

**METRO**

MEETING: Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee
DAY: Wednesday
DATE: November 8, 1995
TIME: 8:30 - 10:00 a.m.
PLACE: Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue
 Conference Room 370

- 10 min. **1. Updates and Introductions** Shanks/Kvistad
- 5 min. **2. Approval of Minutes** Kvistad
 Action Requested: Vote to approve the minutes of June 21, July 19 and September 20, 1995
- 1 hr. **3. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP)**
- Presentation of the Executive Officer's Recommendations Burton
 No Action Requested
- Review of Amendments, Changes and Additions to the RSWMP (changes made to the July 10 draft that are reflected in the October draft) Shanks/Nelson
- 15 min. **4. Other Business/Citizen Communications** Kvistad
- 5. Adjourn**

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

Enclosures:

1. Minutes are not enclosed in this packet because they were distributed as part of the October 18 SWAC agenda packet (that meeting was subsequently canceled). If you did not receive that packet and would like copies of the minutes, call Connie Kinney, 797-1643.
2. Executive Officer's Recommended Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, October 1995
3. Errata to the October 1995 RSWMP
4. Amendments, Clarifications and Additions to the RSWMP
5. Letter from Robert Baumgartner, DEQ, regarding the draft RSWMP

**SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF MEETING OF June 21, 1995**

MEMBERS

Ken Spiegel, Clackamas County	Susan Ziolko
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources	Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste Systems
David White, ORRA	Jeanne Roy, Citizen
Lexus E. Johnson, Oregon Hydrocarbon	Steve Schwab, CCRRA
Tom Miller, Wash. County Haulers	Steve Miesen, BFI
Jim Cozzetto, Jr., MDC	Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
Dave Kunz, DEQ	Lynda Kotta, East County Cities
Lynne Storz, Washington County	Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers

GUESTS

Bob Martin	Keri Painter, Columbia Resource Co.
Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.	Debra Fromdahl, Sanifill, N.W.
Ray Phelps, OWSI	

METRO

Jon Kvistad, SWAC Chair	Marie Nelson
Ruth McFarland, Metro Council Chair	Jennifer Ness
Debbie Gorham	Deborah Adams
Doug Anderson	

1. Approval of May 17, 1995 Minutes - Action Item

Jeanne Roy requested that page 3, paragraph 5, first sentence, be amended to read: "Ms. Roy did not think that staff had ~~not~~ fully evaluated the estimated cost and tonnage impacts of practices described in the draft as "additional key elements." The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

2. Updates and Introductions

Lex Johnson introduced Ed Keenen to the Committee. Mr. Johnson announced that Oregon Hydrocarbon had reorganized and merged management of its Tacoma and Portland facilities. Mr. Keenen would manage the two facilities and Mr. Johnson would serve as a consultant to the organization during the next year before retiring.

Terry Petersen reported the Metro Solid Waste Department was undergoing reorganization. Sam Chandler, former Operations Division Manager had resigned. Rather than hire a new Operations Manager, the operations functions would be assumed by existing managers. Reorganization decisions will be announced at the July SWAC meeting, he said.

3. Multi-Family and Status Report

Jennifer Ness, Metro Solid Waste Planner, reviewed highlights of a printed summary which had been included in the agenda packet. She explained that the region's goal to implement recycling systems for 85% of the region's multifamily complexes was ambitious. Because of continued population increases and more complexes being built, the region had fallen short of that goal. Although the region is currently at 70% completion, a few jurisdictions had already exceeded the 85% goal. She explained the 1996 goal was a more realistic assessment would allow local governments and waste haulers to catch up with the backlog. The region's future plans were consistent with SWAC's Regional Solid Waste Management Plan recommendations, she said.

4. Yard Debris Waste Reduction - Status Report

Jim Goddard, Recycling Manager, presented highlights of a written report entitled "Analysis of Yard Debris Recycling System." One of the report's significant findings was that the region's rate of yard debris disposal had decreased significantly since 1987 and that the region had met the 1993 goals of the Yard Debris Recycling Plan. He pointed out that the new 1995-2005 Regional Solid Waste Plan (RSWMP), currently being developed by SWAC, would replace the former RSWMP, of which the Yard Debris Recycling Plan was a part.

Goddard explained that an estimated 47,000 tons of yard debris a year is still disposed. Much of this waste is disposed by self-haulers and through residential drop-box activity. Programs will be designed to divert this yard debris from disposal. Overall, he said the benchmark will be to divert 17,000 tons of yard debris from disposal by the year 2000.

Ms. Roy was concerned that yard debris disposal tonnage in the draft RSWMP were not consistent with the figures used in the Yard Debris Waste Reduction Status Report. Mr. Goddard and staff analyst Deborah Adams explained that the RSWMP tables would be adjusted to reflect an update to Metro's Waste Characterization Study analysis. The two documents would then be consistent.

Ms. Roy supported staff's proposal to develop waste diversion and recycling programs for residential self-haulers. Mr. Goddard said a work group would be formed to determine an action plan. The work group would be represented by the appropriate local governments, waste haulers, processors, and other parties. Ms. Roy said she also wanted to propose some language changes in the report. She and Mr. Goddard agreed to meet to work out these changes.

5. Licensing of Yard Debris Processors - Action Item

Bill Metzler, Solid Waste Planner, presented the recommendations of a regional work group of yard debris processors, local government representatives and others.

Dave Kunz explained that the DEQ dealt with odor issues on a complaint basis, and that currently, there was no funding for further DEQ involvement in managing these types of facilities.

Ken Spiegel discussed the siting and facility concerns in Clackamas County. The public wanted further assurances that facilities be managed appropriately, he said. The County asked for Metro's help and supported the licensing approach.

Further discussions included the need to complete the licensing standards sections that are under revision and to clarify program costs and administration procedures.

The licensing program proposal was tabled until SWAC's concerns were addressed, including revisions to the unfinished sections. Mr. Metzler thanked the committee for their comments and, and he would return with the necessary revisions.

6. Survey of 1,000 Households Regarding Recycling, Disposal, and Other Solid Waste Practices - Status Report

Deborah Adams, Solid Waste Analyst, reviewed highlights of a written report on the results of a recent telephone survey conducted by Metro. The survey objectives were to:

- Solicit opinions from a broad cross-section of the region's citizens, particularly those not normally involved in solid waste issues;
- Receive feedback on general questions relating to Metro's current update of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan;
- Compare the results from a previous survey completed in 1990; and
- Gather information that would be helpful in designing education and promotion programs.

Highlights of survey results included: 86% of those responding said they used residential curbside recycling collection programs regularly or periodically; Only 6% reported to dispose of yard debris with regular garbage compared to 28% in 1990; 92% of the responding households said they subscribed to garbage and recycling collection services; 43% said they had used Metro's household hazardous waste disposal sites of collection events at least once; and 54% said they would support an advance disposal fee to help support the cost of household hazardous waste management.

7. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Action Item

4. Reload Facilities, Key Concept and Approach

Change the first sentence to read: "The recommended practice is to allow the siting of reload facilities for consolidation of loads hauled ~~sited, owned and operated by haulers for hauling~~ to appropriate disposal facilities."

Since Metro will review proposals to site reload facilities on a case-by-case basis (see item b) below), the key concept should not be worded to place arbitrary restrictions on siting.

due to time constraints, SWAC decided not amend item (e) at this time but to add a new sentence that would clearly state the current Metro policy on vertical integration. Staff acknowledge that SWAC would participate in the deliberation process when Metro revisited its current vertical integration policy.

Page 7-23

Item 1, Yard debris processing system: replace all references in this section to "licensing" with the words "franchising or otherwise authorizing."

This amendment was proposed by Doug Coener because SWAC had not yet decided to recommend whether yard debris processors should be licensed.

Page 7-31

First bullet, "Key Concepts," changed to read: "Household hazardous waste collection services are expensive to provide. The minimum \$5 handling fee currently charged at the two permanent facilities covers a small portion of operating costs. As disposal fee revenues decrease due to effective waste reduction and recycling programs, new revenue sources must be secured to pay for HHW collection. Costs have been paid primarily by all garbage generators through disposal fees. A more appropriate source of funds would be from those who purchase the hazardous products."

Amendments to this section were proposed by both Jeanne Roy and Lynne Storz to more accurately describe the key concept.

SWAC voted to accept the revisions described above. The revisions were unanimously accepted. SWAC then voted unanimously to instruct staff to incorporate these revisions into the May 17 "Discussion Draft" RSWMP and to release a "Preliminary Draft" RSWMP for public review and comment.

8. Other Business/Citizen Communications

None.

9. Adjourn

There being no further business, Chair Kvistad adjourned the meeting. The next SWAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 19, 8:30 a.m.

**SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF MEETING OF: July 19, 1995**

MEMBERS

Jon Kvistad, Chair
Lex Johnson, Oregon Hydrocarbon
David White, ORRA
Susan Keil, City of Portland
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers

Loreen Mills, City of Tigard
Steve Schwab, CCRRA
Jeanne Roy, Citizen

GUESTS

Debbie Fromdahl, Sanifill NW
Ed Keenan, OHI/TPS
Michael Sievers, SSI
Ann McFarlane, McFarlanes Bark

Wendy Frizzell, RCRG
Ray Phelps, OWSI
Chip Terhn, WRI
JoAnn Herrigel, City of Milwaukie

METRO

Bern Shanks
Marie Nelson

Debbie Gorham
Kelly Shafer Hossaini

1. Updates and Introductions

Bern Shanks announced the completion of the Solid Waste Department reorganization. The six departments were consolidated into five, with Terry Petersen as the new Operations Department manager, and Debbie Gorham assuming the management role for the Planning and Technical Services Division. Other changes include the addition of the St. Johns clean-up program to the Engineering Division under Jim Watkins, the addition of the Recycling Information Center to Judith Mandt's Administrative Services division, and added responsibilities for Budget and Finance Manager Roosevelt Carter in Rate Review.

Bern Shanks also reported that the Enforcement Division will spend more time on compliance checking and facility inspections and that Metro will release a press announcement on the subject. He also informed the group that responses have been received on the Request for Proposals for the Disposal and/or Transport of Waste from the Forest Grove Transfer Station and that replies are in progress.

2. 1994 Recycling Level Survey - Status Report

Andy Sloop, Metro Solid Waste Planner, presented the highlights of the "1994 Recycling and Recovery Level Survey" results which had been included in the agenda packet. He reported that the recycling rate increased from 38% to 41% between 1993 and 1994, and that the goal for the 1995 calendar year is 40%. The amount of waste generated actually increased between 1993 and 1994, but more of that increase was recycled than disposed. Overall, the amount of material recycled increased by 20% between the two years, with 43% of that rise being due to an increase in paper recycling.

	Comments Received	Suggested Revision to Preliminary Draft
I	Residential Waste Reduction, continued	
	Residential Food Wastes:	
	Using sewage system as a disposal method is inefficient - need alternatives.	Page 7-9, add language to Practice 5, Key Elements: It is the regional policy to encourage home composting and processing of organics (excluding meat), rather than use of garbage disposals and sewer systems for disposal of food. (Language from 3/15/95 SWAC Planning Subcommittee)
II	Business Waste Reduction	
	Waste Prevention:	
	Explore ways to decrease overpackaging.	Pages 7-10 & 7-11, add language to Practice 1, Roles and Responsibilities: Education efforts will stress decreasing overpackaging. Metro will also support existing or expanded state packaging legislation.
	Source-Separated Recycling:	
	Address event waste recycling.	Page 7-10, Practice 1, Include in Business Waste Reduction Practices as part of the targeted generator strategies.
III	Building Industries Waste Reduction	
	Technical and Educational Programs:	
	Integrate education efforts with strong markets for recyclables.	Pages 7-15 & 7-16, add language to Practice 3, Key Concept and Approach of the Recommended Practice: Education efforts will be integrated with efforts to encourage strong markets for recyclables.
	Explore ways to decrease overpackaging.	Page 7-14, add language to Practice 1, Roles and Responsibilities: Education efforts will stress decreasing overpackaging. Metro will also support existing or expanded state packaging legislation.
IV	Background Section - *Note - These comments were submitted after 7/9/95, and are not included in the 7/10/95 Meeting Comments and Summary.	
	Table 2.6 on page 2-6 does not include Northern Wasco County Landfill.	Page 2-6, add Northern Wasco County Landfill to Table 2.6.

	Comments Received	Suggested Revision to Preliminary Draft
VIII	Other Suggested Revisions, continued	
	In Chapter 7, "Additional Key Elements" should be incorporated into the "Key Elements of the Recommended Practice". (Staff recommendation.)	In Chapter 7, all "Additional Key Elements" will be incorporated into the "Key Elements of the Recommended Practice" in the final draft of the RSWMP.

Due to a lack of quorum, a formal vote of approval could not be taken. As a result, the seven voting members present took an advisory vote and unanimously approved the changes as submitted and approved the release of a Final Draft RSWMP to the Executive Officer and public. Staff was then instructed by the Committee to fax the changes to absent voting members and solicit an electronic vote. This was done on July 20 and 21, 1995. Six replies to the fax were received with all voting to accept and none voting to reject. Votes were solicited from regular members; however, when these members were either on vacation or unavailable, we solicited a vote from their alternate.

The results of the electronic vote were as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Accept</u>	<u>Reject</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Tom Miller	X		"With the exception of residential food waste discussion. Still have reservations about potential health problems." (Revision to 'Residential Food Wastes')
Bruce Broussard	X		
Lynda Kotta	X		
Lynne Storz	X		
James Cozzetto, Jr.	X		
Ken Spiegle	X		

4. Other Business/Citizen Communications

None.

5. Adjourn

There being no further business, Chair Kvistad adjourned the meeting. The next SWAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 20, 8:30 a.m.

KSH:clk
s:share/p&ts/SWAC/0719.sum

**SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUMMARY MEETING OF: September 20, 1995**

MEMBERS

Dick Johnson, City of Portland
Gary Penning, Waste Management
Debbie Noah, E. Mult. Cities
Ken Spiegle, Clackamas County
Jeff Grimm, Grimms Fuel
Tom Miller, Washington County Haulers
David White, ORRA
Jeanne Roy, Citizen
Lynne Storz, Washington Co.

Jim Cozzetto, Jr., MDC&R
Jeff Murray, Far West Fiber
Doug Coenen, Waste Management
Sue Keil, City of Portland
Gary Hansen, Multnomah Co.
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
Bruce Broussard, Citizen
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources

GUESTS

Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.
Trey Debry III, The Scotts Co.
Bert Folger, The Scotts Co.
Wendy Frizzell, RCRG
Michael Sievers, Pacific/West Communications

METRO

Jon Kvistad, Chair
Bern Shanks
Debbie Gorham
Marie Nelson
Todd Sadlo
Jennifer Ness
Bill Metzler
Scott Klag
Tim Raphael
Kelly Hossaini

1. Updates and Introductions

Bern Shanks announced that the Metro Recycling Information Center received national recognition from the National Recycling Coalition for its recycling education programs.

2. Organics Demonstration Project Update - Commercial Food Waste Recovery

Jim Goddard, supervisor of the Recycling System Development Section and group leader of the Organics Demonstration Project, announced that the Project has been reorganized and some changes will be made to previous plans. The new Project staff consists of himself, Bill Metzler, Paul Ehinger, and Jennifer Ness. He reported that the team envisions a cooperative approach to the Project, where commercial generators, one or more haulers, and a processor would work together to collect pre-consumer food waste (such as produce trimmings) and non-recyclable paper for

composting. Jim stressed the importance of such an operation being self-sustaining and economically viable.

Jim then reported that the new request for proposals would be a unique, two-stage process. The first stage will be a qualification phase to ensure that proposers (haulers and processors) meet basic criteria for the project. The second stage would require more detailed proposals by firms that present acceptable proposals in the first stage. Pre-qualified processors and haulers are expected to group themselves into teams for the second stage of the proposal and present strategies.

Bruce Broussard thought that concentrating efforts on the areas with the most organic waste was important. Jim replied that the areas with a lot of the desired material may not be close enough to a processor to make it economically viable to haul it. It will be up to the processor/hauler team to decide the particulars.

Tom Miller mentioned that he was glad to see that Metro is handing the details of this project over to the private sector and asking them to find a solution for the problem.

Sue Keil was concerned that whatever system was put in place should have the capacity to accommodate the amount of organic waste in the region.

As a policy question, Tom Miller was interested in whether Metro will accept an increase to the total solid waste system cost if an organics processing facility ends up costing more on a per-ton basis than what currently exists. Jon Kvistad replied that we need to make sure it is even viable before we can address the potential costs to the system. A policy will have to be explored. Ralph Gilbert then told the group that he had been examining some of the potential organics processing numbers for his own purposes and believes that the facility could actually decrease system costs.

3. Yard Debris Processing and Yard Debris Reload Facility Licensing Program - Action Item

Bill Metzler, Metro Solid Waste Planner, reminded the meeting attendees that a proposal for a Yard Debris Processing and Yard Debris Reload Facility Licensing Program had been presented at the June 21 SWAC meeting, but had been tabled by the Committee until some questions could be answered. Bill informed the group that their questions have since been addressed in a revised document, included in the agenda packet. Bill then directed the group to the section of the revised document where particular concerns had been listed and answered, and reviewed that information with the group.

Sue Keil expressed concern about what agency would have authority over regulating odor problems and would set the standards for control. Bill replied that there would be a high degree of coordination between the DEQ, the local authority, the processor, and Metro to address any odor problems. The objective will be to work with the processor to find the operational problem that is creating the nuisance. Gary Hansen then stated that odor problems are often associated with

bad housekeeping and that reviewing a processor's procedures would help. David White said that Metro's authority over odor control would come from the licensing agreement wherein the processors agree to control odor.

Doug Coenen raised a concern about Section 18 (c) of the proposed yard debris licensing program. He wondered what it meant and why it had been included in the standards. Todd Sadlo responded that the purpose of that section was simply to ensure that like people were treated equally at the facility. Doug then asked why it was necessary to notify Metro of rates and changes to them. He added that this could pose some difficulty as rates can change rapidly, and the processors would ostensibly bear some kind of penalty if they didn't notify Metro within the specified ten days.

After more discussion on Section 18 (c), it was agreed that the section would be changed as follows:

- (c) The Licensee shall adhere to the following conditions with regard to disposal rates charged at the Facility:
- 1) Licensee may modify rates to be charged on a continuing basis as market demands may dictate. ~~Metro shall be notified no later than ten (10) days after any rate changes.~~ Rate schedules should be provided to Metro on a regular basis, and shall be provided to Metro on request. _
 - 2) ~~All #Rates charged at the facility shall be posted on a sign near where fees are collected. All customers within a given disposal class shall receive equal, consistent, and nondiscriminatory treatment in the collection of fees.~~ Rates and disposal classifications established by the licensee shall be reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

Tom Miller asked if processors would continue to have as much input in changes to the licensing system as they have had in its creation. Bill Metzler assured him that that was the intent.

Ralph Gilbert moved for the recommendation of the licensing program with the language change in Section 18 (c). A formal vote was taken and voting members present unanimously approved the recommendation.

4. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Update

Marie Nelson, supervisor of the Regional Solid Waste Planning section, gave the group an update on the status of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). She said that after staff review, some editing changes had been made to the final draft. After comments have been received from the Metro Executive Officer, the document will be republished with all of the changes that have occurred since the preliminary draft. The schedule for Metro Council hearings on the document will also be published at that time. These tasks should be completed by late fall.

5. Other Business/Citizen Communications

Bern Shanks reminded the Committee that there have recently been changes in what had formerly been the Metro Solid Waste Department. The name has been changed to Regional Environmental Management, and the former six divisions consolidated into five. Terry Petersen is now the manager of the Environmental Services division (formerly the Operations division), and Debbie Gorham is now manger of the Waste Reduction and Planning Services division.

Bern also informed the group that the problem of contaminated loads coming from the Oregon Health Sciences University has been addressed, and that there is currently increased routine checking of loads received from medical facilities.

Jon Kvistad informed the group that the Council Solid Waste Committee had been renamed as the Regional Environmental Management Committee (REMCOM).

6. Adjourn

KH:clk
s:sharelp&tslawac\0920.sum

**The Executive Officer's Recommended
Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP)
Final Draft - October 1995**

Errata

The following paragraphs were inadvertently omitted from the Final Draft RSWMP document. These paragraphs should be added at the end of page 1-3, "Metro's Role in Solid Waste Planning", Chapter 1.

"The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan formally establishes Metro's and local governments' commitments to a waste reduction program for the next ten years. While all local governments, including cities, counties and Metro have solid waste management authority, Metro is specifically responsible for preparing, adopting and enforcing the regional plan.

Every local government within the Metro region has an obligation to be actively involved in the implementation of the Plan's waste reduction efforts. The Plan ensures local government adoption of the Plan's waste reduction recommendations through an annual review and approval process of local governments annual waste reduction work plans.

It is expected that local governments will voluntarily participate in this process since availability of Metro Challenge funds are contingent on this approval. However, in the event a local government decides not to participate in the process or to adopt or fail to adopt waste reduction practices consistent with the Plan, Metro will take appropriate action to ensure that the jurisdiction fulfills its waste reduction obligations."

**The Executive Officer's Recommended
Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP)
Final Draft - October 1995**

Amendments, Clarifications and Additions

The purpose of this document is to note all changes made to the previous RSWMP draft (July 10, 1995) that have been incorporated into the October 1995 final draft RSWMP. Throughout this document, page numbers (unless noted as a "new page number") will refer to the July 10 draft. The term "new page number" refers to the October final draft.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S ADDITIONS

- **Waste Reduction Goal**

The Plan has been changed to state that the 50% recycling goal will be met or exceeded by the year 2005, and that the year 2000 recovery goal will be increased to 52%.

Amendment. Page 5-5 (new page 5-7), Goal No. 7, has been changed to read: "The regional waste reduction goal is to achieve at least a 50% recycling rate 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 reduction indicators. The region's interim goal for the year 2000 is the 52% ~~50%~~-recovery rate as defined by State statute."

Amendments. Due to the Goal No. 7 amendment, many figures in the Chapter 9 tables changed. Contact Marie Nelson at Metro (797-1670) for a copy of specific changes to Chapter 9 tables. Note that Table 9.3 (new page 9-8) now indicates that the region should reach a 53% recycling level by the year 2005 and a 52% recovery level by the year 2000.

Addition. Page 7-12 (new page 7-15) has been amended by adding the following language to Business Waste Reduction Practices, Practice 2, Expansion of Source-Separated (Pre-Collection) Recycling, Roles and Responsibilities, new second paragraph. This additional commitment will help ensure the region accomplishes the new goal. "Metro will take responsibility for coordinating a strategy that integrates waste evaluations, targeted generator strategies, and business organic processing efforts in order to accomplish the highest level of waste reduction. This coordination is intended to ensure that businesses have the opportunity to source separate and recycle the types of materials they actually generate."

DIRECTOR OF REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT'S ADDITIONS

- **Vertical Integration**

Require consideration of the effects of vertical integration.

Amendment. Page 5-4 (new page 5-5), Goal 4, has been amended by adding a new Objective 4.6: "In making decisions about transfer station ownership or regulation of solid waste facilities, Metro shall consider whether the decision would increase the degree of vertical integration in the regional solid waste system and whether that 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."

- **Development of Local Recycling Industry**

Amendment. A new objective 9.3 has been added to page 5-5 (new page 5-7): "Support an environment that fosters development and growth of reuse, recycling, and recovery enterprises."

CHANGES MADE AS A RESULT OF METRO LEGAL REVIEW

- **Plan Continuity**

Clarify transition between 1988 RSWMP and new RSWMP.

Clarification. Page 1-2 (new page 1-2), has been changed by replacing the existing final bullet, "Why a Regional Solid Waste Management Plan," with the following language:

- "Replacement of the 1988 Regional Solid Waste Management Plan including its amendments: Waste Reduction Chapter, Plan Development and Amendment Chapter, Special Waste Chapter, Yard Debris Plan, Local Government Facility Siting Standards, Illegal Dumping Chapter, Metro West Transfer and Material Recovery System Chapter, and Household Hazardous Waste Chapter.

There are several solid waste management areas in which long-term recommendations have not yet been fully developed and integrated into the Plan. These are:

- Household hazardous waste
- Disaster debris management
- Illegal dumping
- Local government land use facility siting policies

Incorporation of these elements into the 1995-2005 RSWMP is expected to be completed during fiscal year 1995-96. Information in the previous RSWMP

regarding illegal dumping and facility siting policies should continue to be referred to for guidance until this work is completed.”

- **Metro Authority**

Statement of Metro’s relationship with local governments regarding locally imposed restrictions over Metro’s facilities.

Amendment. A new objective, Objective 6.6, has been added to page 5-4 (new page 5-6: “To the extent that tonnage limits and other locally imposed restrictions would prevent Metro from fully utilizing its facilities to carry out this plan, Metro reserves its authority to override such restrictions, after receiving public comment, by action of its Council.”

- **Revenue System**

Clarify to show that the objective related to Metro’s revenue system.

Clarification. Page 5-6 (new page 5-10), Objective 16.1, the first sentence, has been changed to read: “Charges to users of ~~the waste disposal system~~ Metro-owned disposal facilities will be directly related to disposal services received.”

IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The following clarifications were made as a result of discussions with the State Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in order to demonstrate that the Plan can be effectively implemented. These clarifications do not change the basic implementation philosophy as recommended by SWAC.

- **Relationship Between Metro and Local Governments**

Clarify the relationships between Metro and local governments to ensure the Plan is implemented.

Addition. The following paragraphs would be added at the end of the “Metro’s Role in Solid Waste Planning” section, page 1-4 (new page 1-4):

“The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan formally establishes Metro’s and local governments’ commitments to a waste reduction program for the next ten years. While all local governments, including cities, counties and Metro have solid waste management authority, Metro is specifically responsible for preparing, adopting and enforcing the regional plan.

Every local government within the Metro region has an obligation to be actively involved in the implementation of the Plan’s waste reduction efforts. The Plan ensures local government adoption of the Plan’s waste reduction recommendations through an annual review and approval process of local governments annual waste reduction work plans.

It is expected that local governments will voluntarily participate in this process since availability of Metro Challenge funds are contingent on this approval. However, in the event a local government decides not to participate in the process or to adopt or fail to adopt waste reduction practices consistent with the Plan, Metro will take appropriate action to ensure that the jurisdiction fulfills its waste reduction obligations.”

- **Plan Implementation**

Ensure Metro and Local Governments have allocated enough resources to carry out RSWMP recommendations.

Clarification. Metro and Local Government Annual Work Plans will be included as Appendix C to the RSWMP.

- **Corrective Actions**

Clarify the corrective action process in Figure 6-1.

Clarification. Page 6-3 (new page 6-2), the Figure 6-1 flow chart has been changed to better show the sequence of corrective actions.

- **Corrective Actions**

Provide example of correction action sequences.

Clarification. Pages 6-7 and 6-8 (new pages 6-8 and 6-9), “Corrective Actions,” starting with the third sentence, has been changed to read: “The type of corrective action taken will depend on who is involved (i.e. DEQ, Metro, local governments or the private sector) and will follow a logical sequence designed to achieve compliance with the Plan. Corrective actions could include (not listed in any order of priority) the following:

- ~~Revise RSWMP~~
- Mediate a settlement
- Issue enforcement order
- Obtain a court injunction
- Impose a fine
- Withhold funds
- Metro assume greater responsibility
- Withhold a facility operation franchise

~~Note that these corrective actions are not listed in any order of priority.~~

For example, if private service providers were to have implemented a program and had not, the local government would attempt to mediate a solution with the service providers. If mediation did not achieve satisfactory results, Metro would look to take action. Metro actions would be expected to begin with conflict resolving approaches (for example, reopening mediation between local government and the service provider)

then moving to more forceful approaches if compliance is not achieved (for example, withholding Metro grant funds from the local government)."

Add the following footnote at the end of this section: "See Appendix D for a discussion of Metro's authority to implement the RSWMP."

- **Clarify Plan Details**

Specify who will supply containers in the description of Business Waste Reduction Practices.

Clarification. The following language has been added to page 7-11 (new page 7-14), Practice 2, Roles and Responsibilities, at the end of the first paragraph: "During the development of the programs, issues such as who will provide recycling containers to businesses will be resolved."

- **Program Evaluations and Criteria**

Clarify language about how program evaluations and criteria will be developed.

Clarification. Page 9-2 (new page 9-2), Part II, the final two paragraphs, has been changed to read:

"It is not necessary that every RSWMP program be subject to a complete program evaluation; rather, a *"leading subset"* of programs shall be identified for evaluation in the annual work plans. Programs will be evaluated using the most appropriate assessment methods. All waste prevention programs must be considered for evaluation, as direct study is the most appropriate means of measuring this component of the waste management hierarchy. A general requirement is that programs in the *"leading subset"* be accompanied by a plan for evaluation using the most appropriate assessment methods.

The appropriate methods and levels of detail for evaluation are specific to the particular programs under evaluation, and will be based on characteristics of each program. The annual work plans will specify the measurement methods and performance criteria that will determine whether each program is meeting objectives. Assessment systems shall be in place within one year after a program is identified for evaluation."

Clarification. Page 7-3, first paragraph, last sentence (new page 7-3, second paragraph, last sentence), has been changed to read: "The consensus was that the recommended practices will ~~should~~ serve as the performance standards that alternative practices will be required to equal."

Clarification. The following paragraph has been added to page 7-3, new second paragraph (new page 7-3, third paragraph): "The performance standard will be based on criteria that will include, as appropriate, the following: participation levels; amounts of waste prevented, recycled, recovered, or disposed; consistency with the waste reduction hierarchy; economic and technical feasibility; and impact on other waste reduction activities."

Clarification. The following paragraph has been added to page 7-3, at end of the "Purpose of the Recommended Practices" section (new page 7-4, first paragraph, last sentence): "It is Metro's intent that each local government will implement either a recommended practice or an approved alternative."

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- **Add a discussion of "reuse."**

The following additions address omissions to the July 10 draft RSWMP that were identified as a result of staff discussions with the DEQ. These additions are in keeping with roles and responsibilities recommended by SWAC.

Language has been added to page 7-2, end of bullet from previous page (new page 7-1, third bullet, second paragraph): "A priority will also be to advance existing private and non-profit efforts in reuse, in particular those industries that work from donations ("thrifths"), and the building industry's salvage of reusable materials."

Language has been added to page 7-5, Practice #1, Key Concept, second paragraph (new page 7-6, first bullet): "Waste prevention education and promotion activities will also be used to advance the efforts of private and nonprofit firms "thrift" industries."

Language has been added to page 7-5, Practice #1, Key Elements, final sentence (new page 7-6, second bullet, last sentence): "Private and nonprofit activities in reuse industries will be recognized as an important contributor to regional waste prevention efforts."

Language has been added to page 7-5, Practice #1, Roles and Responsibilities (new page 7-7, second to last paragraph): "Metro will continue to support the thrift industries through means such as discounts on their disposal of non-recyclable items. Efforts will also be made to increase the flow and reusability of materials to these businesses. In FY 1994-95 thrifths accounted for 15,000 tons of reused and recyclable materials. Metro will continue to measure this impact."

Language has been added to page 7-14, Building Industries Recommendations, Practice #1, Key Concept (new page 7-18, first bullet, last sentence): "The recommendations are also intended to support and promote the salvage of usable materials during building renovation and demolition, and to help overcome barriers to acceptance of their reuse."

- **Link Goal 9 (“Sustainability”) and Objective 9.1 to programs**

Clarifications:

Page 7-5, Practice 1, Roles and Responsibilities, final paragraph (new page 7-7, fifth paragraph, last sentence): “These efforts are intended to inform the consumer of the full cost of a product and promote the development of sustainable resource management.”

Page 7-10, Practice 1, Roles and Responsibilities, final paragraph (new page 7-13, second to last paragraph, last sentence): “These efforts are intended to inform the consumer of the full cost of a product and promote the development of sustainable resource management.”

Page 7-23, Practice 5, Key Concept (new page 7-30, first bullet, last sentence): “Including disposal costs in the cost of purchase of a product helps achieve the Plan’s objective of making consumer face the true cost of their choices and promotes the goal of developing sustainable resource management.”

- **Home Composting**

The number of home composting demonstration sites has been clarified.

Clarification. The following language has been added to page 7-6, Practice 2, Roles and Responsibilities (new page 7-8, third bullet, second sentence): “Metro will support at least five demonstration sites.”

- **State Plastics Legislation**

More detail has been added about state plastics legislation.

Clarification. Language added to page 7-7, Practice 3, Roles and Responsibilities (new page 7-9, last sentence): “An important issue to consider in looking at the next 10 years is that if stable plastic markets develop, recent State legislation requires their curbside collection.”

- **Waste Audits and Business Waste Prevention**

Relationship between waste audits and model waste prevention programs have been clarified.

Clarification. Page 7-10, Practice 1, Roles and Responsibilities, first sentence of third paragraph, has been replaced with the following language (new page 7-13, third paragraph, first sentence): “Metro will develop model waste prevention programs for different types of businesses and “events” such as convention and festivals. As they are developed, they will be integrated into the ongoing waste evaluation program.”

- **Use of Recycled Feedstock**

Roles regarding using recycled feedstock have been clarified in Business Waste Reduction Practices, Practice 1, Roles and Responsibilities.

Clarification. Language added to page 7-11, Practice 1, Roles and Responsibilities, end of fourth paragraph (new page 7-13, fourth paragraph, last two sentences): "Metro will also perform analyses of how businesses can substitute recycled feedstock in manufacturing processes. Metro will work with businesses to promote the use of recycled feedstock and integrate technical information on this subject into programs such as the waste evaluations."

- **Dry Waste Processing Capacity**

Contingencies have been added to the action plan in the event of inadequate dry waste processing capacity.

- **Building Trades Recycling**

The level of existing construction and demolition recycling has been described.

Clarification. Language added to page 7-15, Practice 2, Key Concept, at end of first sentence (new page 7-19, first bullet, second and third sentences): "The majority of construction materials are recyclable. The percentage that can be recycled from any project is dependent on the job. Over 85% of the waste from residential construction is currently recyclable in the Metro area."

- **Household Hazardous Waste**

The status of Household Hazardous Waste recommendations has been explained.

Clarification. Language added to page 7-21, after listing of the five recommendations (new page 7-27): "During the next year, additional work will be conducted on the Household Hazardous Waste recommendations. This work will include examination of alternative funding mechanisms and on the most efficient and effective ways of providing collection events and managing the existing permanent facilities. This analysis will then be added to the tables of the recommended practices to be implemented over the next ten years."

Clarification. Page 7-25 (new page 7-32), Household hazardous waste management added to Solid Waste Facilities and Services section as line number 5.

- **Advance Disposal Fee**

Statement on Metro study of advance disposal fees has been clarified.

Clarification. Page 8-6 (new page 8-8, first bullet), Special Disposal Fees, Recommendations, has been revised to read: "Metro should employ it is recommended that Metro pursue study, leading to implementation of charges on specific products"

that (1) make identifiable, extraordinary burdens on the disposal system; or (2) which may be more valuable if reused or recycled.”

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO FOLD-OUT TABLES, CHAPTER 7

- Table 1A - Residential Waste Reduction, Short Term
A correction was made to item 1, Education and Information, Practice (a). Milestone bullet 2 was in error. The correct date is July 1997, not July 1996.
- Several corrections to the fold-out tables were made where fiscal year bar graph did not matching up with the date printed in the “Key Dates and Issues” column. Also, any references in the tables to an “additional key elements” category was eliminated. Practices formerly listed under “additional key elements” are now merged with recommended practices.

Clarification. Contingencies were added to Tables 2B and 3 (new Tables 2B and 3) for the dates of July 1997 and July 1999: “Explore public options if capacity insufficient.”

- Table 4, Solid Waste Facilities, Regulation and Siting, Task 2, practice a), Key Dates and Issues column: 7/96 was changed to 7/97.

OTHER CLARIFICATIONS AND ADDITIONS

- Technical definitions (located in Glossary A) have been changed and added as appropriate.
- Several changes have been made to more accurately describe Metro’s revenue system and flow control authority.
- Any references to the Metro Solid Waste Department have been changed to read: Metro Regional Environmental Management Department.
- The title of Chapter 9 has been changed to “Monitoring and Assessing Performance.”

October 17, 1995

DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY

NORTHWEST REGION

BERN SHANKS
DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
METRO
600 NE GRAND AVE
PORTLAND, OR 97232-2736

Re: October 17, 1995, Draft RSWMP Approval
Meeting

Dear Mr Shanks:

Thanks to you and your staff for taking time out to attend the meeting today to resolve the issues relating to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. I am glad we could come to a mutually acceptable agreement. After incorporation of the modifications agreed upon today, the Plan will meet or exceed DEQ's requirements for approval. Your staff should be commended for a job well done. DEQ reserves formal, final approval for after review of the final draft, which we both anticipate to occur prior to the November 8, 1995, Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting.

Sincerely,



Robert Baumgartner, Manager
Water Quality Technical Services
Northwest Region

RECEIVED

John A. Kitzhaber
Governor



2020 SW Fourth Avenue
Suite 400
Portland, OR 97201-4987
(503) 229-5263 Voice
TTY (503) 229-5471

DEQ-1

Recovery / Recycling Levels

Source	Recovery Goal	Recycling Goal
1988 RSWMP	56% by 2010	
RSWMP Update SWAC Draft	50% by 2000	50% by 2005
RSWMP Update Executive Officer's Final Draft Goal 7, pg. 5-7	52% by 2000	At least 50% by 2005
Table 9.3 (page 9-8) System Benchmarks	52% by 2000 57% by 2005	48% by 2000 53% by 2005
Executive Officer's "Challenge to the Region" statement		53% by 2005
State of Oregon (for the Metro region) ORS 459A.010	40% by 1995 * 50% by 2000 *	
Current Actual 1994 Survey	45% actual - 1994	41% actual - 1994

* The methods used by the State and by Metro to calculate recovery levels are different.

Chapter 9 Tables Reflect New Goals

Summary of Tonnage Changes in the Executive Officer's Recommendations

Type of Business Waste	Expected Disposal Without RSWMP, Year 2005	Net Effect of RSWMP Diversion Programs			Expected Disposal With RSWMP, Year 2005	Disposition in Solid Waste Hierarchy
		July 10 Draft	Additional Diversion in Executive Officer's Recommendation	Total Diversion in Final (October) Draft		
Organics	124,100	-17,000	-31,600	-48,600	75,500	composting recycling
Recyclables	<u>222,000</u>	<u>-65,800</u>	<u>-7,000</u>	<u>-72,800</u>	<u>139,100*</u>	
Total	<u>346,100</u>	<u>-82,800</u>	<u>-38,600</u>	<u>-121,400</u>	<u>214,600</u>	

* Disposal figure also accounts for 10,100 tons prevented through waste audits. This prevented tonnage is unchanged from the July 10 draft.

Organics. The additional organics tonnage is primarily from eating and drinking establishments (mostly, restaurants). The higher tonnage is a result of a broader, more regional collection strategy than in the July 10 Draft RSWMP. In the earlier draft, organics collection was confined to areas where restaurants are clustered together (such as downtown core areas).

Recyclables. The additional tonnage comes from all types of businesses as a result of concerted education efforts through the waste audit program.