



	Committee Members:				
	Paul Bertagna Jackson Dumanch, Alternate City of Sisters	✓	Jared Black Citizen at Large		Luke Dynes Citizen at Large
	Ed Fitch John Roberts, Alternate City of Redmond	✓	Keith Kessariss Citizen at Large	*	Cassie Lacy Robyn Jones, Alternate City of Bend
	Erica Lindberg Ron Shearer, Alternate Republic Services	*	Chris Ogren Citizen at Large	✓	Mike Riley The Environmental Center
✓	Erwin Swetnam Roman Guffy, Alternate Cascade Disposal	✓	Robin Vora Citizen at Large		
	Consultant(s):				
*C	Dwight Miller Parametrix, Inc.	✓C	Ryan Rudnick Parametrix, Inc.	✓C	Aubrie Koenig Conсор
	Staff:				
✓S	Tim Brownell Solid Waste Director	S	Chad Centola SW Senior Advisor	S	Jeff Merwin Solid Waste Manager
*S	Sue Monette SW Management Analyst	S	Kristie Bollinger County Property Manager	S	Shad Campbell IT Applications Manager
S	Peter Gutowsky CDD Director	S	Nick Lelack County Administrator	*S	Stephanie Marshall Legal Counsel Assistant
*S	Lee Randall Facilities Director	S	Kimberly Riley Legal Counsel Assistant		
	Elected Official(s):				
E					
	Guest(s):	✓G	3	*G	10
✓	<i>Present at meeting</i>	*	<i>Videoconference</i>	C	<i>Consultant</i>
E	<i>Elected Official</i>	G	<i>Guest</i>	S	<i>Staff</i>

Decisions/Actions Taken by the Committee in Blue
Items Requiring Follow-up in Red

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Tim Brownell, Deschutes County Solid Waste Director.

1. Welcome: Tim Brownell

Tim Brownell welcomed the group and reviewed the list of Committee members in attendance.

2. Review/Approve Minutes: Tim Brownell

Tim Brownell asked for comments on the minutes from the August 15, 2023 meeting.

Action: Mike Riley made the motion and Erwin Swetnam seconded to approve the minutes from the prior meeting. The committee unanimously approved the minutes as written.

3. Open House Input and Community Outreach Updates: Tim Brownell

Tim shared an overview of recent outreach and community input, including a community open house, briefings with County College and City of Sisters, and meetings with Oregon Natural Desert Association and Bureau of Land Management.

Open House Highlights

Tim summarized the material and discussion from the open house event, noting the event was promoted through a variety of local media with nearly 50 community members in attendance.

- **Recycling and diversion goals:** Tim described potential improvements at Knott Landfill and Negus Transfer Station to help achieve diversion and waste reduction goals. The County is assessing the cost-benefit of opportunities to expand construction and demolition recycling, install a material recovery facility, and expand composting to process existing organics streams.
- **Knott Landfill post-closure concepts:** Tim noted that while the Knott Landfill site is undevelopable, the County is evaluating possible solar recovery at the site and has also been in discussion with Bend Parks and Recreation District about passive park use opportunities.

(SWAC member Robin Vora arrived around 9:14 a.m.)

Upcoming Outreach

Tim listed upcoming outreach activities, including briefings with the cities of Redmond and La Pine, three scheduled SWAC meetings in spring 2024, and ongoing direct outreach to interested parties.

- Mike Riley asked will Knott Landfill continue to have composting onsite? Tim responded it may depend on what's possible at Negus. Ideally, there will be one site and one location closer to the agricultural areas in the north of the county. However, there may be two separate locations for non-putrescible and non-putrescible materials (composting with food waste).
- Robin Vora asked if just three SWAC meetings are planned for spring 2024? Tim confirmed that's the case.

4. Final Site Evaluation Progress Update: Ryan Rudnick

Ryan Rudnick provided a progress update on the finalist site evaluation process, including technical evaluations underway for both the Roth East and Moon Pit sites.

Highway 20 BLM Site

Ryan noted staff are recommending removal of the remaining BLM site based on a variety of technical considerations and the status of the petition to incorporate a City of Mountain. The SWAC had previously retained consideration of this BLM site as a potential back up.

- Robin Vora asked if there is another way for Mountain View proponents to move forward? Tim responded there is potential for an appeal but the status of that process is unknown. Chris Ogden noted advocates could potentially do a ballot initiative.

- Keith Kessar asked did you do additional financial analysis of the costs associated with the amount of rock and excavation needs? Ryan responded the earlier cost factor analysis based on the prevalence of rock at the site is the most current information.
- Robin Vora asked whether additional consideration is being given to the pit under different ownership that was somewhat near the BLM site? Tim Brownell responded that was one of the initial 31 sites evaluated during broad screening; however, the need to design for a significant amount of water coming down the ridge was a key consideration. Ryan added the site was small and constrained and had multiple property owners.

Finalist Site Evaluation Overview

Ryan summarized recently completed investigations and ongoing technical analysis for the finalist sites. This includes geophysical survey, geotechnical investigation, cultural and natural resources field work, transportation and water infrastructure assessment, and environmental assessment. The project team has also developed preliminary site designs for both locations that include similar onsite facilities for maintenance, landfill gas capture, renewable energy connection to the grid, etc.

The County will be reviewing initial supporting materials from the project team in November. The January SWAC meeting will include an update and discussion of preliminary findings. Then the final report will be compiled to support the finalist site recommendation and decision process.

Moon Pit Site

Ryan provided an update on technical analysis underway and shared rendered views of the preliminary site layout. The site development is proposed in three separate phases over the 100-year lifespan.

Conceptual design: The design identifies a prominence for the site of about 150 feet from existing grade. The ‘floor’ of the landfill is determined by the depth of excavation needed to generate materials for daily, intermediate, and final cover. The County is reviewing full buildout concepts for the site while having ongoing conversations about co-use on the site with Hooker Creek. Tim noted proposals have been requested from both site owners, including for County ownership, by November 6.

- Jared Black asked who are the property owners around the site? Ryan Rudnick responded it’s all BLM ownership.
- Jared Black asked is there potential to expand beyond the current footprint? Tim Brownell responded BLM is interested in protecting the wilderness experience in the Badlands area and the County doesn’t anticipate potential to expand the footprint. Ryan noted there may be potential to excavate more within the currently proposed footprint or make other adjustments based on ongoing conversations with Hooker Creek.
- Mike Riley asked are there two peaks shown in the design and what are the approximate heights? Ryan responded the final closure design would have a potential 150-foot prominence.

Ryan shared renderings of the full closure concept—the view in 100 years—which would be partially screened by an existing ridge and junipers at ground level. Tim Brownell noted the parking area for the Badlands would have a view of the facility operations. Ryan added that the prominence of the first cell may be just 75 feet, not the full 150 feet conceived for final closure.

Technical investigations: Ryan walked through information from previous geotechnical observation of the site. There’s roughly 10 to 30 feet of loose material before hitting the hardpan of basalt underlay.

- Robin Vora asked doesn’t the existing site go down about 100 feet? Tim Brownell responded roughly 80 feet deep.

- Keith Kessar asked how the Moon Pit site concept accommodates Hooker Creek’s continued operation? Tim Brownell responded discussions with Hooker Creek are ongoing to consider feasibility of landfill design concepts for the site and mining activity business needs.
- A member of the public asked how deep do you need to go for the landfill? Tim Brownell responded about 20 percent of the landfill is materials to be harvested for fill cover. The need on this site is roughly 50 feet but it may vary depending on the site topography and leachate design. Timm Shimke shared that there’s a side slope 3:1 requirement that may also restrict excavation. Ryan added that ideally mining activity will happen first followed by landfill as a reclamation activity.
- Robin Vora asked will the site owner come back with a proposal with timing for when they can mine and the landfill can go in? Tim Brownell responded yes and that may include partitioning or other options. He added the ideal is to permit the entire landfill area at the same time (rather than in multiple permits for a partitioned site).

Roth East Site

Ryan provided an update on technical analysis underway for the Roth East site evaluation and shared rendered views of the preliminary site layout. The site development is proposed in four phases over the 125-year design life. Tim noted the 350-acre proposed development would be in the southern portion of the 1700-acre site, farthest from the highway.

Conceptual design: Ryan showed renderings of the final closure site design concepts and pointed out onsite features and a proposed new access.

- Robin Vora asked if the part of the development most visible from the highway would be phases two and four? Ryan noted the northwestern part of the development would be the most prominent.
- A member of the public asked if the landfill would be visible from the Pine Mountain summit? Ryan responded that it wouldn’t be directly visible from Pine Mountain Observatory which is positioned on the south side. There is some potential visibility from one break in the ridgeline. The guest shared that paragliders generally launch from the northwest side, and once in the air would see the proposed facility site. Also, when paragliders ‘bomb out’ they may occasionally land in the general area of the site.

Technical investigations: Ryan shared figures of the geophysical results. Geophysical information is used to better understand the cell development potential as well as subsurface characteristics related to groundwater. Initial findings show ‘easy digging’ and a favorable variety of material for site development and operation needs.

- Keith Kessar noted not having to blast could be a comparably high-cost savings for this site.
- A member of the public asked multiple questions.
 - Is there an indication of groundwater depth for the site? Ryan responded that will be considered in the evaluation, but data isn’t available yet. From currently available information, we know the groundwater well has a depth of about 800 feet.
 - Is there a preferred type of subsurface material to support landfill development and operation? Dwight Miller responded the site material is ‘well consolidated’ and will provide a firm foundation for any development on the site.
 - Of the two sites, which would be most visible from Highway 20? Ryan responded there is some subjectivity but both potential sites are setback about 1 mile from the highway. The guest added the Moon Pit site seems fairly well screened.
 - How much blasting would be related to the mining versus the landfill operations? Tim Brownell noted initial discussions with Hooker Creek have assumed blasting for mining operations would occur before

active landfill use in that part of the property. However, the property proposals haven't been received yet.

- Is it feasible to use cover dirt from an older mining operation on Horse Ridge? Timm Shimke noted importing cover materials also likely increases the operational costs.

5. Public Comment:

Public comments are available in the meeting recording. Following is a list of individuals that provided verbal comments.

- Steve Wright
- Harrison Ruffin
- Laurel Collins

SWAC members and the public asked questions and discussion occurred amongst the committee members.

- Mike Riley asked will the cost analysis consider cost-benefit components and greenhouse gas emissions? Tim Brownell responded yes that's part of the evaluation.
- An audience member asked is there a general timeline for the first phase in what appears to be a three to four phase operation for both sites? Ryan responded the first phase would be about 30 to 40 years.
- A guest asked is the timing of the prominence closer to the later phases of development and the 90-year mark? Ryan responded yes. Keith Kessarar noted with technology and diversion it may not be needed to get to the fifth phase of the location.
- A member of the public asked is there consideration of winds near the Roth East site? Tim Brownell responded that climate conditions and ways to mitigate dust during operations are being considered.
- Mike Riley asked has there been success engaging with the Tribes given the status of the evaluation? Tim Brownell responded this is important and the project team will continue to reach out to the Tribes.
- Mike Riley requested that more information about environmental considerations and wildlife corridors, particularly near the Roth East site, be shared in the spring. Tim Brownell shared that some of the discussion with ONDA has been around distinctions between the two sites (Moon Pit has more human experience considerations while Roth East has more ecology considerations especially sage grouse). Ryan added there are a variety of potential mitigations and Tim noted additional property acquisition of Roth West may provide some mitigation opportunities.
- Robin Vora asked has there been consideration of relocating the trailhead or changing the access to add a small spur road? Tim Brownell responded there is work to do to better understand right-of-way considerations. In early discussions, BLM has noted challenges with changes to the access road footprint.
- Mike Riley commented that a big part of the assessment is looking at tradeoffs between an already disturbed and an undisturbed area, including potential impacts on wildlife corridors.
- A question was asked what is the difference in the experience of mining operations versus landfill operations? Tim Brownell responded that the perceived difference for odor, dust, and other considerations will vary by individual.
- A guest asked have there been many odor issues at Knott Landfill? Tim Brownell responded that odor complaints are very rare currently and staff attribute that in part to installing aerated static pile processing composting.
- Mike Riley commented that it'd be helpful to keep the BLM site in reserve and not take action to remove the site from consideration yet. Keith Kessarar added that it'd be helpful to make that recommendation in January when more information is available.
- Robin Vora commented that it seems some of the potentially most cost-effective sites have been removed from the evaluation and may be worth additional assessment. Mike Riley asked if Robin was proposing a motion.

Action: Robin Vora made a motion to add the Highway 97 site back to the evaluation. The motion was not seconded.

(SWAC member Keith Kessarlis left around 10:30 a.m.)

6. SWAC Discussion: Tim Brownell

There was no further discussion from SWAC members.

7. Adjourn: Tim Brownell

Next Committee Meeting: The next SWAC Advisory Group meeting is scheduled virtually or at the Deschutes County Road Department (61150 SE 27th St., Bend, OR 97702) on **January 16, 2024 9 a.m. – 11 a.m.**

- January 16, 2024, 9-11 a.m.: preliminary findings update
- April 2024, 9-11 a.m.: input on finalist sites
- May 2024, 9-11 a.m.: finalist site recommendation

Meeting Adjourned: 10:36 a.m.