unproven (on the horizon) in recommendations
- o. Waste Collection And Transfer
 - i. Add context and relationship to recycling system, reuse system
 - ii. Move “Comparative costs of landfilling vs. waste to energy vs. recycling” to another section
 - 1. Consider each of these ideas individually, as opposed to direct comparisons
- p. Alternative Technologies And Solid Waste Disposal
 - i. Waste stream
- q. Landfill Disposal Options
 - i. “Waste Stream Projections” section should include possible scenarios and
 - 1. larger “ecosystem” that may impact waste stream –
 - a. climate change, regulatory environment, costs, etc.
 - b. May be more broad than just projections associated with the “landfill disposal options” section
 - ii. Projection scenarios could be its own section
 - iii. Environmental Impact Assessment
 - 1. Relates to all sections as an analysis of full lifecycle impacts

SMMP topic notes:

- Include Analysis and investigation as part of each section

- Capacity, Land-use compliance, and legal subcommittees – should have the opportunity to weigh in on “landfill disposal options”
- Reuse should be represented
 - o Liability of repair centers should be included
- Section 2.J. – policy implications summarize any policy implications,
 - o Include any policy implications, recommendations for each section
- Make this document exemplary – RFP considerations outside of Table of Contents

Additional post-meeting notes:

- Combine Duplicative Sections: combine duplicative sections/topics. For instance, we have lifecycle in the introduction and its own section (Section III). Or, is it the idea that the Introduction will briefly comment on all Sections and link to each?
- Ripple Effects & Opportunities on Sustainability: Perhaps in the Introduction, include/combine a section on the social/equity & economic impacts & economic opportunities in terms of the full definition of Sustainability: economy, environment, and equity. Currently, we have equity in II.D.5 and economic opportunities in II.K, but it’s kind of on its own.
- Not Creating Waste: Perhaps in the Introduction or a new Section can be not creating materials in the first place: ReUse Centers, repair centers, etc. This will further help support this document is a true SMMP, not just focusing on waste.

Recording:

- [Recording](#)

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Continue with Table of Contents Review:
 - o Administration And Enforcement
 - o Finalize Table of Contents (highlighting additional items needed, and items to remove)
- RFP considerations outside of Table of Contents

Next Meeting:

- Meeting #4: To Be Scheduled

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [DRAFT Values and Goals to be considered during SMMP planning process - 11/10/22 Update](#)
- [SMMP DRAFT Table of Contents for Discussion - 11/10/22](#)

DRAFT

Meeting #4 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/28/22

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Brian May | |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | X |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | X |
| Daniel Redick | X |
| Ryan McAlister | |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | X |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann | |
| Debbie Palmer | X |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. Values and Goals
 - a. Confirmed consensus around the drafted values and goals statement
2. Continue with Table of Contents Review:
 - a. Reviewing – homework for each subcommittee member to send Daniel their thoughts on the purpose of each major topic – to generate short paragraphs for each about the intended meaning.
 - b. Administration And Enforcement section
 - i. Purpose: What are the strategies/resources needed to effectively monitor progress of the plan, and stimulate/ensure policies are being followed.
 - ii. Stimulate positive engagement of Benton County community/businesses.
 - iii. Buy in?
 - iv. Short term – start to work on legislation.
 - v. Policy development

- vi. Economic impact - Should be considered for each topic/chapter/major section. Could be it's own section (intro/somewhere on top)
 - c. Hazardous Waste should be added – feedback from the open house
 - d. Climate Change could be its own section to communicate:
 - i. Policy impacts
 - ii. Waste stream impacts from climate change policy/shifts
 - e. Life Cycle Impacts of Materials
 - i. Method for ongoing analysis - recommendations from consultant
 - f. Background and waste Stream Analysis
 - i. Historical Solid Waste Data - Purpose? Perhaps for projections. Decadal scale trends
 - ii. Unique waste streams – timber wastes ex.
 - iii. Disposal methods – slash burning, open burning, etc. – impacts
 - g. Waste Prevention/Reduction/Reuse and recycling Analysis
 - i. Waste food (food waste prevention) should be emphasized
 - ii. Recommendations: High level recommendations for recycling and processing in Benton County, regardless of current methods/systems. Adaptable. Collection to meet the coming processing options. List of options for systems, what should Benton County look for? MRF options?
- 3. RFP considerations outside of Table of Contents
 - a. Experience requirements for SMMP

Recording:

- No Recording Available

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Finalize Table of Contents (highlighting additional items needed, and items to remove)
- Homework: Send Daniel suggested purpose/meaning of each major Table of Contents topic
- RFP considerations outside of Table of Contents

Next Meeting:

- Meeting #5: December 12, 2022 – 1:00pm-2:30pm Pacific Time
 - <https://meet.goto.com/704345821>
 - You can also dial in using your phone. United States: +1 (872) 240-3412
 - Access Code: 704-345-821

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [DRAFT Values and Goals to be considered during SMMP planning process - 11/14/22 Update](#)
- [SMMP Subcommittee Report - Working Document 11/14/22](#)
- [SMMP DRAFT Table of Contents for Discussion - 11/14/22](#)

DRAFT

Meeting #5 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 12/12/22

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Brian May | |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | X |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | X |
| Daniel Redick | X |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | X |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann | X |
| Debbie Palmer | X |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. Reviewed [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 12/12/22](#), and worked through each section of the document as it relates to the subcommittee's charge.
 - a. Contracting Out
 - i. Confirmed the subcommittee would like this SMMP development to be contracted out using an RFP process
 - ii. Added several "Qualities of a successful applicant", in addition to those from the homework submissions.
 - iii. Added RFP Considerations Outside of SMMP Table of Contents
 - b. Benefit-Cost Topics - Outlined
 - i. Circular economy costs/benefits
 - c. Confirmed values and goals statement reflects subcommittee expectations for "Add in Vision 2040 and related County documents with similar from other counties referenced" charge element, with the addition of "National," to item number two.

- d. Created list of “Who needs to be at the table* beyond those in the County**,” including interpretations of “at the table” and “county”
- e. No feedback for “A workplan outline with a timeline for completion;”, and the group would like more guidance from the facilitator
- f. No additional feedback on “Topics covered in recent similar planning efforts across the state; and”
- g. Added elements to “What “lessons learned” should be brought forward in this process.”
- h. Discussed “Subjects to be covered;” as it relates to “Questions to be answered in SMMP (largely covered by the SMMP table, restated here as questions):”

Recording:

- [Recording](#)

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Finalize Table of Contents (highlighting additional items needed, and items to remove)
- Homework: Review Draft Recommendations Report to Work Group, send Daniel edits and comments

Next Meeting:

- Meeting #6: Thursday, January 5th, 2023 – 1:00pm-2:30pm Pacific Time

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Eklund - 12/9/22 - SMMP Draft Rec for RFP](#)
- [Geier - 12/9/22 - SMMP Suggested Guidance for RFP](#)
- [Popp - 12/9/22 - SMMP Introductory Paragraphs](#)
- [Popp - 12/11/22 - Benton County Comprehensive Plan](#)
- [Values and Goals to be considered during SMMP planning process - 11/14/22 Updated DRAFT](#)
- [SMMP DRAFT Table of Contents for Discussion - 12/12/22](#)
- [SMMP Subcommittee Report - Working Document 11/30/22](#)
- [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 12/12/22; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)

Meeting #6 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/5/23

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Brian May | |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | X |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Maren Schermer | X |
| | |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. Reviewed [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 1/5/23](#), and worked through each section of the document as it relates to the subcommittee's charge.

- **Contracting out**
 - Add “Be able to answer questions (below table of contents) – RFP process, applicant.”
 - SMMP Document to answer questions (below table of contents).
 - Look at the unique qualities of our community, not one size fits all
 - Ability and willingness to communicate with community.
 - Experience in analyzing policy impacts of materials.
 - Add “most” or “almost all” to specify that RFP does not need to answer every question.
 - Suggestion to prioritize topics, add additional topics that are optional, but a bonus.
- **RFP Considerations Outside of SMMP Table of Contents**
 - Add “Consider materials and links to BCTT SMMP Subcommittee work.”
- **Review and selection**
 - Adding a piece on answering the questions. (Added under “Approach...”)
 - “Address the questions” – language used.
 - Important to consider cost. But it is not number one factor.
 - Point system will be refined later.

- Add interview/presentation to this section, include related points.
 - **Subjects to be covered**
 - Suggestion to add context or priority level to the subjects in this section.
 - Can be addressed by turning subject list into a series of clear questions.
 - Rephrase “our new vision” to “a shared vision.”
 - Address upcoming legislation: Oregon Recycling Modernization Act.
 - Suggestion to mention grant opportunities.
 - **Questions**
 - Suggestion to move questions up and incorporate into **Subjects to be covered** earlier in the document.
 - Process would help eliminate duplicates and streamline questions.
 - **Benefit-Cost Topics**
 - Sam suggested to clarify who is benefitting, who will bear costs.
 - Charge of the group is of a cradle-to-cradle or sustainable materials management focus.
 - Equity considerations, financial impacts.
 - Theme of RFP is “beyond landfills.”
 - Equity of a circular economy, how it engages and impacts consumers.
 - “Who’s at the table” list of stakeholder perspectives to be included.
 - **2040 Thriving Communities Initiative**
 - Suggestion to include reference to state or national vision.
 - Suggestion to include these national/state vision documents as a reference for the reader. However, we want to prevent document from becoming too lengthy.
 - **Who needs to be at the table?**
 - Suggestion to add “larger industry groups.”
 - Add “Large waste generators” as a separate bullet point.
 - Suggestion to include “Building and trades industries.”
 - Suggestion to include “Architecture - American Institute of Architects (AIA).”
 - Suggestion to include “Designers – various materials, products.”
 - Suggestion to add OSU in different capacities –
 - “OSU – Business/Administration.”
 - “OSU – Innovation, science around materials.”
 - **Workplan outline with a timeline for completion**
 - We will come back to this next meeting.
2. Reviewing Rough Draft #1 from Sam.
- a. Reviewing current document and re-thinking in terms of organizing into “Key findings” and “Recommendations.”
 - b. Focus will be zoomed out. Key findings will encompass all the work of the subcommittee, not just the requirements for RFP.

Recording:

- [Recording](#)

Next Steps/Action Items:

1. Reviewing current document and re-thinking in terms of organizing into “Key findings” and “Recommendations.”
2. Reviewing workplan outline with a timeline for completion. We will come back to this next meeting.

Next Meeting:

- Meeting #7: Thursday, January 12th, 2023 – 1:00pm-2:30pm Pacific Time
- Meeting #8. Wednesday, January 18th, 2023 – 1:00pm-2:30pm Pacific Time

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Eklund - 12/9/22 - SMMP Draft Rec for RFP](#)
- [Geier - 12/9/22 - SMMP Suggested Guidance for RFP](#)
- [Popp - 12/9/22 - SMMP Introductory Paragraphs](#)
- [Popp - 12/11/22 - Benton County Comprehensive Plan](#)
- [Values and Goals to be considered during SMMP planning process - 11/14/22 Updated DRAFT](#)
- [SMMP DRAFT Table of Contents for Discussion - 12/12/22](#)
- [SMMP Subcommittee Report - Working Document 11/30/22](#)
- [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 12/12/22; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)
- [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 1/5/23; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)

Meeting #7 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/12/23

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Brian May | X |
| Sean McGuire | |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | X |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | X |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Becky Merja | X |
| Maren Schermer | X |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. Review of updated work
 - Daniel will post the updated version of the report with questions included.
 - Daniel has re-formatted questions under the relevant topic headings.
2. Reviewing workplan outline with a timeline for completion.
 - Daniel is not aware of the County having any guidelines for the RFP timeline.
 - Suggestions for creating an RFP timeline:
 - At least four (4) weeks for the RFP.
 - Work backwards to build a timeline.
 - Create a pre-proposal opportunity for prospective applicants to come and ask questions.
 - Make day required?
 - Schedule the day early in the RFP release period, to allow prospective applicants to review RFP first.
 - Shortlisted firms to receive additional time (e.g., one month) for presentation with possible additional funding (e.g., \$5,000).

- Allow additional time to even playing field for firms that do not have subject experts on staff.
 - Offer webinar along with the release of the RFP to interact, Q&A opportunity.
- Suggestions on the RFP content:
 - Reminder that the scope of this RFP is extremely wide, compared to most RFPs.
 - Add to the RFP that it will have the expectation of teamwork, collaboration.
 - Put guidelines on the length of the proposal.
 - Include sections on corporate responsibility, equity & inclusion. Award points if the section requirements are fulfilled. Put forward county values.
 - Encourage the county to have members of this subcommittee on subsequent meetings for RFP development and selection of consultant.
 - Distribution of RFP in relevant places, publications, including to reach a wide range of candidates. Accessibility of the document. Allow time for the RFP to be posted.
 - Sam recommends reading the report from Subcommittee E. for guidance on communication.
 - Stakeholder involvement: Add requirements or guidelines for the involvement that you want.
- Proposed time frame:
 - Initial 4-week response period.
 - Shortlisted firms to receive another few weeks to prepare proposal.
 - Length of overall project: 1-2 years?
 - Defined by public interaction and requirement and needs from county
- Working with applicants on RFP timeframe and content:
 - Can we receive guidance on timeline from other counties who have undertaken the same process?
 - Considering the tradeoffs of requirements/scope and timeframe possible.
 - Dialogue with the applicants about possibilities within timeframes: “Tell us what you could do in one year, two years, five years, etc.”
 - Release report in sections (based on priority)
 - Give the applicant more flexibility at this stage
- Advisory committee possibilities
 - Technical Advisory Committee (TAC): Vet the ideas submitted by the CAC for feasibility.
 - Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC): Sends issues to the TAC for review. The two groups work in collaboration. Possible sources for membership:
 - SWAC/DSAC included in advisory role during development of the plan.
 - SMMP subcommittee members.

3. Review of report – Section by section.

- Organization of report
 - Organize long bullet point lists into sections with headings.
 - Sam recommends prioritizing finalizing content above stylistic choices.
- **Proposal format and content**
 - Move “references” to the end of list of requirements.

- Add “cost (based on cost matrix).”
 - Sam cautions against assigning points to the cost category.
 - Consider benefit-cost.
 - Cost can also be left out until initial review is completed.
- Add parameters for length of content for each section.
- Change “experiences” to be more specific “Experiences with SMMP in last XX years...”)
- Social responsibility/environmental responsibility/equity
 - Create a points system associated with these qualities.
- **Subjects to be covered – Topics**
 - Homework: Group to review the topics independently before next meeting

4. Key Recommendations/Key Findings

- Daniel included each of the major subcommittee charge points. Pull out findings from each item from the charge.
- Findings:
 - 2) Subjects to be covered:
 - The charges of the total work group are all intimately related and are included within this RFP.
- Recommendations:
 - 1) Contracting out:
 - Recruitment needs to be excessive; the selection of a successful proposal should be careful and thorough.
 - Sets the stage for ongoing adaptive management and refinement into the future. (Add to **Approach** for RFP considerations)
 - 2) Subjects to be covered:
 - Emphasize impacts of the results of the RFP on social equity, innovation, to understand the upstream impacts of material sustainability, and creative solutions that provide pathways for tangible long-term outcomes.

Recording:

- [Recording](#)

Next Steps/Action Items:

1. Review the Subjects to be covered
2. Review Key Recommendations/Key Findings
3. Prepare presentation points and questions for BCTT Workgroup meeting on 1/19/23
 - a. Pick 3 topics that subgroup wants more feedback on.

Next Meeting:

- Meeting #8. Wednesday, January 18th, 2023 – 1:00pm-2:30pm Pacific Time

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Eklund - 12/9/22 - SMMP Draft Rec for RFP](#)
- [Geier - 12/9/22 - SMMP Suggested Guidance for RFP](#)
- [Popp - 12/9/22 - SMMP Introductory Paragraphs](#)
- [Popp - 12/11/22 - Benton County Comprehensive Plan](#)
- [Values and Goals to be considered during SMMP planning process - 11/14/22 Updated DRAFT](#)
- [SMMP DRAFT Table of Contents for Discussion - 12/12/22](#)
- [SMMP Subcommittee Report - Working Document 11/30/22](#)
- [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 12/12/22; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)
- [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 1/5/23; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)

Meeting #8 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/18/23

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Brian May | |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | |
| Joel Geier | |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | X |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | X |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Becky Merja | |
| Maren Schermer | |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

Review of BCTT SMMP Subcommittee Draft #2

1. Key Findings and Key Recommendations

- Fewer Key Findings have been identified so far. Group can identify other Key Findings outside of meeting time. (Next steps)
- Suggestion that Key Findings can be derived from the SMMP outline
- Table of contents
 - Consideration of SMMP report usability for future steps. What will be the level of detail?
 - Full table of contents is included in the appendix of the report. A link to the page is included in the Key Findings/Key Recommendations section.
 - Does this format work for all subcommittee members?
- Each Key Findings/Key Recommendation will contain a hyperlink that – when clicked – will take the reader to the body of the subcommittee report.
- Circular economy is a key topic for the SMMP, should this theme be mentioned more frequently?
- Key Findings/Key Recommendations organized according to subcommittee charge.
- Use hyperlinks to shorten Key Findings/Key Recommendations. Examples:
 - R-1: The SMMP should reference the following sources... [insert link here]

- R-5: The following groups should be brought to the table... [insert link here]
- Only hesitation to leaving out information and including a link instead, is if there are workgroup members are not interested to follow the link.
 - Finding a balance to give the Commissioners and readers what we are talking about, and what they are voting on.
 - Include 1-2 sentences. Then insert link. (For a full description, [click here])
 - For each Key Finding/Key Recommendation, all workgroup members will be voting (either 1,2, or 3).
- Daniel will summarize Key Findings/Key Recommendations to capture the meaning of each, then to include a link to the body of the SMMP report in the Appendix.
- Marge advocates for greater inclusion of concepts such as cradle-to-cradle, and circular economy into the SMMP plan.
 - Sean suggests using order of KF/KR and content to prioritize these concepts.

2. Introduction

- Should the introduction be more informative about the purpose of the SMMP?
 - The Introduction was intended to describe the charge of the subcommittee.
- Themes, key recommendations, other next steps can be placed in the conclusion.
- Daniel and Sean will connect on drafting the Introduction. Will send to the subcommittee members once drafted.

Next steps/Homework

- Subcommittee members to review the report and take note of any areas or themes that members want highlighted in the introduction and conclusion.
- Subcommittee members to identify other Key Findings.
- Identify members to present content in the BCTT Workgroup meeting 1/19/23.
 - Sean volunteers to present at the Workgroup meeting.
 - Sean has a time conflict at 5pm.
 - Sam will move the SMMP group up on the meeting agenda to accommodate.
 - Ken will lend support behind the scenes.
- Identify 3 key pieces to bring to the workgroup on 1/19/23.
 - Suggestion to ask for feedback on the “Who needs to be at the table list”
 - Ask feedback on what else do we want the SMMP to include? (ex. Cradle-to-cradle, other concepts.)
- Ken did not receive BCTT report draft from Sam. Daniel will follow up with Sam about re-sending.
- Scheduling next meeting
 - Meeting again before Draft #3 not necessary.
 - Group will work independently and send comments to Daniel.
- SMMP draft review: Subcommittee members will review draft and send comments to Daniel by Tuesday 1/24/23 at noon.
 - Daniel will incorporate in draft and compile into Draft #3.

Recording:

- **Recording**

Passcode: PcyC%61@

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Subcommittee members to work on identifying other Key Findings.
- Daniel and Sean will work on Introduction and Conclusion sections.
- Daniel will summarize Key Findings/Key Recommendations and add link to full content.
- SMMP draft review: Subcommittee members will review draft and send comments to Daniel by Tuesday 1/24/23 at noon.
 - Daniel will incorporate in draft and compile into Draft #3.

Next Meeting:

Wednesday, February 1st, 10:30-12:00 PM

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [SMMP DRAFT Table of Contents for Discussion - 12/12/22](#)
- [SMMP Subcommittee Report - Working Document 11/30/22](#)
- [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 12/12/22; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)
- [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 1/5/23; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)
- [SMMP Section of Work Group Report Draft #1 1/13/22; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)

Meeting #9 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/1/23

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Brian May | X |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | X |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Becky Merja | |
| Maren Schermer | X |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. Update on of Draft #3 of Subcommittee Report.
 - Will be working from full BCTT group report Draft #3 to make comments and revisions.
 - Goal is for there to be no changes between the group subcommittee report and full subcommittee report.
 - Ken Eklund had submitted comments about the draft before meeting. Daniel has copy/pasted Ken's comments into BCTT Draft #3 in the appendix.
 - Daniel explains that from here forward, all comments will be copy/pasted into the report appendix.
2. Review of Draft #3 of SMMP Group Report Subcommittee Report.
 - **Introduction**
 - Marge suggests substituting word "celebrate" for a more business-appropriate word.
 - John suggests providing context on the traditional approach to managing materials in the county, and the expectation of this document is that it will provide a long-range vision for sustainable materials management in the county.
 - Sam suggests reaching out to DEI Staff from Benton County to review equity language.

- Sam recalls concerns from Planning Commission meeting (1/31/23) about the limitations of the SMMP only applying to Benton County. Other counties are beyond the scope of the Benton County SMMP.
 - The SMMP purpose is to set the stage for a future of more sustainable materials management in Benton County.
 - The landfill is only one small part of the SMMP, is not the focus.
 - John suggests acknowledging that Benton County only has influence over its own population, but potential for change in other ways.
 - Possible for Benton County SMMP to be a model for other counties.
- Sam suggests adding a section on financial incentives for Republic of accepting waste from other counties.
 - Sean asks, would this fit within a different subcommittee introduction?
 - Daniel suggests adding a “Suggested subjects to cover” section for the consultant to explore.
- Introduction section is approved.
- **Development of a Sustainable Materials Management Plan**
 - Introductory paragraph is approved for now. Further changes can be made between meetings.
- **Subjects to be covered: List of Questions (for Consultant)**
 - Marge prefers the format of this list of questions to the Table of Contents format.
 - Focus will remain on questions. Table of Contents will be moved to the Appendix.
 - Brian suggests adding a question on the evaluation of the options for using solid waste funds to support waste management efforts.
 - Marion County charges a 3% collection fee and then can use funding for other solid waste projects.
 - In Benton County, landfill fee is pulled into the General Fund.
 - John suggestion to add: How will the county fund ongoing sustainable materials management recommendations of this plan?
 - Including an evaluation of what other counties are doing.
- **Plan Content**
 - Sean asks: What level of engagement will the consultant have with the Benton County public?
 - Consultant will incorporate feedback from extensive public engagement and stakeholder engagement (SWAC/DSWAC) into plan.
 - Add: “Our expectation is that the consultant will perform analysis and recommendations based on robust outreach to the stakeholders listed in this place. What is your outreach plan?”
- **Key Recommendations**
 - Marge suggests: add a key recommendation about community outreach and engagement.
 - Reference stakeholder list from “who should be at the table” section.
 - Marge suggests to mention SWAC/DSAC specifically.
 - Sean recommends “government advisory groups” to include other groups.

- R-1: John suggests linking the Sustainable Materials Management Framework with a resources (DEQ, EPA, supporting docs.)
 - “Who should be at the table” section – add note that the list does not prioritize groups.
 - **Key Findings**
 - F-2: Replace “~~BCTT Workgroup~~” with “Subcommittee Group”
 - F-3: Need more clarification on the TAC and CAC bodies during process.
 - F-5: Change to “Research and development aspects of the planning process can occur concurrently with public engagement.”
3. Set date for next meeting
- Group thinks that meeting every other week should be sufficient.
 - Next meeting will be February 15th.

Recording: s

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Review Key Recommendations.
- Continue review of Key Findings.

Next Meeting:

- Wednesday, February 15th, 10:30-12:00 PM
- Wednesday, March 1st, 10:30-12:00 PM

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [DRAFT SMMP Subcommittee Recommendations to BCTT Work Group - 1/5/23; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)
- [SMMP Section of Work Group Report Draft #1 1/13/22; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)
- [DRAFT - SMMP Subcommittee Report for Work Group Report Draft #3 - 1/23/23; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)

Meeting #10 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/15/23

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Brian May | |
| Sean McGuire | |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | |
| Marge Popp | |
| Ken Eklund | |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | X |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Becky Merja | |
| Maren Schermer | |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. Review Planning Commission and SWAC/DSAC Feedback

Planning Commission Feedback:

| Feedback | Subcommittee Response and Notes |
|---|---|
| How will the SMMP impact waste outside of Benton County (other counties contributing to the landfill) | <p>Add New KF - This is about the landfill, but also bigger than that. Recognize BC waste contribution (comparably small), but other county contributions as well. Addressing waste from Benton County will be limited compared to the all of the waste from neighboring counties.</p> <p>Add Finding – Recognize percentage of material from Benton County, Should SMMP spend more time strategizing and collaborating with other counties. Benton County has limited control over what counties do, but the county is impacted by other’s waste streams via the landfill.</p> <p>If the county wishes to apply a lower threshold through the Franchise Agreement, that would be difficult without collaboration and broader</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>perspective of waste. Perhaps each county needs to have a plan for addressing waste.</p> <p>Add Rec: SMMP should address how to approach inter county collaboration.</p> <p>Add Rec: Participating counties should have an SMMP in place. Need larger statewide resources to plan for this. Regional plan process.</p> |
| <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage Republic Services to implement the SMMP with other counties. | <p>Add to outreach recs.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the workgroup to use the JSIP as a model of best practices when engaging with the community on the SMMP. | <p>Add to outreach recs.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach out to neighboring counties (that contribute to the landfill) for feedback. | <p>Already included in outreach recs.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the trucking and travel routes that will be impacted by the SMMP in the communication strategy. | <p>Add to outreach recs. - Include truck traffic assessment in SMMP, not exclusive of Coffin Butte traffic, but potential impacts of alternative disposal and recovery methods.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>The BCTT seems to be addressing two very different topics: sustainable materials management (how to reduce the environmental impact of the products/materials we use) and Coffin Butte Landfill (reducing its impacts). This could confuse the public.</u></p> | <p>Should not just be about how Benton County can do better, but from a regional perspective.</p> |
|--|---|

SWAC/DSAC Chair's Interpretation of Individual Member Feedback:

| Feedback | Subcommittee Response and Notes |
|--|---|
| <p>SMMP: This project is way too big to be a part of common understanding for the tight current time frame. Perhaps this section say "County will continue to develop SMMP with cooperation from landfill franchisee."</p> | <p>Franchisee will be a part of the process, but the first comment would limit the ability of the consultant. The process shouldn't be extended further. Perhaps add qualifier (scope not limited by what is defined here).</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>A) diverting waste needs to balance the effort with economic benefit.</p> | <p>Diversion vs. economics might not make sense economically, so the cost benefits might be unrealistic. This should be a goal, but not an absolute.</p> <p>Key Finding – underlying cost benefit analysis would come into play, however, that can't necessarily be the sole driver of the solution. What is sustainability of waste diversion (economic costs, environmental, social)?</p> <p>The result of the process should give us a method of measuring cost-benefits that can be measured by the consultant.</p> |
| <p>B) The SMMP should state that any mandate to divert waste should show a cost vs benefit to the consumer (customers of landfill). Many regulations push the cost burden to the consumer. Material diversion actions should be self-funding.</p> | <p>Addressed above</p> |
| <p>with regard to the environment, resource conservation and the climate problem, things cannot go on like they have been. According to the current international level of knowledge, the only solution to this problem is a circular economy with an IWMS (Integrated Waste Management System) in connection with an energy supply based on renewable energies. The SMMP should have that as an underlying understanding.</p> | <p>Circular economy addressed in current draft.</p> |
| <p>the RFP should proceed with the understanding that a SWMS (Solid Waste Management System) with the technology available today can be a major step towards attaining a CO2-free (waste) economy.</p> | <p>Technology options addressed in current draft.</p> |
| <p>planning the financial effort associated with a progressive approach to waste should be a key part of the RFP. This includes an analysis of how this financial effort compares to landfilling the waste. You want the entity that will work on the RFP to have the necessary international experience and knowledge.</p> | <p>Cost-benefits addressed above. International experience addressed in current draft.</p> <p>Not necessarily needing international experience only, but in addition to local/state/national experience.</p> |

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <p>Benton County seems to be in a struggle between business as usual and a new path forward, a path of benefit to the county and its citizens, and the RFP applicant should be able to assist the County in navigating that struggle.</p> | <p>Addressed in current draft.</p> |
| <p>SMMP-R-4. SMMP-R-4: Bring “lessons learned” into the process from other sources, including feedback from other counties, lessons from past Benton County experiences, examples from California, Washington, or international examples. See full report for more sources.</p> <p>(green highlight) and, not or. Important that lessons learned come from beyond our region</p> | <p>Highlighted text updated.</p> |

2. Review Report Body

- Daniel asked the group if there are any comments, concerns, or proposed edits in the body of the report. The group responded that there are not any areas of the report they would like to focus on currently.

3. Key Findings and Recommendations

- The group reviewed the findings, making minor changes to existing findings and adding the findings addressing the Planning Commission and SWAC/DSAC feedback outlined above.
- The group reviewed the first nine recommendations, making minor changes to some, and adding the recommendations addressing the Planning Commission and SWAC/DSAC feedback outlined above.

Recording: https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/C-G8cnbN_wwWOpz3qX3RYd7qGrU4ndfhEC6l6dUCqmE4KoGUzG2iLNe6cjcMaSMx.iWW3pQwovnQIQ8Zw

Passcode: 1Ari!Yjb

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Review Key Findings and Recommendations.
- Continue review of Key Findings.

Next Meeting:

- Wednesday, March 1st, 10:30-12:00 PM

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [SMMP Subcommittee Meeting Notes - 2/2/23](#)
- [DRAFT - SMMP Subcommittee Report - 1/23/23; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)

DRAFT

Meeting #11 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 3/1/23

Attendance

| Member | Present |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Brian May | X |
| Sean McGuire | X |
| John Deuel | X |
| Joel Geier | |
| Marge Popp | X |
| Ken Eklund | |
| Ryan McAlister | X |
| Staff: Daniel Redick | X |
| Facilitator: Sam Imperati | |
| | |
| Observers: | |
| Becky Merja | |
| Maren Schermer | |
| | |

Agenda and Notes:

1. Review updated Workplan
 - i. Daniel presented the updated draft workplan, noting additional meetings, meeting times, and public comment opportunities.
 - ii. John noted that the robust opportunity for public comment was good.
 - iii. Ryan asked to clarify when polling will occur on 3/23, because he will be unavailable until 3:30. Daniel will ask Sam.
 - iv. Sean asked how the public comments will impact the report or polling. Daniel said the first public survey results will be available the day prior to the 3/23 polling, but would not change the content of the report. The second public comment period would be more for the Board of Commissioners to review while they review the completed report, and also would not change the contents of the report. Sean recommended those points be clarified with the public.
2. Review Workgroup Feedback on Findings and Recommendations
 - i. The group discussed each of the comments received at the 2/23 BCTT work group meeting, adjusting the existing findings and recommendations as necessary. The group completed all of the findings and recommendations comments.

Recording:

- [Recording](#) (Passcode: wF+8.RQ!)

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Review body of the report
- Finalize entire subcommittee report
- Finalize Work group report contents – intro and conclusion statements

Next Meeting:

- Wednesday, March 8th, 10:30-12:00 PM
- Sent doodle poll for 3/13 or 3/14

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [SMMP Subcommittee Meeting Notes - 2/15/23](#)
- [DRAFT - SMMP Subcommittee Report - 3/1/23; \(Word Doc Version\)](#)