



METRO

## A G E N D A

MEETING: REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday, April 21, 1999

TIME: 8:30 a.m.—10:15 a.m.

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

- I. **Call to Order and Announcements** **Ed Washington**
- 5 min. \*II. **Approval of March Minutes** **Ed Washington**
- 15 min. III. **REM Director's Update** **Terry Petersen**  
*Updates from the new interim REM Director, including a discussion of Metro's process for managing the 10% of waste that remains outside the renegotiated disposal contract with Waste Management.*
- 25 min. IV. **Disposal Savings and Solid Waste Rates** **Washington/ Petersen**  
*A discussion of savings that Metro will realize from the renegotiated disposal contract with Waste Management, and options for the use of those savings.*
- 25 min. \*V. **SWAC Membership & Organization** **Doug Anderson**  
*Staff's recommendation on adjusting the committee's membership to reflect changes in the solid waste and recycling field, and a phasing plan for the new membership. Action requested: adopt changes in SWAC Bylaws and approve phasing plan.*
- 10 min. VI. **Transfer Station Service Plan: Schedule** **Bill Metzler**  
*This topic was introduced at the February meeting and discussed further at the March meeting. Based on feedback from SWAC and other stakeholders, staff has refined the work plan and schedule for this project. Staff will present the schedule, and identify the opportunities for SWAC and other stakeholders' involvement.*
- 20 min. \*VII. **Waste Reduction Program for Local Governments** **Jennifer Erickson**  
*A presentation of the framework for waste reduction work between Metro and local governments for next fiscal year. Action requested: recommend Council approve Resolution No. 99-2773 adopting the Year 10 Waste Reduction Work Program.*
- 5 min. VIII. **Other Business and Adjourn** **Ed Washington**

\* *Materials for these items are included with this agenda.*

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

Chair: Councilor Ed Washington (797-1546); Staff: Doug Anderson (797-1788); Committee Clerk: Connie Kinney (797-1643)

S:\SHARE\Dept\SWAC\Agenda\0421swac.aga

## REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

March 17, 1999

### ATTENDEES

#### Voting Members

Ed Washington, Chair, Metro Councilor  
Jeanne Roy, Citizen, City of Portland  
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources  
Garry L. Penning, Waste Management  
Mike Leichner, Washington County haulers (alternate), Pride Disposal  
Dean Kampfer, Multnomah County haulers (alternate), Waste Management  
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County  
Tom Wyatt, Browning Ferris Industries  
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling  
David White, Tri-C/ORRA  
Lee Barrett, City of Portland, (alternate)  
Mike Misovetz, Citizen, Clackamas County  
Lynne Storz, Washington County  
Jeff Murray, Recycling Industry (alternate), Far West Fibers  
Steve Schwab, CCRRA (haulers association), Sunset Garbage

#### Non-Voting Members

Bruce Warner, REM Director  
Rob Guttridge, Clark County (alternate)  
Marti Roberts-Pillon, DEQ (alternate)  
Doug DeVries, Specialty Transportation Service

### GUESTS

Dave Kanner, Washington County  
Todd Irvine, WRI  
Jerry Rust  
Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.  
Easton Cross  
Kent Inman, American Compost

Greg Nokes, The Oregonian  
Arnold Cogan, Cogan Owens Cogan  
Dean Lange, Finley Buttes Landfill  
Sara Jo Chaplen, City of Hillsboro  
Scott Bradley, Waste Management

(Other guests not identified on Sign-In Sheet)

### METRO

Doug Anderson  
Aaron Brondyke  
Marv Fjordbeck  
Connie L. Kinney, Clerk to the Committee

Steve Kraten  
Leo Kenyon  
John Houser

Bill Metzler  
Tom Imdieke  
Meg Lynch

## INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Washington opened the meeting and welcomed the committee members and guests.

Mr. Garry Penning, representing the facilities industry announced he and his family would soon depart the region to residing in the Grants Pass area. He announced that Scott Bradley with Waste Management would assume his duties at Waste Management and at the SWAC meeting.

Chair Washington asked for approval of the February SWAC minutes.

Mr. Ralph Gilbert motioned for approval of the February minutes and Mr. Doug Devries seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved.

Chair Washington specially welcomed Mr. Greg Nokes, reporter for the Oregonian, as a guest of the meeting.

## DIRECTORS UPDATES

Mr. Warner said that negotiations on the disposal contract between Waste Management and Metro will be discussed shortly. He said the City of Portland has embarked on a new frontier, sponsoring the first of a scheduled eight bulky waste collection events three weeks ago. He said that Metro had agreed to cover the cost of disposal for the first two events and then to further evaluate the program. He said the neighbors were very appreciative of this event, however, there were a few complications.

Mr. Barrett, SWAC member and City of Portland staff person in charge of the new program said that due to the overwhelming response from the first of the bulky day collection events that the City has delayed the second event until they can more clearly define the parameters of the program. Mr. Barrett said that in the two previous pilot programs the City did not accept construction debris and during this last event they did. This proved to be a big problem for the haulers to collect and the lumber does not fit into the compactors. He said there was also complaints with regard to materials blowing around due to a delay in pickup. Mr. Barrett said that so-called bulky waste should not have been blowing around. In the future, the City would delineate what materials would be accepted and perhaps a limit on the number of items an individual could set out. Mr. Barrett said the City would be meeting with neighborhood organizations and haulers to iron out some of the difficulties.

Mr. Warner announced that Metro's spring compost and natural gardening events are now underway and you can get more information through Metro's RIC at 234-2000 or by visiting Metro's web site. Mr. Warner said the winners of this year's student billboard contest are being displayed in Metro's lobby. Also displayed are the honorable mention awards and other student submissions to the contest. He thanked A.K. Media for their continued generous support and partnering. He also reminded the committee about the upcoming Earth Day where Metro partners with SOLV and anticipates cleaning up a site in Clackamas County.

Ms. Lynne Storz introduced the new SWAC representative from the City of Hillsboro, Ms. Sara Jo Chaplen.

## WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Warner distributed a copy of the news release announcing that Metro and Waste Management have come to agreement on changes under which Metro would continue shipping its waste to Arlington. He thanked Waste Management for coming to the table and becoming a true partner in putting this agreement together. He stated he believes we have an agreement that will benefit the region and its ratepayers for a number of years. Mr. Warner said this agreement would appear as Change Order #8 before the Metro Council in the month of April. He said that the contract negotiations resulted in a change order that would significantly change the rate per ton the region pays to dispose of solid waste. Mr. Warner said we still will have the sliding scale rate structure and the more tonnage disposed of at Arlington, the less per ton we will pay. Mr. Warner said the Council was concerned that we needed a market check of the rates and this change order allows for one every five years and will allow the rates to be adjusted to the market. He said the main savings effect of this contract would not occur until the year 2000. Mr. Warner said the new agreement includes a modification of the waste delivery guarantees that boils down to removing the limitation on Forest Grove but it still guarantees 90% of the region's putrescible waste. Finally he said the agreement establishes criteria for Waste Management to negotiate an agreement with our current transportation contractor to take over the transportation of the region's waste to Arlington. Mr. Warner said this agreement does not allow Metro to terminate, for convenience, the transportation contract it has with STS, with which it still has a 10-year contract. However, Metro is negotiating options that might lower transportation costs, but that is not part of the packaged agreement with Waste Management.

Mr. Warner said the change order has been prepared, and has been filed with the Council office. The Presiding Officer has requested the Chairman of REM to put this discussion on the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting to provide information to the Council and the Committee. Depending on the outcome of that meeting, it could be to the full Council for their consideration the following week, April 15<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Warner said that because of the January 2000 implementation date of the new change order, there is concern on what the new reductions will mean to the tipping fees and excise tax. He said staff and Council will be working on those issues and it is anticipated information will be made available to the Rate Review Committee by August or early September. Mr. Warner said that anyone interested in receiving an actual copy of the Change Order #8 language, Resolution and Staff Report, is welcome to call himself or Mr. John Houser of the Council Office, 797-1541.

Chair Washington introduced Councilor Rod Parks (also a member of the REM Committee) who is joining us this morning. Councilor Parks is from the East County (Gresham) area.

Chair Washington welcomed anyone interested in giving testimony (either written or oral) with respect to the Waste Management Change Order to attend the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. Chair Washington reminded Mr. Warner that the Council would be on vacation into the middle of September so that any staff reports with regard to rates and excise taxes would need to be available at the beginning of August or after the middle of September.

## SWAC MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

Mr. Warner noted that SWAC is one of the most important committees at Metro, advising the Council on solid waste issues and as everyone can note from the materials in the Agenda packet, there are several committee members that have been on the committee for a very long time. He



said that the SWAC bylaws clearly state that the membership and representation should be periodically reviewed. He said that with the changes taking place in the industry, staff has heard some comments that membership may not be fully representative of solid waste interests in a manner necessary to fulfill the overall mission of SWAC. He said that Mr. Doug Anderson would present some of those issues.

Mr. Anderson distributed a one-page sheet on SWAC objectives. He said we are looking at how best to reflect Metro's constituency. He presented options including: (a) representation from the composting industry, and business ratepayer representation, (b) redefining some existing positions, and (c) keep the committee the same size or reduce it. He said another option is to keep the membership structure as it is and adding some of these other positions.

Chair Washington asked the Committee how they felt about some of these options.

Mr. White commented that combining haulers with facility operators was not a good idea because their interests are not all the same

Ms. Storz said she was concerned about eliminating city representation in favor of only inviting the County to the table for the same reasons that Mr. White commented on.

Ms. Jeanne Roy commented the committee was too heavily hauler and local government dominated and she would like to see more citizen and business representatives. She also commented that she felt the committee was large enough and would prefer it not become any larger. Ms. Roy felt there should be at least one small businessperson representative.

Chair Washington invited the committee's input on these issues during the coming month.

#### TRANSFER STATION SERVICE PLAN

Mr. Metzler said that at the last SWAC meeting, the Plan was introduced to the committee. He said there have been several work sessions but are still in the beginning stages of the project. Mr. Metzler said there are many questions dealing with what types of services should be provided to the region. He said that staff is prepared to take these issues to the stakeholders and decision-makers throughout the region, to assess the criteria, develop alternatives, summarize the impacts from each alternative, and then develop conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. Metzler said today he would like to explore some of the questions the committee brought up during last years code revision process, to flesh them out a little, and to see if they are still valid or if the committee wishes to add to them. Some of the discussion items are:

- Ability of haulers to compete with larger companies with\without a transfer station facility.
- Travel time/Access: cost to ratepayers
- Need for non-vertically integrated haulers to have options
- Policy toward serving the public customer? Or how can we best serve the public customer?
- Effects or impacts of Metro's declining disposal rates on a facility's ability to continue operations?

Mr. Metzler said that Mr. Anderson would facilitate the discussion, while he put some of the ideas down on the flip-chart.

Chair Washington asked Mr. Metzler that if the results indicate there are additional needs in the region, what is the timeline for the complete need assessment? Mr. Metzler said staff is hoping to have the assessment completed by the end of this fiscal year (June 30, 1999). Mr. Metzler said this is dependent upon the role of various stakeholders, policy makers and decision-makers. He said if it is felt the issues need more study, staff is prepared to do this.

Mr. Gilbert said he would like to have an analysis of what effect more services would have on recycling.

Mr. Anderson said many haulers expressed they would find it more cost-effective to compete if they had access to, or more particularly, owned, a facility. He asked if that was still valid, or had it changed?

Mr. Irvine commented this came up when we discussed reload facilities (because they would be restricted to whoever owned that facility). He said it was widely felt that others should be able to share in the savings, however he said that the Metro imposed 50,000 ton limit on the amount of tonnage handled through these facilities, has literally made that impossible. He said it has been necessary to limit the use of the facilities to their own vehicles because they easily handle the 50,000 ton limit.

Mr. White said this raises a bigger question: What is meant by need? Is it regional or local? He said it is the whole issue that the code says you have to show a regional need before you can even get a facility without a regional impact, you can't have it even though it may be a cost benefit to outlying cities and haulers.

Mr. Washington asked for a further definition and discussion of the 50,000 ton cap.

Mr. Anderson said that last year there were a number of folk who felt there was a need for better accessibility to transfer services. He said that Metro was not prepared to have regional transfer stations appear anywhere in the region. Mr. Anderson said that Metro needed to assess what this would mean to public customers, the services that Metro currently gives to its customers in the region, and to what extent new transfer stations should be required to contribute to services that the region might need. He said that Metro serves more than just commercial customers for instance, household hazardous waste and public self-haul. He said that these are often time loss-leaders, and if you don't have a profit center in your business, it would be difficult for some of these centers to provide these extra services. He said that Metro compromised and allowed some local transfer stations and allowed them to proceed and imposing a 50,000 ton cap. He said it was thought that at a certain scale of operation, the philosophical concept was the company needed to provide the region with some of the less profitable services to the citizens. Mr. Anderson said he felt the question was not whether the limit was 50,000 ton, (the limit on the amount of waste that can be landfilled – out the backdoor of the facility) but what is the policy towards serving the public customer on some of these less profitable services.

Mr. Kampfer said he remembered when that 50,000 number was thrown out, we (SWAC) questioned how that number was set. He said that since Metro's two transfer stations handle 250,000 tons, a more likely number would be 100,000, or 1/3 of the regional transfer stations.

Mr. Anderson replied that Mr. Kampfer must therefore presume there is a need and how would he define that need?

Mr. Penning replied that for instance, the east county haulers would very much like to use the Waste Management facility in Troutdale because of its close location. They have already easily reached the 50,000 ton cap they must limit the use to their own haulers, thereby denying a cost-savings to local haulers in the east county area.

Mr. Schwab commented that the public should also have access to these closer facilities. He asked at what point do the facility owner's step up to the plate and provide some regional services. Mr. Schwab said perhaps the costs could be spread out in the user fee.

Dave Kanner commented that it sounds like the broader question is what is the appropriate funding mechanism to deal with the needs of citizens of the region. He said at this point Metro is stuck with all of the unprofitable services.

Mr. Barrett commented that he would like to see some sort of sliding scale. He said that if you move from 50,000/tons and go to 100,000/tons you need to provide a,b,c and if you go further, you need to provide more. He said the theory is that the more tonnage you accept, the greater ability for you to provide additional services.

Mr. Anderson stated that staff have discussed abbreviated services such as accepting hazardous waste once or twice a month, or to tailor the services to the needs of the local area.

Mr. Warner commented there were other ways to provide services other than to provide them at a transfer station, and it was his hope that if it is decided the services are needed and desired, they are provided somehow and that we have a plan to provide those services:

Chair Washington said that in listening to the conversation so far he can fairly make the assumption that this is a rather "hot" and important issue. He asked the committee the issue was important enough that they wanted to solve it, and how soon?

Mr. Warner reminded the committee that the issues were very quickly discussed at the last meeting. He said the team will very methodically work through the issues as was suggested by Mr. Gilbert. He said the team wanted to make sure they were exploring all of the important issues before they proceeded.

Mr. Gilbert stated that we need to go through this process before we make the decision.

Ms. Roy said that as she listened to the discussion it would seem to her that there is a possibility that outlying transfer stations might take away some of the business from the Metro transfer stations and she wonders what will happen to source-separated recycling.

Mr. Anderson said that generally we are at the stage of trying to determine and verify there is an issue that needs solving. He added that at this stage we don't know if it is necessary for outlying transfer stations to provide everything that Metro does or that they only provide stylized services. Mr. Anderson said that he is hearing that part of the reason for these facilities are cost-reduction that could be passed on to the ratepayers. Mr. Anderson said that currently Metro code allows us to grant a transfer station only if the local benefit were greater than any offsetting regional benefit. That is, if the costs at Metro's regional transfer stations were to increase dramatically, at what point would the local benefit give way to regional benefit. This is a question staff will have to grapple with.

Chair Washington asked Mr. Schwab if Mr. Anderson was speaking to the same point he was making about serving the public.

Mr. Schwab said if there is a facility available that is closer to the public, at what level do you allow them access. Mr. Schwab said another point is that even though a cost savings does not reflect an out-of-pocket to the customer that does not mean they are not the recipients of that saving. If it costs less for a hauler to take a load to a closer transfer station, that might allow a hauler to keep his costs at the same level for a longer period of time. He said all cost savings are not reflected through a lower fee.

Mr. Penning said that another point is that collection technology is evolving. He said facilities need the ability to do pilot projects, and take other initiatives. This all takes dollars and facilities need the ability to take its cost savings whenever possible so they can continue this new technology five and ten years down the line.

Mr. Metzler showed a map that illustrated how many miles (and minutes) various haulers were away from the regional transfer stations. He said the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan described a 20-minute travel as being the optimum distance from a facility. He said there were obviously some gaps throughout the region.

Mr. Anderson said the third issue is the need for non-vertically integrated haulers to have additional options at these facilities. He said that currently Metro Code allows an operator to choose who he is open to. He said the question last year was whether there should be access for all haulers. He said the issue is should the transfer station operators be required to be open to all commercial haulers, so that small haulers not be left to the mercy of integrated operators.

Mr. Schwab reminded the committee that even if the 50,000 ton cap were lifted, local land use laws might also limit any more tonnage. He said that as an example, Miller's was unable to raise the tonnage limit.

Chair Washington said he would further discuss with staff some of the issues discussed today to determine where we go from here and whether to expand this discussion. He said he would have further answers to some of the proposed questions at the next SWAC.

## STATE OF THE PLAN REPORT

Mr. Apotheker discussed the latest draft report on the State of the Plan. He said a copy of the new draft will be available at the end of the meeting. Mr. Apotheker said that at the meeting the committee was given a broad overview and today we want your comments and advice on the plans findings. He said we want to use your comments to help structure some prioritized workplans to move towards fulfilling the regions goals. Mr. Apotheker encouraged the committee to submit comments to him, and he can be reached at 797-1698 or Meg Lynch at 797-1671.

Mr. Apotheker continued with a discussion of the State of the Plan, a look at where the region is with regard to the State mandated recycling goals, and an overall structure and analysis of the report to see if we are perhaps missing something in terms of how we have arrived at these conclusions. He said staff has provided three areas of focus the region's efforts need to go into; and lastly, we have some specific recommendations that are in the report for which we would like your comments.

Mr. Apotheker said that even though between 1995-97 the region made no progress on our regional goals on recycling staff does not believe we should change the goals. He said this is based in part on the waste-sort data information DEQ has provided which showed substantial amounts of recyclable materials in all of the wastestreams – from 25% in the residential, single family wastestream, up to 50% in the wastestreams that are self-haul and going to MRFs for example. He said the commercial wastestream is very rich as well, 30% to 35%. He said we can add another 20% to 25% of the wastestream that is available in organics as that program gets going. He said that while the 1995-97 years made no change, in 1997 we started to resume our upward track; recycling increased two points and overall recovery increased one point. He said that 1998 data suggests that we are continuing on that upward track, leading to the conclusion there is no reason to abandon the region's goal.

Mr. Schwab asked if staff was getting all of the reporting data: Greenstones, and others like that? Mr. Apotheker said they are getting all of the information that is being reported to DEQ on recycling and recovery, but they know there are some areas where they could improve those numbers and staff will be doing that, but they haven't seen any big holes. Mr. Schwab said it was going to cost more money to get that extra tonnage of recycling.

Mr. Apotheker said there is enough evidence to suggest that while economics might be a barrier, there is a lot of improvement the region can make in terms of education and focusing our resources, etc. He asked the committee if there was any areas they would like to see staff focus on such as Ms. Roy's suggestion that she would like an analysis on the effect of lowering the tip fee has on recycling.

Mr. Barrett asked if bakery waste being turned into animal feed was counted as recycling?

Mr. Apotheker said that interestingly enough there is some amount of food waste going into recycling and reuse that isn't being tracked by DEQ and that our region is probably the leader in that area. He said it is not huge but it is a growing area and we will be looking at it to see how much of this material can be included in our recovery rate. He said it will have to be determined



whether this material was going into the wastestream or whether it was more of an industrial waste that has always been recovered in some manner.

Mr. Apotheker said we believe our focus of recovery should be on commercial, C&D and organics. He asked the committee if they agreed with that analysis.

Ms. Roy said she totally agreed with that analysis but wondered if that included yard debris. She said she believes there is still a potential for more recovery in that area.

Mr. Apotheker said there was some focus on recovering the self-haul yard debris through changes at our facilities, for instance. Mr. Apotheker asked the committee if they had any additional ideas on how they should focus their attentions. It was noted that Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Schwab, Mr. Murray and Councilor Munroe did not previously receive a copy of the draft plan and therefore would withhold comment until they had an opportunity to review the materials.

Ms. Roy said a significant effort was made a couple of years ago and specific tonnage projections were made based on specific programs to achieve that tonnage. She would like to see a concentrated effort to make tonnage estimates and program recommendations on how to achieve those tonnages come out of this effort.

Mr. Barrett thanked Mr. Apotheker for acknowledging that the region is not on track. He stated that Metro is not going to meet the regional goal, and the state will not reach its goal and that he doubted that the City of Portland will reach its goal by the year 2000.

Mr. Apotheker said that to reach 2%-3% points per year for each of the next three years will be difficult, but if you look at the accomplishments the region has made in the past, it has made those types of improvements. He said he is tempered on his optimism that the region will be able to make those figures, but perhaps as we go through our analysis and get ready for the 1999 report, we may make the suggestions to say that these goals may be achievable, but we may miss them by one year due to that bad year in 1996.

Mr. Cross commented that no one addressed the issue of what drives recycling--money. He said it doesn't do any good to collect mixed-wastepaper if you have to pay to dispose of it. He asked what can you do to subsidize recovery? Mr. Cross said there has to be a market for the collected recycled materials.

Mr. Warner recapped by saying that the group agrees that based on the report and data presented at the last meeting, that staff's conclusions are for the most part on-point. He said he is also hearing that even though we know the specific areas that we need to focus our efforts on, we probably need to get some smart people together from this room to analyze the best ways to focus our efforts on those areas in order to reach our goal.

A comment from one of the guests was that an effort to educate the plethora of contractors who currently hold contractor's licenses on how to recycle and the benefits of recycling. He said the majority of new contractors have no idea on how or what to recycle.



Chair Washington asked the committee if they believed there was a need to convene some subcommittee or task force on any of these issues, i.e., the reorganization of the committee, and any other issues.

Mr. White suggested that the regular committee meet more often.

Chair Washington determined that the committee preferred that staff make some specific recommendations on the issues discussed at this meeting and bring them back next time to the full committee and they would then decide if further action from the full committee.

Mr. Warner commented that staff has a very aggressive schedule. He said he believes he hears the committee needs other venues for this group to see our work product and reaction and that we will revisit our process.

Councilor Monroe commented that he is assuming that the 50,000 ton cap is based with the idea that smaller haulers can use those facilities, and now that is not taking place. He said that he would ask Metro staff to look for a component for those small haulers that would allow them to use those facilities, wherever the cap be in the future, that a component be there so that the questions that were asked on these topics are not locking out those small haulers from the closer facilities.

Chair Washington thanked the committee for their help in the various topics that were discussed. He said the topics are important enough that staff is asked to help in the in fleshing out the issues and he thanked the committee and staff for their participation and input.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted

Connie L. Kinney  
Clerk to the Committee

Staff Report  
**SWAC Membership and Organizational Representation**  
 April 21, 1999

At the March 17 meeting of SWAC, Metro announced its desire to balance representation on SWAC to better reflect Metro's solid waste constituency. Staff proposed two draft options to achieve this objective, and asked SWAC for comment. Staff also indicated that on April 21, it would ask SWAC to approve: (a) one of the draft options, (b) a modification of one of the options, or (c) an alternative developed by SWAC that addresses the issue of representation.

Comments on the March 17 options are listed on the next page. Staff has incorporated most of these comments into the Recommended Option below. The alternative option in the table reflects other comments received.

The SWAC Bylaws have also been revised, and are attached as an appendix to this report.

Comments that have not been incorporated in either the Recommended Option or the revised Bylaws are listed on Page 3 of this staff report.

**Action Requested: Approval of the Recommended Option and revised Bylaws.**

Recommended Option for Changing Representation on SWAC  
 (Voting Members)

<u>Current Organization</u>	<u>Recommended Option</u>	<u>Alternative Reflecting Other Comments</u>
Chair (Metro) .....1	<b>Chair (Metro) .....1</b>	Chair (Metro)..... 1
Recycling Industry .....1 <i>undesignated (1)</i>	<b>Recycling Interests ....3</b> <i>Facilities (1)</i> <i>Composters (1)</i> <i>Recycler/advocate (1)</i>	Recycling Facilities ....2 <i>Recyclers (1)</i> <i>Composters (1)</i>
Hauling Industry .....4 <i>County Areas (3)</i> <i>undesignated (1)</i>	<b>Hauling Industry .....4</b> <i>County Areas (3)</i> <i>At-Large (1)</i>	Hauling Industry .....4 <i>Non-geographic? (3)</i> <i>At-Large (1)</i>
Solid Waste Facilities..4 <i>undesignated (4)</i>	<b>Disposal Sites .....3</b> <i>undesignated (3)</i>	Disposal Sites.....4 <i>Facilities (2)</i> <i>Landfills (2)</i>
Citizens.....4 <i>County Areas (3)</i> <i>City of Portland (1)</i>	<b>Citizen-Ratepayers....6</b> <i>Citizens (3)</i> <i>Businesses (3)</i>	Citizen-Ratepayers.....6 <i>Citizens (3)</i> <i>Businesses (3)</i>
Governments .....7 <i>Cities (4)</i> <i>Counties (3)</i>	<b>Governments .....6</b> <i>Cities (4)</i> <i>Counties (2)</i>	Governments..... 6 <i>Cities (4)</i> <i>Counties (2)</i>
<b>TOTAL</b> 21	<b>TOTAL</b> 23	<b>TOTAL</b> 23

## Comments Received

1. Agrees with Metro's desire for a more balanced committee, and in particular, to put business representatives on the committee. Suggests that one of the business seats go to a "small" business. Also agrees that committee is large, but doesn't strongly oppose a large committee. Option 1 [from March 17—see the table that is reprinted on page 4 for reference] seems to meet objectives best.
2. The solid waste hauling industry is currently represented geographically (one from each of the counties, plus a region-at-large representative). The haulers need to tell you if this still works for them. Maybe "large" and "small" haulers, or franchised and non-franchised, or vertically integrated and non-vertically integrated makes more sense today. This is especially important if the number of hauler representatives goes down, as in Options 1 and 2 [see reprinted table on page 4].
3. Business ratepayer representation is long overdue. [Multiple comments.]
4. (a) One of the business representatives should be from the construction industry. (b) The business representative should be drawn from business types or service needs. Suggest office/retail—"dry" waste businesses, hotel/grocery store/restaurant "organics" generators, and construction & demolition representatives. (c) Can see a case for "large" and "small" business representation and also "franchised" and "non-franchised" representatives. But also, organics generators need to be represented. You can probably catch the "size" and "franchised" aspects if you do a good job with selecting businesses by type.
5. It appears in the staff report that haulers are thrown together with facilities for purposes of "industry" representation. This is not appropriate, because their interests are not all the same.
6. No matter what you do with the hauling industry representation, at least one should represent the region at large.
7. The Columbia Ridge landfill should have its own representative.
8. Recycling interests are still under-represented, particularly in Option 2 [see reprinted table on page 4], where disposal interests have 6 representatives.
9. The Bylaws should not allow a single company to have more than one seat at the table. [Multiple comments.]
10. You need to clarify if the position on SWAC goes with the person, the company or the group being represented. We've had people retire or quit in the past and just name their replacement. That isn't right, and doesn't seem consistent with the Bylaws.
11. In Option 1 [see reprinted table on page 4], there is concern about having one person represent the interests of all jurisdictions within each county, while Portland is able to represent itself. Prefer Option 2 regarding the government representation.
12. The Clark County representative should be converted into a voting member. Clark County is becoming more a part of the region in solid waste, just as it is in transportation, air quality, etc. Also, there should be more recycling representatives, whether these are processors, actual recyclers or recycling advocates.

## Comments not Incorporated

The Staff seeks SWAC comment on the following comments, which have not been incorporated into the Recommended Option or revised Bylaws:

1. The size of the committee has increased, rather than maintained at 21 or reduced. However, none of the respondents indicated that the size of the committee is a critical factor.
2. The Clark County representative remains a non-voting member.
3. Should representation for Disposal Sites be more specific, such as representatives for "facilities" and representatives for "landfills," or some other classification?
4. Representation for the Solid Waste Hauling Industry is based on geography (as now). Other suggestions have included representation for (a) "large" and "small" haulers; (b) vertically integrated and non-vertically integrated companies; (c) franchised and non-franchised collectors.
5. Should representation for Business-Ratepayers be more specific, such as for dry waste generators, organics generators, and construction & demolition generators?

## Phasing Plan

On March 17, staff also indicated that it would ask SWAC to approve a plan for phasing-in the changes to the committee by reclassifying new vacancies as they occur, and appointing a new member from the appropriate group. However, if SWAC approves the Recommended Option, such phasing will not be necessary, as the option is based primarily on adding new members to achieve balance.

## Next Steps

If SWAC approves the Recommended Option and revised Bylaws on April 21, Metro staff will return to the May 1999 meeting of SWAC with a review of the membership, and a schedule for soliciting new members.

Options for Changing Representation on SWAC

**Reprinted from the March 17 Staff Report to SWAC for Reference**

(Voting Members)

<u>Current Organization</u>	<u>Reorganization Option 1</u>	<u>Reorganization Option 2</u>
Chair (Metro) .....1	Chair (Metro) .....1	Chair (Metro)..... 1
Industry .....9	Industry .....6	Industry ..... 8
<i>Recycling (1)</i>	<i>Recycling (2)</i>	<i>Recycling (2)</i>
<i>Hauling (4)</i>	<i>Hauling (2)</i>	<i>Hauling (3)</i>
<i>Disposal (4)</i>	<i>Disposal (2)</i>	<i>Disposal (3)</i>
Citizens.....4	Citizen-Ratepayers.....6	Citizen-Ratepayers.....6
	<i>Citizens (3)</i>	<i>Citizens (3)</i>
	<i>Businesses (3)</i>	<i>Businesses (3)</i>
Governments .....7	Governments .....4	Governments .....6
<i>Cities (4)</i>	<i>City of Portland (1)</i>	<i>Cities (4)</i>
<i>Counties (3)</i>	<i>County areas (3)</i>	<i>Counties (2)</i>
TOTAL                     21	17	21

Appendix A  
METRO  
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
BYLAWS  
(Draft Revision April 21, 1999)

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

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

MEMBERSHIP

Regular Voting Members

Chair (Metro) .....	1
Recycling Interests .....	3
<i>Facilities (1)</i>	
<i>Composters (1)</i>	
<i>Recycler/advocate (1)</i>	
Hauling Industry .....	4
<i>County Areas (3)</i>	
<i>At-Large (1)</i>	
Disposal Sites .....	3
<i>undesignated (3)</i>	
Citizen-Ratepayers .....	6
<i>Citizens (3)</i>	
<i>Businesses (3)</i>	
Governments .....	6
<i>Cities (4)</i>	
<i>Counties (2)</i>	
TOTAL	23



### Non-Voting Members

Metro Regional Environmental Management Director (1)  
Department of Environmental Quality (1)  
Clark County (1)

### Associate Members

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

### APPOINTMENT OF REGULAR MEMBERS

1. Candidates for the representative of recycling facilities shall be solicited from the processing industry and appointed by the Metro Executive Officer. Candidates for the representative of composting facilities shall be solicited from the composting industry and appointed by the Metro Executive Officer. Metro shall solicit candidates for the remaining recycling representative from recycling industries, environmental advocates and other business and civic groups. Candidates for the remaining recycling representative may also submit their names directly to the Metro Executive Officer. The remaining recycling representative shall be appointed by the Metro Executive Officer
2. Solid Waste Hauling Industry candidates shall be solicited from the hauling industry and appointed by the Metro Executive Officer. Solid Waste hauling industry representatives shall include one from each of the three Counties, plus one representing the region at large.
3. Disposal Site candidates shall be solicited from the disposal industry and appointed by the Metro Executive Officer.
4. A pool of candidates for the citizen representatives shall be nominated by the participating jurisdictions, SWAC members, and by civic and business groups. Candidates may also submit their names directly to the Metro Executive Officer. The Metro Executive Officer shall appoint one citizen member from each of the three Counties, as available.
5. A pool of candidates for the business representatives shall be nominated by business groups, the participating jurisdictions, and SWAC members. Candidates may also submit their names directly to the Metro Executive Officer. The Metro Executive Officer shall appoint three business members, as available.
6. The representative from the City of Portland shall be appointed by the Mayor of Portland.
7. Representatives of Cities within a County shall be appointed by consensus of those Cities.
8. Representatives from the Counties shall be appointed by the Chairperson of the County Board.

### APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Alternate members shall be specifically named for recycling, the solid waste hauling industry, disposal site, and government positions and shall be appointed in the same manner as regular members. Alternates can vote in the absence of the regular Committee member and have full rights and responsibilities of the Committee member in his/her absence. Upon resignation of an Advisory Committee member, a new member shall be appointed in accordance with the APPOINTMENT OF REGULAR MEMBERS section of the Bylaws.

#### APPOINTMENT OF NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Non-voting members may be named by the non-voting agency represented.

#### MEMBERSHIP

**Terms of Office** - The Executive Officer may review the status of the Committee Membership every four (4) years and appoint new members as needed.

**Attendance** - It is expected that members will be present and participate at all regular meetings. Members who are absent from four or more regular meetings in one calendar year may be asked by the Executive Officer or Committee Chair to resign. Industry, facility and government representatives who send alternates to attend in their absence will be counted as present.

**Restriction on Representation by One Company** - No more than one regular voting member of the Committee may be employed by the same company.

#### OFFICERS

**Chair** - The permanent Chairperson of the Committee shall be a Metro Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.

**Vice-Chair** - In the absence of the Chairperson, the Committee shall be chaired by the Vice-Chairperson which shall be a Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.

#### SUBCOMMITTEES

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

Appendix B  
METRO  
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE BYLAWS  
(As Amended by the Committee on Nov. 20, 1996)

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

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

MEMBERSHIP

*Voting Members (21 total):*

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

*Non-Voting Associate Members (6 total):*

Metro Regional Environmental Management  
Director (1)  
Department of Environmental Quality (1)  
Port of Portland (1)  
Clark County (1)  
Marion County (1)  
Yamhill County (1)

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

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

1. Representatives from the Counties shall be appointed by the Chairperson of the County Board.
2. The representative from the City of Portland shall be appointed by the Mayor of Portland.
3. Representatives of Cities within a County shall be appointed by consensus of those Cities.
4. A pool of candidates for the citizen representatives shall be nominated by the participating jurisdictions, SWAC members, and by civic and business groups. Candidates may also submit their names directly to the Metro Executive Officer. The Metro Executive Officer shall appoint one citizen member from Clackamas County, East Multnomah County, Washington County, and the City of Portland as available.
5. Industry candidates shall be solicited from the industry and appointed by the Metro Executive Officer. Solid Waste hauling industry representatives shall include one from each of the three Counties.
6. Terms of Office - The Executive Officer may review the status of the Committee Membership every four (4) years and appoint new members as needed.
7. Appointment of Alternate members - Alternate members shall be specifically named for industry, facility and government positions and shall be appointed in the same manner as Committee members. Alternates can vote in the absence of the regular Committee member and have full rights and responsibilities of the Committee member in his/her absence. Upon resignation of an Advisory Committee member, a new member shall be appointed in accordance with this section of the Bylaws.
8. Attendance - It is expected that members will be present and participate at all regular meetings. Members who are absent from four or more regular meetings in one calendar year may be asked by the Executive Officer or Committee Chair to resign. Industry, facility and government representatives who send alternates to attend in their absence will be counted as present.

## OFFICERS

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

## **SUBCOMMITTEES**

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



**METRO**

**DATE:** April 12, 1999

**TO:** Members of the Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee

**FROM:** Jennifer Erickson, Senior Solid Waste Planner *JRE*  
Bryce Jacobson, Associate Solid Waste Planner *BJ*

**RE:** Year 10 Annual Waste Reduction Program for Local Governments

The following packet contains a draft staff report, draft Resolution No. 99-2773, and a draft of the Year 10 Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan for Metro and Local Governments.

All of these items are scheduled to be discussed in a public forum at the April 21, 1999 Council REM Committee Meeting, and then are scheduled to go before the REM Committee and full Council for formal approval and adoption on May 5, 1999 and May 13, 1999 respectively.

These materials are being presented to SWAC for review and approval. Metro project staff is seeking a recommendation from SWAC that this resolution and work plan be approved by the Council REM Committee and full Council.



## STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 99-2773 FOR THE PURPOSE  
OF APPROVING THE YEAR 10 ANNUAL WASTE REDUCTION WORK  
PLAN FOR METRO AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

Date: April 12, 1999

Presented by: Terry Petersen  
Jennifer Erickson

## PROPOSED ACTION

Adopt Resolution No. 99-2773

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

### **History:**

The Annual Waste Reduction Program was established in 1990 to provide local governments with funding assistance needed to implement recycling and waste reduction activities within their jurisdiction. These activities are integral in helping the region meet the objectives of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) and State Law.

Through this and other programs, Metro and local governments have worked together to provide single and multi-family residential recycling services, yard debris collection, home composting education, waste reduction consultations to businesses, in-school programs for students and teachers, public outreach and education, and many other valuable programs and services.

With \$200,000 in additional funding provided by Metro in 1997-98 and 1998-99 through a new competitive matching grant program, local governments partnered with school districts, chambers of Commerce and others have implemented more aggressive and targeted commercial recycling programs and services.

### **Framework:**

The RSWMP provides the larger long-term framework for the region's solid waste and recycling infrastructure. The Annual Waste Reduction Implementation Plan is one of many important planning and implementation tools for achieving the goals set forth by the Regional Plan.

The 1999-00 Annual Waste Reduction Program Funds will assist local governments defray the cost of both new and existing waste reduction and recycling programs as required by the RSWMP. The annual work plan which lists the tasks to be completed under the program was developed collaboratively with seven local government recycling coordinators representing the twenty-seven jurisdictions in the region, Metro staff, DEQ representatives, SWAC, businesses and citizens. The format allows jurisdictions to develop and implement programs based on local circumstances while meeting the intent of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan goals and objectives. The Plan framework has been through a public comment period and no input was received during the public process.

The annual work plan framework comes directly from the RSWMP recommended practices. In addition to these recommended practices, there are other supporting programs that are not specifically listed in the RSWMP but are important ongoing implementation programs that provide a valuable contribution to the RSWMP goals. As with the RSWMP, the Annual Plan recognizes the need for local flexibility in implementing programs.

**Approval Process:**

This program is divided into two distinct areas; a per-capita revenue-sharing program, and a competitive grant program open to interested parties in partnership with a local government. Each program has a distinct application, review and approval process as described below.

For the revenue-sharing portion, each local government will submit a brief description of how each element will be completed. These 1999-00 work plans will be due to Metro by June 1, 1999. Work plans will be reviewed by a Metro committee consisting of representatives from the Waste Reduction, Planning & Outreach Division and Metro Council staff. Discussions will be held with each local government to review areas of concern, make clarifications and to finalize the elements for that jurisdiction's plan. The review committee is charged with granting administrative approval of the work plan to the jurisdiction. Any jurisdictions proposing alternatives to the framework in the Annual Plan will be subject to an independent review process. The final reports for the previous year's program (1998-99) are due to Metro by August 1, 1999 and will also be reviewed by the committee.

The review committee will meet with local governments at their request throughout the year to review status and assist with amendment of work plans if necessary. At the end of FY 1999-00, local governments will submit a final program report which describes how they have accomplished their planned work items. The same Metro committee will review these reports. If any work plan items were not completed or were found to be deficient, the committee will meet with the local government to determine the cause and appropriate action to allow the problem to be remedied. Penalties may be applied if other options for resolution are exhausted.

For the competitive portion of this program, interested parties (with a local government as lead) will propose programs designed to enhance recycling within the business sector. Proposals that include waste prevention elements will receive a more favorable rating. Proposals will be evaluated by the same committee described above.

The \$784,200 budgeted for the program in 1999-00 will be allocated as follows:

- \$600,000 towards the per-capita revenue-sharing portion of the program
- \$184,200 towards the competitive grant portion

**Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee Recommendation:**

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee reviewed the Year 10 Annual Work Plan and has recommended that it be forwarded to the Metro Council for approval.

**Possibilities for the Future of the Program:**

Metro staff recently completed the State of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Report. This report reviewed the regions recycling and recovery progress in conjunction with RSWMP

goals. The report found the residential sector to be ahead of the curve with regard to meeting goals, but the commercial, construction & demolition and organics programs are lagging behind. The Report recommends that greater levels of effort be placed on these sectors if the region is to meet its goals. Recently Local Government Solid Waste Managers have come together with Metro to discuss the strengthening of our joint efforts and to narrow the focus and commit the necessary resources to programs that will get us to our goals. In light of the State of the Plan Report and the guidance provided by the Solid Waste Managers Group, the Annual Waste Reduction Program for Local Governments will see significant changes beginning in FY 1999-00 and manifesting in FY 2000-01. Local governments and Metro agree that significant efforts in the commercial C&D and organics sectors need to be made, and the Annual Plans are a key implementation tool for doing so.

#### BUDGET IMPACT

A total of \$784,200 has been budgeted for this program.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 99-2773.

\\METRO1\REMSHARE\ERICA\WRP\yr10stf.rpt.rtf

April 7, 1999

**BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL**

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING ) RESOLUTION NO. 99-2773  
THE YEAR 10 ANNUAL WASTE )  
REDUCTION WORK PLAN FOR METRO ) Introduced by:  
AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ) Mike Burton, Executive Officer  
)

WHEREAS, The Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan for Metro and Local Governments has been a significant part of the region’s waste reduction and recycling programs for the past nine years in order to attain state mandated regional recovery goals (OAR 340-90-050); and

WHEREAS, The Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan serves as an implementation tool for the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan continues to be one of the primary mechanisms for Metro and local governments to establish and improve recycling and waste reduction efforts throughout the region; and

WHEREAS, The means of implementing these waste reduction tasks is through the Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan, which is adopted by Metro and local governments and defines the work to be completed by each jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, A cooperative process for formulating and implementing the Year 10 Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan was used by Metro and local governments and ensures a coordinated regional effort to reduce waste; and

WHEREAS, The Year 10 Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan has been through a public comment period and the plan has been amended to reflect input received during this process; and

WHEREAS, The Year 10 Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan is consistent with and meets the intent of the goals and objectives in the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan funding distribution to local governments is a revenue-sharing program that is tied to adherence to the plan and satisfactory completion of work plan elements; and

WHEREAS, The Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan grants are funded in the 1999-00 budget; and

WHEREAS, the Year 10 Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan has been reviewed by the Solid Waste Advisory Committee and recommended for Metro Council approval; and

WHEREAS, The resolution was submitted to the Executive Officer for consideration and was forwarded to the Council for approval; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Metro Council approves the Year 10 Annual Waste Reduction Work Plan for Metro and Local Governments (attached hereto as Exhibit "A") and supports increased efforts to reduce waste in the Metro region.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rod Monroe, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

JE:  
S:\SHARE\ERIC\AWRP\YEAR10.RES  
April 7, 1999

# YEAR 10 ANNUAL WASTE REDUCTION PLAN TASK FRAMEWORK

DRAFT  
April 12, 1999

**Prologue:** The following 1999-2000 Local Government and Metro waste reduction plan framework was developed based on the recommended solid waste practices as listed in the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP).

Tasks implemented by the local jurisdictions are designed to build on the foundation of the RSWMP and contribute to the accomplishment of the regional waste reduction goals. As defined in the plan, local jurisdictions will all contribute to local and regional monitoring, measurement and evaluation of specific programs as well as the measurement and evaluation efforts for the overall solid waste system.

Some of the important intergovernmental coordination efforts that the local governments, Metro and hauler representatives undertake are not specifically addressed in the task list, but are a vital component leading to the successful implementation of the region's waste reduction and recycling programs. Representatives from Metro and local governments meet on a regularly scheduled basis in two work groups to plan programs and coordinate approaches to reduce duplication of effort and to create consistent programs to serve the region's citizens. The two primary work groups are the Local Government Recycling Coordinators and the Commercial Work Group. Both groups have spent considerable time and effort developing and implementing this and past year's programs. Other groups are formed on an ad hoc basis to address particular projects as they arise.

As with the RSWMP, the annual plan provides for a certain degree of local flexibility in the implementation and measurement methods used by local governments to complete tasks. Each local jurisdiction, through completed annual plans, details their own implementation methods that reflect progress toward local and regional goals. Individual jurisdictions' measurement methods will be combined into a regional framework to provide overall measures of the system as a whole.

**Compliance with State Law:** All local jurisdictions will continue to be required to comply with all provisions set forth in State Law (OAR 340-90-040) in addition to the tasks listed in the RSWMP. Metro will continue to be the reporting agency for the region's three county area.

**Annual Work Plan Development and Approval Process:** The public input process and program plan development schedule are incorporated into the Year 10 Annual Plan as Attachment A.

### **Alternative Practices:**

Alternative practices are defined as solid waste management programs or services that are proposed by a local government as an "alternative" to a "recommended practice" in the



Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. An alternative practice must demonstrate the same level of expected performance as the recommended practice. Alternative practices allow for local government flexibility in meeting the RSWMP's objective. The specific application, evaluation and approval criteria for alternative practices has been developed and is included with this document as Attachment B.

### **Regional Benchmarks**

Regional benchmarks are designed to give precise and reliable indicators of system trends that reflect the net effects of all factors that influence the system, including recommended practices. Recommended practices were designed to identify areas of regional interest, set expectations regarding what can be accomplished, and provide a strategy or approach that can also serve as the basis of an alternative practice. The programs and tasks outlined in this plan are based on the recommended practices set forth in the RSWMP.

Three groups of regional benchmarks - system, facility and disposal benchmarks - each containing several quantifiable measures, will track performance of the solid waste system under RSWMP. These benchmarks are listed in the attached table 9.3 from the RSWMP. The expected performance of the recommended practices by the year 2000 and 2005 is shown in the attached table 9.2a and 9.2b from the RSWMP respectively. Each column in the center section of the tables represents a recommended practice, with tonnage impacts on each generator and material type indicated. The tonnages are the amounts of waste that would have been disposed in the absence of the recommended practices. Accordingly, they are shown as reductions in disposal or landfilled quantities.

### **Annual Plan Format:**

Some changes to the format of the framework have been made for Year 10. In previous years, all of the recommended practices were listed and local governments were required to provide detailed information on ongoing as well as new or changed program areas. For the 1999-2000 program year, most recommended practices are listed in a table format with check-off boxes for each task. All fully-implemented and ongoing programs need only be noted as continuing, with narrative required only if changes to the ongoing programs will be made during 1999-2000. Local jurisdictions are expected to continue maintaining implemented recommended practices and services as noted in the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

Certain program areas or recommended practices have either 1999-2000 key dates associated with them or they have been identified as areas of regional interest for this particular program year. For the Year 10 program cycle, commercial waste prevention and recycling, organic waste programs, and construction and demolition waste are the areas of focus. These tasks require that more detailed program planning and implementation detail be presented in the annual plans submitted to Metro.

Please fill in information requested in the tables below each local government priority task. Under the Metro priority tasks that note local government assistance, please acknowledge whether or not your jurisdiction will be assisting with these practices. If not, please provide an explanation of your reasons.

**I. RESIDENTIAL WASTE PREVENTION PRACTICES**

**1. Education and Information for Waste Prevention**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

Continue to emphasize waste prevention in local public education programs. (M to assist)

Date First Implemented	1999-2000 Ongoing? (Yes/No)	1999-2000 Program Changes

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Design and implement annual regional media campaigns focused on waste prevention. *Fall 1999 regional outreach campaign will combine waste prevention and recycling message.* (LG to assist)
- b) Continue with “Earth-Wise” purchasing and waste prevention programs focused on households. (LG to assist)
- c) Continue to provide educational and promotional resources and materials to encourage the purchase of recycled products. (LG to assist)

**2. Expand Home Composting**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Continue to promote home composting and Metro home composting workshops. (LG to lead local promotion of home composting in general and assist in promoting Metro’s workshops)

Date First Implemented	1999-2000 Ongoing? (Yes/No)	1999-2000 Program Changes

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Continue to provide home composting workshops in the Spring and Fall. (LG to assist)
- b) Maintain demonstration sites to serve all areas of the region. (LG to assist)

- c) Continue bin distribution program if appropriate and necessary.

**Expand and Increase Participation in Existing Residential Curbside Programs**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Expand and increase participation in existing residential recycling programs annually. (improve performance of existing recycling services or add materials to curbside collection programs)

Date First Implemented	1999-2000 Ongoing? (Yes/No)	1999-2000 Program Changes

- b) Monitor multifamily recycling service availability to maintain provision of collection services for at least four materials at the 85% completion level. Provide information to Metro in order to update database as needed. (M to assist)

Date First Implemented	1999-2000 Ongoing? (Yes/No)	1999-2000 Program Changes

- c) Regional education and promotion campaigns to support single and multifamily curbside recycling. *Fall 1999 regional outreach campaign will combine waste prevention and recycling message.* (M to assist).

Date First Implemented	1999-2000 Ongoing? (Yes/No)	1999-2000 Program Changes

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) If need is determined by the results of the DEQ Waste Composition Study, develop programs that target the reduction of yard debris in self-haul loads at disposal facilities. (LG to assist).
- b) Regional education and promotion campaigns to support single and multifamily curbside recycling. *Fall 1999 regional outreach campaign will combine waste prevention and recycling message.* (LG to assist).

- c) Assess scrap paper markets 1999-00. (LG to assist).

**4. Develop New Collection Technologies**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Continue to investigate and examine new opportunities in collection technology (e.g., co-collection, alternative schedules, selective commingling, weight-based rates). (M to assist)

Date First Implemented	1999-2000 Ongoing? (Yes/No)	1999-2000 Program Changes

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Research the strength of markets and market capacity for materials that might be added to curbside programs as local conditions require. (LG to assist).
- b) Assist local governments in the examination of new collection technologies as local conditions require.

**II. BUSINESS WASTE REDUCTION PRACTICES**

*NOTE: The recommendations forthcoming from the State of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Report as well as the Commercial Waste Assessment currently being conducted in the region may significantly impact the tasks listed below.*

**1. Waste Prevention and Recycling Education, Information and Market Development**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Waste prevention, diversion and procurement evaluations will be conducted with a goal of reaching 80% of targeted businesses by 2000.  
TARGET: 100% of goal by July 2000.
- b) Assist with regional media campaign design and development. Apply messages locally.

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Model waste prevention programs developed for different types of businesses. Update existing materials and consider adding additional business sectors (LG to assist).  
TARGET: 45% of targets by July 2000.

- b) Regional and local media campaigns emphasizing waste prevention (LG to assist with regional effort and lead local efforts).

**TARGET:** Regional media campaign planned for Spring 2000.

- c) "Earth-Wise" programs including promotion campaigns, model procurement policies and recycled product guides. Annual updates and publication of guides, targeted promotions.
- d) Continue to provide technical or financial assistance to processors or end users of recycled materials.
- e) Education efforts developed to stress reduction in over-packaging. Promote development of sustainable resource management. (inform consumer of full costs of product).

## **2. Expand Source Separated Recycling**

### **Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Collection of paper (newspaper, corrugated cardboard, high-grade office paper, and scrap paper) and containers (glass, steel, aluminum, PET & HDPE) from businesses. For businesses that do not dispose of significant quantities of paper and containers, the most prevalently disposed recyclable materials (e.g. scrap metals, wood, yard debris, or plastic film) will be collected.

**TARGET:** 100% of businesses by January 2000.

- b) Appropriate recycling containers provided to small businesses.

**TARGET:** 100% by January 2000

- c) Continue business recycling recognition programs (i.e., BRAG program) (M to assist).
- d) Report to Metro on the percent of customers who recycle through their regulated solid waste hauler. Include 1999 target and any findings related to success or failure, and any proposed changes the current approach.

**TARGET:** Restate initial targets and provide feedback on progress.

### **Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Assist with and support promotion of BRAG program on a regional level.
- b) Coordinate strategy to integrate waste evaluations, targeted generator studies and business organic processing efforts in order to accomplish the highest level of waste reduction (LG to assist).
- c) Conduct a comprehensive commercial measurement study to assist in local and regional planning efforts. (LG to assist)

### **3. Collection and Off-Site Recovery of Source Separated Food Waste and Non-Recyclable Paper**

**NOTE: The feasibility of implementing an organics recovery program will be determined by a cooperative regional planning effort to begin in Spring/Summer 1999. The results of this effort will determine future actions in this arena.**

#### **Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Develop organic waste collection systems from larger generators (M to assist).  
Implementation is contingent upon development of regional processing capacity.

#### **Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Develop strategies to encourage siting of processing facilities for organic waste (LG to assist).
- b) Increase efforts in the area of waste prevention, donation, and community partnerships for organic waste generators (LG to assist).

### **4. Regional Processing Facilities for Mixed Dry Waste**

#### **Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Local governments to assist with Metro tasks listed below.

#### **Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Analyze waste composition data to determine if marketable materials are present in recoverable quantities at processing facilities.
- b) Examine factors that affect post-collection recovery, including System Fee Credits, waste composition and source separation programs.
- c) Analyze the transfer station service plan to determine if the western part of the Metro region needs additional post collection recovery.

### **III. BUILDING INDUSTRIES WASTE REDUCTION PRACTICES**

**NOTE: The 1998 Building Industries/Construction and Demolition Debris Generator Study showed the need to target technical and education programs to specific subsectors of the construction industry. This and other findings from this study should be taken into account in creating Year 10 work plans.**

### **5. Develop Targeted Technical and Educational Programs**

#### **Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Conduct on-site audits designed for increasing waste prevention and recycling (LG to identify sites, Metro to assist with evaluations and training).



**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Using existing building industry associations and networks including “Earth Wise Building Alliance”, provide technical assistance and train builders about salvage, waste reduction, recycling, buy-recycled and other environmental building practices (LG to assist). Maintain system after June 1998.
- b) Conduct on-site audits at construction and demolition sites to promote waste prevention (LG to assist)
- c) Provide educational tools and training to local governments.

**2. On-Site Source Separation of Recyclables at Construction and Demolition Sites**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Assure the availability of on-site services for two or more materials and ensure that generators requesting hauling services for construction and demolition sites are offered these services.
- b) Promotion of and education about on-site recycling collection services. To be coordinated with task *a.* above.

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Develop educational materials that target new recoverable materials for source separation when markets are available (LG to assist). Materials to be developed by July 1999, implement FY 99-00 contingent upon favorable markets.

**3. Develop Markets to Support Reuse and Recycling rather than Energy Recovery**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Local governments to assist with Metro tasks listed below.

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Support salvage practices and markets for reused building materials. Monitor private sector progress in the use of salvaged building materials.
- b) Support development of industries using recycled construction and demolition materials.

**4. Develop Regional Dry Waste Processing facilities for Waste from Sites Where Separation and Collection of Recyclables is Not Possible**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Local governments to assist with Metro tasks listed below.

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Analyze waste composition data to determine in marketable materials are present in recoverable quantities at processing facilities.
- b) Examine factors that affect post-collection recovery, including System Fee Credits, waste composition and source separation programs.
- c) Analyze the transfer station service plan to determine if the western part of the Metro region needs additional post-collection recovery.

**IV. SOLID WASTE FACILITIES AND SERVICES:  
REGULATION AND SITING**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Local governments to assist with Metro tasks listed below.

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Continue to implement composting facility franchise and licensing program and facility oversight.
- b) Continue assistance and active participation in local government siting and zoning code development and revision process.

**V. SOLID WASTE FACILITIES AND SERVICES:  
TRANSFER AND DISPOSAL SYSTEM**

Note: Specific recommendations will be developed after the service plan has been completed in Summer 1999.

**VI. SOLID WASTE FACILITIES AND SERVICES:  
HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT**

*NOTE: During fiscal year 1998-99, Metro will be coordinating a household hazardous waste planning process which will include the revision of the RSWMP chapter on Hazardous Waste. This process will result in changes to the following 1999-00 work areas and tasks*



**Continue to Provide hazardous Waste Collection, Recycling and Disposal**

**Local Government Priority Tasks:**

- a) Promote household hazardous waste prevention and reduction through adult and school education programs (cooperative with Metro).

Date First Implemented	1999-2000 Ongoing? (Yes/No)	1999-2000 Program Changes

- b) Promote the use of Metro’s two permanent household hazardous waste collection facilities.

Date First Implemented	1999-2000 Ongoing? (Yes/No)	1999-2000 Program Changes

- c) Assist in the siting and staffing of household hazardous waste mobile collection events in your jurisdiction. Annually as needed.

**Metro Priority Tasks:**

- a) Continue to provide hazardous waste collection, recycling and disposal services to the region’s households and conditionally exempt commercial generators at Metro South and Metro Central transfer stations.
- b) Promote household hazardous waste prevention and reduction through adult and school education programs (cooperative with LG).
- c) Promote existing facilities to increase the number of customers served in total and by geographic regions.
- d) Provide service to outlying areas not conveniently served by permanent household hazardous waste collection facilities. LG to assist in identifying areas of need, staffing, and siting of mobile collection events.

**VII. ADDITIONAL OR ONGOING LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS OR TASKS**

Please provide a description of any additional or ongoing waste reduction and recycling programs implemented in your jurisdiction that have not been mentioned earlier in this plan. If any of these tasks or programs are being changed during fiscal year 1999-00, please explain the changes that will take place and how they will impact local and regional waste reduction efforts.

<b>Existing or Existing Local Government Programs and Tasks</b>			
<b>Program/Task</b>	<b>1999-00 with no changes (✓)</b>	<b>1999-00 with change (✓)</b>	<b>Explanation of program/task change during 1999-00.</b>

**Attachment A**  
**Annual Work Plan - Development and Approval Process**  
**Alternative Practices - Application, Review and Approval Process**

Timeline	Annual Work Plan Process	Alternative Practice Process
<b>ANNUAL WORK PLAN PHASE</b>		
The Annual Work Plan phase is the time when Metro and local governments, using the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan as a guide, determine the general types of activities that will be implemented in the upcoming fiscal year (July 1 through June 30).		
November	<b>Draft developed</b> by Metro and local govt. staff for the upcoming fiscal year period	Local governments are encouraged to share plans about alternative practices with Metro as early in the planning process as possible, especially if the proposed alternative is a major departure from one or more recommended practices.
December/ January February →	<b>Regional public involvement</b> Public Comment and Metro SWAC review of draft and final REMCom Work session on draft REMCom public hearing on final	
February/March	<b>Council approval process</b> Metro Council consideration and adoption	
<b>ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PHASE</b>		
The implementation planning phase is the time when Metro and each local government develop specific programs, projects and activities for the upcoming fiscal year (July 1 through June 30). This process is timed to coincide with government budget schedules.		
Feb. 1 to May 1	<b>Details developed</b> by Metro and local government staff that are consistent with the general Annual Work Plan framework.	Alternative practices developed by local governments
Feb. 1 to May 1	<b>Local and Regional Public Involvement</b> Local SWAC and other public involvement Metro budget hearings Local government budget hearings, Other	Local governments work with local solid waste advisory committees to develop implementation details, including alternative practices.
May 1		<b>Deadline - Alternative Practice Concept Submitted</b> by local government to the REM Director.
May 1 - 31		<b>Alternative Practice Concept Considered and Approved</b> by REM Director. The Director may seek the advice of the regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee regarding the alternative practice during this time. <b>Alternative Practices made available for public comment. **</b>
June 1	<b>Implementation Plans Due</b> to Metro from local governments Public Comment on Implementation Plans *	<b>Alternative Practice Details Due</b> to Metro from local governments as part of the detailed annual work plan.
<b>PLAN IMPLEMENTATION</b>		
July 1	Start of Fiscal Year - Implementation begins	Implementation begins
Nov. 30	Intergovernmental agreements for grant funding approved and funds distributed to local governments	
<b>PROGRESS REPORTING</b>		
Aug. 1	Local govt. progress reports due to Metro for previous fiscal year period	Reports will include information about how alternative practices are performing
Nov. 30	Metro publishes annual "State of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan" status report for the previous fiscal year period	Metro's report will include information about how alternative practices are performing

REMCom - Metro Council Subcommittee, the Regional Environmental Management Committee

SWAC - Solid Waste Advisory Committee

\* Interested persons will be notified that implementation plans are available for comment before final approval. See the next page for a description of that process.

\*\* Interested persons will be notified that Alternative Practices are available for comment before final approval.

**Annual Work Plan - Development and Approval Process**  
**Public Input Process for Metro and Local Government Implementation Plans**

1. The following steps will determine the development and approval of Local Government Waste Reduction Implementation Plans.
2. Annual Waste Reduction Implementation Plans are received by Metro from local governments on June 1, 1999.
3. Metro staff review of plans submitted and notice to interested parties that plans may be reviewed and comments submitted (2 week time-frame).
4. Metro staff will compile both Metro comments and any public comments received.
5. Metro and local government staff will meet to review all comments submitted.
6. Metro and local governments will decide if any comments received warrant changes to the plans.
7. Metro will approve local government plans, as modified through steps 1) through 5) above, within two weeks of meeting with the local governments.

Analysis and consideration of public comments on local government implementation plans received by Metro is an administrative process. Local implementation plans will not be subject to Metro Council, local Council or Commission approval. Public comments are advisory only and may not result in changes to the local government annual implementation plans.

## **Attachment B**

### **Alternative Practices Application, Review & Approval Process**

#### **Background**

An “alternative practice” is a solid waste management program or service that is proposed by a local government as an alternative to one or more of the recommended practices stated in the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). The purpose of this appendix is to provide clarification about the intent of alternative practices and to describe a process by which they will be reviewed and approved.

#### **Intent of Alternative Practices**

- They should focus on the strategy underlying the recommended practices
- Perform at same level or better than the recommended practice it is intended to replace
- Allow for local flexibility in programs and services
- Remove barriers to better, innovative approaches
- Be approved using a simple, administrative process

#### **At what point does an approach become an “alternative”?**

- If the local practice is a departure from the concept described in the RSWMP
- If the local practice represents a change in the solid waste management hierarchy (e.g., a move from source-separation and recycling to recovery)
- If the local practice diverts substantially from the annual work plan “line item” framework elements

#### **Process for application and review of an Alternative Practice**

- Local governments requesting an alternative practice will submit, for the REM Director’s approval, a proposal that demonstrates how the alternative will perform at the same level as the recommended practice.
- If the proposed alternative is a major departure from the recommended practice, the local government is encouraged to submit its proposal to the REM Director as early in the annual plan development cycle as possible.
- To demonstrate the same level of performance, the proposal for an alternative practice should address, as appropriate, the following criteria:
  - . Estimated participation levels
  - . Estimated amount of waste that will be prevented, recycled, recovered, or disposed
  - . Consistency with the waste reduction hierarchy and source separation priority
  - . Economic and technical feasibility
  - . Estimated impact on other waste reduction activities
- The REM Director will consider and may approve the proposal based on the criteria listed above.