Framework Subcommittee Meeting,
6/11/19

Agenda

June 4, 2019
11 a.m.-1 p.m.
Location: Local Government Center (LOC), 1201 Court St NE, Salem, OR — 2nd floor, Shirley Kalkhoven Board Room
Conference call-in information: 1-888-585-9008 — conference room number: 200 729 387

10 a.m. Housekeeping, Frame for the Day

10:15 a.m. Framework development: proposed work plan through 2019
  ● OC will share a proposed approach for the group to build scenarios and through the SC, coalesce around a ‘preferred alternative’
  ● Check for agreement on approach

11 a.m. Final input on ‘scoping’ for contractor work
  ● Share themes from Gap analysis; what if anything more must be analyzed in this process given it is critical to high function and not currently being met in Oregon?
  ● Particular frameworks for study?

11:40 a.m. Wrap up/Next Steps
  ● Contractor selection update
  ● Subcommittee homework?
  ● Next meeting

12 p.m. Adjourn

Action item memo

Subcommittee members present: Kristan Mitchell, Pam Peck, Loretta Pickerell, Amy Roth, Kristin Leichner, Dave Larmouth, Sarah Grimm, Shannon Martin, and Michael Wisth

DEQ Staff: Justin Gast and Peter Spendelow

Members of the public: N/A

Facilitation team: Robin Harkless and Amy Delahanty

Action items:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>BY WHOM?</th>
<th>BY WHEN?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Select members of the research selection committee with a subgroup of the Frameworks Subcommittee.</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● DEQ to look into contractor capacity/requirements for socioeconomic analysis of scenarios</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>During RFP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● DEQ to investigate whether proposer frameworks are considered confidential.</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>During RFP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Determine when the Life Cycle Analysis work should be presented to the Steering Committee as an important measuring desired ‘function’</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Develop stakeholder outreach plans to integrate with frameworks effort</td>
<td>Pam Pack liaison with Engagement subcommittee</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Welcome & Meeting Purpose:** Robin welcomed the group and introductions were made. Robin shared the goals of the meeting were to: 1.) share themes from the Gap analysis exercise to help determine what if anything more must be analyzed by the subcommittee and contractor; 2.) share a proposed approach for the group to build scenarios, and through the SC, coalesce around a ‘preferred alternative’; and 3.) hear the contractor selection update.

**Proposed approach.** Robin shared a proposed frameworks scenario-building process similar to an analysis and decision making processes her team has worked with in NEPA planning efforts, as a way to simplify and organize the steps the group could take to build scenarios, analyze them and evolve them into a preferred framework. It is broken out into phases of work that include scoping, “alternative” building, analysis, and selection of a ‘preferred alternative’. Using this approach, she suggested the scoping effort is being completed via the SC development of desired functions, and the sub-committee’s gap analysis exercises. Robin shared the scoping info will guide the contractor’s development of the concepts into draft scenarios for the subcommittee and Steering Committee to analyze and evolve to a preferred. **The group generally agreed with the above process approach with no suggested comments or changes.**

Justin Gast (DEQ) provided a brief update of the frameworks research scope of work and provided further details on the above timeline and subcommittee activities. Justin noted as part of the RFP process, DEQ is requesting contractors propose ten frameworks they anticipate analyzing for this research. He shared this was in part to determine the breadth and scope of knowledge of the contractor about various recycling systems. He noted as detailed above in the approach, subcommittee members will be able to review the proposed frameworks and provide input on the methods for analysis. The researcher will then conduct its research and propose five, in-depth scenarios. Subcommittee and Steering Committee members will engage in a workshop session to review the five scenarios together and select one or two ‘preferred alternatives’ to modernize Oregon’s recycling system framework. In parallel with the frameworks research, DEQ will also be getting results in from the physical infrastructure. It’s expected the results
from the physical infrastructure would later overlay onto any further refinements of the ‘preferred alternative.’ The subcommittee tasks were outlined as follows:

**Task 1:** Scoping aka Gap Analysis (completed today June 4).

**Task 2:** Frameworks Review / Refine and provide feedback on the research methods for analysis (July)

**Task 3:** Review the five scenarios (September)

**Task 4:** Subcommittee and Steering Committee Scenarios Analysis with the contractor (October)

There was a comment and suggestion from one subcommittee member to have an economist as part of the team of selected contractors. They noted doing a cost-benefit evaluation of the preferred scenarios is an important decision making criteria for selecting the ‘preferred alternative.’ Justin agreed to look into this, possibly refining the qualifications requirements in the RFP.

**Themes from Gap Analysis.** Justin Gast shared a summary of ‘potential frameworks to consider’ and ‘themes’ articulated which he said were informed by the subcommittee’s gap analysis exercise. The intent of his document was to highlight themes that came up multiple times in discussions and to help further inform and refine the researcher’s anticipated work. After a robust discussion about the specific themes highlighted in the document, the group coalesced and agreed to use the Steering Committee approved Functions Document and Frameworks Subcommittee gap analysis meeting summaries to help inform the contractor’s work. The group felt the Functions Document was well articulated and captures the full range of interests and desires. Subcommittee members noted if there are any questions related to the documents, they could be a sounding board to the contractor.

*DEQ agreed that if they determine there are areas of inquiry they need to have the contractor pursue that are different from the guidance offered to date by the Steering Committee and subcommittee, they will explicitly share those areas or changes with the subcommittee to support transparency in the process.

*The group noted a need to be attentive to timing of this effort sequenced with the stakeholder input process. Pam Peck will serve as liaison between the two subcommittees.

**Next Steps & Action Items:**

1. DEQ to recruit members of the research selection committee.
2. DEQ to determine when the Life Cycle Analysis work will be presented to the Steering Committee
3. DEQ to investigate whether proposer frameworks are considered confidential.
4. Next Frameworks Subcommittee will be **July 30th, 2019**.

**Meeting materials**
Framework Research Workplan, 6/3/19

“Scoping” = Functions document, gap analysis

Contractor proposes 10 Frameworks and a method for evaluation. Subcommittee will review and provide input on Frameworks and method.

With its initial findings and report submittal (late Sept), Contractor to provide subcommittee with five in-depth Framework scenarios for analysis.

Analyze in-depth Framework scenarios in preparation for November workshop.

Hold workshop. Recommended Framework scenarios to then go through external stakeholder process.

With stakeholder input, finalize Framework.

- Scoping: Subcommittee work completed. (June 4)
- Subcommittee to provide input on Contractor-provided Frameworks and method of evaluation. (July)
- Subcommittee, OC, and Contractor to plan fall workshop (structure, roles, etc.). (Aug)
- Contractor to submit to subcommittee initial report and Framework scenarios. (Sept)
- Subcommittee, Contractor and Steering Committee to analyze in-depth Framework scenarios. (Oct)
- SC workshop (Nov)
- Steering Committee to select Framework and implementation plan. (early 2020)

The Recycling Steering Committee is a collaborative of representation from the Assoc. of Oregon Counties, Assoc. of Oregon Recyclers, Assoc. of Plastics Recyclers/Denton Plastics, EFI, Far West Recycling, Lane County, League of Oregon Cities, Metro, NORPAC, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc., City of Portland, Recycling Partnership, Rogue Disposal & Recycling, Waste Connections, and Waste Management. For more information, visit https://go.usa.gov/xmYYe.