

March 16, 2023, BCTT Workgroup DRAFT Meeting Minutes #9

1. Agenda

Topic	Lead	Start	Duration	Materials
Welcome Review Agenda Approve Draft M8 Minutes Updated Workplan Public Polling on Recommendations	Facilitator	1:30	15 mins	Working M9 Agenda Draft M8 Minutes Updated Workplan Poll Link
Comment Period	Public & Workgroup	1:45	30 mins	Comments (Updated 3/XX/23) Link Expires 3/20/23. Password: Benton1!
Introduce Key Findings and Key Recommendations (FRs) Crosswalk DOC Review Tonight's Plan Member FRs Feedback Session 1	Facilitator	2:15	45 mins	Draft FRs Crosswalk Document
Break	All	3:00	15 mins	
Member FRs Feedback Session 2	Facilitator	3:15	75 mins	Draft FRs
Dinner	All	4:30	30 mins	
Comment Period	Public & Workgroup	5:00	30 mins	
1) Member FRs Feedback Session 3 2) Stretch Break 3) Member FRs Feedback Session 4 4) Discuss: Final polling on Body of the WG Report, not on the Appendix. The Appendix SUB sections will be approved by the Subcommittees, but not the full Workgroup. While linked to the findings and recommendations for ease of reference, they are for background purposes only. 5) 1-2-3 Polling Refresher	Facilitator	5:30	50 mins 10 mins 50 mins	Draft FRs 1-2-3 Polling
Next Steps: 1) Next Steps 2) Last Meeting: 3/23/23, 1:30 to 7:30 PM	Facilitator	7:20	10 mins	Updated Workplan
Adjourn	All	7:30		

**March 16, 2023, BCTT Workgroup
DRAFT Meeting Minutes #9**

2. Attendance

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

March 16, 2023, BCTT Workgroup DRAFT Meeting Minutes #9

Benton County Staff:

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

Facilitation Staff:

ICM Resolutions	Sam Imperati	X
ICM Resolutions	Amelia Webb	X

3. Minutes

Topic	Minutes
Welcome Review Agenda Approve Draft M8 Minutes Updated Workplan Public Polling on Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sam welcomes the group and takes roll. - He walks through the Agenda - there are no questions. - He asks for comments on M8 Minutes. There are none, so they are approved. - Sam shows the Updated Workplan on the screen and explains how the Public Polling survey works and what it looks like. - Sam then walks through the rest of the workplan calendar and shows where on the County website the public poll link is.
Comment Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No one wants to comment in the room, so Sam looks asks for people on Zoom. Please see Appendix A for the transcribed comments. The meeting recording can be found here. There are three, and their comments are as follows. <p>There is still 15 min in this period, so while the group is moving on if someone from the public wants to comment they can still share.</p>
Introduce Key Findings and Key Recommendations (FRs) Crosswalk DOC Review Tonight's Plan Member FRs Feedback Session 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Darren sets up the Flipboard, writing a heading for each sub. - Sam then explains how this activity will go. He explained that he will go around and ask sub-staff if there are any FRs that would benefit from workgroup discussion. Staff will then be asked if there are findings or recommendations that intersect with another sub, and thus should be addressed. Sam will then lead the same process with sub-members. - SMMP: no FRs identified by Daniel, the sub members in the room, or the sub members online. - Capacity: no FRs identified by Daniel. Chuck has a comment. The apex of their work is connected to the SMMP, but he will "take it on faith" that they are in a good place. Ken explained he cannot speak to the FRs because he has not had time to review them. Ginger explained that the document was still being edited at midnight last night, so

March 16, 2023, BCTT Workgroup DRAFT Meeting Minutes #9

	<p>while they are familiar with the document, and she does not think there is anything polarizing, but they cannot say with complete certainty that there is consensus yet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sam clarifies that he is not asking for censuses or any formal polling. This is a collaborative opportunity to discuss topics that are lingering. – This is not the last call. - Ken echoes that he also has not had time to look at the FRs.. - Legal: no FRs identified by Greg, members of the sub in the room, or members of the sub on zoom. - Past CUP: no FRs identified by Inga. Catherin explains that any lack of consistency in their report is partly due to that they did not have all the answers in the documents. She then explained that the areas not solidified are identified in the introduction and conclusion of their report. Mark Yeager says that, while he does think some need to be highlighted, he has not had time to look at it to see what the document looks like. Ed then offers the list of topics. – The geographical area, collection, leche management, perception/expectation issues, closer, hot pockets in the community.... - CEO: no FRs identified by Amelia or sub-members. <p>Now looking to see if there are any FRs that are different across sub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal: Greg begins identifying issues that need to be looked at. Such as the 2002 memorandum of understanding. - CUP: Security of financial assurance needs to be looked at with Legal and DEQ. - SMMP: recommendation 25 connects to legal and land use material.
Break	
Member FRs Feedback Session 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marge says that she now feels like we need a few more months because the subcommittees have existed in their own silos, so we need time to work with interconnection. - Chuck notes that he has really tried to keep up and watch other sub's recordings. John echoes that the subs have done good work and they have a certain level of trust with each other. - Sam says we will talk about it more at the end of the meeting together. - Darren then walks through each FRs that was identified by topic order. - Danial sets up the first issue and corresponding sub-members reflect and discuss. Sam clarifies that the deliverables will be for the expert hired based off of the RFP created from the SMMP report. Now, is there a line item in the SMMP that addresses the issue Marge raised about the issues for the County hosting a landfill? Yes, but Marge explains that it would be a much bigger part of the discussion. Sam: Is there a section on the costs and benefits of hosting the landfill? Daniel: There is a cost-benefit section on the lifecycle of materials. It is implied that part of the consultant's job will be identifying the impact of different materials' lifecycles. Sam notes that it should not be implied but explicitly stated. – After continued discussion, Daniel explains

March 16, 2023, BCTT Workgroup DRAFT Meeting Minutes #9

	<p>that they did not make the landfill the center of the SMMP because that would make it more of an SWMP. They wanted to be more inclusive than just the landfill. Catherine would like the landfill not to be the center of it, but maybe have it be more active in the discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Daniel reads some of the recommendations that address it, and Marge says that this does NOT cover the benefit and cost to Benton County residents. Daniel then points to the landfill disposal section, which lists many questions that speak to the pros and cons. Marge notes that, while this may be, that is buried in the appendix. It should not be hidden. There should be a recommendation. Sean then talks on the nuances of what was discussed. They looked at how the system could change, not just a valuable part of the system. Ed seconds that the cost-benefit part is not clear. It needs to be clearer.- Marge agrees, and her point is that there is this whole other issue that has fallen through the cracks, and that should be stated.- Sam: I am not hearing that it fell through the facts or that there is any disagreement. What I'm hearing is that this needs to have clear FRs. He asks the SMMP members to draft an FRs so that it won't be missed. Daniel points to Finding 6, which could address a lot of this. Marge feels that Finding 6 does not address the issue.- Sam assigns John Deuel to re-work the current FRs or create new ones that address the cost-benefit part. He will send it to the sub, and they will discuss them over the weekend. Darren then writes the formal task for the whole group to see.- Now moving to the subcategories identified to look at in the CUP.- FRs looked at for #1 are CUP F-6, CUP F-14, LLU F-6, LLU R-7. These are then explored by the sub-members and workgroup. – get agreement on what happened with the 1984 discussion.- Very in-depth discussion of some of these important historic analyses. Not having a consensus on all of them is ok. Continuing to debate these issues won't lead us anywhere. So, let's say "there is diff interpretation of these key documents. Look to the appendix here for them. The recommendations come from our want to not have this happen again. Ginger wants to make sure there is a really clear distinction that Republic did not own Coffin Butte till 2008, so they are NOT the ones who did not communicate in the past. They are the ones who have been at the table.- The reality of the legal system in OR is different from hand and glove here. The state has a land use system where the County can look at what conditions of approval it would like. Has its own septate jurisdiction and rules, which, among other trends, are focused on safety. The current system requires the county to issue a CUP b/f DEQ look at it to see if it is safe. This is in conflict with the way the OR legislator has set it up b/c it keeps the County and DEQ from getting to work together and reconciling differences upfront. B/c SYSTEMS and such change over time, it is unclear who controls the screening. –
--	--

March 16, 2023, BCTT Workgroup DRAFT Meeting Minutes #9

	<p>note: DEQ is protective, they set minimums. The County and the disposal company can set higher together. There is a recommendation a/b clarifying the intersections b/w the County and DEQ.</p>
Dinner	<p>Did not get to start till 4:55, so dinner will run till 5:15. Then workgroup members will bring their food inside and eat during the public comment.</p>
Comment Period	<p>One person in the room and 5 on zoom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please see Appendix A for the transcribed comments. The meeting recording can be found here. There are three, and their comments are as follows. - 6:00 – mayor of Albany Alexander D. Johnson II - his short comment to the public.
<p>1) Member FRs Feedback Session 3 2) Stretch Break 3) Member FRs Feedback Session 4 4) Discuss: Final polling on Body of the WG Report, not on the Appendix. The Appendix SUB sections will be approved by the Subcommittees, but not the full Workgroup. While linked to the findings and recommendations for ease of reference, they are for background purposes only. 5) 1-2-3 Polling Refresher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Start with Catherine. Then Audrey says that there is nothing stopping DEQ from communicating what each other’s requirements are. They do NOT make any legal recommendations to the County– We get additional clarification from Ginny. - LSCL – R-3 - Touched on pretty much everything but leachate, Odor enforcement example given by Ed. - Sam: The theme I am hearing is that on the surface of the docs, it appears that there are ways to register complaints and such. However, when you scratch the surface, they have no real enforcement mechanism. – 6:19 - - The more opportunities – coordinated – for the community to communicate complaints, the better. - Is the issue of trucking Leachate in the SMMP? NO, but CUP R-13. Now, let’s cross-reference that to the SMMP too so we don’t miss it.
<p>Next Steps: 1) Next Steps 2) Last Meeting: 3/23/23, 1:30 to 7:30 PM</p>	
Adjourn	

March 16, 2023, BCTT Workgroup
DRAFT Meeting Minutes #9

4. Polling Issues

None

5. ZOOM MEETING RECORDS:

Recording: [Link](#)

6. Meeting Chat:

Currently Pending

7. Appendix A: Public Comment Transcriptions

Currently Pending

- Liz Davis:
- Fred Penni:
- Linda Brewer:
- Etc.

March 16, 2023, BCTT Workgroup DRAFT Meeting Minutes #9

Jim Fairchild:

My name is Jim Fairchild, and I live at 31540 Homestead Road, Philomath.

Today I am here with you because our county leadership has determined the best course of action is to provide a complex vehicle to make an end-run around two legal bodies and ~~two~~ disparate goals, apparently to bypass two previous county rejections of landfill expansion. I'll ignore the third revenue stream goal that undercuts both.

First is the development of a county solid waste management plan. What we see here is instead a reflective consideration of how we've gotten to this point, while the existence of the BCTT usurps the deliberative and regular Advisory Councils. Where is the future waste management plan?

Second is addressing the continued acceptance of regional solid waste here. Some is undoubtedly hazardous. That acceptance is by agreements already entered into, without an informed understanding of the consequences of those agreements--unintended or not. We'll see what you offer as a recommendation.

Through months of discussions and review, I see that you are no closer to either of these necessary goals. You all may well be better informed, but what are you doing with all this information?

I continue to be extremely disappointed with county leadership, ranging from misinformation on a number of issues by the county counsel, to the dismissal of two public representatives on the BCTT.

I have been reading through the documents provided from months of work. In the area immediately surrounding Coffin Butte there are wetlands that may be contaminated from uncollected surface and groundwater leachate. Some of those wetlands are within the E.E. Wilson State Wildlife Management Area. Yet your documents say there are no significant wetlands in the area. This implies that someone looked for significant wetlands, though there is no documentation supporting such a claim. Your report could claim "we did not determine whether significant wetlands occur in the area", but it is disingenuous at best to claim none are there when you didn't look. In layman's term this is disinformation. As you are applying statutorily defined language, I would consider this a falsification.

I can't begin to address air quality, traffic, noise, odor, and other significant harms this landfill and any expansion would bring. These are just some of the underlying reasons county residents do not want landfill expansion, and a forever future toxic waste site. Their health is more important than a revenue stream for your county government.