

## BCTT Subcommittee – E.1. Community Education

### Charge:

- 1) General Landfill History
- 2) Develop protocols for the timely and broad distribution of CUP-related information to the public, other governmental entities, and internal committees, groups, and divisions.
- 3) Community Education/Outreach/FAQs, etc.
- 4) Report Executive Summary

### Subcommittee Members:

Mark Henkels  
Ginger Rough  
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan  
Louisa Shelby  
Marge Popp  
Mary Parmigiani

Staff: Amelia Webb

Facilitator: Sam Imperati

### Relevant Documents:

Subcommittee Website: [Link](#)

### Working Documents:

- [Daniel's Initial History Document](#)
- [Republic's Initial History Document](#)
- [11/17/22 M5 Open House Notes](#)
- [150-Day Time Limit v3](#)
- [Dissemination of Information Draft Memo v2 \(Legal Minimums\)](#)
- [SPWG Survey Outreach](#)
- [Doyle - 12/13/22 - Memo to Legal Issues Subcommittee re post-closure obligations](#)
- [BCTT Subcommittee E1 Report Handout 12/15/22](#)

### Meetings:

(These are hyperlinks to take you to the relevant part of the document.)

- [Meeting #1 – 12/2/22](#)
- [Meeting #2 – 12/7/22](#)

- [Meeting #3 – 12/12/22](#)
- [Meeting #4 – 1/4/23](#)
- [Meeting #5 – 1/9/23](#)
- [Meeting #6 – 1/16/23](#)
- [Meeting #7 – 1/23/23](#)
- [Meeting #8 – 2/1/23](#)
- [Meeting #9 – 2/13/23](#)
- [Meeting #10 – 2/20/23](#)
- [Meeting #11 – 2/27/23](#)

**Meeting #1 – 12/2/22**

**Agenda:**

- Welcome
- Introductions
- Scope
- Discussion
- Next Steps

**Attendance:**

Member	Present
Ginger Richardson	X
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	
Louisa Shelby	
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

**Notes:**

- 1) General History:
  - a. Directed at public and those new to the issue.
  - b. Not as detailed as initial draft
  - c. Narrative more than table of newspaper articles
  - d. Other historical details will appear in the Capacity and CUP reports for cross-referencing.
  - e. ICM’s Amelia Webb will merge the existing documents into one for review at the next meeting.
- 2) Next CUP Communications Protocols:

- a. Start with legal requirements from Legal Subcommittee
- b. Look at wide distribution via multiple communication channels.
- c. Note opportunities for input from the jump.
- d. Possible Open House/Community Forum events
- e. Benton County devoted website with public comment email/form, Etc.
- f. Legal Issue: Apply to just landfill CUP or all CUPs – perhaps, two processes; one for big/large area impacts vs. smaller/localized impacts, etc. May require code amendments.

3) Executive Summary:

- a. Sam will take the introductions from each subcommittee report and merge them into a draft document for the BCTT Final Report
- b. Emphasis will be on recommendations.
- c. Note where “consensus” and MAJ- MIN
- d. Reference to individual member statements
- e. Subcommittee E members = Executive Summary editors of Millie and Sam’s drafts
- f. Final BCTT Polling:
  - i. Under development
  - ii. Heavy focus on the recommendations vs is there agreement with every sentence of every substantive section’s text and table, etc.




4) Community Education Plan:

- a. Focus on the ending of the BCTT process and preparation for next CUP.
- b. SMMP info?
- c. FAQs from a process perspective – not the substantive perspective
- d. Outreach Plan

Here are the Open House Notes.

**BCTT Open House Subcommittee Poster Notes:**

**Dot Color Meaning:** When members of the public shared ideas, questions, or other comments when talking to a subcommittee member, the member wrote that feedback on the large sheets of paper on the wall behind their table. If other public members reflected on an already written comment, the subcommittee member added a red, yellow, or green dot sticker next to the statement to indicate the new member of the public’s reaction to the existing idea.

	Red = I do NOT support the statement
	Yellow = I support the proposal, but I would prefer to have it modified in some way to give it full support
	Green = I fully support the statement

**Education & Outreach:**

- Meet groups where they are. Go to them to listen and present information ●●
- Meetings or elected officials and/or task force.
- Promote Master Recycler Program
- Soap Creek V.N.E.Q.S. (Valley, Neighborhood, Environment, Quality, and Safety) ("V-necks") ●● (Debbie Palmer)
- Property management groups (Duerkson) ●
- The County's - Linn, Benton, Lincoln, Marion, Polk ●
- Communicated with teachers to teach info in schools ●●
  - Right now, we need to make sure the schools know about BCTT ●
- Youth involvement ●
  - OSU / High School (CHS, CV, SC, SAHS, AOS, WAHS) ●●
- OSU extension services ●
- Corvallis sustainability committee (coalition) ●
- Republic Services ●
- Language choices for educational materials ●●
- Community incentives for solid waste considerations repurchasing ●
- Resources available for analyzing / comparing Solid Waste choices, cost vs benefits ●
- Social media
- Websites
- How to reach out to elderly? ALL - life-long learning ●
  - Community Center, Assisted Living
- Evaluate demographics for education ●
- Newspaper – events

### Post-Meeting Note:

Sam forgot to include the following existing document... sorry!

Chronological history of Key Coffin Butte Landfill Topics a) History: Coffin Butte Landfill was created in the late 1940s by the U.S. Army as part of waste disposal from the former Camp Adair. It was expanded and designated a regional landfill under the 1974 Chemeketa Region Solid Waste Management Program, a cooperative effort between Benton, Linn, Marion, Yamhill and Polk Counties. Valley Landfills, Inc., purchased the landfill in 1975 for use as a municipal landfill. In 2000, Allied Waste Transportation, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Allied Waste Industries, Inc., purchased the stock of Waste Control Systems, Inc., which included its wholly owned subsidiary Valley Landfills, Inc. In 2008, Republic Services, Inc. merged with Allied Waste Industries, Inc. Republic Services, Inc. is the parent company of all operating subsidiaries in the State of Oregon, including Valley Landfills, Inc. Regardless of the specific legal entity tied to a particular contract or facility, it is common for our employees and our customers to refer to us using our brand name "Republic Services."

DRAFT

**Subcommittee Meeting Recording:** [Link](#)

Passcode: &F!skP8

**Next Steps/Action Items:**

- Schedule next meeting
- Millie provides merged document (On hold pending Geier/Whitcombe emails.)

**Workgroup Presentation:** 12/15/22 Pending

**Next Meeting:**

Meeting #2: December 7, 2022, from 3:30 to 5:00

- Link: <https://uoregon.zoom.us/j/98167832898>
- Dial in using your phone. United States: +12532050468
- Access Code:
- Agenda:
  - Introductions
  - Review Scope
  - Benton County Practices
  - Raised Work Product and Copyright Issues
  - History Element Next Steps
  - Next Steps on Other Elements
  - Plan for 12/15 Workgroup Report
  - Set Regular Meetings
  - Adjourn

**Meeting #2 – 12/6/22**

**Agenda:**

- Introductions
- Review Scope
- Benton County Practices
- Raised Work Product and Copyright Issues
- History Element Next Steps
- Next Steps on Other Elements
- Plan for 12/15 Workgroup Report
- Set Regular Meetings
- Adjourn

**Attendance:**

Member	Present
Mark Henkels	X
Ginger Richardson	X

JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	X
Louisa Shelby	X
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

**Notes:**

The 4 Subcommittee Tasks:

- 1) Using the general Initial histories of Coffin Bute already provided (Joel’s and Nancy’s pending) create an overall history of the landfill.
  - a. This task needs to be complete no later than 1/6/23 for presentation to the Workgroup on 1/12/2022.
  - b. Currently, the subcommittee thinks this history should...
    - i. Be a timeline of key events that will also include foot and/or endnotes for people who want to do a deeper dive into events.
    - ii. Have recognition of the historical significance of the land Coffin Bute occupies and a Native Land Use Acknowledgement.
    - iii. Emphasize events from the last few decades, as these will be of the most interest to the general reader.
    - iv. Be roughly 5 to 15 pages (a better understanding of length will occur once work begins on this task).
    - v. Be aimed at the general public as the reader, but also having enough resources built-in so that people in the future will not need to go through the research process again.
  - c. NOTE: The subcommittee will NOT be including details on CUP or detailed landfill history. The CUP and Capacity Subcommittees, respectively, are creating those timeline documents.
- 2) Create clear recommendations on the “best practices” for County communication with the public for the next CUP. (During the last CUP process some of the neighbors did not feel the County communicated effectively.)
  - a. These recommendations will be created by examining the minimum requirements for public communications (See attachments from Legal Subcommittee pending link), and the list of current County methods for public outreach (provided by Corey (See attachment pending link.))
  - b. Subcommittee E will present their recommendations to the Workgroup. Once finished, the Workgroup recommendations will be given to the Board.
  - c. These recommendations could also apply to future communications concerning the SMMP.

- 3) Create a community outreach plan for the County to use going forward to wrap up the BCTT process and communicate future developments like the CUP, Franchise negotiations, and the SMMP RFP, etc.
  - a. This includes...
    - i. Telling the public what the Workgroup has done,
    - ii. Providing information on FAQs that relate to the Workgroup process, and
    - iii. Giving the public a picture of what communication will look like for the next CUP (which will be established by task 2) and SMMP.
- 4) Help with the drafting and editing for the Executive Summary of the BCTT Final Report
  - a. More details to follow in January/February

#### Task Assignments:

- 1) Task 1 - Marge Popp & Mark Henkels
  - a. Staff Member: Amelia (Millie) Webb ([ameliawebb@icmresolutions.com](mailto:ameliawebb@icmresolutions.com))
- 2) Tasks 2 & 3 – Louisa Shelby & Mary Parmigiani
  - a. Staff Members: Cory Grogan & Sam Imperati

#### Other Notes:

- Subcommittee discussion settled on the potential use of paper mailers as a highly effective way to communicate with the public.
  - Emphasis on having the mailers be some sort of postcard for visibility and financial reasons.
  - Could the mailers go into something already being sent out by the County?
- Discussion of involving schools, particularly high schools, in the outreach.
- Discussion of the feedback form/survey on the Draft Workgroup Report (focus on recommendations) that will be sent to all of Benton County (best method(s) for distribution to be determined). The goal is to send it out around January 24<sup>th</sup>, closing it around February 10<sup>th</sup>.
  - The question was raised if other Counties should also receive the survey.
    - Other Counties are participating in this process Ex-Officio. While they use the landfill and can be involved, we are, currently, prioritizing the people of Benton County when asking for BCTT feedback.
    - The idea of potentially having PIOs from other Counties and/or groups was mentioned.

#### **Next Steps/Action Items:**

##### FOR STAFF:

- Sam is following up with the County's legal counsel on the use of Joel and Nancy's documents. At the next Workgroup meeting all members will be asked their position on their individual contributions.



- Cory is “getting the ball rolling” on the potential for mailers as a way to communicate with the public.
- Sam will draft potential survey feedback questions on the Draft Workgroup Report and send them to Subcommittee E for review in January.

**FOR MEMBERS:**

- Begin thinking of questions you want to bring to the Workgroup on the 15<sup>th</sup> about the Subcommittee’s tasks and goals.
- Marge and Mark – Review [Daniel’s Initial History Document](#)
- Louisa and Mary – Review Cory’s document with the existing methods of County outreach
- If possible, review the potential Workgroup meeting outline for the Subcommittee’s report-out, below.

**Workgroup Presentation: 12/15/22 Pending Discussion on 12/12**

**Draft Outline of Subcommittee Presentation:**

- 1) Charge
- 2) Members
- 3) Major Tasks Summary (above)
- 4) Discussion Prompts: Taking each of the four major tasks, one at a time:
  - a. Ask for questions for clarification?
  - b. Are we headed in the right direction?
  - c. Ask for suggestions for Subcommittee Consideration?

**Subcommittee Meeting Recording: [Link](#)**

**Passcode:** \*?ht4YUO

**Next Meeting: 12/12/22 at 5:00 PM**

- <https://uoregon.zoom.us/j/92555671689>
- Meeting ID: 925 5567 1689

**Draft Agenda:**

- 1) Welcome
- 2) Sub-Subcommittee Progress Reports
- 3) Prep 12-15-22 Workgroup Presentation
- 4) Presenter(s)
- 5) Adjourn.

## Meeting #3 – 12/12/22

### Agenda:

- Welcome
- Sub-Subcommittee Progress Reports
- Prep 12-15-22 Workgroup Presentation
- Presenter(s)
- Adjourn

### Attendance:

Member	Present
Mark Henkels	X
Ginger Richardson	X
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	
Louisa Shelby	X
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	
Joel Geier	X

### Notes:

#### 1) Task 2 Updates & Discussion:

- a. The group again agrees some type of mailer or postcard is needed.
- b. The existing problem is people need to already be “in the loop” to get information. We need to do more to get information about the information channels.
  - i. Emphasis again on youth involvement
  - ii. Maybe have the postcards / mailers have a QR code or website to sign up so people get the information going forward digitally.
    1. *(A first wave of physical information that is more expensive will help insure the less expensive digital outreach is successful in the future.)*
- c. When laying out the recommendations for outreach the subcommittee should note what the outreach legal minimum, which was provided to us by the Legal Subcommittee. (This is the “X” amount of feet Marge brought up from the [Dissemination of Information Draft Memo](#).)
- d. Potential areas to notify at different tears.
  - i. Whole county – some areas into Polk County – Adair Village – Soap Creek - populations along major transport hubs – a “smell radius” – etc.

ii. Potential Working Draft Chart

Notification Subject	Notification Type	Who is Notified	Timeline
BCTT Report	Email blast	Everyone "X" Miles from Landfill	48hrs after dropped
BCTT Survey	Email blast, website post	Entire County	Open 1 month
Board Hearing on Report	Email blast, website post	Everyone "Y" Miles from Landfill	24hrs after scheduled
CUP Filing	Post Card, email blast	Entire County	24hrs after initiation
CUP Completion	Email blast, website post	Entire County	24hrs after initiation
Planning Commission Meetings	Post Card, website post	People on exiting email list	2 weeks before meeting
SWAC Meetings	Website post	Entire County	Within 2 business days
Board Meetings	Website post	Entire County	30hrs after scheduled

**NOTE: The data displayed in the above table was entered in at random. This data serves to represent only the potential TYPES of information that could be used in each column. As this is not the real data created by the subcommittee, there is no relationship between the data currently listed in each row.**

2) CUP Communication Recommendations Scope Clarification:

- a. The recommendations for CUP communication will be shared with the Board. The Board can choose to apply these recommendations to only the upcoming expansion CUP or CUP's in general. How this Subcommittee frames their CUP communication recommendations will affect how widely applicable they are.
  - i. For Example: The recommendations could be different depending on the size, impact, and location.
- b. Ginger notes that Republic will not be supportive of CUP communication recommendations made that only apply to Republic.

3) Task 1 Updates & Discussion:

- a. The History will...
  - i. Be about 10 to 15 pages so it is complete but readable,
  - ii. Have [Daniel's Initial History](#) as an appendix item,

- iii. Have a timeline with information like what the land was originally, changing ownership, permissions, and County relationships, etc. , and
- iv. It will have extensive endnotes for reference.
- b. Stages of Creation:
  - i. Once Mark and Marge create their first draft the document will be edited and adjusted by all of Subcommittee E.
  - ii. Once Subcommittee E has created the new draft it will be presented to the full Workgroup for editing and adjustment.
- c. Mark and Marge had time to review Daniel, Nancy, and Joel’s Initial Histories’, and will review [Republic’s Initial History](#) before drafting.
- d. Joel Geier discussed his work product and copyright position.
- e. Vance emails:

**From:** CRONEY Vance M <[Vance.M.CRONEY@Co.Benton.OR.US](mailto:Vance.M.CRONEY@Co.Benton.OR.US)>

**Sent:** Friday, December 9, 2022 1:14 PM

**To:** Sam Imperati <[samimperati@icmresolutions.com](mailto:samimperati@icmresolutions.com)>

**Cc:** NICHOLS Darren <[darren.nichols@Co.Benton.OR.US](mailto:darren.nichols@Co.Benton.OR.US)>; KERBY Joseph <[Joseph.Kerby@Co.Benton.OR.US](mailto:Joseph.Kerby@Co.Benton.OR.US)>

**Subject:** RE: Subcommittee E: Clarification on use of my work products regarding landfill site and local history

Sam, Darren, and Joe:

Mr. Geier is “asserting copyright for” two documents he submitted to Benton County in late summer/early fall 2022. As part of his assertion, Mr. Geier asserts only the full text of his submissions may be utilized, or, in the alternative, modifications (presumably including excerpts) may be used, but only with his express permission.

Benton County is under no legal obligation to accommodate either demand.

At the outset of the Benton County Talks Trash committee (BCTT) process, a charter describing the topics, conduct and procedure was created, adopted by the Board of Commissioners, and provided to each member of the committee. Specifically, Article XIII.E., states, in part: “Communications’ (statements and votes made during meetings, memoranda, work products, records, documents, text messages, pictures, or materials developed to fulfill the charge, including electronic mail correspondence) are public records. The personal notes of individual members taken at public meetings might be public record to the extent they relate to the conduct of the public's business.”

The material submitted by Mr. Geier is a public record, both as described in the charter provision above, and in ORS 192.311(5)(a) which defines a public record as “any writing that contains information relating to the conduct of the public’s business, including but not limited to court records, mortgages, and deed records, prepared, owned, or used or retained by the public body regardless of physical form or characteristics.”

Mr. Geier's submissions have been published on the county's website for nearly 3 months; thus the county has retained the documents. The documents have been drawn upon for various aspects of BCTT's research and exploration; they have been used.

There is no doubt Mr. Geier's submissions are public records.

Public records, which are not exempt from disclosure, may be viewed or copied by any member of the general public. But, copyrighted material may not be copied by the public, even if they are public records of a governmental entity. However, under the fair use doctrine copyrighted material may be used for comment, teaching, or research without infringing on the copyright. 17 U.S.C. §107. The test for whether a copyrighted document can be used without permission includes the following considerations:

- (1)** the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes;
- (2)** the nature of the copyrighted work;
- (3)** the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
- (4)** the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work." 17 U.S.C. §107

In this instance, the purpose of a report from the BCTT is to inform the public of common understandings reached by the committee. That is clearly a form of education and satisfies the overarching justification for fair use of any copyright material. Then, taking a brief look at the legislatively identified criteria, the use of Mr. Geier's material in any report created by BCTT is not for profit. Additionally, courts look to whether the work has been published; unpublished works warrant greater copyright protection. See *Harper & Row Publishers v. Nation Enterprises*, 471 U.S. 539 (1985). Mr. Geier's submissions have been posted – published – on Benton County's public website for nearly three months.

The nature of the submission is, essentially, a factual recitation of certain geological, topographical and natural features in and around the landfill. As such, very little creativity or original material has been created. See *Sony Corp. of America v. University City Studios, Inc.*, 464 U.S. 417 (1984). The amount of information to be used, if any, is undetermined at this time. However, if the usage is minor, a paragraph or two, and is almost entirely factual, it would likely not be considered a substantial portion of the entire work. Finally, because both of Mr. Geier's documents have been publicly displayed on the county's website for nearly 3 months, the effect of excerpting his documents on the potential market or value of the work is negligible.

To summarize: Mr. Geier's submissions are public records for which no exemption to disclosure applies. While Mr. Geier may assert his work has copyright protection, the fair use doctrine established by Congress permits the use of his work by BCTT.

Thanks. Vance.

**From:** CRONEY Vance M <[Vance.M.CRONEY@Co.Benton.OR.US](mailto:Vance.M.CRONEY@Co.Benton.OR.US)>

**Sent:** Friday, December 9, 2022 3:56 PM

**To:** Sam Imperati <[samimperati@icmresolutions.com](mailto:samimperati@icmresolutions.com)>

**Cc:** NICHOLS Darren <[darren.nichols@Co.Benton.OR.US](mailto:darren.nichols@Co.Benton.OR.US)>; KERBY Joseph <[Joseph.Kerby@Co.Benton.OR.US](mailto:Joseph.Kerby@Co.Benton.OR.US)>

**Subject:** RE: Subcommittee E: Clarification on use of my work products regarding landfill site and local history

Sam:

I don't know enough about Nancy's documents to say definitely. Glancing through them, it appears the history document is similar to what Joel submitted in that it is a fact heavy. What I don't know is whether it was "published." If it was published by being posted to our website, then I'd think the same analysis could apply to this document.

The promises broken document appears to have far less factual content and more original content. Also, I don't know if it was published (posted to our website). These two variables might alter the conclusion of fair use protection for use of this document. I haven't studied it closely so I can't say for sure. Sorry. Vance.

#### **Next Steps/Action Items:**

- Louisa & Mary: Send in by 10:00 AM on 12/15/22.
  - Draft 1pg doc. w/ statement of what you are doing, a brief overview of the County/Legal standard used last CUP, what you are thinking about having as your recommendations, and why the changes.
    - (For the first part they can copy and paste from M2 notes, and for the second part they can copy and paste info from the legal Subcommittee memo.)
  - The recommendations you are thinking of can be laid out in a table to help capture the nuances needed for effective communication.
- Mark & Marge:
  - Draft 1pg Doc. w/ overview of the current outline for the History/Timeline Document you are creating.
  - This will include the current subjects and questions listed by Mark when he updated Subcommittee E on Task 1's progress.

**Workgroup Presentation:** 12/15/22

See above Action Items.

**Subcommittee Meeting Recording:** [Link](#)

**Passcode:** =n.266Xn

**Next Meeting:** 1/4/23 from 3:30 to 5:00

## Meeting #4 – 1/4/22

### Agenda:

- 1) Welcome
- 2) Re-cap of where we are in this Subcommittee’s process.
- 3) Sub-Subcommittee Progress Reports / Updates
  - a. History Task
    - i. Existing timeline from newspaper articles for appendix
    - ii. Environmental and Historical context write-up
    - iii. The focal concerns (see #5 of [E1 Report Handout 12/15/22](#))
      1. Specific aspects of history and/or geography to include suggested at the 12/15/22 WG meeting?
  - b. Outreach Tasks
    - i. Past / standard County Communication
    - ii. Possible additional methods
    - iii. How to differentiate outreach
    - iv. Current break-down of outreach by tier
- 4) Discussion of Sub-Subcommittee key items from reports
- 5) Re-cap the status of work completed and establish next priorities.
- 6) Schedule next meeting and assign “Next Steps”
- 7) Adjourn

### Attendance:

Member	Present
Mark Henkels	X
Ginger Richardson	X
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	(Cory – 30min)
Louisa Shelby	X
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	(Phone)
<b>Observers:</b>	

### Notes:

- Discussion with Cory:
  - o Mailers are looking to be very expensive. Alternatives could be local newspaper ads, social media ads, radio ads, etc. These are still expensive, but less than mailers and they might be able to serve the same purpose.
- Landfill Newsletter?

- The subcommittee is able to recommend to the County that, along with other measures, the County should ask Republic to notify people via their channels. This is the most the Subcommittee can do regarding Republic's communications.
- History Task Update:
  - 4 sections of the history 1) Background on location & early history, 2) Waste disposal generally till 1983, 3) Waste disposal generally from 1983 to 2010, 4) Waste disposal generally from 2010 to 2022
- Outreach Task Update:
  - They are currently collecting information from other Counties plans.

**Next Steps/Action Items:**

- Combine [BCTT Subcommittee E1 Report Handout 12/15/22](https://uoregon.zoom.us/rec/share/ON3uCmMpgMwwaygCayiLqT2jPXphnIBq56UdCG1or0eG SBqAacjhoigr90LijCg.ktoSxkKLxBd7F4oW) document with Louisa's 1/2/23 notes document and developments from the meeting discussion.
- Edit the completed history documents for review.

**Subcommittee Meeting Recording:**

<https://uoregon.zoom.us/rec/share/ON3uCmMpgMwwaygCayiLqT2jPXphnIBq56UdCG1or0eG SBqAacjhoigr90LijCg.ktoSxkKLxBd7F4oW>

Passcode: ?00yh1.j

**Next Meeting: 1/9/23**

**Meeting #5 – 1/9/23**

**Working Agenda:**

- 1) Welcome
- 2) Questions for Cory:
  - a. How can the County's current outreach plan and the radius metric Sub E is developing be integrated?
  - b. Discuss Next Steps for Final WG Report Section VI Part A?
- 3) Sub-Subcommittee Progress Reports / Updates
  - a. History Task
    - i. Group feedback on current draft
    - ii. Sam's feedback on current draft
    - iii. Next Steps
  - b. Outreach Tasks
    - i. What is the status of the recommendations?
      1. Current break-down of outreach by tier
    - ii. What additional material do you need?
    - iii. Current break-down of outreach by tier
- 4) Re-cap the status of work completed and establish next priorities.




- 5) Assign “Next Steps”
- 6) Adjourn

**Attendance:**

Member	Present
Mark Henkels	X
Ginger Richardson	
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	(Cory – 30min)
Louisa Shelby	X
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

**Notes:**

- Orienting Sub E work:



- Talking with Cory:
  - Using Reddit? – They have done “ASK Me Anything” events in the past
  - Incorporating a radius/tiered model w/ the County’s methods. (NOTE: this idea is primarily for CUP type information that would be highly location specific.)
    - Door-to-door outreach
    - USPS targeted mailers
    - “Next-door” can be set for neighborhoods.
    - “Everbridge” (typically used for emergency notifications, but companies can use it for employees too) – It will send you communication (text, email, call, etc.) until it knows you have seen the message.
- Presenting to the WG on Thursday:

- Cory can come for the 1<sup>st</sup> part of the meeting.
- Mark cannot come, and Marge need to leave part way though. Given this Sub E will be the first Sub to present and Marge will go first.
- History Presentation:
  - Change title of History WG Report section to something like “Geographical Context & History” (?)
  - Can we reconcile a History “A” and History “B” ?
  - Could we have a minimalistic timeline type of history for new readers to get their bearings AND have a more comprehensive history(s). So a Timeline, and a combined history or a “History A” and “History B.” ?
  - Notes from Sam:
    - CORE CONCERN: The uncertainty is that it feels like the history document could become a surrogate for the CUP discussion.
      - The history needs to inform, not influence.
    - The word “Community” is factually accurate, but it could also imply a level of homogeneity that washes out the full range of communities and voices. It would be good to specify what communities (ex: the \_\_\_ neighborhood communities, the County’s business community, etc.) so people don’t get confused.
    - Better to stick to primary sources for the purposes of this history document.
    - The end of the current history document is more of a point of view.
    - Opinions and editorials, quotes, etc. are valuable, but better suited to a different section OR their own “perspective-oriented” history.
    - There is likely to be pushback on some of this language from Ginger (Republic). Given this, they may want to add paragraphs to the history, or have their own “perspective-oriented” history document.
  - NOTE: There does not HAVE to be consensus within Sub E on the documents produced. However, documents that have consensus carry more weight.
  - Mark notes that he presented to the WG the idea of a narrative history instead of a timeline, and there were no complaints from the WG.
  - Mark and Mary also note, “what makes the history is the friction” (Mark), and you cannot have a history without conflict.
  - Louisa emphasizes that as long as all information is credibly cited and all (both) are represented, it is a good history.
- Materials from Cory (1/5/23)

Following up on the discussion we had at the beginning of last night’s meeting. Here is what I am tracking for action items to support the Solid Waste Process Workgroup and this committee. Please feel free to provide feedback:

- CUP Filing - share through Benton County communication channels and share with partners.
- CUP Completion - share through Benton County communication channels and share with partners.

- Look into two possibility of a public event open house to share info about the final report and survey.
- Confirm mailer is not possible due to budget constraints.
- Look into/develop plan advertising options as an alternative to the mailer.

Also since we discussed it last night and in case you are interested, here are a couple of examples of how we consistently share information through Benton County communication channels:

#### **Commissioner and Sheriff Oath of Office**

- [Benton County Website](#)
- [FlashAlert for media partners with video, photos, and captions](#)
- [Constant Contact Organic Subscribers](#)
- [Constant Contact Benton County Employees](#)
- [Feature video with Commissioner Malone](#) - YouTube
- [Feature video with Commissioner Van Arsdall](#) - YouTube
- [Flickr](#)
- [Facebook](#)
- [Instagram](#)
- [Twitter](#)
- [LinkedIn](#)
- Nextdoor, posting Tuesday with E-news.
- Shared content and coordinated with BCSO.

#### **Overnight and Daytime Warming Center/Weather Warning**

##### **Health Department**

- [Nextdoor](#)
- [Facebook post](#) and ongoing Day-time Warming Center campaign
- Website [English Press Release](#)
- Website [Spanish Press Release](#)
- [Constant Contact Health Community Partner email](#) (PreK-12, Faith, CBOs, HOPE)

##### **Benton County**

- Sent to all Benton County employees.
- [Benton County organic subscribers on Constant Contact](#)
- [LatinX Radio Partners](#)
- [Media Partners](#)
- [Nextdoor](#)
- [Facebook](#)
- [Twitter](#)
- Sharing BCHD social media posts
- Linn-Benton Regional Communication Partners

##### **Benton County Sheriff's Office**

- Sharing social media posts

#### **POST-Meeting Note:**

- The current discussion of Native Tribes that originated from the lands that are now Benton County does not fix the goal of the history section of the report. However, having a Land Use

Acknowledgement is critical to include in the final WG Report. Given this, a new section will be added to the beginning of the report so a formal Land Use Acknowledgement will be prominent and easily accessible to readers.

- The official guidelines for Land Use Acknowledgements (published through Oregon.gov) can be found [here](#). Below is a sample of what the Acknowledgment could look like for the WG Report.
  - *“Indigenous tribes and bands have been with the lands that we inhabit today throughout Oregon and the Northwest since time immemorial and continue to be a vibrant part of Oregon today. We would like to express our respect to the First Peoples of this land, the nine federally recognized tribes of Oregon: Burns Paiute Tribe, Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw Indians, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, Coquille Indian Tribe, Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and The Klamath Tribes. It is important that we recognize and honor the ongoing legal and spiritual relationship between the land, plants, animals, and people indigenous to this place we now call Oregon. The interconnectedness of the people, the land, and the natural environment cannot be overstated; the health of one is necessary for the health of all. We recognize the pre-existing and continued sovereignty of the nine federally recognized tribes who have ties to this place and thank them for continuing to share their traditional ecological knowledge and perspective on how we might care for one another and the land, so it can take care of us. We commit to engaging in a respectful and successful partnership as stewards of these lands.”*

#### **Next Steps/Action Items:**

- “Homework:”
  - Louisa and Mary will send out their document to the Sub by Tuesday morning. Marge, Ginger, and Mark will email / track change their comments to the group no later than Noon, Friday 1/13/23. Mary and Louisa will compile the feedback and send their new draft to Sam no later than noon on Tuesday, 1/17/23. Sam will then copy and paste this draft into the DRAFT WG Final Report that is being sent out 1/17/23.
  - Sam and Ginger will type up and send feedback to Mark and Marge on the history as soon as possible.
- Next Meeting Action Items:
  - The 1/16/23 Sub E meeting will be partly used to prep both the History and Outreach presentations for the WG meeting on 1/19/23.
  - It will also be used for Ginger to reflect on the History with the group, as she was not at the 1/9/23 meeting.


#### **Meeting #6 – 1/16/23**

#### **Working Agenda:**

- 1) Welcome
- 2) QUICK review of Sub E’s document(s) relationship to the Final WG Report. \*\*\*
- 3) Cory’s status on his section of the Final WG report.

- a. (His presentation to the WG on 1/19/23)???
- 4) Homework Check-In
  - a. Did everyone get their feedback to Mary & Louisa by Noon, 1/13/23?
  - b. Did Sam and Ginger get their feedback to Mark & Marge?
- 5) Outreach Task WG Presentation Planning
  - a. Finalize clarification about CUP communication application.
    - i. *County notification process should apply to all county issues pertinent to residents. The CBL process is like a test case for across-the-board county communication, and that intention should be voiced in the written document.*
    - ii. *The specific maps shown in the document are just for Coffin Butte. However, the model that is being shown (the radii of communication) is to be applied to any CUP.*
  - b. What additional methods should be employed?
    - i. Marge – *“Local newspaper should continue to be an outlet, but other communication channels are needed, both for dissemination of information AND to provide a platform for community dialogue.” – “A system for accepting resident feedback (number 8) would also benefit all county issues.”*
  - c. Getting data on the number of homes included in the different radii?
- 6) Discussion of History feedback
  - a. Comments from Ginger
  - b. Different types of histories
    - i. Timeline and merged narrative history.
    - ii. Timeline and 2 “Position-Oriented” histories.
- 7) Outreach Task WG Presentation Planning
- 8) Assign “Next Steps”
- 9) Adjourn

\*\*\*



**Attendance:**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Present</b>
Mark Henkels	X
Ginger Richardson	X
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	
Louisa Shelby	X
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

**Notes & Discussion Between Meeting 1/9 and 1/16:**

- Mark and Marge want to emphasize that the social context and past conflicts must be included in the record for the public to understand where things are today. *(Mark email - Wed 1/11/2023 2:14 PM – RE: History and Context Document)*
- Questions from Ginger *(Wed 1/11/2023 4:21 PM – RE: Sub E Report Docs for Feedback)*
  - Do we mean this notification to be for all CUPs filed with the county? Or just Coffin Butte?
  - How did we arrive on the 10-15-mile radius?
  - How many homeowners does that encompass?
- Marge Reply and Considerations: *(Wed 1/11/2023 5:34 PM – RE: Sub E Report Docs for Feedback)*
  - She agrees the County notification process should apply to all county issues pertinent to residents. The CBL process is like a test case for across-the-board county communication, and that intention should be voiced in the written document.
  - She also thinks area residents are eager to have information about County projects and viewpoints regarding them available to them in the same way as newspapers used to cover issues.
    - Seconds the local newspaper should continue to be an outlet, but other communication channels are needed, both for dissemination of information AND to provide a platform for community dialogue.
    - A system for accepting resident feedback (number 8) would also benefit all county issues.
- Mary Regarding Ginger's questions: *(Wed 1/11/2023 8:31 PM – RE: Sub E Report Docs for Feedback)*
  - The specific maps shown in the document are just for Coffin Butte. However, the model that is being shown (the radii of communication) is to be applied to any CUP.

- The 10-mile radius we felt would encompass the County, while the 15 miles would encompass some of surrounding areas that might be interested in the landfill, Ex. hauling routes, etc.
- As far as the homeowners question, I'll have to get back to you on that as I am not sure.
- I will clarify that this notification process is meant to be used on all CUP related processes, not just Republic Services in the document.

**Notes:**

- Affirmation that, yes, the CUP communication recommendations are not Republic specific. However, they can be size and/or scope specific.
- Instead of “big v. small” we are looking at how influential it is.
  - The “County-Wide Effects”
- We need to follow up with Cory on his section.
- Notes by Ginger a/b the History:
  - It is a little long, some stuff might be better served in the appendix of the document.
  - A clear road map should be laid out at the start.
  - Some bullet point elements and graphics would help with readability.
- History Conversation:
  - Note: The history we are doing encompasses more than the original charge.
  - Mark wants to be sure that, if we do remove some elements (such as water issues) from the history that they will not be completely absent from the document.
  - Note: The County does not have a say over water issues. That is under the authority of DEQ. So first the County does a CUP, and then DEQ does their environmental review.
  - Ginger: Maybe we don't lead with the conversation about wet vs.. dry climates? It is good information to have, but putting it first it creates a lens that colors the rest of the history.
    - Marge: This was not intentional, and still including it but moving it somewhere else in the history sounds like a good potential compromise!

**Next Steps/Action Items:**

- DUE Tuesday (1/17/23) @ 5:00 PM
  - **Marge & Mark** will review Ginger's comments on their most recent history draft, “**JAN 16 LANDFILL HISTORY DRAFT\_Ginger.**” They will address as many of the comments as they can, leaving the ones that require group discussion.
  - **Mark & Marge** will track change Ginger's “**History 1-13-23 Community Education**” document.
  - **Ginger** (and **Mary and Louisa** if interested) will track change Marge's “**History Main Themes**” document.
  - **Ginger** (and **Mary and Louisa** if interested) will track change Marge's “**Timeline Coffin Butte Landfill II**” document.

- **Cory** will track change Mary and Louisa’s “Charge E-Community Outreach” document.

## Meeting #7 – 1/23/23

### Working Agenda:

- 1) Welcome
- 2) Go over new document.
- 3) Clarify Land Use Acknowledgement
- 4) Go over the edits made with each section.
- 5) Assign “Next Steps”
- 6) Adjourn

### Materials Between Meetings:

Email from Cory (1/18/23) - I made a comment about it but did not use track changes and noticed it is still there. I don't think trivial is the right word to use. We can reach approximately 8000 community members to share info about the SWPPWG using two of our lists. We also track the click rate on these emails which shows us we are reaching more people at a higher engagement rate than we average on social media. So these email lists are a significant and important tool for us. I feel that line could just be omitted.

**Mary and Louisa** will review the DLCD public involvement information and incorporate it into the Sub E Report. This may entail adding new information and adding the DLCD information has sources for current recommendations to strengthen their position. Your changes need to be sent in by 2:00 PM on Monday so I can make sure they are formatted consistently to present at our subcommittee meeting at 5:00 PM on Monday.

**From:** CARNEY Sadie \* DLCD <[Sadie.CARNEY@dlcd.oregon.gov](mailto:Sadie.CARNEY@dlcd.oregon.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2023 3:49 PM  
**To:** Sam Imperati <[samimperati@icmresolutions.com](mailto:samimperati@icmresolutions.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: DLCD Outreach Protocols

Ha – sorry about the delay. Kick-off of leg session has had us running around this week! And last week! DLCD is a pretty lean ship – still under 70 employees.

[Our report](#) does a pretty good job of describing the work, pages 8-10. It doesn't (or I don't think it does) cover the outreach we conducted to the Land Conservation and Development Commission's (LCDC) Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (public meetings with public comment opportunities) or the LCDC (2-3 presentations, all with public comment opportunities in person, at the meetings, held in geographically diverse areas of the state). Staff also presented to the Wildfire Programs Advisory Council 3-4 times, and used their feedback to further refine recommendations.



A definite highlight was the Spanish language focus group. We offered incentives for participation and used translation services. Attendees were survivors who had been displaced in the 2020 wildfires that impacted Talent and Phoenix. Many were still living in temporary situations.

We also had a list serve that was specific to subscribers for this work.

On our website, you can find this info:

#### Community Engagement

To help implement SB 762, DLCD staff convened a Wildfire Adapted Communities Stakeholder Group to assist the department in identifying issues and provide input on recommendations. The Stakeholder Group included members from across Oregon representing a broad spectrum of interests and organizations as well as individuals from fire affected communities and underrepresented groups. See the [Wildfire Adapted Communities Stakeholder Group Member List](#). Community listening sessions, an online open house, surveys, a Latino community focus group, and other methods of engaging Oregonians and federally recognized Tribes also informed the recommendations report. View the [Community and Stakeholder Engagement Summary](#).

To create an inclusive Stakeholder group, staff used US Census Data to create an overall picture of Oregon demographics and sought, to the extent we were able, to emulate that distribution with a broadly representative stakeholder group. The problem was the hired lobbyists requested/demanded to be included in the group and then dominated the conversation and shut people down almost entirely after the first meeting. It was a shame. If we'd had greater capacity, it would have been more beneficial to have separate conversations for those with access to and familiarity with traditional power structures. Alas, as you know with SB 762, timelines were tight.

FWIW, here is the language we use when attempting to recruit, include and prioritize traditionally marginalized, under-represented and under-served communities. We then ask applicants to voluntarily provide their demographic information. I can provide you with the demographics questions we use if you are interested.

“DLCD and LCDC are striving to ensure the CIAC reflects the demographics (income, age, ability, race, and ethnicity) of Oregonians as a whole. The agency has defined these priority populations for recruitment for the CIAC:

- Black/ African American
- Native American/ Native Alaskan
- Latino/Latina/Latinx
- Asian and Pacific Islander
- People with Limited English Proficiency
- People Living with Disabilities
- People Experiencing Homelessness
- Low Income Oregonians
- Renters

- Youth (Under 25)

Sadie Carney

Policy Analyst & Communications Manager | Director's Office

Pronouns: she/her

Cell: 503-383-6648 | Main: 503-373-0050

[sadie.carney@dlcd.oregon.gov](mailto:sadie.carney@dlcd.oregon.gov) | [www.oregon.gov/LCD](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD)

Happy to answer other questions. Hope this helps.

**Attendance:**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Present</b>
Mark Henkels	
Ginger Richardson	X
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	X
Louisa Shelby	X
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

**Notes:**

- Sara (Equity and Inclusion director from the County) will look at the Land Use Acknowledgement drafts and help create one for the report and for the County website.
  - NOTE: Mary and Louisa would also like her to look at their outreach materials.
- Sam put in the current version of the history (so Ginger’s track changes). We will not have time for Mark and Marge to respond before Wednesday, so the track changes version is what will be in the WG report (Draft 3) when it is sent out Wednesday. Mark and Marge will respond to Ginger’s edits, and then the subcommittee as whole will track change (a.k.a. - Mary and Louisa).
- Sam added the intro, conclusion, and updates to the recommendations table in the Sub E report to match the changes Mary and Louisa made since the 19<sup>th</sup>.
- The Appendix of the WG report will have the subcommittee’s full report in it.
  - Hence the text “The full Subcommittees Report can be found linked [here](#), and in Section 5 of Appendix C
- Concerning the orange flow chart Ginger made, Marge is concerned that “zooming in” on this one section of the history gives it disproportionate emphasis compared to other parts of the history. – Solution to this conversation found in Next Steps/Action Items.
- Some wording Ginger would like to change in the timeline text is, 1) make the language around the “largest fire” in OR history consistent with the language used in the narrative part of the history, 2) change the verb “doubles” in the 2017 timeline text to “rose” for mathematical accuracy (or use the exact percentage), and 3) for the 1980s timeline text try to get the names of the specific Counties for additional detail.
  - Sam notes this information may be available in the Legal Sub’s documents.
- The School House photo should be added to the narrative history section for additional detail and to break up the text.
- A map may also be added, but the CUP subcommittee is already including several maps, so we will need to look into this more.

## Next Steps/Action Items:

### Community Education Section

- **Mary and Louisa** will condense the current introduction to shorter version that will go at the start of Sub E's section in the body of the WG report. The current introduction will be used in full as the introduction to the Sub E report, which will be located in the WG report appendix.
- **Sara** will look at the Sub E report.
- **Mary and Louisa** will talk to **Ginger** about tours and other connectivity on Republic's end.

### History Section

- **Ginger** will update the green timeline graphic to include 1) all of the text in the written timeline not already included, 2) her comments on additions from her track changes, and 3) a condensed version of the last few boxes of the orange flow chart she made.
  - She will then remove the written timeline as will no longer be needed.
- **Ginger** will also turn the text from the first part of the orange flow chart document into sentences, and add them to their corresponding section on the written history narrative.
- **Marge** will bring Mark up to date on from this meeting.
- **Mark and Marge** will see if they can find the specific Counties referenced in the 1980s timeline bullet/text.
  - Sam notes this information may be available in the Legal Sub's documents.



## Next Meeting:

- Wednesday, February 1<sup>st</sup>, from 5:30 to 6:45 PM.

## Meeting #8 – 2/1/23

### Agenda:

- 1) Welcome
- 2) “Getting our bearings.”
  - a. Reminder of where we are in WG the process. (See below.)
- 3) How to get source documents to each other to help with confusion.
  - a. Sam can set up a drop box.
  - b. Other ideas?
- 4) Louisa’s postcard
  - a. Update from Cory: He is still trying to follow up with the group on advertising if not a mailer to help promote the final report and survey possibly with an open house. He will discuss with leadership if that is still what the group recommends.
- 5) Landfill Mascot Discussion
- 6) Open House and Survey Discussion
- 7) Go over the edits made with each section.
- 8) Assign “Next Steps”
- 9) Schedule next meeting
- 10) Adjourn



Today

1/30/2023	1/31/2023	2/1/2023	2/2/2023	2/3/2023	2/4/2023	2/5/2023
SWAC/DSAC & PC give D3 feedback						
Subs Meet X2 to refine D3						
Sub E & FAC to Ex Sum						
2/6/2023	2/7/2023	2/8/2023	2/9/2023	2/10/2023	2/11/2023	2/12/2023
SWAC/DSAC & PC give D3 feedback						
Subs Meet X2 to refine D3						
Sub E & FAC to Ex Sum						
				SWAC & PC D3 Feedback to FAC		
2/13/2023	2/14/2023	2/15/2023	2/16/2023	2/17/2023	2/18/2023	2/19/2023
Subs Meet X2 to refine D3				WG Members Rev. D4		
Sub E & FAC to Ex Sum						
		Sub Feedback DUE		FAC sends D4 to WG		
FAC Compiles D4						
2/20/2023	2/21/2023	2/22/2023	2/23/2023	2/24/2023	2/25/2023	2/26/2023
WG Members Rev. D4			WG Meeting 8	Informal WG & Public Polling		
			Rev. PC, SWAC & Subs' responses and suggested changes at meeting			
Subs Meet for "Last Call"						
Add Public Involvement & Polling Info						
2/27/2023	2/28/2023	3/1/2023	3/2/2023	3/3/2023	3/4/2023	3/5/2023
Informal WG & Public Polling						
Subs Meet for "Last Call"						
Add Public Involvement & Polling Info						
		Polling Due				
3/6/2023	3/7/2023	3/8/2023	3/9/2023	3/10/2023	3/11/2023	3/12/2023
FAC complies D5					WG Members Rev. D4	
Subs Meet for "Last Call"				FAC Sends D5 to WG		
Add Public Involvement & Polling Info						
3/13/2023	3/14/2023	3/15/2023	3/16/2023	3/17/2023	3/18/2023	3/19/2023
WG Members Rev. D4			WG Meeting 9	Interested Members Draft Personal Statements		
			Official Polling & Finalize Report at M9	FAC updates D5 w/ Sub E Rev.		
Subs Consulted as Needed						
3/20/2023	3/21/2023	3/22/2023	3/23/2023	3/24/2023	3/25/2023	3/26/2023
Interested Members Draft Personal Statements				Final Report to Board		
FAC updates Final Draft w/ Sub E Rev.						
Subs Consulted as Needed						
	Member Statements Due					
3/27/2023	3/28/2023	3/29/2023	3/30/2023			
	? BCTT Presentation to Board					

**Attendance:**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Present</b>
Mark Henkels	X
Ginger Richardson	X
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	X
Louisa Shelby	X
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

**Notes:**

- **Conversation around Original Sources:**
  - Mark and Marge will look at Gingers edits and see if they have any questions and they will reach out to ginger. The issue had basically been resolved.
- **Update from Cory:**
  - There is budget from outreach, he is just waiting for confirmation on if there's the 11,000 to do mailers. If there isn't money for mailers there will be for other advertising options, which have been discussed previously.
- **Mascot:**
  - Most of the subcommittee members are not interested in the mascot idea, and even if they were it seems more like something that would fit the SMMP then the landfill itself.
- **Survey & Open House:**
  - Sam provides an overview of what the survey and open house can look like.
    - Doing a survey will be a lot of work for members who are already very tired, but it does let the public address and make comments directly to the WG.
  - The next opportunity for a media blast would be around February 23rd when the work group meets, they could do a blast then about the survey going live on Monday the upcoming opportunity to give live feedback with an open house.
  - Open House:
    - The group agrees that doing one open house that we have had time to do significant advertising about would be the best course of action. However, given that not everyone can easily schedule for one time window, potentially doing two, one in the evening during the week and went on a weekend, would be ideal.
  - Survey:
    - The survey should be simplistic and very straightforward. Subcommittee agrees it should definitely not be the full 100 plus findings and

recommendations I will be in reports. At the most, a simplified version of each subcommittee's recommendations can only be included in the survey.

- There will be continued discussion of this next subcommittee meeting.
- **Community Outreach Report/Mary and Louisa Section:**
  - Mary and Louisa would like the group to go through and edit their product. Things like, ways to simplify phrasing, things to cut, and making sure nothing is missing are the priorities, are all emphasized.
  - Ginger, Mark, Marge, and Corey all agree that what Mary and Lisa have produced is a great product and they are all generally pleased with it.
  - By Saturday at noon, mark, marge, and ginger will change and or comment Mary and Louise's document and send it to them. Mary and Louisa will then incorporate these comments and produce the final version of their product.
- **History Section:**
  - Ginger reviews her response to Mark and Marge's comments on the history document, as well as makes a few notes about the comments Mary provided.
  - Most of the issues have been resolved, or would need very minor changes that Mark and Marge will address before the next subcommittee meeting.
  - Note. The section that had previously been moved from the beginning to the body of the report, as Ginger didn't like leading the history section with it, could be moved to be a part of an introduction / "why you should care enough to read this history" section at the beginning of the history pages in the WG report.
    - Potential language for this section: Currently part of the beginning of the history document reads, this report has three purposes. The wording could be changed to "in order to appreciate the cup, SMMP, [work done by other subcommittees] you first need to understand [the three purposes]. This would motivate people to read the history in order to understand the rest of the report.
- **Land Use Acknowledgement:**
  - The Equity and Inclusion director from the County created a final version of the acknowledgement. This item is now completed and finalized.
- Sam introduced the idea of taking the current history document and moving some of the details within the narrative piece to footnotes.
  - All the text currently within the document would be the same. The only difference would be instead, for example, the current discussion of the First Peoples would be edited to a sentence or two in the body of the history narrative. The full discussion would then be inserted into a footnote for people to read if interested. This would make the "body" of the history shorter while still ensuring all the material currently in the history is still present.
  - Marge says she will tell Mark about this idea and a group will discuss more at the next sub community meeting.

### Next Steps / Action Items:

- **Sam / Amelia** will send out the current version of Mary and Louisa’s document and the history document with Mark, Marge, Ginger, and Mary’s edits. These will be the documents people will work from.
- **Mark, Marge, and Ginger** will change and/or comment on Mary and Louise’s document and send them the changes by noon on Saturday, February 11<sup>th</sup>.
- **Mary and Louisa** will then incorporate these comments and produce the final version of their product and send it to the subcommittee before our next meeting, 5:00 to 6:30 on Monday, February 13<sup>th</sup>.
- **Marge** will tell Mark about the footnote idea, and we will discuss more at the next subcommittee meeting.
- **Marge and Mark** will address the edits made by Ginger and Mary. They will then send the new document to the subcommittee before our next meeting, 5:00 to 6:30 on Monday, February 13<sup>th</sup>.
  - This version of the history will then be available to the full subcommittee to edit.
- **Mark and Marge** will also look at the “Key Points” and the green graphic timeline to ensure it is accurate and up to date.

### Meeting #9 – 2/13/23

#### Agenda:

- 1) Welcome
- 2) Open House and Survey Discussion
- 3) Someone from the workgroup being at the sustainability event?
- 4) Go over Mary and Louisa’s document with Ginger, Mark, and Marge’s feedback.
  - a. Check footnotes are correct.
- 5) History Discussion
  - a. Footnotes idea?
  - b. Remaining Ginger and Mary comments (ones not addressed since the last meeting)
  - c. Has the “Key Points” and graphic been updated?
- 6) Assign “Next Steps”
- 7) Schedule next meeting
- 8) Adjourn

#### Attendance:

Member	Present
Mark Henkels	X
Ginger Richardson	X
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	X
Louisa Shelby	



Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

**Notes:**

- **Mailer/Outreach Update from Cory:**
  - It's around 11 to 12 thousand to do the mailers, so if we are to do them we could still do additional advertising, but probably wouldn't be able to afford a heading in the Gazette Times, running commercials, or doing mid-valley radio.
  - It's about \$1,000 to do just digital ads, and about 6 to 7,000 to do a full media push without mailers.
    - (Side Note: the county is currently having problems with being blocked on some sites.)
  - The justice department went all out for the media for their past event, and they had excellent turnout. Around 300 people.
  - While we didn't collect data on the demographics of people there or how they learned about the event, they did collect data on the format of the event, which was exceedingly positive.
  - Mary and Louise like the idea of doing a Mailer and social media ads in order to cover the most demographics.
- **Sustainability Personal?**
  - It is too close to the final report being publish, and BCTT members are stretched very thin. In addition, you need to already be an established member of the sustainability group to participate.
- **Open House & Survey Update from Sam:**
  - The Open House
    - Will be week of Feb 27<sup>th</sup>.
    - 3h including a break.
    - On Zoom
    - Have a balance of 2 subcommittee members for each sub.
    - Sam will initiate, moderate, and walk through the work as it appears in the report.
    - Each sub will have about 20 minutes to facilitate their discussion.
    - The purpose is for the public to have a change to ask questions before they do the survey.
  - Survey
    - The goal is to have it completed/ due March 6<sup>th</sup>, and it will be attached to the back of the final WG report.

- Will only have questions about the *recommendations* from each Sub, not findings.
  - Potential question format: “Are there any facts you are aware of that appear to be missing from this section?” “Are there any that are incorrect?”
  - FROM DISCUSSION: The end of the survey will have a space for any additional feedback. If people want to offer feedback on the History section, they can do so here. However, there will be no questions specifically about the History section.
- **CEO Discussion:**
  - We need to explicitly charge someone with the recommendations, with the task of notifying people about the CUP.
    - Mary and Louisa will put this in.
  - A few minor changes were made but it looks good overall.
  - Mary and/or Louisa will check the footnotes to make sure they are all there, attached to the correct sentences, and numbered correctly.
  - We will leave the formatting of the tables alone for now because the County is having a graphics person format the whole report later.
- **History Discussion:**
  - Mark and Marge do not want to use footnotes to simplify the main text of the history.
  - However, we will use footnotes instead of endnotes to cite sources.
  - The comments made by the group were either already resolved or were addressed together during the meeting.
  - Now that we are clear on the content, Ginger will update the green flowchart/graphic before Wednesday.
  - The two historic photos Marge found will be added to the corresponding history sections, and Ginger will find an available photo of the schoolhouse, and a current and representative photo of the landfill, to also be included.

#### Next Steps / Action Items:

- **By Wednesday!!!**
  - EVERYONE!!!
    - Please look over Joel’s document and email the subcommittee if there is anything you would like to address and/or add, particularly to the History section. We will discuss this together at the next Sub Meeting.
      - Pages 1 – 11 is Joel’s feedback on the History section.
      - Page 33 have one piece of feedback for the CEO recommendations.
  - Mary & Louisa
    - Add a new recommendation above the tables that explicitly charges someone with the recommendations (the task of notifying people about the CUP, etc.) This needs to be placed in the first 7 pages of the

document (the part that will go in the body of the WG report), and in the full Sub E report (which will be in the appendix of the full WG report.)

- Check the footnotes to make sure they are all there, attached to the correct sentences, and numbered correctly.
- Ginger
  - Updated the green flowchart/graphic.
  - Find an available photo of the schoolhouse, and a current and representative photo of the landfill, to also be included.

### Meeting #10 – 2/20/23

#### Agenda:

- 1) Welcome
- 2) Discuss SWAC / Joel’s comments. – Mark’s 2/19 email
  - a. Document Linked [Here](#) (Exclusively Joel’s comments can be found [Here](#))
- 3) Please review the Planning Commission’s feedback for discussion next Sub Meeting.
  - a. Document Linked [Here](#)
- 4) Check in on the Appendix section(s) of the Sub E report and if having postcards be part of almost every outreach recommendation is still our intent.
- 5) Plan what will be presented to the WG on the 23<sup>rd</sup>.
  - a. For the CEO material / Sub E Report
  - b. For the History Section
- 6) Schedule the next meeting
- 7) Adjourn

#### Attendance:

Member	Present
Mark Henkels	X
Ginger Richardson	X
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	
Louisa Shelby	X
Marge Popp	X
Mary Parmigiani	X
Staff: Amelia Webb	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

#### Notes:

- **History Document:**
  - We discussed the changes Mark & Marge would like to make based on SWAC/Joel’s feedback. This, and Ginger’s edits, are deemed acceptable and will

be integrated into the history. A few other edits were also discussed and approved, such as adding a note about wetlands and some language around Shemeka, etc.)

- **Planning Commission’s Feedback:**
  - We went over the Planning Commission’s feedback as a group. They had minimal notes for the history and CEO, and no edits to either document were deemed necessary.
- **Open House Clarification:**
  - Note of clarification from Sam – The open house Sub E has been planning will likely happen AFTER the Board is presented with the final WG report. The Virtual open house happening before that is an opportunity for the public to ask questions before they complete the “public input survey.”
- **CEO Document:**
  - There appeared to be an error in creating the most current version of this document, as the one sent out before the meeting was missing some of Ginger and Louisa’s edits, but not all. The out-of-date information was identified to be fixed by staff.

#### **Next Steps / Action Items:**

- **Staff:**
  - Send out the current version of History (copy w/ updated green graphic and images) for Mark and Marge to work on.
  - Fix the CEO document and send it out for Ginger, Mary, and Louisa to work on.
- **Mark & Marge:**
  - Update the history document with the changes discussed above.
- **Ginger:**
  - Review the fixed version of CEO document for any remaining errors or changes.
- **Mary & Louisa:**
  - Review the fixed version of CEO document for any remaining errors or changes, paying special attention to the footnotes!

#### **Meeting #11 – 2/27/23**

#### **Agenda:**

- 1) Welcome
- 2) Review the updated History.
  - a. (Mark & Marge’s edits in response to SWAC/Joel, Ginger’s edits, Shemeka, etc.)
- 3) Review the updated CEO Report
  - a. Mary & Louisa did read-through for consistency and checking footnotes.
- 4) Discuss any updates that need to be made based on WG M8
- 5) Discuss “Next Steps.”
- 6) Schedule the next meeting
- 7) Adjourn

**Attendance:**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Present</b>
Mark Henkels	
Ginger Richardson	
JonnaVe Stokes/Cory Grogan	
Louisa Shelby	
Marge Popp	
Mary Parmigiani	
Staff: Amelia Webb	
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	
<b>Observers:</b>	

**Notes:**

**Next Steps / Action Items:**

DRAFT