

A G E N D A



METRO

MEETING: **REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

DATE: Tuesday, December 12, 2006

TIME: 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Room 370 A&B, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

- 5 mins. **I. Call to Order..... Mike Hoglund**
Introductions/announcements
*Approval of minutes**
- 10 mins. **II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update..... Mike Hoglund**
- 70 mins. **III. RSWMP Issues, Policies and Goals* Janet Matthews**
Planning issues and guiding direction recommended by staff for the updated RSWMP will be presented at this meeting. Opportunity for SWAC discussion will continue through January.
- 30 mins. **IV. Curbing Residential Curbside Recycling Contamination.....Kolberg, Klag**
At the July 27th SWAC meeting, information on the campaign to reduce residential curbside recycling contamination was presented. This agenda item is intended to provide information on how the outreach campaign was implemented over the summer and early fall, and to present findings from the evaluation. These findings include the results of a "before and after" field study and a follow-up phone survey.
- 5 mins. **V. Other business and adjourn..... Mike Hoglund**

*Denotes material included in the meeting packet

All times listed on this agenda are approximate. Items may not be considered in the exact order listed.

Chair: Councilor Rod Park (797-1547) Staff: Janet Matthews (797-1826) Committee Clerk: Susan Moore (797-1643)

JM:sm

M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\2006\SWACpacket121206.doc

Queue



METRO

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

MINUTES OF THE METRO SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COMMITTEE (SWAC) MEETING

Metro Regional Center, Room 370A/B

Thursday, November 16, 2006

Members / Alternates Present:

Mike Hogleund
Mike Leichner
Bruce Walker
Paul Edwards
Rick Winterhalter
Dave Garten
Dave White

Ralph Gilbert
Ray Phelps
Glenn Zimmerman
Lori Stole
Dean Kampfer
Wade Lange
Jeff Murray

Mike Miller
Audrey O'Brien
Matt Korot
Theresa Koppang
Steve Schwab
Dean Large
Tom Badrick

Guests and Metro staff:

Janet Matthews
Barb Disser
Tom Chaimov
Easton Cross
Terrell Garrett
Alison Cable

Julie Cash
Lee Barrett
Heidi Rahn
Roy Brower
Brad Botkin
Marv Fjordbeck

Paul Ehinger
Bryce Jacobson
Wendie Kellington
Mike Dewey
Jim Watkins
Gina Cubbon

I. Call to Order and Announcements Mike Hogleund

- Solid Waste & Recycling Director Mike Hogleund convened the meeting at 2:05 p.m. and announced that due to a conflict with a Council Session, Councilor Park would be unable to attend.
- Mr. Hogleund asked for approval of the previous meeting's minutes; Ray Phelps so moved, and Dave Garten seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

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

- Mr. Hogleund reported that the final redraft of the MRF (material recovery facility) Standards has been forwarded to work group members; and responses should be received by November 27. Next, staff will work on drafting an Ordinance to amend the Metro Code and administrative procedures accordingly. SWAC will be fully briefed in December, prior to Council adoption in January or February.
- Lee Barrett, Jim Watkins, and Bryce Jacobson have been sorting through residual ("back door") waste at MRFs to help ascertain the standard that will be set for EDWRP (the enhanced dry waste recovery program). Five of seven facilities have been looked at thus far, for a total of 13 waste sorts (at least two at each of the facilities). Sample sizes ranged from 360- 1,800 lbs. and the residual rate was calculated for wood, metal, and cardboard. A range of 2.8% to 63% residual was found. (The 63% would have been 20%, he explained, but for a very large piece of recoverable wood that the facility had not removed.) The overall results seem to support the idea of a 20% residual standard from the back door, but more sorts are being done.

III. RSWMP Update Project: Issue Identification.....Janet Matthews

Ms. Matthews handed out the RSWMP table of contents (attached), showing which items are still being shaped by ongoing discussions with stakeholders. She briefly explained the status of those items, and said that this meeting's discussion would focus on key planning issues related to the disposal system. The System Performance Goals (as attached to the minutes in the agenda packet) would be used as the framework for a brainstorming exercise, she said, and reviewed that piece. She asked that the group consider where there are areas needing improvement; i.e., that fall short of those performance goals. The proceedings were then turned over to Tom Chaimov, who handed out "Opportunities for Improving the Disposal System" (attached). He explained that the piece showed suggested RSWMP planning issues (such as Waste Allocations) and then correspondence to individual system goals. Most opportunities for improvement, he noted, seem to be within the operational side, and several relate to more than one System Goal.

Before discussion began, Waste Connections' Dean Large suggested that Metro take note of how many facility representatives disagree with the idea that Metro-owned facilities be held to different recovery standards than the private sector facilities. Mr. Chaimov captured this on the white board as "Performance standards at non-Metro versus Metro Facilities" (e.g., dry waste recovery standards).

For the City of Portland, Bruce Walker commented that he understood that the conclusion has not yet been drawn to the issue. Mr. Hoglund reminded the group that the planned discussion of RSWMP deals with the solid waste system over the next ten years; the previous meeting's discussion was of EDWRP, "a program we're in the process of implementing, and we're in the process of trying to get as close to [Mr. Large's] suggestion as we possibly can." He acknowledged the issue of self-haul volumes presenting recovery obstacles.

Mr. Chaimov went over the items on the handout:

Sustainable Operations: SWAC has talked a lot about how to make solid waste services greener, Mr. Chaimov began. He noted this issue has been dealt with, in that sustainability goals for the solid waste system were approved by SWAC last year.

Landfilling Recyclables: This topic referred to market motivations and structure, Mr. Chaimov said. "What are the market motivations to reduce waste?" he ventured. "The structure of the market may be such that not everyone is equally motivated to reduce waste or recover waste" He used the example of vertical integration: "...owning a landfill, and the profits involved with owning a landfill tend to create market motivations that are kind of in conflict with reducing waste." encourage market incentives that discourage recycling. Mr. Phelps disagreed with that assertion. After some further discussion, Mr. Hoglund stated that the issue refers to landfilling of recyclables, a problem that has been proven by waste sorts. "We know that there are recyclable materials that have value on the commodity markets that are still going in the landfill," Mr. Hoglund said. Metro is working towards a policy that will lead to fewer landfilled recyclables, and it's certainly "...a difficult choice for a landfill owner to determine sometimes if it's just cheaper to push it, or to try and find a market for something." Mr. White commented that there's a balance between what is marketable and what is economically feasible.

Waste Allocations: Mr. Chaimov took on this issue by saying that the initial thought for allocating waste to other facilities was to provide better access (and therefore lower costs) for consumers. He asked the group if they felt that things such as tonnage caps, non-system licenses, etc. maximize public benefit. Mr. Phelps stated that there should be service areas that have exclusive rights to the nearby waste. Regarding barriers to access, he added that Metro could help get rid of facility "clustering" by identifying or indicating where facilities are needed. There were opposing views on the subject, including Far West Fibers' Jeff Murray, who noted that locating facilities is a business decision, and each will fail or succeed partly based on the location they choose.

Future Commercial Access & Capacity: Mr. Chaimov noted that this was essentially covered in the previous conversation.

Self-Haul Access and Capacity: Is this issue and the previous one different enough to remain separate? Mr. White said that self-haul needs to be tied in with recovery, and felt that self-haul loads don't get recovered. Mr. Winterhalter said that from Mr. Ehinger's presentation, it was his understanding that because Metro South and Metro Central are by and large the only facilities taking self-haul, that makes recovery very difficult. "If every facility took a bit of that, there may be further opportunities for recovery," he said. Mr. Walker added that because there may be a big potential for improved recycling in self-haul, perhaps self-haulers should source-separate. "What are the responsibilities of people who bring [self-haul loads] in?"

Pricing Policies: Mr. Chaimov said that this item held several issues. He began by saying that one of Metro's roles in the system is as kind of price leader, helping to "keep the lid on transfer [station] prices around the region." Recent pricing policies towards cost-of-service, however, makes Metro's rate more sensitive to where tonnage goes. Is that what it should be? "If tonnage moves away from Metro's transfer stations, prices in the region could go up," he continued. The opposite is also true. Mr. Gilbert responded that if Metro raises its prices, waste will just go someplace else. He disagrees with self-haulers having to separate their loads; there are facilities that do that for them, but their loads do need to be picked through. Mr. Phelps commented that Metro subsidizes self-haul by not charging for cost-of-service; one of the consequences of that policy is that Washington County's customers end up subsidizing Metro customers.

Another area where there could be room for improvement, Mr. Chaimov continued, could be private facilities' pricing policies. "Do the prices of the price followers accurately reflect their cost of their providing the service?" he asked rhetorically, noting that the answer is unknown. Private companies tend to not be transparent about their pricing, and some local governments who regulate rates don't have the resources to examine those. Mr. Hoglund asked if perhaps there should be a cost plus system for private facilities. Pride Recycling's Mike Leichner responded that local jurisdictions are welcome to look at their rates, but he is uncomfortable with Metro coming in and looking at collection costs. Mr. Phelps added that he has a problem with Metro telling him what to charge because they're a competitor.

Mr. White stated that he is tired of the "constant innuendo" that private facilities over-charge. Maybe Metro actually forces private facilities to charge less than they want to because Metro is competition, he asserted. "I have confidence in the local jurisdictions to ask the questions they need to ask, and I think the innuendo is inappropriate," he concluded. Mr. Walker commented that the pricing policies of private facilities came up when Council was looking into whether Metro should continue to own its transfer stations because local governments were unsure how to track costs if Metro was no longer the price leader. Now that Metro is keeping its stations, he felt it was no longer an issue.

Terrell Garrett of Greenway Recycling added "There's a basic problem with the integration of the collection companies with the transfer facilities as far as the transparency you're talking about. When you combine that with the significant barriers to entry [into the system] out there, there is no transparency." He suggested that if those barriers to entry were relaxed, competition would take care of anyone who was overcharging by charging less.

Ms. Matthews wrapped up the agenda item, saying that it will be brought before the group again for further input. Comments e-mailed to Mr. Chaimov or Ms. Matthews would be included with the minutes, she offered. Staff will write up a narrative of the issues identified and offer ideas for providing guidance in RSWMP.

IV. Recycle at Work Campaign: Generating Business Partners.....Heidi Rahn and Alison Cable

Heidi Rahn, co-project manager (with Alison Cable) of the Recycle at Work Campaign quickly outlined the program. Metro provides \$600,000 each year to local governments, she said, so that they have the resources to do outreach to businesses. The biggest problem was that the word wasn't getting out widely enough. The goal of this year's campaign was to create a consistent regional look (see PowerPoint presentation, attached.) and focus creating partnerships with businesses. Outlining the program's success thus far, Ms. Rahn told the group

that the website has had over 22,000 hits. SWAC member Wade Lange helped the project by speaking about it on Oregon Public Broadcasting radio, and trade organizations put related information into their newsletters. Additionally, the Portland Business Journal put inserts in their publication, and printed a large ad thanking all the partners.

Continuing the presentation, Ms. Cable explained what the partnerships entailed. This approach was so successful, she said, partner businesses are continuing to be signed up. She showed two KGW-TV news spots regarding the project.

Citizen representative Dave Garten asked how the results are being measured - by how much tonnage has been received from those businesses? No, Ms. Cable replied, the difference will show in recycling rates. The City of Gresham's Matt Korot added that measurement of this type of campaign is based upon how many businesses sign on, and how much interest is generated.

Legacy Health System's Tom Badrick commented that while the program is good, it caused problems for Legacy. Hospitals have extremely specific rules regarding paper and its disposal. "For the buildings that we have, we have 850 document destruction containers," he said. Putting in other types of containers (such as the Recycle at Work boxes) simply causes confusion. There are places (such as hospitals) where this kind of program doesn't work. He was also concerned because he was not contacted, so one of their campuses participated (out of seven) and it caused both consternation and confusion.

Mr. Walker commended the campaign, saying that it's important for Metro to create regional campaigns; because local governments don't have the resources. He said he supports the direction, and the fact that Metro created an umbrella campaign that has "some very important components to it for the region," including the idea of signing up partners. Getting that commitment has made a big difference, Mr. Walker concluded. Mr. White, too, said he appreciated the coordination with local governments.

V. Other Business and Adjourn Mike Hoglund

Mr. Hoglund thanked the members and audience for their attendance, and announced that the next meeting will be Thursday, November 30 at 10 a.m.

Adjourned 3:55

Prepared by:

Gina Cubbon
Administrative Secretary
Metro Solid Waste & Recycling Department

Gbc/sm

Attachments: Previously provided.

M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\2006\SWAC111606min.doc
Queue

**SWAC Agenda Packet
Agenda Item III**

RSWMP Issues, Policies and Goals

**Areas of Issue Identification and Guiding Direction
in the RSWMP update**

Context of the Plan (Chapter 1,
Issue Identification)

- Waste generation
- Disposal of recyclable resources
- Toxics in the environment
- End of pipe management
- A more sustainable solid waste system
- System planning issues (waste allocations, self haul services, facility regulation and pricing issues)

Regional Policies (Chapter 3)

Facilities and Services

- System performance
- Facility ownership
- Facility regulation
- Facility operations
- Transfer capacity and access
- Material recovery capacity and performance
- Host community enhancement
- Facility zoning

Regional Policies (Chapter 3)

Rates and Revenue

- Adequacy and reliability
- Equity and transparency
- Waste reduction
- Affordability
- Implementation and administration
- Predictability

System Sustainability Goals and Objectives (Chapter 5)

- Air emissions
- Stormwater mgmt.
- Natural resource use
- Toxic materials
- Green building
- Health and safety practices
- Education
- Quality work life
- Sustainability values

REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (UPDATE)

<i>Planning issue</i>	<i>Desired outcome</i>	<i>Ways in which issue will be addressed in RSWMP</i>
1. Waste generation	Slow the growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-going waste prevention strategies • (TBD) New strategies from DEQ process
2. Landfilled resources	Reduce disposal of readily recoverable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require processing of all dry waste before landfilling • Establish targets for increased recovery of business-generated recyclables in local jurisdictions
3. Toxics in the environment	Reduce use and improper disposal of HHW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education on non-toxic alternatives • Continued collection of HHW at round-up events and permanent sites
4. System managed "end of pipe"	Product mfrs. share responsibility, e.g., e-waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize product stewardship efforts based on environmental impact, barriers to recycling, and financial burdens to local govt. • Work at regional, state, and national level to develop and implement policies and industry-wide agreements
5. Increase sustainability practices	Operations of the solid waste system are more sustainable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate, implement, report on progress in achieving system sustainability goals and objectives
6. Allocation of waste	Ratepayers benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (TBD) System Improvements workplan
7. Public/private pricing	Ratepayers benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate transparency policy • (TBD) System Improvements workplan
8. Self-haul services	Higher recovery of self-hauled material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (TBD) System Improvements workplan
9. Facility regulation	Clear entry standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (TBD) System Improvements workplan
10. Long-term goals (e.g., waste generation goal, recovery goals beyond 2009)	Add new target-based goals to RSWMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (TBD) Evaluate and recommend long-term goals for future Plan amendment

Residential Curbside Outreach Campaign



Evaluation Results
SWAC December 12, 2007

Agenda

1. Vicki
 - Background – why, what
 - Feedback
2. Scott
 - Field work results
 - Phone survey
3. Discussion



Outreach Campaign

- Background – why, what
- Feedback



Evaluation Methods

- Curbside Field Study
 - Put out glass and plastic bags?
 - ~ 900 HH's visited twice
- Phone survey
 - Glass and plastic bag recycling
 - Surveyed ~300 of 900 HHs visited
 - Called small sample of HH's with roll cart



Results – Summary

- Field study
 - Only marginal improvement on setting glass aside
 - But positive trends
 - More segregation of glass inside bins
 - More use of rigid containers
- Telephone survey
 - Better reported behavior regarding glass
 - Information from hauler may be a key



Curbside Fieldwork – Overview

- Number HHs visited
 - “Pre” - 980 HHs
 - “Post” – 884 HHs
- Comparability of visits
 - Percentage Pre / Post at curb
 - Garbage: 94% / 92%
 - Glass: 44% / 45%
 - Plastic bags: 11% / 9 %



Curbside Fieldwork – Results

- All HHs with glass
 - “Pre” 434 HHs
 - “Inside bin” **71%**
 - “Outside bin” **29%**
 - “Post” 400 HHs
 - “Inside bin” **68%**
 - “Outside bin” **32%**



Curbside Fieldwork – Results

- 263 HH's with glass both visits
 - “Pre”
 - “Inside bin” **70%**
 - “Outside bin” **30%**
 - “Post”
 - “Inside bin” **64%**
 - “Outside bin” **36%**



CF Results - *Inside Bin Behavior*

- All HHs with glass
 - “Pre” 309 HHs
 - Loose in bin **61%**
 - Segregated (bagged) in bin **39%**
 - “Post” 271 HHs
 - Loose in bin **53%**
 - Segregated (bagged) in bin **47%**



CF Results - *Outside Bin Behavior*

- All HHs with glass
 - “Pre” 125 HHs
 - “Rigid” container **15%**
 - “Post” 129 HHs
 - “Rigid” container **20%**



Telephone Survey – Overview

- Bin HH's
 - Targeted HHs visited in Field Study
 - 288 completed
- Roll cart HH's
 - Random selection from major roll cart areas
 - 79 completed



Telephone Survey – Results

- Bin HHs with glass: 268
 - “Inside bin” **59%**
 - “Outside bin” **41%**
- Roll cart HHs with glass:
 - “Inside cart” **14%**
 - “Outside cart” **84%**



TS Results - Ad Recall

- Bin HHs – 288
 - Glass Ad 19%
 - Plastic Bag Ad 8%
- Roll Cart HHs – 79
 - Glass Ad 15%
 - Plastic Bag Ad 5%



TS Results - Behavior Changes

“In last 3-4 months, changed the way you recycle glass?”

- Bin HHs – 277
 - Yes 22%
- Roll Cart HHs – 70
 - Yes 11%



TS Results - "What promoted this change?"

	<u>Count</u>	<u>%</u>
Newspaper story	1	1.7
Radio news story	1	1.7
Website	1	1.7
TV news story	5	8.3
Mailer or notice from City or County	5	8.3
TV ad	7	11.7
Other	8	13.3
Mailer from hauler	10	16.7
Notice left at curb from garbage hauler	22	36.7
Total	60	100%



Next Steps

- Consult with stakeholders
- Consider options



Options to Consider

- More TV time with message – repeat the campaign
- More integration of TV ads with local gov't & hauler messaging
- Just focus on the “leave behinds”
- Wait until an area is ready for roll carts – then do education

