

**METRO**

MEETING: Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee

DAY: Wednesday

DATE: October 18, 1995

TIME: 8:30 - 10:15 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
Action Requested: Vote to approve the minutes of
June 21, July 19 and September 20, 1995 | Kvistad |
| 45 min. 4. | Regional Solid Waste Management Plan
Presentation of the Executive Officer's Recommendations
No Action Requested | Burton |
| 30 min. 5. | Solid Waste Advisory Committee Organization
Discussion Item Only
No action will be taken at this meeting | Burton/Shanks |
| 15 min. 6. | Other Business/Citizen Communications | Kvistad |
| 7. Adjourn | | |

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

REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

List of Key Department Staff - At October 1, 1995

Bern Shanks	Director of REM	797-1661
Vacant Position	Outreach Coordinator	
Administration		
Judith Mandt	Administrative Manager	797-1649
Katie Dowdall	Community Enhancement Programs	797-1648
Vicki Kolberg	Recycling Information Supervisor	797-1514
Aletta Yantis	Support Services	797-1646
Connie Kinney	Support Services, SWAC	797-1643
Budget & Finance		
Roosevelt Carter	Budget & Finance Manager	797-1680
Phil North	Franchise Administrator	797-1685
Engineering & Analysis		
Jim Watkins	Engineering & Analysis Manager	797-1699
Dennis O'Neil	St. Johns Landfill Closure	797-1697
Chuck Geyer	Contract	797-1691
Paul Ehinger	Cost Analysis	797-1789
Environmental Services		
Terry Petersen	Environmental Services Manager	797-1669
Penny Erickson	Sr. Site Supervisor	797-1659
Jim Quinn	Household Hazardous Waste Supr.	797-1662
Waste Reduction & Planning Services		
Debbie Gorham	Waste Reduction & Planning Services Manager	797-1679
Doug Anderson	Technical Services Program Supr.	797-1788
Jim Goddard		797-1677
Marie Nelson	Planning Program Supervisor	797-1670
Leigh Zimmerman	Recycling Program Supervisor	797-1671
Other Phone Numbers:		
Department Information / Front Desk		797-1650
Recycling Information		234-3000
Fax - Metro Regional Center		797-1795
Metro Central Station		223-6775
Household Hazardous Waste Services		223-8133
Metro South Station		657-2873
Household Hazardous Waste Services		655-0480
Jon Kvistad, Councilor	Solid Waste Advisory Committee Chair Council Solid Waste Advisory Committee (now Regional Environmental Management Committee--REMCorn) Chair	797-1549


S:\SHARE\NELS\PERSONNEL\REM.LST

Distributed to SWAC 10/18/95

**METRO**

DATE: October 9, 1995

TO: SWAC Members

FROM: Jim Goddard, Organics Task Force Leader 

RE: Organics

During the September 20, 1995 meeting of SWAC, I reviewed the status of the Organics Program. At that time, I promised to provide you with the attached *Plan for the Development of a Food Waste Recovery System*. In the near future you will receive a draft of the Phase I RFP for review.

Please call me at 797-1677, or Bill Metzler at 797-1666, with comments, corrections, or additions to the plan.

JG:db

Attachment

cc: Debbie Gorham, Waste Reduction Manager
Bill Metzler, Organics Work Team
Paul Ehinger, Organics Work Team
Jennifer Ness, Organics Work Team

S:SHARE/GODD/ORGANICS/RFP1005.LTR

DRAFT PLAN
for
DEVELOPING A FOOD WASTE RECOVERY SYSTEM

BACKGROUND

Food waste accounts for almost one quarter (200,000 tons) of all garbage landfilled from the Metro region each year. Non-recyclable paper contributes another 60,000 tons annually to those same landfills. Fortunately, these organic waste materials can be diverted from the landfill and turned into compost products and soil amendments that rebuild the fertility of soils.

Currently, the Metro region diverts almost 100,000 tons a year of yard debris from the landfill through composting. Processing food waste is the next logical step to removing even more organic material from the waste stream. It is expected that a significant portion of food wastes and non-recyclable paper can be recovered at a cost equal-to or lower-than landfilling. This has been proven in many areas of the country where food waste composting has already begun. It should be possible to economically recover food waste in the Metro region as well.

WHY DO IT?

Attainment of regional waste diversion goals (outlined in the Draft Regional Solid Waste Management Plan) relies heavily on the collection and processing of source-separated organics, including food waste.

Additionally, interest in the development of a food waste recovery system has been exhibited by generators, haulers and potential processors. Unfortunately, none of these interested parties have been able to develop such a system.

METRO'S ROLE

While none of the individual interested parties have been able to develop a food waste recovery system that will help the region meet its goals, Metro is in a unique position to act as a catalyst. Metro can provide coordination, help establish partnerships, identify and work to remove barriers that have prevented the system from developing thus far and defray some of the cost and risk of establishing the initial operation of the system. Based on its unique position, Metro proposes to work with local governments, DEQ, haulers, generators and processors to conduct a food waste collection and processing project. The goal of this project is to establish an economically viable and self-sustaining food waste recovery system that will help the region meet its waste diversion goals.

ELEMENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL SYSTEM

In August 1995, a work group of Metro staff was formed to ascertain what elements are necessary to ensure the success of a food waste recovery system. To that end, the work group reviewed: the results from the organics conferences held in 1993; responses to a request for information issued in 1994; composting experience developed in and out of the region; and a draft request for proposals for organics processing. They also met with 12 haulers and processors who may be interested in participating in the food waste recovery system and visited a successful food waste collection and composting program in Seattle. All in all, the work group concluded that **a successful food waste recovery system should include:**

1. **Commercial, pre-consumer vegetative waste from food warehouses, grocery stores and restaurants only.** Non-recyclable paper from these sources could also be included. These wastes are least problematic with regard to odor, health and safety, and rodents. Dairy and meat products should not be included.
2. **The joint participation and efforts of local governments, DEQ, haulers, processors, generators and compost consumers.** Metro, on its own, cannot create, implement and ensure the success of a food waste recovery system but it can act as a catalyst and play a participatory, facilitating role if necessary.
3. **System profitability.** For the organics recycling system to be self-sustaining, each part of the system needs to operate profitably. This will provide an economic incentive for keeping food waste out of the landfill.
4. **A mutually acceptable arrangement between the hauler and the processor to ensure that they can each make the system work profitably.** This link (arrangement) between the hauler and the processor is particularly critical because Metro would not (or could not) exercise flow control. Therefore, the hauler must ensure the processor that they can obtain food waste from generators of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the processor's needs. In turn, the processor must produce a product that can be profitably marketed. If either of these conditions is not in place, a system will have no chance of success.
5. **Resolution of land use and permitting issues.** Siting a processing facility and odor control must be resolved before a food waste recovery system can be established.

THE PROCESS

A two phase Request For Proposal (RFP) process will be used. Phase 1 will be a screening step to ensure that proposers for hauling and/or processing have met the minimum requirements for a successful project, such as obtaining a site for processing and being able to control odors during collection and processing.

Proposers who have satisfactorily met the criteria of Phase 1 will be allowed to submit a more detailed and complete proposal for Phase 2. Phase 2 proposals must include both hauling and processing. Therefore, companies that proposed only hauling or processing in Phase 1 will be encouraged to build a formal relationship with another company so that both hauling and processing will be covered.

Phase 1: (Phase 1 allows all parties involved to address major concerns about a proposed system before a large commitment has been made in time and effort on everyone's part.)

- The Phase 1 proposal consists of a "Fill in the Blank" form for hauling and/or composting services for food waste.
- All Phase 1 proposals will be reviewed by Metro, local governments and DEQ. Reviewers will have the opportunity to critically evaluate the potential for a proposer to succeed and to ask more in-depth questions if it appears that they have not addressed all of the issues adequately.
- All Phase 1 proposals will be evaluated; each proposer will receive a list of issues that need to be resolved in order for a Phase 2 proposal to be considered.
- A mandatory pre-Phase 2 conference will be held for all proposers going on to that phase.

Phase 2: It is expected that proposers will use different collection arrangements, processing techniques and will produce different end products.

- Phase 2 proposals must include both the hauling and processing aspects of an organics recovery system.
- Phase 2 proposals must address how the operation can be sustained after the trial period (covered by this proposal) has been completed.
- Phase 2 proposals must include more detailed information about all operations.

TIMELINE

Since a Food Waste Recovery Project will involve Metro, local governments, DEQ, processors, haulers, generators and compost users, a great deal of coordination is required. This will involve reviewing the proposed Plan of Action, and Phase 1 and Phase 2 RFP's with all involved. To that end, the following schedule is proposed:

Distribute proposed Plan of Action (this document) with Metro management, SWAC, Metro Councilors, local government work group, DEQ and potential proposers. Get input.	Sept./Oct. 95
Develop Phase 1 RFP	Sept./Oct. 95
Review Phase 1 RFP with Metro management, SWAC Metro councilors, local government work group, DEQ and potential proposers	Oct./Nov. 95
Issue Phase 1 RFP	Nov. 95
Review Phase 1 proposals (involve local government work group) and identify those eligible to propose Phase 2	Jan. 96-Mar. 96
Develop Phase 2 RFP	Oct.-Dec. 95
Review Phase 2 RFP with Metro management, SWAC, Metro councilors, local government work group, DEQ and potential proposers. Get input.	Dec. 95-Mar. 96
Issue Phase 2 RFP	Mar. 96
Review Phase 2 proposals (involve local government work group)	Mar./Apr. 96
Award Phase 2 RFP	May 96

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

MEMBERS

Ken Spiegel, Clackamas County
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources
David White, ORRA
Lexus E. Johnson, Oregon Hydrocarbon
Tom Miller, Wash. County Haulers
Jim Cozzetto, Jr., MDC
Dave Kunz, DEQ
Lynne Storz, Washington County

Susan Ziolko
Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste Systems
Jeanne Roy, Citizen
Steve Schwab, CCRRA
Steve Miesen, BFI
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
Lynda Kotta, East County Cities
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers

GUESTS

Bob Martin
Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.
Ray Phelps, OWSI

Keri Painter, Columbia Resource Co.
Debra Fromdahl, Sanifill, N.W.

METRO

Jon Kvistad, SWAC Chair
Ruth McFarland, Metro Council Chair
Debbie Gorham
Doug Anderson

Marie Nelson
Jennifer Ness
Deborah Adams

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.

- Metro implement a licensing program for new and existing facilities, with a process to ensure coordination and problem solving with processors and local governments.
- Local governments amend zoning ordinances and development codes as needed to: 1) include clear and objective zoning standards; 2) require facilities to have a Metro license as a condition of land use approval; and 3) amend collection franchises to ensure that yard debris collected at curbside is delivered to only licensed facilities.

Mr. Metzler explained that Metro was asked by some local governments and processors to help develop effective, region-wide solutions for managing facility siting and operational concerns. The regional work group investigated various management options and after exploring a local government model ordinance approach, the group concluded that the licensing program would be the most effective option.

Lynne Storz relayed the concerns of Washington County about directing haulers to specific licensed facilities. She also indicated that the county nuisance control program could resolve potential issues relating to facility odor problems

Sue Kiel asked about the relationship of the licensing proposal to the yard debris product quality standards program. Mr. Metzler explained that currently they are separate issues. The licensing program deals primarily with operational issues that influence the physical impacts of facilities. The product quality program is now voluntary, but may be folded into the licensing program.

The proposed annual licensing fee of \$300 was discussed and it was suggested that this amount would not be sufficient to administer the program.

Todd Sadlo discussed the licensing standards dealing with enforcement, financial assurance and indemnification. He explained the language similar to existing Metro Code language for facility franchising. He would consider proposing some modifications to these Code sections at the request of the regional work group.

Lynn Storz asked who would enforce the standards, and under what authority. Mr. Sadlo explained that the Metro Code was the authority and that Metro Solid Waste Enforcement Unit could be part of the process, if required, and that the.

Mr. Johnson thought that licensing was not the right term, rather it should be a franchise. Discussion followed about the differences between franchising and licensing yard debris processing facilities.

Sue Kiel suggested the work group focus on the end product, not the process. She expressed concern about too many layers of government, given that local government, DEQ and OSHA would all be involved in regulating the processors.

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 or 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

Marie Nelson, Solid Waste Planning Supervisor, summarized the actions requested of SWAC at this meeting:

- Review the May 17, 1995, "Discussion Draft" of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) and make revisions as necessary;
- Release a "Preliminary Draft" RSWMP for public review and comment;
- Instruct staff to return to the SWAC on July 19 with the Preliminary Draft RSWMP and to provide an additional opportunity for SWAC to revise the draft based on public comments received through early July.

Ms. Nelson then reviewed changes that staff and SWAC members had requested be made to the draft RSWMP (based on review of the May 17 Discussion Draft):

Page 5-4

Goal 5, Performance

Add the words "on an annual basis" back into the sentence.

Performance will be compared annually to measurable benchmarks, although not all measurement studies will be conducted annually.

Page 7-21

2nd bullet, Key Elements of Alternative Practices

Delete the second sentence.

The example proposed to be deleted could be perceived as favoring dry waste processing over source separation. No disposal fee break has been proposed for recyclers, for example.

Page 7-22

2nd bullet, Roles and Responsibilities, 3rd paragraph

Change the last sentence to read: "Metro will consider what public actions might be taken to pursue RSWMP goals ~~arrange for or directly provide more processing service.~~

This language is consistent with page 7-17, 3rd bullet, 3rd paragraph.

Page 7-24

2nd bullet, Key Elements of the Recommended Practices

Delete paragraph a)

Paragraph a) is redundant and not necessary. Paragraph b) addresses the development of performance standards.

Page 7-25

1st paragraph, item 5

Delete the words "moved to next page."

The sentence was not moved to the next page. Rather, the concept was reworked and included on page 7-25, item e).

Page 7-27

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.

Pages 7-8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, and 21

Bullets titled "Key Elements of Alternative Practices"

The last sentence of each "Alternative Practices" section should be dropped. This sentence, wherever it appears in Chapter 7, should now read: "Other alternative practices may be adopted that achieve the same performance as the recommended practices. ~~See Chapter 8, "Monitoring the Plan," for expected performance in terms of tons of waste disposed.~~"

This paragraph confused two issues. It was intended to say that alternative practices should meet the same performance standards as recommended practices. However, Chapter 8 addresses how to monitor the system, not how to establish the equivalence of recommended practices and alternatives.

SWAC agreed to all the above language changes. In addition to the above changes, the following amendments were made to the document:

Page 5-4

Objective 3.3 should be changed to read: "After consideration of technical and economic feasibility, Metro ~~and local governments~~ will support a higher system cost for waste reduction practices to accomplish the regional waste reduction and recycling goals.

Lynne Storz recalled that at an earlier SWAC Planning Subcommittee, it had been agreed to delete the "local government" reference from this objective. Staff concurred.

Page 7-2 and 7-3

Last bullet, last sentence, change to read: "Practices that would likely be more costly in the current system, such as the collection of residential food waste, are included as recommendations contingent on ~~the future development of new techniques that would reduce the costs of the practice~~ cost effective collection and processing techniques.

Jeanne Roy proposed this amendment.

Page 7-7

First bullet, first paragraph, last sentence, change to read: "The media efforts will be patterned on current recycling campaigns ~~with inventive story lines~~ and will use radio, television, and print media."

Lynda Kotta proposed this amendment in order to simplify the description of the recommended practice.

Page 7-22

First bullet, item (e), key element to the recommended practice of developing dry waste processing facilities: add a new paragraph describing Metro's current policy on vertical integration.

There was considerable discussion about whether SWAC should deliberate what Metro's policy on vertical integration should actually be in this context and forward that recommendation to the Executive Officer as part of the draft RSWMP. However,

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	Loreen Mills, City of Tigard
Lex Johnson, Oregon Hydrocarbon	Steve Schwab, CCRRA
David White, ORRA	Jeanne Roy, Citizen
Susan Keil, City of Portland	
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers	

GUESTS

Debbie Fromdahl, Sanifill NW	Wendy Frizzell, RCRG
Ed Keenan, OHI/TPS	Ray Phelps, OWSI
Michael Sievers, SSI	Chip Terhn, WRI
Ann McFarlane, McFarlanes Bark	JoAnn Herrigel, City of Milwaukie

METRO

Bern Shanks	Debbie Gorham
Marie Nelson	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.

3. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Action Item

Marie Nelson, Solid Waste Planning Supervisor, summarized the actions requested of SWAC at this meeting:

- Review RSWMP public involvement efforts and comments received to date, and agree on any revisions the public had recommended to the Plan;
- Vote to forward final RSWMP recommendations to the Metro Executive Officer.

Ms. Nelson summarized public involvement efforts that had taken place to date. She said that the public meetings and city council meetings were a positive experience. All of the city councils visited were interested in certain waste reduction efforts, such as home composting. They felt strongly about the importance of education in waste reduction and were interested in waste prevention opportunities. The cities were also eager to receive credit for the waste prevention they had already accomplished. Local governments were concerned about the high cost of services. East Multnomah County cities also questioned the "no new transfer stations" recommendation, given a longer hauling distance from East Multnomah County to Metro facilities.

Attendance at public meetings was low with a total of 48 citizens at five meetings. There was a lot of concern at the meetings about high garbage rates, but there was strong support for waste reduction and prevention.

A telephone survey of 1,002 Metro area citizens was also conducted as part of the public involvement efforts. (The results of this survey were presented at the June 21, 1995 SWAC meeting, along with a written report included in that meeting's agenda packet.)

Ms. Nelson then distributed a matrix that summarized the comments received through July 9, 1995, as a result of the public involvement efforts. Because of this review, the Committee unanimously agreed to make changes to the Plan as noted on the following matrix:

	Comments Received	Suggested Revision to Preliminary Draft
I	Residential Waste Reduction	
	Waste Prevention:	
	Explore ways to decrease overpackaging.	Pages 7-5 & 7-6, add language to Practice 1, Roles and Responsibilities: Education efforts will stress decreasing overpackaging. Metro will also support existing or expanded state packaging legislation.

	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
IV	Background Section , continued	
	Page 4-2, first paragraph and first sentence under "Service Provision - Transfer Stations", clarify that 90% of acceptable waste is transferred to Columbia Ridge Landfill and presently 10% to another Subtitle D disposal facility, as this accurately reflects existing contractual obligations and current conditions.	Page 4-2, change "Service Provision Transfer Stations", first paragraph, to read: Three transfer stations (Metro Central, and Metro South, and Forest Grove) <u>transfer stations</u> currently receive <u>most of the region's waste from regional haulers</u> and transfer it to the Columbia Ridge Landfill. <u>A third transfer station in Forest Grove receives approximately 10% of the region's waste from haulers which is transferred to another general purpose disposal facility.</u> While these facilities are logistically sited for most haulers in the region, certain outlying areas of the region are less well served. Metro's past policy has been to support uniform levels of transfer station service throughout the region.
VIII	Other Suggested Revisions	
	Page 2-7, reference to Map 2.2, Northwest Solid Waste Facilities	Delete reference; map will not be included in document.
	Page 8-2, change last bullet under "Design and Implementation Principles".	Page 8-2, last bullet under "Design and Implementation Principles", change to read: <u>Waste and Subject to Metro Charges.</u> The following categories determine whether <u>materials that are delivered for disposal at solid waste facilities within the Metro boundary</u> disposed materials may be subject to Metro charges: 1) waste that is generated within the Metro boundary and delivered to appropriate disposal facilities; <u>and</u> 2) waste, regardless of location of origin, that is disposed within the Metro boundary. This policy applies to all waste including residuals from solid waste processing facilities.
	Modify zoning requirements to include space for recycling areas in new construction. (SWAC recommendation, proposed by Steve Schwab and endorsed by all members present.)	Page 7-11, add language to Alternative Practices: Modify zoning requirements to include space for recycling areas in new construction. Page 7-11 & 7-12, add language to Roles and Responsibilities: Metro will provide technical assistance to local governments on incorporating recycling space requirements into building and zoning codes.

	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:

Name	Accept	Reject	Comments
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:elk
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:aharelp&ts:swac\0920.sum