Appendix C.1: Subcommittee Reports: Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP)

Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP)

C.1. Subcommittee

DRAFT 3-1-23

Table of Contents

1. Table of Findings

Key Findings:

This subcommittee proposes 7 findings as part of its overall charge. The subcommittee is not in agreement on all findings, and the following findings have **NOT BEEN REVIEWED** by the full subcommittee. These do not represent consensuses of the subcommittee, and they may be revised by the subcommittee further.

SMMP F-1: Many SMMP's and related RFP's exist in Oregon and beyond.

SMMP F-2: The charges of the SMMP Subcommittee are intimately related and should be included within the RFP.

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

SMMP F-4: Length of overall project can be heavily impacted and defined by the level of public interaction/engagement included in the project.

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

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

SMMP F-7 - Benton County has limited control over what counties do, and how much material they haul to Coffin Butte Landfill, however, the county is impacted by other counties' waste streams contributions to facilities within Benton County (via Coffin Butte Landfill, Pacific Region Compost, and transportation methods through the county).

SMMP F-8 – The 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative identified our communities' Core Values and has been adopted by Benton County government.

Commented [RD1]: From Ryan: Regarding the Key findings/Key results – I am struggling to add additional content or comments – I really think we have a very good chunk of work completed and now it is the refining of it/simplification of it (less is more).

Commented [RD2]: What do we mean by this? It can be left open, may be referenced mores specifically elsewhere.

Commented [RD3]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- Add context - timeline.
- Consider public engagement outside of the county
- Consultant would help define
- Consider making recommendation to include rural areas of the county

2. Table of Recommendations

Key Recommendations:

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

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

SMMP R-X – 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-2: 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.

SMMP R-3: Counties impacting Benton County through their materials management practices (including by contributing materials to Coffin Butte Landfill) should have an SMMP in place. Need larger statewide resources to plan for this. Regional plan process.

SMMP R-4: 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-5: 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.

Commented [RD4]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- highlight 2040 more

Commented [RD5R4]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- what is implementation planning, what does it take to get from point-to-point?
- add specific work plan

Commented [RD6R4]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- highlight unique aspects of Benton County.

Commented [RD7R4]: Perhaps this would be added to the demographics section of SMMP, not necessarily a finding.

Commented [RD8R4]: Good plans have a break-down of goals, action items, priorities, and recommendations for those items.

Commented [RD9]: Add comments from Planning Commission, SWAC/DSAC discussion.

Commented [RD10]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- remove aspirational

SMMP R-6: Bring "lessons learned" into the process from other sources, including international examples as well as other counties, lessons from past Benton County experiences, and West Coast states, and See full report for more sources.

SMMP R-7: Beyond those in the County, a wide assortment of stakeholders should be brought to the table. Stakeholders include community members, advocacy groups, businesses and industry, local and state government, and resources for innovation. See report for full stakeholder list. The consultant should provide recommendations based on analysis and extensive outreach and engagement with community stakeholders from the "who should be at the table" list. These stakeholders should represent a broader area than Benton County.

SMMP R-8: It is recommended that the RFP indicate the need for researching and exploring opportunities for a regional multi-county approach to achieve the goals of sustainable materials management. RFP firms with experience with Oregon's materials management legislation, policies and other county materials management plans may have the capability to address this need.

SMMP R-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. SWAC/DSAC 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.

Commented [RD11]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- highlight international examples.

Commented [RD12]: From John (2/17 email), addressing highlight above, and corresponding finding.

Commented [RD13R12]: Addressing this: ADD Recommendation about collaboration with other Counties, in addressing impacts of materials from other counties. Include strategies to engage other counties.

Commented [RD14]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- explain in more detail, better highlight here

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 length of overall project will depend heavily on the level of public interaction/stakeholder engagement included in the project, and by requirements from the county. Time should allow for extensive public interaction and engagement. In order to expedite the process, certain procedural elements should be done concurrently. The timeline should generally be defined throughout the process.

Commented [RD15]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- rephrase as Rec? currently matches finding.

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

Commented [RD16]: Notes from 2/23 WG meeting:
- like to see more community engagement than CAC

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.

3. 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.

Introduction

The main theme of this subcommittee's work around the Sustainable Materials Management Plan, is that the plan should help transition our communities from a focus on end-of-life waste management to a more holistic, systemic approach via a truly Sustainable Materials Management Plan. The many positive impacts include:

- Full Life Cycle/Cradle-to-Cradle Principles of Sustainable Material Management
- Circular Economy Opportunities both Locally and Regionally
- Inclusion of Equity Considerations
- Encourage and Recognize Innovation & Shared Prosperity

Benton county is seeking a new SMMP that will guide decisions and policies for future generations. Based upon the magnitude of content and ideas – this SMMP feels like it will be leading (ushering in) a paradigm shift in how we view and interact with materials we use in our everyday lives.

Work in Progress: Why? Why are we doing this and why do we need a new SMMP – if we can clearly tie the *why* behind the need for a better/newer/new SMMP – this will only strengthen the findings and recommendations. Give context, something like "the traditional approach to managing materials in the county and beyond is the end-of-life approach. The challenges, including the landfill's limitations environmentally and economically, the reason for the document is to chart the expectation and aspirations for a longer range vision that will guide the county towards more sustainable materials management."

The primary task of the subcommittee was to develop a "table of contents" outlining the subjects to be covered in an SMMP. The group started by looking at examples of Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) documents from various Oregon counties, listing, reviewing, and comparing the topics covered in each. The group was able to add to and edit that list, creating a "table of contents" of topics to cover in a future SMMP, as well as an associated list of questions for the SMMP to answer. Benefits and costs were covered throughout the as it related to various topics and discussions, and are largely included in the overall approach of sustainable materials management approach, which evaluates the impacts across the full life cycle of materials, weighing the "costs and benefits" in the decision-making process.

The group also reviewed Benton County's 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative and examples of values and goals expressed in other planning documents to develop overarching framework to be considered for developing an SMMP.

The more recent subcommittee work has focused on future next steps and recommendations around the RFP process, including contracting out, workplan and timeline, and who's at the table. The group has included considerations of lesson's learned from outside of Benton

Commented [RD17]: From Ryan: Intro ideas:
Benton county is seeking a new SMMP that will guide decisions and policies for future generations
Based upon the magnitude of content and ideas – this SMMP feels like it will be leading (ushering in) a paradigm shift in how we view and interact with materials we use in our everyday lives.
Why? Why are we doing this and why do we need a new SMMP – if we can clearly tie the *why* behind the need for a better/newer/new SMMP – this will only strengthen the findings and recommendations.

Commented [RD18]: Sean and Daniel's additions,

Commented [RD19]: Different word choice, something more business appropriate

Commented [RD20]: This is one of the answers to "how to accomplish equity", tied with equity. Ask county EDI coordinator.

Commented [RD21]: Ryan's additions

Commented [RD22]: Sean and Daniel's additions

County, including neighboring county jurisdiction presentations provided to the full work group.

How to read the document:
The document is split up into the following major sections, each containing various related work group charge element. Each charge list key findings and/or key recommendations. These key findings and recommendations summarize more complete content found in the rest of the report.

The following is a complete report including findings and recommendations put forth by individual members of the subcommittee. The report, findings, and recommendations have not yet been vetted and approved by the full subcommittee, and the majority and minority opinions have not been noted. The subcommittee will continue to work to refine these elements further. The subcommittee has worked collaboratively to develop a draft report focused on investigating and discussing elements of the charge.

Development of Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP)

A. Topics covered in recent similar planning efforts across the state

The primary task of the subcommittee was to develop a "table of contents" outlining the subjects to be covered in an SMMP. The group started by looking at examples of Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) documents from various Oregon counties, listing, reviewing, and comparing the topics covered in each. Subcommittee members reviewed and discussed pros and cons, and the differences between the various approaches frameworks. Subcommittee members identified key topics to include on Benton County's plan, including aspects of climate change, equity, health impacts, economic opportunities, and many others. The group was able to add to and edit that list, creating a "table of contents" of topics to cover in a future SMMP, as well as an associated list of questions for the SMMP to answer.

Commented [RD23]: Daniel's additions

Work In Progress: ADD FINDINGS

Among the planning documents referenced in the development of the "topics to be covered", the subcommittee reviewed topics covered in the following recent similar planning efforts across the state:

- Materials Management in Oregon 2020 Framework for Action
- Materials Management in Oregon 2050 Vision and Framework for Action (2012)
- Deschutes County Solid Waste Management Plan (2019)
- Lane County Solid Waste Management Plan (2019)
- Lincoln County Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan (2004)
- Marion County
    - 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:
    - 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)

As an outcome of the discussion reviewing other plans, members organized the topics into an aggregated framework, including the questions below, as well as a "table of contents" in the appendix.

Commented [RD24]: Daniel's additions

B. Subjects to be covered

~~1)~~ Our expectation is that the consultant will perform an analysis and provide recommendations based on robust outreach to the stakeholders listed in this document. The RFP should ask "how will the applicant address this, and what is the applicant's outreach plan?"

Questions to be answered in SMMP

Commented [RD25]: Combine into major sections

Commented [RD26R25]: Complete

INTRODUCTION

- What is the context of the plan?
- What are the purpose and goals of the plan?
- What issues are addressed by the plan, and what issues are excluded?
- What is the new approach to managing waste: Sustainable materials management framework vs. Solid Waste management framework?
- How does this plan lead with equity?
- What are the Values, principles, and vision of the plan?
- How do these values translate to measurable criteria for evaluating and analyzing the full life cycle impacts of materials and the management system?
- What are the Goals and actions of the plan across the material lifecycle, including Shared prosperity, Product design and manufacturing, Product consumption and use, Product end-of-life management, and Disaster resilience?
- How do readers navigate the plan?
- How does the county measure progress on the plan?
- How will Implementation, compliance, and amendments to be plan work?
- What are the Roles and responsibilities of the various agencies and stakeholders?
- What are the state and local requirements?
- What is the management planning process?
- How is stakeholder input used in the planning process?

CLIMATE CHANGE

- What climate change policies impact materials management?
- What materials management practices impact climate change?
- What are the Waste stream impacts from climate change policy/shifts?
- What are the Social, Political, Legislative Dimensions of climate change as they relate to materials management?
- What are the possibilities for transition assistance from state and federal initiatives addressing climate change related to disposal alternatives?

LIFE CYCLE IMPACTS OF MATERIALS

- What is the Scale of impacts (Regional, state, national)?
- What are the full lifecycle/Net environmental impact of materials/systems?
- Which materials are most impactful?
- Which Disposal methods are most impactful?
- What are the Impacts of generation sources (industries, large quantity generators)?

BACKGROUND AND WASTE STREAM ANALYSIS

- what are the Characteristics of the Planning Area?
- What is the Description of the Materials Management System?
- What are the community impacts from the materials management system?
- What is the Summary of Annual Solid Waste Generation across Benton county wasteshed (disposal and recovery)?
- What are the Current and Projected Waste Stream Composition and Quantities?
- What is the waste stream generation by economic sector/industry?
- What unique waste streams exist in Benton County?
- Where compared to waste management hierarchy is Benton County?
- What is the Waste Stream Generation Forecast, including Economic, environmental, and material trend factors?

WASTE PREVENTION/REDUCTION/ REUSE AND RECYCLING ANALYSIS

- What are the Existing Waste Reduction and Reuse Programs, their effectiveness, and needs and opportunities?
- Equity and livability costs/impacts? How equitable are the current waste/recycling/prevention services provided in Benton County to traditionally underserved populations and all communities, and what are the standards to strive for?
- Can we foster legislation to encourage building codes that support recycling capabilities and other sustainable materials use in construction? Can we require a level of waste reduction and re-purposing of building materials and demolition debris?
- What is the most impactful approach to Construction and Demolition materials and Deconstruction?
- What are the Alternatives for Increased Waste Reduction, Reuse, and Recycling?
- What are the Potential impacts/benefits of utilizing alternative options, and What is needed to accomplish effectiveness?
- How do Recommendations from Advisory Groups and Public impact options?
- What is the Analysis and recommendations for policy as related to Increased Waste Reduction, Reuse, and Recycling?
- What are Options for supporting circular economy?
- What are Options for integrating extended producer responsibility?

RECYCLING AND MATERIALS PROCESSING

- What are the Existing Collection and Processing services and facilities?
- How is Food Waste – Organics treated?
- What are the Needs and Opportunities?
- What are the Alternatives for Processing Recyclable Materials, Sorting Technologies and MRF options?
- What are the Proven vs. Unproven alternatives?
- What are the Recommendations for Collection and Recycling/Processing?
- How can we encourage local construction companies to provide recycling facilities for tenants with the use of building codes, subsidies or penalties to encourage responsible construction that will continue to be viable in the future?

WASTE COLLECTION AND TRANSFER

- What is the Regulatory Framework?
- What is the Local Authority?
- What are the Existing Collection Services?
- What is the Commercial Waste Collection approach?
- What is the current Transfer Station Operation Approach?
- What are the Waste and Vehicle Volumes to Each recycling depot and collection event?
- How are Unique wastes collected
- What are the transfer station Facility benefits and costs related to disposal options?
- What are Other Operation Related Requirements?
- What are Collection Considerations for Specific Wastes?
- What are the Needs and Opportunities for collection and transfer services?
- How to Increase Commercial Waste Collection of Recyclable Materials?
- What are the options, benefits, and costs of Regional Intermodal transfer station(s)?
- What are the Comparative costs of landfilling vs. waste to energy vs. recycling?
- What is the Comparison of different waste disposal and material management governance models?
- What European/Global Strategies to Consider?
- What options are there for Multiple franchised collection service providers?
- Can the issues of a franchise permit for an intermodal transfer station be compliant with BC 23.220 by a qualified third party compliant with BC 23.210 (1) (2), or
- b. Can the intermodal transfer station be enjoined with the current Holder (hauler) franchise agreement (discretionary), or
- c. Can the intermodal transfer station be enjoined with the current disposal site agreement party (discretionary)?
- What are the potential transportation and truck traffic impacts of the current disposal system, as well as alternative disposal options and recovery methods, across major impact areas both inside and outside of Benton County?

ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

- What are the alternative waste technologies available to lessen or replace landfilling?
- What options are there for material Flow Control?
- What are the Waste Disposal Projections?
- What are the Needs and Opportunities?
- What are the Alternatives and Evaluation?
- What are the Alternatives for Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Disposal?
- What are the options for Mixed Waste Processing?
- What is the Technology Summary?
- What is the Evaluation of Options?
- What are the Findings and Recommendations?
- What are Disposal methods are utilized in Benton County and elsewhere – slash burning, open burning, etc. and what are their impacts?
- What means (funding, regional collaborations, etc.) are necessary to bring these technologies into Benton County or the region?

HAZARDOUS WASTE

- What is the Existing Collection and Processing system?
- What are the Collection and Processing Services?
- What are the Processing/collection Facilities?
- What are the Needs and Opportunities?
- What are the Alternatives?
- What are the Recommendations for Collection /Processing services and facilities?

LANDFILL DISPOSAL OPTIONS

- What is the county authority for waste disposal?
- What is the description of the existing landfill disposal system/process, and what are the pros and cons?
- What are the Waste Stream Projections
- What are the Projection Scenarios - climate change, regulatory environment, costs, etc.
- What is the Landfill Lifespan
- What is the Env. Impact Assessment of the landfill?
- What are the Needs and Opportunities?
- What are the landfill Disposal Options, including Long-Haul Waste to Out-of-County Landfills and alternatives?
- What are the waste disposal recommendations?

- What are the true environmental impacts of landfilling for Benton County? Especially: what is the greenhouse gas footprint of the landfill? What do these impacts look like when projected into the future?
- What are the true economic costs and benefits of landfilling for the County? What do these costs and benefits look like when projected into the future?
- What are the various paths that the County can take to transition away from landfilling at Coffin Butte Landfill?
- What means (funding, collaborations, etc.) are necessary to make to embark upon these paths?
- Are there landfills other than Coffin Butte Landfill that should be considered? What are the tradeoffs (economic, environmental)?
- What is the path forward that balances these competing interests: reducing waste generation/increasing recovery vs. economic interests of landfilling?
- What is the risk assessment of the landfill? How can the County best manage these risks?
- What is the long-term outlook for the landfill? What is its best closure plan? What measures should be in place to manage the landfill's impacts after closure?

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

- How can we use government grants and programs that are being set up to combat the effects of climate change to create a truly unique and innovative program that makes the best use of the resources available in our county and highlights our most valuable assets to enable our residents to 'be their best selves' in terms of living a sustainable life?
- How can the county explore potential for conflict between income from the landfill and the approach of reducing waste to the landfill?
- How will the county fund and/or support ongoing sustainable materials management recommendations of this plan, including an evaluation of funding options, for systemic longevity?

Commented [RD27]: Suggestion from Brian, how to direct consultant to explore program funding options, comparing to other counties. Other services covering system costs. How to replace landfill funding source with other options? Diversifying revenue sources? Currently landfill fees go into general fund.

GENERAL

- Which options for addressing the above issues best reflect the County's (and the State's) stated values?
- How are each of the plan recommendations centered in equity?
- What are the details of the analysis, investigation/evaluation, and recommendations for each topic?
- How do we support and extend the Oregon 2050 Vision for Materials Management?
- How do we support Oregon SB 582, the Plastic Pollution and Recycling Modernization Act, in our county?

- What is a practical, economically feasible, and innovative path for our county to move from where we are today to a responsible and sustainable community?
- How can we use our unique assets and any economic benefits we might glean from our county natural resources? Can we use our rivers and forests to foster more sustainable local practices?

C. (New) Add in 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative and related County documents with similar from other counties referenced

Highlight 2040 findings, examples and goals from other documents

KR: 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)

D. (Moved from Common Understandings) Benefit-Cost Topics are only Outlined

Benefits and costs were covered throughout the as it related to various topics and discussions, and are largely included in the overall approach of sustainable materials management, which evaluates the impacts across the full life cycle of materials, weighing the "costs and benefits" in the decision-making process. The following list benefit and cost considerations are represented as more of a analysis of pros and cons, and not as an economic analysis in most cases.

- SMMP content should include cost-benefit analyses in the evaluation and recommendations of major topics.
- Circular economy costs/benefits should be addressed in the SMMP.

Commented [RD28]: Address planning commissioner Lee's concerns about the scope of SMMP - beyond landfill

Commented [RD29R28]: The SMMP is not focused on the landfill, the landfill is a small part of overall sustainable materials management and the lifecycle of materials.

Commented [RD30R28]: While Benton Co has the most influence over it's own jurisdication, change happens through a variety of way, potentially impacting the region through ideas like creative franchise agreements, state legistlation, positive examples

Commented [RD31R28]: Conflicting motivations/tensions btw two completing concepts, for reducing waste to the landfill and income from the landfill.

Commented [RD32R28]: Add above subjects to be covered.

Commented [RD33]: Cradle-to-cradle, not just the landfill

Commented [RD34]: Added description

    - Description of different approaches (sustainable, cradle to cradle, circular economy) should also be outlined.
- The SMMP should clarify Benefit-Cost perspectives being addressed through an equity analysis, including:
    - Financial cost impacts associated with materials management and outcomes
    - A perspective that goes beyond landfilling
    - Equity of circular economy, how it engages and impacts consumers (product/material oriented)
    - "who's at the table" list of stakeholder perspectives

E. What "lessons learned" should be brought forward in this process.

Staff invited members of various jurisdictions to share their experiences and processes in solid waste/materials and materials management.

> Work in Progress: Summarize lesson's learned from other jurisdictions present at full work group meeting

In addition to those "lessons learned", the group recommends considering the following:

- Feedback from other counties who have developed materials management plans
- International examples of landfill alternatives (such as Germany, Finland, Sweden, and South Korea)
- Examples from California and Washington
- Lessons from past Benton County experiences with contracts with Republic, engagement,
- Lessons from individual processes vs. integrated systems
- Workgroup process and its findings

F. Who needs to be at the table* beyond those in the County**

Subcommittee discussed and identified stakeholders that we felt needed to be included in various aspects of the SMMP process. This list is not prioritized in any way. These were presented to the full work group, and their feedback was incorporated into the list, including local and state agencies, non-profits, advocacy groups, communities, equity and health advocates, key private sector companies and industries, and more below:

Governmental Agencies

- DEQ
- Economic Development Office County/Corvallis
- Small Cities
- Government advisory groups relating to the subject matter
- Neighboring counties
- Equity, Diversity, Inclusion coordinator
- Waste generation sources (jurisdictions) – how much weight should non-county members be given? Economy of scale?
- Tribal governments

Community

- Community Members
- Low-income populations
- Multi-family residents
- Diverse Language Representation and underserved communities not speaking English as first language
- Residents and businesses from rural areas of the county

Advocacy Groups

- Local Advocacy groups (Willamette valley) – sustainability coalition, river keepers, watershed councils
- National Advocacy groups
- Youth organizations - civics/schools

Business and Industry

- Larger industry groups
- Large waste generators
- Building industry - USGBC
- Architecture (AIA) American Institute of Architects
- Designers – various materials, products, etc
- OSU – Business/Administration
- OSU – Innovation, science around materials
- Hospital/medical,

- Business community
- Restaurants,

Materials Management and Processing

- Disposal sites
- Collectors/haulers
- Materials processors - MRF's
- End users of secondary materials)

*at the table - meaning who to be consulted for feedback through the development of this plan, discuss regional coalitions/partnerships/collaboration
**County government/staff

RFP Process

G. A workplan outline with a timeline for completion

Staff used Deschutes county RFP as an example and starting point for this discussion. Subcommittee brainstormed different components that they concluded should be in the RFP process and hiring of a consultant. The recommendations are as follows:

- RFP Development
  - RFP Development feedback opportunity from Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) and Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
  - Consider DEQ's RFP Process for Modernizing Oregon's Recycling System as an example
- RFP Release/Announcement
  - Distribution to allow time for it to be posted to various trade groups, equity-minded sharing to underrepresented groups, international-minded
- Webinar – interact ***live***, field questions, make presentation
- Pre-proposal/bid/RFP Q&A opportunity for prospective applicants – possible to make this element required/mandatory
  - Early in the RFP release period
- Opportunity for respondents to express interest as primary or sub-contractors
- RFP Response Due Date
  - At least 4 weeks time that the RFP is available prior to application dead line.
- Review committee to shortlist firms
  - 2 weeks

Commented [RD35]: From Ken Eklund: **1. We've been asked to weigh in on many specific procedural elements of the RFP, that we really should not be making. I'm talking about deadlines, time expectations, scoring matrices, and so on – things that really should be decided by someone charged with and experienced with constructing the actual RFP package. We did the best we could, and what we came up with should remain in our report somewhere, but let's leave those specifics out of our recommendations, in favor of what we recommend the county's intentions and priorities should be. We should say that we recommend that the Planmaking process should prioritize completeness over promptness, i.e., that a complete plan is more important to us than it being ready by any particular future date, for example. That's appropriate and important for us to do.**

- Shortlisted firms awarded additional time for presentation with optional funding for expected presentation/deliverables
    - Additional month (within 1 week if no work product/report is due, just an interview).
- Evaluation and Selection Timeline
    - Evaluation team review period
        - Including Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) and Community Advisory Committee (CAC) review opportunity
    - Presentations/Interviews
- Develop work plan further with contractor selected
- Length of overall project
- Plan Development
    - Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) - Vet technical information from consultant, get to a place of consensus
    - Community Advisory Committee (CAC) - Review in areas of disagreement for technical experts
    - SWAC/DSAC advisory role during the development of the plan
- General public meetings – number of meetings

H. Contracting out;

There are many topics being recommended, which are likely beyond the capability of any single party. Multiple parties could be involved in the SMMP development process.

Benton County should use an RFP to find consultant(s) and/or other stakeholder groups to assist Benton County in developing a Sustainable Materials Management Plan.

Qualities of a successful applicant should include:

- Technical Knowledge and Abilities
    - Demonstrated familiarity with international examples of reduced or eliminated reliance on landfilling.
    - Conversant in the design and implementation of these alternative waste technologies, be able to evaluate their suitability for use in Benton County, and be able to map out rough timelines for their deployment
    - Demonstrate their ability to design a well-imagined and resilient Plan that can assess the likelihoods of such climate-impacted events as wildfires, floods, population migrations, unprecedented disruptions to energy and transportation infrastructure, and so on
    - Show their ability to map out the County's changing social, economic, environmental and regulatory landscapes, and ability to develop a Plan to navigate the County through them
    - Ability to show Economic/Env/Social impacts, and comparative analysis

Commented [RD36]: organize into categories

Commented [RD37R36]: Complete

- Be able to suggest programs and ways in which the community could participate, and measure their participation
- Be able to answer (most, almost all) questions (below table of contents) – RFP process, applicant
- Be able to map out the social, ethical and environmental landscape of climate change

- Experience
  - Experience with inclusivity, outreach campaigns
  - Experience in such community engagement.
  - Have some experience with large university communities
  - Experience with jurisdictions with non-standard waste streams – like high-tech industries, labs, forestry
  - Experience in analyzing policy impacts of materials
  - Have experience in SMMP development in the past (traditional and innovative)
  - Demonstrated experience with jurisdictions like Benton County (rural areas for example, industries)
  - Demonstrated experience showing Economic/Env/Social impacts, and comparative analysis

- Values
  - Show their understanding of the importance of the values listed in Benton County's "Core Values" and the State of Oregon's "Materials Management in Oregon 2050 Vision and Framework for Action," and will describe how these values will permeate the process and the product of the SMMP.
  - Be able to keep 2040 Thriving Communities Initiative core values in mind during the entire process of formulating an SMMP plan, and trace each recommendation back to the values expressed in the Initiative
  - Be able to lay out innovative pathways for the County to reduce negative environmental impacts in keeping with county and state values

- Work Plan and Process
  - Able to incorporate measures into its Planning process and product that will help the County respond to various trends affecting current and projected waste streams
  - incorporate a map of social, ethical and environmental landscape of climate change into its Planning process and product
  - Able to allow and encourage community involvement in the development process, and demonstrated experience
  - Ability and willingness to communicate with the community

- Be able to engage with the community throughout this process with any innovative measures on how this can take place, either virtually or with town hall type gatherings. Consider using the Justice System Improvement Project (JSIP) as a model of best practices when engaging with the community on the SMMP
- Look at the unique qualities of our community, not a once size fits all plan
- Will be able to incorporate these evolving Social, Political, Legislative Dimensions around climate change into its Planning process and product
- Consider materials and links to BCTT SMMP Subcommittee work
- Early stage outreach to community, including students, multi-family residential, single-family residential, rural residential, businesses, local builders, developers

- Plan Content
  - Will delineate paths for the County to establish clearer knowledge about and control over these environmental impacts (methane and other GHGs) by its franchisees, and incorporate these responsibilities into its Planning process and product
  - SMMP document to answer (most, almost all) questions (below table of contents)
  - Should be able to articulate a clear narrative or set of scenarios that describe how the Plan will be a resilient guide for the future
  - Will provide an analysis and recommendation for the "subjects to be covered", incorporating feedback from extensive public engagement and stakeholder engagement, SWAC/DSAC

RFP Development

- Provide details about Workgroup process and its findings to RFP applicants
- Prioritize topics, adding additional topics that are important to consider
- Communicate accurate priorities to applicants
- Members of this BCTT SMMP subcommittee should be offered to participate in subsequent stakeholder group meetings for RFP development and review
- SWAC/DSAC should have an advisory role during the development of the plan
- RFP Release/Announcement should:
  - communicate an expectation that this plan can be approached by teams (multiple firms), instead of just single firms
  - Put guidelines on the size/length of proposals and sections of proposals
  - Be distributed to allow enough time for it to be posted to various trade groups, equity-minded sharing to underrepresented groups, internationally minded outlets

- 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)
- The RFP should demonstrate flexibility through allowing further work plan development after applications are reviewed and accepted
- Length of overall project:
    - Can be heavily impacted and defined by the level of public interaction/stakeholder engagement included in the project, and by requirements from the county
    - R&D from consultant can occur in the background
    - Applicants should include various scope/cost options for 1 year, 2 years, and 3 year timelines.
    - The report should be released in sections, based on timeline and content priorities.
- This RFP process should 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.
    - SMMP Sub-Committee members should be included in the CAC.

Proposal Format, Content, Review And Selection[1]

Proposal must contain the following information, with parameters around each of these items in terms of document length:

a) Cover Letter (P/F).
b) Project Team Experience and Qualifications.
    a. Experience, Capabilities and Resources of the Proposer. 25 points.
    b. Experience of project team members. 25 points.
    c. Experiences with other SMMP in the last 5 years
c) Understanding of Project.
d) Approach to the Scope of Work. 25 points
    a. Fully and completely address all of the questions listed
e) Cost Proposal (based on cost matrix)
    a. Reasonableness of the Cost Proposal. 15 points
    b. Various options based on timeline and scope
    c. Review committee is not given the cost information until initial review is complete
    d. Important consideration, but not the most important consideration

Commented [RD38]: Important to consider cost, but not number 1 criteria

[1] Source of some section content: Deschutes County 2017 SWMP RFP

f) Project Schedule. 10 points
g) Social/environmental responsibility
    a. Use county values as evaluation criteria
h) References.
i) Interview/presentation (how important compared to other criteria?)
    a. Separate scoring criteria/process for the interview
    b. The group preparing the RFP will want to make sure that they set enough points with this process so that it can swing the point selection one way or another. The RFP group will want to prepare a list of questions or items they are wanting the interviewees to answer ahead of time and weigh out each question to ensure that it leads to a discovery of which consultant best fits the needs of the county.

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.

Commented [RD39]: From Ryan: Interview/presentation of firms section (page 6 I think): My sense is that the group preparing the RFP will want to make sure that they set enough points with this process so that it can swing the point selection one way or another. The RFP group will want to prepare a list of questions or items they are wanting the interviewees to answer ahead of time and weigh out each question to ensure that it leads to a discovery of which consultant best fits the needs of the county.

Conclusion

A good SMMP will serve the county and citizens now and in the future – it will be adaptable to new technologies while aligning with clearly stated county/state goals.

The county should not rush the selection process or solicitation process – selecting the correct partner whose core values and vision align with what has been assembled will be a key component to getting the best outcome in this process.

Commented [RD40]: From Ryan: Conclusion ideas:
A good SMMP will serve the county and citizens now and in the future – it will be adaptable to new technologies while aligning with clearly stated county/state goals
I don't think we can rush the selection process or solicitation process – selecting the correct partner whose core values and vision align with what has been assembled will be a key component to getting the best outcome in this process

Commented [RD41]: Suggested content from Ryan for conclusion

Appendix A: Drafted Table of Contents Outlining Elements of Recommendations

TOPICS
INTRODUCTION
Context of the Plan
Plan Purpose and Goals
Issues Addressed by the Plan (include discussion of exclusions to the Plan)
A new approach to managing waste: Sustainable materials management framework vs. Solid Waste management framework
1) Addressing the full life cycle of materials
2) Moving From Where We've Been to Our New Vision ~~Our New Vision~~ (provide timeline)
3) The life cycle of products and materials
4) The garbage and recycling system
5) Leading with equity
Environmental impacts of products and materials
1) Measuring environmental impacts (Full Life Cycle Analyses)
2) Reducing our impact
Values, principles, and vision
1) Overview
2) Values
3) Principles
4) Vision
Goals and actions
1) Overview
2) Navigating the action tables
3) Shared prosperity
4) Product design and manufacturing
5) Product consumption and use
6) Product end-of-life management
7) Disaster resilience
Measuring progress
1) Plan Indicators

Commented [RD42]: Clarify what this means

Commented [RD43]: Rephrase to a shared vision, not limiting to a current idea of this "new vision"

TOPICS
Implementation, compliance, and amendments
1) Overview
2) Roles and responsibilities
3) The County's Role in Solid Waste Management Planning and Operations
4) Oregon statutory requirements
5) Requirements for local governments
Address upcoming legislation, Oregon Recycling Modernization Act
6) Plan implementation
7) Plan oversight
Legal foundation and policy guidance
1) Overview
2) Legal foundation
3) Policy guidance
4) Plan Organization
Management Planning Process And Summary
1) Building On Previous Planning Work
2) Management Planning Process
3) Public And Stakeholder Input
4) Common Themes Of Public And Stakeholder Input
6) Valuable Partnerships
Local Economic Development
Opportunities for innovation and entrepreneurship
CLIMATE CHANGE
Policy Impacts
Waste stream impacts from climate change policy/shifts
Social, Political, Legislative Dimensions
LIFE CYCLE IMPACTS OF MATERIALS

TOPICS
Introduction
Scale of impacts (Regional, state, national)
Which materials are most impactful
Which Disposal methods are most impactful
Impacts of generation sources (industries, large quantity generators)
Method and recommendations for ongoing analysis
BACKGROUND AND WASTE STREAM ANALYSIS
Introduction
Characteristics of the Planning Area
Description of the Solid Waste Management System
Analysis of community impacts from solid waste management system
Summary of Annual Solid Waste Generation
1) Refuse Collection
2) Transfer Stations
3) Disposal Facilities
4) Recycling Facilities
Current and Projected Waste Stream Composition and Quantities
1) Definition
2) Historical Solid Waste Data
3) Waste Stream Composition
4) Waste stream generation by economic sector/industry
5) Unique waste streams – timber wastes ex.
6) Disposal methods – slash burning, open burning, etc. and their impacts
7) Waste Stream Generation Forecast, including Economic, environmental, and material trend factors
WASTE PREVENTION/REDUCTION/ REUSE AND RECYCLING ANALYSIS
Introduction
Background
Existing Waste Reduction and Reuse Programs

TOPICS
1) Waste Reduction Programs, including food
2) Reuse Programs
3) Recycling Programs
4) Composting
5) Needs and Opportunities
Construction and Demolition materials and Deconstruction
Alternatives for Increased Waste Reduction, Reuse, and Recycling
1) Enhance Current Promotion/Education/Support Services
2) Target Certain Types of Generators or Waste Streams to Increase Diversion by Expanding Basic Services
3) Targeted high impact materials for Reduction, Reuse, and Recovery
Sorting at point of generation
4) Target Recovery of New Materials
Potential impacts/benefits of utilizing alternative options. How do these impact Benton County? What is needed to accomplish effectiveness?
Analysis of Recommendations from Advisory Groups and Public
Analysis and recommendations for policy as related to Increased Waste Reduction, Reuse, and Recycling
Options for supporting circular economy
Options for integrating extended producer responsibility
5) Recommendations
RECYCLING AND MATERIALS PROCESSING
Background and Existing Conditions
1) Existing Collection and Processing
2) Collection and Processing Services
3) Processing/collection Facilities
4) Yard Debris and Wood Waste Process Facilities

TOPICS
Food Waste - Organics
5) Needs and Opportunities
Alternatives
1) Processing Recyclable Materials
Sorting Technologies and MRF options
Proven vs. Unproven alternatives
2) Recommendations for Collection and Recycling/Processing
WASTE COLLECTION AND TRANSFER
Background and Existing Conditions
1) Regulatory Framework
2) Local Authority
3) Existing Collection Services
4) Commercial Waste Collection
5) Transfer Station Operation Approach
6) Waste and Vehicle Volumes to Each Transfer Station
7) Recycling at Transfer Stations
Unique wastes
Transfer Station Descriptions
1) Facility Needs
2) Disposal at a New In-County Landfill
3) Disposal at an Out-of-County Landfill
4) Other Operation Related Requirements
5) Collection Considerations for Specific Wastes
Needs and Opportunities
1) Collection Services
2) Need to Implement Transfer Station Capacity
Alternatives and Evaluation – Analysis and Investigation
1) Increase Commercial Waste Collection of Recyclable Materials
2) Develop Transfer Stations Capacity

TOPICS
Regional Intermodal transfer station
Comparative costs of landfilling vs. waste to energy vs. recycling
Comparison of different waste disposal and material management governance models
3) Recommendations
European/Global Strategies to Consider
Multiple vendor options
ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL
Background and Existing Conditions
1) Introduction
2) Flow Control
3) Existing Landfill Disposal
Waste Stream Projections
1) Waste Disposal Projections
2) Needs and Opportunities
Alternatives and Evaluation
1) Alternatives for Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Disposal
2) Mixed Waste Processing
3) Technology Summary
possibilities for transition assistance from state and federal initiatives addressing climate change
4) Evaluation of Options
5) Findings and Recommendations
HAZARDOUS WASTE
Background and Existing Conditions
1) Existing Collection and Processing
2) Collection and Processing Services
3) Processing/collection Facilities
5) Needs and Opportunities
Alternatives
1) Collection and Processing services and facilities
2) Recommendations for Collection /Processing services and facilities
LANDFILL DISPOSAL OPTIONS

TOPICS
Background
County Authority for Waste Disposal
Existing Landfill Disposal And list pros and cons of it
Waste Stream Projections
Projection Scenarios - climate change, regulatory environment, costs, etc.
Landfill Lifespan
Env. Impact Assessment
Needs and Opportunities
Disposal Options
1) Long-Haul Waste to Out-of-County Landfills
2) Alternative Options
3) Evaluation of Disposal Options
4) Recommendations
ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT
Introduction
Background and Existing Conditions
1) Solid Waste Administrative Agencies
2) Solid Waste Advisory Council (SWAC) and Disposal Site Advisory Committee (DSAC)
3) Solid Waste Enforcement
4) Financing and Funding Sources
5) Economic footprint
6) Economic impact
7) System revenue
Monitoring plan progress
Ensuring Policies are followed
County community and business engagement
What grant opportunities, and how can county leverage them?
Needs and Opportunities
1) Management Considerations
2) Financing and Funding Considerations
3) Management Issues

TOPICS
Structure of Solid Waste-related governmental and decision-making bodies
Policy Development
Alternatives and Evaluation
Basis for deciding franchise contracts; annual renewals; capital costs
1) Administration/Management
2) Finance and Funding
3) Recommendations
CONCLUSION
RESOURCES