

## Subcommittee Report to Work Group - Working Document

### Contents

Charge .....	2
Members.....	2
Meeting #1 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 10/25/22 .....	3
Meeting #2 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/9/22 .....	6
Meeting #3 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/15/22 .....	10
Meeting #4 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/29/22 .....	16
Meeting #5 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 12/6/22 .....	20
Meeting #6 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 12/13/22 .....	24
Meeting #7 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/3/23 .....	27
<b>Meeting #8 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/10/23 .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Meeting #9 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/17/23 .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Meeting #10 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/7/23 .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Meeting #11 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/10/23 .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Meeting #12 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/15/23 .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Meeting #13 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/22/23 .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Meeting #14 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 3/6/23 .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Meeting #15 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 3/8/23 .....</b>	<b>49</b>

## Charge

Charge A: Common Understandings Tasks

1) A chronological history of key Coffin Butte Landfill topics:

- A) Size
- B) Specific locations
- C) Assumptions (e.g. when will the landfill close?)

## Members

<b>Bill Bromann</b>
<b>Brian May</b>
<b>Chuck Gilbert</b>
<b>Daniel Redick</b>
<b>Ginger Rough</b>
<b>Ian Macnab</b>
<b>Ken Eklund</b>
<b>Mark Yeager</b>
<b>Paul Nietfeld</b>
<b>Shane Sanderson</b>
<b>Staff: Daniel Redick</b>
<b>Facilitator: Sam Imperati</b>

## Meeting #1 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 10/25/22

### Attendance

<b>Member</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Bill Bromann</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Brian May</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Chuck Gilbert</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ginger Rough</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ian Macnab</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ken Eklund</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Marge Popp</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Mark Yeager</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Paul Nietfeld</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Shane Sanderson</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Staff: Daniel Redick</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Facilitator: Sam Imperati</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Observers:</b>	

### Questions to be Explored by Subcommittee:

1. Landfill lifespan and closure
  - When will the landfill close?
  - What is the landfill's Service life?
  - How does the expected quarry excavation status at time of cell 5 capacity change the projected lifespan for cell 6 and total landfill lifespan estimates?
  - Can cell 6 start being used in 2025 (at completion date of cell 5)?
  - How much airspace will be created by the quarry excavation?
  - How can the landfill's current state provide information about capacity and lifespan, given uncertainties about the future and future variables?
  - Can we use probability distributions when uncertainty exists?
  - What is the projected annual tonnage anticipated moving forward? How can variables like garbage volumes, market shifts, and wildfires be used in these projections?
  - What leads to increase in annual tonnage?
  - What leads to changes in lifespan estimates?

- What are possible scenarios?
- What do we know what will happen based on each scenario

## 2. Landfill Site and Operations information

- Is 178 available acres included only on north side?
  - Yes, only on North Side. Includes quarry space.
- What are the Closed, active, and future active cells? North vs. South?
- Is Republic contractually obligated with knife river to let them remove all material from the quarry?
- What are the contractual obligations?
- What does Republic Services consider to be feasible regarding operations impacting site life, including the amount of material accepted annually?
- Can Ian and Bill (Republic Services) present to the group to provide a calendar look at what planning looks like at the landfill, including various aspect of the business side, collection, and franchises, for best projecting waste on annual basis?
  - Yes

### Recording:

- [Recording](#)

### Next Steps/Action Items:

### Next Meeting:

- Meeting #2: November 8, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm
- Meeting #3: November 15, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm

### Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [DRAFT Report Common Understandings: Solid Waste History \(IV.A.1.A\)](#)
- [DRAFT Report Common Understandings: Landfill Size and Development History \(IV.A.1.B\)](#)

- [DRAFT Report Common Understandings: Specific Landfill Locations and Cell Size \(IV.A.1.C\)](#)
- [DRAFT Report Common Understandings: Assumptions \(IV.A.1.F\)](#)
- [Whitcombe - 9/12/22](#)
- [Nietfeld - 9/14/22](#)
- [Geier - 9/3/22 - History](#)
- [Geier - 9/4/22 - Site Description](#)
- [Common Understandings Feedback - Republic 9-30-22](#)
- [Landfill Site Life - Republic Services 9-30-22](#)

DRAFT

## Meeting #2 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/9/22

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	X
Brian May	X
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough	X
Ian Macnab	X
Ken Eklund	X
Marge Popp	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	X
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	

### Agenda and Notes:

#### Proposed report outline:

1. SIZE
  - a. Landfill lot size – Cell size or lot size? Brief summary for how tax lots have progressed over time. 1980's+, 1974+
    - i. Table of VLI purchases over time, with notes on those sections subjected to zoning changes (e.g. FC -> LS)
      - a. Include other land-use info, using land-use subcommittee information
      - b. Does this tie-in to the subcommittee charge?
    - ii. Permitted space grants, perhaps in a simple table


- a. Only certain instances of the permitted space changing – aiming to outline how permitted space changes
- b. Differentiate what has occurred within permitted footprint, and what has occurred in VLI parcels/other property. Two tracks:
  - i. VLI Tax Lots
  - ii. Landfill site, cells and operation on permitted space

b. History

- i. Intake volume plot (intake per calendar year)
  - a. Summarize in a chart
- ii. Available space lot (available airspace over time)
  - a. Cubic yards, volume. Use landfill annual reports for this data?
  - b. EPA reported capacity (capacity increase from 2016-17)
    - i. GHG Reporting page
    - ii. Does it have relationship to quarry operation?
  - c. Some adjustments to permitted airspace, document reasons
    - i. Stability analysis implications – triangle – Republic staff to provide details on changes in capacity
  - d. 2000+ : Most relevant adjustments

c. Current state

- iii. Map showing current landfill area, annotated with tax lots and zoning
  - a. Drawing G03 from the SDP
  - b. Clearly defined boundaries around VLI owned property
  - c. Buffer property? Related to charge?



iv. Map showing existing and planned landfill cells. Could simply reference the detailed maps and drawings of Appendix A of the 2021 Site Development Plan (SDP), with discussion if needed

a. [Site Map - 2021 Coffin Butte Landfill SDP Drawing G02](#)

2. SPECIFIC LOCATIONS – redundant?

- a. Table of specific lots (with zoning designations and permitted constraints (if any)) making up the landfill property
- b. Maps – G02-G03?



Republic to explain, walk through model that they use annually to help determine the site life – perhaps 15-20 minutes at beginning of 11/15 meeting

A. What assumptions and projections is republic making in this modelling?

Proprietary tool from republic. They can discuss key inputs.

How soon can the quarry be fully excavated for maximum airspace?

Post meeting addition:

- Sam requested that Republic Services provide more details around the quarry, including:
  - o When is the quarry going to be fully excavated?
  - o What factors impact the timeline for quarry excavation?

Recording:

- [Recording](#)

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Continue with Proposed report outline – “Landfill Life Projections”
- Open House Questions/Survey

Next Meeting:

- Meeting #3: November 15, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Nietfeld - 11/8/22 - Information for A.1 Subcommittee meeting of 9 Nov. 2022](#)
- [Site Map - 2021 Coffin Butte Landfill SDP Drawing G02](#)

## Meeting #3 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/15/22

### Attendance

<b>Member</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Bill Bromann</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Brian May</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Chuck Gilbert</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ginger Rough Richardson</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ian Macnab</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ken Eklund</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Marge Popp</b>	
<b>Mark Yeager</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Paul Nietfeld</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Shane Sanderson</b>	
<b>Staff: Daniel Redick</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Facilitator: Sam Imperati</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Observers:</b>	
<b>Debbie Palmer</b>	<b>X</b>

### Agenda and Notes:

#### Republic Services Presentation:

- Survey the site in the fall, allowing for better window of good weather for using drones
- Request tonnage reports between surveys
  - o Drives impact on an annual basis for capacity
  - o Look at entire permitted footprint for flyover
    - Waste settles in previous cells, recovering some airspace that may have been occupied previously
    - Overall site density
    - Make determination how much airspace was consumed
      - Tonnage – computer scale system at the landfill, same as reported annually
      - Aerial survey cubic yardage
    - Calculate Density
  - o Next step in process:

- Around May, active landfill planning meeting
  - Republic Services' business sector leaders from the region
  - Follow set spreadsheet of categories to ensure all parties are knowledgeable about landfill developments, revisit existing developments, discussing current, near-term projects, and longer (5-year) projects.
  - Ensure meeting requirements/regulations, as well as environmentally sound
  - Landfill gas infrastructure, stormwater infrastructure, leachate aspects, when next capping projects are proposed
    - Some of these items don't occur each year at the landfill
- Update quantities and costs
  - Capping, closure
  - Factors impacting western Oregon landfills
- Tonnage projections
  - Forecasting next-year's tonnage
  - Based on existing annual tonnage recorded
  - Project what they believe to expect to receive the following year
  - Coordinating with those involved with franchise and collection
  - Projected population growth considered
  - Not including unanticipated occurrences like: wildfires, unforeseen accidents leading to large volumes of waste
- Capacity/site life calculations - Function of density, airspace consumed, and forecasts
  - Primarily driven by density and tonnage
  - Sometimes seeing reductions in tonnage, increasing site life
  - Waste agreement with Waste Management (Riverbend to Coffin Butte)
- Questions:
  - 5 year fill plan – projections revisited annually evaluating:
    - Rate, estimate input
    - Where to fill, ensuring ample footprint for customers and operations
    - Where they are in the hill, impacting gas infrastructure, water flow,
    - Revisited more frequently than annually in some instances
    - How major projects impact fill
  - Business development between landfill and collection operations. What processes coordinate these two, considering landfill capacity and collection agreements?
    - Planning meetings, and meetings surface on as-needed basis
    - Staff engaged in franchise agreements, like Julie Jackson, all parties are pulled together to ensure waste accepted meets regulatory requirements and capacity needs
  - How often are projections/modelling updated?
    - Primarily annually
    - Overall site is annual, quarterly in current fill section
    - Marion County uses annual projections – seeing consistent increases in last 6-year, not very predictable
  - Gain of 8 million cubic yards reported to the EPA?

### 3. LANDFILL LIFE PROJECTIONS

b. Simple projection of landfill capacity (filled + airspace) projected to the end of this year (2022); this will effectively be a projection of what will be in the 2022 Coffin Butte Annual Report “Landfill Capacity” section and can be used to detail and explain underlying assumptions of density, cover allocation and intake rate for subsequent longer-term projections (in 3(b) below), and can serve as a reasonably confident baseline for the longer-term projections

- Current data from 2021
- Should be able to pull 2022 aerial projection
- Forward-looking projection in two sections:
  - First, this 2022 projection
  - Consider factors that go into these projections
  - Is this useful?
  - Is SDP helpful to use as baseline?
    - SDP is a snapshot in time, can change
    - SDP Table 1 volume estimates are “the best we have”
  - Another table in exhibit B – tons/day, projects consumed airspace
  - An engineering document focused on design, with the best information available, providing anticipated tonnage/capacity
  - Overall site life, not by cell
  - Represents benchmark at end of 2021
  - Leverage expertise of SDP relating to capacity, at a finer resolution. Can the SDP table serve as a baseline, adjusted based on the assumptions the group wants to explore?
  - Leaving out the cell-by-cell detail can be problematic
  - Approved permitted airspace – the Table below uses total permitted airspace
    - Impacts to that volume are tonnage and density
    - Assume density, project tonnage – worst case scenario and other scenarios
    - Establish range
    - Variables – Baseline, tonnage cap tonnage level, percentage growth, extra variables shouldn’t be included in the baseline.
    - Annual planning and forecasting – why can’t we use that information as the baseline?
      - 3-year average density
  - Action Items
    - Words/Numbers on Paper for site life

- Stating permitted airspace
- Agree on date – forecast of remaining 2022, forecast 2023
- Quarry:
  - How soon can the quarry be fully excavated for maximum airspace? What factors impact the timeline for quarry excavation?
    - Requires acceleration based on the timeline
    - Republic is actively working with Knife River on this
    - Timeline based on the cell 5 lifespan
    - Can move into a small section of cell 6
    - Reasonable ETA for how soon the quarry can be excavated?
      - Cost/impacts
      - 2-3 hypothetical scenarios
      - Ramifications of those scenarios
      - Need to be in quarry by 2025 (estimate)
      - Ask for as much factual information as possible for next meeting
  - Human factors for scenario development
- c. A detailed site life projection to End of Life (EOL). The most obvious model for this is contained in the 2021 SDP produced for the franchisee. Table 1 of this SDP provides a detailed breakdown of projected life by landfill sub cell, and Section 2.2 of this document details the assumptions underlying the numbers in Table 1.

**Table 1**  
**Site Life Projection**

	<b>Plan View Footprint (Acres)</b>	<b>Capacity (CY)</b>	<b>Cumulative Capacity (CY)</b>	<b>Total Life of Cell (Years)</b>	<b>Year Capacity is Reached</b>
Cell 5D/5E	6.1 <sup>1</sup>	4,834,330	4,834,330	4	2025
Cell 6A	19.8	1,482,260	6,316,590	1	2026
Cell 6B	11.3	1,029,430	7,346,020	1	2027
Cell 6C	4.3	1,742,130	9,088,150	2	2029
Cell 6D	11.0	1,859,820	10,947,970	2	2031
Cell 6E	3.9	1,078,420	12,026,390	1	2032
Cell 6F	5.1	1,686,070	13,712,460	2	2034
Cell 6G	2.4	2,015,260	15,727,720	2	2036
Cell 6H	1.1	1,295,450	17,023,170	1	2037
Cell 6I	1.2	1,622,130	18,645,300	2	2039

Notes: 1 – Cell 5 consists of Cells 5A through Cell 5E. Cell 5A through 5C are currently lined and accepting waste. Cell 5D (3.5 acres) was lined during 2021 and is awaiting approval for waste acceptance to begin in 2022. Cell 5E (2.6 acres) is planned to be lined in 2023. The plan view footprint presented in this table represents the areas of Cells 5D and 5E.

- d. Modifications of the projections in the SDP should be presented incorporating various scenarios for higher/lower flow (e.g. wildfire debris, recycling rates, washed population changes, status change to other landfills in the waste flow area, etc.)
- e. Summary table of EOL estimates for all considered scenarios (3(b) and 3(c))

Possible additional informative sections could include

- 3. Q&A – list key questions and answers derived by the subcommittee
- 4. Open Questions
- 5. Appendices
- f. Intake volume table (could be sourced from DEQ or franchisee records)
- g. Used/Available space table (franchisee records are probably best here)
- h. Life projection details (notes on assumptions, calculations, etc.)

Recording:

- Recording

## Next Steps/Action Items:

- Landfill Site Life - Numbers
  - Stating permitted airspace
  - Agree on date – forecast of remaining 2022, forecast 2023
- Human factors for scenario development – Relating to site life
- How soon can the quarry be fully excavated for maximum airspace? What factors impact the timeline for quarry excavation?
  - Reasonable ETA for how soon the quarry can be excavated?
    - Cost/impacts
    - 2-3 hypothetical scenarios
    - Ramifications of those scenarios
    - As much factual information as possible for next meeting

## Next Meeting:

- Meeting #4: November 29, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm
- Meeting #5: December 6, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm
- Meeting #6: December 13, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm

## Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Nietfeld - 11/8/22 - Information for A.1 Subcommittee meeting of 9 Nov. 2022](#);
- [Report to Work Group DRAFT](#);
- [MacNab - 11/11/22 - Coffin Butte Landfill Site Map and Cell Dates](#);
- [Site Map - 2021 Coffin Butte Landfill SDP Drawing G03](#);
- [Coffin Butte Landfill Annual Report Data, Airspace & Site Life - 2014-2021](#)

## Meeting #4 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 11/29/22

### Attendance

<b>Member</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Bill Bromann</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Brian May</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Chuck Gilbert</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ginger Rough Richardson</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ian Macnab</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ken Eklund</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Mark Yeager</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Paul Nietfeld</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Shane Sanderson</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Staff: Daniel Redick</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Facilitator: Sam Imperati</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Observers:</b>	
<b>Debbie Palmer</b>	<b>X</b>

### Agenda and Notes:

- Review Report Outline from previous two meetings
  - This is not intended to be the body of the report, just an appendix
- Landfill Site Life - Numbers
  - Stating permitted airspace
  - Agree on date – forecast of remaining 2022, forecast 2023
  - Meeting in the middle of scenarios and background/assumptions
  - Paul and Ginger will start to draft report, copying
- Human factors for scenario development – Relating to site life: Presentation from Ken Eklund
  - Human factors determine inflow of material to the landfill
    - Business relationships, signed contracts
    - Climate change and surrounding social/political/legal structure
      - Youth activist lawsuits about climate change



- Legislation – international to local
  - Methane
  - Methane emissions reduction program
    - Rewards and penalties
      - Funds
      - Fee schedule for regulation
    - Landfills included
- Activism
  - Direct action
  - Removal of high methane elements of landfill
- Changes to landfill infrastructure, disruptions from climate change
  - Wildfires
  - Floods
  - Population migration
- Unforeseen territory
  - Cannot predict, but can estimate risk assessment
- Direct measurement for emissions monitoring can help compare landfill emissions to alternatives, as opposed to modelling tools
- Gas at Roosevelt is owned by Klickitat PUD
- EPA model uses a calculation for emissions
- Republic uses aggressive approach to capture that gas
- How can two landfill gas modelling efforts come up with two vastly different numbers for emissions? How do these compare to reality? It might be time to measure the gas to find out what is actually happening.
- Fines on Inflation Reduction Act are related to Oil and Gas Industry, and currently do not relate to the solid waste industry (landfills)
- SPS and NESHEP regulates emissions/pollution
- Oregon requires emissions monitoring
- EPA is looking for methane emissions, including fugitive emissions
- How soon can the quarry be fully excavated for maximum airspace? What factors impact the timeline for quarry excavation?
  - Planning to begin excavation next year, working with Knife River. Republic will not be sharing agreement details, or what it costs to excavate.
  - How soon? Still to be determined. Actively communicating with Knife River to plan out quarry planning details, but it is not ready to share at this time.
  - Looking at specific window to move material to achieve necessary airspace to support remaining life of the landfill as specified in SDP

- How much volume is needed to be extracted from the quarry?
- Remaining timeline prior to requiring Quarry space? Possible cell development schedule is construction in 2025, to be ready by 2026. More details to be shared as it is available.
- Reasonable ETA for how soon the quarry can be excavated?
  - Cost/impacts
  - 2-3 hypothetical scenarios
  - Ramifications of those scenarios
  - As much factual information as possible for next meeting

#### Recording:

- [Recording](#)

#### Next Steps/Action Items:

- Review progress to date
- Paul and Ginger present report progress, guide discussion to missing items
- Quarry questions/updates:
  - How soon can the quarry be fully excavated for maximum airspace? What factors impact the timeline for quarry excavation?
    - Reasonable ETA for how soon the quarry can be excavated?
    - Cost/impacts
    - 2-3 hypothetical scenarios
    - Ramifications of those scenarios
    - As much factual information as possible for next meeting

#### Next Meeting:

- Meeting #5: December 6, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm
- Meeting #6: December 13, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Nietfeld - 11/8/22 - Information for A.1 Subcommittee meeting of 9 Nov. 2022 ;](#)
- [Report to Work Group DRAFT;](#)
- [MacNab - 11/11/22 - Coffin Butte Landfill Site Map and Cell Dates;](#)
- [Site Map - 2021 Coffin Butte Landfill SDP Drawing G03;](#)
- [Coffin Butte Landfill Annual Report Data, Airspace & Site Life - 2014-2021](#)
- [MacNab - 11/22/22 - Coffin Butte Landfill Capacity](#)

DRAFT

## Meeting #5 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 12/6/22

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	
Brian May	
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	X
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	
<b>Observers:</b>	
Maren Schermer (Benton County)	X

### Agenda and Notes:

#### 1. Review progress to date

- Paul has outline of report to present. Report needs work in terms of:
  - Real estate footprint
  - Landfill life projection
  - What we want to show in terms of projections
- How to address topics between Republic and landfill neighbors. Remaining questions:
  - Outline of footprint – There are different perspectives on the footprint of the landfill. How do we address this in the report?
    - Suggestion to follow Sam’s proposed method of putting all perspectives down on paper, rather than agreeing on one.
      - Use Sam’s approach of looking at assumptions underlying the perspectives.
    - There are factual numbers on the footprint that are not up for debate.
    - It’s useful to discuss current footprint and permitted footprint. Landfill has expanded over time, along with additional land to be used as a buffer.

- Next step will be to document the different points of view, unless there is any objection from Republic.
    - Republic does not object, everyone deserves to have their viewpoints heard.
    - Group should make sure to keep the perspectives within the scope of the charge. Figuring out what deliverable is for each question.
2. Paul and Ginger present report progress, guide discussion to missing items.  
Specific items covered below:
- A.1. subset items
    - Charge A. 3: Looking at assumptions: Interpreted to mean the assumptions behind the estimation of landfill operational lifetime.
      - Need to define “landfill operational lifeline” to distinguish between the time that it will continue to accept waste vs. the landfill will remain.
    - Should we clarify between the footprint of the landfill disposal area vs. the entire footprint of landfill site.
  - B. Membership composition: (Page 4) Does anyone disagree with the designation of membership in this way?
    - SWAC bylaws state that an individual cannot represent SWAC, only a quorum. Should identify as “community member” instead?
      - Members of SWAC identified are all members of SWAC, but not representing the group.
      - Suggestion to list as residents of the community, but also members of SWAC.
    - “Citizens” terminology changed to “community members.”
  - Landfill size (page 5). How should the timeline of landfill history be presented?
    - A. i. History. Per the 2002 MOU
      - “Franchise (VLI) agrees that the approximately 56-acre parcel...”
        - Does this reflect the proper verbiage from the MOU?
        - Ginger and Republic will look at have there been any documents that superseded this?
      - Paul suggests documenting growth of landfill, perhaps through a table to show acreage of growth.
      - Is this material being covered by any other subcommittees? Not wanting to duplicate work.
        - All sub-committees are focused on the history, due to their charge. Other subcommittees are looking at history, but are not creating a full illustrated history.
      - Suggestion to include timeline, table of dates, snapshots of the footprint
        - Suggestion to use a map with color to differentiate between landfill space and disposal space.

- Daniel explains a detailed timeline already exists. Would rather have group lead what information is needed. Land ownership is not yet drawn up, but we have information that can be accessed.
  - Paul suggest we extract from master timeline several points in terms of footprint. Landfill has grown significantly, and would like to show how much it has grown.
    - Next steps: Paul will work with Daniel to pull dates from the timeline, begin to map data.
- Current footprint: Language on summarizing current configuration.
  - Ian clarifies that language from 1983 CUP “Not to exceed 2 acres...” is no longer relevant. Landfill is now required to cover everything daily.
- B. Permitted disposal capacity (pg. 5)
  - Daniel states there is a 2011 site development plan to add as another data point.
  - If possible, explain how the capacity increased from 18,000,000 in 1995 to 35,530,000 in 2003. (E.g. a permit from DEQ).
    - Ian does not have the data on this increase. Perhaps the development of triangles to expand and make more efficient use of fill space.
    - Paul suggests difference could have been the development of cell 6.
- ii. Capacity utilization (pg 6) Figure: Coffin Butte Landfill Reported Airspace (2014-2021)
  - Ginger would want Republic engineers to confirm accuracy of numbers.
  - Ian has data from 2022 Annual Report that could be added.
  - Some of the permitted airspace is rock currently, not airspace. Ken suggests definition of “airspace” would be helpful.
  - Ian explains airspace always requires some excavation, landfill staff always building for a couple of years in the future.
- iii. Near-term (circa 2025) capacity issue: the “Quarry Problem”
  - Paul suggests this section could address previous section. Paul will define “airspace” in this section.
  - Ginger states Republic leadership does not like the terminology a “Quarry Problem”. Can work together to settle on some other verbiage.
    - Republic Services is currently in conversation with Knife River. We might want to come back in a month to re-visit this section.

## Recording:

1. [Recording](#)

## Next Steps/Action Items:

- Read through the draft of the report.
- Ginger will work on gathering info on: 2002 MOU review, 1995 vs 2003 jump in capacity, Language around quarry.
- Additional updates from Ginger and Ian:
  - No new updates on conversations with Knife River. We can check back in several weeks.
- Send any comments or changes about report to Daniel, cc the BCTT email.
  - Daniel will add edits to the draft and then upload the information onto the website.
- Ken requests a written response from Republic on landfill increase.
- Other items to note:
  - Public comments are being collected in the BCTT email account and will be posted ahead of the next BCTT meeting on Dec. 15<sup>th</sup>.
- Next meeting:
  - Paul and Ginger will lead continued review of report.
  - Continue thinking about how we want to discuss landfill projections, and considerations that could knock the projections off track.

#### Next Meeting:

- Meeting #6: December 13, 2022 – 10:30am-12:00pm

#### Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Nietfeld - 11/8/22 – Proposed Report Outline](#);
- [Subcommittee Report Outline Progress Table - 11/30/22](#)
- [Report to Work Group DRAFT](#);
- [MacNab - 11/11/22 - Coffin Butte Landfill Site Map and Cell Dates](#);
- [Site Map - 2021 Coffin Butte Landfill SDP Drawing G03](#);
- [Coffin Butte Landfill Annual Report Data, Airspace & Site Life - 2014-2021](#)
- [MacNab - 11/22/22 - Coffin Butte Landfill Capacity](#)
- [Nietfeld - 12/2/22 - Subcommittee A.1. Report Initial Draft](#)

## Meeting #6 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 12/13/22

### Attendance

<b>Member</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Bill Bromann</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Brian May</b>	
<b>Chuck Gilbert</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ginger Rough Richardson</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ian Macnab</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Ken Eklund</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Mark Yeager</b>	
<b>Paul Nietfeld</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Shane Sanderson</b>	
<b>Staff: Daniel Redick</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Facilitator: Sam Imperati</b>	
<b>Observers:</b>	
<b>Debbie Palmer</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Camille Hall</b>	

### Agenda and Notes:

Work through the Next Steps/Action Items identified in the Subcommittee Meetings Report document.

1. Paul and Ginger present report progress.
  - Paul and Ginger reviewed the next sections of the draft report, starting with “Section 3”.
  - Added Ian’s (Republic Services) landfill site life projections and scenarios
  - Discussed other information to include in this section:
    - Derived from Republic Services annual measurements
    - Describe the underlying method for calculating these numbers
    - List assumptions
    - \*Includes quarry, which currently has unexcavated rock
    - Quarry sequencing/staging – timeline and description. May be combination of options.
    - Where the landfill is currently receiving waste stands over a number of previous cells. At the time of transition to place liner in the quarry, they will be starting a new footprint, without a lot of area to fill on top of or against. Considering efficiencies of fill and stability of hill. Larger



footprint needed when starting fill that is not leaning against existing fill/cell.

- Add potential factors that could change the site development plan expectations
- Review Events and Factors with Potential Lifetime Impact
  - Recession
  - Wildfire – ex: 2020 wildfire debris tonnage
  - Impacts to other disposal facilities – ex: riverbend
  - Contaminated soils – spills – ex: fuel tanker that spilled on highway 99
  - Population growth
  - List various known factors impacting longevity
  - Include footnotes that show we cannot predict every scenario
  - List examples using known information, not projections, but historic data for context
  - Not just Coffin Butte Landfill impacts, but generally all landfills
  - Impacts may not be immediate, but experienced over the course of years.
- Chuck explained his proposed contribution to the Appendix B: Capacity Data, a table listing various elements of capacity and projections.
- Ken presented his proposed contribution - Section 4: Human Factors Affecting Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity

## Recording:

2. [Recording](#)

## Next Steps/Action Items:

- Next meeting:
  - Paul and Ginger will lead continued review of report.
  - Send Daniel comments and proposed edits to the draft report.

## Next Meeting:

- Meeting #7: Tuesday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2023 – 10:30am-12:00pm

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Nietfeld - 11/8/22 – Proposed Report Outline](#);

- [Subcommittee Report Outline Progress Table - 11/30/22](#)
- [Report to Work Group DRAFT;](#)
- [MacNab - 11/11/22 - Coffin Butte Landfill Site Map and Cell Dates;](#)
- [Site Map - 2021 Coffin Butte Landfill SDP Drawing G03;](#)
- [Coffin Butte Landfill Annual Report Data, Airspace & Site Life - 2014-2021](#)
- [MacNab - 11/22/22 - Coffin Butte Landfill Capacity](#)
- [Nietfeld - 12/2/22 - Subcommittee A.1. Report Initial Draft](#)
- [A.1. Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity Subcommittee Report Working Document - 12/6/22](#)
- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v2 12/13/22 \(Word Doc\)](#)

DRAFT

## Meeting #7 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/3/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	X
Brian May	
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	X
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
Observers:	
Debbie Palmer	X
Marge Popp	X

### Agenda and Notes:

1. Review subcommittee tasks:
  - Sam suggests thinking about how subgroup's findings will be digestible by larger group in the full report.
  - Ex., organizing subgroup report into "Key findings" "Recommendations."
  - Timeline for report:
    - Sam to compile Draft 2 to send out to workgroup on 1/13/23. Draft 3 sent out on 1/24/23. (See calendar schedule for workgroup.)
2. Review of report:
  - Today, we will focus on certain points in the report. There is insufficient time to go through page by page.
  - Please send all comments to Daniel to incorporate into draft.
3. Paul and Ginger guide review of draft.  
Summary (Notes listed by section):
  - III. Common terms: Comments
    - Cells 1 and 1a are unlined. Would they not qualify as engineered landfill?
  - Section 1: Landfill Size; A. Physical Real Estate Footprint;
  - i. History

- Daniel has added information on land use, tax lots, property dates.
  - Republic will review maps, appendix, to check purchase dates. Will send comments to Daniel.
- A. ii. Current Footprint
  - 1983 CUP language states maximum area to remain uncovered. Republic now covers all of landfill.
    - Mark to check on how CUP subcommittee has handled language. Make sure language aligns with Republic.
- B. Permitted Disposal Capacity; i. Historical permitted capacity benchmarks
  - Daniel clarifies difference in reported “capacity” between Site Development Plans and Annual Reports.
  - Paul provides historical context of landfill history and perception as a small landfill. Offering projections over time would show how the size of the landfill has grown over time.
  - Paul, Ian, and Ginger will discuss the capacity measures to include.
  - Ken suggests “anticipated closure date” as an alternative measure to capacity.
  - Mark can look at prior land use applications.
- iii. Near-term (circa 2025) capacity
  - Ginger and Republic will update this section. Re: negotiations with Knife River.
- C. Intake Volume; i. Recent intake volume: 1993-2021
  - Daniel updated chart with the intake volume on record. Removed red line for 2020 FA limit (not a hard limit, it is a threshold that would trigger county review.)
  - Homework: Paul asks that team reviews Comments/Discussion
- ii. Intake volume by source 2016 – 2021
  - Chart review - Daniel clarifies that jump between 2016 and 2017 was due to increase in Metro and increase in “Other” category counties.
  - Discuss the “other” category. Add an asterisk to explain growth.
  - Does Republic have any additional information on this?
- iii. Long-term intake volume TBD – 2021
  - Paul will take the lead (with Daniel) in finding data on long-term intake.
- Section 2: Specific Locations
  - Historic maps detail how different landfill zones were sited in 1983, 2002.
  - Paul to add description of “non-disposal zone” (discuss with Republic) not being regulation, but could be altered by CUP
- Section 4: Human Factors Affecting Landfill Size/Capacity (by Ken Eklund)
  - Ken can summarize section.
- C. Events and Factors with Potential Lifetime Impact

- Daniel suggests leaving list of impacts as a brief bulleted list, due to lack of information to add factual data.
- Ken suggests we discuss speculative factors vs. facts.
- Sam suggests thinking about the level of detail that we want to include about Events and Factors. Also include tie-in with SMMP work.

## Recording:

- [Recording](#)

## Next Steps/Action Items:

1. Continued review of report.
  - a. Send comments to Daniel. Daniel to post updated version of report on website.
2. Start thinking about report format. Suggested by Sam.
  - a. Ex., Divide report into “Key Findings”, “Recommendations”.
3. Start thinking about the level of detail we want to include about C. Events and Factors with Potential Lifetime Impact. Suggested by Sam.

## Next Meeting:

- Meeting #8: Tuesday, January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – 10:30am-12:00pm
- (Tentative) Meeting #9: Tuesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – 10:30am-12:00pm

## Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [MacNab - 11/22/22 - Coffin Butte Landfill Capacity](#)
- [Nietfeld - 12/2/22 - Subcommittee A.1. Report Initial Draft](#)
- [A.1. Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity Subcommittee Report Working Document - 12/6/22](#)
- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v2 12/13/22 \(Word Doc\)](#)
- [Rough - 12/14/22 - Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v3 - Republic Feedback](#)
- [Eklund - 1/2/23 - Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v3 KE](#)
- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v4 1/3/23 - Word Doc](#)

## Meeting #8 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/10/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	
Brian May	
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	
Ian Macnab	
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
Observers:	
Debbie Palmer	
Marge Popp	

### Agenda and Notes:

1. Work on Introduction, Key Findings, and Recommendations
  - Every group will create their own section or main body of BCTT report (Introduction, Key Findings, and Recommendations).
  - Subcommittee reports will be linked or included at the end of full group report.
  - Submit draft of all to Sam by 12pm noon on **January 17<sup>th</sup>**.
  - Draft version of Key Findings and Recommendations. (Not final version)
  - Preference between subcommittee docs hyperlinked or included in doc?
    - Preference for a hybrid version.
- Introduction: Will include charge for subcommittee.
  - Add to introduction: The following is a list of findings and recommendations; they have not been vetted by the larger group. In upcoming weeks, subgroup will continue to vet these.
    - This will help address time constraints to decide on key findings and recommendations.
- Key Findings: Subcommittee members to send Daniel thoughts or ideas.

2. Review of Subcommittee A.1. Report document
  - Discussion about the level of detail we want to include about C. Events and Factors with Potential Lifetime Impact.
    - Question is whether to leave the list as bullet points or build out each topic.
    - Suggestion to provide some level of detail and allow consultants developing the SMMP plan work on the rest.
      - Concern that this would be postponing the step 2+ years.
    - Concern that the this falls within the charge of this subcommittee.
    - Explanation might be needed to clarify what is meant by each bullet point.
    - Provide a list of possible landfill alternatives – Connect with SMMP subcommittee work.
    - Evaluating the likelihood and impact of each scenario is beyond the scope or capacity of this workgroup.
      - However, we can identify the factors or scenarios that we wish to study.
      - Suggestion to agree on several examples or scenarios to detail.
      - Difficult to predict validity of assumptions or interplay between scenarios.
    - Consideration of Scenarios 1 & 2 projections put forward by Republic in report.
      - Concern about asymmetry of including Republic's scenarios, but not other scenarios (in C. Events and Factors section).
    - Highlights the importance of the eventual creation of the SMMP.
    - Add language that frames some factors as being developed within the section, but not all scenarios are developed.
  - Return report feedback to Daniel by Friday, 1/13/23 by 2pm.
  - Homework:
    - Add to sections 3 and 4 to get them to the appropriate level of detail.
    - Continued review of updates in document.
    - Comment with any Key Findings or Recommendations for Daniel to add.

#### Recording:

- [Recording](#)

#### Next Steps/Action Items:

- Continued review of updates in document.
  - Add to sections 3 and 4 to get them to the appropriate level of detail.
  - Comment with any Key Findings or Recommendations for Daniel to add.
- Return report feedback to Daniel by Friday, 1/13/23 by 2pm.

## Next Meeting:

- Meeting #9: Tuesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – 10:30am-12:00pm

## Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [A.1. Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity Subcommittee Report Working Document - 12/6/22](#)
- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v2 12/13/22 \(Word Doc\)](#)
- [Rough - 12/14/22 - Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v3 - Republic Feedback](#)
- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v4 1/3/23 \(5 MB\)](#)
- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v5 1/10/23 \(5 MB\)](#)
- [A1 Section Work Group Report Draft 1 - 1/10/23 \(138 KB\)](#)



## Meeting #9 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 1/17/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	
Brian May	
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	X
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
Observers:	
Debbie Palmer	
Marge Popp	

### Agenda and Notes:

1. Continued review of report.
  - Reviewed key areas of the report, focusing on major updates:
    - History – need to at history prior to 1974
    - Coffin Butte Landfill Images – purpose is to show how the landfill has changed over time. Could be more helpful to have similar perspectives to compare images to one-another.
    - Historical benchmarks – Benton County staff are working on finding more historical benchmark info. Site Development Plan data is not going to provide total capacity, just capacity of planned development, which makes it unhelpful in this context to compare to total capacity data.
    - Intake Volume – Some disagreement among subcommittee members as to how best to explain 2000 vs. 2020 “limits” in text as graphs.
      - “Volume” should be updated to language communicating “weight”/”tonnage”
      - Discussion items could be helpful Key Findings
      - Intake volume by source – need to add discussion bullet points like the graph above.
    - Cell Detail – new chart added, “Closed” could be updated to “Capped/Closed”

- The date of closure/capping can be complex. Closure dates can be complicated. Burn dump no longer has closure date due to move to Cell 6. Final Cap might be better terminology. Only Cell 1 and 1A has been fully closed (in the 1990s). Final cap areas that exist might only be for part of the cell, because they are tied to other cells (2, 2b, cell areas along Coffin Butte Road). Request for Ian/Ginger to add verbiage.
- Nominal Life Projection CY 2023 to End of Life – Redundant charts can be simplified down to one single chart.
- Events and Factors with Potential Lifetime Impact – disagreement among subcommittee as to how much detail to include in each factor. Request for subcommittee to review the content and propose edits.

## Recording

- [Recording](#)

## Next Steps/Action Items:

- Review and highlight Key Findings and Key Recommendations in subcommittee report document
- Propose edits to Subcommittee Report
  - Propose edits to Events and Factors with Potential Lifetime Impact section/content

## Next Meeting:

- Meeting #10: Tuesday, February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – 10:30am–12:00pm

## Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v6 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)
- [A1 Section Work Group Report Draft 1 - 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)

## Meeting #10 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/7/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	
Brian May	X
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	
Debbie Palmer	
Marge Popp	

### Agenda and Notes:

1. Review comments in report, and either resolve or identify as a point of dispute.
  - Goal of meeting is to look at comments and decide which we can review. Cleaning up document.
  - Section 3 of Subcommittee report review.
    - Ken had drafted one version of Section 3; Daniel drafted an alternative version.
    - Discussion over process of drafting sections.
    - Discussion over differences between the two sections.
      - All material can be considered and commented on by subcommittee.
    - Suggestion to add labels over both versions for clarity.
    - Ken's longer draft and shorter draft.
      - Ken's longer draft is included at the back of the subcommittee report.
      - Section 3 (drafted by Ken) is the shortened version.
  - Sam suggests consideration of a process to consider subcommittee sub-group to consider the differences off-line.
  - Next steps – What is the best way to move forward?
    - Ginger suggests taking a look at document for 48 hours and come back together.
    - Review document, either make track changes and send to Daniel, or bring changes to next meeting for discussion.

- How to track the suggestions that are made on previous track changes?
  - Suggestion to accept all changes on Section 3 for a fresh copy.
    - Does not mean that the content is accepted.
  - Subcommittee can then look at the content and make comments.
  - Daniel will create a version of the subcommittee report with all changes accepted. Will send out to subcommittee members for review.
  - The County cannot host the document on Google Docs for synchronous editing. But, a subcommittee member can host the doc on Google Docs
    - On Google, content or a comment can be deleted, and there will be no record.
- Sam suggests sending a “clean” version (with changes accepted) and a “dirty” version (with changes not accepted).
  - Version to edit will be Version 8, plus any subcommittee members’ in-progress comments.
- Scheduled Friday meeting, February 10<sup>th</sup> from 9am-11am
- Next steps:
  - Send all in-progress edits to Daniel by 5pm today (2/7/23).
  - Daniel will send out copy for review.
  - Subcommittee members will review and send versions to Daniel by Thursday at 3pm.
  - Daniel will send out updated version for review before Friday at 9am.

## Recording

- [Recording](#) (Passcode: Tx7LrF\*J)

## Next Steps/Action Items:

- Daniel will email a “clean” copy of version 8 of A.1. report.
- Subcommittee members will review and send comments to Daniel by Thursday at 3pm.
- Daniel will send out updated version of A.1. report by end of day on Thursday, for subcommittee review prior to Friday 9:00am meeting.

## Next Meeting:

- Meeting #11: Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – 9:00am–11:00am

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage:](#)

- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v6 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)
- [A1 Section Work Group Report Draft 1 - 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)
- [Work Group Report Draft #3 \(PDF Format\) \(Word Format\) \(Link expires 2/24/23; Do to the large file size, this link goes to a file-sharing platform, requiring the password below\)](#)  
Password: Benton1!

DRAFT

## Meeting #11 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/10/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	X
Brian May	X
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	X
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	
Debbie Palmer	
Marge Popp	

### Agenda and Notes:

1. Review of report. Next steps for report captured in memo sent by Sam (9pm 2/13/23).
  - Request for Daniel to group all Key Findings and Key Recommendations by topic (9a on Sam's list)
    - Comparing scenario images with different versions. Compare and combine. Remove image on page 9. (Will keep image on page 5.)
  - Discussion of Section 3 scenarios section.
    - Consider likelihood of different scenarios. Should it use possibilities or probabilities?
    - Audience of text is the Planning Commission, the Board of Commissioners, and the public.
      - Message needs to be simplified to reach this audience.
    - Estimate of date the landfill will close is captured from pages 5-6.
    - **Are we asking questions? Or are we providing answers?** 9c on Sam's list. (Landfill lifespan)
      - Want to include list of possible factors to impact lifespan of landfill for Planning Commission and other readers who want more context.
      - Readers want to know the range of dates, and to know other factors that could impact dates.

- Solid Materials Management is complementary to solid waste. Questions can help tee up the future work towards SMMP.
- Suggestion to just add questions that could impact capacity due to the uncertainties. without providing likelihood.
  - “What impacts will \_\_\_\_\_ have on landfill lifespan?”
- As government making projections, there are always going to be unforeseen factors that we cannot predict, nor can we predict the impact they will have.
- Make it clear that these factors are assumptions. There may be other factors included.
- Review of Ginger’s document, which includes questions but adds context and critical thinking.
- **Creating a Section 3 chart**
  - Create a chart with Ken’s version and Daniel’s version in each column side-by-side.
    - Subcommittee will then come to a consensus on a version to include in the report.
  - Differences between Daniel’s and Ken’s versions:
    - Daniel’s version goes issue by issues, lists the possible increase and decrease impacts. Ken’s version lists all factors that can increase the lifespan, then lists the factors that all decrease landfill life.
    - Suggestion to retain/include Ken’s wording of “Shortens landfill life (only as far as the baseline)”
  - Sam suggests creating a chart: Column 1: Factor. Column 2: How the factor can shorten lifespan. Column 3: How the factor can lengthen lifespan. Column 4: Questions to ask consultant.
    - Republic would prefer not to include Columns 2 & 3 on the possible.
    - Concerns about chart losing details. Sam clarifies that chart can include full paragraphs into the chart.
  - Daniel will merge the Section 3 versions into the chart. Subcommittee will then review and make recommendations.
  - Page 15 Graphic created by Ginger captures a different list of factors.
    - Daniel will include information from the Page 15 chart (Ginger) and include in the graphic
  - Republic services is willing see the chart and then decide what Republic can support.
  - **Group consensus to make chart.**

## Recording:

- [Recording](#) (Passcode: 73b.cj+M)

## Next Steps/Action Items:

- Daniel will create Section 3 factors chart to send to group

## Next Meeting:

- Meeting #12: Wednesday, February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – 3:30pm–5:30pm

## Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v6 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)
- [A1 Section Work Group Report Draft 1 - 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)
- [Work Group Report Draft #3 \(PDF Format\) \(Word Format\) \(Link expires 2/24/23; Due to the large file size, this link goes to a file-sharing platform, requiring the password below\) Password: \[Benton1!\]\(#\)](#)



## Meeting #12 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/15/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	
Brian May	
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	X
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
Observers:	

### Agenda and Notes:

1. Discussion of subcommittee report format.
  - Sam's suggestion to restructuring subcommittee report to move key charts and info to beginning of report. (Historical projections chart, Intake chart, Source of waste chart)
  - Suggestion to duplicate charts when adding to top of the report, so charts can still exist within their context.
  - First 15 pages of subcommittee report will be copied to the body of the report. Content to move to beginning:
  - Charts to move to beginning (4 total):
    - Reported Year of Reaching Estimated Landfill Capacity chart.
      - Data from Annual reports going back to 1998. Line not connected from 1999 – 2001 because there is data missing.
      - Find a new way to visualize the data, to make data cleaner. (Bar chart?)
      - Add narrative text to explain the data. Add asterisk for missing data.
    - Historical life projections chart.
    - Intake chart.
    - Source of waste chart.
2. Discussion of Table – 'Coffin Butte: Site Life Scenarios.'
  - Ginger to remove 'pandemic' in parenthesis.
  - Why are legislation, legal action, climate change and activism neutral?

- Ginger created the chart as an initial point, but group conversation has gone beyond this point. Will either be edited or removed.
  - Chart still provides a helpful snapshot. Suggestion to remove “positive/Neutral/Negative” and alphabetize the factors.
3. Discussion of chart – ‘Coffin Butte: How could site life change from the baseline scenarios?’
- Most subcommittee members have not yet had a chance to review chart.
  - Scenarios could be key in deliberation from Planning Committee.
  - The SMMP contractor may not have the information to answer these questions.
  - Ginger drafted chart, but questions need review from subcommittee members.
  - Tonnage cap and quarry schedule could raise questions about alternative options from Planning Committee.
    - Tonnage cap
      - Expand language to anything that limits intake (i.e., limit to traffic.)
      - Republic have expressed willingness to maintain the intake tonnage cap.
      - Tonnage cap is a negotiable point in next franchise agreement, need to add this consideration.
    - Quarry
      - Quarry discussion cannot be posed to the SMMP consultant, as it is Republic’s proprietary information.
      - Ginger is in communications with Knife River, negotiations are moving forward.
      - Knife River needs to remove more rock than normal to prepare the cell for waste disposal when cell 5 closes.
  - Suggestion to add “What if” scenarios to landfill life to end of the report (add after factors/scenarios.)
    - Ken planning to salvage parts of Section 4: Human Factors section
      - Republic is open to seeing the reviewed version from Ken.
4. Plan to move forward.
- Draft 4 purpose will be to tee up Key Findings and Key Recommendations in preparation for Workgroup Meeting on Thurs. 2/23/23.
  - Prioritize Key Findings and Key Recommendations.
  - Current version of report [pared down, scenarios removed, track changes removed] is the starting point for going forward.
  - Suggestion for Mark, Chuck, Paul, Ken to submit one copy of track changes to Ginger and Ian at Republic Services.
    - Group agrees to process, but not to the timeline.
  - Sam suggests pausing review process to refine KF/KR. Thoughts?
    - Concern about extensions to overall BCTT timeline.

## Recording:

- [Recording](#) (Passcode: 8#?JwZRg)

## Next Steps/Action Items:

- Review of Key Findings and Key Recommendations
- Review of Section 3: Scenarios chart

## Next Meeting:

- Daniel to send out email to find next meeting time.

## Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [Master Working Document Subcommittee A1 Report v6 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)
- [A1 Section Work Group Report Draft 1 - 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)
- [Work Group Report Draft #3 \(PDF Format\) \(Word Format\) \(Link expires 2/24/23; Due to the large file size, this link goes to a file-sharing platform, requiring the password below\) Password: Benton1!](#)

## Meeting #13 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 2/22/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	X
Brian May	X
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	X
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
Observers:	
Maren Schermer (Benton County)	X

### Agenda and Notes:

- Findings and recommendations review
  - Key Findings comments from Paul. Terminology:
    - "Tonnage cap" vs. "2020 Intake Limit"
      - Tonnage cap the legal term used in the Franchise Agreement.
        - Tonnage cap is an anecdotal term, needs to be defined.
      - 2020 Intake Limit refers to the specific flat 1.1 million ton limit defined in the Franchise Agreement.
    - "Franchisee" vs. Republic Services, Inc. / Valley Landfills, Inc.
      - Valley Landfills Inc. is the legal entity, signed the franchise agreement.
    - "Wasteshed" vs. "Service area"
      - Commissioners used to "wasteshed" in a different context. "Service area might be more accurate.
      - Add a definition for "service area."
  - LSC F TBD: Landfill life (longevity) is the availability...
    - Confusion over meaning of the finding.
    - Need to remove this finding and instead add definition for term: "remaining landfill life."
  - LSC F-2: Finding on landfill lifespan/projected closure date.

- Version C uses data from 2013 Annual Report
  - Version C contains data from the 2003 CUP on the additions about the additions of the East and West triangles.
    - Bill explains that data was then later determined to be unstable for disposal on an engineering level.
    - Leave as a separate finding. Bill adds language for this finding.
  - Keep versions B and C as separate findings.
  - LSCL-F-TBD: Expansion and Site Life. Options A, B, & C
    - Republic would prefer version C, with the last sentence removed.
    - Last sentence can be retained with the percentages removed to avoid confusion.
    - In version D., bold the language “expansion would not necessarily guarantee an increase in site life.” Additional text added to the end.
    - Version D will be maintained.
  - LSCL-F-TBD: Chuck’s findings will be added to the body of the report.
    - Remove from Findings list.
  - LSCL-F-5/31/34/35/45: Multiple versions relating to the EOL and intake volumes.
    - Suggestion to use version A as the baseline version for future edits.
    - Add details from version D on “existing demand in the wasteshed.”
    - Bill and Republic do not like versions E or F.
    - Mark suggests addition of language that the customer base and wastestream is in the control of Valley Landfills Inc.
    - The language is unclear due to the use of passive voice. Would be clearer if we change language to active voice.
  - LSCL-F-32/44/44: EOL finding, using different data sources.
    - Site development plan has limited enforceability by DEQ.
    - Bill clarifies that there are binding aspects of the plan, but the lifespan projections are just a snapshot in time.
      - Information is provided to the best of Republic’s knowledge, but situations can change due to circumstances.
    - To use version A. To add “intake volume estimate is not binding or controlling...”
2. Plan to move forward?
- Suggestion for Paul, Ginger, and Daniel to work through remaining Key Findings and Recommendations to reconcile different versions to bring KF/KR draft to the meeting tomorrow.
  - Ginger available after 2:30pm.
  - Request, if possible, to preview document beforehand highlight preferred version of each finding and recommendation.
- Recording: [Recording](#) (Passcode: 6uhu#i\$K )

## Next Steps/Action Items:

- Paul, Ginger, and Daniel to meet before 5pm today (2/22/23) to work through remaining Key Findings and Recommendations.

## Next Meeting:

- BCTT Workgroup Meeting: Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup> 3:00pm – 7:30pm.

## Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [A1 Section Work Group Report Draft 1 - 1/17/23; \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)
- [Work Group Report Draft #3 \(PDF Format\) \(Word Format\) \(Link expires 2/24/23; Due to the large file size, this link goes to a file-sharing platform, requiring the password below\) Password: Benton1!](#)
- [Subcommittee A.1. Report V8 - 2/3/23; \(Download Word Document Version, password: Benton1!; expires 3/5/23\)](#)
- [Subcommittee A.1. Key Findings and Key Recommendations Draft - 2/17/23 \(PDF\); \(Download Word Document Version\)](#)

## Meeting #14 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 3/6/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	
Brian May	
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	X
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
Observers:	
Nate Tisdell (Linn County)	X

### Agenda and Notes:

1. Review Workgroup Feedback on Findings and Recommendations
  - i. The group discussed each of Republic Service's comments, adjusting the existing findings and recommendations as necessary. The group completed all of the findings and recommendations comments.
  - ii. Ken Eklund introduced his proposed findings and recommendations, to be discussed in the next meeting.

### Recording:

- [Recording](#) (Passcode: pTAEy&f1 )

### Next Steps/Action Items:

- Paul, Ginger, and Daniel to meet before 5pm today (2/22/23) to work through remaining Key Findings and Recommendations.

### Next Meeting:

- BCTT Workgroup Meeting:

Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage:](#)

DRAFT



## Meeting #15 Report to BCTT Work Group DRAFT – 3/8/23

### Attendance

Member	Present
Bill Bromann	X
Brian May	
Chuck Gilbert	X
Ginger Rough Richardson	X
Ian Macnab	X
Ken Eklund	X
Mark Yeager	X
Paul Nietfeld	
Shane Sanderson	
Staff: Daniel Redick	X
Facilitator: Sam Imperati	X
<b>Observers:</b>	
Nate Tisdell (Linn County)	X
Maren Schermer (Benton County)	X

### Agenda and Notes:

#### 1. Review body of Subcommittee Report

- Section 3: Site Life Change from Baseline Scenarios table.
  - Ken and Ginger collaborated to put together table.
  - Boxes in darker color are parts that were still in discussion. For discussion:
    - Permitted airspace loss due to disasters such as wildfire – refers to a landfill fire (fire impacts landfill directly.)
      - Bill suggests that there are two separate concerns: 1) Impact of a potential fire at the landfill; 2) Impact of wildfire debris.
      - Mark brings up that a wildfire could reach landfill.
      - Ginger proposes re-worded version. Daniel updates draft.
    - Exceedance beyond tonnage cap.
      - Text is agreed upon. It was flagged to remember for later points in the subcommittee report.

- Ian suggests removing “enforcement.” Benton County did not have mechanism for enforcement under the 2000 Franchise Agreement, the option was to initiate a baseline.
      - Ken suggests changing “enforcement” to “threshold.” Language is changed.
    - Population growth/change
      - Daniel suggests adding “how will population growth impact waste generation?” Question will then guide SMMP
      - Mark concerned about implication that landfill service area is fixed.
        - Question is answered in above box.
      - Chuck suggests including clarification that “service area” is not just Benton County.
  - Review of section complete.
- Executive summary
  - Content to be included in main report.
- Appendix D: Climate change and other environmental activism/legislation
  - Ken addresses comment to delete section.
  - Ginger (and Republic members) are not certain if information fits within the charge of the subcommittee.
    - Methane could be impacted by food waste legislation.
    - Chuck suggests that methane connects to future SMMP. Suggestion to keep section and add mention to SMMP.
    - Republic members suggests moving section to SMMP content.
    - Ken mentions that section expands on the Section 3 Chart.
  - Ken explains that the purpose of Appendix D is to expand on the box in Section 3 chart: “Climate change and other environmental legislation.”
  - Bill states that he cannot accept inclusion of Appendix D. Cites major omissions in terms of the gas-to-energy methane plant adjacent to the landfill and composting center nearby.
  - Mark proposes review of Appendix D to keep some content but to remove any parts that Republic opposes.
  - Sam suggests reviewing a clean version of Appendix D. (All track changes accepted.)
  - Ginger willing to work with Ken offline to review document with Republic’s concerns in mind.
    - Ken in agreement to review with Ginger.

Recording:

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Ginger and Ken to review Appendix D offline.

- Will complete review by next Monday (3/13).
- Daniel will review and complete Definitions and Common Terms section.
- Sam and Daniel to make a plan to prepare content for meeting on Monday (3/13)

#### Next Meeting:

- Meeting #16: March 13, 2023 – 10:30am-12:00pm

#### Relevant Documents located on [Subcommittee Webpage](#):

- [A.1. Landfill Size/Capacity/Longevity Subcommittee Report Draft - 3/6/23](#)

DRAFT