

# Public Involvement Plan

---

## 2.1 Introduction

A critical aspect to consider when siting a garden refuse processing facility is the development of effective dialogue between SWA and its stakeholders. Simply stated, the public needs to know the facts about a proposed decision to decide whether they can support it. This section describes the framework of a Public Involvement Plan (plan) that will ensure two-way communication: sending information out to the public (information techniques) and receiving public ideas, issues, and concerns (public participation techniques).

This plan was developed as part of Phase One, Project Initiation, through researching past experiences with regional waste management issues, conducting interviews with key stakeholder representatives, and holding roundtable discussions with the members of the team assembled to participate in this element of the project. This plan identifies representative stakeholders and their primary concerns, and outlines a “road map” of communication methods to involve stakeholders during the planning for and development of a garden refuse processing facility.

The recommended plan recognizes that there are six phases in facility planning and development (as outlined in Section 1, Introduction) and that stakeholder issues are likely to change as the project evolves. Hence, this section outlines the general communication objectives for each phase but acknowledges that the plan is dynamic. As the project proceeds into each phase, the plan should be updated to reflect changing communication needs.

The emphasis of the plan proposed here is to support the next phase of the project, which will be Phase Two: Structuring and Designing the Project. However, this plan recommends an intermediate phase to build relationships, called Phase One-B, immediately following the current effort. As will be disclosed through this plan, there is a lack of trust among many stakeholder groups in Sacramento County. Phase One-B recognizes that there is a need to establish two-way communication with communities throughout the County prior to beginning site selection.

Phase Two will include the site selection process and conceptual facility design, in preparation for the environmental review and permitting process. Consequently, the recommended plan focuses on community and stakeholder issues expected to emerge during the siting process. Phase Two of the project will also include the development of agreements between the SWA and its member agencies; this will precede the start of the siting process. In addition, in Phase Two, the SWA will seek expressions of interest from potential private-sector partners for operating the facility. The private-sector participants in the solid waste industry are important stakeholders, and the specific approach to involving these stakeholders during Phase Two is included in Section 4 of this report.

## 2.2 Public Involvement Objectives

SWA staff assembled the project team identified in Section 1, Introduction, to assist with the Phase One effort, including the development of the public involvement plan. One of the project team's highest priorities is to develop proactive public involvement in the siting and development of a garden refuse processing facility. All members of the project team recognize and support a public involvement program that will identify public concerns, be considerate of public issues, and incorporate public input into the siting and development of the new facility.

To this end, the public involvement plan objectives are to:

- Identify and clearly address stakeholder concerns early
- Develop clear and understandable information materials that help to answer questions and offer opportunity to provide input into the process
- Provide easy access to information and avenues for stakeholders to provide meaningful input
- Ensure that public input is reflected at each stage of the project development
- Communicate the project purpose – to provide cost-effective and environmentally beneficial service to the SWA member jurisdictions

## 2.3 Situational Analysis

### 2.3.1 Context for Public Involvement Plan

Typically, the public becomes involved with waste management issues only when problems arise or when new facilities are proposed that could become a nuisance and thus adversely affect property values or the quality of life in the community. However, the SWA wants to engage stakeholders actively in the siting and development of a garden refuse processing facility from the very beginning of the project. By involving the public at the outset, a common understanding of expectations and performance can be developed. Ideally, the facility will serve as a source of pride for both the community and the operators.

First, the plan should state the context for engaging stakeholders and outline their interest in the project. The project need is clearly stated in Section 1, Introduction, of this document. To solicit interest in and support for project development, the project need must be compelling for stakeholders, and the project itself must provide perceived benefits such as cost savings and environmental improvement.

However, perceived problems usually generate a higher level of interest among stakeholders than do perceived benefits. The stakeholders will likely call on past experiences with various waste management facilities as reference points. Through interviews and newspaper articles, past experiences were researched to find what the public has perceived as problems associated with waste management facilities (see

Appendix 2A for a list of facilities used as a reference for public experiences). Table 2-1 lists those public concerns for all facilities and those unique to the particular facility types.

**TABLE 2-1**  
Public Concerns for Waste Management Facilities

Facility Type	Community Issues of Concern
Common to All Facility Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trucks hauling waste are noisy and pollute the air, and they propel rocks that chip windshields</li> <li>• Bad odors occur (prevailing winds can carry odors up to two miles away)</li> <li>• Visual nuisance occur from the facility siting and the truck traffic</li> <li>• Citizens were unaware/not notified of permitting process and therefore unable to have input</li> <li>• Confusion exists between waste management facility types; the public seems to associate all facilities with landfills</li> <li>• Adjacent real estate values are reduced</li> <li>• Agency staff and information provided are generally mistrusted</li> <li>• History of mismanagement practices has created a sense of discomfort with waste management facilities</li> </ul>
Landfills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaching liquids contaminate groundwater</li> <li>• Methane gas emissions cause air pollution</li> <li>• Refuse materials litter the roadways</li> <li>• Vectors (flies, seagulls, and other wildlife) are attracted to refuse at landfills and thus to surrounding communities</li> </ul>
Garden Refuse Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water runoff contaminates nearby waterways</li> <li>• Garden refuse ferments before arriving on the site, causing odor control problems</li> <li>• Excessive storage of garden waste occurs</li> <li>• High temperatures in stored materials can lead to spontaneous fires</li> <li>• Vectors (flies and mosquitoes) are attracted to the site and thus to surrounding communities</li> </ul>
Transfer Stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Untreated water runoff contaminates nearby waterways</li> <li>• Garden refuse ferments at the site, causing odor control problems</li> <li>• Excessive storage of garden waste occurs</li> <li>• High temperatures in stored materials can lead to spontaneous fires</li> <li>• Refuse materials litter the roadways</li> <li>• Trucks hauling waste are noisy and pollute the air, and they propel rocks that chip windshields</li> <li>• Vectors (flies, seagulls, and other wildlife) are attracted by the refuse piles`</li> </ul>

Many of these concerns are built on experiences of the communities and the record of violations of the California Integrated Waste Management Board and County regulations. However, some are perceptions based on a lack of understanding.

Education is an important aspect of public involvement. Also, positive experiences with landfills and garden refuse processing facilities are usually not expressed because well-managed waste facilities go largely unnoticed. Well-managed facilities such as Sacramento County's North Area Recovery Station have learned from the problems of other facilities and have incorporated mechanisms minimize or avoid problems into their operations. When the City of Sacramento garden refuse processing facility at 28th and C Streets closed in 2001, several members of the community expressed disappointment. While truck traffic and occasional odors would sometimes bring complaints, the community gardeners and elementary school gardens experienced the value and convenience of the compost materials. In order to minimize public impact, the City had enacted a strong issue resolution program of quick response to nuisance calls and was able to ward off most odors with enzyme treatments and misting agents, and during some seasonal periods, the City had closed operations until the weather changed.

Another potential public concern is the confusion that may arise between other similar projects that may be proposed during the development of the garden refuse processing facility. Confusion could arise over the definition of the project and the responsible agencies, the commitment level of the agencies to maintain a quality facility, and the nuisance issues relevant to each project.

Investigations have discovered that stakeholder communications in areas of Sacramento County related to waste management facilities have not been positive nor adequate to build two-way communication. In each situation investigated, there appears to have been mistrust about the decision-making process or between residential and community stakeholders and local government representatives. Frequently, residents formed coalitions to stop, correct, or change the situation. Because of this experience, the purpose of this plan is to recommend methods to engage stakeholders early, to identify issues of concern up front, and then to address the issues openly during the facility planning, development, and operating stages.

### **2.3.2 Stakeholder Assessment**

The project team developed a list of potential stakeholder groups and key contacts. The project team discussed these groups' potential issues and experiences with solid and green waste management systems. SWA staff had interviewed several private industry operators in 2002; the results of these interviews helped identify potential concerns of this stakeholder group. Because the project is only in the earliest initiation phase and no potential sites have yet been identified for the facility, the consensus of the project team was that it would be premature to interview neighborhood groups at this time. A select group of people was interviewed to reduce rumors and minimize misconceptions about the status of the garden refuse processing facility project. The project team tried to interview people who would be potentially capable of representing larger constituent groups or who were knowledgeable about local waste management issues based on their experience with the Kiefer Landfill or Lionudakis issues. At this stage, a small group of the interviewees were:

- Mark White, Sacramento Cities/County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) member

- Pat Braziel and Jane Smith, Sacramento County District 5 office, staff to Sacramento County Supervisor Don Nottoli
- Liz Aguire, Galt City Clerk
- Doug Kobold, Sacramento County Department of Waste Management and Recycling
- Steve Kalvelage, Sacramento County Local Enforcement Agency
- Mike Root, Sacramento City Program Analyst
- Christina Ragsdale, Sacramento County Public Works Agency, Communications and Media Officer
- Dan Regan, Sacramento County Department of Waste Management and Recycling, Communications and Media Officer
- Rex Albright, Executive Director of the Sacramento City Chamber of Commerce
- Kurt Haven, Rancho Cordova Chamber of Commerce

Interviews were conducted in May and June of 2003. The individuals were asked about issues of concern and suggestions for positive forms of stakeholder involvement. Interviewees also volunteered names of other influential members of the community who would be valuable to talk with as the project develops. During the course of the interviews, it became apparent that in-depth, two-way communication with members of the community(ies) potentially affected by the project will be increasingly important, especially during the siting process.

The geographic area for stakeholder outreach is generally Sacramento County and its cities in Phase One-B. However, as potentially suitable site areas are identified, the stakeholders groups may extend outside the County boundaries to include nearby communities. During the siting process, emphasis for the communications and outreach effort needs to be on stakeholder identification and involvement in the areas generally defined as suitable for potential garden refuse processing sites, and when potential alternative sites are identified, on the neighbors and communities around the sites and along potential truck transport routes. At present, potential stakeholders have been grouped into categories of similar interests and objectives, as follows:

- **Elected Officials:** County supervisors, city council members.
- **SWA Member Agency Staff, SWAC Members, and City/County Managers:** Once contracted, the P3 will be grouped in this category.
- **Business Organizations and Major Employers:** Chambers of commerce, Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, Sacramento-area business improvement associations, local farm bureaus.
- **Citizen Groups:** Neighbors of potential sites, landowners, neighborhood associations, communities along access routes, community planning advisory councils, service group leaders, community activists.

- **Potential Private Operators:** Garden refuse processors, private haulers and solid waste firms, end product users.
- **Special Interest Organizations:** Environmental organizations, nature conservancies, ECOLOG.
- **Agencies:** California Integrated Waste Management Board; Sacramento County Local Enforcement Agency; and other local, state and federal agencies, depending on site constraints.
- **Media:** Local editors, journalists, broadcast media.

Through these interviews, it was learned that some stakeholder groups have issues that are uniquely important to them; however, all share concerns about facility siting and the potential for nuisance problems from facility operations. Table 2-2 summarizes general issues that have been identified so far for each stakeholder category. The table also lists a preliminary set of public involvement methods for each group. A full description of public involvement methods is in Appendix 2B.

**TABLE 2-2**  
Stakeholder Matrix

<b>Stakeholder Category</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Potential Outreach and Involvement Methods</b>
Elected Officials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controversy surrounding the project</li> <li>• Achieving equitable share of benefits and risks among member agencies</li> <li>• Cost-effectiveness of garden refuse management system</li> <li>• Public perception of a garden refuse composting facility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWA Board meetings</li> <li>• One-on-one conversations</li> <li>• Briefing to support staff</li> </ul>
SWA Member Agency Staff, SWAC Members, City/County Managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost/benefit analysis will determine degree of interest</li> <li>• Maintaining operational controls and gaining public support for the facility</li> <li>• Reaching a fair and equitable long-term public-private contract</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Periodic team meetings</li> <li>• Contractual agreements</li> </ul>
Business Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site location and associated nuisances, especially traffic impacts or conflicts with business development plans</li> <li>• Not fully convinced of project need, but interested in benefits from mutually compatible industries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speaker bureaus (presentations to monthly organized meeting groups)</li> <li>• Phone and/ or lunch information exchange interviews</li> <li>• Surveys (combined at other presentations)</li> </ul>

**TABLE 2-2**  
Stakeholder Matrix

<b>Stakeholder Category</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Potential Outreach and Involvement Methods</b>
Citizen Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mistrust of SWA/County's responsiveness to voiced concerns and doubt about need for a garden refuse processing facility within the County</li> <li>Nuisance risks and doubt about the technological capacity to prevent/control odor, noise, litter, vectors</li> <li>Traffic impacts along access roads</li> <li>Effect of the facility on property values</li> <li>Concern about equitable distribution of waste management responsibility</li> <li>Potential that citizens will feel lack of influence in site selection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surveys</li> <li>Small informal focus group meetings</li> <li>Booth days – establish an information booth at scheduled events</li> <li>Community open house public meetings</li> <li>Working groups in alternative analysis process</li> <li>Educational tours</li> <li>Civic presentations</li> <li>Web site/ newsletters/ flyers/ fact sheets</li> </ul>
Private Operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attaining security of investment</li> <li>Assured long-term tenancy</li> <li>Difficulty in managing competition inside one operating site (if multiple operators)</li> <li>See the proposed facility as competitor</li> <li>Need market for low grade products (as well as high grade) to avoid accumulation</li> <li>Interested in better availability of compost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One-on-one information exchange interviews</li> <li>Engage in work group for alternatives analysis process</li> <li>Provide tours of facilities</li> </ul>
Special Interest Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site-specific environmental concerns, such as damage to wetlands and valuable habitats, contamination of groundwater, disruption of wildlife patterns, degradation of air quality, traffic impacts, etc.</li> <li>Interested in whether SWA member agencies are meeting waste diversion goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One-on-one information exchange interviews</li> <li>Engage in work group for alternatives analysis process</li> <li>Offer tours of facilities</li> </ul>
Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting regulatory standards</li> <li>Maintaining a positive public relations history</li> <li>Involvement in the site design and management plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Send informational materials</li> <li>Include in the CEQA process phase</li> <li>Invite to oversight committee meetings</li> </ul>
Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interested in gathering information easily in order to keep the public informed</li> <li>Interested in special interest stories that affect local residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arrange personal informational interviews with local newspaper editors</li> <li>Keep journalists apprised of upcoming events and key decision points</li> </ul>

## 2.4 Public Involvement Plan

### 2.4.1 Public Involvement Overview Through All Phases of Development

The Public Involvement Plan identifies the use and timing of appropriate communication methods to meet project goals and objectives. The forms and emphasis of communication with stakeholders are different in the different phases of facility development. The following briefly outlines public involvement through the project phases, beginning with an interim phase that offers the public outreach effort a jump start. The outline is intended to be an overview, briefly identifying the project goal, key involvement methods, communication messages, and final product to be expected from each phase of public involvement. Section 2.4.2 details the plan, emphasizing upcoming elements of project development for Phases One-B and Two.

#### Phase One-B: Relationship Building

**Goal: Establish two-way communication with stakeholders to build trust.** This Public Involvement Plan recommends an additional phase prior to the site selection in Phase Two. Phase One-B, Relationship Building, recognizes the need to build communication channels with stakeholders that have expressed concern about existing waste processing facilities, demonstrating to them that SWA is eager to listen and respond to their issues and concerns. The primary communication objectives are to understand stakeholder issues, build communication channels, and establish relationships with concerned stakeholders. The primary products from this process are intended to be a stakeholders mailing database, an understanding of key messages that will build trust and willingness to participate, and refinement of appropriate communication methods and venues.

#### Phase Two: Structuring and Designing the Project

**Goal: Select a site that meets project needs with maximum support and minimum opposition.** In Phase Two, the principal activities in which stakeholder involvement is critical will be (1) site selection and facility design in preparation for the permitting and environmental analysis process and (2) commencing the public-private partnership, including the development of agreements between the SWA and its member agencies and the early involvement of potential private-sector partners. Involvement of potential private-sector partners is discussed in Section 3 of this report. In Phase Two, emphasis is placed on incorporating key community stakeholders into an siting alternatives working group that will allow the community to influence the site selection and the key project elements. The siting evaluation process must be objective and depends on well-structured and defensible criteria that incorporate community values. Occasionally checking in with the broader community will help to validate the process and decisions being made at key milestones. Communication issues will include the need to differentiate between the new garden refuse processing facility and other proposed facilities, and to build support around the project purpose and site selection process. At the end of Phase Two, the siting alternatives working group will forward a site selection recommendation to the SWA Board.

### **Phase Three: Facility Permitting**

**Goal: Obtain permits and entitlements for a garden refuse processing facility that will be a good neighbor.** In this phase, SWA will enter the environmental analysis process, which involves further development of the site design and analysis of environmental impacts. The process for public involvement is stipulated in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. CEQA requires a public scoping process even though many of the issues will already have been identified during Phases One-B and Two. In Phase Three, the momentum should continue to build on existing relationships while placing very intensive emphasis on adjacent community members and property owners. In this phase, the siting alternatives working group may evolve into a project development oversight committee that reviews site planning elements, environmental impacts, and mitigation measures. Regular consultation with interested stakeholders and regulatory agencies will reduce surprises and improve the environmental review. Communication messages should emphasize that the SWA will hold the major facility permits, thus giving it direct control and enforcement capabilities to ensure that the facility is operated to minimize nuisance problems and produce high-quality products. Phase Three results in an agency decision to accept the environmental document and select the preferred site alternative.

### **Phase Four: Final Design**

**Goal: Design a cost-effective design that meets regulatory and community issues.** The design phase is an opportunity to incorporate operational and environmental features that evolved due to public input and to communicate these features to the nearby communities and stakeholders along site access roads. It is anticipated that the oversight committee will be maintained through the remainder of the project development and used to check progress and assist in dissemination of project information. Communication messages should emphasize the positive features of the project that were achieved by stakeholder involvement and share technological features that will minimize nuisance issues. The public should feel informed and be provided opportunities to understand the facility functions.

### **Phase Five: Construction**

**Goal: Build a facility on time, on budget with minimum impact on community and environment.** During the construction phase, stakeholder relations strategies should continue to focus on the community around and near the site and along access routes for construction vehicles. Two-way open communication via the community oversight committee, community boards, and direct mail flyers to community members is important to avoid impacts related to construction activities on the site and construction traffic on access roads. Completion of the construction phase is a good opportunity to celebrate the community's diligence, input, and success in developing a high-quality facility through an intense public involvement process.

### **Phase Six: Operations**

**Goal: Be a cost-effective, environmentally sound operation and good neighbor** During startup, stakeholders will be attentive and anxious to know that the site will operate as planned and designed. Extra effort to keep communication pathways open will show

responsiveness on the part of SWA. Providing status updates on nuisance issues to the oversight committee and educational opportunities about the processing operations will encourage positive communication flow. As assurance to the community, the oversight committee will institute an “Issue Resolution Plan.” Together, SWA and the private partner will implement the plan to address nuisance complaints, answering directly to the complaint issuer and to the oversight committee. Elements of the plan will include how communication will be handled and the range of technology that may be used to remedy the situation. The plan should emphasize expediting resolution.

At this point, the SWA can begin to become an industrial citizen— a member of the community and part of the business fabric. As an industrial citizen, the SWA becomes a participant in local activities, keeps adjacent neighbors and community members informed, and looks for synergistic opportunities with other business organizations.

Table 2-3 provides another outline of the plan through each phase, listing which stakeholder groups will be the primary target, the message or intent of the communication, and recommended public involvement methods to meet the project goal for that phase. Based on information about stakeholder issues and concerns in Table 2-2, specific stakeholder groups are linked to project phases and key communication needs. Stakeholder groups other than those identified in Table 2-3 may also be interested in particular phases of the project, but their concerns were not as strongly expressed in relation to that project phase.

**TABLE 2-3**  
Stakeholder Interaction by Phase of Project Development

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Concerned Stakeholders</b>	<b>Communication Emphasis (Message or Intent of Communication)</b>	<b>Primary Public Involvement Methods</b>
Phase One-B: Relationship Building	Elected officials, citizen groups (adjacent to existing facilities, service group leaders), business organizations, special interest organizations, media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand stakeholder issues, build communication channels, and establish relationships</li> <li>Identify key messages that build trust and willingness to participate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct and analyze in-person informational interviews</li> <li>Conduct informal focus group meetings</li> <li>Identify and develop potential spokespersons</li> </ul>
Phase Two: Structuring and Designing the Project	Elected officials, citizen groups (especially potential site neighbors and land owners), business groups, media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differentiate between the composting facility and other proposed facilities</li> <li>Build support around the project purpose and site selection process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Siting alternatives working group</li> <li>Web site/ newsletters/ fact sheets/ flyers</li> <li>Distribute information that requests input</li> <li>Civic presentations</li> <li>Open house meetings in communities around potential sites</li> </ul>
	Private operators, elected officials, and SWA/member agency staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Illustrate quality partnership that builds trust and quality facility management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 3</li> </ul>

**TABLE 2-3**  
Stakeholder Interaction by Phase of Project Development

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Concerned Stakeholders</b>	<b>Communication Emphasis (Message or Intent of Communication)</b>	<b>Primary Public Involvement Methods</b>
	Private operators, elected officials, and SWA/member agency staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project cost analysis and site-related design features prove that the project is fiscally responsible and profitable and environmentally superior</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Section 3</li> </ul>
Phase Three: Facility Permitting	Elected officials, member agencies, special interest organizations, citizen groups (site neighbors, landowners, access route communities), business groups, regulatory agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SWA will hold the major facility permits, thus giving it direct control and enforcement capabilities to ensure that the facility is operated to prevent nuisance problems and produce high-quality products</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish regular oversight committee meetings</li> <li>Conduct meetings in the local community</li> <li>Open house scoping meetings</li> <li>Newsletter/ web site updates</li> <li>Informational exchange meetings with agencies, decision makers, and the public</li> </ul>
Phase Four: Final Design	Public-private partnership (SWA, member agencies, private operator), citizen groups (site neighbors, landowners, access route communities), regulatory agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Announce positive features of the project that were designed through input from stakeholders; and share technological features that will minimize nuisance issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep oversight committee updated</li> <li>Newsletter/ web site updates</li> <li>Community and neighbor group updates</li> </ul>
Phase Five: Construction	Public-private partnership (SWA, member agencies, private operator), citizen groups (site neighbors, landowners, access route communities), SWA/member agency staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manage construction activities sensitively for adjacent communities</li> <li>Celebrate the community's diligence, input, and success in developing a high-quality, environmentally superior facility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep oversight committee updated</li> <li>Newsletter updates</li> <li>Community group updates</li> <li>Celebration</li> </ul>
Phase Six: Operations	Public-private partnership (SWA, member agencies, private operator), citizen groups (site neighbors, access route communities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain open door approach to community, follow through, and demonstrate continued presence</li> <li>The facility is educational</li> <li>Participate as a member of the community in local events</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep oversight committee updated</li> <li>Community group updates</li> <li>Adopt an Issues Resolution Plan to address community complaints</li> </ul>

While each phase must reach out with new pieces of information and new messages, the following communication methods will be adapted but used throughout the project phase following Phase One-B:

- Microsoft PowerPoint® presentations
- Flyers or fact sheets to address frequently asked questions (FAQs) and technology themes
- Web site with email and survey-input opportunities

### **2.4.2 Public Involvement Plan for Phases One-B and Two**

This section addresses the next two phases of the project, Phase One-B and Phase Two, in detail. The Public Involvement Plan in Phase One-B and Phase Two are focused on addressing particular stakeholder groups' issues. Table 2-4 shows stakeholder issues as identified in Table 2-2, with appropriate communication methods to meet communication objectives. Table 2-4 identifies measures that help to reflect whether the communication objectives are being met. To complement this table, Appendix 2C contains a conceptual work plan for implementation. As indicated in Table 2-3, strategic stakeholders during Phase One-B are elected officials (this group includes SWA, member agencies and staff, and SWAC), citizen groups, business groups, special interest organizations, and the media. Phase Two, during the site selection process, will include elected officials (this group includes SWAC and SWA/member agency staff), citizen groups, business groups, and the media. Based on preliminary interviews, other stakeholder groups such as special interest groups and regulatory agencies did not reveal concerns that were strongly relevant to this phase of project development and therefore are not reflected in this matrix. However, it is never too early to provide information and cultivate support for the project.

### **2.4.3 Tracking Public Involvement Measures**

As indicated in Table 2-4, measures have been developed to track progress towards meeting communication objectives. It is important to understand whether the communication and involvement methods are effective at achieving the project goals, as well as areas where emphasis be placed to improve the outreach efforts.

TABLE 2-4  
Stakeholder Communication For Phase One-B and Phase Two

Stakeholder Group	Issues	Communication Objective(s)	Communication Methods	Measures of Whether Communication Objective(s) Are Being Met	Milestones/ Timeline
<b>PHASE ONE-B: RELATIONSHIP BUILDING</b>					
<b>Project Phase Goal:</b> Establish two-way communication channels with key stakeholders to build public trust					
<b>Elected officials (includes SWA and member agencies, staff, and SWAC)</b>	Concerned about public controversy	Keep elected officials apprised of public opinion monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hold one-on-one interviews with staff and/or elected officials to determine who are the major opinion makers in north and south districts</li> <li>Interview key community leaders to identify message points</li> <li>Provide periodic updates about community relation activities and objectives to SWA Board and SWAC meetings</li> </ul>	<p>SWA board member identify 3 key stakeholders in both north and south County to initiate relations building</p> <p>SWA Board acknowledges receipt of community relations status updates</p>	Offer updates on a routine basis

**TABLE 2-4**  
Stakeholder Communication For Phase One-B and Phase Two

Stakeholder Group	Issues	Communication Objective(s)	Communication Methods	Measures of Whether Communication Objective(s) Are Being Met	Milestones/ Timeline
<b>Citizen Groups</b>	Mistrust of SWA/County's responsiveness to voiced concerns and doubt about need for a garden refuse processing facility within the County	Demonstrate SWA's interest in and understanding of citizen concerns by building lines of communication  Build community trust by following through with communication commitments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct interviews with key community leaders to determine what messages are consistent (resonate) between focus groups and interviewees</li> <li>• Conduct focus groups among Lionudakis neighbors and The Oaks on what went wrong and what could be better (i.e., CAKL members, Rosemount residents)</li> <li>• Conduct focus groups with key County community groups to explore opinions and relationship building solutions (Include Sloughhouse Virginia Sigmourni, Galt Historical Society)</li> <li>• Within 2 weeks of communication-contact, send a letter of appreciation for shared time and input with bullets listing result of meeting.</li> </ul>	<p>Receive at least 5 messages that consistently resonate with community values</p> <p>Develop at least 5 factors that will influence stakeholder confidence in SWA and member agencies (do's and don't's)</p> <p>Cultivate at least 3 spokespersons/ project advocates from within communities that have potentially suitable sites</p> <p>Identify community participants commitment for site selection process</p> <p>From interviews and focus groups, develop a database of over 100 stakeholders that wish to remain involved and/or want updated information. Collect opinions about SWA and a garden refuse facility as a baseline to measure against</p> <p>Update public involvement plan to reflect appropriate avenues of communication and input opportunities</p>	

TABLE 2-4  
Stakeholder Communication For Phase One-B and Phase Two

Stakeholder Group	Issues	Communication Objective(s)	Communication Methods	Measures of Whether Communication Objective(s) Are Being Met	Milestones/ Timeline
<b>Business Organizations and Large Employers</b>	Not convinced of project need, and limited understanding of potential for mutual benefit	Begin two-way communication that introduces project potential gathers local business issues and information needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arrange 2 to 3 small focus group meetings (lunch provided) with key business leaders to identify business synergies and mutual benefit potential</li> </ul>	<p>Identify 5 positive business benefits/</p> <p>Identify 2 business participants who may commit to site selection process</p>	
<b>Special Interest Organizations</b>	Not familiar with purpose of and need for garden refuse processing facility	Begin two-way communication that introduces project and gathers local issues and information needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arrange in-person interviews with the Nature Conservancy Manager, Sacramento Valley Conservancy, local chapter of Sierra Club, Farm Bureau, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>Identify 10 environmental issues that will affect the position of environmental organizations on a garden refuse facility</p> <p>Identify 1 to 2 key participants to represent special interest organizations in the site selection process.</p>	
<b>Media</b>	Not familiar with purpose of and need for garden refuse processing facility	Begin two-way communication that introduces project and gathers local issues and information needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arrange personal informational meeting with local newspaper editors (Galt Herald, Lodi Centennial, River Valley Times, Grapevine Independent, and others throughout the County) as well as with the broader news media</li> </ul>	<p>Three journalists commit to running a story once the site selection process begins (Phase Two).</p> <p>Editors offer information about hot button issues for local public stakeholders and validates messages gathered from community groups.</p>	

TABLE 2-4  
Stakeholder Communication For Phase One-B and Phase Two

Stakeholder Group	Issues	Communication Objective(s)	Communication Methods	Measures of Whether Communication Objective(s) Are Being Met	Milestones/ Timeline
<b>PHASE TWO: SITE SELECTION</b>					
<b>Project Phase Goal:</b> Select a site that meets project needs with maximum support and minimum opposition					
<b>Elected Officials (SWA and Member Agencies), SWA/member agency staff, SWAC)</b>	Concern about public controversy	Keep elected officials apprised of public opinion polls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide periodic (quarterly) updates about community relations activities and objectives at SWA and SWAC meetings</li> </ul>	<p>SWA board acknowledges receipt of community relations status updates</p> <p>SWA Board majority support moving forward and express at least 1 positive feedback per update.</p>	Throughout project on routine basis
	Concern about public perception of a garden refuse processing facility (past nuisance issues generates opposition in siting process)	<p>Develop awareness of successful garden refuse processing facilities and technologies;</p> <p>Demonstrate objective, defensible siting criteria and alternatives analysis process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain communication and feedback at SWA Board and SWAC meetings and/or one-on-one meetings with key elected officials and agency staff</li> <li>Keep officials informed through information tools: fact sheets, civic presentations, etc.</li> <li>Present siting alternatives and decision process results at key milestones</li> </ul>	<p>Majority of SWA Board validate process and approve of working group's criteria development</p> <p>County Supervisors representing areas that have potential sites voice support for project development</p> <p>Each agency's lead staff express confidence in site selection process and agree to be spokespersons as needed.</p>	<p>Information materials must be available to elected officials and agency staff prior to public dissemination</p> <p>Periodic updates on siting process</p>

**TABLE 2-4**  
Stakeholder Communication For Phase One-B and Phase Two

Stakeholder Group	Issues	Communication Objective(s)	Communication Methods	Measures of Whether Communication Objective(s) Are Being Met	Milestones/ Timeline
	Concern about cost effectiveness of garden refuse management system	Develop understanding of cost elements including transport and operations; maintain and increase commitment to project need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication and feedback at SWA Board and SWAC meetings and/or one-on-one meetings with key elected officials and agency staff. Inform officials/staff through cost analysis fact sheets and benefits statements.</li> </ul>	<p>SWA agency staff recommend approval of the project financials.</p> <p>Majority of SWA Board members voice support for the project financials and help to support waste stream commitments from their respective communities.</p>	Preliminary cost analysis must be available early in siting process
<b>Business Organizations</b>	Concerned over site selection nuisances, especially traffic impacts of a new facility or conflicts with intended business development plans	<p>Demonstrate that site selection criteria consider business community objectives</p> <p>Begin to identify facility's compatibility and mutual benefit with other business expansion objectives</p>	<p>Collect criteria through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solicit input/feedback during Town Hall/open house meetings and civic presentations via comment cards and verbal input. (Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce meetings)</li> <li>Conduct brief surveys of top 20 business in areas of the county that have potential sites involve business representatives in the siting alternatives working group</li> </ul>	<p>Businesses generate list of issues and concerns around site and a method to discuss mitigation of these issues.</p> <p>30 percent of return on survey and over 50 percent of those conveyed understanding for project purpose</p> <p>3 lead business community representatives (head of local Chamber, Rotary representative, etc.) support key siting criteria and generally supports site recommendation with testimony and/or letters to the SWA Board</p>	Information dissemination and criteria feedback precedes alternative sites analysis

**TABLE 2-4**  
Stakeholder Communication For Phase One-B and Phase Two

Stakeholder Group	Issues	Communication Objective(s)	Communication Methods	Measures of Whether Communication Objective(s) Are Being Met	Milestones/ Timeline
<b>Citizen Groups</b>	Potential that citizens will feel lack of influence in site selection	Engage community representatives early and reflect input in the siting criteria development and alternative sites analysis process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage community representatives in the alternative sites analysis working group (Contact Linda Schotzel/County Planner for names)</li> <li>Provide opportunities to validate working group at key milestones through Town Hall/open meetings, CPAC meetings, news media, and web site</li> <li>Provide easy access to project manager and team to ensure project commitment and willingness to be accessible</li> </ul>	<p>Minimum of 10 citizen representatives actively engage in the site selection process and remain committed throughout. (i.e., attend 3 of 4 meetings). They agree to sign a charter of commitment.</p> <p>Exceed community's average for public meeting attendance</p> <p>CPACs in areas that have potential sites send representatives to engage in site selection process</p> <p>Good geographical representation at public meetings through communication efforts (create map of those contacted by home address).</p> <p>Input is received from web site postings, and calls to project manager</p> <p>Siting analysis process receives positive feedback testimony at SWA Board meetings</p>	<p>Informational meetings should be held within potentially affected communities at start of site selection process, then again at key milestones (i.e., criteria definition and choosing site alternatives, then once preliminary site alternatives rating has occurred, etc.)</p> <p>Cultivate news articles prior to beginning site analysis</p> <p>Hold public meetings within communities at key siting milestones (criteria developed, alternative sites identified, etc.)</p>

**TABLE 2-4**  
Stakeholder Communication For Phase One-B and Phase Two

Stakeholder Group	Issues	Communication Objective(s)	Communication Methods	Measures of Whether Communication Objective(s) Are Being Met	Milestones/ Timeline
<b>Citizen Groups</b>	Not familiar with purpose and need for garden refuse processing facility within Sacramento County	Convey project need consistent with community values of cost effectiveness, access to quality products and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop information and materials reflective of community issues and values; place on web site and distribute within the community</li> <li>Provide siting alternatives analysis kick-off open house meeting, emphasizing project need and use opportunity to survey attendees for siting criteria</li> </ul>	<p>Selected working group members will be asked to review information materials for clarity, ease of reading and ability to answer questions.</p> <p>Good geographical representation at public meetings (map attendees)</p> <p>Over 50 percent of comment cards at meeting convey project need understanding regardless of approval rating.</p>	
	Concern about nuisance risks and doubt about the technological capacity to manage nuisances: odor, noise, litter, vectors, traffic impacts, and the effect of the facility on property values	<p>Develop awareness of successful garden refuse processing facilities</p> <p>Develop understanding of SWA as permit holder with enforcement and control authority over operations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop informational materials about successful operations and place on web site and distribute within the community.</li> <li>Information web pages also include a brief question survey automated to appear after 3 page viewings.</li> <li>Arrange tours of successful sites for key community representatives</li> <li>Fact sheet and presentations focus on SWA's ability to control nuisances</li> </ul>	<p>500+ copies of informational materials are distributed within 3 months.</p> <p>Web site viewing duration is measured along with survey input and emails/Web surveys are automatically fed into database crossed reference with date and pages that were viewed.</p> <p>After tour, half of the attendees are willing to speak to their representative groups about project benefits/or invite project team member to present information.</p>	<p>Early information dissemination and continued easy access</p> <p>Tours of successful facilities should be done at the start of the siting process</p>

**TABLE 2-4**  
Stakeholder Communication For Phase One-B and Phase Two

Stakeholder Group	Issues	Communication Objective(s)	Communication Methods	Measures of Whether Communication Objective(s) Are Being Met	Milestones/ Timeline
	Community concerns about equitable distribution of waste management responsibility	Demonstrate objective siting criteria and process that reflect community concerns and values and include representatives of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer to hold small focus group meetings to small groups of citizens – bring coffee and snacks to resident’s home or small community centers</li> <li>• Engage citizen representatives from potentially affected areas in criteria development and the siting alternatives working group</li> <li>• Reflect working group’s progress at open house meetings, newsletters and web site updates</li> </ul>	<p>Minimum of 10 citizen representatives actively engage in the site selection process and remain committed throughout. (i.e., attend 3 of 4 meetings). They will be asked to sign a charter to participate</p> <p>Be invited to speak with at minimum 5 small citizens groups to gather input and provide information.</p> <p>30 percent of comment cards and verbal testimony reflect understanding for process and the value of participant’s input</p>	Siting criteria must be established before any potential sites are identified in order for the process to remain objective
<b>Media Group</b>	Interested in special interest stories that may affect local community:  Desire easy access to information and interviewees	Achieve unbiased, factual newspaper articles and broadcast media presentations, both locally and regionally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide easy-to-use communication tools: web, fact sheets, etc.</li> <li>• Arrange to offer background briefings for at least 3 local newspapers and broadcast media</li> <li>• Develop feature article content and images</li> </ul>	Media story log - Rate newspaper articles for length of articles, use of project advocates in story, use of educational information and over all positive or negative conclusions about the project.	<p>Early distribution and access to information materials</p> <p>Cultivate news items at key decision points and prior to holding public meetings.</p>

It is recommended that “Public Involvement Plan Effectiveness Reports” be prepared to coincide with key milestones. For instance, a report should be developed to summarize Phase One-B in preparation for Phase Two, but there may be a need for several effectiveness reports in Phase Two to monitor opinions and feedback in the siting alternatives analysis process. For example, an effectiveness report would follow after holding an open house meeting and several civic presentations. The report would assist the siting alternatives working group in validating or adjusting their siting criteria.

The report would incorporate information from, but not limited to, the following sources:

- Official statements at SWA Board meetings
- Interviews and phone conversation statements
- Small focus group communication
- Responses to surveys/comment cards
- Letters stating formal/informal positions
- Viewer duration on the Web site
- Newspaper articles
- Progress in reaching quantitative objectives

The record will indicate baseline opinions as gathered during Phase One-B and identify the overall project goal for that phase. Opinions will be rated on a Likert Scale (i.e., angry, against, neutral, favorable, advocate) adjusted appropriately to the communication objective. The report will then record progress against the individual communication objectives for each stakeholder group, by listing communication methods used, the numbers of participants, and communication objectives. An electronic database should be used to ensure that accurate records will be maintained, information can be readily accessed, and conclusions can be supported with actual data.

## 2.5 Recommendations

1. Implement the Public Involvement Plan for building relationships and establishing communication with key community stakeholders. This plan is summarized in Table 2-4. Implementation should start immediately after an SWA Board decision to commence Phase Two of the project.
2. At the start of the facility site selection process, implement the Siting Component of the Public Involvement Plan to improve community stakeholder support and minimize project opposition. This plan is summarized in Table 2-4.