



METRO

MEETING: Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee
DATE: Wednesday, June 19, 1996
TIME: 8:30 - 10:30 a.m.
PLACE: Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue
 Room: Council Chamber Annex, 2nd Floor

- | | | |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 15 min. | 1. Updates and Introductions
Rate Restructure Process
Illegal Disposal Task Force | McFarland / Burton |
| 5 min. | 2. Approval of Minutes
Action Requested: Approve the Minutes of May 15, 1996
(See Attached Minutes) | McFarland |
| 30 min. | 3. Material Recovery Facilities (MRF's) - Franchise Process
Status Report - No Action Requested | Goddard |
| 30 min. | 4. Metro Transfer Stations - Operations Contracts
Rebid Operations Contracts for Metro South and Central Transfer Stations
Project Schedule and Process
Work Session - No Action Requested
(See Attached Report) | Watkins |
| 20 min. | 5. Organic Waste Processing - Demonstration Projects
Status Report - No Action Requested
(See Attached Report) | Foseid |
| 5 min. | 6. Discuss Tentative Meeting Agenda for July 17 | McFarland / Nelson |
| 10 min. | 7. Other Business/Citizen Communications | McFarland |
| | 8. Adjourn | |

All times listed on this agenda are approximate. Items may not be considered in the exact order listed.
 Committee Chair: Councilor Ruth McFarland (797-1547)
 Staff: Marie Nelson (797-1670) Committee Clerk: Connie Kinney (797-1643)

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY OF: May 15, 1996

MEMBERS

Voting Members Present

Committee Chair: Ruth McFarland, Metro Councilor
Hauling Industry: Tom Miller, Washington County Haulers Assoc.
David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc.,
Tri-County Council
James Cozzetto, Jr., MDC/ERI
Solid Waste Facilities: Doug Coenen, Waste Management of Oregon
Steve Miesen, BFI/Trans Industries
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
Citizens: Jeanne Roy, Recycling Advocates
Government: Loreen Mills, Washington County Cities (Staff, City of Tigard)
Debra ("Debbie") Noah, Multnomah County Cities (Councilor, City of Gresham)
Recycling Industry: Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling

Alternate Members Present

Recycling Industry: Jeff Murray, Farwest Fibers
Solid Waste Facilities Gary Penning, Waste Mgt. of Oregon

Non-Voting Members Present

DEQ Ed Druback
Government Carol Devenir, Port of Portland

Non-Voting Members Absent

Government: Dave Kunz, DEQ

Voting Members Absent

Hauling Industry Steve Schwab, Sunset Garbage Collection Company
Recycling Industry John Drew, Far West Fibers
Citizens Bruce Broussard, Cad Tek
Government: Gary Hansen, Multnomah County (County Commissioner)
Bob Kincaid, Clackamas County Cities (Staff, City of Oregon City)
Susan Keil, City of Portland (City Staff)
Lynne Storz, Washington County Cities
Citizens: Merle Irvine, United Disposal
Bruce Broussard

Guests Present

Easton Cross, Consultant
JoAnn Herrigel, City of Milwaukie
Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.
Leo Kenyon
Debbie Fromdhal, Sanifill
Richard K. Jones, Citizen

Metro

Mike Burton, Executive Officer
Ruth McFarland, Chair, Metro Council
Marie Nelson
Kelly Schafer Hossaini
Connie Kinney

Doug Anderson
Terry Petersen
Scott Klag
Tim Raphael
Bill Metzler

Susan McLain, Councilor
Andy Sloop
Rod Munroe, Councilor

1. Updates and Introductions

Bern Shanks Resignation

Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer, brought the meeting to order and announced that Bern Shanks, Director of Regional Environmental Management, had resigned his position to take a job as Director of the Department of Fish and Wildlife in Washington state. Mike Burton will be the acting interim director until a new director is recruited. The recruitment process will begin in the near future.

Introductions

Councilor McFarland introduced Metro Councilor Susan McLain to the Committee.

Approval of Minutes

Councilor Ruth McFarland asked that the approval of the meeting minutes be taken at that time instead of after the rest of the scheduled updates. James Cozzetto asked that the record for the April 1996 SWAC meeting reflect that he was not present at that meeting. Jeanne Roy requested the record be changed to reflect that she asked that Metro change the name of the facilities currently being called materials recovery facilities; she was not just expressing a concern. She said she had also heard local governments referring to the term MRF as the sorting of recyclables. Jeanne Roy then moved that the minutes be approved with the changes as stated, and the Committee unanimously approved.

Solid Waste Stakeholder Meetings for Rate Restructuring

Doug Anderson, Supervisor of Technical Services, gave the Committee an update on the solid waste stakeholder meetings that took place in April 1996. He distributed a draft of the stakeholder comments to the Committee. He said that there wasn't any strong consensus about how to change the way rates are currently assessed. Most of the stakeholders were interested in the topic, but did not understand how Metro actually operates. This prevented a strong consensus with regard to what was wrong with the current rates and so how they should be fixed.

Mr. Anderson said four or five options have been considered, including the status quo, downsizing Metro, differential rates, and a generator fee. Generally, support for the status quo seems to be the strongest. He then explained that the comments gathered will be analyzed and the questions asked will be answered so everyone can get up to speed and the process can move on. Metro will be holding more stakeholder meetings on the subject in June 1996.

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) Franchise Applications

Jim Goddard, Acting Manager of Waste Reduction and Planning Services, presented an update on the status of the MRF franchise applications process. He explained that the purpose of the process is to come up with ways to correct some of the problems that have been occurring under the present system of MRF franchising.

He then distributed a summary page that explained the proposed MRF regulatory approach, including its objectives, process, and an overview of the franchise document.

Mr. Goddard explained that the Metro MRF team has been building a franchise template for MRFs. This template will set out the format and conditions that will apply globally to all MRFs. The template being constructed uses a modular approach to franchising. The facilities are being called solid waste processing facilities because they are processing solid waste for the purpose of recovering recyclables. The template will allow these facilities to add other types of recovery methods to their current operations, for example yard debris processing, and these additions will be included in their franchise agreement as a module. This will allow for a more consistent treatment of franchise applications, because a custom agreement for each facility will not have to be drafted.

In addition, Mr. Goddard said the franchise document will provide clear definitions of "authorized" and "prohibited" wastes. He said that there has not been adequate oversight of MRFs in the past, and in the future Metro will visit the MRFs every other month so that there is better on-site knowledge of operations.

Councilor McFarland asked what will be done if MRFs are found to be accepting prohibited wastes and how it will be prevented. Mr. Goddard replied that prevention will be aided by the implementation of oversight procedures involving Metro and the franchise holder. There will also be financial penalties and incentives in place. Also, the franchise operators will have to explain to Metro in their franchise applications how they will prevent and handle prohibited wastes. The franchise document will address all of these aspects of the franchise system.

Mr. Goddard said that after soliciting comments from SWAC, stakeholders, local governments, MRF operators, and the Metro Council, it was clear that some consider the strict 45% recovery rate imposed on MRFs as a penalty. The point of the recovery rate is to ensure that the facilities are doing a good job of recovery, but it is also important that the rate is not unduly restrictive. To rectify the situation, some options are being considered. One option is to charge a percentage of the Metro user fee depending upon what recovery percentage has been achieved. If the MRF achieves the established recovery rate then no extra charge will be incurred. If the MRF falls below the recovery rate, some increment of the user fee will have to be paid on the percentage of material processed that falls below the recovery rate. This will allow operators to process those loads that have less than the set rate of recoverables, but are still viable for processing.

It would be important in this kind of arrangement to establish a range of noncompliance as well as a penalty range below the fixed recovery rate. A MRF would receive a notice of noncompliance if its recovery rate fell into the range of noncompliance. This notice would go into the MRF's franchise file. There could also be room for an incentive if a MRF did substantially better than the fixed recovery rate.

Mr. Cozzetto asked if there would be a penalty associated with falling into the range of noncompliance. Mr. Goddard replied that there would not be a formal penalty beyond the reminder that the established recovery rate has not been met. However, the operator would have to pay the increased fees associated with falling below the set recovery rate.

Ralph Gilbert commented that under the described scenario, he would be forced to get into the trucking business to meet the recovery rate. This would alienate his current customers. He also said that the high recoverable loads have been bypassing him since other MRFs have come on line and he will have a difficult time reaching the 45% rate. Mr. Goddard replied that up to this point the discussion has been around a generic MRF concept, but there may have to be different types of facilities.

Loreen Mills said that as the region becomes more successful in establishing commercial recycling, more recyclables will be pulled out and the 45% rate will eventually have to be lowered because it can't be met. Mr. Cozzetto agreed that the 45% recovery rate will become harder and harder to hit, and asked if the rate could be reviewed periodically. Mr. Goddard responded that it could.

Tom Miller commented that markets dictate the contents of loads to a greater degree than can be managed in terms of programs, because economics push recycling. When the market can't support source separation of the material, the most economically viable method of handling it might be to put it all in one container and send it to a MRF. He also said he thinks that the recovery rate was an arbitrary rate set to avoid having source separated materials get into that system, and there's a better way to handle it. For example, qualifying the deliveries rather than the facilities.

Mr. Cozzetto asked what the tonnage caps for MRFs are to be based on. Mr. Goddard replied that the tonnage cap will be the reasonable operating range once the facility gets up to speed. It will be a checkpoint to review what effect the cap has on the system. Mr. Cozzetto asked if there will be a process to increase the cap if a facility shows an increased ability to process material. Mr. Goddard replied there would be.

Councilor Susan McLain commented that a point that hadn't been made yet was that it is important to determine how a franchise fits in to the rest of the system, what it will be next to, what kind of wastestream is in its area, and that sort of thing. She said she thinks it is very responsible of Metro to consider these things and not just hand out franchises without doing some research. It protects both the system and the facilities.

Organic Waste Processing Demonstration Projects

Jim Goddard reported to the Committee that the Phase II Organic Waste Processing proposals were received last month and are currently being reviewed. In the schedule formerly distributed for this project, a checkpoint was included to determine if the goals of the pilot project will be met through the proposals. That

checkpoint has not yet been reached, but should be before the next SWAC meeting. He asked the Committee if there was still interest in that checkpoint and the Committee agreed there was. Mr. Goddard said he would schedule a meeting in early June to do that.

Metro Central Transfer Station Dry Waste Pilot Project

Councilor McFarland introduced the item so that SWAC could hear about it prior to it being taken up at the Regional Environmental Management Subcommittee (REMCOM).

Terry Petersen, Manager of Environmental Services, gave the Committee a brief review of the project. He said that Metro has a contract with Oregon Waste Systems (OWS) to send 90% of the waste it takes possession of to OWS' general purpose landfill. However, some separated dry waste could be sent to a lower cost limited purpose landfill and this will save money on the cost of disposal.

Councilor McFarland asked if Metro chose the method of having BFI, Inc. deal directly with the operators of the Hillsboro Landfill in order to avoid the bid process. Mr. Petersen replied that from his perspective it was simply the easiest and quickest way to get the project underway, especially since there is a window of opportunity over the summer in which to conduct the project before the transfer stations go out to bid.

Councilor McLain said that her purpose in attending the SWAC meeting was because she has been involved with the dry waste project as a Washington County councilor. She said that as a councilor she was interested in the project for a couple of different reasons. First, there is a review of the transfer station contracts coming up. She thinks it is important to understand the relationship of the transfer stations to the six MRFs in the region, and to understand what the options are for the transfer stations. Second, she was interested in how the project fits in with the overall regional recycling goals and the implementation of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

Councilor McLain said she has been working with Washington County on this subject. She said that Washington County is currently going through a financial audit and rate review process. They think the dry waste project may be an opportunity test case that they can benefit from in terms of information gained. She said that the Washington County SWAC is very interested in the pilot project and it will be presented to them at their May 21, 1996, meeting. They and the Washington County solid waste staff will then compile a report on how to make the pilot project a win-win for the industry, Washington County, and Metro. She said her understanding is that the target date for having this completed is July 1, 1996.

Doug Coenen commented that through the project there is an opportunity for Metro to avoid the long haul cost, but that Oregon Waste Systems and Metro have not yet discussed the implications of the project. He also asked if the pilot project works out well, will there be an opportunity for other disposal vendors to bid on it in the long term and, if so, who is Metro looking at for such a contract? Terry Petersen

said there are not currently a lot of limited purpose landfills available to bid for it, and he does not want to speculate about what will happen in the next five years.

Results of the Yard Debris Survey

Marie Nelson distributed to the Committee the preliminary results of the curbside yard debris program measurement study that had been coordinated by Jennifer Ness, Metro Solid Waste Planner. She said the results are encouraging in that every jurisdiction studied passed the requirement of having no more yard debris in their garbage than the weekly curbside standard of 5.63%. She and Mr. Goddard answered several questions about how the study was conducted. Councilor McLain noted that due to new housing developments in parts of Washington County, it would be important for staff to ensure that local programs would continue to meet the standard of equivalency to weekly curbside yard debris collection.

3. Transfer Station Activities

Terry Petersen, Manager of Environmental Services, briefed the Committee about a proposed pilot project to recover wood waste from Metro South Transfer Station, deliver it to the Metro Central Transfer Station, and then ship it to a facility to be used as hogged fuel. Through a change order to Metro's existing contract with Jack Gray Trucking, the back haul capacity of their trucks can be used to haul the wood waste from the Metro South facility to the Metro Central facility. This will be cheaper than the current system of taking wood waste from Metro South to a yard debris processing facility. Estimated cost for waste recovered as hogged fuel is \$24/ton for transfer, transport, and disposal. This compares with \$42/ton for landfill disposal.

Mr. Petersen said there are two policy issues connected with the pilot project. First, whether the savings should be passed on to the customer and, second, whether the material should be diverted from the yard debris processing facility and taken to be used as hogged fuel.

The contract change orders will go before the Regional Environmental Management Council subcommittee on June 5, 1996.

4. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Hazardous Waste Planning

Due to the limited amount of time available, Scott Klag did not discuss the development of the Hazardous Waste Planning Task Force in detail. He reported that several persons had expressed interest and would be contacting others outside SWAC regarding their interest in serving on the task force.

5. Discuss Tentative Meeting Agenda for June

No discussion occurred.

6. Other Business/Citizen Communications

None.

7. Adjourn

S:\SHARE\IP&TS\SWAC\MINUTES\SWAC0515.SUM

Summary of Draft Request for Proposals
for the
Operation of Metro South and/or Metro Central Station and
Related Policy Issues for Discussion by SWAC
(c.g. 6-12-96)

The following is a summary of a draft RFP for the operation of Metro's transfer stations, and related policy questions. These have been prepared for SWAC in order to solicit input for use in revising the document.

General

The RFP invites proposals for operation of Metro South, Metro Central or for both. A proposal may not be for more than one arrangement (i.e. a proposal to operate Metro South may not contain a variation to also, or just, operate Metro Central). Vendors may submit more than one proposal.

Generally, the work consists of the transfer of waste received at the facility into transfer vehicles owned and operated by the Waste Transport Services Contractor. Payment for this service will be made on the basis of incoming weights as established at Metro scalehouses at both transfer stations. Payment will consist of a fixed monthly lump sum as well as a variable portion based on the amount of waste received.

In addition, the operator can recover materials for sale to markets. For each ton of materials recovered, the operator will receive a recovery credit payment from Metro (\$30/ton) and retain 100% of the revenues from the sale of materials. These payments are in addition to the payments based on incoming tons. As part of its proposal, proposers may purchase the FBF line at MCS.

The work also includes the option to separate, transport and dispose of up to 50,000 tons of dry waste from the MCS. The proposer can propose to divert from incoming tons, dry waste which is appropriate for disposal at a limited purpose landfill. The proposal must contain the tonnage which will be diverted, and the cost to separate, transport and dispose of the diverted dry waste. The proposed amount cannot exceed 50,000 tons annually and the amount proposed must be guaranteed.

The length of the negotiated contract with the successful proposer will be for a period of five years. Due to the type of financing used to construct the facilities, Metro must retain the unconditional right to terminate the contract at the end of three years. If Metro does not terminate the contract at this point, the two remaining years of the contract will be exercised. An additional financial restriction is that no more than fifty percent of the revenue due the Contractor may be made in variable payments.

Policy Questions

Dual Operation: This is the first time both stations are up for grabs simultaneously. This raises some new concerns. If a single firm operates both stations, there is a concern that our (Metro and station customers) flexibility and the level of service provided will be reduced since competition between contractors no longer exists. As a result, service and prices may be

negatively impacted. A different view is that coordination between the stations will be greatly enhanced, positively affecting service (in particular materials recovery at Metro South) and prices.

The policy question is should Metro prohibit operation of both transfer stations by a single entity?

Vertical Integration: Metro has in the past been concerned that if a transfer station operator was involved in the solid waste collection business, that other collection companies would receive poorer service than the operator's. The Metro Code reflects such concerns, containing a specific prohibition against a franchised transfer station being involved in solid waste collection. Metro has had only one firm operate a station which was also involved in collection. No such discriminatory complaints have been received.

Should Metro prohibit operation of Metro transfer stations by firms involved in the solid waste collection industry locally?

A separate policy issue arises if the operator is involved in disposal. The current approach of the RFP is to promote materials recovery through incentives only. If the transfer station operator owns a landfill which receives waste from the station (either mixed or dry waste), materials recovery may suffer since there may be a financial incentive for the firm to maximize the amount of waste transferred for disposal. Firms not involved in disposal may therefore be better candidates for operating the station if materials recovery is to be maximized.

Should Metro prohibit operation of Metro transfer stations by firms involved in solid waste disposal of the region's waste?

Should Metro consider the above prohibitions for a single entity operating both stations, even though it would not do so if different firms operated the two stations?

Materials Recovery: The RFP is structured to encourage materials recovery through financial incentives. For each ton of waste recovered, an operator will receive the transfer fee, a \$30/ton recovery credit and all revenue from sale of the materials. The operator receives all three regardless of whether the material is recovered for reuse, recycling or energy production.

Should the same incentive be provided regardless of the end use of the recovered material?

Currently materials recovery incentives differ at each station. The Metro South operator does not receive the transfer fee or a recovery credit but does keep all sale revenues. The Metro Central operator receives a lower credit for recovery on FBF production and only 80% of sale revenues from recyclables. The current recovery credit is higher than that proposed in the RFP, being the full avoided cost for transport and disposal or \$38.50/ton.

Should the materials recovery incentives be standardized at both stations?

The pure incentive based approach was chosen to allow the operator to make cost effective decisions on what to do with incoming waste. An exception being that Metro will retain the right to negotiate for the use of a subcontractor (such as St. Vincent DePaul) to recover reusables from the wastestream.

Should a mandatory recovery rate be stipulated in the next operating contracts?

Dry Waste: An operator will be able to bid an amount and price for separating, transporting and disposing of dry waste at Metro Central. This should result in a lower total cost than if the waste were transported and disposed as general purpose waste. It is the first time Metro has included this option in a transfer station procurement. If the operator can make more money from this opportunity than from materials recovery, it could negatively affect recovery rates. There appears to be no superior environmental reason for separation and disposal of dry waste.

Should Metro prohibit dry waste separation at transfer stations?

Wages and Benefits: The current employees of the private firms operating Metro transfer stations are compensated based on their contributions over a number of years. In a highly competitive environment, firms may propose wages and benefits that are significantly lower than the current employees receive. While Metro would receive some economic benefit, it is probable that the level of service would also fall.

Should Metro specify some minimum wage and benefit levels in the RFP?

Evaluation Criteria: Proposals would be evaluated based on cost, the materials recovery plan, and the operation and maintenance approach proposed. Seventy points would be given to the low cost proposal, with the other proposals receiving scores based on how close they are to the lowest cost proposal. Ten points would be available for the proposed materials recovery approach. Points would be awarded based on the evaluation committee's analysis of the proposed approach. Twenty points would be available for the proposed operation and maintenance approach, which would consider such factors as efficiency, customer satisfaction, and routine and special maintenance plans.

Is the allocation of points appropriate and should other criteria be used?

Schedule

Review of Draft RFP by Interested Parties	July to mid-August
Redraft	
Council Review and Approval	September
Vendors Prepare Proposals	October
Proposals Evaluated	November
Negotiate Contract	Dec - January
Council Award	February
New Contractor(s) Mobilize	March/April

CG:clk
S:\SHARE\GEYE\STATIONS\REBID\SWAC.DOC

COMMERCIAL FOOD WASTE COLLECTION AND PROCESSING
PILOT PROJECT 1996-97

PROJECT OVERVIEW:

PURPOSE:

The Commercial food waste collection and processing pilot project is designed to provide information regarding the feasibility of source separated, collection, transport, processing and marketing of commercially generated pre-consumer vegetative food waste. The information obtained from this project will help Metro, local governments, food businesses, waste collectors and food waste processors determine how they can best work together to implement organic waste recovery programs that are cost effective, environmentally sound and publicly acceptable.

BUDGET IMPACT:

The maximum amount allocated for this contract is \$175,000.00. The money is intended to defray the costs associated with a small scale project and the costs associated with meeting Metro, local government, and DEQ data requirements. Metro does not make a financial commitment to the successful food waste collector and processor teams beyond the term of this project on June 30, 1997.

SUMMARY:

This pilot project was developed as a two phased proposal process. Phase I RFP (RFP 4 95 R- I 7AREM) was issued in November 1995 and Phase II was issued in March 1996. Proposals were received from 10 processors and 6 haulers in Phase I. Each proposer was interviewed by an evaluation committee made up of staff from Metro, local government and DEQ

In the Phase II only two processors and two haulers submitted proposals. The two processor/hauler teams were Oregon Waste Systems/ Waste Management of Oregon and Oregon soils Corporation/Cloudburst Inc. the two applicants have been interviewed by the Organics Committee Members and both have been selected for funding.

SELECTIONS:

• **Oregon Soils Corporation/Cloudburst hauling**

This project will develop and operate a vermicompost facility in partnership with an existing yard trimmings composting facility (American Compost). The operation includes bringing daily to the site up to 50 tons of source separated vegetative food waste. The material will then be mixed with compost and yard trimmings and loaded into six, 10 foot by 300 foot long "vessels". Worms contained in these vessels will break down the food mixture; as part of the vermicompost process, worm castings will be collected and marketed as a soil nutrient.

- **Oregon Waste Systems/Waste Management of Oregon**

This project will provide training assistance to the generators to maximize vegetative food waste diversion and minimize contaminants. OWS/WMO will collect and transfer the source separated food waste to their composting site located at the Columbia Ridge Landfill. At the site the vegetative food waste will be mixed with ground yard trimmings and composted in windrows 7 foot high by 15 foot wide by 200 foot long. The end produce will be marketed in the Metro Region.

CONTRACT STATUS:

Metro is currently in contract negotiations with each proposer and estimates that we will have signed contracts from Oregon Soils/Cloudburst Inc. and Oregon Waste Systems/ Waste Management of Oregon by June 30, 1996. Implementation of the projects will start on July 1, 1996.

S:\SHARE\DEPT\FOSEID\ORGANICS.DOC

REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 95-2172A, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF RFP NO. 95-17A-REM FOR A PHASE I COMMERCIAL FOOD WASTE COLLECTION/PROCESSING PROJECT

Date: November 8, 1995

Presented by: Councilor Kvistad

Committee Recommendation: At the November 7 meeting, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 95-2172A. Voting in favor: Councilors Kvistad, McFarland, and McLain.

Committee Issues/Discussion: Jim Goddard, Regional Environmental Management Recycling System Development Supervisor, presented the staff report and reviewed the purpose of the resolution. Goddard indicated that the proposed resolution represented the next step in an organic wastestream recycling project initiated by staff during FY 93-94. Through a series of workshops, a regional conference and the work a staff workgroup, it has been determined that commercially generated vegetative food waste should be targetted for increased recycling.

Goddard indicated that the recycling project would be divided into two phases. Phase I would be initiated with the adoption of the proposed resolution authorizing issuance of an RFP for a pilot project to collect and process commercial food waste. Proposers would be asked to complete several questionnaires designed to solicit economic and environmental information related to their particular proposal, including the specific site that would be used to process the material. This information would be reviewed by Metro, local governments and DEQ. Significant concerns would be identified and each proposer would be asked to address these concerns, if they intend to submit a formal project proposal during Phase II of the project development.

Goddard noted that issues such as land use permitting and odor abatement would be addressed during the Phase I review of project proposals. The compatability of the source material and the proposed processing method also would be examined.

Phase I of the project would be completed by March 1996. The Phase II RFP for detailed project proposals would be issued in March and the evaluation and awarding of the contract would be completed by May. The pilot project would be for one year and would be completed by July 1997.

The source of the food waste for the project would be pre-consumer commercial waste generators, such as grocery stores, produce companies and food processors. The successful proposer would be required to process a minimum of 1,000 tons of waste during the term of the pilot project. The feasibility of food waste recycling would be evaluated at the end of the project.