

**METRO**

MEETING: Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee

DAY: Wednesday

DATE: February 15, 1995

TIME: 8:30 - 10:30 AM

PLACE: Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue
Conference Room 370

- 1. Approval of Minutes** **Kvistad**
- 2. Updates** **Kvistad**
 - A. New Metro Services for CEG Hazardous Waste (Conditionally Exempt Generators) Chandler
 - B. Status of the Proposed Regional Recycling Promotion Campaign Gorham
- 3. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan**
 - A. Discussion of February 3 Meeting with DEQ, Local Governments and Metro on Statutory Responsibilities and Authority Petersen
 - B. Review of Planning Process and Schedule Nelson
 - C. Status Reports from the SWAC Planning Subcommittee
 1. Recommended Waste Reduction Practices Subcommittee/
 2. Recommended Disposal Practices Metro/Staff
- 4. Other Business/Citizen Communications** **Kvistad**
- 5. Adjourn**

Enclosures:

1. Minutes from the January 18, 1995, SWAC Meeting
2. Report from the SWAC Planning Subcommittee on Recommended Solid Waste Practices
3. Sierra Club Newsletter, Article on the Regional Solid Waste Management Planning Process

METRO SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY OF JANUARY 18, 1995

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste System
Lynda Kotta, Alternate, East Mult. Co. Cities
Lynne Storz, Washington County
Susan Keil, City of Portland
Steve Miesen, BFI
Debbie Noah, East Mult. Co. Cities
Chad Debnam, Citizen
Estle Harlan, ORRA
Tom Miller, Wash Co. Refuse Disposal Assn.
Steve Schwab, CCRRA
Jean Roy, Citizen
Jim Cozzetto, Jr., Metropolitan Disposal & Recycling
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
Merle Irvine, Citizen
Susan Ziolko, Clackamas County
Ken Spiegle, Clackamas County
Kathy Kiwala, City of Lake Oswego
Dean Kampfer, Haulers ORRA
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers
Lex Johnson, Oregon Hydrocarbon
Emilie Kroen, City of Tualatin

GUESTS:

Joe Cassin, Sanifill
Ray Phelps, OWS
Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.
Dova DeVries, Jack Gray Transport
Kim Knudeson, Washington County

METRO:

Chair Jon Kvistad, Councilor
Susan McLain, Councilor
John Houser, Council Analyst
Bob Ricks, Finance
Carol Kelsey, Executive Management
Bob Martin
Terry Petersen
Marie Nelson
Connie Kinney

1. Introductions

Martin

Bob Martin, Metro Solid Waste Director, introduced new SWAC members: Debbie Noah, Gresham City Councilor, representing the East Multnomah County cities; and Chad Debnam, alternate for Bruce Broussard, a citizen representative. Carol Kelsey, staff to Executive Officer Mike Burton, was

introduced. Ms. Kelsey said that Executive Officer Burton would be attending SWAC meetings whenever possible.

Mr. Martin then acknowledged that SWAC member Estle Harlan would be leaving the committee within a month. He presented her a plaque of appreciation for her long-standing work representing the waste hauling industry. He said the region had benefited from her contributions and that she would be missed.

Mr. Martin introduced the new SWAC Chair, Metro Councilor Jon Kvistad to the committee. Councilor Kvistad was appointed to chair the regional SWAC by new Council Presiding Officer, Ruth McFarland.

2. Approval of Minutes

Kvistad

Sue Kiel moved to approve the November 16, 1994, SWAC meeting minutes as submitted. The minutes were approved.

3. Updates

Kvistad/Martin

Metro Council Organization and Meeting Schedule. Chair Kvistad reported on recent Metro Council organizational changes following the November elections. Copies of Resolution No. 95-2070 were distributed to the committee which outlined Councilor assignments for 1995 and the new meeting organization.

4. Revision and Adoption of the SWAC Bylaws

Petersen

Terry Petersen, Solid Waste Planning & Technical Services Manager, reported that January was a traditional time to review concerns related to SWAC membership and organization. The current bylaws were distributed to members in advance of the meeting for review and comment. Mr. Petersen mentioned that SWAC currently had one active subcommittee: The SWAC Planning Subcommittee.

Mr. Petersen said he had received comments from SWAC members throughout the year suggesting the length of four-year appointments be evaluated; that additional solid waste industry and/or citizen representatives be added; and the recent Council re-organization would require a change in the bylaws concerning the appointment of the SWAC chair.

After discussion, there were no actions taken to change terms of office or to add new members. Sue Kiel moved, seconded by Lex Johnson, to recommend that the Metro Council amend the section of the bylaws relating to SWAC officers as follows:

1. The permanent Chairperson of the Committee shall be ~~the Metro Council Solid Waste Committee Chairperson~~ a Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.
2. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Committee shall be chaired by ~~the Metro Council Solid Waste Vice-Chairperson~~ a Vice-Chairperson which shall be a Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.

The vote was unanimous. Chair Kvistad said he would carry SWAC's recommendation to the Council.

6. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan

Nelson

Marie Nelson, Metro Solid Waste Planning Supervisor, distributed a proposed schedule for updating the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) by the end of the fiscal year. The schedule listed key work elements that would be developed by the SWAC Planning Subcommittee before draft recommendations were forwarded to the full SWAC for review and comment. Work elements included:

- Distribute a status report to interested parties inviting their participation;
- Develop and conduct a public involvement program;
- Develop recommended solid waste practices for the next 5 and 10 years;
- Define roles and responsibilities;
- Reach consensus on target benchmarks and system measurement;
- Prepare a proposal for plan adoption, implementation and conflict resolution; and
- Incorporate the above elements into a draft RSWMP document for review by the public, local government staff and officials, solid waste industry representatives, the DEQ, Metro Executive Officer, Metro Council and other interested parties.

After discussion the committee approved the process and timeline. Discussion highlights included:

- SWAC needs clarification from the DEQ regarding its requirements for the RSWMP;
- Involve the DEQ during the Planning Subcommittee process;
- The public must be involved early in the decision-making process;
- Use the Region 2040 public involvement approach for this project (involve local governments early in the process; conduct "listening post" community meetings throughout the region;
- Develop materials for distribution that describe the key issues in lay terms); and
- The RSWMP should include a workable process for Metro/local government conflict resolution.

7. Other Business / Citizen Communications

Kvistad

Chair Kvistad asked if the committee wanted to continue meeting on the third Wednesday of each month, 8:30 AM to 10:30 AM. The committee agreed to maintain its regular meeting schedule.

8. Adjourn

Kvistad

REPORT FROM THE SWAC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

Regional Solid Waste Management Plan
February 15, 1995

The SWAC Planning Subcommittee has been working on a major revision of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. The Subcommittee is scheduled to deliver a complete draft to the SWAC at the March 1 meeting. The SWAC is scheduled to deliver a recommended plan to the Metro Council at the May 17 meeting.

This report summarizes the Subcommittee's discussions to date regarding waste reduction practices and solid waste facility needs to the year 2005. These recommendations are being presented to the SWAC at this time as a "reality check" to make sure that the Subcommittee is on the right track. No formal SWAC action is requested.

Tables 1-5 are organized into short-term residential waste reduction practices (1995-2000), long-term residential waste reduction practices (2000-2005), business waste reduction practices, construction & demolition waste reduction practices, solid waste facilities regulation and siting, and transfer and disposal system.

Each table includes "**Recommended Key Elements**" and "**Alternative Key Elements**". The recommended key elements are ones that the Subcommittee believes should be implemented by the region during the next 10 years. Recognizing the need for flexibility, however, the Subcommittee has developed a list of alternatives key elements that might be implemented in place of, or in addition to, the recommended key elements.

The Subcommittee's concept is that **Target Benchmarks** will be the basis for monitoring plan performance. The SWAC has discussed in the past different kinds of benchmarks. Examples are general system benchmarks (e.g. regional recycling level), facility benchmarks (e.g. tons delivered to transfer stations), and disposal benchmarks (e.g. amount of yard debris disposed weekly by single family households). The target benchmarks will be established by estimating the expected performance of the set of **recommended key elements**. Potential performance of alternatives to the recommended key elements will be judged against these target benchmarks (e.g. weekly yard debris or equivalent reduction in the amount disposed).

Tables 6 and 7 compare the solid waste system with the recommended practices and for a "base case" where there is essentially no change in today's solid waste practices. For example, total transfer station waste in the year 2005 would be only slightly higher than today's levels if the recommended practices are implemented and if they perform as expected. In contrast, with no change to the system, transfer station waste would grow to about 940,000 tons by the year 2005.

The format for the February 15 SWAC meeting will be:

1. The Subcommittee and Metro staff will summarize the key concepts and issues related to each table.
2. The SWAC will suggest changes or point out concerns regarding each table.
3. Worksheets will also be distributed for written comments. Given the limited amount of time, it may not be possible to have a thorough discussion of every issue at the meeting. The discussion will be managed so that some time is allocated to each table.
4. The Subcommittee will then meet to incorporate SWAC comments and continue to develop implementation details and target benchmarks.

TABLE 1. RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Residential Waste Reduction-- Short Term 1995-2000

Recommended Practices	Recommended Key Elements	Alternative Key Elements	Expected Results	*Roles & Responsibilities (Key Elements)	Related Practices and Issues
WASTE PREVENTION					
1. Education and Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Regional media campaigns that emphasize waste prevention practices b) Expand local education programs and shift to a greater emphasis on waste prevention c) "Earth-wise" purchasing and waste prevention programs targeted to households 		Prevention of junk mail, scrap paper and packaging waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop & coordinate model education programs (M, LG, H) "Earth-wise" purchasing programs (M) Implement Education Programs (LG & M) Funding of regional media campaigns (M, LG, PS) 	Successful prevention will reduce quantity of materials collected in curbside recycling programs
2. Home Composting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Composting workshops b) Demonstration sites in all parts of the region c) Five year phased-in bin distribution program based on results of current pilot programs d) Promotion and education on how composting complements but does not replace curbside yard debris programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Yard debris bans (where service alternatives available) b) Extend program for an additional five years 	Modest increase in number of households composting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Composting demonstration sites (M) Workshops (M & LG) Bin distribution (M, LG, PS) 	Coordination with local curbside yard debris programs
RECYCLING					
3. Expand existing residential curbside programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Weekly collection of yard debris and scrap paper for single family households b) Recycling containers at all multifamily complexes (scrap paper included where space allows) c) Regional education & promotion campaigns d) Target low-participant neighborhoods with special education/promotion efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Local flexibility in adding new materials (e.g. aerosols) b) Material bans (where alternatives to disposal are available) c) Promote use of commercial collection service (e.g. through landlord tenant laws) <p>OR</p> <p>Other alternative practices that achieve the target performance benchmarks</p>	Regional uniformity of services leading to increased levels of participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify residential collection franchises (LG & H) Identify neighborhoods with low participation. Targeted education and promotion (M & LG) 	<p>Increased participation could overburden the collection technologies now being used</p> <p>See also Facilities Recommendations on siting and land use issues for yard debris processing facilities</p> <p>Increased use of collection service could reduce self-haul traffic at transfer stations</p>

TABLE 1. RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Residential Waste Reduction-- Long Term 2000-2005

Recommended Practices	Recommended Key Elements	Alternative Key Elements	Expected Results	*Roles & Responsibilities (Key Elements)	Related Practices and Issues
<p style="text-align: center;">RECYCLING</p> <p>4. New collection, transfer and disposal technologies</p>		<p>a) Continue cooperative development of promising new technologies. Examples include: Co-collection of waste materials (e.g. yard debris & refuse)</p> <p>b) Alternative collection pickups for different materials</p> <p>c) Selective commingling</p> <p>d) Weight-based collection rates</p>	<p>Improved efficiency and reduced overall waste handling costs</p>	<p>Develop new integrated collection, transfer, and processing system (H, LG, & M)</p> <p>Collection truck modifications (H & LG)</p> <p>Modify collection franchises (LG & H)</p> <p>Transfer station & processing facility modifications as needed to accommodate new collection technologies (M, PS)</p>	<p>Coordinate with other transfer station modifications</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">ORGANICS</p> <p>5. Curbside collection and processing of residential food wastes</p>	<p>a) Siting and development of regional processing capacity for commercial food waste prior to development of residential programs</p> <p>b) Residential programs phased-in and dependent on results of pilot programs</p>	<p>a) Collection approaches could include collecting bagged residential food wastes together with yard debris</p>	<p>Significant reduction in residential disposal tonnages; 30% of residential waste is food.</p>	<p>Processing capacity (PS)</p> <p>Facility Siting (PS, LG)</p> <p>Facility Standards (M, DEQ)</p>	<p>Willingness and capacity of existing yard debris processing facilities to accept food</p> <p>Regional policy to encourage home composting or collection of organics (excluding meat wastes) rather than garbage disposals and use of sewer system for disposal of food</p> <p>Possible coordination with co-collection technologies</p> <p>Coordination with commercial organics practices</p> <p>See also Facilities Recommendations regarding organics</p>

TABLE 2. RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Business Waste Reduction

Recommended Practices	Recommended Key Elements	Alternative Key Elements	Expected Results	*Roles & Responsibilities (Key Elements)	Related Practices and Issues
<p>WASTE PREVENTION & RECYCLING</p> <p>1. Education, Information, & Market Development</p>	<p>a) Model waste prevention programs for different types of businesses</p> <p>b) Waste prevention, diversion, & procurement evaluations with a goal of 90% of all businesses by the year 2000</p> <p>c) Coordinated regional and local media campaigns emphasizing waste prevention</p> <p>d) "Earth-wise" programs including promotion campaigns, model procurement polices for targeted generators, product guides</p>	<p>a) Disposal Bans (where alternatives to disposal are available)</p>	<p>Prevent paper, packaging, and other business waste</p>	<p>Model waste prevention programs (M)</p> <p>Coordinated on-site waste evaluations (LG, H, M)</p> <p>Coordinated regional and local media campaigns (LG, M)</p> <p>"Earth-wise" purchasing, recycled product guides and other targeted generators strategies (M)</p>	<p>Successful prevention will reduce quantity of materials collected in source separation and post collection programs</p>
<p>RECYCLING</p> <p>2. Expand source-separated recycling</p>	<p>a) Collection of commingled paper and containers (Glass, tin, aluminum, PET, and HDPE) from businesses not currently receiving recycling services</p> <p>b) Appropriate recycling containers (e.g. roller carts, bins, OCC cages) provided to all small businesses</p> <p>c) Education & promotion of recycling services including providing waste evaluations to targeted generators</p> <p>d) Continue the existing system of private "market recyclers" (e.g. Weyerhaeuser office paper collection)</p> <p>e) Business recycling recognition programs</p>	<p>a) Voluntary: Provide businesses economic incentives to recycle through collection rates</p> <p>b) Regulate Generator: Businesses required to participate in commingled collection paper and containers</p> <p>c) Regulate Collector: Require collectors (franchise haulers or others) to provide recycling services for commingled paper and containers</p> <p>d) Include small businesses in residential curbside programs</p> <p>e) Disposal bans (where alternatives to disposal are available)</p> <p>f) Businesses required to have waste reduction and recycling plans</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Other alternative practices that achieve the target performance benchmarks</p>	<p>Substantially increase business recycling</p>	<p>Changes to collection franchises (LG & H)</p> <p>Recycling plan requirements - filing, standards (LG)</p> <p>Service provision (PS)</p> <p>Coordinated recycling information and waste evaluations (LG, H, & M)</p> <p>Business recycling recognition programs (PS, M, LG)</p>	<p>Successful prevention will reduce quantity of materials collected in source separation and post collection programs</p> <p>Fair market value issues</p>

TABLE 2. RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Business Waste Reduction (continued)

Recommended Practices	Recommended Key Elements	Alternative Key Elements	Expected Results	*Roles & Responsibilities (Key Elements)	Related Practices and Issues
<p style="text-align: center;">ORGANICS</p> <p>3. Collection and off-site recovery of source separated food and non-recyclable paper from businesses IF costs do not substantially exceed the current cost of collecting and landfilling of organics as waste and there is no reliance on exclusive facility franchises or flow control</p>	<p>a) Siting & development of processing capacity for regional organic waste</p> <p>b) Collection from larger food generators (short term)</p> <p>c) Include small generators (long term)</p>	<p>a) Waste prevention practices</p> <p>b) On-site composting where appropriate</p> <p>c) Reload and transfer if needed, depending on processor location and collection technologies</p>	<p>Substantial reduction in disposal of wastes for generators served</p>	<p>Facility siting (M, LG, PS)</p> <p>Modify collection franchises (LG & H)</p> <p>Processing capacity (PS)</p> <p>Collection systems (LG & H)</p> <p>Reload and transfer if needed (H & M)</p>	<p>Franchised haulers "ownership" of separated food wastes</p> <p>Regional coordination needed to develop cost-effective practices</p> <p>Land use siting process for organic facilities</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">POST COLLECTION RECOVERY</p> <p>4. Regional processing facilities for mixed dry waste</p>	<p>a) Sufficient capacity to serve entire region</p> <p>b) Reasonable access for all haulers</p> <p>c) Metro fee waivers on recovered material</p> <p>d) Markets for recovered materials</p> <p>e) Vertical integration allowed as a Metro policy</p>		<p>Establishment of viable collection & processing system for recyclable materials that are not separated at the source</p>	<p>Ownership of processing facilities (PS)</p> <p>Facility Siting (PS, LG)</p> <p>Facility Regulation (M)</p>	<p>Source separated programs are a higher priority but local conditions may favor use of these facilities</p>
<p>5. Fiber based fuel</p>	<p>a) Continue to support when economically feasible as an alternative to landfilling</p>		<p>Provide a "last chance" recovery option</p>	<p>Ownership of new processing facilities (PS, Equipment at transfer stations may be Metro owned</p>	<p>Impact on availability of feedstock by upstream recycling?</p>

TABLE 3. RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Construction & Demolition Debris Waste Reduction

Recommended Practices	Recommended Key Elements	Alternative Key Elements	Expected Results	*Roles & Responsibilities (Key Elements)	Related Practices and Issues
<p align="center">WASTE PREVENTION</p> <p>1. Development of targeted technical and educational programs</p>	<p>a) "Earth-wise" building program, including programs promoting use of recycled building materials in new construction</p> <p>b) On-site audits at C&D sites to promote waste prevention practices</p> <p>c) Technical assistance and educational information for builders and others on waste prevention practices for C&D waste</p>		Continued growth in reuse and prevention of C&D waste	<p>Targeted promotion and education campaigns (M, LG, & PS)</p> <p>Coordinated technical assistance, audits (LG, H, M)</p>	
<p align="center">RECYCLING</p> <p>2. On-site source separation at construction sites where practical and cost-effective</p>	<p>a) Local governments ensure availability of on-site services</p> <p>b) Promotion of and education about on-site recycling collection services</p>	<p>a) Waste prevention practices</p> <p>b) Expand dry waste processing capacity</p>	Significant reduction in C&D disposed	<p>Modify collection franchises and regulations as needed to ensure service availability (LG & H)</p> <p>Targeted promotion and education campaigns (M, LG, & PS)</p>	Impact on dry waste processing facilities?
<p>3. Market development to support recycling rather than energy recovery</p>	<p>a) Support development of industries using recycled C&D materials</p>	<p>a) Reduce incentive on materials recovered for energy relative to recycling</p>	Significant increase in wood recycled not burned	<p>Technical research and market development (M, PS)</p>	
<p align="center">POST COLLECTION RECOVERY</p> <p>4. Development of regional dry waste processing facilities for C&D waste from sites where separation and collection of recyclables is not possible</p>	<p>(See #4 under Recommended Business Practices)</p>				

TABLE 4. RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Solid Waste Facilities - Regulation and Siting

Recommended Practices	Recommended Key Elements	Alternative Key Elements	Expected Results	*Roles & Responsibilities (Key Elements)	Related Practices and Issues
1. Regulations regarding ownership of processing facilities	a) Remove Metro restrictions on vertical integration of processors and haulers		Increased hauler access to dry waste processing services	Modify Metro Franchise Code [Chapter 5.01.120 (f)] (M)	
2. Yard debris processing system	a) Establish facility performance standards for yard debris processors b) Adopt uniform standards for facility siting c) License or permit yard debris processors	a) Metro franchises for yard debris processors	Increase stability & environmental acceptability of yard debris processing facilities	Modify Metro Franchise Code (M) Adopt clear and objective standards for siting yard debris processing facilities (LG) Modify collection franchises: direct haulers to use Metro approved facilities (LG & H)	
3. Establish organic waste regulatory system	a) Establish facility performance standards for organic waste processing facilities b) Adopt uniform standards for facility siting c) Franchise processors		Provide environmentally sound and publicly acceptable processing facilities	Modify Metro Franchise Code (M) Adopt clear and objective standards for siting organic processing facilities (LG) Modify collection franchises: direct haulers to use Metro approved facilities (LG & H) Facility standards (DEQ, M)	

TABLE 5. RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Transfer & Disposal System

Recommended Practices	Recommended Key Elements	Alternative Key Elements	Expected Results	*Roles & Responsibilities (Key Elements)	Related Practices and Issues
<p>1. Maintain existing system of 3 transfer stations. Build no new transfer stations. No redirection of haulers from Metro South to Metro Central.</p>	<p>a) Modifications to existing facilities as required to maintain service levels</p> <p>b) Implement waste reduction practices and waste handling practices (e.g. restrictions on self-haulers) sufficient to reduce demand on transfer facilities</p> <p>c) Modify the existing stations as needed to coordinate with any changes in collection technologies (e.g. co-collection of waste and recyclables)</p>		<p>Maintenance of existing service levels given growth forecast & planned waste reduction practices</p> <p>(See Tables of Facility Benchmarks showing effects of recommended practices)</p>	<p>Modify transfer facilities (M)</p> <p>Implement waste reduction practices (LG, PS, H, & M)</p>	<p>Metro South tonnage limitations</p> <p>In the event waste reduction efforts are inadequate, options to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis depending on tonnages and cost will include:</p> <p>(1) operational changes to existing facilities</p> <p>(2) redirection of haulers from Metro South to Metro Central</p> <p>(3) remodeling of existing facilities</p> <p>(4) adding reload capacity</p> <p>(5) building a new transfer station</p>
<p>2. Maintain the existing system of private general- and limited-purpose landfills</p>			<p>Sufficient regional disposal capacity for at least the next 10 years</p>	<p>Landfill Ownership (PS)</p> <p>Facility Regulation (LG, M)</p>	
<p>3. Maintain options for haulers to choose among disposal alternatives</p>	<p>a) Designated out-of-region landfills for accepting certain wastes</p> <p>b) Franchised in-region system of private landfills and processing facilities</p> <p>c) Non-system user licenses for individual haulers delivering waste to other facilities</p>		<p>Sufficient regional disposal alternatives for at least the next ten years</p>	<p>Hauler and facility regulation (LG, M)</p>	
<p>4. Reload facilities</p>	<p>a) Addition of reload capacity to existing private processing facilities to serve areas distant from existing transfer stations or to address capacity problems at existing facilities</p>	<p>a) New reload facilities built and operated by individual haulers</p>	<p>If utilized, assists in maintaining existing service levels</p>	<p>Ownership and Operation (PS, H)</p> <p>Facility Regulation (LG, M)</p>	<p>Reload options to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis depending on future tonnages & costs</p>

S:\SHARE\IP&TS\94PLAN\DECEMBER\RECP215.DOC

SWAC Planning Subcommittee
February 15, 1995

Table 6. System Measures
DRAFT Expected Performance Under Recommended Practices

System Benchmark	Base Case (No Change)		Recommended Practices
	Year 1995	Year 2005	Year 2005
Regional Recycling Level**	39%	37%	43%
Regional Recovery Level***	42%	42%	48%
Generation (annual tonnage)	1,725,100	2,010,000	1,987,800*
Generation per Capita	1.34	1.39	1.37
Recycling (annual tonnage)	743,600	846,800	953,400
Recycling per Capita	0.58	0.59	0.66
Landfilled Waste (annual tonnage)	981,500	1,163,200	1,034,400
Landfilled Waste per Capita	0.76	0.80	0.72
Hierarchy by Component (%)	100%	100%	100%
Waste Prevention	NA****	0%	1%
Recycling	28.3%	28%	33%
Composted	6.4%	6%	6%
Recovered for Energy	7.9%	8%	8%
Landfilled	57.4%	58%	52%

- * Difference in generation from the base case is due to new waste prevention programs, accounting for 22,200 tons.
- ** Reported according to the State standard which excludes waste-to-energy from the calculation.
- *** Calculation includes waste-to-energy.
- **** Waste reduction is measured relative to the base year. NA=not applicable

SWAC Planning Subcommittee
February 15, 1995

Table 7. Effect of Recommended Practices

	Base Case (No Change to Existing System)				With Recommended Practices, Year 2005	
	Year 1995		Year 2005		Tonnage	Percent of Generation
	Tonnage	Percent of Generation	Tonnage	Percent of Generation		
New Waste Prevention Programs					22,200	- na -
Home Composting					12,100	- na -
Business Waste Evaluation					10,100	- na -
Source-Separated Recycling	681,000	39%	773,600	38%	889,400	45%
Current Source-Separation	681,000	39%	773,600	38%	773,600	39%
New Source-Separation Programs	0	0%	0	0%	115,800	6%
Expand Residential Curbside					23,900	1%
Commingled Residential Plastics					NP	
Commingled Business Paper					NP	
Commingled Business Paper&Containers					49,500	2%
Onsite C&D Separation					32,100	2%
Business Organics Recovery					10,300	1%
Residential Organics Recovery					NP*	
Post-Collection Recovery*	62,600	4%	73,200	4%	64,000	3%
Total Waste Reduction	743,600	43%	846,800	42%	953,400	48%
Total Landfilled	981,500	57%	1,163,200	58%	1,034,400	52%
Generation	1,725,100	100%	2,010,000	100%	1,987,800	100%
Total Generation + Waste Prevention	1,725,100		2,010,000		2,010,000	
Deliveries to Transfer Stations	793,200		939,200		813,000	

NP = Program not proposed for inclusion in RSWMP

NP* = Pilot program proposed with later phase-in if successful.

NOTE: All projections are based on the "expected" Region 2040 growth scenario, and no change to the transfer and disposal system.

* The reduction in post-collection recovery over the base case is due to the effect of upstream, source-separation programs that reduce feedstock to mixed dry waste processors--in particular, the source-separated C&D program.

COLUMBIA OVERLOOK

The bimonthly newsletter of
the Columbia Group Sierra Club

FEB-MAR 1995

ADVANCING METRO'S RECYCLING EFFORTS

by Phil Kreitner

Metro has been slackening on its commitment to its Solid Waste Management Plan. The Columbia Group, in participation with OSPIRG and Recycling Advocates, has been pressuring Metro to fully execute its waste management policy. Metro's SWMP is expected to be updated in 1995. In the interim, Metro has been slow to fully execute its agenda.

There has been many shortfalls in Metro's implementation and enforcement of the SWMP. Some localities have failed to institute a commercial recycling program and/or weekly yard debris pickup. These programs were supposed to be implemented by July of 1994. Metro has failed to withhold "challenge grant" money from non-compliant localities.

The recycling coalition has also expressed frustration with the prevailing achievement measures used by Metro to monitor progress in implementation of the SWMP. A component of the SWMP is the Waste Reduction Program. The current WRP forecasts a 56% waste recovery rate by 2010. Metro currently claims the recovery rate to be 42%— 38% diverted to recycling or composting plus 4% burned for

"energy recovery." There is a predominant reliance upon categorical "means" goals for municipalities (e.g. Is there a recycling collection program in operation?) rather than quantitative "ends" goals (e.g. Is newspaper being collected from X% of residences?). In addition, Metro relies upon solid waste collection and transfer systems which operate across local jurisdictional lines, thereby producing only aggregate collection data. This makes it difficult to impossible to evaluate elements of the performance of individual localities.

Metro does not make clear the logic behind its choice of benchmark parameters along the solid waste continuum. It fails to explicitly
(continued on page 4)

UPCOMING PROGRAM NIGHTS

FEBRUARY 8th 7:30pm office
Guest speaker: Jeff Curtis, Director
of WaterWatch

MARCH 8th 7:30pm office
Guest speaker: Jeanne Roy of
Recycling Advocates

PLEASE JOIN US!

Columbia Group Sierra Club
1413 SE Hawthorne Blvd
Portland, OR 97214

NON-PROFIT
U.S. Postage
PAID
Portland, OR
Permit No. 1090

Environmental Lobby Days!
February 14th & April 24th
State Capitol, Salem
For more information, please read page 10

differentiate among the downstream (disposition), mid-stream (collection), and the upstream (generation) stages of the solid waste stream. This vagueness has allowed a preoccupation with the downstream statistics of "reduction" (i.e. landfill avoidance), which lump the solid waste fates of recycling/composting with that of burning (energy recovery). Example of a downstream measure: the proportion of collected regional waste plastic that is being kept out of landfills. Less public emphasis has been put on midstream measures of collection (e.g. the amount of yard waste collected per single family household in a specific locality). Metro shows even less evidence of concern with upstream measures relating to the creation of waste (e.g. the kinds and amounts of non-deposit packaging being consumed in a given locality). The relative lack of attention to upstream numbers, ignoring what goes in the door from the store and concentrating on what is goes out the door to the curb, lets consumers off the consumption hook, encouraging them to view the solid waste problem as simply one of disposition rather than one of creation.

The downstream bias is abetted by Metro's use of the term "generation" to represent "collection." Although most generated trash is presumably collected, making the terms quantitatively equivalent, there is a critical psychological difference: "generation" implies creation and "collection" implies disposition. It is more culturally comfortable and commercially profitable to agonize over how to get rid of our trash than to discipline ourselves to create less of it. Moreover, Metro's employment of the term "waste reduction" in a downstream application mimics a widespread subversion of the meaning of the first of the "3 R's." "Reduction" has been appropriated to mean waste disposal reduction, rather than the waste generation reduction implicit in the concept of "Reduce, Reuse, Recycle."

Ironically, Metro's construing of "waste reduction" to mean "Landfill avoidance" has, in conjunction with its dependance upon landfill tipping fees to pay for its solid waste management efforts, created a recycling paradox: the more Metro must spend on increased recycling, the more it has to earn from less dumping. Meanwhile, the trash-generating, recycling public is left mystified by news of recycling success being followed by announcements of higher tipping fees.

The waste stream monitoring effort has to be made (a) broad enough to encompass the entire length of the resource appropriation - use - disposition process, (b) deep enough to discriminate specific materials and generators, and (c) sustained enough to distinguish transient perturbations from longer-term trends. We need to be able to answer an inclusive range of questions: Who is generating how much non-reused container material and of what kinds? How much of that is being collected? How much is being burned or buried? What are we doing to reduce the values of all three sets of these numbers?

If you want to learn more about Metro recycling, attend our March Program night, featuring Jeanne Roy of Recycling Advocates. The Recycling Committee meets the fourth Monday of each month at 7:30 pm.

Natalie K. Arndt, L.Ac.

STATE LICENSED ACUPUNCTURIST

Pain Relief

Stop Smoking

4351 SE Hawthorne
Portland OR, 97215
(503) 230-1340

CLEAN WA

by David Pardue

Clean water is the ecological most valuable and scarce resource of our nation. Without it, life will be lost. The impact of the Clean Water Act to protect wetlands, lakes, rivers, estuaries and streams has been overstated. The Controlled Congress has provided the additional funding that this critical legislation will almost certainly prevent serious damage to our environmental resources. We must make every effort to prevent this from happening.

The Water Quality Council is a national organization that provides information about the future, what impact it will have on Oregon and what you can do to preserve the power of the law. The first section

METRO

A plan to pass legislation within the metro area in May. The bond funds to acquire areas in the metro area. Their regional studies include areas along the Willamette river. Funds for community local areas.

Since a similar campaign was defeated at the Campaign for Clean Water taking voter action. They have hired consultants in Oregon's legislative campaign. An effort is being made



METRO

DATE: February 10, 1995

TO: Ruth McFarland, Council Presiding Officer
Jon Kvistad, SWAC Chair

FROM: Terry Petersen, Solid Waste Planning & Technical Services Manager

THROUGH: *BM* Bob Martin, Solid Waste Director

RE: SWAC Recommendation to Amend its Bylaws

At its meeting of January 18, 1995, the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee unanimously voted to recommend its bylaws be amended to reflect the new Council organization. Specifically, the Committee recommended amending the section regarding the process for appointment of the SWAC Chair:

"OFFICERS:

1. The permanent Chairperson of the Committee shall be ~~the Metro Council Solid Waste Committee Chairperson~~ a Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.
2. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Committee shall be chaired by ~~the Metro Council Solid Waste Vice-Chairperson~~ a Vice-Chairperson which shall be a Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council."

A complete copy of the bylaws, as recommended, is attached.

If you want to propose other changes, please let me know. Otherwise, I will assume you agree with SWAC's recommendation and will consider the bylaws amended per SWAC's recommendation.

Please call me (797-1669) or Marie Nelson (797-1670) if you have questions.

TP:clk

Attachments: SWAC Bylaw

Minutes of January 18, 1995

cc: Marie Nelson, Planning Supervisor
John Houser, Senior Council Analyst

S:SHAREP&T\S\SWAC\BYLAWS.MEM

METRO
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
BYLAWS
(January 1995)

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Evaluate policy options and present policy recommendations to the Metro Council and Executive Officer regarding regional solid waste management and planning.
2. Advise Metro on the implementation of existing solid waste plans and policies.
3. Provide recommendations concerning the solid waste planning process to ensure adequate consideration of regional values such as land use, economic development, and other social, economic and environmental factors.
4. Provide recommendations on the compliance of regional solid waste management and planning with applicable state requirements.
5. Provide recommendations on alternative solid waste policies and practices developed by subcommittees of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.
6. Recommend needs and opportunities for involving citizens in solid waste issues.
7. Recommend measures to build regional consensus for the management of solid waste.

MEMBERSHIP

Voting Members:

Metro Council (1)
Clackamas County (1)
Multnomah County (1)
Washington County (1)
Clackamas County Cities (1)
Multnomah County Cities (1)
Washington County Cities (1)
City of Portland (1)
Solid Waste Hauling Industry (4)
Recycling Industry (1)
Solid Waste Facilities (3)
Citizens (3)

Non-Voting Associate Members

Metro Solid Waste Department Director (1)
Department of Environmental Quality (1)
Port of Portland (1)
Clark County (1)
Marion County (1)
Yamhill County (1)

Additional associate members without a vote may serve on the Committee at the pleasure of the Committee.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

1. Representatives from the Counties shall be appointed by the Chairperson of the County Board.
2. The representative from the City of Portland shall be appointed by the Mayor of Portland.
3. Representatives of Cities within a County shall be appointed by consensus of those Cities.
4. A pool of candidates for the citizen representatives shall be nominated by the participating jurisdictions and the Metro Executive Officer shall appoint one citizen member from each county as available.
5. Industry candidates shall be solicited from the industry and appointed by the Metro Executive Officer. Solid waste hauling industry representatives shall include one from each of the three Counties.
6. The Executive Officer may review the status of the Committee Membership every four (4) years and appoint new members as needed.

Alternate members shall be specifically named and shall be appointed in the same manner as Committee members. Alternates can vote in the absence of the regular Committee member and have full rights and responsibilities of the Committee member in his/her absence. Upon resignation of an Advisory Committee member, a new member shall be appointed in accordance with Section II of the Bylaws.

OFFICERS

1. The permanent Chairperson of the Committee shall be a Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council~~the Metro Council Solid Waste Committee Chairperson.~~
2. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Committee shall be chaired by the Metro Council Solid Waste Committee Vice-Chairperson which shall be a Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Working groups may be established by the Chairperson as necessary upon request of the Committee. Membership composition shall be determined according to mission and may include individuals who are not members of the Committee. All such sub-committees shall report to the Committee.