

**SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**March 24, 2009 at 6:30 PM**  
**Senator Hearing Room**  
**555 Court Street NE, Salem Oregon 97301**

**DRAFT**

**Routine Business:** Bob Anderson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm.

**Members Present:** Gregg Dart, Russ Johnston, John Matthews, Judy Skinner, Mary Kanz, Bonnie Sullivan, Brian Sund, Fred Stearns, Bob Anderson, Glenn Zimmerman, Susie Riches, Marian LaBounty, Kevin Joyce, and Sharon Johnson

**Members Absent:** None

**Public Signed in:** Susann Kaltwasser, Carroll Johnston, and Kacey Duncan

**Staff Present:** Jeff Bickford, Carol Ault, Melissa Austin, Bill Worcester, Director of Public Works, and Commissioner Janet Carlson

<p><b>Motion:</b> Russ Johnston moved to approve the February minutes. The motion was seconded.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> (1) At the end of the minutes, Sharon had asked Mr. Drennen to make 'stronger' language that the county would have more impetus to reduce waste and he said he could do that. (2) Pg. 1, approving the minutes, should have been 'January Minutes'. (3) 'Updating' the member handbook should say 'creating' ..... (4) Pg. 4, 'Interview Subcommittee' should be 'Membership Subcommittee'.</p> <p><b>Abstentions:</b> None</p> <p><b>Dissensions:</b> None</p> <p><b>Results:</b> Minutes approved with corrections.</p>
---

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Carroll Johnston talked about some of the alternatives that should be considered when weighing the alternatives of waste minimization vs. incineration and landfilling. Several areas that should be considered are that waste minimization helps address the greenhouse gas issue, whereas, incineration and landfills actually increase them. Waste minimization has the potential to create many jobs, whereas, incineration and landfills create a lesser number. Waste minimization avoids the problems of dealing with ash or new landfills. Waste minimization avoids the variety of toxin issues that are raised on the Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) web site. There are questions about the adequacy of regulatory standards for incineration and landfills, whereas this would not be the case with waste minimization. In regarding regulations, please recall that leaded paint and leaded gasoline met regulatory standards for many decades before they were finally banned. Waste minimization will not affect garbage fees if the carbon dioxide cap and trade regulations are instituted, whereas, the alternatives probably will affect those rates if cap and trade goes into effect.

Questions are asked by the SWMAC. Answers are by Carroll Johnston

- Q. In considering those items listed above, were you suggesting that some of those concepts be incorporated into the SWMP?
- A. Those are the things that should propel us into waste minimization. I would like to see a greater emphasis and much more proactive incentives for waste minimization.

- Q. Is it right, as a representative of the PSR, that you are supporting resources be put towards education and minimization? How many people do you represent in your group?
- A. That's correct. About 1,100 members statewide.
- Q. Do you have specific ideas as to how we might modify Chapter 4 to encompass more of what you're referring to?
- A. It's more a matter of how much weight you put on this.
- Q. Of the 1,100 statewide members, do you have any estimate of how many Marion County members there might be?
- A. Roughly 100.

**Sussann Kaltwasser**, League of Women Voters for Marion/Polk Counties.

Ms. Kaltwasser read a letter written by Kathrine Reed, President of the League of Women Voters, regarding the SWMP. See Attachment #1.

Questions are asked by the SWMAC. Answers are by Sussann Kaltwasser.

- Q. Does the League have specific suggestions how SWMAC, County Commissioners, and the City could increase the cooperation and communication?
- A. As is outlined in this letter, we'd like to see some activities in other parts of the county (ie; Silverton, Woodburn, MT Angel, etc.) to give people an opportunity to hear the kinds of things that were shared at the forums at Willamette University and also a summary of what's discussed at SWMAC.
- Q. Has the League considered going to the outlying communities?
- A. We are a Marion/Polk County organization, and if the county would like to partner with the League, we could certainly see if we could help facilitate some of that activity.
- Q. The letter states that the studies were done in 1970. Is that correct?
- A. The Marion/Polk county government study was originally done in 1970. The League updated it several years ago for Marion County. Once we've adopted a study, it can be changed or updated. That's what we are doing right now with the Marion County SWMP study.
- Q. What method does the League use to get folks to come to your meetings and are you able to measure what areas you are drawing these people from?
- A. Ms. Kaltwasser said there were about 45 in attendance at the first forum and about 90 signed in for the second forum. The newspaper is one of the methods used for recruiting attendees. The other one is to network with organizations that have an interest. ie; the city clubs, the Kiwanis, the Audubon Society, PRS, etc. A lot of it is done by email and by word of mouth, getting into newsletters and bulletins. In general, most people that attended are from Salem and Keizer.
- Q. Mary asked Jeff: What steps are being taken in other parts of the County as far as contact information?
- A. Jeff said that as the SWMP gets closer to finalizing, this would be taken to the outlying cities such as Woodburn.
- Q. How many meetings do you see having in the outlying cities? How do you envision this outreach process working?
- A. Sussann said it's essential to get some of the appointed officials in the county to have a work

session or a community forum sponsored directly with Woodburn, Silverton or wherever. They have their own mechanism for noticing the community. The League has found that getting on other group's agenda to be an effective way to interact and get the word out. This also draws more attendance.

- Q. John asked Jeff is there is a proposed way by the county to get the word out.  
A. Jeff said meet with city councils and also have a larger public forum that would take the place of the April SWMAC meeting.

- Q. Would the League be able to help get the word out regarding the April workshop?  
A. Sussann said they would be willing to work with Marion County in that area.

Glenn said the state is working on the rules for the compost making process and the rules are drafted through a stakeholder group and other committees through DEQ. They develop tentative rules and then it's put out for public comment for 30 days, hearings are held at three locations throughout the state where public comments are gathered, and then information is taken back to the stakeholders group for revisions. Glenn suggested that this process possibly could be used for the SWMP where the SWMAC would make the recommendation of the SWMP and then the county would hold public hearings to address the issues.

Marian added that it's a pretty standard procedure with any environmental agency to handle things that way and that mail lists and email lists are popular.

#### **INTRODUCTIONS** by Jeff Bickford

Kevin Joyce has recently filled a vacant Citizen-at-large position on the SWMAC. Kevin is a banker by trade, grew up in Stayton and has just completed the Salem Leadership Program. Kevin is in the Master Recycler program and is happy to be serving on the SWMAC. Susie has volunteered to be Kevin's mentor.

#### **Membership Update** by Jeff Bickford

\* The membership subcommittee met last week and will meet again this Friday, March 27<sup>th</sup> to discuss possible changes to the interview questions and to develop a set of expectations, roles, and responsibilities.

\* We have received a letter of resignation from David Furr, who filled a Citizen-at-large position on the SWMAC.

#### **Council Input/Announcements/New Business**

Sharon asked about the role of council members.

---

Motion: Sharon Johnston moved that the SWMAC meet with the BOC to get a clearer picture of the SWMAC's mission.

Discussion: Bob thought it might be premature at this juncture to try to set up a meeting with the BOC until the council decides what the topic of discussion will be.

Russ read the mission statement of the SWMAC, which is: *To develop, review, and recommend to the Board of Commissioners an integrated waste management system, which is financially feasible, and protects the public health and environment of Marion County.*

Fred asked Jeff the date of the original SWMP. Jeff said the original was written in 1995 and was updated in 2002.

RESULTS: There was no second to the motion, therefore the motion failed.

---

Brian congratulated John Matthews for his appearance in the Salem Monthly. In Brian's words, John is a *Super Hero!*

Gregg said that, though last month he introduced a suggestion that the SWMAC discuss a 1% of contingency fees to be set aside specifically for a demonstration project, he wanted to clarify that he is not a contender for any of those funds, should it be recommended and approved.

Gregg suggested changing the *Governmental Legislative Subcommittee* to a *Liaison Committee to promote intergovernmental cooperation*. Gregg said he would then like to serve on that subcommittee.

Bonnie announced that Mary Kanz is collecting school supplies, soccer balls and soccer shoes to send to kids in Iraq. Mary explained that this project was a suggestion from her Son, Major Jason Bender who is stationed in Iraq. Major Bender emailed Mary the information and she took it on from there.

#### **STAFF UPDATES** by Jeff Bickford

Jeff said anything the council would like distributed (by mail or email) to each other must go through him first.

#### **April is Earth Month**

- \* Earth Day at Oregon Gardens is April 18<sup>th</sup> and is free.
- \* The HHW Event at the Woodburn Wal-Mart is April 25 from 9am-3pm. The City of Woodburn PW Dept. co- sponsors this event.
- \* Legislative issues statewide – banning of burning infectious waste in the state. Jeff talked about greenhouse gas generation. Both EPA and DEQ have recognized WTE as a net greenhouse gas reducer. For more information contact Jeff Bickford, 503-588-5169.

#### **Flow Control**

Jeff explained that flow control was granted to the county because we enter into long-term agreements for disposal and need to meet those commitments. If flow control were pulled away from the county in the year 2014, it would have a substantive financial impact to the solid waste system. With the loss of revenue, there would be a lot of programs that we wouldn't be able to afford to do.

Q. Would it be helpful if the SWMAC made a recommendation on that proposal?

A. It was suggested the council wait, since the bill has not been drafted or passed yet.

#### **SWMP – Q & A- Recommendations and Priorities** by Doug Drennen, JR Miller & Assoc.

Discussion took place on the overview of the SWMP, the Executive Summary, and the Implementation Schedule. Mr. Drennen said this plan is a guidance document to use as to where the county puts their efforts to make things happen. A copy of Mr. Drennen's PowerPoint Presentation is available upon request by calling Carol at 503-588-7917, or email: [cault@co.marion.or.us](mailto:cault@co.marion.or.us)

Doug talked about the impact of 2002 SWMP Recommendations. The recommendations for the 2009 SWMP update fall into these main areas, and are as follows:

**Reduce/Prevent Waste** – the goal is to reduce waste generated by people at home and at work. The

key promotional programs, key education programs, and key customer services were discussed.

**Recycle More Materials** – the goal is to increase amount of materials recovered from the waste stream through reuse and recycle.

**Maintain cost effective processing and disposal system** – the goal is to continue stable, long-term system to manage waste that is not recycled.

- \* Begin negotiations with Covanta to continue processing Marion County's waste
- \* Complete Facilities Master Plan to determine what system improvement is needed to meet future needs.

### Discussion

Bob suggested that the council review the “reduce, recycle, reuse strategies”, starting with Chapter 4.

John Matthews said he was very impressed with the progress that's been made thus far on waste reduction and feels rewarded that the rest of the council is thinking along these lines as well. John is working with the State Fair to set up a program to reduce the waste by recycling the food waste with the help of Compost Oregon. John said we are here to develop the SWMP and make the best recommendations to go out to the county population as best we can. But once that's done, our job is not over. Our job is to help the county with ideas, research, development, question, etc. to work that plan and to be able to come up with recommendations to reduce waste, to increase multi-family housing recycling, to increase and facilitate commercial recycling, etc.

Sharon said she liked the slide show and had several comments on the executive summary. Sharon feels that trying to be done with the SWMP by June of 2009 is too fast. Jeff said there was no *hurry* in completing the plan.

### Recommendation 6.1

**Based on what we now know regarding merging technology and the process that we currently are using with the WTEF, Bob asked each council to share their input.**

**Sharon** said she thinks common sense says to use the WTEF that we have. Sharon wants a matrix to look at in terms of health and costs. Bob asked Sharon what is needed in the matrix. Discussion followed.

**Commissioner Carlson** said that everyone in Marion County that works with her knows that she always asks for a matrix when there are work sessions. Commissioner Carlson said that the table that Mr. Drennen presented to the BOC with the cost per ton for various options would be a starting place for that, and perhaps add a few columns that deal with the emissions and factors being looked at.

**Mr. Drennen** asked for clarification from the Board. He also pointed out that Appendix A is 30-40 page assessments of the technologies that are being promoted as alternatives. Bob Anderson talked about the emission comparison between the WTEF and merging technology.

**Fred Stearns** said keep on doing what we are doing and is fully in favor of the WTEF and should consider a third burner.

**Glenn Zimmerman** said since the WTEF is doing fine, we ought to move forward with it.

**Brian Sund** agrees that we should continue with the WTEF, but is not convinced right now that the emerging technologies have anything to offer at this point and time.

**Gregg Dart** said his concerns have been safety in pollutants and some of the information that's been raised in the forums and disseminated through the process of examining through the WTEF still raises questions in his mind. In terms of the next five years of the termination of the WTEF contract, those concerns need to be highlighted and thoroughly addressed and alternatives need to be examined.

**Judy Skinner** said that since the facility continues to operate whether it gets the waste from Marion County or not, that it makes a lot of sense to continue to use it to reduce what we have to landfill. We are doing a good thing by taking responsibility for the trash that we are generating and not trying to ship it off to someone else's backyard.

**John Matthews** agrees with what's been said so far. In regard to presenting what the future of what Covanta is consuming right now (base load), do we need to sell our potential decision to support continuation of that? If so, do we need a matrix for that as well as a matrix for the incremental increases?

**Susan Riches** agrees with other council members and thinks the WTEF is by far the best option to consider right now.

**Mary Kanz** supports Recommendation 6.1 for all the reasons discussed.

**Russ Johnston** said right now the WTEF has 55,000 tons of waste that goes outside of Marion County. This needs to be worked with to develop these other technologies or emerging technologies that are coming to trial.

**Marian LaBounty** fully supports maintaining Covanta for all the reasons stated. Marian pointed out that the information on emissions is very foggy and subjective. WTE deals with the waste that is not being recycled and it produces a marketable commodity that is in high demand. Gasification, on the other hand, creates one thing only, which is oil. Oil is very much a commodity market. Alternative technology is something we should look at, but not jump into it.

**Bonnie Sullivan** said in educating the public we need to define what the WTEF is and what they do. There may be advantages and disadvantages if the county doesn't pursue continuing the contract with Covanta, but for right now, she feels this in reinventing a wheel that works right now and will continue to work with our recommendations and getting other educational programs out there to help the public know what really needs to be done.

**Doug Drennen** said if the council doesn't feel there is enough information, please be specific. There isn't a lot on emissions, but the data was examined and reported on. If there are things that are needed, please let Doug know.

Discussion took place on the feasibility of a third burner at the WTEF. Sharon suggested putting the third burner on hold for 10 years and concentrate on educating the public in reducing waste. Sharon would like to see a summary matrix that has suggestions.

John commented that if we support keeping the WTEF with the baseline stuff, our job isn't over. We need to sell that to the rest of the population. In doing so, a matrix would help if we had the right parameters.

Bob said that many of the things that are included in this plan will be the result of negotiations between the county and the WTEF, if that's the direction the council recommends to the BOC.

Discussion on the matrix ensued.

Mary suggested that the next meeting be a workshop and strongly suggested each council member have all the information distributed thus far with them at the workshop. Doug said the initial matrix of alternatives would be discussed and expanded if desired.

### **Where do we go from here?**

March 24 – SWMAC to review the Executive Summary/Implementation Schedule

March 26 – League of Women Voters Forum

April 15 – Complete assembly of final Draft 2009 SWMP Update and send to SWMAC

April 28 – Public Meeting – Testimony on Final Draft SWMP – SWMAC Meeting to consider sending to Board of Commissioners

May or June Meeting – Board adoption of 2009 SWMP Update

Q. What is an open forum?

A. A group of people that is well informed to meet and plan.

Jeff explained that a short presentation of the overview and background of the SWMP would be given at the beginning of the public workshop on April 28<sup>th</sup>. The council agreed to have Jeff reserve a location and let all know. An agenda will be provided. Discussion followed.

Q. At what point would we take the SWMP to other communities?

A. Doug pointed out that the SWMP is a resource manual or guidance document and the direction to do more commercial is going to take some time and there will be some rate adjustments and education that will take place.

Judy asked about the tipping fees at the WTEF. They were supposed to go down when the bonds were paid off. Jeff explained that the statement in the paper wasn't exactly true. Bill Worcester said that there was another paragraph that the reporter chose not to add, which said that nothing is set yet. The paragraph went on to say that it was just speculation.

Bob Anderson said that the county has done an incredible job and it's astonishing that the tipping fees haven't been raised for the last 17 years. Doug's studies support this.

Judy commented that when the council started with the recommendations with the SWMP, the commissioners said that they wanted all things that require money to be softened. Doug said the Boards statement was to find out what the results and costs are before making a commitment.

A hard copy of the updated SWMP Draft will be sent to all SWMAC members once received from Mr. Drennen.

Mary said the council has every intention of recommending policy to the BOC and said we should be very careful about cutting a suggested contract in half because it does affect dollars and filters back down to the rate payers.

Glenn commented on Recommendation 3.5.3 – Provide more reuse. Glenn suggested we bring some of the thrift stores like Goodwill, Habitat for Humanity ReStore, etc. as partners in Marion County and along with that measure what's being brought in and what's being sold/reused. Instead of the word voluntary, Glenn suggested visiting these stores to obtain a report from them on reuse. The council agreed with Glenn and suggested it be added in the SWMP somewhere. Gregg said that

Habitat for Humanity does track the tonnage that they are receiving as donations. Discussion followed.

The council asked Jeff to reserve the room at South High School for the April 28<sup>th</sup> Public Workshop. Judy asked if a sign could be placed directing entry to the meeting.

**ATTENDANCE**

No absences

**NEXT MEETING AGENDA – April 28, 2009**

**Public Workshop to discuss the Solid Waste Management Plan**

**Bonnie asked Jeff to suggest that public bring their written comments/questions to the Public Workshop.**

**MEETING REVIEW**

Meeting went very well

Great questions

We've come a long way as a group

MOTION:	Mary Kanz moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded.
---------	--

Discussion:	None
-------------	------

Results:	Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 9:40pm
----------	--

**Note: If anyone would like to schedule a time to come to the office to listen to the recorded version of these minutes, you may do so by calling 503-588-7917.**