

Assessments Of Land Use Conditions

Definitions of the Compliance Phrases Used Within The Following Table:

In Compliance = Compliance demonstrated. Basis: cite basis e.g., In County Records

Not In Compliance = Basis: cite basis e.g., Need more specific information. Explanation: provide citations. References: provide when available. Suggestions or Open Items: for coming into compliance.

Compliance Status Unclear = Assessment not made due to one or more of the following: regulatory requirements not triggered, information sources not available, condition appears to have lesser environmental / ecological / economic / public safety, etc. impact, or insufficient information available.

County Requirement Superseded = Requirement no longer relevant. Cite over-riding County land use decision, DEQ reference, LUBA opinion, state statutes or administrative rules, county code, county comprehensive plan etc.

Compliance Not Demonstrated = Additional information from the County and/or DEQ needed to assess compliance.

Use Decision Provided for Background = Information in document provides useful insight of community/governmental perspectives at the time.

Note

The format for evaluation of more complex conditions by subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager is:

Subcommittee Members

Compliance Opinion:

Basis:

Explanation:

Notes:

Open Item(s)

Table 2. Assessments of Land Use Conditions

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. The service area to be served by the Coffin Butte Site should be defined and the approval should be confined to serving only areas MI, WS, DA, KV, MI, CO, AL, LV, and MH, as defined on the enclosed map ¹²³ . Expanding Coffin Butte to service additional areas should require a re-review by the Planning Commission. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This condition was rendered unenforceable by a 1998 Supreme Court decision that found that limiting areas to be served by a regional landfill were unconstitutional violations of the Commerce Clause (see memorandum prepared by Legal Subcommittee and appended to their report). Prior to that, it was superseded by the 1983 land use decision adopting the Landfill Site zone and text amendments to the Benton County Code and Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to accept this assessment until additional research is complete. • Modified in 1983, but still relevant as to intent – not sure how to rank this...with every land use application there has consistently been discussion about how much Benton County residents did not want out-of-county waste being deposited into the landfill; I believe the meeting minutes reflect that the applicant stated that the landfill was just for Benton County • Republic: Republic Services acquired Coffin Butte Landfill in 2008. Certain records prior to that date may be incomplete. We agree that the changes to the County's land use regulations and subsequent conditional use approvals mean that the analysis | | | |

¹²² The [Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report](#) was produced in 1974 as part of a regional collaborative effort between Benton, Marion, Linn, Polk, and Yamhill counties (Stevens, Thompson & Runyan, Inc., 1974a). This report details recommendations and options for disposal sites, collection strategies, and other materials management approaches.

¹²³ The [Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report](#) labels specific Chemeketa Region Service Areas, including the general areas of Monmouth/Independence (MI), West Salem (WS), Dallas (DA), Kings Valley (KV), Corvallis (CO), Albany (AL), Lobster Valley (LV), and Monroe/Harrisburg/Halsey (MH), which are mapped and detailed on Figure IV-7 of the Report (Stevens, Thompson & Runyan, Inc., 1974b).

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>and the conditions in the 1974 decision are no longer relevant. Further, Republic Services¹²⁴ has reported the counties of origin and tonnage for the last 20 years to the Board of Commissioners under the terms of its franchise agreement.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Not In Compliance</p> <p>Basis: RSI [Republic] Annual reports over multiple years indicate solid wastes outside of the geographical area defined in this 1974 Approval have been and continue to be disposed of at Coffin Butte e.g. (see RSI [Republic] annual report (add link to most recent report))</p> <p>Explanation: Further searches of County and RSI [Republic] files are needed to establish if or when this condition was superseded to authorize landfilling materials outside of the 1974 defined area. Benton County Code 25I dated 1983 authorizes acceptance of material from Sweet Home and Lebanon. Alternatives to finding historical authorization may include BOC and Planning Commission action to void limitations on the geographic area allowed to bring material to Coffin Butte. A relevant concept is the DEQ definition of "regional" landfill. It is based on tonnage received. It does not refer to a geographic area. It is based on tonnage processed. Additional searches for State statutes or regulations that prohibit counties from limiting the areas from which wastes can be received from is suggested.</p> <p>Notes: Support for 1977 geographical definition found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 1983 Code reference "BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR BENTON COUNTY, OREGON An Ordinance Amending the Benton County Comprehensive Plan and Specifically Amending the Public Facilities and Services and Environmental Quality Elements and Amending the Comprehensive Plan Map Ordinance 25I" Specific language to be inserted in the code under "Landfill and Solid Waste Policies" includes: "27. The Coffin Butte site shall have a landfill site designation and shall serve as a regional landfill servicing a geographical area including Linn, Polk, and Benton Counties." | | | |

¹²⁴ For ease of reference, "Republic Services" is used throughout this version of the document but depending on the topic the actual legal entity on the applicable permits documents or otherwise may be Valley Landfills, Inc.

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>◆ PC-83-07-C(3) PDF page 13</p> <p>Note: 1974 Chemeteka report defines "regional" in physical geography terms, DEQ defines "regional" in terms of amount of tonnage received. DEQ Reference: 23) "Regional disposal site" means a disposal site that receives, or a proposed disposal site that is designed to receive more than 75,000 tons of solid waste a year from outside the immediate service area in which the disposal site is located. As used in this subsection, "immediate service area" means the county boundary of all counties except a county that is within the boundary of the metropolitan service district. For a county within the metropolitan service district, "immediate service area" means the metropolitan service district boundary. From https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors459.html per B Fuller to S Imperati email 110722</p> <p>Status of search for County business related documents mentioning geographic service area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Franchise Agreements prior to 2020 not found. Need to find this. ◆ No mention of geographic service area in 2020 Franchise Agreements (https://www.co.benton.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_development/page/8136/valley_landfills_landfill_franchise_agrmt_2020.pdf) ◆ There is a 2016 Benton County / RSI [Republic] Memorandum of Understanding the is an "...acknowledgement that Coffin Butte Landfill will be accepting municipal solid waste currently being delivered to Waste Management's Riverbed Landfill for a term of 1-2 years, beginning in January of 2017. (https://www.co.benton.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_development/page/8136/republic_svcs_river_bend_landfill_500952_mou_120116.pdf) <p>Open Item: Search DEQ permits for information allowing geographic areas to use CB Landfill.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member - Republic</u></p> <p>Disagree with subcommittee members that conclude "not in compliance." This condition was superseded by the 1983 change to the County's regulatory structure as evidenced by subsequent decisions which did not carry forward this condition. It is also evidenced by the 2002 Memorandum of Understanding between Republic and Benton County, which concluded that the Republic was in full compliance with county regulations as of that date. In any event, such locational limitations were rendered</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| unenforceable by a 1998 Supreme Court decision, which found that such limitations were unconstitutional violations of the Commerce Clause. (This decision is discussed in detail in a memorandum prepared by Legal Subcommittee and appended to their report.) This condition has been long superseded and any attempt to impose a similar condition would be unconstitutional (and is also now outside the County's scope of review under the Development Code.) | | | |
| 2. The site management activities conducted at Coffin Butte should be reviewed periodically by the County Sanitarian (ex-officio member of the Planning Commission). A report of compliance to all state and local standards should be made at least once annually to the Planning Commission by the Sanitarian. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| County Requirement Superseded. First, this condition is directed at the county to complete, not the applicant, and should not have even been included as a Condition of Approval for the applicant. Second, staff has come across minutes and other documents that reference annual reporting by the County Sanitarian to the Planning Commission. Third, subsequent to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee being instituted, this information was relayed to that group, not the Planning Commission. Fourth, currently, the County Sanitarian has been replaced by a Solid Waste and Water Quality Program Coordinator. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report was supposed to be annual but this assessment only mentions one year. More information needed to confirm compliance. • I see annual reports dating back to 2005. Were there annual reports submitted before then? • Replaced by DSAC in 1983, but still relevant as to intent; if DSAC had been regularly informed of non-compliance with conditions of approval, perhaps the landfill would have been more compliant | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Basis: Reporting requirement may have been met by Disposal Site Advisory Committee in 1983 (Workgroup Committee Comments). DSAC records need review to ascertain if this condition is being met. SWAC reportedly receives annual landfill reports however neither the County Sanitarian nor the Planning Commission are involved in reviewing the reports.</p> <p>Note: Planning Commission review as PC and as Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) per Oregon Statewide Land Use Planning Goal Number 1, is unclear at this time</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member - Republic</u></p> <p>This condition was superseded by subsequent decisions that did not carry it forward.</p> | | | |
| 3. Efficient leachate collection and treatment, including the old site, should be maintained by the applicant to insure against pollution of nearby waterways. In addition, wells should be established on the periphery of the solid waste site to monitor any potential seepage into underground aquifers (groundwater pollution). | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This is an oversight function for DEQ. The applicant supplies a description of the leachate collection system and monitoring wells within their annual reports.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree strongly with staff: "efficient leachate collection and treatment" is extremely relevant, a continuing problem, and in fact domestic wells have been contaminated, which should be noted in the "common understandings" document. Contamination of domestic wells has been a continuing concern of owners of parcels adjacent to the landfill, for good reason (see 1993 Coffin Butte Annual Report, the Helms Well, page 4). Current leachate treatment is impossible onsite, as promised in the most recent CUP (2003), it is certainly possible to argue that the intent of this provision was not to have landfill leachate treatment burden public facilities (the Corvallis water treatment facility is so overburdened by leachate that 15 million gallons/year +/- are trucked to a Salem facility). Let's have the discussion about whether it is "efficient" to import waste into | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Benton County instead of diverting it to landfills with less precipitation (which consequently produce less leachate) and whether discharging dioxins/PFAS into the Willamette is “polluting...nearby waterways”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These requirements are still relevant. Has the original collection-retention lagoon been maintained and was it effective in iterating leachate? Past members of SWAC assessed that it was not effective. • Wells were required to monitor potential seepage of contaminants into groundwater. "Runoff" refers to surface waters, not groundwater, so this assessment does not address the original requirement. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: The fate of leachate generated by the landfill should not simply be ignored by the County and delegated to DEQ. The requirement to “insure against pollution of nearby waterways” is very much still relevant. Trucking of leachate to Corvallis’ sewage treatment plant does not result in effective treatment or insure against pollution of nearby waterways. Many of the toxic pollutants contained in leachate simply pass through the treatment plant with very little or no pollutant removal and end up in the Willamette River (PFAS, heavy metals, pesticides, pharmaceuticals, personal care products (PCP)). The Willamette River is a key recreation asset (boating, fishing, swimming, etc.) for residents of Benton County, and a source of drinking water supply for downstream residents (e.g., Adair Village).</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated</p> <p>Basis: A review of DEQ and RSI [Republic] records is needed. Evidence that “Efficient leachate collection and treatment...” is occurring is needed.</p> <p>Explanation: It is understood from RSI [Republic] that leachate treatment no longer occurs at the landfill. Leachate is being trucked to the city sewage treatment facilities in Corvallis and Salem for treatment and discharge to the Willamette River. Evidence that treatment to levels suitable for discharge to the river is needed to confirm RSI [Republic] is in compliance.</p> <p>Notes: The landfill generates about 25 million to 32 million gallons per year of leachate to be trucked off site to city treatment facilities. This volume equates to approximately twenty trucks per day traveling to Corvallis or Salem. Concerns include the impacts on county roads, road traffic, road safety and the Willamette River. Many of the toxic pollutants contained in leachate simply pass through the treatment plant with very little or no pollutant removal and end up in the Willamette River (PFAS, heavy metals, pesticides, pharmaceuticals, personal care products (PCP)). The Willamette River is a key recreation asset (boating, fishing,</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>swimming, etc.) for residents of Benton County, and a source of drinking water supply for downstream residents, e.g. Adair Village.</p> <p>Open Items: Staff's comments on the applicability of "later conditions for run-off" to leachate need clarification. Caution to readers, "Leachate" is not the same as "runoff". [Note Out of BCTT Charge: A review treatment system performance records would be prudent.]</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member - Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with Staff. Leachate regulation is within the exclusive jurisdiction of DEQ. The County has no authority or expertise to regulate leachate or to adopt or impose environmental conditions or regulations that conflict or add to DEQ's regulations. Republic has permits with the City of Corvallis and the City of Salem. The cities handle the treatment of the leachate and have and must continue to comply with permits to discharge wastewater. Republic's disposal of Leachate is in compliance with its DEQ and City of Corvallis permits.</p> | | | |
| <p>4. The scars that erode the face of Coffin Butte, when plans meet DEQ approval, shall be filled and compacted to a condition permitting re-seeding and eventual visual reclamation of the area and including screening with natural vegetation that portion of the subject property abutting the county road.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. Subsequent expansions of the footprint and additions to uses on and adjacent to the site made this condition unrealistic to fulfill until the entirety of the landfill is completed. This specific condition is no longer relevant as new reclamation plans have been approved.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree strongly with staff. "Temporary" cover of tarp-covered closed landfill cells sitting "temporarily" for a generation is clearly not the intent of this provision. Meeting minutes and applicant statements provide clarification as to the intent of this provision. This provision additionally requires "visual reclamation" of an area which has been so deformed by an accumulation of | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>garbage that is geographic in scope. This provision also addresses screening, which is also clearly a non-complied-with condition of approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was part of conditions of approval for a landfill that was then scheduled to close by 2000. The condition was not met. To date, no part of the site has been reclaimed by seeding with native vegetation. The "scars eroding the face of Coffin Butte" have in fact been increased by subsequent expansions, to a height well above the proposed grade for the currently permitted landfill design, even after expansions. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinions:</p> <p>A. Physical Design Requirements: In Compliance</p> <p>B. Reclamation & Visual Requirements: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis: DEQ has oversight of the geotechnical design of the landfill and has issued permits for the landfill. DEQ also regulates both the timing and scope of reclamation through closure and post closure requirements. Cessation of dumping at the landfill triggers the application of these requirements.</p> <p>The appearance of the facility is the purview of Benton County. It is unclear how the County has interacted with DEQ to ensure the County's requirements for the appearance of the closed landfill are reflected in closure and post closure plans approved by DEQ.</p> <p>Explanations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Scars" are not defined in the CUP condition. It is presumed that "scars" refer to areas where earth or rock has been excavated from the butte. Additional landfill cells are planned to be built along this rock face. It is unclear what type of plan needs to be submitted to DEQ for approval to meet this condition? While this land use action is nearly 50 years old, it sets the baseline expectations for how this industrial activity can be allowed to exist as a non-compatible land use in AG, forest, and rural residential lands. <p>Notes:</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Ref: County File: Reclamation Plan - Closure-Post Closure Plan_Report_Final. Report Title: "Worst Case" Closure and Post-Closure Plan, Coffin Butte Landfill, Benton County, Oregon, Prepared by GeoLogic, September 2020</p> <p>Open Item(s): DEQ records concerning the landfill need to be reviewed.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with Staff. The landfill has changed substantially since 1974 and certain areas of the landfill have been closed and covered and seeded over time per DEQ regulations. This condition is no longer relevant. Reclamation of the site will continue as cells close and will be part of the final Closure Plan.</p> | | | |
| <p>5. That by July 1, 1976, a plan including detailed elements on design, location, management, and financing of a solid waste resource recovery system be prepared and submitted to the Planning Commission for further consideration. Until such a plan is completed, the conditional use approval shall be limited to only the sanitary landfill method of waste disposal.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The condition was completed with the creation of the 1977 Waste Control Systems, Inc. Solid Waste Management Plan</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs detail, & relevant as to intent: This plan said that the landfill would close by the year 2000 and be replaced by a waste-to-energy facility. Approval of a landfill in 1974 was not a "forever landfill" – it was a bridge to a different way of dealing with solid waste. It is important to note that, in order to not repeat prior mistakes <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: In Compliance</p> <p>Basis: Document (1977 Waste Control Systems, Inc. Solid Waste Management Plan)</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Note: Not available via County records, subcommittee has procured and exists in appendix | | | |
| 6. The landfill operation shall be phased so that only a small acreage is used for fill at one time and then this acreage shall be returned to grazing, another farm-type operation or other permitted use as approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. Subsequent expansions of the footprint and additions to uses on and adjacent to the site made this condition unrealistic to fulfill until the entirety of the landfill is completed. This specific condition is no longer relevant as new reclamation plans have been approved.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEQ approval of a reclamation plan does not supersede county conditions of approval. No part of the landfill has yet been restored to grazing, farming, or even natural alternatives such as native prairie vegetation. • Disagree strongly with staff. Land use is land use, and is a County regulation. Unless specifically referred to in the land use language, DEQ has parallel, authority, not overriding authority. Land use policies deal with compatibility issues (i.e. generation of odors/dust); DEQ policies deal with environmental quality. Those are different regulatory bodies and one saying "this is OK" does not negate the authority of the other (Unless that is specified within the regulation itself, which in this case it is not) <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinions:</p> <p>A. Physical Design Requirements: In Compliance</p> <p>B. Reclamation & Visual Requirements: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>A. Compliance Opinion for "small acreage" condition: In Compliance.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Basis: Based on participant observations and company testimony during September 2022 County sponsored Coffin Butte Tour (see Site Tour Notes on BCTT website).</p> <p>B. Compliance Opinion for "...shall be returned to grazing..." condition: Compliance Status Unclear Basis: Per DEQ guidance, Closure of the landfill does not occur until all disposal operations cease. Potentially this is 15 or more years from now. RSI [Republic] is not required to submit a Closure Plan until 5 years prior to Closure. In the interim, if the landfill were to close today, RSI [Republic] provides a "Worst Case" Closure and Post-Closure Plan which describes the condition the site is to be left. The current "Worst Case" plan provides for a grass cover on slopes. There is no mention of visual screening.</p> <p>Explanation: Landfill operations and closure are governed by DEQ requirements. Some of the landfill areas have not received wastes since the 1990s, others since 2011. RSI [Republic] has determined areas of the landfill are "In Closure" under Federal rules. Approximately 41.7 planimetric acres have already received Final Closure. This area should already have a 1.5 feet thick Vegetative Cover per Federal requirements and be suitable for reuse.</p> <p>Notes: RSI [Republic] closure representations and DEQ position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSI [Republic] Ref: County File: 5Reclamation Plan - Closure-Post Closure Plan_Report_Final. Report Title: "Worst Case" Closure and Post-Closure Plan, Coffin Butte Landfill, Benton County, Oregon, Prepared by GeoLogic, September 2020 <p>2.3 Areas to Receive Final Closure</p> <p>The present "worst case" closure scenario consists of constructing a final cover over the existing active landfill minus the areas that have already received final closures to-date. At present, landfill liner has been constructed through Cell 5C (see Figure 1), totaling 123.5 planimetric acres of lined waste footprint. Approximately 41.7 planimetric acres have already received final closure; therefore, the area still to receive final cover is 81.8 acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DEQ <p>Ref. From: FULLER Brian * DEQ <Brian.FULLER@deq.oregon.gov>, Sent: Monday, November 21, 2022 5:03 PM, To: Edward Pitera Subject: RE: Cells in Closure</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Our interpretation of "MSWLF Unit" is that it applies to the entire landfill not individual cells. Being that the landfill is not yet full, the "clock" on final closure has not yet started. It is common for landfills to build new cells on top of older filled cells that are in temporary cover/closure. Final closure/capping under this scenario would occur when these uppermost cells are full or waste sequencing for an area is completed. This also allows for multiple cells to share leachate and gas collection and control systems. Approval could be considered granted via DEQ approval of the Site Development Plan and through the further refined final engineered closure plans.</p> <p>CFR 258.2 Definitions</p> <p>Municipal solid waste landfill (MSWLF) unit means a discrete area of land or an excavation that receives household waste, and that is not a land application unit, surface impoundment, injection well, or waste pile, as those terms are defined under <u>§ 257.2 of this chapter</u>. A MSWLF unit also may receive other types of RCRA Subtitle D wastes, such as commercial solid waste, nonhazardous sludge, very small quantity generator waste and industrial solid waste. Such a landfill may be publicly or privately owned. A MSWLF unit may be a new MSWLF unit, an existing MSWLF unit or a lateral expansion. A construction and demolition landfill that receives residential lead-based paint waste and does not receive any other household waste is not a MSWLF unit.</p> <p>Open Items: A pathway to achieve the County's expectations of what closure of the landfill will look like is needed.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff. Republic notes that the active landfill area remains approximately the same size when the Landfill moves from one cell to another. This has been true for the life of the Landfill.</p> | | | |
| 7. That efforts be made to encourage voluntary separation of recoverable materials such as tin, aluminum, paper, glass, etc. to reduce the amount of landfill materials. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The applicant has and is fulfilling this condition.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|---|
| 1974 | CP-74-01 | Designating Coffin Butte Landfill as a regional sanitary landfill site as recommended in the Chemeketa Regional Solid Waste Program Report ¹²² and Sanitary Landfill expansion. | PC Approved PC Decision Appealed BOC Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some efforts have been made but they have been largely ineffective. Benton County's ratio of recycling to landfilling has not improved appreciably since the 1970s. Presumably the intent of this provision was to have recycling efforts contribute to increasing the life of the landfill. Currently, Benton County could go to zero waste tomorrow, and presumably, the landfill would still take in the maximum volume cap within a short time, because of the new owner's vertical integration. This should be noted in the Common Understandings document. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Explanation: RSI [Republic] is "In Compliance" in Benton County based on personal experience but Benton County contributes less than 10% of the total volume sent to the landfill and is only one of more than 20 counties RSI [Republic] draws material from.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance with this condition, and since 1974 has gone much further in encouraging and making it easier to recycle. Goals/targets for recycling are appropriate considered as part the LTMMP process but are not appropriately considered as part of the CUP process. The regulatory framework has changed significant since 1974.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. Cross reference the narrative and the map in both documents. | | | |
| <i>*Clarification On Content Needed. See Subcommittee Comments</i> | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. The narrative was updated to provide information related to conditions 1 through 7. The updated narrative is found in the document titled "PC-83-07-C(3)" starting on Page 3 of 60 | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impossible to assess with missing narrative | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> *Clarification Of Condition Content | | | |
| Information in "PC-83-07-C(3)" includes requirements for terracing, post closure grazing and "...will be consistent with the expected future use of these lands as indicated by the existing farm and forest land use designations." | | | |
| Note: County records incomplete although referred to in "PC-83-07-C(3)" no site plan is included. | | | |
| Excerpts follow: | | | |
| Reclamation, physical layout, and maintenance provisions: From pdf file pages 4 & 5 (original document page 4) | | | |
| "ii. Reclamation (Conditions No. 2 and 6) | | | |
| When completed the present landfill area (see site development map) will appear as a low terrace rising from Coffin Butte Road into the site. The expansion area, labelled " Additional Landfill Disposal Areas" on the site plan, will consist when completed of a series of terraces progressing up the lower south slope of Coffin Butte. Each | | | |
| terrace in the expansion area will consist of a +/- 12 ft, high vertical " confinement berm" sloping 3/ 1, and a 10 20 ft, wide | | | |
| horizontal surface at 2% slope. The overall slope of the terraced hillside will be similar to the existing slope. An upgradient | | | |
| cutoff drainage system see site plan will be provided to intercept seasonal surface drainage and route it around the new fill | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>area. The feasibility of reclaiming the site in this manner is discussed in the attached letter dated May 23, 1983, prepared for Valley Landfills by Sweet, Edwards & Assoc., geological consultants.</p> <p>All disposal areas, including the terraces, will be reclaimed for pasture. Portions of this landfill property including the completed disposal area site plan, as well as some of the outside lands in the vicinity of the landfill, are currently use for this purpose. The area within the landfill reclaimed for pasture will be maintained by periodic regrading and replanting as required to compensate for settling. Otherwise, maintenance will consist of farming methods commonly used for pastureland."</p> <p>Reclamation From pdf file page 4: (original document page 2)</p> <p>"Reclamation of the: landfill in the manner described will be compatible with the existing predominant open space and resource lands characteristics of the adjacent and surrounding lands and the current uses of these lands, and will be consistent with the expected future use of these lands as indicated by the existing farm and forest land use designations."</p> <p>Reclamation From pdf file page 18 (original document page 8):</p> <p>... "Reclamation of the landfill in the manner proposed will be compatible with the predominately open space and resource lands characteristics of the adjacent and surrounding lands and the current uses of these lands, and will be consistent with the expected future use of these lands as indicated by the current farm and forest land use designations.</p> <p>Based on the need to provide facilities for waste disposal, the lack of any other existing or planned disposal sites within this area, the environmental, economic, social and energy benefits from maintaining the existing landfill, and the established compatibility' of the landfill with the adjacent land uses, changing the land use designation for the Coffin Butte Landfill qualifies for an Exception to Goal 4."</p> <p>Reclamation From pdf file page 16 (original document page 6):</p> <p>"The long- term environmental consequences of this proposal to the region served by the landfill will be to have a recognized site for waste disposal operating under a D.E.Q.- approved development plan and meeting D.E.Q. standards."</p> <p>End of quotations</p> <p>Compliance Opinions:</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>A. Physical Design & Geotechnical Requirements: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>B. Reclamation Requirements: Compliance Status Unclear (Not triggered see CP-74-01 (6))</p> <p>Compliance Opinion(s):</p> <p>A. Compliance Opinion for Physical Design & Geotechnical Requirements: County Requirements Superseded Basis: Landfill design concepts conveyed in site plans from 1983 appear to be superseded by subsequent DEQ approved Site Development Plans. Explanation: DEQ requirements on landfill design, operation and closure have primacy over County requirements. Notes: County provided records are incomplete. Although referred to in "PC-83-07-C(3)", no site plan drawing is included. Open Item: Referred to site plan is needed since it may point to areas where DEQ approved plans incorporate County requirements.</p> <p>B. Reclamation Requirements: Compliance Status Unclear (Not triggered per DEQ. See DEQ 2022 explanation in CP-74-01 (6)) Basis: Closure not triggered see CP-74-01 (6) Explanation: Site is an on-going operation and not subject to DEQ reclamation requirements at this time. Notes: The reclamation requirements cited in 1983 need review. Current practices to manage the risks to human health and the environment posed by a closed landfill plus current practices for maintaining the integrity of the final cap need to be considered. Open Item(s): None</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with Staff. The 1983 Narrative is no longer relevant to the current operation given the subsequent CUP approvals have changed the operation.</p> | | | |
| <p>2. Expand the narrative statement, section (1.a.ii), on reclamation to include the physical configuration of the completed landfill areas and method of maintenance of the proposed pasture uses. Include a statement regarding the effects of methane and internal heat generation on the long-term maintenance of the pasture, and include irrigation plans if proposed.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The narrative was updated to provide information related to conditions 1 through 7. The updated narrative is found in the document titled "PC-83-07-C(3)" starting on Page 3 of 60</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impossible to assess with missing narrative • We have not been provided with the necessary information to assess whether the narrative was amended to fully address these issues, or whether the assessment of methane generation was adequate for purpose. As noted above, there is still no "pasture" on the site. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: The first narrative is not included in the record. The revised narrative does, in fact, use the words methane, heat generation, screening, leachate, etc. Reading the narrative, it can only be concluded that none of the promises in the narrative have been completed. The most obvious of these are the restoration to pastureland, grazing, and screening. Leachate is not currently being used to irrigate the trash.</p> <p>*See 'Clarification Of Condition Content' under Subcommittee Comments for PC-83-07 / L-83-07 Condition 1</p> <p>Compliance Opinions: County Requirements Superseded</p> <p>Basis: There are three aspects of this condition: Physical Configuration, Maintenance Method, and Methane Statement. Landfill design concepts conveyed in site plans from 1983 appear to be superseded by subsequent DEQ approved Site Development Plans and site closure requirements.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <p>"Methane Statement"</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>From pdf file pages 5 (original document page 3) "The completed disposal areas will be covered by a minimum eight inch clay cap covered by twenty-eight inches of soil. The depth of the cover will minimize the effect of methane on the pasture grasses. Similarly the cover crop should not be affected by internal heat generation. Rather, warm subsurface temperatures have proved beneficial to root development."</p> <p>Explanation: None</p> <p>Open Item(s): None</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff. The 1983 narrative is no longer relevant to the operation given subsequent approvals and changes over time.</p> | | | |
| <p>3. Describe in more detail in the narrative, the method of screening; include a description of the location, height, width, depth and physical composition of the berm; and include the type and location of vegetative screening; and include a statement regarding the long-term maintenance of the berm and vegetative screens.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The narrative was updated to provide information related to conditions 1 through 7. The updated narrative is found in the document titled "PC-83-07-C(3)" starting on Page 3 of 60</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For this and other statements regarding "updates of the narrative, the Solid Waste working group has not been supplied with sufficient information to evaluate compliance. This same comment applies to all entries below. We are being asked to opine on these things without adequate information. I suggest that we should not be giving a rubber stamp of approval to statements that we have not actually had opportunity to examine fully -- it's both meaningless and likely to be abused in future CUP applications. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impossible to assess with missing narrative <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: There is a very detailed description of the promised screening in the narrative. However, none of the promises have been kept, nor has the County taken any enforcement actions to ensure completion of screening requirements.</p> <p>Compliance Opinions. There are three aspects of this condition:</p> <p>Physical berm: County Requirement Superseded by subsequently issued DEQ Site Development Plans</p> <p>Vegetative screening: Not In Compliance</p> <p>Maintenance: Not In Compliance based on current appearance of site</p> <p>Basis:</p> <p>Screening Requirements: physical berm, vegetative screening, and their maintenance</p> <p>From pdf file pages 6 & 7 (original document page 4 & 5)</p> <p>It is recognized that these conditions are from a 1983 document. Actions may have been taken at that time but the County did not provide records to substantiate compliance at that time nor continued maintenance of screening requirements.</p> <p>"iii. Screening (Condition No. 3)</p> <p>Additional screening will be provided in keeping with the current site screening program used at the landfill. This program consists of a keyed berm with conifers planted 10' on center along Coffin Butte Road from 99W to the landfill entrance _road, and similar plantings extending north along 99W from Coffin Butte Road to the north landfill property line.</p> <p>The permanent, fixed, keyed berm is represented. on the site development plan by the solid black line labelled " Approximate Solid Waste Disposal. Boundary." As shown, the berm encompasses the present landfill area and the existing development area. The berm is 10 - 12 feet high, 10 feet wide at the top and 60 - 70 feet wide at the base, and has an outside slope of 3/ 1. The depth of the key is three feet. The berm is composed of low permeability materials from on- site sources. The berm has been hydroseeded and will be grazed.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Screening plants will consist of trees from the tree farm owned by Valley Landfills on their land south of Coffin Butte Road. Initial height of the plantings will range from 6 - 10 feet. Additional plantings can be made on the terraces to screen disposal operations on the slopes, as needed. The plantings will receive ongoing maintenance by the landfill operators."</p> <p>Explanation: None</p> <p>Notes: 1983 site plan drawing was not provided in the County documentation.</p> <p>Open Item(s): None</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>The landfill site has changed substantially since 1983, so it likely impossible to determine what was done or not done in 1983.</p> | | | |
| <p>4. Include in the narrative the anticipated chemical composition of any leachate material to be used for irrigation south of Coffin Butte Road; and include documentation that the material to be utilized as irrigation meet federal and state standards for any runoff that may leave the property lines.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The narrative was updated to provide information related to conditions 1 through 7. The updated narrative is found in the document titled "PC-83-07-C(3)" starting on Page 3 of 60</p> <p><u>Workgroup Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For this and other statements regarding "updates of the narrative, the Solid Waste working group has not been supplied with sufficient information to evaluate compliance. This same comment applies to all entries below. We are being asked to opine on these things without adequate information. I suggest that we should not be giving a rubber stamp of approval to statements that we have not actually had opportunity to examine fully -- it's both meaningless and likely to be abused in future CUP applications. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impossible to assess with missing narrative <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager/</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: A rudimentary analysis of leachate composition is included in the revised narrative. It is now known that the chemical composition of leachate from landfills is far more complex and dangerously toxic.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: In Compliance</p> <p>Basis: Analysis was provided and is still being performed on leachate sent offsite for disposal. Per RSI [Republic], leachate use for onsite irrigation ceased many years ago.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>This condition is no longer relevant because Coffin Butte no longer irrigates leachate on site. Leachate regulation has gotten stricter since 1983 and DEQ has exclusive jurisdiction over leachate. Republic continues to comply with DEQ requirements.</p> | | | |
| 5. Include in the narrative review of the Environmental and Operational Factors in Art.XXX.05.A.1.(f) for the approximately 10 acres proposed for addition to the landfill area. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The narrative was updated to provide information related to conditions 1 through 7. The updated narrative is found in the document titled "PC-83-07-C(3)" starting on Page 3 of 60</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For this and other statements regarding "updates of the narrative, the Solid Waste working group has not been supplied with sufficient information to evaluate compliance. This same comment applies to all entries below. We are being asked to opine on these things without adequate information. I suggest that we should not be giving a rubber stamp of approval to statements | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>that we have not actually had opportunity to examine fully -- it's both meaningless and likely to be abused in future CUP applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impossible to assess with missing narrative, where are the 10 acres proposed for addition? need drawings <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: County Requirement Superseded</p> <p>Basis: Current DEQ permits supersede this condition From pdf file pages 7 & 8 (original document page 5 & 6)</p> <p>v. Other Information Required by the Development Director (Conditions No. 5 and 7)</p> <p>A review of the Environmental and Operational Factors of Art. XXX . 05. A1 is contained in a report titled Coffin Butte Sanitary Landfill Expansion Plan prepared by Randy Sweet, Geologist, and Regional Consultants, Inc. in Oct., 1977. This report was submitted to the Benton County Commissioners, Health Department, and Solid Waste Advisory Committee. A copy of this report will be made available to the Development Department if requested.</p> <p>The small ponds will remain as at present for the next ten years. At the end of this period the use of the ponds and surroundings will be reevaluated and, if anything is to be done, state of the art engineering practices will be employed in conformance with the standards in effect at that time. A modified site development plan will be submitted for County review when appropriate.</p> <p>Open Item: Address DEQ primacy question</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic Agrees with staff for some of the reasons stated above.</p> | | | |
| 6. Provide a detailed reclamation plan that sets form the anticipated physical characteristics of the “terracing” including an average height and width of the terracing, provide documentation that the site is physically available to be reclaimed in this manner. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The narrative was updated to provide information related to conditions 1 through 7. The updated narrative is found in the document titled "PC-83-07-C(3)" starting on Page 3 of 60</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For this and other statements regarding "updates of the narrative, the Solid Waste working group has not been supplied with sufficient information to evaluate compliance. This same comment applies to all entries below. We are being asked to opine on these things without adequate information. I suggest that we should not be giving a rubber stamp of approval to statements that we have not actually had opportunity to examine fully -- it's both meaningless and likely to be abused in future CUP applications. • impossible to assess with missing reclamation plans (which would probably be in the form of drawings, not "narrative") <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: There is a very detailed description of the promised screening in the narrative. However, none of the promises have been kept, nor has the County taken any enforcement actions to ensure completion of screening requirements.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion(s): Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Open Item: DEQ vs. County primacy. Which organization has primacy over what? A clear understanding is needed of DEQ's and the County's role in addressing aspects of the landfill such as design, operation, monitoring (including noise, light pollution, odor, etc.), appearance, and screening from public view, etc.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with Staff.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 7. Submit for review by the Development Director a plan detailing the proposed method Valley Landfills shall use to protect the small ponds found in the Northeast corner of the property. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The narrative was updated to provide information related to conditions 1 through 7. The updated narrative is found in the document titled "PC-83-07-C(3)" starting on Page 3 of 60</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For this and other statements regarding "updates of the narrative, the Solid Waste working group has not been supplied with sufficient information to evaluate compliance. This same comment applies to all entries below. We are being asked to opine on these things without adequate information. I suggest that we should not be giving a rubber stamp of approval to statements that we have not actually had opportunity to examine fully -- it's both meaningless and likely to be abused in future CUP applications. • Impossible to assess with missing pond protection plans (note: presumably not in compliance since the small ponds currently appear to be buried below a large pile of waste) <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis:</p> <p>Notes: From pages 6-8</p> <p>"The small ponds will remain as at present for the next ten years. At the end of this period the use of the ponds and surroundings will be reevaluated and, if anything is to be done, state of the art engineering practices will be employed in conformance with the standards in effect at that time. A modified site development plan will be submitted for County review when appropriate."</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Explanation: Pond location unclear.</p> <p>Notes: None</p> <p>Open Item(s): Address DEQ primacy question</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff.</p> | | | |
| <p>8. The current DEQ operational permit will expire on January 31, 1984. Valley Landfills, Inc. has been requested to submit an updated, long-term leachate control plan as part of the permit renewal process. This plan must contain provisions for a leachate storage facility so leachate irrigation will not occur on pasture lands from November 1 through May 1 of each year. The control plan must also provide for a soil study that designates present and future leachate irrigation areas. This plan must show that the amount of irrigation area available is compatible with future leachate generation volumes so metal or nutrient accumulations in the soils will remain far below any toxicity levels.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. Leachate is an oversight function of DEQ.</p> <p>The requirement is for a leachate control plan, there is no requirement that states that all leachate must be treated on-site. Planning staff would not have had enough expertise to be able to dictate how leachate is handled. A CUP application is a government review of a proposed use, hauling leachate is not a land use but an action that is dependent on a land use. The soil study referenced above was in regard to leachate irrigation areas, not a general review of soil toxicity. Since leachate is no longer disposed of through irrigation, this condition is no longer applicable.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEQ does not monitor soil toxicity • request has been made of Brian fuller, DEQ to find out if DEQ monitors soil toxicity | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there has never been a cup submitted to Benton County that included off-haul of all leachate generated at the landfill for treatment at municipal facilities & release into the Willamette. all cup's (1974/1983/2003) where documentation is available have contained, in the application, assertions that all leachate would be treated on-site. • This statement is not adequate to confirm that these conditions were met, or that they were fully evaluated by DEQ. Certainly in the case of "irrigation area," any such plan did not work and as a result the leachate is being hauled to wastewater treatment plants rather than being irrigated. It would be more accurate to characterize this as a failure of design that led to non-compliance, which required alternative methods to maintain DEQ permitting. • Republic: Republic Services maintains an active solid waste permit with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and is in compliance with that permit. Further, leachate irrigation ceased in the late 1990s, as a result of new regulatory rules. All leachate is sent to a local wastewater treatment plant. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: The effort to absolve the County of any responsibility for ensuring proper management and treatment of leachate ignores the County's duty to ensure compatible land use in Benton County. Leachate generation is a by-product of approving the hosting a landfill in the County. Ignoring the fate of leachate generated by the landfill is akin to approving a residential subdivision without any consideration of how and where the sewage generated is safely disposed.</p> <p>The fate of leachate generated by the landfill should not simply be ignored by the County and delegated to DEQ. Trucking of leachate to Corvallis' sewage treatment plant does not result in effective treatment or insure against pollution of nearby waterways. Many of the toxic pollutants contained in leachate (PFAS, heavy metals, pharmaceuticals, personal care products, etc.) simply pass through the treatment plant with very little or no pollutant removal and end up in the Willamette River. The Willamette River is a key recreation asset (boating, fishing, swimming, etc.) for residents of Benton County, and a source of drinking water supply for downstream residents e.g. Adair Village</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: County Requirement Superseded (Specific requirement no Longer Relevant)</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Basis: Leachate storage exists on site for holding leachate prior to trucking to off-site locations. No leachate is currently being land applied on landfill properties. No soil study needed</p> <p>Note: Leachate processing at a wastewater treatment facility may not be an appropriate or effective treatment for leachate and subcommittee recommends further evaluation</p> <p>Open Item(s): Management and effectiveness of current leachate transfer/treatment at city treatment works.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with Staff. This condition is no longer relevant because Coffin Butte no longer irrigates leachate on site. Leachate regulation has gotten stricter since 1983 and Republic continues to comply with DEQ requirements.</p> | | | |
| 9. As the site expands eastward, additional monitoring wells will be required. Depending on DEQ budget limitations, the permittee may have to share in the responsibility for sampling and monitoring of these wells. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This is an item under the oversight of DEQ. The Comm. Dev. Department does not confirm and inspect records to ensure that conditions such as these are completed. It is a DEQ permit and if the DEQ does not approve the permit then the applicant could not continue the use and would be out of compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services has added additional monitoring wells as required and continues to be in compliance with its DEQ permits. • As above, there should be a check of whether DEQ has actually evaluated this. Just because DEQ approved a permit does not necessarily mean that this condition was met. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> domestic wells have been contaminated. current subchapter part "d" dual landfill liners have been required since 1993. this technology is less than 30 years old, and may have to continue to perform for hundreds of years, during which time the liner can become brittle. the EPA has concluded that all landfills will eventually leak "no liner ... can keep all liquids out of the ground for all time. eventually liners will either degrade, tear, or crack and will allow liquids to migrate out of the unit. some have argued that liners are devices that provide a perpetual seal against any migration from a waste management unit. EPA has concluded that the more reasonable assumption, based on what is known about the pressures placed on liners over time, is that any liner will begin to leak eventually. "citation: EPA, 1988 is any leachate collected in the secondary collection system? if so, the liner is already leaking <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis: Documentation unclear as to what wells involved and which organization is to provide it. Presumed in RSI [Republic] Annual Report.</p> <p>Explanation: Presumed in RSI [Republic] Annual Report. Needs further information on how the reports are reviewed for compliance with site groundwater contamination goals.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with Staff. Monitoring wells are within the jurisdiction of DEQ. The County can exercise no oversight of DEQ's responsibilities. Republic has a DEQ approved Environmental Monitoring Plan that includes a map of all monitoring wells.</p> | | | |
| 10. Screen the landfill operation with fencing or berms so it cannot be seen from the County Road or adjacent properties. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Compliance Status Unclear. The screening may have been installed but has eroded or been removed during further site development. It should be recreated and maintained to be in compliance with the requirement. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services' records are incomplete, as this amendment is nearly 40 years old, and the company was neither the owner, nor the operator of the landfill at that time. However, Republic Services has planted trees to screen the landfill from Highway 99. Based on the age of the condition and the changing site conditions over the past four decades, Republic disagrees with the conclusion that this condition has not been completed. • not in compliance document not included letter from the Oregon justice department regarding screening requirement per the 1967 highway beautification act • There should be a more clear statement that the applicant is not in compliance with this requirement. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Mark Yeager: The revised narrative submitted by the applicant is very detailed. None of the requirements have been completed or maintained. The County has not taken any enforcement action to ensure that these requirements be met. | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: Not In Compliance | | | |
| Basis: Personal observations | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |
| Our comments remain the same. The site has changed so much since 1983 it is impossible to determine what might have done and any screening requirements imposed then would no longer be relevant to the current operation. And required screening will be addressed at the time of the new CUP (as occurred in the 2021 process.) | | | |
| 11. Daily cover of refuse with earth is not possible at this site due to the clay soils. The current (and future) permit addresses requiring daily compaction of refuse and require exposed refuse areas to not exceed 2 acres during the periods of October 15 to June 1 and to not exceed ¼ of an acre during all other periods. This shall be adhere to. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| County Requirement Superseded. This is under the oversight of DEQ. The landfill uses an alternative daily cover approved by DEQ, which includes Covanta Ash material. The landfill also uses temporary cover. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services generally agrees with this assessment but would like the record to reflect that we do use site soils as daily cover, in addition to alternative daily covers. • land use requirement not addressed by staff: this is a land use requirement; DEQ is not mentioned, and does not have override authority need more information: does the area of open fill exceed ¼ of an acre from June 2 through October 14? what is it now? does the area of open fill exceed 2 acres during the periods of October 15 through June 1? • The statement here does not address whether exposed refuse areas have been limited to the acreages stated. There should be a more clear statement of whether this has been complied with, and whether the county has done any monitoring. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Mark Yeager: Using highly toxic Covanta Ash material to cover the garbage is another example of the County absolving itself from any obligation to protect Benton County residents from incompatible land uses. Oregon DEQ does not have a stellar record for effectively preventing pollution (air or water) through their permit processes. | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: County Requirement Superseded by Subsequent DEQ Operating and Monitoring Permits | | | |
| Notes: Unclear if there are environmental impacts of the alternative cover material used at the site such as leaching constituents in wet weather, airborne dust generation in dry weather, etc. An example issue of Covanta incinerator ash as alternate daily cover. Information on chemical composition and physical testing should be made available. Generally recognized assessments of leachable materials such as the Toxic Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) should be used. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> <p>Our comments remain the same. Regulation of landfill cover is within DEQ's exclusive regulation and the County no authority to differ from DEQ. This condition is no longer relevant because DEQ now requires the landfill to fully cover the waste each day with soil or approved alternative daily cover.</p> | | | |
| <p>12. Occasionally, leachate seeps through the site berms during heavy rainfall periods. If these occur in the future, a requirement to channel these flows into the leachate collection system within a timely period (i.e., 3 days) may be added.</p> | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> <p>County Requirement Superseded. Overseen by DEQ. This condition appears to be no longer be applicable. If the condition were still applicable, it authorizes the County to add a requirement in the future if leachate seeps through the berms. The applicant is in compliance unless a) the County has subsequently directed the applicant to channel leachate flows and b) the applicant has failed to do so; there is no evidence that both a) and b) have occurred, therefore the applicant is not out of compliance. Whether the County should have done more monitoring is a question that can be discussed but is not relevant to determining whether this condition has been complied with.</p> <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: This condition was put in place prior to today's highly-engineered landfill design requirements. At the time, landfill liners were not required. Republic Services complies with all current regulatory requirements, which include liners. Leachate does not seep through perimeter berms. • disagree with staff: DEQ not mentioned, therefore DEQ does not have regulatory authority. question: does leachate seep through site berms? is not answered • Whether overseen by DEQ or not, there should be a clear statement of whether this condition has been complied with, and whether the county has ever checked on this. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis: The locations the berms in question have not been provided. The berms may be along Coffin Butte Road between the road and three unlined areas (Old Closed Land, Cell 1, Cell 1A). It should be recognized that not all of the landfill cells constructed in the past 50 years were built to the same environmental standards and have different levels of leachate control.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic complies the current DEQ requirements for leachate management.</p> | | | |
| <p>13. DEQ permits are normally issued for a maximum of 5 years. As part of the permit renewal process, DEQ requires updated operational and construction plans to reflect the current permit period. As such, changes in environmental controls may be required to incorporate new technology into the landfill operation.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This is an advisory to the applicant rather than a condition that needed to be met.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As mentioned therefore it is appropriate to refer to DEQ compliance, although if the LUCS is not current, the permit may not be valid <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis: Compliance not demonstrated. Need DEQ solid waste permits from period 1983 to 2000.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------|
| 1983 | PC-83-07 L-83-07 | Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map, and a Site Development Plan (M-48615-83, PC-83-07-C(1)). | BOC Approved. |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| This condition is no longer relevant. There have been multiple iterations of subsequent DEQ permits since 1983. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|---|
| 1994 | PC-94-03 | A conditional use permit for a 2.2 megawatt power generation facility. The facility would utilize the gas generated from the decomposing refuse in the landfill as the fuel source. | Community Development Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. The facility shall be housed in a structure approximately 50 by 100 feet or less in size, as described in the application materials. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Original generator building 3,900 square feet. Superseded by subsequent expansion approval.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • missing information: application materials • This is actually a really great way to answer a factual question. Allowable structure size, 5000 sf, built structure, 3,900 square feet, that's verifiable data. It would of course be good to have the application materials, since that is referenced (for example, were other building materials specified?) <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: None given as of 12/11/22</p> <p>Basis: Low Priority</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff.</p> | | | |
| 2. Noise levels shall comply with the New Industrial and Commercial Noise Standards (OAR 30403-355)-as measured at the nearest dwellings existing on the date of approval of this conditional use permit. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Noise testing completed in 1997.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|---|
| 1994 | PC-94-03 | A conditional use permit for a 2.2 megawatt power generation facility. The facility would utilize the gas generated from the decomposing refuse in the landfill as the fuel source. | Community Development Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise is an issue at the landfill and 1997 was a long time ago -- ensure the facility is still in compliance; verify that noise standards have not been updated • Was there ever a follow-up study after the facility was expanded? | | | |
| <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: To ensure land use compatibility, compliance with noise requirements cannot be a snapshot in time. Periodic testing and monitoring to ensure continued compliance is required and the County does not monitor or enforce land use (e.g., noise impacts) requirements.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis: County staff represent that compliance with noise limits is driven by resident complaints. More detailed information on the County process for receiving, managing, and resolving complaints of this nature is needed to establish if this condition is being met.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff. The condition required compliance at approval. Whether other members of the committee think the condition was inadequate can't be collaterally attacked after 18 years and isn't relevant to whether the power plant complied.</p> | | | |
| <p>3. The applicant is responsible for ongoing monitoring of noise levels. Upon request of the Planning Official, the applicant shall provide the County with sufficient information to determine whether the facility is in compliance with Condition 2 of this permit.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The applicant is only required to provide documentation at the request of the Planning Official. Available records do not indicate any such requests by the Planning Official.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|---|
| 1994 | PC-94-03 | A conditional use permit for a 2.2 megawatt power generation facility. The facility would utilize the gas generated from the decomposing refuse in the landfill as the fuel source. | Community Development Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services agrees with the County's assessment. Our available records do not indicate any such requests by the Planning Department. • County has not monitored. • noise is an issue at the landfill: ask the applicant to demonstrate that the facility is in compliance | | | |
| <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: To ensure land use compatibility, compliance with noise requirements cannot be a snapshot in time. Periodic testing and monitoring to ensure continued compliance is required and the County does not monitor or enforce land use (e.g., noise impacts) requirements.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis: County staff represent that compliance with noise limits is driven by resident complaints. More detailed information on the County process for receiving, managing, and resolving complaints of this nature is needed to establish if this condition is being met.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>This condition is only triggered if the Planning Official so requests. If there is no evidence that the Planning Official ever made such a request, then the power plant has been in compliance.</p> | | | |
| 4. The applicant shall obtain and comply with all applicable permits from Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The applicant shall provide copies of all DEQ permits to the County. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The requirement is that the applicant send a copy of the DEQ permit to the county, so the county is simply a receiving body for this information. This is a standard type of condition that ties a county permit to a permit issued by another agency. The County does not actively monitor compliance with outside agency permitting requirements, but if the outside agency</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|---|
| 1994 | PC-94-03 | A conditional use permit for a 2.2 megawatt power generation facility. The facility would utilize the gas generated from the decomposing refuse in the landfill as the fuel source. | Community Development Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| determines that their permitting requirements have not been met then the applicant is also out of compliance with the Benton County permit. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when was the most recent LUCS on file at DEQ completed? | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated | | | |
| Basis: No record of required action provided. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |
| This condition was imposed on the power plant. | | | |
| 5. Expansion of the generating capacity of the facility is authorized under this permit as long as all conditions of approval, including those specifying building size and noise levels, are met. The Planning Official may require that the applicant obtain a new conditional use permit in order to expand the facility if, in his judgment, conditions existing at the time of the proposed expansion warrant a conditional use review. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>Staff</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. The applicant submitted for a new CUP approval (S-97-58) for the expansion of the facility. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated | | | |
| Basis: No record of required compliance with noise levels provided. | | | |
| Note: need to add CUP document reference as notated above in staff comment | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|---|
| 1994 | PC-94-03 | A conditional use permit for a 2.2 megawatt power generation facility. The facility would utilize the gas generated from the decomposing refuse in the landfill as the fuel source. | Community Development Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 6. Lighting shall be located so that it does not face directly, shine or reflect glare onto an adjacent street or property. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Monitoring of this condition is complaint driven. Staff has no records of complaints regarding lights at the power generation facility.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County has not monitored • Not enough information to determine if this condition is met. • staff comment is non-responsive; check the facility at night • While we are on the landfill tour on Saturday, I heard you [Ian] talking with Joel Geier, and the subject of the arc lamps on the scene came up (photo attached). You told Joel that the lamps were not used mornings, only in afternoons. However, I went out this morning at 6 am and saw that the lights were indeed already on atop Coffin Butte, and there appeared to be operations going on, as I could see the red taillights of trucks moving around up there also. So it seems you are mistaken about the use of the arc lamps, and have been for some time. All last winter, for example, the lights were on every workday morning. I know this because I can see them from where I live when I go out to get the paper, weather permitting. They were on even if I got up at 5 am. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Can the County describe the system for documenting, responding to, and resolving complaints received? A complaint driven system of enforcement is unsatisfactory, particularly when Benton County residents are unaware of specific requirements and certainly rely on Benton County staff to monitor and enforce land use requirements.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated</p> <p>Basis: No record of addressing compliance with lighting complaints provided.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|---|
| 1994 | PC-94-03 | A conditional use permit for a 2.2 megawatt power generation facility. The facility would utilize the gas generated from the decomposing refuse in the landfill as the fuel source. | Community Development Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> We note that this condition only applies to lighting at the power plant. There is no evidence that power plant has ever been in violation of this condition or that there have been any complaints. We would say “in compliance” or “no evidence of non-compliance.” | | | |
| 7. Obtain all required septic, access, building, plumbing, mechanical, electrical, and other applicable permits prior to construction. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. Staff was able to find the following permits: Electrical - C9500565, C9501197, C9600514, C9600852. No building permits were found but this does not mean that they were not submitted, it is more a function of the county's issues related keeping track of old records. Ultimately, if the permits had not been submitted and approved and the building inspected then the building could not have been put into use. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> • septic/ada/building/plumbing/mechanical? certificate of occupancy? <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Compliance Opinion: None given as of 12/11/22 Basis: Low Priority | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------|
| 1994 | PC-94-10 | Zone change from Rural Residential to Landfill Site Zone, Comprehensive Plan change from Rural Residential to Landfill Site. | BOC Denied |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> believe that the record and rational of this land use proceeding is relevant to the evolution of the Coffin Butte Landfill.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: None given as of 12/11/22</p> <p>Basis: Low Priority</p> <p>Review of the record in this land use proceeding provides important historical context. The public comments and the Notice of Decision in this matter are critical to understanding the history of the landfill and the sentiment of the residents of Benton County at that time.</p> <p>Open Items: need to review this documentation</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|--|
| 1994 | PC-94-11 | A conditional use permit to expand the area approved for a landfill within the Landfill Site Zone and update the site development plan. | PC Approved; PC Decision Appealed; Application Withdrawn |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> believe that the record and rational of this land use proceeding is relevant to the evolution of the Coffin Butte Landfill.</p> <p>Review of the record in this land use proceeding provides important historical context. The public comments and the Notice of Decision in this matter are critical to understanding the history of the landfill and the sentiment of the residents of Benton County at that time.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------|--|---|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. The Phase I generation facility shall be located in a structure approximately 75 by 85 feet; as shown in the application. The Phase 2 expansion shall be located in a building approximately 120 by 200 feet, as shown in the application materials. The Phase 2 expansion shall be located at least 300 feet from State Highway 99W, as shown in the application materials. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. The expansion added 4,300 square feet to the original building. <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Compliance Opinion: None given as of 12/11/22 Basis: Low Priority | | | |
| 2. Both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 expansions shall be constructed in accordance with the application materials. In addition, the siting standards of BCC 60.405 (2) and (3) and BCC 60.415(4), (5), (9), and (11) shall be met. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. Staff was able to find the following permits: Permit B0700147 Phase I expansion & Permits B0700323, B0700416, B0700415, F0600068, B1400497. Zoning Compliance review occurs concurrent with the construction plan review to ensure that the site plan submitted with the building permit meets county regulations and conditions of approval. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> • certificate of occupancy? <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------|--|---|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: None given as of 12/11/22 | | | |
| Basis: Low Priority | | | |
| 3. Noise levels for both Phase I and Phase 2 expansions shall comply with the Noise Control Regulations for Industry and Commerce in Oregon Administrative Rules 340-035- 0035 as measured at the nearest dwellings existing on the date of approval of this conditional use permit. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. Noise Compliance Monitoring memorandum submitted on June 11, 1997, by Pacific Northwest Generating Cooperative. Subsequent to the compliance monitoring memorandum, the County would require additional testing only if there was reason to believe the noise standards were no longer being met, such as through a noise complaint received from an adjacent dwelling. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • And were complaints received? Not enough information to determine if this condition was met. • County has not monitored subsequent • Is this document available to the public? • noise is an issue at the landfill; ensure the facility is still in compliance; verify that noise standards have not been updated | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Mark Yeager: Can the County describe the system for documenting, responding to, and resolving complaints received? To ensure land use compatibility, compliance with noise requirements cannot be a snapshot in time. Periodic testing and monitoring to ensure continued compliance is required and the County does not monitor or enforce land use (e.g., noise impacts) requirements. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------|--|---|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>A complaint driven system of enforcement is unsatisfactory, particularly when Benton County residents are unaware of specific requirements and certainly rely on Benton County staff to monitor and enforce land use requirements.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis: County staff represent that compliance with noise limits is driven by resident complaints. More detailed information on the County process for receiving, managing, and resolving complaints of this nature is needed to establish if this condition is being met.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>The Power Plant was in compliance at the time of approval and there have been no complaints since.</p> | | | |
| 4. The applicant is responsible for ongoing monitoring of noise levels. Upon request of the Planning Official, the applicant shall provide the County with sufficient information to determine whether the facility is in compliance with Condition 3 of this permit. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Available records do not indicate any requests for noise monitoring by the Planning Official.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services agrees with the County's assessment. Our available records do not indicate any such requests by the Planning Department. • County has not monitored • noise is an issue at the landfill; ensure the facility is still in compliance • Not enough information | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------|--|---|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Requiring the Applicant to self-monitor and regulate without any oversight by the County is ineffectual and a disservice to the residents of Benton County to whom County staff and the Board of Commissioners are accountable.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p>Basis: County staff represent that compliance with noise limits is driven by resident complaints. More detailed information on the County process for receiving, managing, and resolving complaints of this nature is needed to establish if this condition is being met.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>The Planning Official has never asked for additional information, so the Power Plant is in compliance or that there is no evidence of non-compliance.</p> | | | |
| <p>5. The applicant shall continue to provide sanitation facilities for the generation plant employees that are located on site. The facilities shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Drinking water within the generating plant building by a potable water container, refilled periodically; b) A portable toilet located at the generating plant site; c) Plumbed restroom facilities, with water closets and hot and cold running water shall be available for use by employees at the Coffin Butte Landfill office; d) Generating plant employees shall have vehicles available for trips to the Coffin Butte Landfill office restroom facilities; e) The maximum number of generating plant employees shall be five (5). | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------|--|---|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>In Compliance. An OSHA letter from September 29, 1997, relating to the toilet facilities and drinking water stated that the facility was compliant with OSHA standards for sanitation. The County does not monitor ongoing compliance with conditions such as this, unless there is reason to believe the operation may be out of compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applicant "shall continue"...is the facility still in compliance? is potable water still available, are the other conditions complied with? portable toilet/available vehicles/5 maximum employees? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: None given as of 12/11/22</p> <p>Basis: Low Priority</p> | | | |
| <p>6. The applicant shall obtain and comply with all applicable permits from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The applicant shall provide copies of all DEQ permits for the generation facility to the Community Development and Parks Department.</p> | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This is a standard type of condition that ties a County permit to a permit issued by another agency. The County does not actively monitor compliance with outside agency permitting requirements, but if the outside agency determines that their permitting requirements have not been met then the applicant is also out of compliance with the Benton County permit.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <p>when was the most recent LUCS on file at DEQ completed?</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|---------|--|--|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated</p> <p>Basis: No record of required actions provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>This is a responsibility of the power plant.</p> | | | |
| 7. Lighting shall be located so that it does not face directly, shine, or glare onto an adjacent road or property. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Monitoring of this condition is complaint driven. There are no records of any complaints. If there is current concern that the power plant lighting is out of compliance with this condition that could be investigated, but at this time there is no evidence of noncompliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check the facility at night • County has not monitored • Not enough information <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Can the County describe the system for documenting, responding to, and resolving complaints received? A complaint driven system of enforcement is unsatisfactory, particularly when Benton County residents are unaware of specific requirements and certainly rely on Benton County staff to monitor and enforce land use requirements to ensure compatibility.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------|--|---|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Basis: No record of addressing compliance with lighting complaints provided. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |
| If there is no record of complaints and, ergo, no record that the power plant has failed to respond to complaints, then there is no basis for a conclusion that the Power Plant has done anything other than comply. | | | |
| 8. The property owner shall submit a declaratory statement to be recorded in the Benton County Deed Records for the subject property that recognizes the rights of adjacent forest uses, consistent with BCC 620.220(). | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. The document was submitted and recorded. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide copy in documentation | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: No compliance opinion | | | |
| Basis: Low priority | | | |
| 9. The applicant shall prepare a site-specific development plan addressing emergency water supplies for fire protection. The plan shall be submitted to the local fire protection agency for review. The plan approved by the local fire protection agency shall be submitted to the Community Development and Parks Department prior to the issuance of building permits for the structure for Phase 1. A revised site-specific development plan shall be completed prior to issuance of construction permits for the Phase 2 expansion. The site development plan shall address: | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------|--|---|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| a) Emergency access to the local water supply in the event of a wildfire or other fire-related emergency; b) Provision of an all-weather road or driveway to within 10 feet of the edge of identified water supplies which contain 4,000 gallons or more and exist within 100 feet of the driveway or road at a reasonable grade (e.g. 12 percent or less);and c) Emergency water supplies shall be clearly marked along the access route with a Fire District approved sign. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. This is a standard requirement for a building permit. The site plan and construction drawings are reviewed by the applicable fire agency. The agency supplies a review based on adopted fire requirements and state fire codes. The building permit for the addition could not have been approved without fire review. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services is also conducting further research. • appears to be not in compliance. these (plus assurance of power generation in an outage) would be a good start at considering requirements for the LS zone in a potential revisit of chapter 77 • This explanation of status cannot be accepted until the topic has been researched. <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Mark Yeager: Landfill activities have a high potential of igniting fires and there have been fires previously at Coffin Butte. The potential for starting a wildfire is also great given the location of this industrial activity. Further, the frequency of power outages and landfill operations (e.g., pumps for water supply, leachate management and methane gas extraction) are dependent on reliable power supplies. Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated Basis: No record of required action provided. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|---------|--|---|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> This condition was imposed on expansion of the power plant, not on the landfill. We note that the landfill maintains an onsite water truck and water stand approximately 1 mile from the landfill entrance and 1.5 miles from the power plant entrance. The landfill uses daily cover to keep the amount of waste that is uncovered and available to burn to a minimum. Operators are trained on what to do if a fire starts and how to contain it. | | | |
| 10. The applicant shall obtain all required septic, road approach, building, plumbing, mechanical, electrical, and other applicable permits prior to commencement of construction for both the Phase I and Phase 2 expansion. Contact the Permits Clerk and Building Official at the Community Development and Parks Department regarding permits and fees. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. Standard advisory condition. Completed for Phase 1. Phase 2 of the expansion has not been utilized by the applicant. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO for Phase 1? CO for Phase 2? • Republic Services' records do not show any non-compliance issues with Phase II. While the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP request, primary responsibility for compliance would have been with Pacific Northwest Generating Cooperative, an independent third-party contractor and not a Republic Services' subsidiary. • What about Phase 2? <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Compliance Opinion: No compliance opinion | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|------------------------|---------|--|--|
| 1997 | S-97-58 | A conditional use permit to expand the generating capacity of the existing electric generation plant that is served by the gas produced at the Coffin Butte Landfill. Phase I of the expansion would increase the capacity of the plant from the current 2.2 MW to 5 MW and Phase II would increase the capacity to 10 MW. | Community Development and Parks Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Basis: Low priority | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. Obtain approval of a reclamation plan from the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries or the Oregon Division of State Lands. Operation and reclamation plan shall demonstrate consistency with the intended subsequent site use. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. This is a standard type of condition that ties a County permit to a permit issued by another agency. The County does not actively monitor compliance with outside agency permitting requirements, but if the outside agency determines that their permitting requirements have not been met then the applicant is also out of compliance with the Benton County permit. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a CUP closeout process at Benton County CDD? | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Mark Yeager: What is the mechanism whereby any State agency is informed of a County land use action to allow an activity that requires a permit from a State agency? If the County issues an approval for a land use prior to the landowner getting the required permits, how will the County ensure that all the required permits have been received since the County does no monitoring or enforcement. | | | |
| Compliance Status Unclear. No record of required action provided. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |
| The reclamation plan for the quarry is governed by DOGMI and the operation cannot close the site until those permits are obtained. The current reclamation plan is eventually landfill in the quarry area and cap it when the landfill closes. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 2. if the mining is the primary cause of traffic on the unpaved public road, that road shall be kept dust-free by the applicant if dwellings are located within 300 feet of the roadway. The applicant and lease-holding operator shall endeavor to use only those public roads designated for truck usage, unless making local deliveries of mineral and aggregate resources to residential areas serviced by roads not designated for truck usage. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This would be Coffin Butte Road and this road is paved.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a CUP closeout process at Benton County CDD? • Is there no equivalent condition about dropping rocks which create road hazards on the highway? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: This is a classic example of an unenforceable condition of approval – who or how will the “primary cause” of traffic be determined? Then the requirement that the applicant or quarry lease holder “endeavor” to use only roads designed for truck traffic, what does that mean? A meaningless condition that does not have any chance of being enforced. Issuing a land use approval to a property owner binds the property owner and that obligation cannot be transferred to the lease holder.</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. No record of required action provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>There is no quarry traffic on any unpaved roads. The primary road that the quarry traffic uses is paved (Coffin Butte Rd). An occasional truck might use one of the roads to the north of the site to deliver gravel to a homeowner or if the county is doing maintenance on a gravel road, but is not very common. Rock trucks are not the primary traffic on any of the gravel roads surrounding the site. This condition has never been triggered.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 3. The applicant or lease-holding operator shall provide screening to partially obscure the mining site from view by adjoining occupied property and public roads in Soap Creek Valley and north Benton County to the extent reasonable and practicable to do so. The screening shall consist of an ornamental fence or wall, a vegetated berm, or preservation of vegetated natural slope in character with the natural landscape of Soap Creek Valley. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. The 1.43 acres is located along the north side of the quarry and the landfill. This is now part of a landfill cell so screening just this small piece of land is impracticable. The wording of this condition is unfortunately subjective, making determination of compliance not clear and objective.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services did not own Coffin Butte Landfill at this time. Therefore, we do not have detailed records about any screening that was done. While the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP request, primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirement would have been the third-party quarry contractor. It appears from Google Earth historical photos that the third-party contractor did make an attempt to construct some berms and screening, but Republic Services do not have access to those records. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a CUP closeout process at Benton County CDD? • Not in compliance. The quarry is visible for miles around. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. Further, making an attempt to provide screening is not compliance. Again, County inability or unwillingness to monitor or enforce conditions of approval makes the whole land use review and approval process meaningless.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Compliance Status Unclear. Field verification needed. | | | |
| <p>4. The applicant or lease-holding operator shall ensure that the mining operation does not exceed the maximum sound level permitted by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. The applicant or lease-holding operator shall monitor noise generated by mining activities on one randomly selected day per month when noise complaints are received, notwithstanding a minimum of one time per year. Noise data and reports of findings from this monitoring shall be placed on file, in a timely way with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. A berm, or other sound-absorbing construction materials such as acoustical cinder blocks or other similar methods may be used to reduce the sound off-site to levels at or below those permitted by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Any sound-reduction construction will be consistent with the visual buffering required in Condition #3 above. The applicant or lease-holding operator shall limit blasting to the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. Again, County inability or unwillingness to monitor or enforce conditions of approval makes the whole land use review and approval process meaningless.</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. No record of required action provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>As noted above, mining has long ceased at this site. There is some evidence that the berm was constructed but has since been removed. Conditions of this CUP relating to mining operation on site are no longer relevant.</p> | | | |
| 5. Provide on-site parking for employees, customers, and visitors to the mining site. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? • In compliance <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. | | | |
| Condition No. 5 | | | |
| No Compliance Opinion | | | |
| 6. Maintain a security fence between the mining operation and the public road when such road is located within 200 feet of the mining operation. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? • In compliance | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. | | | |
| No Compliance Opinion | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 7. Not excavate in a manner which would result in disturbance of perimeter fencing or screening, or would impair the intent of the reclamation plan. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? • The provision for screening has not been met, as noted above. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply.</p> <p>No Compliance Opinion</p> | | | |
| 8. The quarry operation hours shall occur only between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 7:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Quarrying operations shall not be conducted on Sundays. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? • Generally in compliance (the quarry has been a better neighbor than the landfill, in this regard). • "Operating hours" seem to be where there is most reluctance to make a clear statement that the landfill is out of compliance. Three or four special kinds of "operations" are mentioned that take place outside of the operating hours that were stated as conditions for the permits. On this last issue, for comparison I took a look at Lane County's Short Mountain Landfill. That landfill only serves commercial account holders, yet they seem to be able to restrict those haulers to their stated operating hours (7 AM to 5 PM weekdays and Saturdays). Seems like there's a lesson for Benton County our working group in there. <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> <p>Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. Again, County inability or unwillingness to monitor or enforce conditions of approval makes the whole land use review and approval process meaningless.</p> <p>Limiting "quarry operations" to 7:00 am to 5:00 pm creates a potential conflict with prior condition #4.</p> <p>In Compliance: Periodic County inspections are suggested to address resident concerns.</p> | | | |
| 9. The applicant shall retain the dual-access road system to provide for emergency service access to the subject site. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? • There is only one serviceable route in to the quarry site for emergency service. The bridge over Soap Creek is no longer passable for emergency vehicles (both structurally unsound and with barriers in place). | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. Again, County inability or unwillingness to monitor or enforce conditions of approval makes the whole land use review and approval process meaningless. | | | |
| Compliance Status Unclear | | | |
| 10. The quarrying activity shall be limited to the 600-foot contour elevation and below, as shown by the applicant on Attachment 2 to the application. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? • Google Earth images from 8/13/2020 show that quarrying activity extends up to approximately the 700 ft contour. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. Again, County inability or unwillingness to monitor or enforce conditions of approval makes the whole land use review and approval process meaningless.</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>The referenced Google Images are of the LS zoned area in which quarries are an outright permitted use, not the area of this CUP. The excavation in this area complied with the 600 foot limit.</p> | | | |
| 11. Copies of water quality and air quality permits, and data produced from associated monitoring programs, required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file, in a timely way, with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? • This explanation of status cannot be accepted until the topic has been researched. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. Again, County inability or unwillingness to monitor or enforce conditions of approval makes the whole land use review and approval process meaningless.</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. County records need to be reviewed</p> | | | |
| 12. Copies of storm-water runoff permits and data produced from associated monitoring programs required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file in a timely way, with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This 1.43 acres is no longer being quarried.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: As noted above, the owner/operator of Coffin Butte Landfill was the applicant for this CUP only because it was the property landowner. Primary responsibility for compliance with these and other requirements would have rested with the third-party quarry contractor. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1999 | PC-99-06 | A Conditional Use Permit for mining and processing of mineral and aggregate resources. The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarry operation. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extraction believed to be completed, see next permit request, staff should verify. is there a cup closeout process at Benton County CDD? • This explanation of status cannot be accepted until the topic has been researched. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: As the property owner, RS or any previous landowner cannot delegate their responsibility to comply with conditions of approval to a third-party. It is the responsibility of the landowner to comply. Again, County inability or unwillingness to monitor or enforce conditions of approval makes the whole land use review and approval process meaningless.</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. County records need to be reviewed.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. Obtain approval from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality for landfill operations on this site. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This is a standard type of condition that ties a county permit to a permit issued by another agency. The County does not actively monitor compliance with outside agency permitting requirements, but if the outside agency determines that their permitting requirements have not been met then the applicant is also out of compliance with the Benton County permit.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services has obtained all the necessary approvals and permits from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and remains in compliance with these conditions and approvals. • does the most recent LUCS on file with DEQ predate • this cup application? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: What is the mechanism whereby any State agency is informed of a County land use action to allow an activity that requires a permit from a State agency? If the County issues an approval for a land use prior to the landowner getting the required permits, how will the County ensure that all the required permits have been received since the County does no monitoring or enforcement.</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. Site plan for area of interest needs to be provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic Services has obtained all the necessary approvals and permits from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and remains in compliance with these conditions and approvals. Republic has to have both permits in hand to begin operation in</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| a new area, and the County will know because of the requirement that the Landfill file copies of the approved permits with the County. | | | |
| 2. In cases where landfill operations are the primary cause of traffic on unpaved public roads in the area, those roads shall be kept dust-free by the applicant. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. No longer applicable. Coffin Butte Road is entirely paved. The county considers this condition to be completed.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See previous comment on this issue re: Robison Rd. and Wiles Rd. • The public section of Coffin Butte Road is entirely paved. • there continue to be unpaved public roads in the vicinity of the landfill. does the landfill contribute to traffic on those roads? if so, how much? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: This is a classic example of an unenforceable condition of approval – who or how will the “primary cause” of traffic be determined? Many roads in the vicinity of the landfill are unpaved and are likely to receive traffic headed to the landfill.</p> <p>No Compliance Opinion</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>This condition is moot. There are no unpaved public roads serving the landfill; this condition is not applicable.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 3. The applicant or lease-holding operator shall ensure that the landfill operation does not exceed the maximum sound level permitted by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This condition is only applicable to the 1.43-acre site, not the entire landfill. Since the site was incorporated into a cell, this condition is no longer relevant.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise is an issue at the landfill; ensure the facility is still in compliance • Not enough information. • Not monitored by the county. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: How and when does the County ensure that the maximum sound level has not been exceeded. Since this is another example of complaint-based enforcement, what system is in place to document, respond to, and resolve noise related complaints? The landowner cannot delegate regulatory compliance or accountability with these types of requirements to a lease-holding operator.</p> <p>Compliance Not Demonstrated. No evidence of County process to capture / respond to action provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>There is no evidence that Republic is not in compliance.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 4. Provide on-site parking for employees, customers, and visitors to the landfill site. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • truck traffic to the landfill begins backing up HWY 99 beginning before 4:30am; ensure that traffic to the landfill does not pose a safety hazard <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>No compliance opinion</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic has multiple parking spots at its office and scale house.</p> | | | |
| 5. Maintain a security fence between the landfill operation and the public road when such road is located within 200 feet of the landfill operation. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Security fence is present</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check fence perimeter to ensure fencing is intact and surrounds the entire perimeter; from a casual inspection, it appears deferred maintenance may be in order <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>No Compliance Opinion</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>The subject property is more than 200 feet from any public road.</p> | | | |
| 6. The landfill operation hours shall occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12:00 p.m. through 5:00 p.m. on Sundays, with 24-hour access for commercial customers. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This condition only applies to the 1.43-acre site, not the entire landfill so cannot be enforced.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services is in compliance with this requirement, which governs landfill operations. However, it's important to note that internal operations, which include the arrival of field personnel on-site, begins at 4:30 a.m., Monday through Friday, and at 7:30 a.m. on Saturday. Additional operations not governed by the conditional use permit include work by third party contractors on landfill infrastructure, and commercial customers, who have 24-hour access to the Landfill. • "Operating hours" seem to be where there is most reluctance to make a clear statement that the landfill is out of compliance. Three or four special kinds of "operations" are mentioned that take place outside of the operating hours that were stated as conditions for the permits. On this last issue, for comparison I took a look at Lane County's Short Mountain Landfill. That landfill | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>only serves commercial account holders, yet they seem to be able to restrict those haulers to their stated operating hours (7 AM to 5 PM weekdays and Saturdays). Seems like there's a lesson for Benton County our working group in there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does 24 hour access work with compliance to noise complaints? • Not in compliance • Not in compliance. See previous note regarding operating hours. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Not in Compliance. Staff and RS do not get to interpret operating hours to mean something different than what was imposed as a written condition of approval. The words are the words. By definition the industrial activity of operating an active landfill is an incompatible use in an agricultural, forest and rural residential area. As such, operating hours are critical to mitigation of the numerous deleterious effects of the landfill operation. Requiring the landfill to limit operations to mitigate impacts "The landfill operation hours shall occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12:00 p.m. through 5:00 p.m. on Sundays, with 24-hour access for commercial customers" means what it says, and the condition of approval was adopted by the Planning Commission. The public has a right to expect the operating hours to be enforced as approved and adopted. Beginning operations at 4:30 a.m. is a violation of this condition of approval. Under staff and RS interpretation, could the landfill operate 24 hours a day?</p> <p>No Compliance Consensus for Subcommittee</p> <p>Note: Condition is written poorly and would be improved with better clarification on Hours of Operation</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees that the condition could be better written, but County's interpretation that "operating" means open to the public is at least as plausible as Mark's interpretation, particularly given the second part of the sentence which creates an exception for industrial customers. Text has to be interpreted in context, particularly given that some staff obviously have to be there 24/7.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Historically the site did operate 24 hours a day for commercial customers. That ceased in the early 2000s, but it was Republic's choice to do so and not a county requirement. We operate 5am-5pm for commercial customers. The landfill does have to have staff onsite from 4:30am-5:30pm to support the customers. This is no different than any other business that needs staff before and after their operating hours. Public customers are limited to 8am-5pm. | | | |
| 7. The applicant shall retain the dual-access road system to provide for emergency service access to the subject site. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Complete. The landfill is accessible from Tampico Road (via Soap Creek Road) and from Hwy 99W (via Coffin Butte Road).</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services is in compliance with this requirement and has made a dual-access road system. Access is available via Highway 99 and Tampico Road. • good candidate for Chapter 77 review • This explanation of status cannot be accepted until the topic has been researched. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>No Compliance Opinion</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 8. The landfill activity shall be limited to the 600-foot contour elevation and below, as shown by the applicant on the Site Development Plan in the application. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The applicant indicates they are in compliance with this condition.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services is in compliance and operating within the 600-foot contour elevation as specified in the Site Development Plan. • applicant should provide lidar, coordinate & verify with county GIS • Not in compliance. The south face of Coffin Butte is scarred/eroded by excavations above the landfill up to approximately 675 ft elevation, per GoogleEarth images dated 8/13/2020 <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Did the staff do any independent verification that the landfill is operating within the 600-foot contour?</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance with 600 foot limit; the condition does not apply to parts of the landfill outside of the 1.43 acres.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 9. Copies of water quality and air quality permits, and data produced from associated monitoring programs, required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file, in a timely way, with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The condition only requires that copies of documentation are given to the County, not that the county review and ensure that the applicant is in compliance with DEQ conditions. The county regularly receives copies of these documents.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these available for inspection, and if so, where? • landfill not in compliance with June surface emission methane monitoring required by DEQ; Benton County should obtain an independent assessment of overall methane emissions, arsenic levels in monitoring wells are high, odor: per public records requests, odor complaints to DEQ are not documented/investigated/logged to the extent that residents have given up on making complaints to DEQ. per testimony at CU-21-047, odors are significant enough at the landfill that people sometimes cannot leave their homes; DEQ is apparently unaware of this situation, suggested action: ask DEQ how better to communicate current odor problems at the landfill to DEQ, annual report to DEQ: for many years, the reports required by Benton County DSAC to DEQ "documenting local citizens' concerns and the manner in which the owner or operator [of the landfill] is addressing those concerns" (ORS 459.325) have not been completed and submitted as required by Oregon statute. even now, there is no DSAC meeting dedicated to this required activity. as a result, DEQ has not been informed of many of the problems that citizens experience at coffin butte landfill. dedicated DSAC meeting to which the public are invited to air landfill concerns, include the results of this meeting in DEQ annual report <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Mark Yeager: Are the reports reviewed? Any independent verification by staff that the monitoring requirements for both air quality and water quality are being met and reported as required? The June 2022 report of methane exceedances and re-testing looks suspect – 7 hours to perform first test, just over an hour for the re-test?</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. County records need to be reviewed</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance with this condition. The condition does not require (nor does the County have the authority to require) oversight of DEQ's administration of its permits.</p> | | | |
| 10. Copies of storm-water runoff permits and data produced from associated monitoring programs required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file in a timely way, with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The condition only requires that copies of documentation are given to the County, not that the county review and ensure that the applicant is in compliance with DEQ conditions. The county regularly receives copies of these documents.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these available for inspection, and if so, where? • see CUP LU-15-001 the area zoned LS is inadequate to fully contain landfill operations and as a result ancillary landfill operations spill out onto properties not zoned for landfill operations (forest conservation/exclusive farm use/rural residential). this is why the landfill has had so many applications for non-by-right land uses over the past 50 years. this is a question that should be addressed holistically, not piecemeal. once landfill operations begin to be allowed on non-landfill parcels, those non-landfill | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2002 | PC-02-07 | A Conditional Use Permit for landfilling of an area that will be excavated for mining of mineral and aggregate resources Approved by the Planning Commission with Conditions. (West Triangle Expansion). The proposed area consists of 1.43 acres adjacent to the existing quarrying and landfill operation, and is designed to fulfill the reclamation plan for the previously approved quarry on this site. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>parcels, over time, become indistinguishable from landfill parcels. this incrementally blights the neighborhood and should be addressed in a bcc code revamp</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Are the reports reviewed? Any independent verification by staff that the monitoring requirements for both air quality and water quality are being met and reported as required?</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. County records need to be reviewed</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance with this condition. The condition does not require (nor does the County have the authority to require) oversight of DEQ's administration of its permits.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. The applicant shall continue to operate within the approval of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Solid Waste Disposal Permit No 306. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The Comm. Dev. Department does not confirm and inspect records to ensure that conditions such as these are completed. It is a DEQ permit and if the DEQ does not approve the permit then the applicant could not continue the use and would be out of compliance with the County land use approval as well as DEQ rules.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services has obtained all the necessary approvals and permits from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and remains in compliance with these conditions and approvals. • when was the most recent LUCS on file at DEQ completed? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Compliance Opinion: In Compliance</p> | | | |
| 2. In cases where landfill operations are the primary cause of traffic on unpaved public roads in the area, those roads shall be kept dust-free by the applicant. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Coffin Butte Road was paved.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See previous notes re: Robison Rd. and Wiles Rd. • there continue to be unpaved public roads in the vicinity of the landfill. does the landfill contribute to traffic on those roads? if so, how much? <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Same comment as before – who and how is “primary cause” defined and enforced? Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unclear <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> Republic agrees with Staff. All county roads to and from the landfill are paved, so this condition is moot. | | | |
| 3. The applicant or lease-holding operator shall ensure that the landfill operation does not exceed the maximum sound level permitted by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> County Requirement Superseded. County monitoring of this condition is complaint-based and this condition would only have applied to landfill uses on the 9.45 acre property which has been incorporated into a larger landfill cell. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County does not monitor. • noise is an issue at the landfill; ensure the facility is still in compliance | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. How and when does the County ensure that the maximum sound level has not been exceeded. Since this is another example of complaint-based enforcement, what system is in place to document, respond to, and resolve noise related complaints? The landowner cannot delegate regulatory compliance or accountability with these types of requirements to a lease-holding operator.</p> <p>Compliance Not Demonstrated. No evidence of County process to capture / respond to action provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance, there is no evidence of any formal complaints about noise levels.</p> | | | |
| 4. Provide on-site parking for employees, customers, and visitors to the landfill site. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Complied with.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • truck traffic to the landfill begins backing up hwy 99 beginning before 4:30am; ensure that traffic to the landfill does not pose a safety hazard <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>No Compliance Opinion.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Queuing onto 99 happens rarely, usually doing big projects. Our gates don't open until 5:00 a.m. | | | |
| 5. Maintain a security fence between the landfill operation and the public road when such road is located within 200 feet of the landfill operation. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This condition was only applicable to the 9.45 acre site. But, all landfill areas adjacent to public roads have a security fence. Complied with.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check fence perimeter to ensure fencing is intact and there are no deferred maintenance issues <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>No Compliance Opinion.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>This area is more than 1000 feet from any public road.</p> | | | |
| 6. The landfill operation hours shall occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12:00 p.m. through 5:00 p.m. on Sundays, with 24-hour access for commercial customers. | | | |
| Comments | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>County</u></p> <p>County Requirement Superseded. This condition only applied to the 9.45-acre site that has been incorporated into a larger landfill cell. No operating hour requirement has been applied to the entirety of the landfill.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services is in compliance with this requirement, which governs landfill operations. However, it's important to note that internal operations, which include the arrival of field personnel on-site, begins at 4:30 a.m., Monday through Friday, and at 7:30 a.m. on Saturday. Additional operations not governed by the conditional use permit include work by third party contractors on landfill infrastructure, and commercial customers, who have 24-hour access to the Landfill. • not in compliance • Not in compliance, see previous notes on operating hours. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Not In Compliance. Staff and RS do not get to interpret operating hours to mean something different than what was imposed as a written condition of approval. The words are the words. By definition the industrial activity of operating an active landfill is an incompatible use in an agricultural, forest and rural residential area. As such, operating hours are critical to mitigation of the numerous deleterious effects of the landfill operation. Requiring the landfill to limit operations to mitigate impacts "The landfill operation hours shall occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12:00 p.m. through 5:00 p.m. on Sundays, with 24-hour access for commercial customers" means what it says, and the condition of approval was adopted by the Planning Commission. The public has a right to expect the operating hours to be enforced as approved and adopted. Beginning operations at 4:30 a.m. is a violation of this condition of approval. Under staff and RS interpretation, could the landfill operate 24 hours a day?</p> <p>No Compliance Consensus for Subcommittee</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Note: Condition is written poorly and would be improved with better clarification on Hours of Operation | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> Republic agrees that the condition could be better written, but County’s interpretation that “operating” means open to the public is at least as plausible as Mark’s interpretation, particularly given the second part of the sentence which creates an exception for industrial customers. See further discussion above. | | | |
| 7. The applicant may relocate the eastern haul road, and shall retain the dual-access road system to provide for emergency service access to the subject site. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. The landfill is accessible from Tampico Road (via Soap Creek Road) and from Hwy 99W (via Coffin Butte Road) <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services is in compliance with this requirement. The eastern haul access road was relocated, per county regulations, during the construction of Cell 4 in 2012. Access is maintained today. • good candidate for chapter 77 review • This explanation of status cannot be accepted until the topic has been researched <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> No Compliance Opinion <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> Republic is in compliance. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 8. Copies of water quality, stormwater runoff, and air quality permits; and data produced from associated monitoring programs, required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file in a timely way with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> In Compliance. The requirement for the county to receive copies of the documents and the county regularly receives copies. Appendix I https://www.co.benton.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_development/page/8136/2021_cbl_site_developm ent_plan_appendix_g_i.pdf | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these documents available for public inspection, and if so, where? • landfill not in compliance with June surface emission methane monitoring required by DEQ; Benton County should obtain an independent assessment of overall methane emissions, arsenic levels in monitoring wells are high, odor: per public records requests, odor complaints to DEQ are not documented/investigated/logged to the extent that residents have given up on making complaints to DEQ, annual report to DEQ: for many years, the reports required by Benton County DSAC to DEQ "documenting local citizens' concerns and the manner in which the owner or operator [of the landfill] is addressing those concerns" (ORS 459.325) have not been completed and submitted as required by Oregon statute. even now, there is no DSAC meeting dedicated to this required activity. as a result, DEQ has not been informed of many of the problems that citizens experience at coffin butte landfill. contamination: domestic wells have been contaminated | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Mark Yeager: Are the reports reviewed? Any independent verification by staff that the monitoring requirements for both air quality and water quality are being met and reported as required? The June 2022 report of methane exceedances and re-testing looks suspect – 7 hours to perform first test, just over an hour for the re-test?</p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. County records need to be reviewed</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance, and you can review the County records at the link provided by staff. The condition does not purport to give the County any oversight role with regard with DEQ's administration of its owner permits and could not do so.</p> | | | |
| <p>9. A plan for a landscape buffer to mitigate visual impacts shall be approved by the Community Development Department. Landscape screening in the form of deciduous trees between the east triangle and Highway 99W, and a mixed deciduous/evergreen buffer shall be planted and maintained in good health by the applicant.</p> | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>Compliance Status Unclear. The applicant indicates they placed a screen between the triangle and Hwy 99W but it either died or was destroyed by subsequent development.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services was unable to find records relating to this requirement, nor does it have any indication that there was any enforcement action from the County. Republic Services did plant a mitigating/vegetative buffer in 2016. • Not in compliance • not in compliance | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Not In Compliance. The County freely admits that it does no monitoring or enforcement of its adopted conditions of approval, and the County states that it relies on the applicant to comply with the requirements. Republic says they can't find their records related to the screening requirements and states further "nor does it have any indication that there was any enforcement action from the County." Review of this extensive record of land use actions for the landfill demonstrates this exact circumstance over and over. Apparently, the conditions of approval have absolutely no meaning and cannot be relied on to mitigate the impacts of incompatible land use activities performed at the landfill.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Not In Compliance</p> <p>Basis: Visual inspection.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>As noted previously, Republic did plant a buffer in 2016.</p> | | | |
| 10. Approval shall be obtained from the Oregon Division of State Lands for any activities on the subject property that affect designated wetlands. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This is a standard type of condition that ties a County permit to a permit issued by another agency. The County does not actively monitor compliance with outside agency permitting requirements, but if the outside agency determines that their permitting requirements have not been met then the applicant is also out of compliance with the Benton County permit.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2003 | PC-03-11 | A Conditional Use Permit for excavation and landfilling of 9.45 acres adjacent to the existing landfill operation, approved by planning commission with conditions. This portion of the landfill would represent an addition to the existing, previously approved, Landfill Site Zone. (East triangle). | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services has obtained all the necessary approvals and permits from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and remains in compliance with these conditions and approvals. • Must be active monitor • verification of compliance should be obtained. did the wetlands formerly include the small ponds that were slated for protection in the 1983 rezone <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Obviously there are or were wetlands on the property in the vicinity of the activity otherwise the County would not have added this condition of approval. It is again inexplicable that these types of requirements are not monitored or enforced. What is the point?</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated.</p> <p>Basis: No record of required action provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic has obtained approval from DSL for any wetland disturbances on sit. Republic did construct mitigation wetlands as required and DSL gave their full approval that the wetlands met all requirements in 2017. That concluded Republic obligations under the permit</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | 1U-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. Development shall comply with the plans and narrative in the applicant's proposal identified as Attachment 'A' except as modified by the approval or the conditions below. Modifications to the operation of the facility other than those addressed through this decision, including, but not limited to, the relocation of additional activities, or the configuration of relocated activities in a manner not substantially in conformance with the submitted conceptual site plan, shall require approval through a Modification of a Conditional Use Permit request (BCC 53.225). | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> In Compliance. Standard condition requiring the applicant to implement the conditional use permit as described in their application. Planning staff reviews the building permit to ensure that the site plan meets county code requirements and Conditions of Approval. The building permit would not have been issued without planning staff approval. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services believes it is in compliance with the terms of the 2011 conditional use permit. • narrative not provided, attachment A not provided • Why doesn't the county monitor compliance. considering that the county receives \$X million per biennium which originally was supposed to be dedicated to issues associated with hosting a landfill? | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. It is again inexplicable that these types of requirements are not monitored or enforced. What is the point of having this condition? Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Basis: No record of required action provided. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |
| Republic is in compliance with this site plan. | | | |
| 2. As required by BCC 60.220 (2) the applicant shall record a declaratory statement acknowledging the rights of adjacent and nearby property owners to conduct forest operations consistent with the Forest Practices Act and Rules prior to issuance of building permits. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. Completed. Issuance of the building permit is confirmation that the declaratory statement was signed. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has staff verified documentation | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. No record presented. In a earlier condition of this nature, staff indicated they did not know whether this action was completed. Where is this statement in the record? | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated. | | | |
| Basis: No record of required action provided. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 3. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the applicable siting standards specified in BCC 60.405 through materials submitted for issuance of building permits. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. Standard advisory condition. Issuance of the building permit is confirmation that the siting standards were met. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> • certificate of occupancy? ADA compliance? <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> No Compliance Opinion | | | |
| 4. All new facilities constructed under this approval shall comply with the applicable provisions of Building Code, Electrical Code, Plumbing Code, Mechanical Code, Fire Code, and rules and regulations imposed by state and federal agencies. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. Standard advisory condition. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> • certificate of occupancy? | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| No Compliance Opinion | | | |
| <i>Conditions of Approval from PC-03-11 that remain applicable and should be continued (as of the time of this decision):</i> | | <i>References Conditions #'s 1 through 8 of PC-03-11</i> | |
| 1. (5)Obtain necessary approvals from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality for landfill operations on this site. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. Standard advisory condition. The Comm. Dev. Department does not confirm and inspect records to ensure that conditions such as these are completed. It is a DEQ permit and if the DEQ does not approve the permit then the applicant could not continue the use and would be out of compliance. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Republic: Republic Services is in compliance with the DEQ requirement.• DEQ permit approvals should be listed here. Are all of them up to date?• when was the most recent LUCS on file at DEQ completed? | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. How do state agencies like DEQ become aware of some pending or approved land use action by Benton County? Having these types of requirements with no monitoring or enforcement is inexplicable. (MARK YEAGER 121622)</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated.</p> <p>Basis: No record of required action provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>As noted above several times, Republic cannot proceed with any development requiring a DEQ until it has obtained the permit. And Republic cannot get the permit from DEQ until it has obtained the County permit. The County has no authority to enforce or have any oversight over a DEQ permit. This condition is self-enforcing.</p> | | | |
| 2. (6) In cases where landfill operations are the primary cause of traffic on unpaved public roads in the area, those roads shall be kept dust-free by the applicant. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Coffin Butte Road is entirely paved.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status assessment here does not address whether unpaved public roads were kept dust-free prior to paving. For example, Tampico Road has only been fully paved within the past 3 years, and received frequent landfill traffic. Did the applicant demonstrate compliance by performing dust suppression on that road prior to the recent paving by the county? Robison Road, | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Wiles Road, and Rifle Range Road still receives frequent traffic associated with the landfill, as well as frequent illegal dumping. All of these are still unpaved, except for small sections of Robison Rd. east of Military Rd and at the Soap Creek crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there continue to be unpaved public roads in the vicinity of the landfill. does the landfill contribute to traffic on those roads? if so, how much? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated (121622) The comments above capture the concern – there are several unpaved roads in the vicinity of the landfill that receive landfill traffic. Who determines “primary cause” and what does the County do about it?</p> <p>No Compliance Opinion Edward Pitera (112322)</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff; this condition is moot.</p> | | | |
| 3. (7)The applicant or lease-holding operator shall ensure that the landfill operation does not exceed the maximum sound level permitted by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This condition only applies to the recycling and transfer station which is unlikely to create more noise than the landfilling activities.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be stated more clearly that compliance cannot be confirmed, as the county has never checked. • noise is an issue at the landfill; ensure the facility is still in compliance | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated (121622) How and when does the County ensure that the maximum sound level has not been exceeded. Since this is another example of complaint-based enforcement, what system is in place to document, respond to, and resolve noise related complaints? The landowner cannot delegate regulatory compliance or accountability with these types of requirements to a lease-holding operator.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated.</p> <p>Basis: No record of County process to capture / respond to complaints provided.</p> | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |
| <p>There is no evidence to indicate that Republic is not in compliance with this requirement. We note that this CUP is specific to the public drop off facility. It is only in operation M-S 8am-5pm. It consists of customers hand unloading material into trailers so it is relatively quiet compared to the main landfill operation.</p> | | | |
| 4. (8)Provide on-site parking for employees, customers, and visitors to the landfill site. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> truck traffic to the landfill begins backing up HWY 99 beginning before 4:30am; ensure that traffic to the landfill does not pose a safety hazard <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> No Compliance Opinion Edward Pitera (112322) <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> Republic is in compliance; all staff and visitors have space to park on site. | | | |
| 5. (9) Maintain a security fence between the landfill operation and the public road when such road is located within 200 feet of the landfill operation. | | | |
| <u>Comments</u> <u>County</u> In Compliance. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> check fence perimeter to ensure fencing is intact and there are no deferred maintenance issues <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> No Compliance Opinion (Mark Yeager 121622 & Edward Pitera (112322)) <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | 1U-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| Republic is in compliance. The closest public road (HW 99) is more than 200 feet away from the public drop off facility. | | | |
| 6. (10)The landfill operation hours shall occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12:00 p.m. through 5:00 p.m. on Sundays, with 24-hour access for commercial customers. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>This condition should have been revised to apply directly to the recycling and transfer station, not the entire landfill. This condition, as written, is unenforceable.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic Services: Republic Services is in compliance with this requirement, which governs landfill operations. However, it's important to note that internal operations, which include the arrival of field personnel on-site, begins at 4:30 a.m., Monday through Friday, and at 7:30 a.m. on Saturday. Additional operations not governed by the conditional use permit include work by third party contractors on landfill infrastructure, and commercial customers, who have 24-hour access to the Landfill. • Clearly not in compliance. if landfill operations routinely start at 4:30 am M-F. Operations are operations, no way to spin this. • Not in Compliance <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Not In Compliance (121622) Staff and RS do not get to interpret operating hours to mean something different than what was imposed as a written condition of approval. The words are the words. By definition the industrial activity of operating an active landfill is an incompatible use in an agricultural, forest and rural residential area. As such, operating hours are critical to mitigation of the numerous deleterious effects of the landfill operation. Requiring the landfill to limit operations to mitigate impacts "The landfill operation hours shall occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12:00 p.m.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>through 5:00 p.m. on Sundays, with 24-hour access for commercial customers” means what it says, and the condition of approval was adopted by the Planning Commission. The public has a right to expect the operating hours to be enforced as approved and adopted. Beginning operations at 4:30 a.m. is a violation of this condition of approval. Under staff and RS interpretation, could the landfill operate 24 hours a day?</p> <p>In Compliance_Edward Pitera (112322)</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Same comment as above; the Staff interpretation is more plausible than Mark’s when read in context (and the County does in fact get to interpret its conditions in the first instance).</p> | | | |
| 7. (11)The applicant shall retain the dual-access road system to provide for emergency service access to the subject site. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services is in compliance with this requirement. The eastern haul access road was relocated, per county regulations, during the construction of Cell 4 in 2012. Access is maintained today. • good candidate for chapter 77 review • This assessment of status is not possible for the working group to confirm until research has been completed. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| No Compliance Opinion (Mark Yeager 121622 & Edward Pitera (112322)) | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |
| Republic agrees with staff. | | | |
| 8. OMITTED | | N/A | |
| 9. (12)Copies of water quality and air quality permits, and data produced from associated monitoring programs, required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file, in a timely way, with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. The county regularly receives copies. Appendix I https://www.co.benton.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_development/page/8136/2021_cbl_site_development_plan_appendix_g_i.pdf | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">landfill not in compliance with June surface emission methane monitoring required by DEQ; Benton County should obtain an independent assessment of overall methane emissions, arsenic levels in monitoring wells are high, odor: per public records requests, odor complaints to DEQ are not documented/investigated/logged to the extent that testimony has been given that residents have given up on making complaints to DEQ, annual report to DEQ: for many years, the reports required by Benton County DSAC to DEQ "documenting local citizens' concerns and the manner in which the owner or operator [of the landfill] is | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>addressing those concerns" (ORS 459.325) have not been completed and submitted as required by Oregon statute. even now, there is no DSAC meeting dedicated to this required activity. as a result, DEQ has not been informed of many of the problems that citizens experience at coffin butte landfill. contamination: domestic wells have been contaminated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These have not all been made available for public inspection. Whether this is the fault of the applicant or the county is impossible to judge, as a member of the interested public. During the 2021 CUP process, I had to use Public Information Request procedures to obtain information from DEQ that was not available from Benton County. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Are the reports reviewed? Any independent verification by staff that the monitoring requirements for both air quality and water quality are being met and reported as required?</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unsure</p> <p>Basis: Insufficient information provided to demonstrate compliance e.g. a documented work process, summary reports, etc.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance and the committee review the County records at the link provided by staff. The condition does not purport to give the County any oversight role with regard with DEQ's administration of its owner permits and the County has no jurisdiction to do so.</p> | | | |
| 10. (13)Copies of storm-water runoff permits and data produced from associated monitoring programs required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file in a timely way, with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| Comments | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2011 | LU-11-016 | Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a new public recycling and refuse transfer facility at Coffin Butte Landfill. The request also includes enhancements to the stormwater conveyance and detention system, as well as a container and drop box storage area, and a landfill construction staging and storage area in FC zone. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The county regularly receives copies. https://www.co.benton.or.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_development/page/8136/2021_cbl_site_development_plan_appendix_g_i.pdf</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the July 2022 DSAC meeting, Applicant's representative stated that runoff reports for the PRC composting facility were provided to DEQ but not to Benton County, because the county had never requested those explicitly. This needs to be clarified. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Are the reports reviewed? Any independent verification by staff that the monitoring requirements for both air quality and water quality are being met and reported as required?</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unsure</p> <p>Basis: Insufficient information provided to demonstrate compliance e.g. a documented work process, summary reports, etc.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance and the Committee can review the County records at the link provided by staff. The condition does not purport to give the County any oversight role with regard with DEQ's administration of its owner permits and the County could not do so.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. Development shall comply with the plans and narrative in the applicant's proposal identified as Attachment 'A', except as modified by the approval or the conditions below. Modifications to the operation of the facility other than those addressed through this decision, including, but not limited to, the relocation of additional activities, or the configuration of relocated activities in a manner not substantially in conformance with the submitted conceptual site plan, shall require approval through a Modification of a Conditional Use Permit request (BCC 53. 225). | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. This would have been checked through site plan review. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • narrative not provided, attachment a not provided <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Mark Yeager: This list of standard conditions that never get reviewed for compliance or enforced does not build confidence in the land use planning process in Benton County. No Compliance Opinion <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> In the absence of any evidence that Republic in not in compliance, the assumption should be that it is in compliance. | | | |
| 2. As required by BCC 60.220 (2), the applicant shall record a declaratory statement acknowledging the rights of adjacent and nearby property owners to conduct forest operations consistent with the Forest Practices Act and Rules prior to issuance of building permits. | | | |
| Comments | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <u>County</u> In Compliance. This was recorded as required. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services understands this requirement. At this juncture, no building permits have been issued for this area. • This explanation of status cannot be accepted until the topic has been researched. • unknown compliance | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> Mark Yeager: This list of standard conditions that never get reviewed for compliance or enforced does not build confidence in the land use planning process in Benton County. No Compliance Opinion | | | |
| 3. Any new access to a county road or change to an existing access shall require a permit issued through the Benton County Public Works Department. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> In Compliance. Standard advisory condition. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services has not added or requested additional access and understands the stated requirement. • have changes in landfill access received a public works permit? | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> No Compliance Opinion | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 4. Disturbance of 1 Acre or More. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is required for all construction activities that disturb one acre or more. The NPDES permit must be obtained through Benton County Public Works and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Standard advisory condition.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services has not added or requested additional access and understands the stated requirement. • have there been construction activities that disturb one acre or more? if so, have NPDES permits been obtained? • No evidence of compliance. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. This is a new requirement and will likely make the list of standard conditions of approval that will not be monitored or enforced.</p> <p>Compliance Not Demonstrated. County records need to be reviewed.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>The access and NPDES are independent permitting requirements; Republic must comply with these requirements regarding whether they are imposed as a condition of approval. That is why staff call them "advisory." The purpose of these kinds of condition is put the applicant on notice that could be additional permitting requirements. As noted above, Republic's operation hasn't triggered either of these permitting requirements, so we shouldn't be expected to prove a negative.</p> | | | |
| Conditions of Approval from prior approvals that remain in effect (as of the time of this decision): | | References Conditions #'s 1 through 8 of PC-03-11 | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 1. (5) Obtain necessary approvals from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality for Landfill operations on this site. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. The Comm. Dev. Department does not confirm and inspect records to ensure that conditions such as these are completed. It is a DEQ permit and if the DEQ does not approve the permit then the applicant could not continue the use and would be out of compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: This is not part of the Landfill and DEQ permits are not required. If such approvals become necessary in the future, Republic Services will obtain them. • when was the most recent LUCS on file at DEQ completed? if the landfill is not compliant with land use conditions of approval, would DEQ still approve all necessary permits? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. This list of standard conditions that never get reviewed for compliance or enforced does not build confidence in the land use planning process in Benton County.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated.</p> <p>Basis: No record of required action provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>As noted, if DEQ permits are required, then Republic must obtain those permits to proceed. The County does not need to nor has the authority to enforce DEQ's permitting requirements. This condition is only violated if DEQ finds Republic in violation. This in turn would allow the County to consider revoking the CUP. That is the purpose of these "comply with state law" requirements. More to the point, there haven't been any landfill operations on this CUP area that would trigger any permit requirements.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 2. (6)In cases where Landfill operations are the primary cause of traffic on unpaved public roads in the area, those roads shall be kept dust -free by the applicant. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. Coffin Butte Road is entirely paved.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of compliance. • there continue to be unpaved public roads in the vicinity of the landfill. does the landfill contribute to traffic on those roads? if so, how much? <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Many previous comments submitted regarding this condition of approval. Many unpaved roads still exist in the vicinity of the landfill.</p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated (121622) The comments above capture the concern – there are several unpaved roads in the vicinity of the landfill that receive landfill traffic. Who determines “primary cause” and what does the County do about it?</p> <p>No Compliance Opinion- Edward Pitera (112322)</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff. The public roads are paved; this condition is moot.</p> | | | |
| 3. (7)The applicant or lease - holding operator shall ensure that the Landfill operation does not exceed the maximum sound level permitted by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This condition is only applicable to the staging and storage area which is unlikely to create noise greater than the landfill operation.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: Republic Services has no record of complaints on this parcel. • County cannot confirm compliance. • noise is an issue at the landfill; ensure the facility is still in compliance <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Property owner cannot delegate compliance to 3rd party This list of standard conditions that never get reviewed for compliance or enforced does not build confidence in the land use planning process in Benton County.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated.</p> <p>Basis: No record of County process to capture / respond to complaints provided.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>As noted above, there is no evidence complaint or violation of this standard.</p> | | | |
| 4. (8)Provide on-site parking for employees, customers, and visitors to the Landfill site. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p>In Compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • truck traffic to the landfill begins backing up HWY 99 beginning before 4:30am; ensure that traffic to the landfill does not pose a safety hazard <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>No Compliance Opinion -Edward Pitera (112322)</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with Staff.</p> | | | |
| 5. (9)Maintain a security fence between the Landfill operation and the public road when such road is located within 200 feet of the Landfill operation. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • check fence perimeter to ensure fencing is intact and there are no deferred maintenance issues <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>No Compliance Opinion (Mark Yeager 121622 & Edward Pitera (112322))</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic agrees with staff.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| 6. (10)The Landfill operation hours shall occur between 8: 00 a.m. and 5: 00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12: 00 p.m. through 5: 00 p.m. on Sundays, with 24 -hour access for commercial customers. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>This condition should have been revised to only apply to the staging and storage area. As written, it is unenforceable.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: This is not part of Coffin Butte Landfill operations. It is a material storage facility. There are no operating hours here. • Clearly not in compliance • not in compliance <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Not In Compliance (121622) Staff and RS do not get to interpret operating hours to mean something different than what was imposed as a written condition of approval. The words are the words. By definition the industrial activity of operating an active landfill is an incompatible use in an agricultural, forest and rural residential area. As such, operating hours are critical to mitigation of the numerous deleterious effects of the landfill operation. Requiring the landfill to limit operations to mitigate impacts "The landfill operation hours shall occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12:00 p.m. through 5:00 p.m. on Sundays, with 24-hour access for commercial customers" means what it says, and the condition of approval was adopted by the Planning Commission. The public has a right to expect the operating hours to be enforced as approved and adopted. Beginning operations at 4:30 a.m. is a violation of this condition of approval. Under staff and RS interpretation, could the landfill operate 24 hours a day?</p> <p>In Compliance_-Edward Pitera (112322)</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> Republic references our prior comments on the same condition. | | | |
| 7. (11)The applicant shall retain the dual - access road system to provide for emergency service access to the subject site. | | | |
| Comments <u>County</u> In Compliance. <u>Workgroup Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Awaiting additional research.• Republic: Republic Services is in compliance with this requirement. The eastern haul access road was relocated, per county regulations, during the construction of Cell 4 in 2012. Access is maintained today. <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> No Compliance Opinion (Mark Yeager 121622 & Edward Pitera (112322)) <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> Republic is in compliance | | | |
| 8. OMITTED | | N/A | |
| 9. (12)Copies of water quality and air quality permits, and data produced from associated monitoring programs, required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file, in a timely way, with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| Comments | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: There are no permits or monitoring data as this relates to a material storage facility. • As noted above, these are not available for public inspection as required. • landfill not in compliance with June surface emission methane monitoring required by DEQ; Benton County should obtain an independent assessment of overall methane emissions, arsenic levels in monitoring wells are high, odor: per public records requests, odor complaints to DEQ are not documented/investigated/logged to the extent that testimony has been given that residents have given up on making complaints to DEQ, annual report to DEQ: for many years, the reports required by Benton County DSAC to DEQ "documenting local citizens' concerns and the manner in which the owner or operator [of the landfill] is addressing those concerns" (ORS 459.325) have not been completed and submitted as required by Oregon statute. even now, there is no DSAC meeting dedicated to this required activity. as a result, DEQ has not been informed of many of the problems that citizens experience at coffin butte landfill. contamination: domestic wells have been contaminated <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated Material storage areas can and do generate stormwater runoff unless they are completely covered. How and when does the County know if permits for this facility are procured from DEQ?</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unsure</p> <p>Basis: Insufficient information provided to demonstrate compliance e.g. a documented work process, summary reports, etc.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>The enumerated permits and monitoring information is on file at the link previously provided by staff, which is all this condition requires. The County has no authority to conduct oversight over DEQ's permitting requirements. Further, this condition is not currently relevant to this CUP because the subject property is a grassy field that Republic might need to use someday for storage.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| 2013 | LU-13-061 | Conditional Use Permit for "minor additions and modifications" at Coffin Butte Landfill to change the location of a construction staging and storage area in the vicinity of the existing office structure. | Planning Commission approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | | |
| In addition, the way the methane monitoring works is that if a methane detector registers over a certain level, Republic has to complete remediation within a set period of time and then re-monitor several times at that location. As long as the landfill follows these prescribed steps it is not out of compliance. The whole point of surface monitoring is to try to find detections and fix them. This is why the permit is structured that way. | | | |
| 10. (13)Copies of storm -water runoff permits and data produced from associated monitoring programs required of the applicant by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, shall be placed on file in a timely way, with the Benton County Community Development Department for public inspection. | | | |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: There are no permits or monitoring data as this relates to a material storage facility. • As noted above, these are not available for public inspection as required. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Material storage areas can and do generate stormwater runoff unless they are completely covered. How and when does the County know if permits for this facility have been issued by DEQ?</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Status Unsure</p> <p>Basis: Insufficient information provided to demonstrate compliance e.g. a documented work process, summary reports, etc.</p> | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|--|---|
| 2015 | LU-15-001 | Alteration of a nonconforming use to continue and enhance a stormwater treatment facility in the Exclusive Farm Use Zone, associated with Coffin Butte Landfill. | Community Development Department Approved |
| Conditions of Approval | | Current Status | |
| 1. Development shall substantially comply with the plans and narrative in the applicant's proposal identified as Attachment A. Significant modifications to the construction or operation of the stormwater system other than those addressed through this decision shall require additional approval. | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <u>County</u> | | | |
| In Compliance. This is a standard condition requiring applicant to implement the land use as they proposed it in the application. The County has no evidence that implementation was significantly modified from what was approved. | | | |
| <u>Workgroup Committee</u> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Republic: This development condition was at the County's discretion. However, as it relates to stormwater system construction and monitoring, Republic Services has all the DEQ permits necessary and is in compliance.• attachment a is not provided• We are missing a clear statement from the county on whether the site is in compliance, independent of DEQ. See previous comments. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u> | | | |
| Mark Yeager: Compliance Not Demonstrated. Nonagricultural uses in the EFU zone are specifically limited by ORS. Whether the continuation and alteration of a non-conforming use in the EFU zone is appropriate may be beyond the scope of this review. However, that fact that this action was approved at the staff level, and apparently at the behest of the department, requires further review. More time is needed to review the record. Was Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) notified of this land use action? | | | |
| Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated. | | | |
| Basis: No record of required action provided. | | | |
| <u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u> | | | |

| |
|---|
| Republic is in compliance |
| 2. The applicant shall obtain and maintain compliance with the terms of all necessary federal, state, and local permits for construction and operation of the stormwater system described in this application. |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>County</u></p> <p>In Compliance. This is a standard type of condition that ties a County permit to a permit issued by another agency. The County does not actively monitor compliance with outside agency permitting requirements, but if the outside agency determines that their permitting requirements have not been met then the applicant is also out of compliance with the Benton County permit.</p> <p><u>Workgroup Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic: This development condition was at the County's discretion. However, as it relates to stormwater system construction and monitoring, Republic Services has all the DEQ permits necessary and is in compliance. • the stormwater system is in an area identified as "wetlands" – does this trigger additional permitting requirements • We are missing a clear statement from the county on whether the site is in compliance, independent of DEQ. See previous comments. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>(Mark Yeager) Many previous comments regarding lack of system or follow up to ensure that applicant secures permits for approved activities. Meaningless condition with no follow up or enforcement.</p> <p>Compliance Opinion: Compliance Not Demonstrated.</p> <p>Basis: No record of required action provided</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Republic is in compliance.</p> |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|-----------|--|---|
| 2021 | LU-21-047 | <p>Conditional Use Permit to expand Coffin Butte Landfill. Republic Services proposed: to create a new disposal cell for the Coffin Butte Landfill which will extend from the current cell south of Coffin Butte Road; close Coffin Butte Road to public traffic (vacate the right-of-way*) so the new cell can cover the road; relocate a replacement roadway (for landfill and quarry traffic only) around the area of the new disposal cell; relocate the leachate ponds south of Coffin Butte Road, and move some other structures.</p> <p>Closing Coffin Butte Road will likely require improvement of at least one other roadway in the area to accommodate increased traffic—potentially Tampico Road or Wiles and Robison Roads.</p> | Planning Commission Denied; PC Decision Appealed; Application Withdrawn |
| <p>Comments</p> <p><u>Workgroup Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic Services appealed the Planning Commission’s decision, but voluntarily withdrew that appeal to engage with the community and participate in the Oregon Consensus process. Republic Services and Coffin Butte Landfill remain committed to the Oregon Consensus process and this group’s work. We look forward to being part of Benton County’s long-term solid waste management and diversion solution strategy. <p><u>Subcommittee Members Edward Pitera, Catherine Biscoe, Mark Yeager</u></p> <p>Use Decision Provided for Background</p> <p>Subcommittee believes that the record and rational of this land use proceeding is relevant to the evolution of the Coffin Butte Landfill.</p> <p>Review of the record in this land use proceeding provides important historical context. The public comments and the Notice of Decision in this matter are critical to understanding the history of the landfill and the sentiment of the residents of Benton County at that time.</p> <p>Open Items: Subcommittee needs to review this documentation</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member – Republic</u></p> <p>Any new CUP application filed by Republic will be a new application accompanied the appropriate studies and justifications.</p> | | | |

Conditional Use Permit land use applications that were NOT APPROVED

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|---|----------|--|------------|
| 1994 | PC-94-10 | Zone change from Rural Residential to Landfill Site Zone, Comprehensive Plan change from Rural Residential to Landfill Site. | BOC Denied |
| There are no conditions proposed for a zone change. | | | |

| Date | File # | Request | Result |
|--|----------|---|--|
| 1994 | PC-94-11 | A conditional use permit to expand the area approved for a landfill within the Landfill Site Zone and update the site development plan. | PC Approved; PC Decision Appealed; Application Withdrawn |
| <p>Planning Commission approved Conditions of Approval – as the application was withdrawn, these conditions hold no authority.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limit the extent of the fill to be sited on the property to the north and east of the ridge line. 2. Limit the extent of the fill to be sited on the property to be no greater than the existing elevation of the ridge line. 3. Submit a copy of the final approved site plan map to the Development Department that shows the provisions of the site plan in BCC 77.310(2) have been met. The approved site plan shall be signed by the Planning Official when approved. 4. Submit documentation to the Development Department showing the existing fill and proposed plan would be in compliance with Department of Environmental Quality standards. | | | |