**Deschutes County Department of Solid Waste**

**Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**

**March 12, 2019**

**1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**
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Decisions/Actions Taken by the Committee in Blue

Items Requiring Follow-up in Red

**Call to Order**: The meeting was called to order by Timm Schimke, Deschutes County Department of Solid Waste Director, at 1:35 p.m. It was noted there was a quorum of the SWAC in attendance.

1. **Welcome & Introductions**:

Timm Schimke opened the meeting, acknowledged the guests, and indicated there was time on the agenda for public comments. As there were several new people in the room, Timm asked that everyone introduce themselves.

**Review/Approve Minutes:** Timm Schimke

Timm Schimke asked for comments on the minutes for the October 2018 to January 2019 meetings. Action: Erwin Swetnam made the motion and Bill Duerden seconded to approve the October 2018, November 2018 and January 2019 minutes. The committee unanimously approved the minutes as written.

1. **Summary of Disposal Options Public Meeting:**  Doug Drennen & Timm Schimke

The Disposal Options public meeting was well attended with over 50 people. Attendees provided meeting feedback using the Disposal Options survey. The survey was designed to first elicit input as to what criteria was most important to citizens and businesses regarding the decision to site a new in-County landfill or to transport waste out of County to an existing regional landfill. The survey also asked if there was a preference of siting a new in-County landfill versus long haul to a regional landfill.

The County received 42 survey responses from the meeting and online submittals. Environmental considerations were most important followed by cost effectiveness. KTVZ, a local television station, also conducted its own online poll asking people where trash should go once Knott Landfill in Bend is full – either to a new local site or out of the county.

Timm stated that both the County survey and the KTVZ poll show the majority of people (70-75% of respondents) lean toward a new in-County landfill. As these are unscientific surveys, as the County moves forward with implementation, an additional more extensive survey may be used and mass publicized.

1. **Chapter 7 – Draft Recommendations/Discussion:**

Doug presented the proposed recommendations to proceed with siting a new in-County landfill. Recommendation 7.1 states the County should begin immediately to develop the siting process. The timeline to complete preliminary review of location criteria and develop the process to be used in selecting a new site requires time and involvement from agencies and the public. There were questions as to why we were not starting immediately. He stated there is no formal siting model or set procedures to follow and the County should take its time to ensure the approach is fully vetted before moving forward. It was asked whether the recommendation should be limited to County only or possibly use the term “local landfill” or “regional site.” Roughly 75,000+ tons of out-of-county waste makes a landfill regional. After discussing, the language was left as proposed.

Recommendation 7.2 states the County should begin the formal process to site a new landfill by 2021. It was asked why that date. Doug stated the County can start at any time, but assuming it may take up to 8 years to complete the process and obtain permits, this would be the latest the process should begin. As of 2019, the best estimate for the remaining capacity of Knott Landfill is 10 years. Doug said the 8 year schedule is somewhat conservative and assumes there could be appeals for obtaining land use approval or permits from the State.

A guest at the meeting asked about other technologies to reduce waste disposed in landfills. Timm answered that the SWMP does discuss various technologies that might be considered. At this time, these technologies are not feasible. The County will continue to monitor progress and circumstances, which could point towards re-evaluating these technologies in the future.

1. **Chapter 8 – Review/Comments and Draft Recommendations:**

Doug mentioned Chapter 8 was reviewed at the last SWAC meeting, but as several SWAC members were not in attendance, he would present a short overview of the chapter before discussing the recommendations. The presentation touched on the findings of the administration and financial management systems. Basically, the current management structure and coordination between the cities and County has worked well. The County has demonstrated its ability to operate a regional system of transfer stations and the landfill offers cost effective services. DSW operates as an enterprise fund and has produced a stable financial system that has managed rates effectively. Also, the current franchise system, where cities and the County work with private collection companies, is working well.

Doug focused on the Needs and Opportunities section, highlighting the proposed new programs and services identified in the SWMP needed to achieve the goals of the system and the challenges of implementing these new programs. One need is to establish an ongoing process to continue dialog between stakeholders to plan and take actions to implement recommendations contained in the SWMP.

Given the SWMP identified the need to invest an estimated $20 million to $30 million over the next 10 years, it requires the County to evaluate long-term financial options. The financial options can examine how much of future investments can be funded through rates or financed with County bonds.

Doug proceeded to review the recommendations in Chapter 8. There was a question on how old the current interlocal agreements are between the cities and County. There are agreements with the cities of Bend and Redmond only, which were developed in approximately 2006. The SWAC made no changes to these draft recommendations.

1. **Priorities and Implementation Schedule:**

Doug reviewed the draft implementation schedule that was handed out at the meeting. This draft schedule shows each of the 24 recommendations presented in the SWMP and a timeline for moving forward with actions. Recommendations shown in blue indicate the action requires participation of multiple stakeholders, as they impact the services provided in various jurisdictions. These recommendations will need input from the Environmental Center, other stakeholders and the franchise collection companies. Recommendations shown in red reflect actions the County needs to initiate and manage. These will also impact all stakeholders, but the County will need to budget funds to move forward with them.

The implementation schedule reflects sequencing of actions that rely on other activities prior to starting. One example of this is the fact that startup of a system wide commercial food waste collection program should not occur until the compost facilities have been upgraded to handle the increased volume of organics. Another example suggests the County complete a waste characterization study to obtain data prior to implementing a program for processing C/D waste.

Doug discussed each recommendation and the suggested timeline to elicit input as to the priorities reflected in the schedule. Paul Bertagna mentioned expanding yard debris. The City of Sisters offers universal service with garbage and yard debris built into the default service. Mike Riley and Cassie Lacy recommended rolling out food waste sooner than 2022. Mike Riley proposed expanding the wording for recommendations 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 to include space requirements. Action: The committee unanimously agreed to add “and ensures adequate infrastructure and physical space is available” for recommendations 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4.

The SWAC was asked to review the implementation schedule and be prepared to finalize it at the next meeting in April. Doug mentioned that he hoped to get the final draft SWMP out the first week of April if possible. Timm requested committee member feedback be provided before the Board adopts the SWMP.

1. **Comments on the SWMP Summary:**

Doug asked if there were any other comments on the draft Summary provided at the previous meeting. He also stated that the final draft SWMP will contain an expanded Executive Summary that includes the Implementation Schedule. Action: Mike Riley requested to add Tourism as a generator type in the Waste Reduction and Recycling section on page 3 of the Summary.

1. **Next Steps:** The next meeting is expected to be the final meeting of the SWAC. The goal is for SWAC to provide final input at the meeting and send the draft SWMP to the Board for adoption in May.

**Next Meeting:** SWAC Advisory Group meetings will be held the 4th Tuesday of each month at the Deschutes Services Building (1300 NW Wall St., Bend, OR 97703) from 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Public meetings will be held in the evening. The next Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting is **April 23, 2019 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

**Meeting Adjourned**: 3:38 p.m.