



METRO

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

MEETING SUMMARY
Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Metro Regional Center, Room 370A/B
April 27, 2006

Members / Alternates Present:

Councilor Rod Park, Chair	Susan Ziolkko	Ralph Gilbert
Mike Hogle	John Lucini	Dave White
Mike Leichner	Ray Phelps	Mike Miller
Bruce Walker	Dave Garten	Dean Kampfer
Paul Edwards	Glenn Zimmerman	

Guests and Metro staff:

Janet Matthews	Janet Malloch	Dan Wilson
Todd Irvine	Jeff Hampton	Jeff Gage
Brad Botkin	John Drucker	Max Brittingham
Wendy Fisher	Easton Cross	Pat Vernon
Lee Barrett	Bill Metzler	Steve Kraten
Jim Watkins	Martha McGuire	

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

- Councilor Park opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. There was a fire the previous day at Far West Fibers’ Hillsboro facility, he announced. Not many details were known, but Mike Hogle said that materials were being diverted to FWF’s Southeast Portland facility until things are put back in shape, they estimate about two weeks. The City of Portland’s Bruce Walker added that he had spoken with FWF’s Jeff Murray; no one was injured in the blaze, the crew reacted very well. Damage is being assessed; no cause was known as yet.
- A motion for approval of the minutes from March 23’s SWAC meeting was made by WRI/Allied’s Ray Phelps and seconded by Mr. Walker. Approval was unanimous.

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

- Mr. Hogle reported that 440 grant applications (totaling \$959,000) were received by the Nature in Neighborhoods program by the April 5 deadline. Money for this project’s grants comes from the Recycling / Recovery Rate Stabilization Fund. “When we over-collect Excise Tax and it gets to a certain amount, Council can choose to use that for other activities at Metro,” he explained. Nearly \$1 million is available, but will be divided into two rounds of grants for natural habitat restoration and related cleanup activities. Of the applications received, Mr. Hogle continued, 16 were solid waste-related. Of the 32 recommended to Council for approval just under half (15) are related to solid waste. Council will hold

discussion of the grants at its May 2 work session; approval of the Resolution is expected to be on the agenda for May 11's Council Session.

Approximately \$560,000 will be granted in the first round of applications; the next opportunity to apply will occur in September or October; Councilor Park encouraged solid waste industry representatives to partner with community groups or others and apply for grants. Mr. Phelps mentioned that his firm had spoken to one group, who gave the impression that they didn't really know how to use the haulers. Councilor Park said it's possible they didn't realize all the resources available to companies such as Allied. More partnerships will likely occur in future rounds, he said, as people see what kinds of projects are possible. Waste Management's Dean Kampfer said his company has been involved in similar projects, partnering with a school to clear a site, as well as doing some educational support.

- The Rate Review Committee has incorporated the Rate Policy Subcommittee's recommendations (as presented to SWAC) into this year's rate-setting for Metro's transfer stations. Preliminary numbers have the Transaction Fee (which is paid only by Metro transfer station customers) being tiered between self-haul (approx. \$8.50) and Metro automated scale customers (roughly \$3.00). Mr. Hoglund noted that without a split, the Transaction Fee would actually have gone down to @ \$7.00 (from the current \$7.50) to reflect an estimate of higher tonnage. The tip fee, which is \$71.41 this year, will be recommended to Council at \$69.96 for next fiscal year. "The increase in tonnage out-paces the inflation factors in our contracts, so we can lower the tip fee accordingly," Mr. Hoglund explained. These figures (and a complete run-down of the rate components) will be presented to the Council for approval.
- Disposal System Planning Project update: Consulting firm CH2M Hill likely won't have any information for public presentation until June. There will be a progress report at the Council work session on May 16, however, Mr. Hoglund said. Some appraisals have been done on Metro's transfer stations; legal and operational research is also being conducted. Focus groups continue to look at the project, as well; results of those will be presented to Council. In June, staff hopes to be ready to present the three different scenarios and how they fit the various criteria. At that time, Mr. Hoglund concluded, there may be a ranking of which looks good, not as good, etc.
- In January, Mr. Hoglund reminded SWAC members, a project to look at environmental clean-up and "beneficial use" materials accepted at landfills was being launched. The contract was awarded to URS; they're researching this matter "to help us better analyze the rates we charge for clean-up materials and beneficial use materials that are accepted at regional landfills." Landfill owners will likely be contacted by URS in the next several weeks; results will be presented to SWAC for further discussion.
- Lastly, Mr. Hoglund showed the group a recent award the Solid Waste & Recycling Department received from the Oregon Food Bank, for providing \$375,000 in grants to the organization. Projects related to those grants include providing a refrigerated truck to Washington County, and dozens of freezers, refrigerators, canopies for local agencies served by the Food Bank. Other award recipients included Providence Health System and the annual Waterfront Blues Festival.
- In general discussion of the Director's Update, Mr. Walker commented that while he fully supports the rate decrease as recommended, it needs to be understood that doesn't trickle down to the rate-payer automatically. The City of Portland, for instance, foresees an increase in its solid waste rates because of fuel increases and several other factors. Mr. Phelps added that while Metro's rate is decreasing, the agency has still not committed to a full cost-of-service model. Because of Metro's continued public goods model subsidies, private facilities have to charge higher rates, he stressed. Councilor Park agreed that's one of the conundrums of rate-

setting. To help keep the rate from rising dramatically in the past, Metro has used Reserve Account funds, he said. "We're in a position now to pay down the rest of our [bonds]," which would lead to an even lower tip fee. Disposal System Planning should help sort all that out, the Councilor assured.

III. Key Elements of the Interim Waste Reduction Plan..... Janet Matthews

Councilor Park introduced the next agenda item, reviewing that it had been agreed upon to move ahead with the waste reduction portion of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) while waiting for DSP decisions before the full Plan would be finalized and released.

Ms. Matthews asked how many members had at least had a chance to take a quick look at the Plan, which had been emailed just days earlier. A few nodded or raised their hands. Hard copies would be available following the meeting, Ms. Matthews informed the group, and a full discussion would take place at the next SWAC meeting. This update would just be to highlight some key elements needing the Committee's attention. As the Plan is still in draft form, she asked that any errors, inconsistencies, readability issues, etc. please be brought to her attention. (As an example of an inconsistency, Ms. Matthews mentioned that she discovered the term "product stewardship" defined in slightly different ways in the document.)

A brief background of the project followed. SWAC has reviewed components of the Plan periodically over the last several months, Ms. Matthews said, and was given an earlier draft version in September. The Oregon DEQ was then given a draft that had some further changes; they sent back some very helpful comments, largely concerning implementation and compliance issues, to which staff responded. DEQ comments are not contained in the draft itself, but staff can supply those comments and staff's responses upon request, Ms. Matthews added.

The official comment period for the Draft Plan expires in early June, Ms. Matthews informed the group, both the final draft and an online survey are open to the public through Metro's website during this period. She encouraged everyone to take that survey and please add comments. "You can also submit a marked-up Plan to us," Ms. Matthews said, "and the May SWAC meeting will be an additional opportunity for getting comments on the record." Responses to comments will be completed in June. By July or August, the Draft Plan will be presented to Metro Council and the DEQ for their approval. Assuming DSP proceeds on-schedule, the completed Waste Reduction Plan will be folded into the RSWMP early in 2007, after another round of public comment, she added.

"I think that I should again clarify why this Waste Reduction Plan is important," Ms. Matthews stated. "There are a lot of things we bring to SWAC for discussion, for comment, helping us to shape things. Obviously, [the Plan] is important because it's required by the DEQ and we want to comply with what's required in state law. It's also important because the direction that's in this plan is the basis for millions of dollars that will be spent in the region over the next ten years, by both the public and the private sector. But lastly, and perhaps most importantly," she continued, "[the Plan] continues to push for more progress in resource conservation. We all talk about sustainability more and more; [this plan represents] the very heart of sustainability – preserving resources for future generations. That's why our work in this area is still so important, [and] as the Plan ably points out, there's still a lot of work to be done and a lot of relevance to our work."

Ms. Matthews gave a brief preview of the Plan's format. The Executive Summary provides a problem statement and vision for the future, she said, and highlighted the purpose of each chapter. Chapter 2, Ms. Matthews noted, provides hard numbers about trends in the waste reduction system, as well as giving a good explanation of how the region can achieve its goal of 64% recovery by 2009. Continuing through the chapters, she pointed out that Chapter 5, "Plan Implementation" deals solely with implementing waste reduction programs and activities. Other program areas such

as education, product stewardship, and hazardous waste will be handled through the SWAC, Metro Council, and work groups. The Plan's Appendices, Ms. Matthews concluded, has a "handy reference sheet for plan goals and objectives," and a plethora of other useful information, including a glossary of terms.

While reading the Plan, Ms. Matthews said, there are several things she'd like the members to think about and perhaps comment on at the next meeting, though she stressed that "Nothing is off the table." ("You don't have to tell this group that," Mr. Phelps voiced with a smile.)

1. "Do we connect the problems with the solutions very well?" Ms. Matthews said. Look at the problems or issues that the plan seeks to address, versus the adequacy of the response. If anything in the plan doesn't clearly show how the problems noted in the Executive Summary are going to be tackled, please note that.
2. Plan roles: Why are there no numbers beyond 64%? There are no other date-based goals beyond 2009, Ms. Matthews pointed out, because future goals may not be weight-based. The idea of toxicity related goals and other alternatives are being looked into. While 64% is the short-term goal, she added, product stewardship is the long-range goal. "There are arguments to be made that we could establish some in-between goals, and we can always proceed to do that and amend the Plan," Ms. Matthews said. Goals recommended by the Sustainability Work Group are also in the offing; these are an additional set of objectives for the region, and will involve a lot of work. They are not referenced in this plan. "I will be interested in feedback [about goals] at the next meeting, because I think we have a range of opinions on this area," Ms. Matthews said.
3. Responsiveness to public input: While summarized in the introduction chapter, Ms. Matthews would also like members to see if their own earlier input and concerns have been addressed within the Plan.
4. Roles and responsibilities: Does the Plan get it right? The description of the waste reduction system, for instance, with the map of facilities (which, Ms. Matthews mentioned, purposely did not include certain facilities such as reloads and landfills, concentrating instead on facilities that do processing for recovery and/or recycling).
5. Plan implementation: Is it clear how programs will be implemented, and by whom? Is the relationship of the annual work plan to the Waste Reduction Plan itself clear, and does the implementation schedule (in Appendices) make it clear when various objectives will be addressed?

Any other comments are welcomed as well, Ms. Matthews concluded. SWAC members are asked to give real attention to the details contained within the Plan because they are regional leaders in their fields, she said, and many will be directly involved in the implementation. "It will serve to make a good plan better," she said.

ORRA's Max Brittingham asked about the Plan being "Interim." Ms. Matthews replied that the Waste Reduction Plan is part of the RSWMP which is still being updated, and won't be complete until DSP is decided upon. Some components of the RSWMP waste reduction section were significantly out of date, so the Department felt it best to do an update now, she said, and then merge it with the remainder of the RSWMP when updated.

Mr. Kampfer asked which chapters have changed the most since the previous draft; everything except Chapters 3 and 4, Ms. Matthews replied. Mr. Kampfer mentioned, too, that he found the link to the Plan itself somewhat difficult to locate within the online survey; Ms. Matthews agreed, and said she would forward that comment.

IV. 200,000 More Tons of Dry Waste Recovery Lee Barrett

Introducing this agenda item, Councilor Park said that staff is considering reworking the “Mandatory MRFing” title, amongst comments that it sounds draconian. When the subject of mandatory MRFing was first broached, it pertained only to C&D (construction and demolition debris), but expanded to include all dry waste. He turned the proceedings over to Waste Reduction & Outreach Division Manager Lee Barrett for an update of the issue.

Mr. Barrett referred to the decision matrix that had been presented at January’s SWAC meeting. The matrix was used to narrow choices for Council to recommend a direction for staff to go with newer waste reduction programs. “I’ll be clear about this, and we’re trying to be fairly clear about this in the Plan, as well. We really are stepping away from the ‘opportunity to recycle’ model,” Mr. Barrett said, that had been employed regionally for well over a decade. The strategy had been to provide education and the opportunity to participate in existing programs, he said. The RSWMP Contingency Plan Work Group came up with the recommendations for ways to reach the 62% goal of that time. That goal was not reached, and so a more regulatory approach is being looked at now, Mr. Barrett explained. “We’re talking to you today to try and formulate some programs that are more regulatory in nature than this region has been used to,” he advised.

Through the decision matrix, programs for mandatory C&D and dry waste processing, and mandatory business recycling proved to best represent the overall values of SWAC membership, Mr. Barrett continued. Staff took those results to the Council, who then gave the go-ahead.

To reach 2009 goals, 90,000 additional dry waste tons and 125,000 more tons from the business sector are needed, Mr. Barrett informed the group. Staff will be going to Council at the end of July with a program for mandatory MRFing of all dry waste in the region, and will seek to put a minimum recovery requirement on those facilities that don’t currently have one, he said. The program details are still being fleshed out, but likely list specific commodities (wood, metal, cardboard, paper) in an effort to not create an environment in which facilities feel compelled to turn away loads that don’t contain materials they need to help them reach recovery goals. A one-year pilot may be developed, Mr. Barrett continued.

In Fall 2004, a group was put together of primarily Washington County solid waste industry and local government representatives to discuss the possibility of mandatory dry waste MRFing, Mr. Barrett said. Members of that group made some suggestions at that time. A similar group will be put together soon, and a white paper will be presented to SWAC and then to Council explaining the history, previous attempts, expected pros and cons, and goals of the program.

Mike Miller of Gresham Sanitary asked about looking at residual rather than looking at recovery rates. “Is there still any discussion on that, or have we abandoned it,” he asked. The idea has not been abandoned, Mr. Barrett responded, it could be a helpful tool. He’s more interested in seeing what material is being missed than percentages being recovered, he said.

How does the 90,000 needed tons break down in terms of commodities, SP Newsprint’s John Lucini inquired. Two-thirds would be wood, Mr. Barrett guesstimated, with cardboard slightly less than metal. Additional discussion included East County Recycling’s Ralph Gilbert commenting that markets change rapidly. Councilor Park responded that an economic filter will be added to reflect market changes. Mr. Barrett added that the four mentioned commodities would not be the only ones needing recovery, but would be the ones enforced.

Mr. Barrett moved away from the subject of dry waste and moved on to compulsory business recycling. This program may be modeled after that instituted by the City of Portland in 1996, he said, or recovery goals might be set with individual jurisdictions (similar to the state’s setting of washed goals). “Instead of telling the City of Gresham [for instance] ‘you have to require all your businesses to recycle,’ we may say ‘Go ahead and work with your Council to enact a program

that will end up being 6,000 more tons of material being recovered from the business sector between now and 2009,' or whatever that number would be," Mr. Barrett explained. Local jurisdictions would collaborate with their elected officials to decide what would work best in their area.

The RSWMP Contingency Work Group will be reconvened to discuss this program.

In discussion that followed, Mr. Phelps suggested setting dates for the programs as soon as possible to give facilities time to ready themselves with necessary equipment and procedures. Mr. Brittingham asked if Metro has the authority to tell local governments to tell their businesses they have to recycle. "And if you do think you have that authority, how about if that city says, 'Jam it,'" he questioned. Councilor Park assured him that Metro does have such authority, and if a jurisdiction was reluctant, staff would work with them to find out what issues they have and see what kind of help they need to make the process succeed. Mr. Brittingham insisted the whole idea is "an unfunded mandate. You'll drive the price of collection up, you're telling us we have to change our program and increase rates, and you don't have any authority to tell us about collection." Further, Mr. Brittingham commented that while recycling advocates are comfortable with the program ideas, "elected officials are completely uncomfortable with it."

"This will go through the Metro Policy Advisory Committee [MPAC, made up of the region's elected officials]," Councilor Park replied. Mr. Heglund added that an economic pro-forma would be done to help estimate the impact.

As for being unfunded, Clackamas County's Susan Ziolko countered that jurisdictions receive money for such programs, "and all the garbage companies have programs up and running. So it's there, it's just that some businesses choose not to use it." The mandate would be a tool to get them to participate, she said, "and I don't think the costs are going to be that much more because the system is in place, and Metro's already giving [local jurisdictions] a lot of funds for staff to be out there helping businesses." Mr. Brittingham retorted that people don't like being told what to do, especially outside the Portland metropolitan area. Councilor Park agreed, replying that Metro doesn't actually like being told what to do by the State, either. It will all be worked out collaboratively, he said, adding that he has faith that people will be creative to make the programs a success.

After further spirited discussion, Mr. Heglund said there will be a long process to make these programs work. "[Approximately] every half-hour, we're sending 29 tons of paper and magazines to the landfill. That has to stop, or at least some portion of that. We need to all work together and figure out a way that we can help eliminate some of that waste that's going to the landfill, get it reused and recycled. Mills are all set up now, they want the fiber. We need to get back to what the problem statement is, and then we'll figure out how to implement it."

Mr. Miller added that it's a give-and-take issue. "If we don't do it this way, Metro does have the authority to have disposal bans, and no one really liked that option, either," he said. "We have to weigh what the options are." Ms. Matthews reminded the group that discussions have been happening on the subject for over three years; she and the Councilor agreed that it's time to move forward. Mr. Phelps added that in the course of the DSP project, the consultant showed that "it costs less now in Portland to collect recyclable material than it does to collect wet waste because of the high level of waste recovery. So there is that benefit, whereas when we first ramped-up [recycling] was a huge cost... We're going to tweak it rather than invent it."

V. Updating MRF StandardsBill Metzler

The next agenda item, Councilor Park described, would be "MRFing standards in terms of the facilities themselves," and he predicted lively debate. The City of Portland asked Metro to look at

some of their permitting for material recovery facilities to see how they fit with what Metro requires for licensing. It was discovered, the Councilor revealed, “that what the City of Portland thought we were designating as a MRF was a little different than what they were thinking. Questions about noise, air, pollution, water pollution potentially – all these other factors came up. So we’re trying to figure out some kind of standards.” Facilities such as Waste Management’s Troutdale facility are so well-sited that it causes no problems, he continued, and most people don’t even know it’s there. How can this apply to MRFs, as well, the Councilor asked rhetorically.

Bill Metzler of the Regulatory Affairs Division began his presentation by saying this is a new project focusing on current standards for mixed dry waste materials recovery facilities, and for mixed dry waste reload facilities, and look into improvements. (See attached project overview.) Stakeholders such as DEQ, SWAC, operators of current facilities, local governments, and Metro Council will be consulted. Standards in other states will be looked into, as well. Currently, Mr. Metzler explained, licensees’ obligations come into play after the facility is accepted into the system, rather than having applicants demonstrate in advance that the facility will be able to meet operating standards contained in the license. If problems arise after a facility has opened, the situation can be time-consuming and sometimes difficult to resolve.

“Most current MRFs in the system are well-designed, they’re well operated – there’s hasn’t been an issue,” Mr. Metzler pointed out. However, in the wake of an increase in MRF applications, staff noticed that some appear “risky. They didn’t seem to have the same kind of quality controls and weren’t going to be built to the same standards as the ones that are already in the system.” This raised concerns, he said.

To address the problem, Mr. Metzler continued, three key elements would be approached: Updating existing standards to make them clearer; revision of license application forms; and Metro Code amendments to clarify the approval criteria. “We’re going to try to put new standards into the application process,” he said, “so that facility operators – right up-front – will know exactly what is required of them... It will be very clear to them; there will be no surprises, and it will be very clear to [Metro] when we receive a good application.” After adoption of the new standards, they will apply to all new facilities and there will likely be some kind of timeframe for existing facilities to demonstrate compliance. Staff plans to bring some draft standards and application forms to the industry and SWAC through October 2006, as noted in the overview; Council review should begin in January 2007.

Councilor Park asked Mr. Walker about concerns the City of Portland has had. Mr. Walker replied that the City has had problems regarding land use. “There’s a land use application that is needed from the local government [before siting a facility],” he said, but there have been instances of applications that appeared to be for recycling facilities and turned out to be something different, such as a MRF or reload. Those facilities would be treated very differently by the City at the planning phase, Mr. Walker explained. “There needs to be more coordination – I’ll speak directly for Portland – there needs to be more attention paid to that. I believe our planning staff is attempting to look at a portion of the Planning Code to deal with that.” Additionally, Mr. Walker said that there needs to be more consistency in how potential facilities are looked at, particularly any potential environmental or nuisance problems.

Mr. Kampfer felt that the project’s scope doesn’t address the concerns voiced by Mr. Walker. Mr. Metzler agreed, but said that Metro can help jurisdictions better understand the different types of facilities and their potential impact, which should help to a degree. Process issues are important, Mr. Hogle added; staff would look at ways to include this type of coordination in the scope. There are three different bodies that a company goes through to site a facility; it can be confusing and Metro would like to help make it “a little more simple and consistent.”

From the audience, Swanson Bark's Jeff Gage commented that without standards, there's currently very little confidence at the local land use level that facilities will meet them. "We really need coordination from Metro back to land use planners to give us the credit for being able to manage our way [regarding odors, management, etc.] with the standard in-front. Right now, they don't trust us because there's no interaction at that beginning stage," he said. "I'm very glad you guys are working towards that right now, but remember it all lands on land use first, before it goes to you."

Mr. Gilbert said anecdotally that when ECR began operations, they thought they'd covered their bases between the county and city. However, a few months after opening, they were forced to stop accepting materials while land use issues were being settled; after that, they had to get further permitting from the DEQ. It was all very complicated and confusing, "even twenty years ago," he said.

"I realize this is a general overview," Mr. White said, referring to the handout, "but under [the first project goal], you say, 'publish facility standards,' and knowing that [Mr. Walker] has been concerned about recyclable material being disposed of, do you foresee that this project will end up in another discussion about MRF residual – maybe maximum numbers – as a standard?" He'd been under the impression that MRF standards included requirements for very little residual. There's overlap with that aspect and the mandatory MRFing project, Mr. Hogle said, and it may be more appropriate to Mr. Barrett's project.

VI. Other Business and Adjourn.....Councilor Park

Councilor Park adjourned the SWAC proceedings at 12 noon.

Next meeting:
Thursday, May 25, 2006
Room 370 A/B

gbc
Attachment
M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\2006\SWAC042706min.doc
Queue

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Performance Standards for Material Recovery Facilities and Dry Waste Reloads

Project background and purpose:

Temporary moratorium imposed on certain dry waste facilities.

On February 2, 2006, the Metro Council imposed a temporary moratorium (until December 31, 2007) on all new mixed dry waste material recovery facilities and dry waste reloads in the region. The moratorium was imposed in order to provide time to conclude the Disposal System Planning project, to determine how the region can increase material recovery, and to allow for the publication of more detailed and protective MRF standards.

Statement of the problem

As a way to encourage more material recovery, Metro has had a relatively low barrier for entry into the regulated solid waste system for material recovery facilities (MRFs). Instead, it has placed greater emphasis on the obligations of solid waste facility operators once they are in the system through operating standards in the facility licenses. This approach does not always work in the public interest because once nuisance or environmental problems begin to occur, it can be a difficult and time-consuming process to get the facility to correct the problems.

Until recently, published standards have not been needed because material recovery has largely been conducted at high quality facilities with impervious pads, buildings and storm water management systems. However, more recently, license applications to operate MRFs have been submitted for facilities that have minimal control standards that would increase the risks of public nuisances, and adverse health or environmental impacts. These applications submitted to Metro did not demonstrate that the proposed facility would be able to meet existing license operating standards or achieve the standards of the newer MRFs already operating in the region.

Updated standards will be published for material recovery facilities and dry waste reload facilities.

This project will focus on standards for two types of facilities: mixed dry waste material recovery facilities ("MRFs"), and mixed dry waste reload facilities. The standards will be protective of human health and the environment, while encouraging the development of high quality recovery operations, similar to many of the already established MRFs located in the region.

There are three key project elements:

- 1) An update to Metro's existing standards including more clearly defined standards for the building and/or operation of a MRF or reload.
- 2) Revisions to facility license application forms.
- 3) Amendments to the Metro Code to clarify approval criteria.

Once adopted, the standards will apply to all new facilities, and there will be a timeframe for existing facilities to demonstrate compliance with the standards. Metro's existing standards - currently embedded in solid waste facility licenses and the Metro Code - will be examined, updated and published using input from affected stakeholders as well as consideration of facility standards from other states.

Update license application requirements.

In addition to publishing the performance standards, the license application requirements will also be updated to focus more attention on obtaining the information necessary for Metro to approve the license application itself.

- The applicant will be required to provide sufficient information that demonstrates the facility will meet the performance standards.
- The new MRFs will be built and operated in a manner that assures environmentally sound, safe and high quality operations in the region.
- The revised forms will also provide the prospective facility operator with a greater degree of certainty about what will be required to obtain a Metro license by making explicit the standards that must be met.

Project goal:

- Publish facility standards and application requirements for material recovery facilities and dry waste reload facilities.
- Assure that facilities recover material without creating nuisance impacts or harm to people or the environment.

Key milestones:

- Industry and SWAC review (through October 2006 – some discussions likely to be in conjunction with the mandatory MRFing project).
- Council review (Starting in January 2007).

Project stakeholders:

- Existing and future MRF operators / solid waste industry
- SWAC
- Metro Council
- Local governments
- DEQ

M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\2006\SWAC042706min.doc