



# Recycling Steering Committee

Modernizing Oregon's recycling system with support from Oregon Consensus

## Recycling Steering Committee Meeting

### AGENDA

**November 20, 2019, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.**

ODOT 123 NW Flanders St, Conference Room A/B, Portland, OR

**Join Zoom Meeting:** <https://zoom.us/j/2348602747>

Dial: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: **234 860 2747**

**Meeting Purpose:** Familiarize the SC with the work of the Infrastructure research effort; determine needs and questions from the broader stakeholder community; and confirm the course for the next few months of work.

**10:00 a.m. Welcome, Introductions, Housekeeping, Frame for the Day**

**10:15 a.m. Infrastructure Research and Subcommittee:** Brian Stafki (DEQ), Subcommittee Chair

*Objective: Steering Committee members understand the process and products of the updated infrastructure research approach and provide feedback on scenario building and evaluation tasks, and possibly gap analysis.*

- Big picture plan for research
- Subcommittee process and products to date
- Review and feedback on scenario building and criteria for evaluation (Tasks 5 & 6); tentative review and feedback on gap analysis (Task 7)

**11:15 a.m. Break to get lunch**

**11:45 a.m. (Working Lunch) Stakeholder Engagement:**

*Objective: The Steering Committee approves the revised Stakeholder Engagement Plan; provides feedback and confirms the general concept for January 31 info session to inform extended Stakeholders in the Frameworks building/review process; confirms January 31 event 'promotion' expectations for DEQ and the SC; and discusses other engagement opportunities being developed.*

- Review and approval of revised Stakeholder Engagement Plan – Amy Roth (AOR) and Sanne Stienstra (DEQ), Subcommittee Chairs
- January 31 Frameworks Info Session Planning – OC, DEQ
  - Review and provide input on draft meeting purpose and outline – David Allaway and Robin Harkless
  - Identify outreach steps – Sanne Stienstra
- Additional stakeholder engagement beyond January 3 – Amy Roth and Sanne
  - Subcommittee Chairs will share a proposal for a 1/31 follow-up survey and engaging additional/underrepresented stakeholders

**1:00 p.m.      Break**

**1:15 p.m.      Public Comment**

**1:30 p.m.      Wrap Up / Next Steps**

*Objective: Steering Committee members review updated Steering Committee Road Map and meeting schedule; members have heard quick highlights from parallel near-term efforts; action items out of today's session are determined.*

- Action Items identified today – Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus
- Steering Committee work plan and schedule of meetings; special focus on upcoming December meetings – David Allaway, Oregon DEQ
- Highlights from Near-Term efforts: Recycling Markets Stakeholder Group, Communications Workgroup and other groups

**2:00 p.m.      Adjourn**

## Recycling System Steering Committee Meeting Summary

### ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft meeting summary to SC members</li> </ul>	OC	12/2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RSC members to provide feedback on Infrastructure Research approach to Tasks 5 and 6, and draft criteria for evaluation</li> </ul>	ALL	Completed (11/22)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee to develop a January 31st engagement kit for satellite events.</li> </ul>	Co-chairs Sanne Stienstra (DEQ) and Amy Roth (AOR)	Prior to January 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee to draft post-information session questionnaire for RSC input.</li> </ul>	Co-chairs Sanne Stienstra (DEQ) and Amy Roth (AOR)	TBD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share PPT presentations from today's meeting</li> </ul>	DEQ	Completed (11/21)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider and provide opportunity for SC members to familiarize with the Waste Impact Calculator</li> </ul>	DEQ	TBD

### Meeting Attendees:

*Steering Committee Members:* Dylan de Thomas, Sarah Grimm, Nicole Janssen, Scott Keller, Laura Leebrick, Kristan Mitchell, Jeff Murray, Pam Peck, David Allaway, Amy Roth, Timm Schimke, Jay Simmons, Jason Hudson, Matt Stern (on phone), and Bruce Walker.

*Facilitation Team:* Robin Harkless and Amy Delahanty

*DEQ Staff:* Lydia Emer, Sanne Stienstra, Justin Gast, Peter Spendelow, Brian Stafki

### MEETING SUMMARY:

#### Welcome and Agenda Review

Facilitator Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and Recycling Steering Committee (RSC) members provided brief introductions. Robin reminded the audience and others that the RSC meetings are the anchor points for the work that has evolved in

subcommittee meetings and through research, and serves to ground members in the process and set the next phases forward. She noted that while RSC members will not be negotiating around substantive topics during this meeting, they will familiarize themselves with the work of the Infrastructure and Stakeholder subcommittee efforts, and confirm the RSC's work in the coming months.

Robin then highlighted that the Oregon Consensus (OC) facilitation team has been working with DEQ to assist in organizing the effort and helping the Agency prepare to guide the project forward. She emphasized, however, that OC works on behalf of the full Steering Committee to support them in effective collaborative engagement. OC will be reaching out to RSC members in December to check in on the process, and invited SC members to contact the facilitation team with any process questions or concerns along the way.

### **Infrastructure Research and Subcommittee**

Brian Stafki (DEQ) provided RSC members a review of the process and products of the contracted (by Cascadia Consulting) infrastructure research approach to date. The general timeline of tasks for the research were generally as follows:

- Tasks 1 and 2: Collection and processing case study research — Tasks are underway. Will look into dual-stream collection and dual and single-stream processing. Preliminary results to be shared at **January 17th** RSC meeting.
- Task 3: Education/compliance research literature review — parallel process, will feed into results during scenario development. Results expected in **February/March 2020**.
- Task 4: Baseline system cost and material modeling — **Early 2020**
- Task 5-6: Scenario building. Assuming contract amendment can be completed, first round will begin in **February**. Second round expected to occur **April/May**.

There was a question from an RSC member regarding how the research will calculate the baseline system cost (Task 4). Brian shared the contractors will conduct confidential information requests through interviews and/or surveys to gather as much information from Oregon players as possible; and use this data to develop a statewide model of the costs, quantity and quality of recycling, along with environmental outcomes/impacts.

### ***Task 5 Review - Scenario Development Tasks and Timeline***

Brian Stafki provided an overview of the scenario development and evaluation approach with the RSC and said this approach was first approved by the subcommittee at its November 4th meeting, and is being presented to the RSC for any additional input. Scenario development will be conducted in two rounds. For the first round (Task 5) Cascadia will use input from RSC members at the January 17th RSC meeting to identify desired elements, including the foundational research from previous tasks and other known elements to develop and evaluate

several scenarios. Cascadia will then develop up to five scenarios and conduct an evaluation of each against the current baseline (Task 4) using established criteria. RSC members will confirm the five scenarios at a meeting tentatively planned for late February before Cascadia conducts their evaluation. This evaluation will then be presented to the Steering Committee for their input. The results from the first round of scenario development will inform a second round (Task 6), which will be a similar, second iterative approach, resulting in three new scenarios being built for evaluation and potential modifications of the previous five scenarios.

David Allaway, DEQ, briefly expanded upon the proposed approach to modeling the infrastructure cost and material baseline. David reiterated this task will involve the development of a statewide model of the costs, quantity, and quality of recycling, along with environmental outcomes. David stated to obtain cost information about the baseline, DEQ will be relying on the Cascadia consulting team. The consultants will reach out to a number of RSC members, including local jurisdictions, processors, and MRFs, to conduct individual interviews. DEQ hopes to have the model as thorough as possible, and to that end, shared Cascadia has agreed they will not share sensitive information directly with DEQ, but rather will hold information in aggregate form. Additionally, Cascadia will use non-disclosure agreements with individual companies when conducting interviews. David noted that there may be a need for a small group of RSC members to outline the types of questions that could be asked to make sure the researchers are successful in collecting sensitive data.

- *Question:* Does the research on costs include costs to the haulers and processors? Will you be measuring the costs in different areas?
  - *DEQ Response:* Regarding measuring costs in different areas, Washington State built out a similar model, which includes a model of material flows of each and every city in the state. They advised us not to replicate that effort, as it was a massive undertaking. For Oregon’s infrastructure research, it will be four groupings across the state. This will be easier to pull off, but the model will not be surgically precise, it will be directionally correct.
  - *DEQ Response:* Costs will be reflected as a range. Costs to processors to clean materials for market would also be included.

### ***Feedback on the Draft Evaluation Criteria***

Brian Stafki reviewed the proposed draft evaluation criteria with the group. He shared the draft criteria that will be used for scenario evaluation and compared against the baseline or “base-case” modeling (Task 4). DEQ will share the feedback on the draft evaluation criteria with Cascadia who will have to determine the feasibility of describing or measuring a particular criteria. Again, this will be a blended qualitative and quantitative analysis.

- *Question:* Will Cascadia weight the criteria?
  - *DEQ Response:* Cascadia will not be applying specific weight factors. That will be the role of RSC members during deliberations.
- *RSC Comment:* We know from the Metro multifamily study that multifamily units don't have adequate garbage or recycling e.g. bulky waste is an issue. Will that piece of contamination be researched, which is more about the system than education?
  - *DEQ Response:* Possibly. At a minimum we will be able to point to other research that has been conducted, or other consumer-facing interventions in the literature review.
  - *RSC Member response:* Should we ask Cascadia to consider a multifamily multi-tenant scenario? DEQ noted this suggestion and said they will reflect on it. It was also clarified that the scenarios will show distinctions between singlefamily, multi-family and commercial.
- How will DEQ measure environmental outcomes?
  - *DEQ Response:* David briefly reviewed the proposed approach for monetizing environmental benefits. David offered that the evaluation of the estimated environmental impacts will be in addition to modeling traditional transactional costs. He noted DEQ's new Waste Impact Calculator – which is currently under development - will be used to evaluate and quantify environmental impacts, which will translate material flows into environmental outcomes. The outcomes will then be translated into a dollar amount — monetized — possibly using factors provided by the consultancy TruCost, and the monetized social costs would then be considered with the transactional costs. The research will try to get directionality that will help the group answer important public policy questions.
    - *Follow-up Question:* Will the Waste Impact Calculator be available to the RSC?
      - *Response:* Yes, that's our intent. DEQ will follow up with an opportunity for SC members to become familiar with this tool.
    - *Concern about measuring social impacts and potential for controversy.*
      - *Response:* There's a tremendous amount of work done on these sorts of studies. EPA and other federal regulatory agencies in their environmental impacts work are required to do a cost benefit analysis. Having said that, there is significant uncertainty and potential for controversy in these numbers. DEQ will likely present the results as a range to give some indication of degree of uncertainty.
  - *Comment:* As we think about the criteria, there are different answers for single-family residential, multi-family, and commercial. Having a lens of the three sectors, or differences to how they would be applied in the system, would be important.

Regarding the definition of stranded assets and how it would be addressed and defined in the research, David confirmed that to quantify stranded assets for different scenarios would require an inventory of assets, which is not being undertaken. Instead, this criteria will be described

qualitatively as “the potential for stranded assets.” It was suggested that a small group of owners and operators could help to define “potential for stranded assets,” and ask Cascadia whether they could measure those impacts. During the conversation, it was highlighted these conversations may have a chilling effect on infrastructure investment. David acknowledged the concern and noted the RSC will aim to move swiftly through this research. He stated at this juncture, the research will not be making assumptions about who will make changes (who’s assets might be stranded). When the RSC coalesces around a preferred scenario, there will be a gap analysis to figure out how long it will take and how much money that might cost.

- **ACTION ITEM:** RSC members to provide feedback on Tasks 5, 6, and draft criteria by November 22nd.

## **Stakeholder Engagement**

### ***Stakeholder Engagement Plan***

Sanne Stienstra, DEQ, provided a brief overview of the updated changes to the revised Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Updates to the plan included:

- The document now reflects DEQ’s new involvement, which includes additional staff capacity.
- The Plan is oriented towards the January 31<sup>st</sup> Stakeholder session.
- There was clarification and refinement to engagement methods and activities. This includes engaging underrepresented stakeholders.
- The Plan provides clarity regarding Subcommittee member and DEQ staff roles.

There was a question whether the Committee will morph into something different after January 31st. DEQ stated the group should discuss this during implementation planning phase at the end of the process. Following this, Robin paused for a consensus check to approve the revised Stakeholder Engagement Plan and related activities. RSC members agreed they would like to hear the related activities in more depth prior to their approval.

### ***January 31st Meeting Agenda Review***

David reviewed the proposed agenda and objectives for the January 31st Stakeholder meeting, which were:

- Broad stakeholder review of five scenarios
- Steering Committee members and stakeholders to ask questions about the scenarios
- Record initial reactions and additional questions
- Set in motion in-depth stakeholder engagement and deliberations

Proposed Agenda:

- Information Session: 9 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
- RSC Additional Q&A and Debrief Meeting: 12:30 to 2:30 p.m.

David emphasized the RSC will not be deliberating during the information session, as deliberations and consensus seeking regarding the framework scenarios will occur on March 18th. The Stakeholder Session will be a chance for RSC members and broader stakeholder groups to review in detail the scenarios together, and set in motion RSC member's work with its constituencies. There was a concern about the timeline and doing too much within a short window of time. David stated there will be time set aside on January 17<sup>th</sup> for the RSC to continue this conversation. He requested OC to bring forth a proposal for soft consensus seeking /a temperature check of the draft scenarios in advance of the March 18<sup>th</sup> consensus-seeking meeting. He noted that at that point, the RSC will know what the five scenarios are and would have the benefit of that month to digest the information. Other RSC members agreed it was important to keep pushing forward and stay on a firm timeline.

David shared after the information session there will be a post-session survey that will go out to all the participants. The survey will be collected by the Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee and filter the results by constituencies and send to the corresponding RSC member to aid their deliberations. The reflections shared in the room will be synthesized by the OC facilitation team and shared with the SC at the afternoon session. One RSC member shared they will be hosting a satellite event and requested the Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee provide an engagement kit to collect input.

**ACTION ITEM:** Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee will develop a January 31st engagement kit for satellite events.

### *Post-Info Session Survey*

Questions were surfaced regarding the online survey and types of questions that would be asked. DEQ shared the general concept for the survey would include questions around tradeoffs and desired functions. Several RSC members cautioned DEQ and the Stakeholder Engagement subcommittee about how the questions are phrased and how it will be used for deliberations. It was **suggested and agreed** RSC members will have an opportunity to provide input on the draft survey via email, as well as attend the Stakeholder Subcommittee meetings to provide input. It was **agreed** the final survey would undergo a quality check review by DEQ staff with survey design expertise before considered final.

### *Underrepresented Stakeholder Engagement*

Amy Roth (AOR) and Sanne Stienstra reviewed the Underrepresented Stakeholder Engagement proposal with the group. Sanne shared the purpose of the effort would be to incorporate the



views of recycling system stakeholders who are currently underrepresented in the project to modernize

Oregon's recycling system through a series of 4-6 listening sessions following the January 31st information session. Sanne noted these are stakeholders who:

- Have historically lacked access to recycling;
- Have been underrepresented in long-term planning efforts and policy decisions; and/or:
- Are members of a relevant sector or group that does not have a representative on the Recycling Steering Committee

Examples of groups to engage would be:

- Recycling system stewards – such as: Master Recyclers, college students involved with sustainability programs
- Organizations that can represent system users with access barriers (income, geography, or language) – such as: Master Recyclers of color, Trash for Peace, Centro Cultural, Oregon Tradeswomen
- Environmental organizations – such as: Oregon Conservation Network members
- Sort line workers (i.e. workforce interests)

The Committee was then invited to provide any feedback or suggestions. Committee members asked about engaging packaging/branding and retailers, plastics sort line workers, or Washington and California counterparts. It was noted packaging and retailers already have established political capital and/or power, and the purpose of the engagement would be those groups who do not have access to those resources or channels. DEQ noted they have regular scheduled calls with CalRecycle and Washington Department of Ecology. After a brief discussion about sort line workers and some suggestions that members of the SC who are employers would be responsible for gathering and representing those voices, there was a **suggestion and agreement** to broaden the category to “workforce interests.” **It was also agreed** to put Recycling system stewards and environmental organizations as a lower priority than the other categories. DEQ acknowledged there will be a longer-term commitment to engagement with the aforementioned groups, with opportunities during implementation. Sanne then shared next steps will be for DEQ to engage a contractor to assist in the listening session process design, including assistance in drafting questions for meaningful input.

**AGREEMENT:** SC members approved by consensus the revised Stakeholder Engagement Plan and related activities.

**Next Steps & Timeline**

David Allaway reviewed the updated Steering Committee Road Map, parallel near-term efforts, and other key dates for RSC members. (*See PPT for additional details.*)

**\*Facilitator's note:** As a reminder, key dates and project next steps are generally as follows:

**November**

- Frameworks summaries and evaluation matrices sent to RSC
- Future RSC dates Doodle polls will be circulated

**December**

- Review summaries and draft framework scenarios
- January 31st invites are sent
- Feedback on infrastructure study design: review of infrastructure research plans (T3/T4)
- January 31st engagement survey

**January**

- Framework scenarios information session
- Review infrastructure case studies, review scenarios

**February**

- Stakeholder engagement
- Infrastructure preliminary results and scenarios for evaluation are confirmed
- Base case modeling continues

**March 18th**

- Framework coalescing
- Stakeholder engagement

**April-June**

- Base case results
- Evaluate infrastructure scenarios; develop preferred infrastructure scenario
- Integration of legal/relational and infrastructure scenarios

**Summer**

- Implementation planning and report review

Following this, the meeting was **adjourned at 2:00 p.m.**

## **Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the Recycling Steering Committee – UPDATED**

DRAFT 3 | November 5, 2019

### **PURPOSE STATEMENT**

The stakeholder engagement subcommittee (SES) will assist the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the Recycling Steering Committee (RSC) with planning and facilitating stakeholder<sup>1</sup> engagement through the various stages of the RSC process. This plan aims to create pathways for recycling system stakeholders, elected officials, and governments to stay apprised of the RSC's work and create targeted opportunities for them to give input during the process and inform RSC deliberations and decision-making.

### **KEY OBJECTIVES**

Key objectives of the stakeholder engagement plan include:

- Develop a stakeholder engagement process that allows for effective and meaningful engagement and gathers input that may inform RSC decision-making
- Build mutually respectful, beneficial and lasting partnerships between DEQ, the RSC and their stakeholders
- Foster stakeholder trust in the RSC process
- Provide clear and consistent communications
- Incorporate life cycle thinking and goals of the 2050 Vision into recycling system communications
- Use a “no surprises” approach to avoid unintended conflicts and increase transparency and accountability

### **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- *DEQ*: Convene and lead process; co-chair the subcommittee; support with staff and drafting materials; coordinating with DEQ communications office
- *Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee (SES)*: Advise and support DEQ and the RSC in creating plans and materials for stakeholder engagement
- *Association of Oregon Recyclers (AOR)*: Co-chair the subcommittee
- *Recycling Steering Committee (RSC)*: Direct and advise entire process to modernize Oregon's recycling system; approve plans and provide input on materials for stakeholder engagement proposed by SES; implement stakeholder engagement according to approved plans and procedures
- *Oregon Consensus (OC)*: Support SES meeting facilitation and planning as needed

---

<sup>1</sup> “Stakeholders” are: individuals, groups, or organizations that are impacted by the outcome of a project. They have an interest in the success of a project, and can be within or outside the organization that is sponsoring the project. (Source: projectmanager.com)

## PRIMARY ACTIVITIES

- 1. Develop key stakeholder contact list.** Support RSC members in developing a contact list of priority groups and stakeholders, and identify the RSC or DEQ liaison to serve as the appropriate point of contact. This liaison will be responsible for furthering the relationships and providing consistent communication between groups. DEQ will maintain the stakeholder contact list.
  
- 2. Develop supporting outreach materials.** Develop background materials and other communications resources as needed to support RSC meetings and engagement with stakeholders. Materials may include:
  - Fact sheets
  - One-pagers based on interest group
  - PowerPoint presentations
  - FAQs
  - Message map
  - Web contentTopics or focus of materials may include:
  - Basics of current recycling system in Oregon
  - Basic fact sheet about RSC process
  - Timeline of process
  - Summary of frameworks research
  - Summary of infrastructure research
  - Explanation of RSC functions
  
- 3. Support stakeholder engagement for January 31, 2020 Frameworks info session and other stakeholder meetings as needed (TBD).** Develop materials for RSC members to use when inviting stakeholders to meeting(s), which may include an engagement timeline, email templates, background information on RSC project, registration methods, webinar information, and other items as needed. Support meeting planning by providing feedback and suggestions for meeting format and how to engage with stakeholders. Support may also include developing surveys, designing small group discussion activities, or other methods to gather meaningful feedback from attendees.
  
- 4. Gather feedback from recycling system stakeholders who are underrepresented in the RSC process.** Create methods for underrepresented stakeholders (not general public) to learn about the project and give their feedback to the RSC to consider during deliberations. For example, SES may create a proposal for engaging with such stakeholders on the trade-offs involved with different legal and relational framework scenarios.
  
- 5. Provide one-on-one support to RSC members as needed.** Provide additional resources and support to RSC members who may want it. This may involve additional meetings, presentations,

or communications materials depending on the stakeholders' needs.

- 6. Track stakeholder engagement and keep RSC informed.** Create a method for tracking RSC and DEQ stakeholder engagement and report back to the RSC.

## **POTENTIAL ENGAGEMENT METHODS**

The following engagement methods may be used during the stakeholder engagement process.

**Correspondence by phone/email/social media/interested parties listserv:** Disseminate project updates to stakeholders and interested public who sign up for the project listserv, which is administered by DEQ. Inform stakeholders about future RSC and subcommittee meetings.

**Website:** Oregon DEQ's website serves as the repository for all meetings materials, research deliverables, and other pertinent information for stakeholders. DEQ staff will maintain the website and make it accessible as possible.

**Stakeholder listening sessions:** Conduct listening sessions or focus groups with different stakeholders and/or in different regions of the state for key stakeholder groups to gather in person and to hear about the RSC process and provide their input to DEQ and the RSC.

**Surveys:** Gather opinions and views from individual stakeholders through survey(s) to provide opportunities to weigh in on policy questions posed by RSC members.

**Use [Plain Language](#).** Use language that is clear, concise, well-organized, and appropriate to the intended audience. Use plain language to ensure the reader understands as quickly, easily, and completely as possible.

**Offer opportunities for equitable participation.** Provide resources and/or services that encourage and facilitate meaningful participation and contribution from stakeholders. This may include, but is not limited to, providing stipends for participation; childcare; translation and/or interpretation services; plain language review; online meeting participation options and/or hosting meetings at different times of the day or in regions outside of the Portland-Metro area.

## **TIMELINE**

The following timeline includes high level tasks related to stakeholder engagement. The SES may create specific plans for individual engagement efforts listed here, in addition to this plan.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Sub-tasks</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
1. Develop stakeholder engagement subcommittee charter		SES; Approval from RSC	Done
2. Develop stakeholder engagement plan	Revise draft 04-2019 draft plan	DEQ staff	Oct-Nov 2019
	Review plan revision	SES	
	Seek approval from RSC	RSC	
3. Finalize key stakeholders contact list	Add detail to draft list	DEQ staff	Oct-Nov 2019
	Review and add final suggestions	SES	
	RSC members confirm which of their constituents they will invite directly	RSC	
4. Create outreach materials to support RSC with stakeholder engagement		SES and DEQ staff	Ongoing
5. Offer additional stakeholder engagement support to RSC members as needed		SES and DEQ staff	Ongoing
6. Support design and methods for gathering feedback at January 31 stakeholder info session	Brainstorm ideas for Jan. 31 info session	SES	Oct 2019
	Plan methods for gathering stakeholder input during/after meeting	DEQ staff	Oct-Nov 2019
	Review proposal and provide feedback	SES	Oct-Nov 2019
	Seek approval from RSC	RSC	Nov 2019
7. Support logistics for January 31 stakeholder meeting		DEQ staff	Nov 2019-Jan 2020
8. Create proposal for gathering feedback from underrepresented stakeholders	Create draft plan	DEQ staff	Oct-Nov 2019
	Review and provide initial feedback	SES	Oct-Nov 2019
	Review and approve concept (high level)	RSC	Nov 2019
	Continue to revise and finalize plan	DEQ, SES	Nov-Dec 2019
9. Support outreach and invitations for January 31 stakeholder meeting		DEQ staff	Dec 2019-Jan 2020

<b>Task</b>	<b>Sub-tasks</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
10. Implement plan for gathering feedback from underrepresented stakeholders (once approved)	Conduct listening sessions	DEQ staff, SES	Jan-March 2020
	Summarize feedback	DEQ staff, SES	March 2020
	Present to RSC	DEQ staff, SES	March 2020
11. Contribute to new stakeholder engagement plan for implementation phase of RSC process		SES, DEQ staff	Summer 2020