



METRO

MEETING: Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee
DAY: Wednesday, April 17, 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
FY 1996-97 Budget Process
Appointment of the Metro Code Enforcement / Illegal Dumping Work Team | McFarland/Shanks |
| 5 min. | 2. Approval of Minutes
Action Requested: Approve the minutes of March 20, 1996
(See Enclosure #2) | McFarland |
| 40 min. | 3. Materials Processing Facilities (MRF's)
Report and Discussion of Approach to MRF Franchise Applications
Action Requested: Work Session
(See Enclosure #3) | Goddard / Klag |
| 20 min. | 4. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan
 Disaster Debris Management Planning
Report from the Disaster Debris Management Task Force
Action Requested: Approval of Work in Progress and of the
Revised Project Schedule
(See Enclosure #4) | Mills / Hossaini |
| 20 min. | 5. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan
 Hazardous Waste Planning
Action Requested: Approval of a Planning Schedule and Process | Klag |
| 5 min. | 6. Discuss Tentative Meeting Agenda for May 15 | 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 Liaison: Marie Nelson (797-1670) Committee Clerk: Connie Kinney (797-1643)

S:\SHAREP&T\S\WAC\AGENDAS\0417_2.AGA

**SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY OF: March 20, 1996**

Voting Members Present

Committee Chair: Ruth McFarland, Metro Councilor
Hauling Industry: Tom Miller, Washington County Haulers Assoc.
David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc.,
Tri-Councy 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
Government: Loreen Mills, Washington County Cities (Staff, City of Tigard)
Lynne Storz, Washington County (Staff, Washington County)
Recycling Industry: Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling

Alternate Members Present

Recycling Industry: Jeff Murray, Farwest Fibers
Government: Susan Ziolko, Clackamas County

Non-Voting Members Present

DEQ Ed Druback

Non-Voting Members Absent

Government: Dave Kunz, DEQ
Carol Devenir Clark County, Washington (Staff, Clark County)

Voting Members Absent

Solid Waste Facilities: Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste Systems
Recycling Industry: John Drew, Far West Fibers
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)
Debbie Noah, Mult. County Cities (Gresham Commissioner)
Lynda Kotta, Mult. County Cities (Staff, City of Gresham)
Citizens: Merle Irvine, United Disposal

Guests Present

Easton Cross, Consultant
JoAnn Herrigel, City of Milwaukie
Debbie Fromdall, Sanifill NW
Dick Jones, Citizen
Jeff Jones, Sanifill Northwest

Metro Staff Present

Bern Shanks	Kelly Shafer Hossaini	Connie Kinney	Jennifer Ness
Marie Nelson	Scott Klag	Jim Goddard	Jim Quinn
Steve Kraten			

1. Updates and Introductions

Household Hazardous Waste Facility at the Metro South Transfer Station

Bern Shanks told the Committee that recent estimates indicate it will cost \$400,000 to repair the household hazardous waste facility at the Metro South Transfer Station, which was damaged in the February flood. There is ongoing discussion about whether to repair the facility or move it altogether onto higher ground. The decision will depend upon how much reimbursement money is available from FEMA, as well as how much FEMA mitigation money might be available for the project.

Metro Budget

Mr. Shanks reported that the Regional Environmental Management budget for FY '96-'97 reflects a \$2.6 million reduction over the current fiscal year. Materials and services have been cut by over \$2 million and one-half an FTE has also been cut. The budget assumes that 30,000 fewer tons will go to Metro transfer stations during FY '96-'97. Metro staff is still working on a rate proposal to submit to the Executive Officer in July. Mr. Shanks stated that he will give a more detailed update on the rate process later on this agenda.

Materials Recovery Facilities (MRFs)

Mr. Shanks told the Committee that several MRF applications have been received by Metro that have the combined capacity to divert approximately 300,000 tons a year from the wastestream. This number reflects design capacity of the facilities, and not expected throughput. Over half of the diverted tonnage will be returned to the waste stream, in any case, based on the recovery capabilities of the MRFs. About half of the actual diversion may be from Metro transfer stations, but Metro would still receive the Regional User Fee on the process residual, assuming no change in the rate structure. Also, the MRFs will take a couple of years to get up and running to their expected levels.

Dry Waste Processing at Metro Central

Mr. Shanks reported that the trial dry waste diversion project at Metro Central is proceeding. Metro and BFI / Trans Industries are collaborating on the project.

Resignation of Debbie Gorham

Mr. Shanks told the Committee that Debbie Gorham resigned as of March 15, 1996 to pursue other interests and opportunities. Jim Goddard will be the acting manager in her place. A full-time replacement for the position will be sought later in the spring.

Waste Flow Trends

Councilor McFarland mentioned that after looking through Metro waste flow reports through November 1996, she noticed what seemed to be a continuing trend of decreasing waste flow through Metro-owned facilities. The revenue is up slightly because tonnage to non-Metro facilities is up somewhat, but Metro is looking carefully at the FY '96-'97 solid waste budget. She also said that there is no move to raise rates, and Metro is looking closely at contingency and reserve fund policies should there be future shortfalls.

2. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes from the February 21, 1996 SWAC meeting. The Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Year 7 Metro / Local Government Work Plan

Jennifer Ness, Solid Waste Planner, presented the Year 7 Metro / Local Government Work Plan for approval by SWAC. She introduced the Work Plan to the Committee by stating that the format for Year 7 is much like that of Year 6. There are foundation items that all local governments must complete, and there are expansion elements they can choose from to meet their commitment for the year. Ms. Ness told the Committee that the Work Plan is a result of group consensus and reflects a working partnership between Metro and local governments.

Susan Ziolko, Clackamas County, told the Committee that efforts on the Year 7 Work Plan were begun early and reflected the policies of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). She then said that some of the elements of the Year 6 Work Plan that did not tie into the RSWMP were not included in the Year 7 Work Plan.

JoAnn Herrigel, City of Milwaukie, said that she thought the cooperative process used to develop the Year 7 Work Plan was very effective, and made for a positive experience. She also said that the Year 7 Work Plan allows for flexibility and creativity in program development.

Jeanne Roy then distributed a memo to the Committee outlining her concerns about the Year 7 Work Plan and, subsequently, her recommendations for amendments. Her first concern was that the Work Plan elements describing applicable RSWMP Recommended Practices were not specific enough and recommended three ways to achieve more specificity. Her second concern was that the Year 7 Work Plan did not identify programs to be evaluated or evaluation methods, as required by RSWMP. In her memo, she included a recommendation for an amendment to address the issue.

Jennifer Ness responded that Ms. Roy has had significant input in the process of developing the Year 7 Work Plan. She said that, previously, Ms. Roy agreed to the wording of certain sections that she now has asked to be changed. Ms. Ness said that Ms. Roy's recommended changes to the Work Plan regarding evaluation,

especially in the area of business recycling, are not consistent with the fact that recycling is largely voluntary in the region. The City of Portland is the only jurisdiction with mandatory commercial recycling.

Ms. Roy responded that the amendments she asked for during the development process, and Ms. Ness said she included, were not exactly what were included in the Work Plan. For example, she had asked for the language about quarterly notification of recycling to garbage customers that appears in State law. She said her concern was that in the Work Plan there is no assurance that programs will be carried out to reach stated goals.

There was a motion and a second, to amend the Year 7 Work Plan per Ms. Roy's written proposal. Discussion on the issue continued. Councilor McFarland asked the Committee if they wanted to consider the motion to amend, but no action was taken. Councilor McFarland then asked if there was a motion to approve the Year 7 Work Plan, as submitted. The motion was made and seconded, and the Work Plan was approved, with Jeanne Roy dissenting.

4. Metro Rate Proposal - Discussion of Objectives and Process

Bern Shanks spoke to the Committee about the process to initiate rate reform for the region's solid waste system. He distributed a handout that described the process and timeline. He announced that Doug Anderson will be the team leader for the process, and a proposal will be taken to Mike Burton in July 1996. SWAC will also be able to consider the proposal at that time.

Mr. Shanks told the Committee that the purpose of the proposal is to achieve rate equity (charges directly linked to services), maintain reasonable rates, and continue to support incentives to recycle. From Metro's view, the rate proposal needs to provide for stable and predictable funding for those programs not directly tied to disposal, and remain revenue neutral.

Councilor McFarland said that she disagreed with Mr. Shanks that the proposal needed to remain revenue neutral, and that the Metro Council believes it may even be possible to reduce the rates.

Mr. Shanks said that because of the complexity of the rate structure, it ripples through our system and affects people in a lot of different ways. A consultant will be hired to look at how different rates will affect different customers, and part of what will be necessary for that will be input and opinions from the solid waste community.

Easton Cross then asked Mr. Shanks to define what is wrong with the current rates. Mr. Shanks reviewed some specifics of his previous points.

Dave White referred to stakeholder meetings scheduled to take place in April, as outlined in the handout, and asked Mr. Shanks to further define them. Mr. Shanks responded that there will be a whole series of meetings, focus groups, etc. that will involve laying out different rate scenarios. He said that Metro understands that

whatever is done with rates will impact everyone in the system. He also said that all of the meetings will be open to the public and so anyone can attend.

Lynn Storz then asked if, as a Metro objective, flow control was an issue to be addressed by the process. Mr. Shanks replied that he did not want a system that relied upon flow control. Councilor McFarland stated that the federal government will probably not allow us to continue flow control at all in the future, and Metro needs to be able to live within a system that is less favorable to its survival.

5. Report on the Activities of Metro's Enforcement Unit

Steve Kraten, Solid Waste Enforcement Officer, reported to the Committee the recent activities of Metro's Enforcement Unit. He told the Committee that the Enforcement Unit has been involved with the following tasks:

- Shutting down illegal dump and pick operations
- Identifying unreported tonnage being accepted at facilities
- Identifying misreported tons (for example, tons claimed as out-of-region in origin, but actually from within the region)
- Shutting down illegal dump sites and apprehending illegal dumpers
- Stopping the theft of recyclables

Jeanne Roy asked if any attempt was made to measure the tonnage involved in illegal dumping. Mr. Kraten replied that no direct tonnage measurement was taken, but that there has been an increase in Metro tonnage coming in to facilities and that has been partly due to the Enforcement Unit's work. In the future, a way to measure the effectiveness of the Unit will be developed.

Loreen Mills said that the city of Tigard now has more enforcement officers than ever before, and there has been an illegal dumping ordinance in place for five years. She said Tigard has been fairly successful in this area, and that all of the local governments are working hard on enforcement with Metro.

6. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Enforcement Goals, Objectives, and Recommended Practices

Marie Nelson, Planning Services Supervisor, presented the Committee with an overview of a proposed planning schedule and process for revising the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) enforcement goals, objectives, and recommended practices. She asked that at the end of her presentation the Committee consider approval of the planning schedule and process.

Ms. Nelson explained that the project objectives are to: develop goals, objectives, and practices that address major issues; implement recommendations from the Metro auditors' report on the enforcement program; and include any relevant elements from the old RSWMP. She also said that stakeholders would be involved in the planning process through such forums as a regional work group and SWAC.

Ms. Nelson then referred the Committee to Enclosure 6 of the March 20, 1996 SWAC packet, for a detailed breakdown of a proposed planning schedule and process for the project.

Doug Coenen asked what staff thought was missing or needed to be changed in the current goals and objectives for enforcement. Ms. Nelson replied she thought the current goals and objectives are still relevant, but she would like to explore other perspectives and ensure they were inclusive of all of the issues.

Loreen Mills asked Ms. Nelson if she was looking for volunteers to serve on the regional committee to review the enforcement section of the RSWMP. Ms. Nelson said she was noting volunteers, and wanted to ensure that all interest groups were involved.

JoAnn Herrigel asked if Metro was planning on taking the enforcement section update to city councils, as was the process during the RSWMP update. Ms. Nelson replied that it is a possibility if the interest is there.

Dave White stated that he didn't see anything about the theft of recyclables in the handout information. He asked how that would fit into the enforcement update. Ms. Nelson said that theft of recyclables is a new issue; it wasn't on the table when the old goal and objectives were developed. She said that it is an area included in Metro Code Enforcement as well as being a local issue. Mr. White said help from Metro would be appreciated on the local level, but he was concerned about redundancy.

Councilor McFarland asked if there was a motion to approve the planning schedule and process. The motion was made, seconded, and moved forward by the full Committee.

7. Status of Metro Hazardous Waste Programs - Future Plans

Scott Klag, Senior Solid Waste Planner, informed the Committee that, due to the flood activity, work on the future plans for Metro hazardous waste programs is a bit behind schedule. There will be a full presentation of household hazardous waste at the April 1996 SWAC meeting. He told the Committee that during the time allotted on this agenda, Jim Quinn would give them an update on the Metro South Hazardous Waste facility that flooded, and on the temporary debris dump sites that the Metro Hazardous Waste staff helped with during the flood.

Jim Quinn, Hazardous Waste Supervisor, reported to the Committee that the weeks following the flood were challenging for Metro's hazardous waste team. The hazardous waste facility at Metro South was flooded to the roof line and so was, and still is, unavailable for use. There were no environmental or health concerns associated with the flooding of the facility. Work is currently underway to restore the facility to a condition where it can be used, but no remodeling or major improvements will be undertaken until some basic, long-term decisions are made about its future. These decisions will include issues like whether to move the facility to higher ground or leave it where it is.

Mr. Quinn told the Committee that for flood-generated household hazardous waste, two approaches were used: full presence at the temporary dump sites and on-call services to collect material left at the dump sites. Although the exact numbers are not available, approximately 300 people used the hazardous waste drop-off opportunity at the temporary debris sites. Part of this was material that was not flood-related, but a result of neighborhood residents seeing the hazardous waste set-up and bringing in material.

Mr. Quinn also said that satellite household hazardous waste events are proceeding as usual. There will be six full-scale events and six neighborhood events. He then distributed a schedule of these events.

JoAnn Herrigel said that she thought Metro was extremely helpful during the flood. Someone was always available and willing to help, and she wanted to extend her thanks for that. She also thought the on-call service for hazardous waste collection from the temporary sites was a good idea, but that for Milwaukee it was probably just as easy to have residents bring their material to the transfer station since it is close by.

8. Disaster Debris Management / Regional Flood Coordination

Kelly Shafer Hossaini, Solid Waste Planner, gave the Committee an update on flood debris efforts in the region. She thanked the Committee for comments they gave Jim Goddard at the last SWAC meeting and said that they were taken back to the Disaster Debris Task Force at its March 7, 1996 meeting. She said that overall flood debris management in the region went very well, and the experiences will help in the development of the regional Disaster Debris Management Plan. Ms. Hossaini also said that the disaster debris management efforts of just the last six months helped in flood debris management. It helped to get people thinking about disaster debris, and opened the lines of communication.

The action item was not moved on as SWAC recommendations had already been taken to the Disaster Debris Management Task Force.

9. Discuss Tentative Meeting Agenda for April 17

Marie Nelson, Planning Services Supervisor, reported that the following items are tentatively scheduled for SWAC consideration on April 17: approval of a planning process and schedule to include hazardous waste practices in the RSWMP; approval of Disaster Debris Management recommended practices; and a report on the status of MRF franchise applications.

10. Other Business/Citizen Communications

Ed Drubeck, a DEQ NW Region manager, introduced himself and informed the Committee that he was now responsible for oversight on solid waste matters in the Northwest Region.

11. Adjourn

S:\SHARE\P&TS\SWAC\MINUTES\SWAC0320.SUM

SWAC Worksession on MRF's

- I. **QUESTION:** How do material recovery facilities (MRF's) that process loads of mixed waste fit into the normal waste recycling and disposal system?
- II. Issues to consider in answering the question:
 - a. The effect of MRF's on current source-separation based recycling systems
 - b. The contribution MRF's can make to increase recycling of materials from mixed waste that would otherwise be landfilled.

III. BACKGROUND

	Current Recycling Rate	Mixed Waste Received for Processing* (tons/yr)	Totals (Tons/Year)
I. Existing Franchises (location & contact)			
ERI, (Columbia Blvd., Jim Cozzetto, Jr.)	45%	35,000	
WRI, (Wilsonville, Merle Irvine)	45-50%	24,000	
ECR, (Ralph Gilbert, East Multnomah County)	30-35%	44,000	
Wastech, (Wes Hickey, Columbia Blvd.)	60-70%	9,000	
SUBTOTAL FOR EXISTING FRANCHISES			112,000
II. FRANCHISE APPLICATIONS IN PROCESS			
II-A Franchise Renewal Applications			
Marine Drop Box, (Paul Pietrzyk, Columbia Blvd.)	-	10,000	
Pride ¹ , (Mike Leichner, Sr., Sherwood)	-	10,000	
KB ² , (Fred Kahut, Milwaukie)	-	36,000	
SUBTOTAL			56,000
II-B New Applicants			
OrRS ³ , (Bryan Engleson, Northwest Nicolai)	-	36,000	
TDK\WMO ⁴ , (Eric Merrill, Troutdale)	-	23,000	
SUBTOTAL			59,000
II-C Potential New Facilities			
Washington Co. #1	-	35,000	
Washington Co #2	-	5,000	
SUBTOTAL			40,000
SUBTOTAL FOR FRANCHISE APPLICATIONS IN PROCESS			155,000
TOTAL FOR ALL FRANCHISES			267,000

*Estimates contained in this table are based on information submitted by applicants and staff analysis. All tonnage estimates are for Fiscal Year 1996-97 except where noted for new facilities.

¹ Pride - Tonnage estimate is only for that portion of operations in franchise application involving dry waste.

²KB - Operations begin at existing facility and anticipated to be moved to new facility. Full tonnage by calendar year 1997.

³OrRs - Two facilities are being applied for but analysis assumes only one facility becomes operational. Full tonnage by calendar year 1997.

⁴TDK\WMO - Full tonnage by FY 97-98

Precedents Set in Previous MRF Franchises

1. The primary means of regulating MRF activities has been through a 45% recovery rate for mixed waste (established for ERI and WRI).
2. Exemptions have been granted for vertical integration of MRF's being affiliated with hauling companies, landfills or both.
3. Tonnage caps have been used to limit the total mixed waste a MRF can receive.
4. Exemptions have been granted from Metro's rate setting but rate equity on public facilities is required.
5. Definitions of waste acceptable for processing at MRFs have varied between franchises.

II. SCHEDULE:

Metro currently has five Franchise Applications in process. More are expected in the near future. Metro has been slow in processing these Franchise Applications as is evident by the backlog. We are currently trying to work through this backlog as quickly as is reasonable while establishing the coexistent approach to analyzing the role MRF's fill in the system. It is not expected that any Franchise Code changes will be required and no formal recommendation are required from SWAC. However, input from SWAC will be used to develop the consistent direction for dealing with the MRF applications.

JG:ek
S:\SHARE\GODD\L\CGOV\NOT\SWAC\MRF.DOC

**METRO**

DATE: April 10, 1996

TO: Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee

FROM: Kelly Shafer Hossaini, Associate Solid Waste Planner .797-1503

THROUGH: Marie Nelson, Supervisor, Planning Services

RE: Disaster Debris Management Plan

Attached is a copy of the proposed Recommended Practices for Disaster Debris Management. Please review them and be prepared to discuss them at the April 17, 1996, SWAC meeting. SWAC will be asked to endorse the work in progress and recommend a revision of the project's schedule.

The Task Force is recommending to wait and present the proposed Practices for adoption later in the year, as a part of the overall Regional Disaster Debris Management Plan. This will allow the Task Force flexibility in developing implementation strategies and guidelines, and ensure that the role of the recommended practices in the Regional Disaster Debris Management Plan is clearly understood. At the beginning of the disaster debris management planning process, staff had intended to have the recommended practices available for adoption into the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan by June 1996. However, that decision has been reconsidered and the Disaster Debris Management Task Force is not asking SWAC to take any action at this time.

As you will recall, you received an earlier version of these Recommended Practices in your January 17, 1996, SWAC agenda packet, along with corresponding discussion questions. The Recommended Practices you have now received reflect input that you gave through the questionnaires you returned to me, and through your comments at the January 17 SWAC meeting. They also reflect further work on the part of the Disaster Debris Management Task Force.

The major changes to the Recommended Practices since the January 17, 1996 SWAC meeting have been the addition of the following elements:

- Real-time assessment of system capacity for debris removal (Recommended Practice #1)
- Guidelines for the management and operation of temporary disposal sites (Recommended Practice #3)
- Contingencies for debris disposal in the event usual options not available (Recommended Practice #3)
- Contingencies for financial arrangements and tipping fees at Metro transfer stations (Recommended Practice #4)
- Development of a Regional Mutual Aid Agreement (Recommended Practice #5)

Thank you for taking the time to review the revised recommended practices. I look forward to discussing them with you on April 19.

S:\SHARE\HOSS\DISASTER\SWAC0417.MEM

**Proposed Recommended Practices
for
Disaster Debris Management**

Table of Contents

	Page
Goal No. 14 - Disaster Management, Regional Solid Waste Management Plan	2
Overview and Components of Draft Recommended Practices	3
Definition of Participant Categories	4
<i>Outline of Individual Draft Recommended Practices:</i>	
Recommended Practice 1 - Information	5
Recommended Practice 2 - Response Phase	7
Recommended Practice 3 - Recovery Phase	9
Recommended Practice 4 - Fiscal/Financial Arrangements	12
Recommended Practice 5 - Coordination of Efforts	14

Goal No. 14 - Disaster Management, Regional Solid Waste Management Plan

In the event of a major natural disaster such as an earthquake, windstorm, or flood, the regional solid waste system is prepared to quickly restore delivery of normal refuse services and have the capability of removing, reusing, recycling, and disposing of potentially enormous amounts of debris.

Objective 14.1. Provide both accurate and reliable information for use in predicting the consequences of a major disaster and an inventory of resources available for responding to and recovering from disasters.

Objective 14.2. Develop a response phase plan that coordinates emergency debris management services and maximizes public health and safety.

Objective 14.3. Develop a recovery plan that maximizes the amounts of materials recovered and recycled and minimizes potential environmental impacts.

Objective 14.4. Provide for innovative and flexible fiscal and financial arrangements that promote efficient and effective implementation of response and recovery plans.

Objective 14.5. Ensure the coordination and commitment of local, state, and federal governments and the private sector.

Overview and Components of Draft Recommended Practices

1. Information - (Corresponds to Objective 14.1)

Ensure that a current and usable set of information is available for the planning and implementation of disaster debris removal.

2. Response Phase - (Corresponds to Objective 14.2)

The Response Phase should allow for the swift coordination and mobilization of resources and efforts, with the priority on immediate services that will benefit life, safety, and public health.

3. Recovery Phase - (Corresponds to Objective 14.3)

Disaster debris management efforts in the Recovery Phase should minimize environmental impacts and be consistent with the waste management hierarchy. Priority should be given to the existing local facility, hauler, and contractor infrastructure.

4. Fiscal/Financial Arrangements - (Corresponds to Objective 14.4)

Ensure that disaster debris management activities will be properly and efficiently funded through coordination among and between public agencies and the private sector, through compliance with all applicable FEMA requirements, and through the inclusion of proper accounting procedures.

5. Coordination of Efforts - (Corresponds to Objective 14.5)

Develop intergovernmental, mutual aid, and other agreements, as necessary, to ensure the proper coordination and commitment of public agencies and the private sector.

Definition of Participant Categories

Federal Government:	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Includes Army Corps of Engineers
State Government:	Oregon Emergency Management (OEM) Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Regional Emergency Management Group	
Metro:	Metro Staff
Local Government:	County Governments City Governments
Waste Haulers:	Licensed and franchised haulers
Private Sector:	Landfill Operators Solid Waste Facility Operators Association of General Contractors Insurance Company Representatives Citizens

Outline of Individual Draft Recommended Practices

Recommended Practice 1 - Information:

Ensure that a current and usable set of information is available for the planning and implementation of disaster debris removal.

Key Concept and Approach: To properly plan for and implement disaster debris removal activities, certain information must be available to those involved in these activities. It is also important that once this information is gathered it is periodically updated on a regular basis.

Key Elements:

- a) Inventory of regional solid waste disposal, recycling, and processing facilities. Includes: location, storage, processing, and market capacities, and material specifications.
- b) Inventory of regional debris removal resources, e.g., government-owned resources, demolition contractors, garbage haulers, dump truck companies. Includes: equipment and labor capacity.
- c) Assess capacity of regional markets to absorb recyclables produced by recovery activities. Include consideration of specifications required.
- d) Debris tonnage predictions, by geographical area and type of debris.
- e) Inventory of potential temporary debris storage sites around the region.
- f) Prediction of ~~quantities and types of exempt~~ the need for Metro hazardous wastes services.
- g) Real-time assessment of system capacity for debris removal.

Roles and Responsibilities:

Federal Government:

- Supply information regarding debris removal resources under their authority.
- Provide inventory of potential temporary debris storage sites under their authority.
- Assist with debris tonnage predictions.

State Government:

- Supply information regarding debris removal resources under their authority. (ODOT only)
- Provide inventory of potential temporary debris storage sites under their authority. (ODOT only)
- Assist with debris tonnage predictions. (ODOT only)
- Assist with the prediction of quantities and kinds of exempt hazardous wastes. (DEQ only)

Metro:

- Conduct inventory of regional facilities.
- Conduct market capacity assessment.
- Use Metro's disaster management database to predict debris tonnage.
- Assemble and disseminate disaster debris management information and ensure its periodic updating.
- Obtain prediction of ~~quantities and kinds of exempt~~ the need for Metro hazardous wastes services.
- Prepare real-time assessment of system capacity for debris removal.

Local Government:

- Supply information regarding government-owned and privately-owned debris removal resources in their area.
- Provide inventory of potential temporary debris storage sites in their area.
- Assist with debris tonnage predictions.
- Assist with preparation of real-time assessment of system capacity for debris removal.

Waste Haulers:

- Supply information to government agencies.
- Assist with preparation of real-time assessment of system capacity for debris removal.

Private Sector:

- Supply information to government agencies.
- Assist with preparation of real-time assessment of system capacity for debris removal.

Recommended Practice 2 - Response Phase:

The Response Phase should allow for the swift coordination and mobilization of resources and efforts, with the priority on immediate services that will benefit life, safety, and public health.

Key Concept and Approach: In the ~~first 72 hours after~~ initial stages of the disaster, a response strategy should mobilize resources, including ~~executing~~ contracts for debris removal. Priorities should be established for putrescible surge removal and debris removal in critical areas of the community.

Key Elements:

- a) Guidelines for a Response Phase strategy. Strategy should allow ability to:
 - Designate Metro and local government debris removal coordinators and establish inter-communication
 - Designate Regional Information Coordinator for disaster debris removal efforts
 - Regional Information Coordinator Retrieve damage assessment information from the ~~Regional Emergency Operations Center~~ debris removal coordinators
 - Provide disaster debris prediction, inventory, and assessment information to the ~~Regional Emergency Operations Center~~ Regional Information Coordinator and debris removal coordinators
 - Determine the extent of need and the degree to which regional or local response is required using previously developed criteria.
 - Mobilize local resources through the execution of contracts with haulers and contractors responsible for initial work
 - Execute intergovernmental agreements and mutual aid agreements, as required, e.g., between haulers and/or governments
 - Prioritize clean-up areas

- b) Disaster debris removal information/communication system. Include:
 - A phone tree that includes the following communication paths: FEMA, Oregon Emergency Management, Regional Emergency Management Group, media, interjurisdictional, and facilities
 - Templates for information leaflets and distributional avenues for all written information
 - A system for responding to incoming telephone and mail requests for disaster debris information
 - Strategies for immediate and long-term information dissemination to the public, contractors, haulers, and facilities
 - Dissemination of procedures for personal property recovery

Roles and Responsibilities:

Federal Government:

Participate in the development of the information/communication system.
Provide information on experiences with other areas of the country.

State Government:

Assist in the preparation of guidelines for the Response Phase.
Assist in the design of the disaster debris removal information system.

Metro:

Designate Metro debris removal coordinator.
Prepare guidelines for the Response Phase.
Provide disaster debris prediction, inventory, and assessment information to the Regional ~~Emergency Operations Center~~. Information Coordinator.
Develop criteria to be used in determining the extent of need and the degree to which regional or local response is required after a disaster.
Design disaster debris removal information system.

Local Government:

Designate local government debris removal coordinator for each jurisdiction.
Assist in the preparation of guidelines for the Response Phase.
Assist with development of criteria to be used in determining the extent of need and the degree to which regional or local response is required after a disaster.
Assist in the design of the disaster debris removal information system.

Waste Haulers:

Assist in the preparation of guidelines for the Response Phase.
Assist with development of criteria to be used in determining the extent of need and the degree to which regional or local response is required after a disaster.
Assist in the design of the disaster debris removal information system.

Private Sector:

Assist in the preparation of guidelines for the Response Phase.
Assist with development of criteria to be used in determining the extent of need and the degree to which regional or local response is required after a disaster.
Assist in the design of the disaster debris removal information system.

Recommended Practice 3 - Recovery Phase:

Disaster debris management efforts in the Recovery Phase should minimize environmental impacts and be consistent with the waste management hierarchy. Priority should be given to the existing local facility, hauler, and contractor infrastructure.

Key Concept and Approach: Debris disposition should be handled in an efficient, orderly, and cost-effective manner that minimizes adverse environmental impacts, respects the waste management hierarchy, and supports overall health and safety efforts. To ensure that equipment, labor, and services are supplied efficiently and cost-effectively, the priority is to utilize existing local resources in disaster debris management efforts in accordance with the solid waste hierarchy.

Key Elements:

- a) General guidelines for Recovery Phase disaster debris management efforts. Include:
 - Guidelines to limit private burning
 - Guidelines to police illegal dumping
 - Procedures that allow people to recover personal property from damaged structures whenever practicable
 - Process for private clean-up efforts - includes a permit system that defines the process, time limits, requirements, and restrictions
 - Coordination of civil debris clearing efforts
 - Continuation of efforts to mobilize local resources through the execution of contracts with haulers and contractors

- b) Guidelines for Recovery Phase disaster debris collection, processing, and disposal. Include:
 - Guidelines for removal of debris from both residential and commercial properties that are consistent with the waste management hierarchy - salvage, reuse, recycle, recover before landfilling
 - Guidelines for the management and operation of temporary disposal sites
 - Putrescible surge abatement strategies
 - Guidelines to properly collect and process or dispose of exempt hazardous waste.
 - Resumption of regular garbage and recycling service as quickly as possible
 - Contingency procedures for debris removal - includes coordination with the Corps of Engineers, and mutual aid agreements between different haulers, processors, and facilities
 - Contingencies for debris disposal in the event usual options are not available

Roles and Responsibilities:

Federal Government:

Assist with development of guidelines for coordination of civil debris clearing efforts.

State Government:

Assist with the development of private burning guidelines. (DEQ only)

Assist with development of guidelines for coordination of civil debris clearing efforts. (ODOT only)

Assist with the development of exempt hazardous waste guidelines. (DEQ only)

Metro:

Develop guidelines to police illegal dumping.

Prepare personal property recovery procedures.

Assist with development of private clean-up effort process.

Develop guidelines for coordination of civil debris clearing efforts.

Develop approaches for debris removal that are consistent with the waste management hierarchy.

Develop guidelines for the management and operation of temporary disposal sites.

Assist with the creation of putrescible surge abatement strategies.

Develop exempt hazardous waste strategies.

Development of contingency procedures for debris removal and disposal.

Local Government:

Develop guidelines for limiting private burning.

Assist with preparation of personal property recovery procedures.

Develop private clean-up effort process.

Assist with development of guidelines for coordination of civil debris clearing efforts.

Assist with planning for debris removal efforts consistent with the waste management hierarchy.

Assist with the development of guidelines for the management and operation of temporary disposal sites.

Prepare strategies for resumption of regular garbage and recycling service.

Create putrescible surge abatement strategies.

Assist with the development of exempt hazardous waste strategies.

Assist with development of contingency procedures for debris removal and disposal.

Waste Haulers:

- Assist with preparation of personal property recovery procedures.
- Assist with planning for debris removal efforts consistent with the waste management hierarchy.
- Assist with the development of guidelines for the management and operation of temporary disposal sites.
- Assist with preparation of strategies for resumption of regular garbage and recycling service.
- Assist with putrescible surge abatement strategies.
- Assist with development of contingency procedures for debris removal and disposal.

Private Sector:

- Assist with preparation of personal property recovery procedures.
- Assist with planning for debris removal efforts consistent with the waste management hierarchy.
- Assist with preparation of strategies for resumption of regular garbage and recycling service.
- Assist with putrescible surge abatement strategies.
- Assist with development of contingency procedures for debris removal and disposal.

Recommended Practice 4 - Fiscal/Financial Arrangements:

Ensure that disaster debris management activities will be properly and efficiently funded through coordination among and between public agencies and the private sector, through compliance with all applicable FEMA requirements, and through the inclusion of proper accounting procedures.

Key Concept and Approach: The communication and coordination of disaster debris management efforts between jurisdictions and applicable agencies is important to ensure that efforts are not duplicated and record-keeping is accurate. These and other similar types of problems can strain resources, impair the ability to be reimbursed by FEMA, and potentially jeopardize other sources of funding.

Key Elements:

- a) ~~Boiler-plate~~ Standard form contracts for facilities, contractors, haulers, that establish such things as schedule of work, contract price and payment methods, and obligations.
- b) Tracking system for disaster debris management expenses, including collection, hauling, and processing and/or disposal costs incurred.
- c) Tracking system for disaster debris tons processed and/or disposed, by facility, on a regional basis.
- d) Estimate potential Metro and local government financial responsibilities, e.g., employee pay, debris clean-up activities.
- e) Contingencies for financial arrangements and tipping fees at Metro transfer stations.

Roles and Responsibilities:

Federal Government:

Review and comment on Disaster Debris Management Plan.

State Government:

Review and comment on Disaster Debris Management Plan. (OEM only)

Metro:

Ensure that proper steps are taken and conditions in place to meet FEMA requirements for reimbursement.

Prepare ~~boiler-plate~~ standard form contracts.

Develop and Maintain a tracking system for disposal and processing tonnages associated with disaster debris.

Provide technical assistance and information to local governments, as requested, to ensure proper, efficient, and accurate tracking of expenses. For example, hauler franchise information, maps, technical information on disaster debris management, etc. _

Estimate potential financial responsibilities.

Develop contingencies for financial arrangements and tipping fees at Metro transfer stations.

Local Government:

- Ensure proper steps taken to meet FEMA reimbursement requirements.
- Maintain a tracking system for disaster debris management expenses.
- Provide information to Metro, as requested, to ensure proper, efficient, and accurate tracking of expenses.
- Estimate potential financial responsibilities.

Waste Haulers:

- Assist with the monitoring and evaluation elements by documenting disposal amounts and operating costs associated with disaster debris in such a way as to meet FEMA requirements.

Private Sector:

- Assist with the monitoring and evaluation elements by documenting disposal amounts and operating costs associated with disaster debris in such a way as to meet FEMA requirements.

Recommended Practice 5 - Coordination of Efforts:

Develop intergovernmental, mutual aid, and other agreements, as necessary, to ensure the proper coordination and commitment of public agencies and the private sector.

Key Concept and Approach: Properly coordinated disaster debris management efforts will be critical to ensure that those efforts are orderly, efficient, and effective.

Key Elements:

- a) Establish a Regional ~~Master~~ Mutual Aid Agreement for disaster debris management, which reflects attempts to deal with intense disaster situations.
- b) Review of current and future agreements with Metro and private sector (e.g., transfer stations, landfills, processors) to ensure they address the handling of waste following a disaster.
- c) Prepare mutual aid agreements between local governments.

Roles and Responsibilities:

Federal Government:

Assist Metro and the region in the implementation of the Disaster Debris Management Plan.

State Government:

Assist Metro and the region in the implementation of the Disaster Debris Management Plan.

Regional Emergency Management Group:

Administer the Regional ~~Master~~ Mutual Aid Agreement.

Metro:

Develop the Regional ~~Master~~ Mutual Aid Agreement.

Modify current agreements between Metro and private sector, as applicable, to ensure they address the handling of disaster debris.

Ensure future agreements between Metro and the private sector address the handling of disaster debris, as applicable.

Local Governments:

Assist in the development of the Regional ~~Master~~ Mutual Aid Agreement.
Prepare intergovernmental mutual aid agreements.

Waste Haulers:

Assist in the development of the Regional ~~Master~~ Mutual Aid Agreement.

Private Sector:

Assist in the development of the Regional ~~Master~~ Mutual Aid Agreement.
Assist with the modification of government-private sector agreements, as applicable.

S:\SHARE\HOSS\DISASTER\PRACREV~~7~~.DOC