**Deschutes County Department of Solid Waste**

**Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**

**April 23, 2019**

**1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Committee Members:**  |  |  |  |  |
| 🗸 | Jerry AndresCitizen at Large |  | Brant KuceraCity of Sisters | 🗸 | Mike RileyThe Environmental Center |
| 🗸 | Brad BaileyBend Garbage and Recycling | 🗸 | Catherine MorrowCitizen at Large |  | Erwin SwetnamCascade Disposal |
| 🗸 | Jared BlackCitizen at Large |  | Jake ObristCity of La Pine |  | Rick WilliamsCitizen at Large |
| 🗸 | Bill DuerdenCity of Redmond | 🗸 | Cassie LacyCity of Bend |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Consultant(s):** |  |  |  |  |
| 🗸**C** | Doug DrennenJRMA |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Dept. of Solid Waste Staff:** |  |  |  |  |
| 🗸**S** | Chad CentolaOperations Manager | 🗸**S** | Sue MonetteManagement Analyst | 🗸**S** | Timm SchimkeDirector |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Elected Official(s):**  |  |  |  |  |
| **E** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 🗸**G** | **Guest(s): 13** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *🗸* | *Present at meeting* | *\** | *Teleconference* | ***C*** | *Consultant* |
| ***E*** | *Elected Official* | ***G*** | *Guest* | ***S*** | *Staff* |

Decisions/Actions Taken by the Committee in Blue

Items Requiring Follow-up in Red

**Call to Order**: The meeting was called to order by Timm Schimke, Deschutes County Department of Solid Waste Director, at 1:35 p.m. The meeting started late due to technical issues with the projector/computer connections.

1. **Welcome & Introductions**:

Timm Schimke opened the meeting, acknowledged the guests, and indicated there was time on the agenda for public comments. Timm thanked the committee for their time in developing the plan. It was noted this was the last standard SWAC meeting, but based on the plan recommendations there will most likely be future task force or committee needs.

One guest stated he believed the Draft SWMP did not emphasize the potential to recover material received at the Knott Transfer Station, in particular construction and demolition waste. Based on pictures he had taken of the tip floor, he mentioned wood, insulation, metal and other materials discarded at the station were being disposed rather than recovered and reused or recycled. He believes these materials should be recovered either by floor sorting or with processing equipment. He suggested we should endorse the model used by Sweden to recover all materials and not dispose in landfills. After several comments, Doug asked the gentleman whether he had read the Draft SWMP or recommendations. He stated he had not read the Draft SWMP. Doug mentioned his point to recycle more construction and demolition materials is discussed in the Draft SWMP and is recognized as one of the priorities for reducing waste disposed in the landfill. Doug mentioned there are several recommendations, starting with completing a waste composition study, to get a better understanding of what is being discarded. Once the County has a better understanding of the composition, programs can be designed to cost effectively recover these materials and even consider policies to perhaps require customers to separate recyclables. Timm added the County has budgeted funds to begin that study as early as this summer. Once this study is complete, then new programs to recycle more materials will be considered including the possibility of installing equipment to process the materials.

There were no other comments from the guests at this time.

**Review/Approve Minutes:** Timm Schimke

Timm Schimke asked for comments on the minutes from the March 12, 2019 meeting. Action: Mike Riley made the motion and Catherine Morrow seconded to approve the March 2019 minutes. The committee unanimously approved the minutes as written.

1. **Review of Implementation Schedule:**  Doug Drennen

Doug stated the purpose of this final meeting was to receive any comments regarding the Draft Implementation Schedule. Doug presented a few slides that summarized the SWMP and highlighted the key findings and actions. One key action is to develop alternatives to better manage C/D waste and reduce what is disposed in the landfill. After presenting the SWMP summary, he proceeded to the review of the Draft Implementation Schedule.

The Implementation Schedule presents a proposed timeline for taking action on all 26 recommendations in the Draft SWMP. Recommendations displayed with red lines indicate actions to be initiated by the County. Recommendations with blue lines signifies actions involving multiple stakeholders. Most of these actions require cities, the County, franchised collection companies and other stakeholders to collaborate in developing programs and strategies related to enhancing and/or expanding waste reduction and recycling services. Doug asked if any of the SWAC members had any suggested changes to the priorities stated.

Doug pointed out that the timelines to initiate and complete certain actions are estimates and the Draft Implementation Schedule should be used for guidance and is flexible. Certainly, it is possible some actions may be completed sooner while others may take more time to develop policies and initiate actions. However, some actions are intentionally sequenced as they are dependent on one another. For instance, developing a C/D program is dependent on completing a waste composition study that will provide information for developing a strategy to recover materials. With this information, perhaps a processing system could be installed and operated to efficiently sort these materials like other communities. Another example is to phase in the food waste collection programs to coordinate with the evaluation of the compost options and perhaps introduce new technology to improve the process.

1. **Final Comments on Draft SWMP by SWAC:**

Several comments were made by the SWAC. Catherine Morrow asked about the interlocal agreements with cities. Timm stated that he had met with both Redmond and Bend and they were in favor of updating the agreements. She asked about Sisters and La Pine. Timm stated there were no interlocal agreements with these cities. He has met with Sisters and they did not feel the need to execute an agreement and were in support of the SWMP. He has not met with La Pine. Catherine requested that we use the term “intergovernmental” versus “interlocal” as it may not be familiar to some people. Action: The SWMP and other documents will be updated to reflect “intergovernmental.”

Mike Riley wanted to make sure we emphasize the need to maintain or increase education and promotion of waste reduction and recycling programs. Doug responded that this point is made in the SWMP as well as the Executive Summary. Mike also requested it be added to the Summary of the presentation and in any other documents summarizing the SWMP.

Mike also mentioned that recommendations dealing with enhancing multi-family recycling should mention the need to “ensure adequate infrastructure and physical space is available” as one aspect of implementing this program. Also, he suggested that “tourism” be listed as a generator type. Timm mentioned that the recommendations provide general direction and are not intended to get into specific details of each program, but these revisions will be considered.

Timm mentioned he sent a request to each SWAC member to provide any comments on the process or the Draft SWMP. The SWAC was invited to provide feedback during the meeting or at a later time in writing. After brief discussion, the SWAC endorsed the draft SWMP for sending to the Board.

Timm mentioned the adoption of the SWMP represents a starting point and there was much work to be done, particularly over the next 3 to 5 years. One recommendation is to establish an ongoing Task Force or possibly some form of SWAC to participate in the implementation process. He mentioned the cities, in particular, should participate but wanted to know if any of the public volunteers were interested in continuing with the implementation process. Certain members mentioned some interest, but it would depend on the required time commitment.

1. **Next Steps**

Timm thanked the SWAC for their commitment of time and dedication to this process. The next step is to make final edits and send the SWMP to the Board for approval. Information related to the Board meeting scheduled to review the SWMP will be sent to the SWAC.

SWAC members wanted to make sure the Executive Summary would be published as a separate standalone document. Timm indicated it would be separate as well as included in the entire SWMP.

Timm stated the Board is interested in conducting an additional survey to get input on the decision to site a new in-County landfill. This could be a flier inserted with bills to customers or some other method which will provide a wider range of input. Timm mentioned the survey taken by the TV station has received over 400 responses with over 80% stating support for a new in-County landfill.

This was the final meeting of the SWAC. Hors d’oeuvres and refreshments were provided by JRMA, Inc. in appreciation of the dedication and work in preparing the SWMP.

**Meeting Adjourned**: 3:07 p.m.