1. Agenda

Topic	Lead	Start	Durati on	Materials
Welcome Review Participant Meeting Instructions Review Agenda Approve Draft M3 Minutes BOC Action on Updated Workplan	Facilitator	3:00	15 mins	Working M4 Agenda Draft M3 Minutes Updated M3 Evaluations Updated Workplan
Comments 1) Public Oral and Written 2) Member Written	Public Workgroup	3:15	30 mins	Public Comments Member Comments
Tour Questions and Answers: Update	Facilitator	3:45	5 mins	BCTT Tour Questions 10/25
SMMP Values and Goals Discussion	McGuire Reddick	3:50	25 mins	SMMP Values and Goals
Deschutes, Linn, Lincoln, Marion, Polk, & Yamhill Counties: Input on Charge C: SMMP and Charge E: Public Education with Workgroup	Reddick Facilitator	4:15	45 mins	Charge C
Dinner with Subcommittee Connection Opportunity	All	5:00	30 mins	
Subcommittee Reports: Topic A.1. Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity Topic A.2. Past CUP Conditions Topic A.3. Legal Issues and Topic B.1. Land Use Review Topic C.1. SMMP	Subcommitt ee-Led Workgroup Discussions (20 mins each)	5:30	80 mins	Website: A.1. Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity Website: A.2. Past CUP Conditions Website: A.3. Legal Issues and B.1. Land Use Review Website: C.1. Sustainable Materials Management Plan (SMMP)
Next Steps: 1) Member Meeting Four Evaluation (Due Monday at 5:00 PM) 2) Homework for Meeting 5: TBD 3) Next Meeting: 11/17/22 @ 3:00 PM Not 11/3/22. Will include an Open House.	Facilitator	6:50	10 mins	https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/BCTTM4
Adjourn	All	7:00		

2. Attendance

Organization Interest Group	WORKGROUP Member	Alternate	Polling	Ex Officio	Charge	Present
SWAC/DSAC	Joel Geier	Chuck Gilbert	Х		All	Both
SWAC/DSAC	Marge Popp		Х		All	Х
Planning Commission	Elizabeth Irish		X		All	Х
Republic: National	Russ Knocke	Ginger Rough	X		All but C	Х
Republic: Local	Shawn Edmonds	Julie Jackson	X		All but C	Х
Public	John Deuel		Х		All	X
Public	Kathryn Duvall		X		All	X
Public	Christopher McMorran		X		All	Х
Public	Ryan McAlister		Х		All	Х
Public	Mary Parmigiani		X		All	
Public	Ed Pitera		X		All	X
Public	Louisa Shelby		X		All	X
Public	Catherine Biscoe		, X		All	Х
DEQ	Brian Fuller			Х	All but D	Х
Marion County	Brian May	Andrew Johnson		Х	Only C	Х
Linn County	Shane Sanderson			Х	Only C	Х
Benton County	Daniel Redick			Х	All	Х
Benton County	Sean McGuire	Jen Brown		X	All	X

Benton County Staff

Benton County	Darren Nichols	X
Benton County	Greg Verret	X
Benton County	Inga Williams	X
Benton County	Linda Ray	

Facilitation Staff:

ICM Resolutions	Sam Imperati	Χ
ICM Resolutions	Amelia Webb	Χ

3. Minutes

Topic	Minutes
Welcome Review Participant Meeting Instructions Review Agenda Approve Draft M3 Minutes BOC Action on Updated Workplan	 Review agenda Review M3 Minutes, not comments made – Minutes approved. Review M3 eval Sam: is it worth the time and effort to do these? Sam will pose the question to the group at the end of the meeting. Joel and some other members said they couldn't find the link (it is on the agenda) – Sam will send it out in an email Friday. The significant change to the BOC Action and Workplan is that more time was added between the Workgroup meetings, so there is time for subcommittees to meet. No questions
Comments - Public Oral and Written - Member Written	1) Dug Pollock (neighbor of the landfill, engineer, and parent): explained how he helped develop a recyclable ink cartages program, and how ink cartages stopped being classified as "containers" so they could not go into the landfill. He also discussed how Corvallis public schools have been resistant to recycling and continue to throw away things, such as fluorescent tubes, that are not supposed to go into the landfill. Essentially, there are many opportunities to reduce waste, yet people are not checking what is going into the landfill. He also emphasized that these consensus processes are hard for the real public to get involved

- with and be heard. He said these processes tend to favor clients more than the public.
- 2) Debbie Palmer (resident): expressed her opinion that the facilitator misrepresented the neighbors wanting to close the landfill. She elaborated that the neighbors want to stop the landfill from expanding and have it closed. She also noted the difference between intentional and accidental landfills and commented that Republic Services is making money from the landfill as a for-profit company.
- 3) <u>Linda Brewer (resident, soil scientist, and ten-year member of SWAC):</u> stated that, in her opinion, Republic is doing a good job managing the landfill. She also noted that the Benton County trash rate has been held artificially low.
- 4) <u>Pat Schwartz (resident):</u> expressed the belief that the Republic is an important part of the community.
- 5) Cat Newsheller (resident): expressed the belief that Republic is simply trying a new tactic to get what they want expanding the landfill and taking in more trash. She feels that Republic should not be making money off people's health, and if the County lets them expand, they will become out of control. She also shared personal experiences concerning the traffic and debris on HWY 99 from landfill trucks.
- 6) <u>Dale Elizabeth Draeger (resident):</u> explained that they recently visited the landfill and were concerned that people were throwing away recyclable materials like metal. Republic should have someone to monitor the sorting.
- 7) Pat Hare (City Manager of Adair Village): Pat reflected on their positive experiences working with Republic and noted that they are a very large employer in the community. He also notes that when the cost to get rid of trash increases, more trash ends up on the street.
- 8) <u>James Rodell (resident, but not close to the landfill):</u> He would like very clear and transparent communication on whether Republic broke certain agreements and the consequences.
 - Ed: There are disconnects on the historical materials in the different packets.
 - Sam: The County has a working draft of all the information, and the versions members have created are online, but Daniel will put all the materials in one place to make them more accessible.

	 A simple timeline would be good, so people don't talk past each other.
	- A glossary of terms would also be helpful.
Tour Questions and Answers: Update	Joel requested that the Tour Questions be changed so it does not appear that the neighborhood leadership neglected to respond to Republic tour questions.
SMMP Values and Goals Discussion	 Sean gave the presentation. Questions: Marge: How are the values applied to the current workgroup process? To what extent will the core values Sean just presented be in the scope of the SMMP the workgroup presents? The SMMP will look at all this info to incorporate it into their recommendations. The discussion of applying Values to the CUP will be added to the next subcommittee meeting agenda (& potentially the legal one, as well)
	 Daniel reached out to other Counties so they could talk about the issues/topics they have been dealing with / key experiences. Representatives: Paul Seita (Lincoln County), Chad Centola (Deschutes County), Christen Tindall (Polk County), Shane Sanderson (Linn County), and Brian May (Marion County).
	Key takeaways:
	Public engagement is critical, especially with the SWMP or SMMP.
	2) Subcommittees can be very effective
Deschutes, Linn, Lincoln, Marion, Polk,	3) The Recycling Modernization Act should be front and
& Yamhill Counties: Input on Charge C: SMMP and Charge E: Public Education with Workgroup	center 4) They should consider different housing types. EX: Multi-family homes have different recycling resources. How can you still support these homes? 5) Remember that solid waste is a transportation issue. 6) Keep in mind changing technologies (EX: JUNO) 7) Recycling is vital to the transient community. It is an
	equity issue. - Daniel: Important to keep in mind the "cradle to cradle" idea. 99% of the emissions from an
	object come from its use. - Paul: Once you have every area of the County thinking about sustainability, you will have a sustainable community much faster.
Dinner with Subcommittee Connection	

Opportunity	
Subcommittee Reports: Topic A.1. Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity Topic A.2. Past CUP Conditions Topic A.3. Legal Issues and Topic B.1. Land Use Review	 Ken Ekland presented his summary of the A.1. subcommittee meeting. Ginger noted that the County has prior contractual obligations not subject to the workgroup. Sam will compare Ken and Daniel's subcommittee notes. He also reminds the group that it is not productive to argue the Charter, and cost-benefit analysis is not part of the charge. Ed presents A.2. subcommittee summary The goal remains the same. They created a comprehensive and accessible document on the first CUP. Given that each CUP completely supersedes the next, the group may not need to create documents for all 24 to 25 CUPs. However, having the evolving context is helpful. Ed asked if DEQ could provide a list of all the landfill permits overtime. Sam gave out candy. A subcommittee was formed to investigate which Workgroup member(s) took more than their fair share!
Next Steps: 1) Member Meeting Four Evaluation (Due Monday at 5:00 PM) 2) Homework for Meeting 5: TBD	 Liz presents on the legal subcommittee – they decided that the previous lawyer is the best person for the job, despite concerns expressed at earlier workgroup meetings. Many of the legal questions already have answers; they just need to be located among the documentation. Information on who (DEQ, ODFW, etc.) has been monitoring what (water, air, etc.) is needed. Marge presented on the SMMP subcommittee – They have decided to pull out the main concepts and look at each one. They will then add sections that might apply to Benton County and not others. The meeting evals will be optional The next workgroup meeting will be half subcommittee reports, and half open house. Each subcommittee will have a table at the open house
3) Next Meeting: 11/17/22 @ 3:00 PM Not 11/3/22. Will include an Open House. Adjourn	to engage the public – details to follow.

4. Polling Issues

None

5. ZOOM MEETING RECORDS:

Zoom Recording and Transcript: <u>Link</u>

6. MEETING CHAT:

00:23:24	Dale Elizabeth Draeger: I would like to make a comment
00:23:50	Pat Schwartz: I would like to make a comment
00:24:09	WG, Pat Hare Adair Village: I Would like to comment as well
01:45:02	Debbie Palmer: Echoing/amplifying Chad Centola's testimony, and P. Seitz's testimony also, that their SWACs were key to the public engagement necessary to develop their SWMPs
02:53:26	Ken Eklund: No video?
02:54:09	wg Joel Geier: Same problem on my end.
02:54:10	Ken Eklund: The meeting room camera seems to be off?
02:54:28	BOC Info: working on it
02:55:55	Darren NICHOLS: Thank you for working on it.
03:31:28	Ken Eklund: Subcommittee A2: that was a nice report-out, thank you
03:32:01	wg Joel Geier: Yes indeed, I'll second that, Ken, and thank you Ed!
03:37:09	Ken Eklund: BoC Info: it's generally hard to hear most people in the room.
03:38:06	BOC Info: better?
03:38:35	Ken Eklund: Somewhat, thanks!
03:39:33	wg Joel Geier: Yes, I had a hard time hearing Catherine's comment, and also Ginger Rough's comments earlier.
03:52:37	Ken Eklund: Very hard to hear Liz, if you're online.
03:54:01	wg Joel Geier: Thanks, that's much better!
04:08:56	Ken Eklund: Erratum: I'm a member of this subcommittee (name is missing from online member list)

04:10:02 **wg Joel Geier:** Yes, that was my understanding, we should fix the list.

04:14:46 **BOC Info:** updated

04:15:06 **Ken Eklund:** thank you BOC Info!

