



## METRO

**MEETING:** Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee

**DAY:** Wednesday, May 15, 1996

**TIME:** 8:30 - 10:15 a.m.

**PLACE:** Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue  
Room: Council Chamber Annex, 2nd Floor

- |         |  |                  |
|---------|--|------------------|
|         | <b>1. Updates and Introductions</b>  | McFarland/Shanks |
| 10 min. | Rate Restructure Process   |                  |
| 15 min. | Materials Processing Facility (MRF) Franchise Applications   |                  |
| 5 min.  | Organic Waste Processing Demonstration Projects  |                  |
| 20 min. | Metro Central Transfer Station Dry Waste Pilot Project   |                  |
| 5 min.  | <b>2. Approval of Minutes</b>  | McFarland        |
|         | Action Requested: Approve the minutes of April 17, 1996<br>(See Enclosure #2)  |                  |
| 25 min. | <b>3. Transfer Station Activities</b>  | Petersen         |
|         | Consideration of a Proposed Pilot Project for the Recovery of<br>Wood Waste from Metro South Transfer Station for Use as Hogged Fuel<br>Work Session |                  |
| 25 min. | <b>4. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan<br/>Hazardous Waste Planning - Work Session</b>   | Klag             |
|         | Action Requested: Identify Issues to Address in the New Plan<br>(See Enclosure #4)   |                  |
| 5 min.  | <b>5. Discuss Tentative Meeting Agenda for May 15</b>  | McFarland/Nelson |
| 10 min. | <b>6. Other Business/Citizen Communications</b>  | McFarland        |
|         | <b>7. Adjourn</b>  |                  |

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 Liaison: Marie Nelson (797-1670); Committee Clerk: Connie Kinney (797-1643)

S:\SHAREP&T\SISWAC\AGENDAS\051596.AGA

**SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY OF: April 17, 1996**

**Voting Members Present**

Hauling Industry: Tom Miller, Washington County Haulers Assoc.  
David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc.,  
Tri-County Council  
James Cozzetto, Jr., MDC/ERI  
Steve Schwab, Clackamas County Haulers

Solid Waste Facilities: Doug Coenen, Waste Management of Oregon  
Steve Miesen, BFI/Trans Industries

Citizens: Jeanne Roy, Recycling Advocates  
Merle Irvine, United Disposal

Government: Loreen Mills, Washington County Cities (Staff, City of Tigard)  
Susan Keil, City of Portland (City Staff)

Recycling Industry: Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling

**Alternate Members Present**

Recycling Industry: Jeff Murray, Farwest Fibers

Government: Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County  
Lynda Kotta, Mult. County Cities (Staff, City of Gresham)  
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County

Hauling Industry: Mike Leichner, Washington County Haulers Assoc.  
Dean Kampfer, Tri "C"/Alpine

**Non-Voting Members Present**

DEQ: Dave Kunz

Government: Carol Devenir Clark County, Washington (Staff, Clark County)

**Voting Members Absent**

Committee Chair: Ruth McFarland, Metro Councilor

Recycling Industry: John Drew, Far West Fibers

Citizen: Bruce Broussard, Cad Tek

Government: Gary Hansen, Multnomah County (County Commissioner)  
Bob Kincaid, Clackamas County Cities (Staff, City of Lake Oswego)  
Debbie Noah, Mult. County Cities (Gresham Commissioner)  
Ken Spiegle, Clackamas County  
Lynne Storz, Washington County (Staff, Washington County)

**Guests Present**

Easton Cross, Consultant Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.  
Matthew Stern, City of Portland Lex Johnson, TPS

**Metro Staff Present**

Bern Shanks Kelly Shafer Hossaini Connie Kinney  
Marie Nelson Scott Klag Jim Goddard

## **1. Updates and Introductions**

Bern Shanks announced that Councilor McFarland encountered car problems that morning and would attend the meeting as soon as possible.

### **Rate Restructuring Stakeholder Meetings**

Mr. Shanks said that the stakeholder meetings for rate restructuring will be held the week of April 22, 1996. Everyone is invited to attend the meetings and those that are not scheduled to participate should call Doug Anderson if they would like to.

### **Regional Environmental Management Budget**

Mr. Shanks said that the annual budget process for Regional Environmental Management is going well and the budget currently remains largely as it was proposed. The budget will go before the full Metro Council for adoption in June 1996.

## **2. Approval of Minutes**

Doug Coenen requested that the minutes from the March 20, 1996 SWAC meeting be changed to reflect his attendance. Loreen Mills requested that Bob Kincaid's affiliation be changed from Oregon City to Lake Oswego. Steve Miesen moved that minutes from the March 20, 1996 SWAC meeting be approved as amended, Doug Coenen seconded the motion, and the Committee unanimously approved.

## **3. Materials Processing Facilities (MRFs)**

Jim Goddard, Acting Manager, Waste Reduction & Planning Services, reported to the Committee on the current status of the MRF policy issues in the region and asked for the Committee's help with how Metro should proceed to answer the questions raised by those policy issues. He said that Metro is required to franchise mixed dry waste processing facilities. This does not include facilities designed to process commingled or source-separated recyclables. Currently, there are five facilities in the region operating as MRFs and Metro has recently received applications for two more, not counting the two potential new MRFs in Washington County. Mr. Goddard told the Committee that MRFs have a big role to play in recycling and disposal, so Metro doesn't want a haphazard approach taken to their franchise system.

Mr. Goddard then asked the Committee to look at the MRF worksheet included in the SWAC packet. He said that the rest of the meeting time allotted for this issue would be used as a work session. The main question on the worksheet asked how MRFs fit into a waste recycling and disposal system. Mr. Goddard pointed out the two main issues to discuss in relation to that question: The effect of MRFs on current source-separated recycling efforts, and any contributions MRFs can make to increase the recycling of materials that would otherwise be landfilled.

Mr. Goddard said that both ERI and WRI have been significant in shaping how Metro has franchised MRFs. A minimum recovery rate of 45% has been set, exceptions have been given for vertical integration, some franchises have tonnage caps imposed, and exemptions to rate setting have been allowed unless the public is involved. As well, definitions of what materials can and cannot be accepted vary from franchise to franchise.

Jeanne Roy asked why exemptions have been granted in the past for vertical integration. Mr. Goddard responded that they were policy decisions decided by the Metro Council. Now that some have been granted, however, it is difficult to deny those kinds of exemptions in the future.

Doug Coenen asked why tonnage caps are imposed. Mr. Goddard replied that they were designed to ensure that facilities stayed within the scale at which they were brought into the system. They also serve as a trigger to reevaluate a facility if that facility reaches its cap.

Mr. Goddard then asked Merle Irvine to talk about some of the issues he views as important in the MRF franchise discussion. Mr. Irvine began by saying that MRFs have a positive effect on the wastestream and they will help the region reach its recycling goal. He said that he has two concerns about the current franchising system. First, the 45% recovery rate keeps him from accepting loads that contain recyclable material but perhaps not enough to keep his recovery rate up. He said he often has to reject loads that may have only 40% recyclables because he doesn't want to erode his recovery rate. Second, Metro calculates the recovery rate by dividing mixed material received by the amount of material that goes to markets. If he has material left in inventory at the end of the month it counts against him. The ability to move the material out to markets can depend upon container availability and market prices.

Mr. Irvine summarized by saying that these two aspects of the franchise agreement are a problem for his business and cause him to have to manipulate loads. He also said that the system is based on penalties and disincentives, which are negatives and don't help his business to operate as efficiently as it could. The system should be changed so that it operated on an incentive, not a disincentive, basis.

Mr. Goddard then asked local governments how they thought MRF activity would affect source separation of recyclables. Linda Kotta said it is too early to tell what effect they may have on curbside recyclables, but in the future they will probably have an impact on the source separation of business recyclables. She said her concern is that recoverability will be adversely affected by the contamination inherent in mixed loads sent to MRFs. Source separation is preferable.

Lee Barrett, City of Portland, said that the City has been looking into the issue of MRFs in light of their mandatory business recycling policy. He distributed a handout that illustrated the City's position on using MRFs in business recycling. He said the City does not allow what has been recovered at a MRF from a business' waste to be counted toward the business' mandatory recycling goal. Only source-separated and commingled materials count toward the recycling goal.

Rick Winterhalter agreed with the City of Portland policy and said that Clackamas County, too, is concerned about MRFs becoming an alternative to source separation.

Sue Kiel commented that she supports vertical integration. She also said she would like to see recovery rate goals remain on the table for dirty MRFs, as they currently are not required to meet any established goal. She said that the 45% goal seems to have worked well in the past, but she doesn't want to see barriers erected that don't allow for recovering as much as possible. Proper incentives need to be provided.

Jeanne Roy commented that it is Metro's policy to preserve source separation. She was concerned, however, about tons recovered from MRFs cutting into the amount that's being or could be source separated. If it's easier for businesses to just have their waste brought to a MRF, it might detract from what they would otherwise source separate.

Mr. Irvine questioned the expected number of diverted tons (267,000) represented in the handout as being too high. Mr. Goddard said that the number reflects what the MRFs listed on the handout could receive for processing each year after they were up to full speed. The numbers could very well change later, however.

Steve Miesen asked Mr. Goddard how Metro enforces the percentage recovery rate. Mr. Goddard replied that the ways in which Metro can enforce the rate is being revisited, but generally it is effective to go through the MRF's accounting logs and make site visits and load checks. Mr. Irvine said that Metro has access to all of the scalehouse information his business generates so his rate can be monitored.

Doug Coenen commented that Metro certainly has the authority to enforce the recovery rates, but how much energy and resources should really be exerted and is it worth it?

Ralph Gilbert said that from his business experience he can give the Committee a non-vertically integrated slant to the whole MRF issue. He said that in the past his company's recycling rate was in the high 40% to 50% range. Recently, however, it has dropped to as low as the low-30% range. He said this is occurring for two reasons. First, vertical integration has caused him not to receive as many loads as he used to; second, the prices for recyclables have been dropping compared to even last year. His franchise agreement stipulates that he cannot enter into the hauling business so he can't do much about the lack of good loads. He also said that there are people who aren't in the waste system who are getting a free ride at the expense of others. He said that he is a proponent of user fees - everyone should be paying something into the system.

Mr. Gilbert also agreed with Mr. Irvine that minimum recovery rates have an adverse effect on the overall goal of diverting as much from the wastestream as possible.

David White asked why commingling is always seen as a negative when compared to source separation. Jeanne Roy replied that higher quality materials come out of

source separation, and there is greater assurance that the material will get to its highest use. She also said that there is a belief that when people source separate their recyclables it can carry over to them taking more environmental responsibility in other parts of their lives.

Dean Kampfer commented that it is important to remember that the first 40% or so of waste diversion is the easiest to achieve. It's trying to recovery that last ten to 15% that's the hardest and if MRFs help to reach that last percentage then they shouldn't be discouraged.

Ms. Keil then asked what the solution would be to the set recovery rate problem. She said there needs to be a counseling approach to the generator so that they source separate or commingle and don't just throw everything in one can. How can that be achieved as well as diversion of the last percentages of material? Tom Miller replied that a certain level of program performance could be required of the generator before they were allowed to bring waste to MRFs. This would be a type of prequalification program.

Jeanne Roy expressed her concern about what people in the Committee are calling MRFs. The term is being used to mean what journals would describe as mixed waste recovery facilities. In these same journals, the label "MRF" corresponds to facilities that accept commingled recyclables. Jeff Murray replied that for most people MRFs mean facilities that accept dry waste.

Jim Goddard thanked everyone for their input and said he would be back for an update. He said he could also send people information as it comes available.

#### **4. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Disaster Debris Management Planning**

Kelly Hossaini, Metro Solid Waste Planner, gave the Committee an update on the disaster debris management planning process. She said that the Disaster Debris Management Task Force was recommending that the Committee not forward the proposed Recommended Practices to REMCOM at that time, but to wait until later in the year after more work had been done on the implementation guidelines.

Loreen Mills directed the Committee's attention to the proposed Recommended Practices they received in their SWAC packets. She said that the underlined sections reflect most of what has been changed since they last saw the Practices in January. There were no questions or comments on the proposed Recommended Practices.

Marie Nelson then asked the Committee to endorse the Task Force's work in progress and the revised process schedule. The Committee unanimously agreed to do so.

## **5. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Hazardous Waste Planning**

Scott Klag, Metro Solid Waste Planner, distributed and reviewed a summary of the planning issues that will need to be discussed in order to complete development of recommended practices for hazardous waste programs. Issues include collection services, including both events and the permanent facilities, an overall toxics reduction education strategy, funding alternatives, and the conditionally exempt generator program.

He also asked Committee members to complete a matrix to show what stakeholders they thought should be included in the process, their own level of interest in working on a subcommittee, and any other comments they wanted to include.

Loreen Mills expressed concern about the area of funding alternatives. She said that this is an area that local governments are especially concerned about when they begin looking at funding mechanisms. This should be one of the first areas addressed because it will probably dictate what services can be offered. It is also important to look at the issue relatively quickly in light of the current rate restructuring process.

Mr. Klag replied that the rate restructuring talks are happening on a rather broad level, but that fee collection mechanisms might become clearer after the talks have concluded.

Tom Miller commented that services shouldn't be implemented that there won't be a stable source of money for in the future. Lynda Kotta agreed and said that funding should be one of the first issues on the table.

Dave Kunz said he would like to see an evaluation and assessment of the status quo in hazardous waste services. He said that DEQ has some data they have gathered from their satellite collection events and would like to share it.

Mr. Klag asked the Committee to leave any other comments with him after the meeting, or to fax them to him. He told the Committee he would come back with a revised planning schedule and process.

## **6. Discuss Tentative Meeting Agenda for May 15**

Marie Nelson asked the Committee what issues they would like to discuss at the May 15, 1996 SWAC meeting. She said it sounded as though the group wanted to continue with the household hazardous waste discussion. She also announced that there would be another update on the rate restructuring process, the organics demonstration project, and the MRF issue. David White suggested a presentation about the dry waste processing pilot project at Metro Central and the plans to take the residual to Hillsboro Landfill.

**7. Other Business/Citizen Communications**

None.

**8. Adjourn**

S:\SHARE\IP&TS\SWAC\MINUTES\SWAC0417.SUM



**REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, May 15, 1996**

**REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**PROPOSED PLANNING SCHEDULE AND PROCESS FOR  
HAZARDOUS WASTE PLANNING TASK FORCE**

**Work Products:**

The role of the task force is to assist in the completion of the recommended practices for the Hazardous Waste portion of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. Two formal presentations to SWAC are scheduled (one at midpoint and one at end), but smaller monthly updates would also be expected.

**Task Force Structure:**

The task force will be composed of between 6 to 8 members. A single group is the expected format, but subgroups could be created if they are desired by task force members.

**Work session agendas:**

The task force will focus on each of the following four issue areas in turn, but actively consider how they are related as the planning process proceeds:

- Service Issues
- Education for Toxics Reduction
- Funding Alternatives
- Conditionally Exempt Generator Program

Fiscal issues will be an important part of work session agendas, particularly in the early sessions.

**Number of work sessions:**

Eight to ten work sessions of approximately 2 hours would be arranged between now and September. This would mean about 2 meetings per month but depending on the preferences of task force members scheduling could be varied. (For example, a two sessions could be combined on a single day.)

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE AND AGENDA TOPICS

### May

**Work Session #1.** Background including history of programs and discussion of fiscal issues

- Service issues
- Education strategy
- Funding alternatives
- Conditionally exempt generator program (CEG)

### June

**#2.** Agenda: Follow-up to background meeting ( if required)

**#3.** Agenda: Service Issues

### July

**#4.** Agenda: Service Issues and relation to Education Strategy, Funding Alternatives, and CEG program

- ***Midpoint review and presentation to SWAC - after session #4***

**#5.** Agenda: Education Strategy

### August

**#6.** Agenda: Education Strategy and relation to Service Issues, Funding Alternatives, CEG program

**#7.** Agenda: Funding Alternatives

### September

**#8.** Agenda: Conditionally Exempt Generators

**#9.** Agenda: Development of final recommendations

- ***Presentation to SWAC***