



June 20, 2012

John Maxwell, member  
Shane Britton, member  
HWMA Board's Strategic Planning Subcommittee  
Humboldt Waste Management Authority  
1059 W. Hawthorne St.  
Eureka, CA 95501

**Subject: Strategic planning - Planning Advisory  
Committee (PAC) and electronic notification**

Dear John and Shane,

The time is approaching when R3 and the HWMA Board's Strategic Planning Subcommittee ("Subcommittee") and staff members will begin discussing the composition of a Public Advisory Committee and selection of its members. Before beginning the discussion we hope you will first review the public written and verbal input you've already received on this subject prior to, during and subsequent to the November Scoping Workshop.

I'd like to point out that the strategic planning public comments archive on your website is incomplete. Among the missing letters is the November 29, 2011 email from me (see Attachment #1). ZWH's current position and my emailed position on the essential elements of the formation, selection process and the functions of the PAC are almost identical. (As you'll see below, our thinking on stakeholder seats has evolved). In total, you received close to 40 comments by our count, the preponderance of which also took the same position as ours. In this letter we'll flesh out our position, but before doing so we want to emphasize the importance of (1) inviting the public to provide you with their ideas and recommendations before you start making decisions, (2) to use an adequate notification process and (3) to provide a sufficient comment period for all interested parties to respond.

**"Promoting waste reduction and values-added recycling in Humboldt County"**

We strongly urge your Subcommittee to use the same approach as was used in organizing your successful Scoping Workshop and to avoid handling this as a full Board matter; i.e., one that is brought up as an agenda item at a Board meeting. The success of the workshop event demonstrated the importance of using a transparent and inclusive process that maximized public input and gave your Subcommittee the ability to thoughtfully review comments, thus informing the preparation of the workshop summary report and staff recommendations. Contrast that experience with the Board's inadequate, cursory and confused attempt to deal with public RFP review comments at the February Board meeting. The shortcomings of Board meeting process and procedures were glaringly apparent: A short comment period failing to provide adequate time for all Board members to read and review detailed, substantive public comments and for the Board to adequately discuss the implications of comments such as the RFP critique we submitted. **That event serves as a reminder of the reasons why the Subcommittee was created in the first place - to be the Board's receptacle of public input; as its agent to give meaningful consideration of the information it receives; and to conduct follow-up research, as needed.**

In regard to deciding how the PAC is designed and members selected, we would like to see the following procedure, or something functionally similar to it followed for taking input on the PAC's design:

1. A Strategic Planning item is placed on the agenda of an upcoming Board meeting for the purpose of inviting input from the public on the makeup of the PAC, the selection of its members, the conduct of the PAC, and its purpose. (Much of the input you've received to date on the PAC addresses these aspects, but not in detail.)
2. The Subcommittee and SP Project Manager Karen Sherman will be the designated recipients of submitted comment.
3. The public will be notified about the opportunity to comment on the HWMA website, through multiple local media outlets, and electronic notification sent to interested members of the public -- *more on the latter below.*

4. The public will have 30 days to submit comments from the posting of the notice on your website.

5. Comments will be compiled by staff and submitted to the Subcommittee and R3 for discussion at a meeting held for this purpose.

6. The Subcommittee, in consultation with R3, will develop a set of recommendations that will be presented at the next Board meeting for Board review and comment.

7. At the meeting the Board will take public input on the recommendations and decide on a course of action at that time, including the option to delay taking action for a month to consider feedback received at the meeting.

The PAC will, if thoughtfully designed and integrated into the planning process, proactively provide the Subcommittee, staff, and R3 with information and advice that is helpful to the overall process and as a result be a critical factor in building consensus among stakeholders. Stakeholders will all want representation on the PAC. That is understandable - each stakeholder group will bring a point of view, observations and technical information which planners need to take into account.

We in fact believe that the PAC needs to be set up as a Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), with seats assigned to each stakeholder category.

You know that any committee becomes less efficient, and effective, when it's size becomes unwieldy. We don't think the advisory group should more than a maximum of 15 people. When designing the SAC, a goal should be to avoid redundancy yet be sure that people are selected within categories who can provide special information and insight that augments the information gathering and analysis jobs of planners.

A little research of waste management planning efforts reveals several stakeholder categories are common to most SAC's:

- Local government waste management program managers;

- Local government elected officials;
- Business sector representatives (including waste generators and recycled and reused material users);
- Waste collector and processor contractors;
- Public organizations / NGO's who are actively engaged in local waste management projects and policy advocacy;
- Economic development sector;
- Members of the public with strategic planning and waste management expertise, knowledge and experience.

We are not in favor of assigning seats to members of the public whose sole qualification is "ratepayer". This is, in our opinion, would be a wasted position. As we have previously stated, we support a SAC design and selection process that provides a broad knowledge and experience base with an emphasis placed on strategic planning and waste management experience. We fully support a qualifications based selection process.

What should be avoided is to create seats for political jurisdictions, which will politicize what is in essence a technical advisory body. This will be counterproductive. Although jurisdictional considerations should be part of the planning discussion, the plan's - and SAC's - focus should be regional in scope. Jurisdictional seats are unnecessary. If you look at the categories we've listed above - and they are by no means the only ones to consider - you can see how, for example, the differing needs and limitations of rural and urban areas - an important jurisdiction consideration - can be represented quite well within a stakeholder structure. We're confident R3 will provide good advice about stakeholder and selection options and their associated pros and cons that have been used elsewhere.

We believe that all SAC candidates should apply for seats in specified categories, and candidates are required to complete a standard application form. The public should be adequately notified of the application process and be given adequate time to respond. Applicants should be required to describe their particular qualifications for the position for which they are applying. This information will allow the Subcommittee to objectively evaluate and rank

applicants; an objective selection process will give the Board and the public confidence that the qualified candidates are proposed for appointment to the SAC. Again, R3 should have a good idea of what has worked well elsewhere.

Here's where I switch gears. The rest of this letter will address the ongoing and still unresolved issue of electronic notification of interested parties.

ZWH members have made at least three on the record requests since August, 2011 for HWMA to develop and begin using an electronic notification system for the strategic planning process. As you will recall, the HWMA Board heard numerous complaints after the November Scoping Workshop from people who would have attended and participated had they known about the workshop. Prior to the workshop, at either the September or October meeting (I don't recall which), the Board alluded to notifying interested parties electronically. This didn't happen and people felt HWMA had dropped the ball. At the December meeting, when the workshop summary report was presented to the Board, Chairman Maxwell conceded it was a mistake. We estimate the workshop attendance would have been doubled if electronic notification had been given.

We need this problem rectified. Now. The HWMA staff needs to set up a system for regular, timely notification of interested parties of upcoming strategic planning activities, including Subcommittee meetings; posting of progress reports and documents available for review; publicizing public comment opportunities.

I would like to offer a suggestion on how this system can be set up and managed with little effort. Some internet research indicates other IWMP processes have successfully used listservs for this purpose. Individuals desiring notifications and updates are invited to subscribe to the planning listserv, and members have the option of unsubscribing whenever they want. The listserv would be publicized on the website and at Board meetings. Groups like ours will want to notify our members and supporters of its existence.

I urge you to put a listserv or its functional equivalent in place as soon as possible. With

discussions about the SAC about to begin, it is crucial everyone who wants to provide input to the discussions is informed of commenting opportunities. Building consensus around a SAC will be essential to maintaining and building a collaborative planning process that leaves no one feeling excluded or left out. Formation of a broadly supported SAC that is given a proactive role in the planning process will go a long way to bolstering HWMA's public image and help your agency better inform the public about HWMA's waste management activities.

We hope these comments are helpful and thank you for giving them your consideration. Please feel free to get in touch to talk about this or other matters.

**Please enter this letter into the Strategic Planning public record (and post on your website). Thank you.**

Sincerely,

Jud Ellinwood  
1426 Eighth St.  
Eureka, CA 95501  
707-443-9153  
jud@humboldt1.com

ATTACHMENT #1

**From:** Jud Ellinwood <jud@humboldt1.com>  
**Subject:** My HWMA Strategic Planning scoping recommendations  
**Date:** Tuesday November 29, 2011 12:56:48 PM PST  
**To:** info@hwma.net, HWMA Board [board@hwma.net](mailto:board@hwma.net)

**From:** Jud Ellinwood / 1426 Eighth St., Eureka, CA 95501 / 443-9153

**To:** HWMA Staff and Strategic Planning Subcommittee

**Subject:** My HWMA Strategic Planning scoping recommendations

**Makeup, selection and purpose of the Public Advisory Committee**

Members should be selected on basis of their qualifications as described on an application.

Ideally, members will have recycling and/or strategic planning experience.

PAC seats should be a balanced mixture of political jurisdictions and at-large.

Develop an application and information for members of the public wishing to serve on the PAC.

To be considered for appointment, individuals must complete and turn in an application before application deadline.

Application packet will include a description of PAC's role and responsibilities, a general description of range of topics that may be part of planning discussions.

Applicants must commit to participating in all meetings. Members may be removed for excessive absenteeism.

Roles of the PAC shall include:

- Participate in advisory capacity to planner and planning group throughout the planning process.
- After plan is completed provide oversight of implementation by monitoring and evaluating progress (2-4 meetings a year).
- Collaboratively work with HWMA to develop educational/information workshops that will assist HWMA achieve plan goals.
- All PAC meetings shall receive HWMA staff support.

**The planning consultant and RFP (Request for Proposal)**

Preference for a local consultant.

RFP should not limit eligibility to companies. Individual experts shall be eligible too. Contractor could be a team with a local coordinator.

Require planner's attendance at all local PAC meetings and workshops developed by PAC and pertinent HWMA meetings.

Provide routine updates to HWMA and PAC.

Provide more specificity in the RFP scope of work than in the draft RFP in September 8 Board packet. I do not want a consultant's packaged plan; prefer a plan that is designed to address Humboldt's unique conditions.

HWMA and planner must allocate sufficient resources to the planning process to support a thorough scope of work and production of a effective, comprehensive plan. Additional funding shall be sought, if necessary.

### **The strategic planning process**

Process scope of work shall address all forms of waste in the county, including E-waste (BASEL certified), construction and demolition, and disaster.

Process scope of work shall address financing the integrated waste management system.

Scope is countywide, not just HWMA jurisdiction.

Specific process steps:

- Planner and planning group will prepare a draft strategic plan. The draft plan will be made available to the public for public comment. The initial version of the draft document will be reviewed by the Public Advisory Committee. The PAC will provide the Planner with its comments and revision recommendations. Planner and planning group will consider making recommended revisions before releasing a draft document to the public.
- Availability of the draft plan for public comment will be noticed in local media as well as on HWMA website. The public will have at a minimum a 60 day period in which to comment. HWMA member governments will also have the same review and comment opportunity. Comments will be compiled and summarized by the planner, and the draft plan and the comments summary will subsequently be presented to the HWMA board by the Planner. The HWMA Board will review both the draft plan and comments, then provide comments to the Planner.
- All draft review comments will be listed in the Final Plan's appendices.

**Please add these comments to the Strategic Planning written record. Thank you.**