



Below is the script of my verbal testimony for Weds 7/9/25.

Debbie Palmer
37340 Moss Rock Dr
Corvallis, OR 97330-9355

Chair Fowler, vice-chair Haman, members of the Planning Commission,

My name is Debbie Palmer, and I live at 37340 Moss Rock Drive in Soap Creek Valley, about 4 and a half miles south of the landfill.

I second everyone else's gratitude for all the careful time and attention you are putting into this. And if I understand correctly, you plan on extending tonight's meeting time, if needed, in order to hear all our public comment, instead of cutting us off at 8:45pm like you could have. We really appreciate that! We appreciate your granting us the same consideration as you granted Republic Services and County staff. Thank you so much.

My testimony tonight will be in response to information presented at last night's meeting, from both staff and the applicant - and in no particular order.

For starters: this may seem a bit minor - but have you noticed how Republic's visual presentations *never actually show pictures of the dump itself*? They'll show you nice pictures of the surrounding area - beautiful grasslands, rolling hills etc; dare I say... pictures of the "character of the area"? I hope this is not lost upon you. They will never show you pictures of the dump because it is UGLY. Who would want to look at that? [pause] Exactly.

Another thing: this is regarding Fire. Republic's fire consultant has never once mentioned evaluating the impact of wildfire in nearby forests. I.e. he has studiously avoided investigating how likely a major landfill fire could be started due to windblown embers from a wildfire landing on this methane super-emitter. Does that not sound to you like something that should have at least been *considered*? It sounds apocalyptic to me, frankly.

This is just another example of Republic's failing the "burden of proof" test.

Palmer script, p 1 of 3

Moving on: Chair Fowler, you were on the Planning Commission in 2021 when Republic's last expansion application was soundly and unanimously denied. Do you happen to notice how this current application is *uncannily similar* to the first phase of that one? Everything points to Republic's intention to continue to expand this monstrosity — that this is just the first step in what will be a series of applications to expand.

Why would they be spending all this money, and taking "3 to 4 years," to construct something that will only add "six more years" of landfill life? They're not going to stop there. Soon as this "phase" is largely underway — and as Cell 6 "the quarry" rapidly fills, thanks to the cap being lifted — they're gonna apply again.

In an email exchange between County Counsel Vance Croney and Republic's Julie Jackson during the 2020 Landfill Franchise Agreement negotiations (information we got via public records request), Mr. Croney says, "... I want to be sure I'm correct when I discuss with the BOC ramifications of lifting a tonnage cap," and Ms. Jackson replies, "... We have many acres that could hold waste and that will likely be a future discussion with the County."

So they're definitely intending to continue to expand.

Actually... I'll amend what I said about this being the first step in "a series of *applications* to expand": we are actually *extremely* concerned that — if you grant this expansion, and Republic now owns a landfill on both sides of Coffin Butte Road — *that they could, under Oregon statute [ORS 368.351 - "Vacation without hearing"], get Coffin Butte Road "vacated" by the County (i.e. permanently closed) and build their landfill across it... without a public hearing.* Possibly without even having to *notify* the public. Or, in other words: without having to be held accountable via a formal, public, application process like the one we're going through now. Because that is our biggest fear - and Republic's wet dream.

Moving on once more: regarding compliance with past conditions of approval.

Outside counsel Meg Ryan states, "It's the County's legal obligation to monitor the conditions and there is a legal process for enforcing conditions... should the County have the budget to do so."

And planning official Petra Schuetz says, "Until adjudicated, we don't have any evidence that those conditions were not followed."

So, apparently all our filed complaints and photographs and such are not "sufficient evidence"? What we all can see with the naked eye and smell with our noses is not "sufficient evidence"?

It sounds like they are saying someone would actually have to sue, in a court of law, in order to "prove" past conditions were not met? We know the County would not do that (even if they HAD the budget), so that means some member of the public or organization *would have to sue*?

Does that sound like a level playing field to you?

Next: Republic's Fire consultant's attempt to claim that because this dump has been around 70-80 years and hasn't impacted nearby property values thus far, it would somehow on a "go-forward basis" not diminish them, is feeble and specious. 15-20 years ago, let alone 70-80, the landfill *was a fraction of the size it is now*. Its collective impacts are a huge question mark on nearby property values going forward.

Lastly: I wish to remind you that your decision is ultimately *discretionary*. That's in the code. So under your quasi-judicial authority, you have the leeway to judge this application as you see fit. If you feel a concern is valid, then it is valid. I hear a number of you expressing concern about what you can and cannot consider when judging this application. Such as "past performance" of Republic at their landfill across the road from the proposed new dump. Past behavior is absolutely a valid consideration when judging future behavior.

Please. **Use your power of discretion and deny this application unconditionally.**

I thank you for your time, and relinquish any leftover time on my clock to the next speaker, or, if that is not allowed, let it expire.

Palmer script, p. 3 of 3