



METRO

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

MINUTES OF THE METRO SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COMMITTEE (SWAC) MEETING
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers
Thursday, January 25, 2007

Members / Alternates Present:

Councilor Kathryn Harrington
Mike Hogle
Mike Leichner
Bruce Walker
Glenn Zimmerman
Lori Stole
JoAnn Herrigel

Janet Malloch
Jeff Murray
Ray Phelps
Dean Kampfer
Dave White
Anita Largent
Eric Merrill

Dave Garten
Mike Miller
Audrey O'Brien
Matt Korot
Theresa Koppang
Steve Schwab

Guests and Metro staff:

Janet Matthews
Wendy Fisher
Easton Cross
Terrell Garrett
Scott Klag
Tom Chaimov
Bill Metzler

Julie Cash
Corianne Hart
Jeff Gage
Roy Brower
Matt Tracy
Jim Watkins

Warren Johnson
Marv Fjordbeck
Segeni Mungai
Lee Barrett
Linnea Nelson
Gina Cubbon

I. Call to Order and AnnouncementsCouncilor Kathryn Harrington

- Councilor Harrington introduced herself as the new Chair of the SWAC; those present introduced themselves in turn. The Councilor told the group she feels there is a responsibility for providing continuity in her role as Chair, and she looks forward to bringing the thoughts and concerns of the Council to the group as they go through program development and consider new policies aligned with the agency's goals and objectives. Council depends on the SWAC to help with policy implementation, she said, adding that "...one thing I'm looking forward to loud and clear is getting RSWMP done this year, so let's see what we can do."
- Approval of minutes: Dean Kampfer of Waste Management moved to approve the minutes from the December 12, 2006 meeting with no changes. Janet Malloch seconded the motion, which then passed unanimously.

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

- Mr. Hogle announced some changes to the Solid Waste & Recycling Department's organization: Janet Matthews has been named Assistant Director for Policy and Programs and will have oversight for waste reduction and regulatory affairs; Jim Watkins will fill the assistant director role on the operational side. New principal planner hire Matt Tracy (formerly of Columbia County Solid Waste) will be reporting to Ms. Matthews, concentrating initially on helping to finish the RSWMP, and then leading the process to implement the RSWMP sustainable operations goals.

- A consultant has been retained to look into potential emission reductions for garbage and recycling collection vehicles. Workshops will be taking place with a task force, Mr. Hogle informed the group. The City of Portland's Bruce Walker commented that his City Council has a strong interest in the subject and is very happy that Metro has taken the lead.
- Regarding the upcoming transport contract, Dan Pitzler and Bob Wallace of CH2M Hill are studying what will be needed, cost comparisons, environmental concerns and other factors. They will present some background information at the March 20 Council Work Session and begin to build three scenarios based on Council priorities. A new transport operator should be awarded a contract by Summer 2008 in order to prepare for operations to begin January 1, 2010, Mr. Hogle explained.

III. RSWMP PoliciesJanet Matthews

Ms. Matthews previewed her PowerPoint presentation (attached) and asked the attendees to comment for the record afterwards. Staff will review and formally respond to those comments in March, she added. Ms. Matthews handed out a table of current RSWMP Policies and Recommended Revisions (attached) , and asked the group to refer also to the Proposed RSWMP Policies piece from the agenda packet.

Committee member comments (regarding the Guiding Framework except where otherwise noted):

Audrey O'Brien (DEQ) stated that the DEQ "very much supports" the update's direction. Her agency has approved the Interim Waste Reduction Plan within the RSWMP and won't need to approve the Plan in its entirety. Ms. O'Brien offered the DEQ's assistance to help put the Plan into practice .

Dave White of the Oregon Refuse and Recycling Association (ORRA) said that he and his organization support the Plan, but had several points:

- Referring to the Regional Values listed in the agenda packet piece, Mr. White asked that clarification be added for "Performance." It refers to more than just cost, he said, it should include sustainability and analyze the outcomes.
- Who implements and who decides is a looming question in several areas, he continued. Under Regional Policies, Recycling Services Provision, for instance, who will decide what is "to the extent possible" when it comes to local jurisdictions attempting to standardize recycling practices?
- Source Separation: Mr. White asked that this point explain that it also refers to commingled loads that will be separated at a facility.
- New Facilities: As long as there are caps to tonnage allowed at facilities, there are barriers to access. Also, what constitutes "significantly" in the next paragraph, referring to other types of facilities?
- Disposal Pricing: "Sufficiently transparent disposal costs" – Does that suggest, Mr. White wondered, no subsidies (commenting that subsidization masks true cost-of-service)? Clarification on this issue will be needed over the ten-year lifespan of the Plan, he said.

Mike Miller (Gresham Sanitary) concurred with Mr. White, adding that it may be troublesome for jurisdictions to standardize their recycling practices with the rest of the region. They have the right to choose their own collection system, he said. Additionally, Mr. Miller voiced uncertainty regarding disposal pricing and whether the goal can be achieved "in an equitable manner."

Bruce Walker commended staff and committee members for the work done on the RSWMP update. "I think [the Plan] provides very good guidance for us." The challenge, he said, will be in the details, and over time there will be a need to be both adaptable and creative. However, while supportive of the framework and sustainability, Mr. Walker said that because Metro is "staying in the arena" (owning transfer stations), the issue of disposal pricing transparency may not be as important: Having Metro in the system provides a workable arrangement for Portland's rate-making.

Theresa Koppang (Washington County) stated that she very much supports the framework: “These plans are very important documents to local jurisdictions. They are our marching orders,” she said, and several years worth of programs are based upon the Plan. Ms. Koppang had comments on two particular pieces:

- Recycling Services Provision: Standardized recycling is a challenging issue even within Washington County itself.
- Disposal Pricing: Rate transparency is the best way to establish – with confidence – a rate, Ms. Koppang said. She is very supportive of this goal, saying that the more transparency, the better for the rate-payer.

Matt Korot of the City of Gresham (representing East Multnomah County and the cities therein) said that the drafted policies are solid, and he’s comfortable with the outcome. Specific comments:

- Recycling Services Provision: Mr. Korot is supportive of a goal to standardize recycling. It sets a good goal for which to strive, and would benefit the region’s citizens.
- New Facilities: The decision-making process will be crucial when the opportunity arises to put this policy into practice.
- Disposal Pricing: “Provision of garbage and recycling services is a basic public service related to protecting human health and the environment,” Mr. Korot began. It is analogous to utilities such as water, electricity, and sewer and therefore deserves the same amount of transparency and analysis. He would support language saying “fully” transparent.

JoAnn Herrigel (City of Milwaukie) had no additional comments, saying she appreciates the work and looks forward to the final draft.

Mr. Kampfer agreed with Mr. White’s assertions, and said Waste Management is looking forward to the next steps involved. He did voice concern regarding the policy titled “Host Community Enhancement,” pointing out that some communities already charge a community fee in lieu of a Metro fee, and he’s unsure if this policy allows that flexibility. Additionally, Mr. Kampfer said that while WMO supports standardizing recycling systems, they would like to leave the specifics to local jurisdictions so they can consider costs and other factors.

Ray Phelps, of WRI / Allied Waste, agreed with the remarks of both Mr. White and Mr. Kampfer, and added the following comments:

- Recycling Services Provision: Recycling companies should be regulated or franchised. That segment of the market has increased three-fold in the last 18 months alone, Mr. Phelps asserted, which has an economic impact on rates throughout the system.
- New Facilities: Why does it matter whether a facility is publicly or privately owned within this goal, Mr. Phelps asked. “It skews almost every analysis in this regard. Does it stand on its merit regardless of ownership – that should be question.” Additionally, Mr. Phelps commented that he’s “befuddled” as to why rate-payers are considered part of this issue, as they are protected and represented by local government.
- Facility Ownership: “I simply don’t accept this declaratory statement, but I’ll be glad to read the [details].
- Host Community Enhancement: “There is a host community enhancement paid by every operator of every facility in the community. That’s called ‘taxes.’”
- Disposal Pricing: This, Mr. Phelps said, deals with Metro’s pricing. He struggles on the Rate Review Committee with some of the assumptions “with regard to how we determine whether it’s fully costed or not, when in fact, there’s still a subsidy in the Regional System Fee. Mr. Phelps concluded by saying he’ll be very interested in how the specifics play out.

Lori Stole, representing the citizen rate payers of Washington County, suggested that “Sustainability Alternatives Evaluation” may be better stated “Sustainability Opportunities Evaluation.” Additionally, she

noted that within the waste reduction portion, mention is made of a goal that is planned to be complete within two years, and that doesn't make sense within a 10-year plan. A longer term goal would be better. She also stated that as a national leader, it would be nice to see the region incorporate the concept of zero waste in the Plan Vision.

Mike Leichner (Pride Recycling) agreed with the comments of Messrs.. White, Kampfer, and Phelps.

Steve Schwab of Sunset Garbage also stated agreement with Mr. White.

Anita Largent (Clark County) remarked that she supports the work done, and is especially pleased with the inclusion of sustainability.

Eric Merrill of Waste Connections also commended staff's work on the Plan, but voiced concern that some long-term goals seem to "throw the baby out with the bath water." He had comments on both the Guiding Framework and RSWMP Policies & Recommended Revisions documents:

Policies & Recommended Revisions:

- 2.2 – Mr. Merrill noted that this talks about the "Plan Revisions" section; but he was unable to find that in the materials provided.
- 4.3 – Mr. Merrill disagrees that policy guidance is no longer necessary. While the current objective is working, it's important to ensure it is maintained.
- 4.6 – regarding Metro encouraging competition. he commented that this language is important and should be put into the updated Plan under "New Facilities."
- 5 -- Performance: Should remain a policy guidance issue.
- 6.4 – Regarding Metro and local governments working together to ensure that "facilities and services are positive contributions to the region," Mr. Merrill suggests this be kept as a goal in the update.
- 10 – Integration: Rephrase and incorporate more of the language from this goal into "Source Separation."

Guiding Framework:

- New Facilities: Mr. Merrill said that this piece needs clarification.
- System Regulation: (Second paragraph) The current RSWMP Objective 4.2 states that government regulation is "the minimum necessary to ensure protection of the environment..." The new language, however, states that "government regulation will ensure protection..." This can be seen as a major change, and Mr. Merrill suggested staff raise that question with the stakeholders.

Jeff Murray (Far West Fibers) noted that his company uses the RSWMP for future planning and they find it very important. He appreciated Mr. Merrill's comment regarding 4.3 (above), and added that some of the objectives from the current RSWMP became established practices solely because of that document. Mr. Murray requested they be re-stated in the updated Plan to maintain them. Also, regarding the Source Separation value in the Guiding Framework piece, new language could help avoid confusion between source-separation and segregation.

Dave Garten, representing Multnomah County citizens, commended the overall document and had the following comments:

- Shared Responsibility: To what is this shifting? Mr. Garten felt this item needed to be stated more clearly. Is the shift to waste reduction, recycling, etc?
- Access to Services: "The missing piece, from a consumer perspective, is information," he said. From his own experience and that of others, Mr. Garten has found that most citizens have no answer to questions

such as “What do I do with my old couch?” and neither do the haulers when contacted. So while technically there is access, there is a lack of information regarding the services that citizens can access.

- Source Separation: The system should be easy for the rate-payer, and there’s no notion of that in the document.
- Facility Ownership: It’s fine to say that facilities can be either public or private, but Mr. Garten said he feels it’s inappropriate for the document to state that the public is best served by publicly-owned facilities.
- Regarding Goals, some need to be longer-term; he hopes for more solid goals.

Janet Malloch (Blue Heron Paper) said she strongly supports source-separation. Commingling has been problematic, and what all the industry representatives have in common is that they have to separate the recyclables, in one way or another.

Glenn Zimmerman of Compost Oregon spoke about Disposal Pricing and transparency therein. Does a statement such as the one under Values mean the next step could be for regulators to set the cost for private industry? This will need to be addressed in the future, he continued, but at the moment Mr. Zimmerman felt it ambiguous.

Ms. Matthews thanked the members for their comments, and said that regarding long-term goals, members had a legitimate point. A review process is just beginning for potential longer-term goals. New goals will likely be the first amendment to the Plan after it is approved.

Comments made during final discussion on the topic included Dave White noting that “policy” and “goal” seem to be used interchangeably. He felt that they’re more than either: They’re a direction. A preamble of how the policies will be viewed for the next ten years should be incorporated, he said.

Wrapping up the topic, Ms. Matthews explained that the framework SWAC has provided feedback on is “the meat of the Plan.” Today’s discussion was the final development input from SWAC as a body. The next step will be for staff to consider and prepare responses to members’ comments; following that will be a period for public comment. At that time, she noted, everyone is welcome to comment. After public comment, staff will prepare a fairly comprehensive response to all the comments, and bring the final version back to SWAC for a vote. Following that, Council will consider and hopefully approve the Plan.

IV. New Material Recovery Facility (MRF) Standards Roy Brower / Bill Metzler

Mr. Hogle introduced the topic, reminding the group that the genesis of this project was a request from the Council to develop more clear, concise standards for approving MRFs.

Mr. Phelps verified that this is an action item, and moved to forward a recommendation to Council, saying “I think it’s a fabulous piece of work by the Regulatory Affairs group.” Mr. Walker seconded the motion.

The group decided to view the presentation and discuss the issue before voting.

Roy Brower, Regulatory Affairs Division Manager, previewed the presentation. Regulation is one tool, he explained, for achieving system goals (along with contracting and other actions). Issuing licenses and franchises is the primary tool within regulation. While standards have always been included for each individual license or franchise, there was a dispute with an applicant in 2005. Metro later won the dispute in an administrative hearing and in front of Metro Council, but the incident spurred the project to hone and publish MRF standards. These standards, he pointed out, apply to “dirty” MRFs, mixed dry-waste reload facilities and processing facilities. The standards are also, Mr. Brower reminded the group, a separate issue from recovery rate standards.

Bill Metzler showed a PowerPoint presentation (attached), showing examples of some of the problems that the new standards seek to redress. One of the more major new requirements will be that facilities must have a covered building with a pad; existing facilities will have a two-year window in which to come into compliance with all the standards. (Many existing facilities already do meet, and exceed, the standards, Mr. Metzler said.)

Next steps: An amendment to Metro Code will be adopted by Council; the corresponding administrative procedures will be under the COO. First reading to Council will be February 15, followed by a public hearing on February 22. "Typically," Mr. Metzler said, "implementation would be 90-days after adoption, unless there's an emergency clause."

Councilor Harrington asked for questions / comments. Will Metro facilities be exempt from the standards, Mr. Merrill asked. Mr. Brower responded yes, adding that Metro facilities do, however, meet / exceed the standards. Still, Mr. Merrill remarked, Metro should not be exempt. Continuing, he asked that outdoor wood grinding be considered as falling within the standards. Mr. Brower responded that the MRF standards were not developed to incorporate a grinding operation, although the DEQ may soon look at the issue. Wood-only facilities are not regulated by Metro.

Why are Metro facilities exempt if they meet all the standards, Mr. Kampfer asked. Mr. Hogle answered that as a regulator, Metro doesn't have its inspectors inspect their own operations. However, Metro solid waste operations do fall under the jurisdiction of the DEQ.

Mr. Walker complimented staff on their work, adding that the City of Portland Planning Department will be addressing some the land-use issues that have been a problem.

The motion to forward a recommendation of the MRF Standards to Metro Council was reiterated. The members of the SWAC in attendance voted unanimously for the motion.

V. Other Business and Adjourn..... Councilor Harrington

Councilor Harrington handed out a proposed list of future agenda items (attached) and said that she will endeavor to have a rolling three-month calendar planned at all times for the meetings. The Councilor thanked the attendees and adjourned the meeting at 11:54 am.

Prepared by:

Gina Cubbon
Administrative Secretary
Metro Solid Waste & Recycling Department

gbc

Attachments: RSWMP PowerPoint Presentation
RSWMP Policies and Recommended Revisions Table
MRF Standards PowerPoint Presentation
Proposed SWAC Agenda Items for 2007

M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\2007\SWAC012507min.doc

CURRENT RSWMP POLICIES AND RECOMMENDED REVISIONS


Current RSWMP	Recommended Revisions for Update	
System-Wide Goals and Objectives		
<p>Goal 1 - The Environment Solid waste management practices that are environmentally sound, conserve natural resources and achieve the maximum feasible reduction of solid waste being landfilled are implemented by the region.</p> <p>Objective 1.1. The guiding policy for waste management in the region is based on the following priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Reduce the amount of solid waste generated; · Reuse material for the purpose for which it was originally intended; · Recycle material that cannot be reused; · Compost material that cannot be reused or recycled; · Recover energy from solid waste that cannot be reused, recycled or composted so long as the energy recovery facility preserves the quality of air, water and land resources; and · Dispose of, by landfilling, any solid waste that cannot be reused, recycled, composted or from which energy cannot be recovered. 	Incorporated in "Preferred Practices" policy.	
<p>Goal 2 – Education Residents and businesses of the region are knowledgeable of the full range of waste management options, including waste prevention and reduction, that are available to them.</p> <p>Objective 2.1. Provide for public education regarding the costs and benefits of alternative waste management practices in a coordinated fashion such that duplication is avoided and consistent information is provided to the public.</p>		Incorporated in Waste Reduction goals and objectives.
<p>Objective 2.2. Involve the public in five-year updates of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. More frequent Plan revisions may be made as conditions warrant.</p>		Incorporated in "Plan Revisions" section.
<p>Objective 2.3. Standardize waste reduction services within the region to the extent possible to minimize confusion on the part of residents and businesses and construct cooperative promotion campaigns that cross jurisdictional boundaries.</p>		Incorporated in "Recycling Services Provision" policy.
<p>Goal 3 – Economics The costs and benefits to the solid waste system as a whole are the basis for assessing and implementing alternative management practices.</p> <p>Objective 3.1. System cost (the sum of collection, hauling, processing, transfer and disposal) is the primary criterion used when evaluating the direct costs of alternative solid waste practices rather than only considering the effects on individual parts of the system.</p>		Revised basis for cost/benefit analysis in "Sustainability Alternatives" policy.
<p>Objective 3.2. 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.</p>		Concept incorporated in "Sustainability Alternatives" policy.
<p>Objective 3.3. 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.</p>	Concept incorporated in "Sustainability Alternatives" policy.	
<p>Objective 3.4. Government and private industry will work cooperatively to identify, explore and confirm the cost and reliability of emerging solid waste technologies.</p>	Has become established practice. Policy guidance no longer necessary.	
<p>Objective 3.5. Implement a system measurement program to provide data on waste generation, recycling and disposal sufficient for informed decision-making and planning.</p>	Has become established practice. Policy guidance no longer necessary.	
<p>Goal 4 – Adaptability A flexible solid waste system exists that can respond to rapidly changing technologies, fluctuating market conditions, major natural disasters and local conditions and needs</p>	Incorporated in "System Performance" policy.	

Objective 4.1. Implement an integrated mix of waste management practices to provide for stability in the event that particular alternatives become viable.	Has become established practice. Policy guidance no longer necessary.
Objective 4.2. Government regulation is the minimum necessary to ensure protection of the environment and the public interest without unnecessarily restricting the operation of private solid waste businesses.	Incorporated in "System Regulation" policy.
Objective 4.3. Facilities that handle, process, buy and sell source-separated recyclables remain in private ownership in order to maintain greater flexibility to rapidly respond to changing market conditions.	Has become established practice. Policy guidance no longer necessary.
Objective 4.4. Integrate local solid waste solutions into the solid waste management system.	Has become established practice. Policy guidance no longer necessary.
Objective 4.5. Solid waste facilities may be publicly or privately owned, depending upon which best serves the public interest. A decision on ownership of transfer and disposal facilities shall be made by Metro on a case-by-case basis.	Incorporated in "Facility Ownership" policy.
Objective 4.6. Metro shall encourage competition when making decisions about transfer station ownership or regulation of solid waste facilities in order to promote efficient and effective solid waste services. Metro shall consider whether the decision would increase the degree of vertical integration in the regional solid waste system and whether the increase would adversely affect the public. Vertical integration is the control by a private firm or firms of the primary functions of a solid waste system- collection, processing, transfer and hauling and disposal.	Replaced by the "New Facilities" policy.
Goal 5 – Performance The performance of the solid waste system will be compared to measurable benchmarks on an annual basis.	Has become established practice. Policy guidance no longer necessary.
Goal 6 - Plan Consistency The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan shall be integrated with other Metro, state, local government, community and planning efforts and shall be consistent with existing Metro policies for managing solid waste.	Incorporated in "Introduction" section.
Objective 6.1. The RSWMP shall be consistent with the adopted Region 2040 Plan and the Regional Framework Plan, when it is adopted.	Incorporated in "Introduction" section.
Objective 6.2. The RSWMP shall be consistent with the State of Oregon Integrated Resource and Solid Waste Management Plan.	Incorporated in "Introduction" section.
Objective 6.3. Each city and county shall provide appropriate zoning to allow planned solid waste facilities or enter into intergovernmental agreements with others to assure such zoning. Whether by outright permitted use, conditional use or otherwise, appropriate zoning shall utilize only clear and objective standards that do not effectively prohibit solid waste facilities.	Incorporated in "Facility Siting" policy.
Objective 6.4. Metro and local governments shall work together to ensure that solid waste facilities and services are positive contributions to the region.	Established practice. Policy guidance no longer necessary.
· For any community providing a solid waste “disposal site,” as defined by ORS 459.280, Metro shall collect a fee to be used for the purpose of community enhancement.	Incorporated in "Host Community Enhancement" policy.
· Solutions to the problems of illegal dumping and to other adverse impacts caused by changes in the waste management system shall be cooperatively developed.	Has become established practice. Policy guidance no longer necessary.
· To the extent that tonnage limits and other locally imposed restrictions would prevent Metro from fully using its facilities to carry out this Plan, Metro reserves its authority to override such restrictions, after receiving public comment, by action of its Council.	Policy guidance no longer necessary.
Objective 6.5. The RSWMP shall be recognized through city and county comprehensive plan policies and ordinances governing the siting, permit review and development standards for solid waste facilities.	Incorporated in "Introduction" section.
Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives	
Goal 7 - Regional Waste Reduction Goal The regional waste reduction goal is to achieve a recovery rate of 62% as defined by state statute by the year 2005. Per capita disposal rates and reductions in waste generated attributable to waste prevention programs are also acknowledged to be key waste indicators. The region's interim goal for the year 2000 is 52% recovery rate as defined by state statute.	Incorporated in Waste Reduction goal.

Goal 8 - Opportunity to Reduce Waste Participation in waste prevention and recycling is convenient for all households and businesses in the urban portions of the region.	Incorporated in "Recycling Service Provision" policy.
Goal 9 – Sustainability Secondary resource management is a self-sustaining operation.	Policy guidance no longer necessary.
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.	Concept incorporated in "Sustainability Alternatives" policy.
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.	Incorporated in "Waste Reduction Program Areas" section.
Objective 9.3. Support an environment that fosters development and growth of reuse, recycling and recovery enterprises.	Incorporated in "Waste Reduction Program Areas" and "Market Development" policy.
Goal 10 – Integration Develop an integrated system of waste reduction techniques with emphasis on source separation, not to preclude the need for other forms of recovery such as post-collection material recovery.	Incorporated in "Source Separation" policy.
Facilities and Services Goals and Objectives	
Goal 11 – Accessibility There is reasonable access to solid waste transfer and disposal services for all residents and businesses of the region.	Incorporated in "New Facilities" policy.
Objective 11.1. Extend and enhance the accessibility of the infrastructure already in place for the management of the waste stream for which the RSWMP is responsible. These responsibilities include all wastes accepted by general- and limited-purpose landfills, construction and demolition wastes, household hazardous waste and hazardous waste from conditionally exempt generators.	Incorporated in "Waste Reduction Program Areas" section.
Objective 11.2. Provide reasonable access through new transfer or reload facilities if it becomes evident that waste reduction practices and existing transfer and disposal infrastructure will be unable to keep pace with the future demand for disposal services.	Incorporated in "New Facilities" policy.
Goal 12 - Recovery Capacity A regionally balanced system of cost-effective solid waste recovery facilities provides adequate service to all waste generators in the region.	Incorporated in "New Facilities" and "System Performance" policies.
Goal 13 - Toxics Reduction Protect the environment, residents of the region and workers who collect, transport, process and dispose of waste by educating residents of the region on methods eliminating or reducing the risks arising from hazardous materials.	Incorporated in Hazardous waste management goals and objectives.
Objective 13.1. Manage hazardous waste based on the Environmental Protection Agency's hierarchy of "reduce, reuse, recycle, treat, incinerate and landfill."	Incorporated in Hazardous waste management goals and objectives.
Objective 13.2. Educate residents of the region about alternatives to the use of hazardous products, proper use of hazardous products, how to generate less hazardous wastes and proper disposal methods for hazardous waste.	Incorporated in Hazardous waste management goals and objectives.
Objective 13.3. Provide convenient, safe, efficient and environmentally sound disposal services for hazardous waste that remains after implementing prevention and reuse practices	Incorporated in Hazardous waste management goals and objectives.
Goal 14 - Disaster Management. In the event of a major natural disaster such as an earthquake, windstorm or flood, the regional solid waste system is prepared to quickly restore delivery of normal refuse services and have the capability of removing, recycling and disposing of potentially enormous amounts of debris.	Incorporated in Disaster Debris Management (DDM) goals and objectives section.
Objective 14.1. Provide both accurate and reliable information for use in predicting the consequences of a major disaster and an inventory of resources available for responding to and recovering from disasters.	Incorporated in DDM goals and objectives section.
Objective 14.2. Develop a phased response plan that coordinates emergency debris management services and maximizes public health and safety.	Incorporated in DDM goals and objectives section.


Objective 14.3. Develop a recovery plan that maximizes the amounts of materials recovered and recycled and minimizes potential environmental impacts.	Incorporated in DDM goals and objectives section.
Objective 14.4. Provide for innovative and flexible fiscal and financial arrangements that promote efficient and effective implementation of response and recovery plans.	Incorporated in DDM goals and objectives section.
Objective 14.5. Ensure the coordination and commitment of local, state and federal governments and the private sector.	Incorporated in DDM goals and objectives section.
Goal 15 - Facility Regulation. Metro's methods for regulatory control of solid waste facilities will include a system of franchising, contracting, owning and/or licensing to ensure that disposal and processing facilities are provided and operated in an acceptable manner.	Incorporated in "System Regulation" policy.
Metro Revenue System Goals and Objectives	
Goal 16 - Revenue Equity and Stability. To ensure that the Metro solid waste revenue system is adequate, stable, equitable and helps achieve the goals of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.	Incorporated in "Disposal Pricing" policy.
Objective 16.1. Charges to users of Metro-owned disposal facilities will be reasonably related to disposal services received. Charges to residents of the Metro service district who may not be direct users of the disposal system should be related to other benefits received.	Incorporated in "Disposal Pricing" policy.
Objective 16.2. There will be sufficient revenues to fund the costs of the solid waste system.	Incorporated in "Disposal Pricing" policy.
Objective 16.3. The revenue system will help the region accomplish management goals such as waste reduction and environmental protection.	Incorporated in "Disposal Pricing" policy.

M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\2007\SWAC012507 RSWMP policies.xls



Standards for Mixed Dry Waste Facilities (MRFs & Reloads)

SWAC
January 25, 2007





Project goal & purpose

- Council directed staff to update existing standards and imposed a moratorium
- Standards published to prevent nuisance impacts or harm to people or the environment
- Clarify license and franchise application requirements





Why do we need standards?

- Recent applications did not address waste handling impacts
- Existing standards did not anticipate magnitude of new applicant problems
 - ✓ Most existing MRFs already meet the standards
- Region-wide standards ensure a minimum level of consistency
 - ✓ Individual jurisdictions may impose more strict regulations

Examples of issues addressed in standards

- Dust & blowing debris
- Contamination of unprocessed waste and recyclables
- Inadequate load checking for prohibited waste




Examples of issues








Existing examples
MRFs meeting or exceeding the proposed standards

KB Recycling 9602 SE Clackamas Road, Clackamas



Pride Recycling 3980 Tualatin Sherwood Road, Sherwood



Willamette Resources 10295 SW Ridder Road, Wilsonville



Troutdale 869 NW Eastwind Drive, Troutdale



Standards developed & refined
 Developed with input from the “dry waste” workgroup (see Attachment 2: Standards Tables)

▪ Vince Gilbert (ECR)	▪ Theresa Koppang (Washington County)
▪ Howard Grabhorn (Lakeside)	▪ Mike Leichner (Pride Recycling)
▪ Allen Kackman (Elder Demolition)	▪ Mark McGregor (Clean-it-up-Mark)
▪ Dean Kampfer (Waste Management)	▪ Audrey O'Brien (DEQ)
▪ Scott Keller (City of Beaverton)	▪ Ray Phelps (WRI)
	▪ David White (ORRA)

Major new requirements

1. Building with pad (tipping, processing and reloading areas)
2. Allow two years for existing facilities to comply
3. Out-of-region facilities must be in compliance (if taking Metro waste)

Facility standards

1. Code amendment (Council)
 General performance goals
 - Broad expectations for facility
2. Administrative Procedures (COO)
 Specific performance goals
 - Issues addressed in design or operations
 Performance standards / Operating requirements
 - Observable behavior – license provisions
 Templates (application form & license)

Schedule

Facility standards & “lift moratorium”

- Feb. 15: Council – 1st reading. No action
- **Feb. 22: Council public hearing**
- **Action**
 Implementation upon effective date of ordinances (90 days after adoption)
 If “emergency clause” - implementation is effective upon adoption