

Deschutes County Department of Solid Waste
Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
March 19, 2024
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.



**SOLID
WASTE**

	Committee Members:				
*	Paul Bertagna Jackson Dumanch, Alternate City of Sisters		Jared Black Citizen at Large		Luke Dynes Citizen at Large
*	Ed Fitch John Roberts, Alternate City of Redmond	✓	Keith Kessarlis Citizen at Large	✓	Cassie Lacy Vacant, Alternate City of Bend
*	Erica Lindberg Ron Shearer, Alternate Republic Services	✓	Chris Ogren Citizen at Large	✓	Mike Riley The Environmental Center
✓	Erwin Swetnam Roman Guffy, Alternate Cascade Disposal	✓	Robin Vora Citizen at Large		
	Consultant(s):				
✓C	Dwight Miller Parametrix, Inc.	✓C	Ryan Rudnick Parametrix, Inc.	*C	Aubrie Koenig Conсор
	Staff:				
✓S	Susan Baker Solid Waste Manager	✓S	Tim Brownell Solid Waste Director	*S	Chad Centola SW Senior Advisor
*S	Jeff Merwin Solid Waste Manager	✓S	Sue Monette SW Management Analyst	S	Kristie Bollinger County Property Manager
S	Shad Campbell IT Applications Manager	S	Peter Gutowsky CDD Director	✓S	Nick Lelack County Administrator
✓S	Stephanie Marshall Legal Counsel Assistant	*S	Lee Randall Facilities Director		Kimberly Riley Legal Counsel Assistant
	Elected Official(s):				
E					
	Guest(s):	✓G	12	*G	9
✓	<i>Present at meeting</i>	*	<i>Videoconference</i>	C	<i>Consultant</i>
E	<i>Elected Official</i>	G	<i>Guest</i>	S	<i>Staff</i>

Decisions/Actions Taken by the Committee in Blue
Items Requiring Follow-up in Red

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Tim Brownell, Deschutes County Solid Waste Director.

1. Welcome: Tim Brownell

Tim Brownell welcomed the group and reviewed the list of Committee members in attendance.

2. **Review/Approve Minutes:** Tim Brownell

Tim Brownell asked for comments on the minutes from the February 20, 2024 meeting.

Action: Keith Kessarlis made the motion and Erwin Swetnam seconded to approve the minutes from the prior meeting. Chris Ogren abstained as he was not present at the meeting. The remaining committee unanimously approved the minutes as written.

3. **Public Comment:**

Public comments are available in the meeting recording. Following is a list of individuals that provided verbal comments.

- Mark Salvo
- Steve Poyne
- Andrew Walch
- Harrison Ruffin
- Steve Payer
- Linda Swearingen

(SWAC member Robin Vora arrived at 9:10 a.m.)

4. **Site Evaluation Report Review and Discussion:** Tim Brownell, Dwight Miller, Ryan Rudnick

Tim opened the discussion by noting the February meeting gave an overview of the report findings. This meeting will be an opportunity for further questions and to review feedback from the SWAC. During the next meeting in April, the intent is to get a recommendation from the SWAC for a recommended site. The Board of County Commissioners will make the final determination and there will be additional public meetings as part of that decision process. The discussion is summarized below with additional details available in the meeting recording and slides.

Key Considerations:

Dwight Miller noted this meeting is really about time for the SWAC to comment or query the consultant team or staff. Dwight noted both the Moon Pit and Roth East sites are feasible, but there are important additional considerations. He then highlighted overall key considerations for schedule and cost.

- **Moon Pit:**
 - Schedule considerations include: Zone change may be a lengthy multi-step process. Securing the BLM right-of-way may trigger a longer NEPA review process.
 - Cost considerations include: Acquisition and initial development costs are higher in part due to aggregate quality in the initial area of development.
- **Roth East:**
 - Schedule considerations include: Land use permitting process could be lengthy.
 - Cost considerations include: Mitigation for habitat could increase costs. Haul route is slightly longer and will continue to impact costs. Timing of water rights may require increased costs to haul and store water for operations.
- **Discussion:**
 - Robin Vora asked about the partnership and coordination between the mining and landfill operations to blast for and remove rock. Dwight confirmed a partnership could be beneficial, but noted the aggregate quality in the development locations is a factor in the costs. Ryan clarified the estimated costs for initial

development at the Moon Pit site are different than the later phases. Tim stated there is a range of costs to account for the timing of development and potential variation in the external aggregate market.

- Mike Riley asked for clarification about the assumptions for the lifespan costs. Ryan responded that the range is accounted for in the lifespan costs for Moon Pit. Generally, if compared over 100 years the long-term costs are similar, but Moon Pit has higher initial costs.
- Cassie Lacy asked for clarification about how mitigation is included in the cost estimate for Roth East. Tim responded that may need to be adjusted if additional property acquisition is needed for mitigation. Dwight stated the fee in-lieu cost is partially accounted for in the initial development costs. Ryan added there are multiple avenues for mitigation and fee in-lieu is one of those options.
- Mike Riley commented it would be helpful to have clarity around the cost estimate assumptions and ability to compare apples to apples for the conservation range. Tim confirmed the range of costs can be refined with the recent information about potential Roth East wildlife mitigation costs.
- Erwin Swetnam asked whether there is an option to purchase additional acreage at Roth East. Tim responded that it is an option.
- Paul Bertagna asked about variability in Moon Pit development costs and whether County staff have queried the Road department about using the rock for their operations. Most counties own their own pits and are able to control pricing rather than pay market rate. Tim noted there may be some complexities but confirmed that can be further reviewed as an option.
- Keith Kessar asked if there is potential revenue for the County if Hooker Creek continues to do excavation. Tim confirmed that is an option that has been modeled.

5. SWAC Discussion

SWAC members were polled to identify which of the fourteen technical areas they wished to spend time discussing.

• **Topic 2. Site Development/Permitting:**

- Keith Kessar asked about the difference in timing for permitting between the two sites. Dwight responded that both have quite a bit of process required for permitting, but the permitting process for Moon Pit may be slightly more predictable.
- Robin Vora commented he agrees on the assessment of permitting challenges and asked about the land use process. Stephanie Marshall (County counsel) stated both site permitting processes have avenues for appeal but there are many unknowns. Dwight clarified the consultant team does not see the need to widen the Moon Pit access road.
- Robin Vora commented he feels the federal efforts related to sage grouse habitat should be acknowledged in the report.
- Cassie Lacy asked about the urgency of having the new landfill operational given the timing of Knott Landfill reaching capacity. Tim responded that early 2030 is the current estimated remaining life of Knott Landfill and the County is reviewing options to help extend the life of the Knott Landfill.
- Mike Riley commented both sites have several unknowns related to schedule.
- Robin Vora commented he feels the schedule risks are greater at the Roth East site given the sage grouse habitat considerations.

• **Topic 11. Natural Resources:**

- Robin Vora commented he feels the Roth West property is not appropriate for mitigation for many of the local habit species particularly given the ODFW comments. He added the haul traffic for water use until water rights are secured should be noted in the traffic counts given the potential disruption to wildlife. He commented there should be additional consideration for fire risks and the potential differences between the sites. Feels analysis doesn't recognize an important big picture element that mining operations at Moon Pit will continue regardless of which site is chosen.

- **Topic 10. Air Quality and Weather:**
 - Keith Kessarlis asked for clarification about the greenhouse gas emissions data and whether use of electric is considered. Dwight responded that a transition to renewable natural gas sourced from the landfill and then to electric is integrated into the analysis.
 - Cassie Lacy commented there are state directives for energy providers to be carbon free by 2040 and asked about the fuel source and assumptions in the greenhouse gas emission analysis. Dwight responded the 2040 timing is noted with the transition to renewable natural gas shown in the analysis.
 - Robin Vora commented the executive summary should mention some of the public comments about concerns related to dust devils and paragliding. Ryan noted the narrative includes information about the concerns related to dust devils. Tim asked if Pine Mountain has a weather station. A member of the public noted the Horse Ridge weather station may provide better information.

- **Topic 13. Community Assessment:**
 - Robin Vora commented it would be helpful to include more information about the public comments on recreation experience impacts.
 - Chris Ogren commented it would be helpful to note the number and proximity of residences to both sites.
 - Keith Kessarlis commented he feels there are more likely to be appeals for the Roth East site and would like to acknowledge more of the comment record.

- **Topic 3. Transportation System Assessment:**
 - Mike Riley commented the greenhouse gas emissions analysis in the presentation would be valuable to include in the report. Cassie Lacy agreed.
 - Robin Vora asked if the Roth East access would be paved and if that is considered in the analysis. Dwight responded yes that is the current assumption. Ryan added there are several options for access to the Roth East site.

- **Topic 9. Environmental Site Assessment Phase 1:**
 - Dwight provided initial clarification that this report is an Environmental Site Assessment Phase I, which is a standard process.

- **Topic 4. Water Infrastructure Assessment:**
 - Robin Vora commented the potential insufficient water rights at Roth East might be more problematic than described in the report. Ryan responded that the exempt well would provide sufficient supply for winter months, but water trucks would be needed to supplement summer month operational needs. Robin asked if that situation is different at the Moon Pit site. Tim clarified the intention with both sites would be to secure water rights over time. Ryan added the temporary water supply options are available and the costs are slightly higher at Roth East.
 - Mike Riley asked whether the water truck traffic is accounted for in the greenhouse gas emissions analysis. Dwight confirmed the analysis will be updated if needed to include water trucks.
 - Chris Ogren asked for clarification about whether a new well would be needed or just new water rights at both sites. Ryan and Tim responded a new well may be needed at Roth East. Ryan noted the geology and hydrogeology section of the report speaks to the depth to groundwater and availability of groundwater.

- **Topic 12. Cultural Resources:**
 - Mike Riley asked what amount of Tribal consultation has been completed and whether than can be included in the report. Although the consultant team hasn't yet received a response, Dwight and Ryan noted the team will be reaching out again to Tribal contacts.

- Robin Vora commented the possibility of finding resources at Roth East seems slightly higher. Dwight confirmed the assessment is described in more detail in the reports.
- **Topic 14. Cost Estimates:**
 - Robin Vora asked how population growth is being looked at in the cost analysis. Ryan responded the interest in the study is a comparative analysis but a more detailed assessment of population growth may be appropriate for the selected site.
 - Keith Kessar asked how granular the cost assessment is and whether there is analysis at a household bill impact. Tim responded it would be a use impact not a property tax impact. Tim added the difference in cost is likely in the range of 10 cents per month. Customers would see fees through the franchise hauler fees or self-disposal fees. Dwight noted the report can add some clarity to the franchise fee and tip fee cost.

Tim opened the discussion to questions from the public.

- A member from the public asked for clarification about the decision options that will be available to the Board of County Commissioners. Tim responded the Board will take into account the recommendation of the SWAC but it is entirely their discretion which site is chosen. Tim added the master plan information will be provided to the Board that identifies estimated costs for disposal out of county or using other disposal alternatives.
- Mike Riley noted he is inclined to add one more SWAC meeting.
- A member from the public commented there seems to be quite a bit of heartburn over the sage grouse situation. One option from the Roths would be to expand the property acquisition options for potential mitigation.
- Robin Vora noted additional study might be needed to understand mitigation potential.

6. Adjourn: Tim Brownell

Next Committee Meeting: The next SWAC Advisory Group meeting is scheduled virtually or at the Deschutes County Services Building (1300 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR 97703) on **April 16, 2024 9 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

- April 16, 2024, 9-11am; input on finalist sites

Meeting Adjourned: 11:09 a.m.