**Deschutes County Department of Solid Waste**

**Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**

**July 24, 2018**

**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 | 🗸 | Gillian OcknerCity of Bend |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Consultant(s):** |  |  |  |  |
| 🗸**C** | Doug DrennenJRMA | **C** | Jennifer PorterGBB |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Dept. of Solid Waste Staff:** |  |  |  |  |
| 🗸**S** | Chad CentolaOperations Manager | 🗸**S** | Sue MonetteManagement Analyst | 🗸**S** | Timm SchimkeDirector |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Elected Official(s):**  |  |  |  |  |
| 🗸**S** | Phil HendersonDeschutes County Commissioner |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 🗸**G** | **Guest(s): 14** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *🗸* | *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 1:30 p.m. It was noted there was not a quorum of the SWAC in attendance.

1. **Welcome & Introductions**:

Timm Schimke opened the meeting, acknowledged the guests, and indicated there was time on the agenda for public comments. There were a few more attendees than normal including Commissioner Phil Henderson and representatives from DEQ. Timm had each person identify themselves and their affiliation.

**Review/Approve Minutes:** Timm Schimke

No members had comments on the minutes. The May & June 2018 minutes of the meeting will be submitted to the SWAC next month for approval once a quorum is met.

1. **Review of Actions:** Doug Drennen

Before starting the agenda and review of actions, Doug had Sue Monette provide a brief update on the responses to the survey/questionnaire released at the public meeting in June. She stated there have been 91 responses to date and she was in the process of compiling a report. The SWAC was pleased to hear the number of people that are participating. Sue will continue to review and provide a summary report for the next meeting. The survey can be found on the County website at [deschutes.org/swsurvey](https://deschutes.org/swsurvey).

Doug stated the Agenda for the meeting was to review and approve the draft recommendations for Chapter 3 – Waste Prevention / Reduction; Chapter 4 – Recycling Collection and Processing; and Chapter 5 – Transfer Stations. These are still draft and can be modified as we move on to future chapters. Also, we have not discussed prioritizing the recommendations or developed an implementation schedule. We expect that to occur once the draft SWMP has been completed.

* **Definition of Cost Effectiveness Criteria:**

Doug started by presenting the definition for the “Cost Effectiveness” used as part of the evaluation of the different alternatives. This was included in both Chapters 3 and 4. The Committee agreed with the statements, but it was mentioned each of the ratings should include a statement of the impact on capital expenditures. Doug responded he will update the definitions to mention how capital expenditures will be accounted for in each of the cost effectiveness ratings.

Action: The Consultants will update the cost effectiveness ratings to include operational and capital costs for all 3 items (most, least, etc.).

* **Add a Rational Statement For Each of the Recommendations:**

The rational statement has been provided to support the recommendations. A bullet format was used to summarize the recommendations as requested. However, to avoid redundancy and to clarify the purpose of each recommendation, a short explanation was added. These statements were highlighted in blue in the draft chapters sent last week.

1. **Review Final Draft Recommendations:**
* **Chapter 3 – Waste Reduction and Reuse:**

Doug reviewed the recommendations from Chapter 3. The Committee agreed with the recommendations, but still believe there needs to be more specific refinement to breakout multifamily programs from businesses that generate food waste. The recommendations are grouped by the waste reduction element regarding promotion and education. It was mentioned there is a discussion of rate incentives in both Chapters 3 and 4 that appear redundant. Chapter 4 provides more discussion, but perhaps this can be modified to make it less confusing.

Action: Catherine Morrow recommended reducing the fee structure section in Chapter 3 to highlight and leave detail in Chapter 4.

Recommendation 3.4 is to expand the current yard and food waste collection program and consider universal service. A discussion of what is intended by the word “universal” ensued. Doug mentioned it is intended to convey the services offered by the Cities and the County should be the same. However, it can also be interpreted to mean a mandatory service that everyone should subscribe to Countywide.

Commissioner Henderson is not comfortable with requiring everyone to subscribe and pay for certain services, particularly related to yard waste and food waste. Just because these mandatory programs are offered in Portland and Seattle does not mean they are appropriate for the County.

Timm responded these are examples of how successful or not programs are in these communities, but it is not intended to suggest Deschutes County should adopt these same programs. The County and the Cities must determine how these programs are developed and implemented in Deschutes County. Timm agreed we should not use the word universal as this is confusing and the Cities may offer a different level of service for certain programs than the County. The SWAC members agreed that the details need to be developed.

Action: Phil Henderson requested the number or percentage of multifamily houses in Bend. The consultants will ensure this information is contained in the SWMP.

Action: Mike Riley requested the consultants incorporate his prior recommendations to breakout commercial, tourist, food waste, etc. as each task requires different resources and priorities.

Action: The Committee requested rewording Recommendation 3.4 to outline 1) Education, 2) Vegetative waste, and 3) Universal (not mandatory).

The consultant team will revisit the Chapter 3 recommendations to help clarify and define these actions.

* **Chapter 4 – Collection and Recycling Processing:**

The SWAC suggested rate incentives be used as a tool to support the participation in certain services. A brief discussion of this approach continued, and it was agreed to add a recommendation that rate incentives be considered.

Action: The committee requested adding a recommendation to factor fee schedules/structures and rate incentives using examples from similar locations, not Portland, Marion County or other large locations. The consultant team will develop a recommendation regarding the use of rate incentives.

After discussion, the SWAC concurred with the draft recommendations in Chapter 4. Commissioner Henderson excused himself and thanked the SWAC for their work.

Mike Riley requested clarification on how the Chapters 3 & 4 recommendations differ. Chapter 3 = Education, Chapter 4 = Collection.

* **Chapter 5 – Transfer Stations:**

Doug presented recommendations for Chapter 5 – Transfer Stations. Since several SWAC members were not in attendance for the prior meeting, Doug conducted a brief overview of the June chapter presentation.

There is a need to begin investing in the transfer stations due to increased waste flows and customer traffic. The Negus Transfer Station is the most impacted as the site and facilities were not designed to handle the current traffic and level of services. This station is also a key part of the future system as it serves the second most populated area in the County.

The Southwest Transfer Station has also been impacted by increased traffic. Modifications should be planned, but are not as critical as Negus at this time.

The Knott Transfer Station will also need improvements, but these are not critical at this time. The station will need to be evaluated as it gets closer to the time Knott Landfill closes since it may be a primary facility for maintaining the current level of services, depending on where a future disposal site is located.

Action: Catherine Morrow requested clarifying the Chapter 5 recommendations, such as 5.2 have plan done by 2021.

**Next Steps:**

1. Gillian Ockner mentioned a next step is to establish a Recycling Task Force as referenced in the Chapter 4 considerations.
2. The consultants are to provide the material well in advance of the meeting and highlight the version number in the footers of the draft chapters.
3. The consultants are to email another copy of the Glossary to the SWAC and ensure WR/R is included.

1. **Next Meeting:** SWAC Advisory Group meetings will be held the 4th Tuesday of each month at the Deschutes Services Building (1300 NW Wall St., Bend, OR 97703) from 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Public meetings will be held in the evening. The next Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting is **August 28, 2018 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

**Meeting Adjourned**: 3:13 p.m.