

**Clark County
Solid Waste Advisory Commission
Regular Meeting**
Thursday, July 7th, 2016

Clark County Elections Building
1408 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA

SWAC Members Present: Rem Wilson, Allan Jeska, Don Ebbeson, Stephen Schrag, Ty Stober, Alixandra Coker, Simone Auger, Brandon Vick, and Steven Willis

SWAC Members Excused: none

Staff Present: Pete DuBois, Kim Harless, Mike Davis

Others: Rich McConaghy, City of Vancouver; Alan Melnick, Chuck Harman, Kevin Merchel, Roxanne Wolfe, County Public Health; Scott Campbell, Waste Connections;

I. Roll Call, Approval of Minutes

Minutes were unanimously approved as corrected

II. Updates

County Public Health – Chuck Harman & Roxanne Wolfe

- 2nd quarter report to ecology is submitted, once completed will send out to SWAC
- Space situation has been resolved at CCH for transition of SWEO to CCH building
- Will SWAC meetings move? Possible once staff moves, and if SWAC wants to

City of Vancouver – Rich McConaghy

- Ecology is updating the solid waste handling standards – workshops upcoming
- Spring coupon program completed, numbers up a little bit, not all numbers in yet though

Waste Connections – Scott Campbell

- No update

County Solid Waste – Pete DuBois & Kim Harless

- Natural garden tour soon; work to eliminate use of pesticides and chemicals
- Recycled Arts Festival was a huge success; played a video from KOIN's coverage
 - First year getting sponsors
 - Many volunteers, 172 shifts, (audio), 400+ hours
- December 1st, WSRA tour of Metro Paint
 - Stericycle getting ready to begin paint processing facility for paint recycling
- Residue Study, 3 done, 1 to go on July 16th
- Received initial appraisal for property acquisition for CTR turn lane, will be reviewed
 - Landowner is still good, hasn't walked away
 - He is going to build with the plan with the drop lane (audio)
- Final phases of application for Leichner master plan, engineering for review, due 26th of July
 - Last piece to get done before submission – back to SWAC later with comments

III. Honor Don's Ebbeson's 12 years of SWAC service

- Don received awards, comments, and thanks for his service and time served on SWAC

IV. SWAC Rules and Procedures

- Discuss / Elect new chair
 - Two ways for succession plan
 - Vice Chair typically moves on to Chair, then Vice Chair is elected
 - Allan Jeska says he would take it
 - He however does leave around Dec through April, so the Vice Chair would have that time serving as Chair
 - Also doesn't mind staying as Vice Chair
 - Stephen made a motion was made for Allan to go from Vice Chair to Chair, and SWAC to elect a Vice Chair that will cover Allan while he is away
 - Brandon seconded; unanimously approved
 - Ty made a motion to table the election of Vice Chair to next month's meeting
 - Unanimously approved
- Update on Solid Waste Industry Representative
 - Don worked with staff and BOCC to have our contracted hauler as the SWAC Solid Waste Industry Representative -- Scott Campbell to be that representative

V. SWAC Recommendation to BOCC – Stephen Schrag

- Draft was not sent to SWAC members yet, Pete to send out revised recommendation
- Concerns if under the purview of SWAC
 - Leachate of Circle C is a concern, and location is close to the casino
 - Wastewater is similarly concerning to drinking water
 - Wastewater quality issue versus landfill water quality issue
 - If there is a clear link to solid waste, a recommendation can be made
- Alan Melnick discussed that as a public health necessity, the casino can hook up with a public utility despite being a sovereign nation
 - Casino wanted this, a lawsuit from the County and LaCenter cardrooms prevented it from being able to hook up
 - Public Health wants to be able to monitor and observe the system
 - Working on interlocal agreement to be able to access monitoring systems
 - Even if County withdraws lawsuit, cardrooms may not
 - Would have to shut down and stop generating wastewater if a public health emergency occurred; interest in an emergency only hook up to public utility
- SWAC to receive a copy of recommendation by July 18th and discuss at next meeting
 - Stephen made a motion to discuss the recommendation at the August SWAC meeting
 - Allan seconded, unanimously approved

VI. Draft criteria for evaluating termination of the post-closure permit for Circle C landfill – Chuck Harman

- Criteria for landfill to help Public Health be able to say that the landfill will not create a public health hazard
- SWAC first presented criteria in May, and had a lot of questions
 - Kevin did a lot of the research and work to answer questions
- After SWAC's approval to move forward, then Public Health would be able to give presentation to Board of Health
 - Carlson Family presented to next
 - Then public comment period for input before finalizing
 - Then Carlsons will be asked to meet criteria, and if they do, then could move forward to end post-closure permit
- Kevin presented questions and criteria:
 - Clarifying language on settlement, clarifying what subsequent years meant
 - Would be reassessed each following year until criteria met

- How many cubic yards in site: 500,000 cubic yards approximately; it would be very costly (~\$25 M) to move it out of Circle C and into a lined landfill
 - Additionally, there is a good amount of asbestos waste in the landfill; any disturbance would add complications
- Gas production: Lower Explosive Limit (LEL) levels
 - Concentration of gas in air when that chemical first becomes explosive
 - Gases that are below the LEL concentration won't be explosive
 - Cannot exceed 100% LEL at property boundary; 25% LEL at on-site structures; 25% in vent pipes
 - Why higher level at boundary of landfill, but lower in center?
 - Based on soil samples: When gas leaves the soil, will diffuse with air, and thus will drop below the LEL level
 - Structures measured by ambient air monitoring – protective of people entering structures
 - 25% in vent pipes is used because of intent to measure how much gas landfill is producing
 - First two criteria have been measured
 - 3rd criteria, no measurements yet;
 - Ty asked if they have met it in the past
 - Not always; getting some measurements above 25%, but was seasonal occurrences
 - At the boundary there were early detections, but fairly low detection now but not all zeros
 - Below ground tanks may be creating detections
- Leachate production: what is the quantity and rate over time?
 - Only one measurement of flow rate found from Sept 2015: 75 gallons per day
 - Measuring leachate is complicated; underdrain system is also collecting some of the leachate as well as surface water, was designed to move surface water around the landfill, but were contaminated.
 - No engineered liner for landfill, so leachate is exposed to ground water
 - C/D landfill, no known hazardous or municipal solid waste deposited
 - Bottom of the landfill is at much lower elevation than the surface; was a gravel mine before and then they filled it up
- Cost estimates for leachate testing (WAC 173-200-040):
 - Per sample for entire suite, \$1,950 per sample; most expensive is radionuclide (\$490) and dioxins (\$525); don't expect these so these could be excluded
 - Multiply cost by the number of samples and number of wells
- Groundwater monitoring on a quarterly basis, past had VOCs and organics detected
 - Want one more sample set in downgradient wells tested with a full suite
 - To confidently say there is no public health threat from Circle C
- WAC landfill standards require 3 downgradient wells, but there is only 1 at Circle C
 - Aquifer flow contours not well defined for direction of flow
 - Need two more wells for regulations and also to feel confident
 - \$100 per foot = \$5k per well (\$10,000 total for both wells)
 - Annual monitoring costs around \$15k per year, \$54k full suite testing and monitoring; three years' worth of sampling
 - No grandfathering agreement for only one downgradient well; WAC code may predate landfill, however 3 wells are required
 - What if person doesn't want to pay to put wells in?
 - Not trying to make them spend money, want protection of ground water
 - If consultants offer alternatives, PH is open to discussion

- Ty asked if they decided to spend the \$54k, but higher readings were then detected, do they then have to keep monitoring, or will they then have to also do mitigation?
 - If they don't pass criteria, then they have to keep monitoring, and the post-closure permit stays until criteria met
 - We need to define the criteria to know when they can get off the permit
 - If they do get a hit on the monitoring, then they get put into categories of enforcement;
 - Assessment and monitoring period to see if a one-time plume
 - Decision then made on how to do next. Health risk assessments would be done depending on what was detected
 - Ty clarified that they may be taking a risk to get rid of the permit, because there will be more monitoring that could show something; versus not doing more monitoring and not paying more; risk is low though
 - 15k a year now for the post-closure permit, or risk the \$54k to try to get off the post-closure permit
 - There is a huge incentive to do proper cleanup, can then sell property for development
 - 30 acre property, 8 acres is the landfill
- Ty asked if the Carlsons decide they do not want to invest the \$54k and want to stay under current permit – but now we know they aren't up to current standards – would the County then tell them they still need to install other two wells?
 - Chuck said Public Health would recommend that they do that
 - Allan said that we want be able to tell the public we've done due diligence to protect our community's ground water
- Don made a motion to proceed with the project with the criteria as defined
 - Allan seconded; unanimously approved

VII. Clean Cart Campaign Single Family & Multifamily – Kim Harless

- Will be on next month's agenda, due to the lack of time remaining for meeting

VIII. Other Business

- Allan shared that the Reflector had an article about the Recycled Art Festival, car recycling, appliance disposal, composting advertisements, and more; they are backing our solid waste

IX. Comments from the Public on Non-Agenda items – None

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55pm