



METRO

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

MEETING SUMMARY
Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Metro Regional Center, Council Annex
March 24, 2005

Members / Alternates Present:

Councilor Rod Park, Chair
Mike Hوجلund
Rick Winterhalter
Jeff Murray
John Lucini
Dave White

Mark Altenhofen
Glenn Zimmerman
Wade Lange
Anita Largent
Mike Miller
Dean Kampf

Matt Korot
Ray Phelps
Lori Stole
Eric Merrill
Mike Leichner
Paul Edwards

Guests and Metro staff:

Janet Matthews
Kathryn Schutte
Jim Watkins
Roy Brower
Meg Lynch
Jeff Gage
Jan Whitworth

Marta McGuire
Bryce Jacobson
Scott Klag
Jennifer Erickson
Melissa Finn
Judy Crockett

Robin Hawley
René Eyerly
Easton Cross
Les Joel
Steve Apotheker
Gina Cubbon

I. Call to Order and Announcements.....Rod Park

- Councilor Rod Park convened the meeting, and asked attendees to introduce themselves.
- A plaque illustrated with an Earth Day Billboard design was presented to Councilor Susan McLain for her work with the Solid Waste & Recycling Department and its committees over the past 10-15 years. The plaque is inscribed:

“To Susan McLain, with great appreciation for your service as Chair of Metro’s Solid Waste Advisory Committee and your overall leadership in regional solid waste policy.”

Additionally, the Councilor was presented with various recycling-themed products, such as a recycled ruler, hat, sloganed t-shirts, a Frisbee made from recycled plastic, and other items.

- Councilor Park asked for any revisions to the minutes of the previous meeting, or a motion to accept. The minutes were approved unanimously by those present.

II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update..... Mike Hوجلund

- Mr. Hوجلund reported on a number of actions by the Regulatory Affairs Division.
 - Greenway Recycling (St. Helens Road, Portland) has been approved as a dry waste reload facility. The facility was previously a yard debris reload, wood waste grinding operation.

Greenway still needs City of Portland approval for landscaping and other site issues, as well as submitting an Operations Plan update to Metro prior to accepting dry waste.

- Allwood Recycling (a yard debris compost facility on Marine Drive, Portland) was issued a notice of non-compliance by Metro for the migration of leachate from their site into Sandy Creek. The flow of leachate was stemmed within weeks of the notice; Allwood is now developing a professionally-engineered stormwater management plan.
- On March 14, Metro published a public notice for Woodco, a yard debris reload in unincorporated Washington County. Woodco has been a wood fuel and chipping operation since 1953 and would like to become a yard debris and wood waste reload facility. Metro had ordered the operation to cease reload activities in 2003 until such time that they obtained proper land use approval. The County has now issued them such approval, so they are moving forward with their application.
- This year's Rate Review Committee is up and running, Mr. Hoglund said, noting that some members are also on SWAC. He gave a brief bio of the membership; the Committee is chaired by Councilor Park and will be meeting until at least mid-April. Their charge is to look at the allocation methods for Metro's rates (including the Regional System Fee) and how they impact the region. Their recommendation will be brought before SWAC and then the Council.
- Metro's Business Paper Recycling ad campaign for 2005 will be previewed at the April 7 SWAC meeting – that date was being held for a tentative meeting and is now confirmed.
- The new MetroPaint facility (4825 N. Basin, Portland) is ready to open – the April grand opening date will be announced soon; all SWAC members will be invited. He showed a picture of the new facility, which will house latex paint recycling operations as well selling paint and accessories.
- Mr. Hoglund asked Janet Matthews to give an update on state legislation related to solid waste:
 - A state-wide electronic waste (“e-waste”) recovery bill has been introduced. Several groups support the bill and will attend the first hearing for it on Tuesday, March 29. The Bill, SB740, includes an “advance recycling fee” – a charge at the time of purchase to cover recycling at the end of the product's life. It's the first proposal Ms. Matthews knows of in the US that would establish a third-party organization to manage the funds and operations of the program.
 - Ms. Matthews also mentioned a tire recycling bill “that's virtually identical” to the one Metro supported in the previous legislative session.
 - Another bill being introduced would require the Oregon DEQ to put together an advisory committee to examine waste reduction goals that are in statute. “Metro's position on the bill,” Ms. Matthews said, “is that we consider it reasonable to examine the goals – we're engaged in that right now as party of the RSWMP process... We're generally neutral on the bill [because] we're already doing the work that's envisioned for this region, but we'll certainly participate in a working group if the bill is passed.”

Discussion of this bill by SWAC members included Ray Phelps, who viewed Metro's neutrality as appearing to be negative. Ms. Matthews and Councilor Park disagreed, saying that such a review is something already ongoing at Metro so rather than spread staff time more thinly by actively supporting the bill, Metro would prefer to just commit to being part of the advisory committee if it is, indeed, formed. Washington County's Rick Winterhalter added, “To me, as I look at that bill, it makes no sense to me whatsoever. We're in a constant examination of those goals, we continually have a dialogue at the local

government level with the haulers and the businesses that are carrying out the business of recycling. It seems like an extra....I just don't understand the motivation at all."

Councilor Park said he understands it to be a way to make sure the goals are reasonable, and to get the issue back in front of the legislature. Not all jurisdictions around the state have met their goal, he said, "So it's not an attempt by Metro to shift responsibility away from us, it's just the question of re-examining. If we're at, say 59%, and we want to get to 62% - if it's going to cost some huge amount, is that exactly where we want to go?"

Councilor McLain added that Metro has no intention of being negative about the bill, "but as Rick [Winterhalter] said, we're already doing the job. There's no money attached to this bill. They're not giving us resources to do another type of report, so what we're trying to do is say 'we do this work already' and we want to see what the rest of the state says about this." While Metro would join in and be a good partner if it goes through, the Councilor said, "At this point it doesn't even have funding."

III. Annual Waste Reduction Program Plan.....Meg Lynch

Councilor Park introduced Meg Lynch, who presented the FY 2005-06 proposed budget and plan for Metro's Waste Reduction Program. The regional recovery rate for 2003 (the most recent complete data) was 57% - up a full three percentage points from the previous year, Ms. Lynch announced. The largest gains were made in metal and paper recycling, wood recovery, and yard debris recovery. "We believe," she said, "that the annual waste reduction plan is an integral part of helping achieve those impressive recovery goals. It's a huge part of the work we do in the Waste Reduction Division, it constitutes 85% of our budget request for next year."

In existence for nearly 16 years, the Plan was instituted in 1990 because of a compliance order from DEQ that instructed Metro to implement its waste reduction plan and to be the organizing agency for local recycling initiatives. (Note: A copy of the Year 14 performance measures assessment and the Year 16 draft plan were included in the agenda packet.) As part of the Plan, Metro began to provide funds to local governments to help them set up and maintain recycling programs. Money was given on a per-capita basis, roughly in proportion to what ratepayers were contributing to Metro's Solid Waste Fund (which funded the program). Local government expenditures towards waste reduction and recycling programs have steadily increased; in FY 2003-04, local governments invested an average of nearly ten times the funding that Metro provided to them.

In FY 1997-98, a portion of the per capita-based funding was set aside to develop targeted competitive grants to focus on innovative projects that weren't being addressed otherwise.

A performance analysis of the Plan was done in 2000, and showed that while curbside success exceeded expectations (95% participation), more work was needed in the areas of commercial, C&D (construction / demolition) and commercial organics. Consequently, Metro and local governments developed new regional initiatives. Additional performance measures were adopted in FY 2003-04.

Ms. Lynch reviewed the current program, which the proposed budget maintains, and then outlined proposed changes for FY 2005-06. These changes shift some resources to target program areas needing greater results.

- Per capita grant funding for those jurisdictions which receive \$100,000 or more will be given in two portions – the second portion will be contingent upon Metro receiving interim progress

reports from the local government. (Requested budget: \$636,803 – a slight increase over FY 2004-05.)

- Targeted competitive grants will focus on multi-family recycling (apartments, condos, duplexes, etc.) In addition, grant applications will be available to entities other than just local governments and non-profits, and funds will be allowed to carry-over to the next fiscal year “if proposals are not sufficiently rigorous.” (Requested budget: \$80,000 – half the amount that was allocated in FY 2004-05.)
- Technical assistance, education, and outreach to the commercial sector will increase in the waste reduction initiatives portion of the Plan. (Requested budget: \$1,027,000 – an increase from FY 200-05 because of the increased tech assistance for commercial sector.

At the end of the presentation, Committee discussion of the Plan began with a few questions about the report contained in the agenda packet. Waste Connections’ Eric Merrill asked how efficiency can be measured. “The Region needs to meet the goal, we have a limited number of dollars to spend on it, and yet we’re not looking at the most efficient ways to spend the dollars.” He maintained that just looking at accountability and effectiveness doesn’t address if it’s cost-effective.

Mr. Merrill referred to page 15 of the report, specifically vermicomposting at schools. He read that \$43,000 was requested for the project, which he calculated to a cost of \$13,000 / ton. Ms. Lynch pointed out that the table shows that amount was for five projects listed in the same cell. Still, Mr. Merrill said that “I don’t see any analysis of whether or not we’re spending the money efficiently.” Councilor Park responded that while his point was understood, it may have not been the best example. “Education is never efficient,” he said, and Mr. Merrill agreed. Ms. Lynch added that waste prevention, too, is hard to measure.

Joining in the fray, Mr. Winterhalter commented that including how many students were reached could be somewhat helpful, because those students hopefully repeat what they’ve learned at home. “To only look at it as dollars spent, tons recovered, is really missing those other intrinsic benefits that are public good and very hard to measure,” he asserted. Councilor McLain agreed, saying that what’s being taught is an environmental ethic.

ORRA’s Dave White referred to the very first page of the report, noting that while this discussion was about the Plan, his question was whatever happened to the contingency plans developed to help reach the 62% recovery goal. “At some point at SWAC, I’d like a report of the status,” he said. Mr. Hogle replied that “The reason they’re contingency programs is that they’re difficult to implement.” Discussions on how to do more dry waste recovery (“mandatory MRFing”) have begun; three options have been developed internally. “Hopefully we can roll those out in the next month or so to start getting more feedback on that,” he said. The commercial organics plan has begun, Mr. Hogle added; a more complete update will be presented at a future SWAC meeting.

Councilor Park wrapped up the agenda item, asking for a motion to approve recommendation of the proposed Plan for FY 2005-06. Judy Crockett, filling in for City of Portland representatives, moved to approve; the City of Gresham’s Matt Korot seconded.. After some further discussion and clarification, the motion was approved unanimously.

Councilor Park excused himself to attend a bill signing in Damascus, turning the meeting over to Mr. Hogle.

IV. System Sustainability Goals René Eyerly

Mr. Hogle introduced Ms. Eyerly, who did a follow-up to her presentation at last month’s meeting. A subcommittee has been put together to discuss sustainability goals to be included in the RSWMP update, she reported. The first meeting will be spent providing “concrete, tangible examples of sustainability goals that have been set by different businesses and jurisdictions,” as

well as introducing members to various frameworks they may wish to use. She previewed future meetings (as outlined in the agenda packet), and noted that “I really look at this as the first phase in setting sustainability goals. Goals tend to be broad, over-arching statements.” Next steps will include determination of what additional analysis is needed in setting specific targets. The subcommittee will report back to the SWAC and to the Council.

V. Regional Policies for the RSWMP Janet Matthews

Ms. Matthews began her presentation by reviewing last month’s SWAC discussion of regional policies for the RSWMP and followed-up on the items set aside at that meeting for further discussion.

“What we are doing today,” Ms. Matthews explained, “is just beginning down the road of some of the first of these policies and getting your feedback. What SWAC is really here for is to advise Metro on policy, and so this is perfectly in keeping with the purpose of this body as we’re putting these direction-setting chapters together for the updated RSWMP (Chapters 3, 4, and 5). Those chapters will have the framework of our vision, values, regional policies, and then goals and objectives for waste reduction, and for facilities and services.” Over the next several months, she continued, SWAC will be discussing these chapters in detail. “Policies,” Ms. Matthews reminded the group, are defined as “high-level statements to guide and determine present and future decisions and courses of action.” The Plan policies, therefore, are directed at the region’s policy-makers.

Moving forward, Ms. Matthews directed the group’s attention to the last page of the agenda packet, “Regional Sustainability Policies.” Three on this list had been set aside for further discussion. Descriptions of draft policies were handed out (attached) while she explained the format used.

Policy 4.0

Ms. Matthews explained the hand-out, referencing. She noted that nothing in the policy addresses the weight that would be accorded various criteria. “That might vary,” she said, “and decisions would certainly be made on a case-by-case basis. I don’t think we need to get into the fine detail in these policy statements.”

John Lucini asked, “When you evaluate the economic comparisons, how far downstream would you look for economic impacts?” For example, curbside recycling has increased recovery and reduced collection costs, “But further downstream, at the processing end, it may require the end-user of that raw material to invest either in more equipment to deal with more contamination, or to drive up disposal fees on that end. Do you envision looking at those impacts?” Mr. Hoglund said that the model will look at the system as a whole, across the spectrum of collection, hauling, generator costs, etc.

No further discussion or questions developed on this item.

Policy 4.1

This policy was not included in the handout. Ms. Matthews read the policy aloud, “Sustainability practices for the solid waste system may be implemented voluntarily or required by regulation.”

Ms. Matthews reflected on whether this statement is needed. “I think we just wanted to identify that sustainability practices can be implemented in either of those ways,” she said. She proposed that perhaps policy direction could be provided on when regulations might be suitable for sustainability programs.

Reminding the group that Metro has a policy of funding waste reduction programs, as long as they contribute towards the recovery rate, and they’re technologically and economically feasible, Ms. Matthews asked, “Is there guidance in this Plan for when governments in the Region might adopt a

regulatory approach to implement sustainability practices, or is that just a bunch of quicksand and we don't need to wade in there?"

Mr. Korot responded, "It's a big thing of quicksand." Several Committee members echoed his thought: "Yes, a big thing of quicksand." "I can't even see the other side." and all chuckled, understanding the conundrum.

Ms. Matthews acknowledged she thought it might not be a popular idea, but had felt it appropriate to at least broach it with the group. Mr. Hogle asked if the policy would just be dropped entirely; Ms. Matthews said, yes, but the sustainability work group may come out with not only goals, but perhaps a recommendation for policies.

"My point for the Committee," Mr. Hogle said, "is every once in awhile there's a regulation that everybody – or most everybody agrees – is necessary. They're few and far between. If that time ever happens, and the discussion says, 'Remember, we dropped the regulatory piece at that SWAC meeting back in 2005, so we can't look at a regulatory measure.' So I don't think this precludes us from it, but we just don't want to call it to attention [at this time]." The group largely nodded agreement.

There was further discussion on the matter; Mr. White pondered aloud if it should be left in as a placeholder, but also acknowledged that even if taken out, the goals and objectives under 4.0 would address it. Mr. Hogle added that a statement could be included in a definition section or the like, explaining how things are implemented in this system, and reference the various tools there.

Policy 4.1 will be removed.

Policy 5.0

Ms. Matthews explained that this is a new piece, "Provision of Integrated Public Services," which would apply to regional transfer stations. The provision, which includes household hazardous waste as well as source-separated recycling, is already part of Metro Code, but would expand to the Forest Grove franchise when it is up for renewal in 2007.

Mr. Murray asked who would pay for the services provided? Currently, Ms. Matthews replied, the cost is recovered through the Regional System Fee. It's an excellent question, she said. Mr. White said the provision seems to promote public self-hauling, which he feels doesn't fit under the heading of sustainability policies.

Which RSWMP policy category this would fit under is something to consider, Ms. Matthews said. "We had second thoughts about it being here as opposed to the System-Wide portion." Councilor McLain agreed the piece is a better fit under System-Wide, but then Mr. White had concerns about promoting cross-purposes (sustainability versus making disposal easier). "For the record," Mr. White stated, "maybe we don't want to make it as easy in the next ten years."

"We deal, at the Council level, with conflicting goals all the time," Councilor McLain held. "We have the public saying 'We want this service, we need this service, and you're not providing it any other way.' So we want to make sure it's part of the system. I agree with [Mr. White] that there are conflicting values, and I don't mind it being noted, but I think we have to decide if we're going to give the public the service they ask for."

Further comment included the City of Portland's Judy Crockett, who noted that self-haul does exist and as long as it does, "it's a positive thing to have the ability to do recycling and some of the other things that we want to keep out of the wastestream, away from moving towards the landfill as garbage." Mr. Merrill warned that there may be an unintended consequence: While understanding the reason for this being in Metro Code, he said that it locks the Metro transfer stations into providing these services for the duration of the Plan. "Whether that's good, bad, or indifferent, it's a consequence you need to take into account," Mr. Merrill concluded.

Ms. Matthews said that Mr. Merrill's point did come up during staff discussion, that perhaps the policy shouldn't be aimed at a particular type of facility. Perhaps it should simply state that integrated public services will be provided at some class(es) of facilities. Knowing that things change, especially over a ten-year time, an amendment could certainly be made later if the structure of the transfer stations is altered. Mr. Merrill added that he felt that the overall policy piece sounded more like a Code piece than policy.

"We've been asked to look at our household hazardous waste operations, and examine it against potential other models," Mr. Hoglund informed the Committee. The study will be done under an RFP or RFB (Request for Proposal, or Bids) and may be expanded to include household hazardous waste disposal and collection throughout the region. "It there's a different model out there than just our two transfer stations... it would technically be in violation of this policy," he said, so revising the language might be a good idea.

Mike Leichner of Pride Disposal and Recycling agreed, suggesting the verbiage, "will be provided within the Region's solid waste system." In that way, it can be handled through the franchise system.

Waste Management's Dean Kampfer commented that the policy belongs in the System-Wide portion rather than under Sustainability, and that the location of the Forest Grove station is important to more rural self-haulers. As for the hazardous waste portion, he, too is curious about how it would be paid. "If the facility pays, do they get part of the \$4/ton that's being contributed to hazardous waste? And I'd hate to see those facilities have to duplicate Metro's Latex Paint Program – I think you've got a great program that should be built on. Yes, the policy should be more general rather than identifying specific items."

"I guess I just heard you argue that somewhere out in the 'hinterlands' people should be provided all those services," Mr. Winterhalter intoned. Regional transfer stations are required to have DEQ permits, those with DEQ permits for solid waste facilities are required to provide public recycling, he continued. Household hazardous waste is more difficult to provide and requires further discussion. "Maybe that's what comes out of this policy: It forces us to discuss how we're going to do that. Otherwise, maybe it just lies there, fallow, and every time a new regional transfer station comes up, nothing happens." Whenever a new facility is planned, Mr. Winterhalter concluded, there should be discussion about how the public is being served by the system. "If they want to become regional, they step up."

Ms. Matthews summarized the comments, saying that it seems the Committee feels comfortable in making Policy 5.0 "less reflective of regional transfer stations, and more general, to ensure that these integrated public services are provided."

Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives

Drawing the Committee's attention to page three of the table within the handout entitled "Draft Chapter 3" (attached), Ms. Matthews began to review items that are in the current Plan but are proposed for deletion.

"The current Plan, Chapter 5, is titled Regional Policies, but is made up of Goals and Objectives," Ms. Matthews explained. Some of these were policy statements, some goals, some objectives. Staff has worked to separate those that were policy rather than goals or objectives; other things have been moved, and some are being considered for elimination.

Goal 9 – This item, though entitled "Sustainability" refers to economic sustainability. It states, "Secondary resource management is a self-sustaining operation." Because of the Regional System Fee Credit and other subsidizing programs, not only is the goal unrealized, if it were realized many people would be unhappy for various reasons. "It certainly seemed to be advocating guidance,"

Ms. Matthews said, “that is inconsistent with what is going on in the region.” She asked for any comments. There were none.

Goal 9 of this section will be deleted.

Objective 9.1 – “Include both direct and indirect costs in the price of goods and services such that true least-cost options are chosen by businesses, governments and citizens when making purchasing decisions.” Up for deletion because its intent was unclear, Ms. Matthews said. She asked the group if anyone who was present during the creation of this RSWMP remembered why this Objective had been added, and if there’s still a need for it.

Mr. Murray said he thought it was “trying to lead us down the road of looking at the holistic cost, all environmental and economic... It was the first blush of trying to get beyond the obvious costs.” Mr. Hoglund commented that the phrase used in the objective, “least-cost options” was originally coined within the utilities industry – primarily electric - in the late 1980s. It eventually became popular to try to apply the same idea to other areas. It ultimately failed, Mr. Hoglund said. “In electricity, you either have demand management or power supply. It’s easy to get the least cost.” In so other arenas, it doesn’t make as much sense because of all the externalities.

“I don’t think we’d want to drop the concept,” Lori Stole said. No, that wouldn’t be the case, Ms. Matthews assured her. “I think we’re covering [this objective] in other ways, other places, so we’re not going to lose that concept,” she said.

Objective 9.1 – delete.

Objective 9.2 – “Develop markets for secondary material that are stable and provide sufficient incentive for separation of recoverable material from other waste and/or the post-collection recovery of material.” Ms. Matthews said that when looking at market development today, it’s positive that, for instance, that Metro has created a market for recycled paint. “But I think of the Recycling Business Assistance Program that this agency developed; we never really got any bites on that. It wasn’t very successful.” There is a recommended policy under the new Sustainability section that addresses recycling markets. The reason it’s up for deletion, Ms. Matthews concluded, is that A) it’s not a policy, it’s phrased as a goal, and B) developing markets for secondary material feels out of reach.

Councilor McLain gave some background on the item, saying that it was an important piece for Council at the time it was written. “We did feel it was a policy,” she said, “that Metro would get involved – not just in supporting successful market development – but that we would actually try to help, and that if we weren’t the agency that knew how to produce a market, we would at least try to give funds, or try to give technical assistance, or try to give something that was real.” The paint success story is a good one, the Councilor said. “The whole idea was that we should at least – if we want to walk our talk – try to produce something that would be helpful to others in private industry, and others partnering with public and private to get going on that.” Everyone understands that markets go up and down and that this is very difficult to do, she continued, “but I think it is a goal. We made a conscious effort as a Council to make it a goal, and we put it in the RSWMP [because] we felt it was one of those last items that we have to learn to do, and do well, if we really want to ever do anything besides recycle.”

Wade Lange felt that the Fork It Over! campaign is another success story of market creation. Mr. Hoglund wondered if this is properly captured in the Sustainability chapter, “or is it pretty weak?” Councilor McLain said it was weak, “It says we’ll ‘support,’ it doesn’t say that we’re going to try to develop or give resources.”

“I think it says ‘foster,’” Mr. Hoglund offered. “Foster’s worse than ‘support,’” the Councilor rejoined.

Ms. Matthews spoke of the different connotations of “market.” She felt that by some definitions, Fork It Over! might be a reuse rather than a market, which fits under sustainability.

Mr. Merrill recalled that what the group had originally been aiming at was to create long-term markets that were stable and not simply government-driven. “A jump start,” Mr. Murray added.

“I don’t think the idea of market development will be lost whether we revise the two policies that currently refer to markets, or we have some other goal or objectives pertaining to markets is anybody’s guess. But I’m sure we’ll have an updated Plan that has items on market development in it,” Ms. Matthews maintained. Staff just felt it should come out. Councilor McLain still felt that what’s being put in this objective’s place isn’t strong enough. “I just think the words need to be stronger than ‘foster.’”

There will be something related to market development within the Toxicity and Waste Reduction chapter, Ms. Matthews said.

The Committee will be receiving a piece following along the lines of this review for each policy area, Ms. Matthews said. She indicated that some proposed policies are “caught up in discussions that Council’s having on the Disposal System and decisions they will be making in the near future on that subject. Therefore, some items may not be addressed at SWAC until later.”

VI. Other Business and Adjourn.....Rod Park

- Mr. White proposed that Policy 1 include, “as a pre-statement, consistent with State Statute: *After consideration of technical and economic feasibility, solid waste management practices will be guided by the following hierarchy.* So at least there’s some context for deciding if something can or cannot be done.” He and Ms. Matthews had discussed it, and planned to bring it up at this meeting, but time ran short. Mr. Hogle said it can be discussed at the next meeting.
- To a question by Mark Altenhofen regarding the letter to Mr. White within the agenda packet, Mr. Hogle said, “Right now, there are RSWMP collection issues in the Plan. Defacto, it will come up to this group and others – it will be addressed.

Mr. Hogle thanked the group for their attendance, and adjourned the meeting at 12 noon.

**Next meeting:
Thursday, April 28, 2005
Room 370 A/B**

Documents to be kept with the record of the meeting (copies available upon request):

- Draft regional policies

gbc
M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\Agendas\2005\SWAC032405min.DOC
Queue

REVIEW OF
DRAFT REGIONAL POLICIES
FOR THE RSWMP UPDATE

SHORT TITLE: Evaluation criteria for waste reduction or other sustainability alternatives

PROPOSED POLICY: “Waste reduction or other sustainability alternatives identified for business practices or programs will be evaluated based on (a) technological feasibility; (b) economic comparison to current practice; and (c) net environmental benefits.”

BACKGROUND: The current RSWMP states: “The economic and environmental impacts of waste reduction and disposal alternatives are compared on a level playing field in order that waste reduction alternatives have an equal opportunity of being implemented.” This is meant to guide the evaluation of alternatives by stating that economic and environmental impacts between alternatives and disposal will be compared, though it’s not clear what is meant by a “on a level playing field.”

The current RSWMP also states: “After consideration of technical and economic feasibility, Metro will support a higher system cost for waste reduction practices to accomplish the regional waste reduction and recycling goals.” This clearly means that, under certain conditions, Metro is willing to pay more for waste reduction practices that will help achieve the regional waste reduction goal.

NEED: As the region seeks further progress in waste reduction and sustainability over the next decade, can more clearly-stated guidance be provided as to how alternatives should be evaluated? The proposed policy statement attempts to provide needed clarity without changing likely intent of statements in the current Plan, cited above.

POLICY IN PRACTICE: In evaluating diesel filters to reduce particulate emissions of long-haul garbage trucks, Metro would consider technical feasibility. If the filters were technically feasible, direct and indirect costs and benefits of installing filters versus retaining current practice would be evaluated. Weight accorded to each criteria might vary; decisions likely made on a case by case basis.

M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\Agendas\2005\3.24.policy.sustain1.doc

REVIEW OF
DRAFT REGIONAL POLICIES
FOR THE RSWMP UPDATE

SHORT TITLE: Provision of integrated public services

PROPOSED POLICY: “Integrated public drop-off services, including source-separated recycling, disposal, and household hazardous wastes will be provided by regional transfer stations.”

BACKGROUND: Transfer stations in the Metro region are either regional or local. The primary distinctions between the two are tonnage authorizations and service requirements. Regional transfer stations are not limited in the amount of waste they are authorized to accept, unless there are local land use restrictions. Regional transfer stations are also required to provide a range of integrated services to the public.* These provisions are in Metro Code, but not noted in the current RSWMP.

NEED: It is in the public interest to ensure that certain facilities in the region deliver integrated services identified in the proposed policy. (As proposed, the policy regarding provision of integrated public services identifies regional transfer facilities as the provider because that is consistent with current Metro Code.)

POLICY IN PRACTICE: When the Forest Grove franchise is up for renewal in 2007, this policy, consistent with Metro Code, would require a broader range of services for public customers if the facility is to remain a regional transfer station.

M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\Agendas\2005\3.24.policy.sustain3.doc

* Applies to any franchise issued after July 1, 2000. Therefore, currently applicable only to the two Metro facilities, not Forest Grove.