

From: [Alice LaViolette](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Comment on item 3.3b
Date: Monday, April 28, 2025 10:08:38 AM

City Councilors -

I am a resident of Ward 1. Tonight, 4/28, you will be asked to vote on the Legislative Committees recommendations on 5 current bills in the Oregon Legislature. As you consider item 3.3b tonight, I urge you to take a thoughtful look at the committees recommendation for SB 1067 and to please, vote to support this bill.

If passed by the Legislature, SB 1067 , "Authorizes a city within Marion County to control or direct the disposal, transfer or material or energy recovery of solid waste generated within the city". SB 1067 has the support of Senator Deb Patterson, Representative Paul Evans and Representative Lesly Munoz.

Tonight you have the opportunity to show your support of Salem city staff, councilors and civic leaders to make local decisions concerning solid waste policy and practice without the interference of another unit of local government. The Covanta/Reworld incinerator in Brooks was finally closed at the end of 2024. Thankfully, we no longer have pollution from this facility hanging over valley communities and farmland. But, can you trust Marion County not to resume operations of this incinerator?

Please show your support of our community leadership and vote to support SB 1067.

Thank you,
Alice LaViolette
Ward 1

From: [Diane Chavez](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Agenda Item 3.3b
Date: Friday, April 25, 2025 11:38:26 AM

Members of the city council,

I are grateful to Senator Deb Patterson for introducing SB 1067 as requested by her Salem constituents.

Now that the incinerator is closed there is no need for state law to take away Salem's autonomy over our own solid waste. However, if the incinerator were to be restarted by a new company, as happened recently in Vancouver, BC, we would have no power to prevent our garbage from going there and causing harms to Brooks residents and to the planet with toxic emissions and CO2 emissions.

There is nothing in SB 1067 that would work against long range regional planning for solid waste as proposed in HB 3794.

There is nothing in SB 1067 that would prevent Salem from continuing to work cordially and cooperatively with Marion County on solid waste policy.

SB 1067 would guarantee that Salem could carry out the objectives and strategies of our Climate Action Plan regarding solid waste without interference from another unit of local government.

I support Seator Patterson's bill and hope that the city council will, as well.

Thank you,
Diane Chavez

From: [Jim Scheppke](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Agenda Item 3.3b
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2025 3:25:06 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council:

I am writing to ask you to **not** vote to oppose SB 1067.

The bill has already passed the Senate with bipartisan support and will be heard in the House Climate, Energy and Environment Committee which includes former City Councilor Tom Andersen and Representative Mark Gamba who is a co-sponsor of the bill along with Representative Paul Evans and Representative Lesly Munoz. 350 Salem will be there in force to strongly advocate for the bill that was introduced by Senator Deb Patterson partly at our suggestion. We feel confident that the bill is headed for passage in the House with strong majority support.

SB 1067 is needed to repeal an obsolete provision in state law that was enacted four decades ago so that all the solid waste in Marion County could be directed to the new garbage incinerator in Brooks that began operations in 1986. With closure of the incinerator last December there is obviously no need for this law.

Salem is the only major Oregon city outside of the Metro area that does not have authority to manage its own solid waste (what Marion County likes to euphemistically call “flow control”). Lane County does not have “flow control.” Benton County does not have “flow control.” Deschutes County does not have “flow control.” Jackson County does not have “flow control.” Why does Marion County need “flow control”? It does not.

At the Legislative Committee meeting where this was discussed City staff claimed that SB 1067 is **in conflict** with another bill the City is supporting, HB 3794, which would form a regional task force to plan for solid waste management in the Willamette Valley. That bill has passed out of a House committee and has been sent to the Ways and Means Committee because it has a fiscal impact. **The statement by City staff was untrue.** There is absolutely no conflict between the two bills. How do we know that? **Senator Patterson is a sponsor of both bills!** The Legislative Committee was not informed of this.

In the staff report for Agenda Item 3.3b there is the following concerning "benefits and concerns" about SB 1067. Please consider *my responses* to each.

Benefits:

- Local control of solid waste, but Salem would not likely exercise their authority.

If this is unlikely, why not pass SB 1067 to give Salem the same authority that every other city in Oregon has outside of the Metro area? If there ever was a difference of opinion on how solid waste should be handled why not give the second largest city in Oregon the ability to negotiate?

Concerns:

- Marion County flow control provides funding and allows county to develop necessary

regional infrastructure to manage solid waste.

***Not true.** With the closure of the incinerator at the end of December the funding that Marion County received from tipping fees at the incinerator ended. At the last City Council Solid Waste Committee meeting Commissioner Cameron told the Committee that the County was “bleeding” with the loss of **\$500,000 a month** that funded their Environmental Services Department.*

- City benefits by Marion County managing solid waste regionally (Earthwise Business network, community outreach and education, coordination of RMA requirements)

There is nothing in SB 1067 that would prevent this from continuing if it was in Salem’s best interests. The loss of revenue from incinerator tipping fees is likely to greatly reduce or eliminate some of these efforts.

- Future solid waste management will likely see more need for county-wide flow control (ReHub – Polk)

Again, there is nothing in SB 1067 that would not allow this if it was in Salem’s best interests.

Please do not oppose SB 1067 which is all about **giving YOU the authority** to exercise **your leadership** over solid waste policy to benefit Salem citizens.

Jim Scheppke, Ward 2
jscheppke@comcast.net

From: [Phil Carver](#)
To: [citycouncil](#); [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Comment on Council 4/28/2025 agenda item 3.3b.
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2025 5:14:20 PM

Mayor Hoy and Members of the City Council:

I am Phil Carver. I reside at 1007 Newport Rd. SE, Salem 97306. I am speaking tonight on behalf of the several hundred Salem members and supporters of 350 Salem regarding agenda item 3.3b, legislative policy on SB 1067.

We were very disappointed to learn that your Legislative Committee supported a staff recommendation to oppose SB 1067 at your meeting a few weeks ago. We were among the Salem constituents of Senator Patterson who suggested the need for legislation to repeal a law that is four decades old that takes away Salem's authority over the disposal of our own solid waste. Salem is the only major city in the state, outside of the Metro area, that doesn't have this authority.

All SB 1067 would do is restore Salem's freedom to work with Marion County. Without the passage of this bill Salem would have no say in what happens regarding our solid waste.

Salem's authority to manage its own waste was taken away in the early 1980s in anticipation of the start-up of the County's solid waste incinerator in Brooks. The County needed to be able to direct all of the solid waste in the county to go there to make it viable. But now the incinerator has been shut down and is unlikely to reopen. That law is no longer needed.

The Legislative Committee was told by staff that SB 1067 was in conflict with another bill, HB 3794, that the City supports. That is INCORRECT. That bill would form a regional task to do long range planning on solid waste. SB 1067 would definitely allow Salem to cooperate with the study and any implementation. Senator Patterson is a sponsor of both bills.

350 Salem also supports SB 1067 because we know that reducing and better managing our solid waste in Salem is a major component of the Salem Climate Action Plan which has eight objectives and 24 strategies concerning solid waste. To carry out our plan effectively, Salem needs to be in charge of our solid waste, and not another unit of local government.

There is nothing in SB 1097 that would prevent Salem from continuing to work cordially and collaboratively with Marion County on solid waste planning and implementation. It would just put us in a good negotiating position with the County, should we need it — if ever. We would not have that without SB 1067.

Finally, we don't believe this matter should be decided tonight in the absence of Councilor Nishioka who chairs the Council Solid Waste Committee. 350 Salem OR has attended nearly all of her committee meetings and we have had several good conversations with her about solid waste policy. We think you need to hear her views on SB 1067 before making a decision.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

From: [Carroll Johnston](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Agenda Item 3.3b re: SB 1067
Date: Friday, April 25, 2025 12:52:59 PM

I am writing to ask the Salem City Council to support SB 1067 that was sponsored by Senator Patterson. This bill that is currently in the Oregon Legislature would give the City of Salem and other larger towns in Marion County control over their own solid waste stream.

It is not true that this bill would impede or prevent Salem from cooperating with a regional solid waste plan as referenced in HB 3794 if City leaders choose to do so. Instead, it merely prevents the Marion County Commissioners from being able to dictate to the City how they should handle their trash. If City leaders choose to cooperate with the County, they can; but if they find flaws in what the County is proposing, they can choose a better course of action.

Many of us were not happy when Marion County Commissioners repeatedly chose to burn trash and thousands of tons imported medical waste annually in an incinerator that spewed toxic substances and huge amounts of greenhouse gases into surrounding communities. The Commissioners seemed unfazed by those negative effects because the incinerator served as a “cash cow“ for the County and provided a source of hidden “tax” money that was never approved by those citizens who had to pay for it. One former Commissioner publicly made fun of the concept of human caused climate change.

The City can make better choices than Marion County has done to date. Emphasis should be placed on waste prevention and reduction, rather than incineration or landfilling. Passage of SB 1067 will give the City much more leverage in the development of regional plans for waste prevention and waste management in the future.

Although for the moment the incinerator appears to have shut down, that does not mean it could not be resurrected, as was the case with another Reworld incinerator in British Columbia after it was bought by a large foreign corporation. The City of Salem should never again allow its trash to become part of such an enterprise.

Please let it be known to the Oregon Legislature that the City of Salem supports SB 1067.

Carroll Johnston

Sent from Carroll's iPhone

From: [Kim Davis](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [citycouncil](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Agenda Item 3.3b
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2025 3:19:36 PM

Dear Salem Mayor and Councilors,

Senator Patterson introduced SB 1067 as another step to protect the health and well being of her constituents and all Oregonians. There is no reason for the Salem City Council to oppose this bill and remove Salem's autonomy over our own solid waste. SB1067 is not in conflict with HB3794 which would provide for much needed long range regional planning for solid waste (and appears to have lukewarm support at best as currently written at this time).

SB 1067 would enable Salem to carry out the objectives and strategies of our Climate Action Plan regarding solid waste without interference from another local government. Further, it would relieve its citizens of the fear that a new corporation could resume trash burning and polluting at a future time with no choice provided to them. Personally, I am totally frustrated knowing that citizens here pay higher hauling fees, and have much fewer options or resources available to them to reduce waste, and to increase composting and recycling, as so many other Oregon municipalities do.

Time is of the essence. Waste management is a rapidly worsening issue that must be addressed. Please don't present barriers to legislative bills that will support us rather than tie our hands.

Thank you.
K Davis
97306

From: rachaelrevolting
To: [citycouncil](#); [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Support for SB1067
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2025 12:06:52 PM

Councilors,

I am writing to ask that you reconsider your planned opposition to SB1067. I am strongly in favor of our city remaining in control of future decisions regarding our solid waste and not turning that over to the county. Knowing about Marion County's historic support for incineration, I am concerned that they could agree to more toxic burning should another private company step in and resume that practice (which is extremely unhealthy for the entire valley community as well as the whole dang planet). It is my understanding that the passage of SB1067 would not stop the possibility of collaboration with regional partners regarding solid waste plans. Therefore, giving up local control of such an important environmental issue seems unnecessary and potentially harmful to our stated climate action goals. I do hope you will at least have discussion about this at Monday's council meeting and come around to see that there is nothing good to be gained by giving away the power to make our own decisions about solid waste policy.

Thank you for your work,

Rachael Atchison
Ward 3

From: [Ray Quisenberry](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Public comment on agenda items 3.3b . Solid waste
Date: Friday, April 25, 2025 8:59:06 PM

To Mayor Hoy and councilors:

My name is Ray Quisenberry. I'm a resident of Ward 1.

I'm writing to voice my support for SB1067, giving Salem authority over our solid waste. My understanding is that we surrendered this authority many years ago, along with other Marion county communities, in order to meet the feed stock supply needs for the Brooks trash burner, making the project viable. However, now that the burner is ceasing operations, we need to rethink if we still want Marion County controlling our solid waste. SB 1067 gives us that option, if we elect to take it.

When making a decision regarding the bill, It should be remembered that in the Salem Climate Action plan, there are several measures that deal with solid waste reduction as a means to reduce GHG emissions. With control of our solid waste restored to Salem, we would have an opportunity to put these measures into practice.

Marion county has never had the climate as a priority, and I've even heard one of the commissioners make a comment questioning climate science just a few years ago. We can't expect any help from the commissioners on the issue of the climate. So it's up to us.

So let's take control of our solid waste, put together a serious zero waste plan, and do the right thing for everyone.

Thank you
Ray Quisenberry
Sent from my iPad