



METRO

A G E N D A

MEETING: REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday, February 17, 1999

TIME: 8:30 a.m.—10:00 a.m.

- NOTE NEW TIME -

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

- 5 min. I. Call to Order, Announcements and Introductions** *Ed Washington*
- 5 min. *II. Approval of November Minutes** *Ed Washington*
- 10 min. III. REM Director's Update** *Bruce Warner*
- 30 min. *IV. State-of-the-Plan Report** *Steve Apotheke*
The first comprehensive report on the implementation status of Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) programs and goals since the plan was adopted in 1995. REM staff's recommendations will also be presented. **Comments requested**
- 25 min. *V. Transfer Station Service Plan** *Bill Metzler*
Questions about regional transfer stations remain unanswered after the code revision: does the region need more regional transfer stations; and if so, how many should there be, what services should they provide, how should they be provided, and where should they be located? Metro has targeted July 1, 1999 to have these questions answered, together with an implementation plan. At this meeting, staff will present the process for answering these questions, recommend SWAC's role, and hold a brief work session on the objectives of the project and evaluation criteria for the solution. **Comments requested**
- 5 min. VI. 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\ANDES\SUBCOM\0217\swac.aga

REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
November 16, 1998

ATTENDEES

Voting Members

Tom Wyatt, BFI
Vince Gilbert, East County Recycling (alternate)
Jeanne Roy, Citizen, Portland
Tam Driscoll, City of Gresham (alternate)
Steve Schwab, CCRRA
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County
Dean Kampfer, Waste Management (alternate)
Frank Deaver, Citizen, Washington County area
Lynne Storz, Washington County
Garry Penning, Waste Management
Kathy Kiwala, Washington County cities (for Loreen Mills)
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources, Inc.

Non-Voting Members

Bruce Warner, REM Director, Metro
Rob Guttridge, Clark County (alternate)
Doug DeVries, STS

METRO

Regional Environmental Management

Doug Anderson	Jim Watkins	Paul Ehinger
Terry Petersen	Jennifer Erickson	Steve Kraten
Aaron Brondyke	Meg Lynch	Dennis Strachota

Other Metro

Marv Fjordbeck	Leo Kenyon	Tom Imdieke
----------------	------------	-------------

GUESTS

Easton Cross	Todd Irvine	Dick Jones
Diana Godwin	Doug Drennen	Greg Nokes
Dean Large	Paulette Rossi	

Announcements

Mr. Warner indicated that Clark County's alternate, Rob Guttridge, was attending today's SWAC meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Garry Penning moved the approval of the September SWAC minutes. Mr. David White seconded the motion. Mr. Warner commented that on page three, the word "knowledgeability" should be knowledge and ability. With this amendment, the Committee approved the minutes unanimously.

Director's Updates

Mr. Warner acknowledged Eric Koellner, Metro South Hazardous Waste Lead Technician. Mr. Koellner has saved Metro from having to purchase pails for distributing recycled paint. Mr. Koellner located a yogurt manufacturer that was disposing of 5-gallon containers in which it received yogurt products. Mr. Koellner arranged to have the company donate the containers to Metro's hazardous waste program, thereby saving the company on disposal, and providing Metro with perfectly good containers and to be filled with Metro's recycled paint. This will allow approximately 23,000 5-gallon pails to be reused per year and will save Metro approximately \$50,000 on the purchase of new pails.

The Regional Environmental Management Committee of the Council (REM Com) took heard ordinances granting the three franchises for direct haul on November 15, 1998. Waste Management had originally requested a variance to the Code requirement that "sealed" containers be used for direct-hauling from Recycle America, but withdrew their request prior to the public hearing. The Committee moved Willamette Resources Inc., Pride Disposal, and Recycle America's franchise requests forward to the full Council with "do pass" recommendations on all three. These franchise requests will be heard by the full Council on November 24, 1998. *[Note: the Council has since heard, and unanimously approved, all three ordinances.]* Metro is ready to implement direct haul provisions of the franchise agreements.

Mr. Warner said the Council also passed a resolution on November 15 notifying Waste Management of a default under Article 29 (the "change of control requiring consent" provisions) of the contract between Metro and Oregon Waste Systems. He said Metro received a reply from Waste Management, Inc. disagreeing with Metro's assessment. Waste Management claimed that they did not need to seek Metro's consent to the merger with USA Waste. However, they agreed to "voluntarily" request consent that Metro accept the "new" Waste Management as its disposal contractor. Mr. Warner indicated that REM Com had recommended by way of a resolution to Metro Council that they deny Waste Management's request for consent.

Designated Facility Agreements Revision

Mr. Warner commented that this would probably be the first of a number of discussions on this topic to the SWAC. He said there has been a lot of interest on the part of facilities outside the region to revise their Designated Facility Agreements with Metro since most of them have expired. Furthermore, the agreements are not consistent in a number of ways. Mr. Warner requested input on this issue from the group after the overview from Mr. Kraten.

Mr. Kraten explained the Designated Facility Agreements (DFA) are arrangements between Metro and out-of-district landfills that authorize the landfills to accept waste generated from inside the Metro region. He said that in exchange for that authorization, the facilities agree to collect REM's Regional System Fee and Metro's excise tax and remit those to Metro. He said we presently have two versions of the agreements: one for near-by facilities (Hillsboro and Grabhorn) and another for the distant landfills (Columbia Ridge, Roosevelt and Finley Buttes). Nearby facilities are authorized to accept construction demolition and land clearing waste, where the distant facilities are limited to accepting residue only from the processing of construction demolition and land clearing waste received from a Metro franchised facility. Mr. Kraten said

the agreements were all written for two-year terms and have all expired, but have remained in force due to an "Evergreen Clause."

Mr. Kraten said Metro is looking at revisions to deal with disaster debris, change the terms of the agreements (perhaps lengthen to five years), and also bring consistency to all of the agreements and relax some of the restrictions on the waste that can be accepted. Mr. Kraten called the committee's attention to some suggestions outlined in the agenda packet for revisions to the agreements and called for comments.

Mr. Warner said he would like to poll each of the committee members around the table on the issue and then move to a general discussion and perhaps identification of additional issues.

Mr. Vince Gilbert: commented that he was prejudiced on this issue. He said his company even recovers materials from composition roofing, i.e., gutters, pieces of wood. Mr. Gilbert would still like all materials put through a MRF before being landfilled and in fact would like to see the agreements broadened to exclude all dry waste. Mr. Gilbert's question is why bury in the ground what can be used? Mr. Warner commented that instead of reducing restrictions on landfilled materials that Mr. Gilbert would like to see the agreements exclude further materials and Mr. Gilbert concurred.

Mr. David White: commented that the economics of transporting material would dictate, to some degree, how much MRFinng goes on before it is transported to a distant landfill. Mr. White doesn't see the local and far away restrictions on materials inconsistencies as making sense. Mr. White said the association members he represents are getting back to him with their comments and he will forward them to Mr. Warner.

Ms. Jeanne Roy: commented she is more inclined to go with Option 2, and may be inclined to increasing the restriction on close-in landfills, but needs more information. Ms. Roy said she sees no inherent advantage in all agreements being consistent.

Mr. Rick Winterhalter: Said he would dismiss No. 3, and probably agrees with Option 2..

Ms. Tam Driscoll: commented she feels the same as Mr. White, and also agrees that Metro might want to tighten up restrictions a bit.

Mr. Steve Schwab: commented it was his belief that designated facilities were sorting materials before landfilling anyway. He added that Metro collects fees and taxes in any event. Mr. Schwab believes in uniformity.

Mr. Dean Kampfer: said he believes Option 2 makes the most sense. Mr. Kampfer also believes the best effort to recover be made before moving material any distance. He believes load consolidation should be made before moving.

Mr. Doug DeVries: had no further comments.

Mr. Frank Deaver: commented that money is a resource too. He said he leaned towards Option 2 or maybe even 3.

Mr. Jeff Murray: commented he would not take a stand. Mr. Murray did say that the economics of making any resource recovery after transporting to a distant landfill were probably geared toward landfilling, however.

Mr. Rob Guttridge: Said he tended toward Option 2

Ms. Lynne Storz: said she wanted more information on definitions of materials such as special waste, and is transportation of waste limited to commercial haulers or also self-haul.

Mr. Kraten said the DFA lists seven things under waste authorized to be disposed of at Hillsboro Landfill. Mr. Kraten said it does not speak specifically to waste brought to the landfill by either commercial or self-haul but speaks more to the types of waste. Ms. Storz asked if waste was excluded by omission from the agreement?

Mr. Kraten read from the agreement: “. . . Any other waste company can accept at the facility, consistent with the authority granted by DEQ and with the facility status as a Limited Purpose Landfill.”

Mr. Warner said the agreement does not restrict self-haul, but the issue is what will we do about the recovery of the self-hauler? Ms. Storz agreed. Mr. Warner commented this was a very good question.

Mr. Lee Barrett: commented that speaking for the City of Portland, Option 2 would be their choice.

Mr. Garry Penning: said that the whole definition of dry waste wasn't there when the agreements were written and C&D and CDL were set forth as acceptable materials. He commented that we should now define recoverable dry waste and materials, but that CDL was once an all-encompassing term.

Ms. Kathy Kiwala: commented she believes there should be consistency among all of the agreements. She also believes all recoverable material should be recovered before hauling to a landfill.

Mr. Tom Wyatt: said he was for increasing recovery. He believes economics of location will take care of a portion of it. Uniformity is good.

Mr. Tom Miller agreed.

Mr. Merle Irvine: said consistency is good. Was surprised to find out what the local DFAs were now receiving. Mr. Irvine said he was interested in Option 3.

Mr. Warner asked for comments from the audience.

Ms. Diana Godwin, attorney representing Regional Disposal Company, Roosevelt Landfill. Ms. Godwin said that Roosevelt Regional Landfill came on-line in 1991, and in May, 1992 Regional Disposal Company requested a business license from Metro in order to provide waste services to generators in the Metro area. Ms Godwin said that after a year of negotiation with Metro and the SWAC group a two-year agreement was drawn which took effect in April, 1993. The agreement has been extended through an Evergreen Clause since its expiration. Ms. Godwin said the company she represents had really wanted to have a business license relationship with Metro. She said that since Roosevelt Landfill is located outside the jurisdictional boundaries of Metro they are neither licensed nor franchised by Metro, and Metro has no jurisdiction over its rates, ownership, business contracts or operation, but Metro does have an interest in ensuring that any landfill serving the Metro area generators is environmentally sound, has sound business practices and will faithfully collect the proper Regional User Fees and Excise Taxes to Metro and reimburse them accordingly. Ms. Godwin also said Roosevelt needed to keep adequate records on what types of waste is being disposed of from generators in the Metro area. She said because of this her client Roosevelt landfill has some ideas on how a new Designated Facility Agreement should be approached.

Ms. Godwin said she believes that the market place and economics will dictate what will go to a distant landfill. She said she believes there have been some inequities in the DFAs. She said she believes that where you have a private business relationship between a disposer and an industry or someone who has materials for disposal and there is an out-of-state business willing to take it that the interest of Metro is limited to making sure that fees and taxes are collected and remitted, records are appropriately provided, and the landfill is operated in an environmentally sound manner.

Mr. Warner, summarizing commented that materials recovery, for example, is not something Metro should place restrictions on because the economics will drive what should be pulled out.

Ms. Godwin said that was basically their feeling. She said that prior DFAs have restricted Roosevelt landfill such that they are unable to take the dry residue from a MRF, unless it is a dry residue from CDL processing, whereas that same dry MRF residue is allowed to go to a non-designated facility.

Mr. Anderson, explaining the reason for limitations to certain wastes in the DFAs, said that Metro's contract language with Waste Management originally stated that Metro was required to send 90% of waste that is delivered to a General Purpose Landfill to Columbia Ridge Landfill. He further explained that Roosevelt Landfill is a General Purpose Landfill. That "90%" language has since been changed, but when the DFAs were drafted, he said that in order to protect our contract obligations, Metro limited the DFAs to accepting wastes that were not covered by the contract—such as PCS and MRF residue. He said that on the other hand, Grabhorn and Hillsboro are Limited Purpose Landfills, are not allowed to take putrescible waste under their DEQ permit, and therefore are non-issues with respect to Metro's contract. Mr. Anderson also agreed with Mr. Penning that the definition of dry waste has "creeped" over time.

Mr. Warner asked the group if there were additional issues they wanted to explore on Designated Facility Agreements. He said his office would begin visiting facilities and talking with them to bring the agreements current and make them as uniform as possible if that is the will of the group.

Ms. Roy said there is a difference between close in landfills and out-of-region landfills, mainly that they are further from the markets.

The Service Plan: Planning for Regional Transfer Stations

Mr. Anderson said this is an issue remaining from the revision of Metro's Code. He explained that, under the newly-revised Code, regional transfer stations can take over 50,000 tons per year and are "full service" facilities. A regional transfer station is required to accommodate public customers and household hazardous waste as well as commercial haulers. He said Metro is now embarking on a process to deal more fully with how to deliver all of the various services that are needed throughout the region. He said other issues might be whether these facilities should accommodate yard debris or food waste reloading. Mr. Anderson said there are also emerging issues in co-collection, and if so do we need to be in position for that? And, is there a role for these facilities in the emerging co-mingled recycling arena?

Mr. Anderson said the goal at this point is to develop a process for deciding on what regional transfer stations are and how to provide for them. He said a project team has been put together and is meeting for the first time this week. He said the team is comprised of: Bill Metzler, Sarah Adams Lien, Penny Erickson and Chuck Geyer.

Mr. Warner asked for comments and/or suggestions.

Ms. Roy suggested that if Metro was going out to solicit comments from stakeholders they might want to consider a presentation to a group of Master Recyclers that she has worked with for the past six or seven years.

Mr. Kampfer asked how much tonnage flowed through the existing three regional transfer stations. Mr. Anderson said that in round numbers, Metro Central and Metro South receive within 20,000 to 30,000 tons of being the same and receive a total of 350,000 tons each in the door. He said that Forest Grove takes about 85,000 to 90,000 from the region, but take more tonnage total because they receive waste from western Washington County and other areas.

Mr. Kampfer questioned whether the 50,000 ton threshold was the right number. He said perhaps that number should be closer to 100,000.

Mr. Warner said he agreed, that is a worthy discussion. What is the breakpoint?

Ms. Roy said she would like to know how long it takes the region's customers to reach a household hazardous waste site. She said she believed the original goal was 20 minutes and it way beyond that limit for her.

Mr. Anderson said Metro currently has a study on hazardous waste as well. Metro will introduce this study to SWAC next year, perhaps about March.

Update: Status of Waste Reduction Programs

Mr. Anderson said this is a continuation of the discussion of last September. He said that Metro has reporting responsibilities that are state mandated and those required by our Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). He said an annual report is due DEQ every February on the implementation status of programs, as well as waste disposed of at various landfills. Mr. Anderson said a bi-annual report is due to Environmental Quality Commission in July of every even numbered year which is similar to the DEQ report in its requirements. He said as well, our RSWMP requires a report on certain numbers on various programs.

Mr. Anderson explained we are attempting to create a State of the Plan report which encompasses all of these to actually link programs and recommended practices with their performance (how well various practices themselves actually perform). He said that by agreement with DEQ, this State of the Plan report will be our report to DEQ every February. *[Note: RSWMP specifies that reports be completed earlier than February, to allow for input into annual planning and budgeting activities. DEQ has agreed to accept these reports in lieu of creating a separate report for the February requirement.]*

Mr. Steve Apotheker, the principal author of this report gave an overview of tonnage, disposal and recovery rates in the region. Mr. Apotheker distributed some tables containing information he proceeded to discuss. He said that in 1992 Metro projected what our 1995 baseline disposal, (landfilling), energy, and recycling recovery should be. He said that in years past Metro was responsible for computing recovery numbers for the region but a couple of years ago a transition began where DEQ took on those responsibilities. He said that in 1995, the total recovery number of 42.5% matches what we projected. The total wastestream that DEQ determined was 1.73 million tons (that's the total generated) which also matches to 20,000 or 30,000 tons of our baseline projection. Mr. Apotheker continued to explain how our tonnage and recovery numbers were arrived at.

Mr. Apotheker said the plan assumes that the recovery activities in 1995 (which captured 740,000 diverted tons) will capture perhaps an additional 27,000 tons within the region as we approach the Year 2000. He said that means we need to find an additional 247,000 of additional diversion to meet our recovery rates of 52% given a wastestream that is projected to be almost 2 million tons. Mr. Apotheker said we are really banking on diversion of commercial waste to get us to that 52%. He said after that ¼ of this additional recovery is expected from post-collection activities (from reload, transfer stations, etc).

Mr. Apotheker said that noting our improvement between 1995 and 1997, we added roughly 100,000 tons of additional recovery, which doesn't include two contributions (home composting and business waste prevention programs). He said that given where we should be today, that number should be closer to 247,000 tons, which means we are only at 40% of where we need to be to reach our goal.

Update: Draft Master Facility Plan

Mr. Jim Watkins, Metro Engineering & Analysis manager, said that one of the key goals in the 1996 RSWMP was to eliminate the need for a publicly owned transfer station and Metro developed a Master Facility Plan for its two existing transfer stations. He said this planning effort became the framework for a Five-year capital improvement plan. He introduced Mr. Paul Ehinger, the project manager of the 5-year capital improvement plan.

Mr. Ehinger said that the three major solid waste sites (Metro Central, Metro South and St. Johns Landfill) represent five solid waste facilities (2-household hazardous waste facilities, 2-transfer stations, 1-landfill). He said the major goals of our planning process is to comply with RSWMP, since that is what our elected officials directed to do. He said we also wanted to improve customer service and safety for Metro's customers and transfer station contractor's employees. Mr. Ehinger said Metro wanted to make improvements that would allow additional recovery efforts, to improve efficiency and eliminate traffic congestion as much as possible. He said we also wanted to plan improvements for future flexibility and recovery efforts and stay with the marketplace.

Mr. Ehinger said that Metro retained a consultant, did a preliminary report and have implemented most of the improvements that came up in that report, some of which were: added new scalehouse, added automated weighing systems, and changed traffic pattern on entrance to station. He said the most major improvement proposed at Metro South is a new public off-loading area. He said at this time STS has the rights to park trailers on that part of the site and we have to make arrangements to have access to the area. He said that the one main finding of the study is that Metro South is currently operating at or above capacity, particularly on the number of vehicles coming through, and most of those vehicles are self-haul.

Mr. Barrett asked why, when we have a system in place to collect solid waste from the residents in this region don't we use it? Why are we spending money so that any John Doe can drag their useless articles down to the transfer station and clog the lineup?

Mr. Ehinger said that the primary purpose of these improvements is to remove the public customers from the commercial queues and unclog that lineup. But these changes also make it easier for the public customer, and so Mr. Barrett has a good question and one that has been discussed by this group. How we deal with the public customer is a policy issue.

Mr. Ehinger continued to say there is a total of about four million dollars worth of construction at Metro South.

Ms. Roy commented that an encouragement for recycling is to be able to drop off source-separated recycling before the scales and wanted to know if that was the plan of improvements?

Mr. Ehinger said sadly not, although it was an internal goal, there was no place on the site to place it. He said we are, however, trying to keep all the public-related (small vehicle) stuff in one place.

Mr. Murray asked if there had been a study conducted illustrating the possibility of dramatic growth in the Metro South Transfer Station area?

Mr. Ehinger said the service study of which Mr. Anderson spoke earlier may identify that type of possibility, and we also conducted a customer survey. He said that small load vehicles average size load is 4/10ths of a ton whereas larger commercial trucks average 5 tons at least, and the 5-ton vehicles are in and out of the tipping area an average of seven minutes or less versus 20 to 30 minutes for the individual hauler.

Mr. Gilbert commented his facility also had traffic problems because of confined space and he solved it by separating waste type instead of commercial and individual customers.

Other Business and Adjourn

Ms. Driscoll commented that in January 1997, we had that ice storm from which was created lots of storm debris. Metro provided emergency funding for disposal of that debris. She said that predictions are that January and February of 1999 will be colder and wetter. She said that Gresham is currently in the process of deciding whether or not they will be able to provide cleanup services and wants to know if Metro will again provide emergency cleanup funds.

Mr. Barrett commented that the City of Portland has decided they will be unable to provide cleanup activities however there are depots, though they will charge for customers to haul debris to. He said of course financial help from Metro was always appreciated.

Mr. Warner said an Executive Order has been issued as to how Metro will respond to any type of disaster and we will provide you with a copy of that order. Mr. Warner said RSWMP has contingency plans for disasters and contingency plans.

There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned.

Agenda Item IV
State-of-the-Plan Report
Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee
February 17 ,1999

On February 17, Metro staff will present an assessment of the *Regional Solid Waste Management Plan* to SWAC. This "State-of-the-Plan" report contains the first major assessment of the Plan since it was adopted in 1995.

The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan was developed by SWAC, adopted by Metro Council, and approved by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The Plan provides direction for meeting regional solid waste needs through the year 2005. In particular, the Plan:

- Establishes regional solid waste goals and objectives, including a commitment to reaching a 52 percent recovery rate by the year 2000.
- Serves as a regional framework for the coordination of solid waste practices.
- Satisfies state law requiring implementation of a waste reduction plan for the region.

The State-of-the-Plan Reports are "intended to help determine whether the solid waste system is generally on track with respect to the ... Plan's goals, processing and disposal capacity, environmental regulations [and] to provide a significant amount of the objective feedback for Plan management and steering" [RSWMP page 9-2].

On February 17, Metro staff will present conclusions and recommendations to SWAC, based on findings from the State-of-the-Plan Report. These recommendations will initiate a dialogue on potential Plan amendments. A schedule for this process is shown below.

Copies of the draft State-of-the-Plan Report will be available at the February 17 meeting.

Schedule for the State-of-the-Plan Report

Actions on the State-of-the-Plan Report:

<i>Release of full State-of-the-Plan Report at SWAC</i>	<i>February 17</i>
<i>Presentation of findings & recommendations at SWAC</i>	<i>February 17</i>
<i>Findings forwarded to DEQ</i>	<i>February 28</i>
<i>Close of public comment period on report</i>	<i>March 17</i>
<i>SWAC action on recommendations (as revised if necessary)</i>	<i>March 17</i>

Implementation of State-of-the-Plan recommendations, if necessary:

<i>Draft ordinances for plan amendments released</i>	<i>April 14</i>
<i>SWAC action on ordinances</i>	<i>April 21</i>
<i>Ordinances filed</i>	<i>April 22</i>
<i>First Council reading of ordinances</i>	<i>May 6</i>
<i>REM Committee action on ordinances</i>	<i>May 19</i>
<i>Second (final) Council reading of ordinances</i>	<i>May 27</i>

State-of-the-Plan Report: an Outline

The State-of-the-Plan Report covers the range of areas addressed by the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan:

- Waste Reduction
 - Residential
 - Multi-Family
 - Commercial
 - Commercial organics
 - Construction & Demolition
- Solid Waste Disposal and Recovery Facilities
- Illegal Dumping
- Disaster Debris Management
- System Financing

For each of these areas, the State-of-the-Plan Report includes a description of implementation activities since RSWMP was adopted, assessment of implementation status, performance (quantitative where possible), and activity-specific recommendations depending on whether the activity is on schedule and performing as expected.

The State-of-the-Plan Report also covers Plan management: the annual planning process, funding, and measurement and monitoring.

Findings on Waste Reduction: a Preview

The 1998 State-of-the-Plan Report finds that most RSWMP elements are on schedule and performing as expected. However, the key area in which the region is underperforming is in waste reduction, as indicated in the following table.

**Regional Solid Waste Management Plan
Selected Waste Reduction Indicators**

	Baseline (1995)	Actual 1997	Target (2000)
Recovery Rate	42%	42%	52%
Per Capita:			
Recovery	0.56	0.62	0.71
Disposal	0.76	0.87	0.65

Source: RSWMP Table 9.3 (baselines and targets) and draft State-of-the-Plan Report (actuals).
Per-capita rates reflect waste from all sources, and are expressed in tons per person per year.

The simple messages in these numbers are:

- Recycling and recovery are only slightly outpacing regional growth.
- Disposal is fast outstripping growth.
- Because disposal is growing faster than recovery, the recovery rate has stalled.
- *We are not on track to meet the Year 2000 regional recovery rate target.*

Much of the RSWMP is devoted to waste reduction programs. The Plan establishes quantitative waste reduction targets and recommends particular practices ("Recommended Practices") which, if implemented as specified and perform as expected, will meet the Year 2000 targets.

Much of the time at SWAC on February 17 will be devoted to findings and recommendations on waste reduction programs. Through the *State-of-the-Plan Report*, Metro staff will identify the status of each detailed Recommended Practice, and provide estimates of their performance. These findings will form the basis for recommendations for changes to the Plan. During the month from February 17 to March 17, SWAC is asked to consider and comment on these recommendations, to make additional recommendations, and to take formal action at their March 17 meeting.

\\metro1\rem\share\lande\isopr at 2-17 swac.doc

Service Provision Plan for Regional Transfer Stations

Metro Regional Environmental Management - Department Mission Statement

To contribute to the livability of the Metro region by taking actions that reduce and manage the region's solid waste in an effective, economical, and environmentally sound manner.

Project Objective

At the completion of this project, the Department will have a Service Provision Plan, which will recommend the optimum number of regional transfer stations for the Metro region, the services such regional transfer stations should provide, how they should be provided, and where they should be located.

Project Statement

The Metro Code (Chapter 5.01) anticipates the potential need for new Regional Transfer Station services and identifies general obligations and limits for these facilities. In addition, the Metro Code requires new Regional Transfer Stations (over 50,000 tons annually) to be consistent with the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). However, the RSWMP (Solid Waste Facilities and Services – Transfer and Disposal System) states that as a “recommended practice”, there shall be no new transfer stations. New transfer stations can be considered as an “alternative practice”, on a case-by-case basis. The RSWMP identifies benchmarks for tracking the need for more transfer stations and a methodology for making amendments to the Plan, but does not identify evaluation criteria.

There is a perceived need for transfer station services beyond the three existing regional facilities (Metro South, Metro Central and Forest Grove). The impacts of growth, traffic congestion and an increase in waste generation and disposal have been identified as some of the contributing factors to the need for additional regional transfer station services.

Description of Deliverables

The principal deliverable will be a recommended implementation plan, based on answers to the project questions above (or as amended). This plan will be supported by a project report that describes the project process, options considered, analysis, and justification for the recommendation.

The implementation plan will include a “users guide” and recommended changes to Metro Code and Administrative procedures including criteria for evaluating applications, service standards and performance standards for facilities.

Project Team

Penny Erickson, Environmental Services Division
 Chuck Geyer, Engineering & Analysis
 Sarah Adams Lien, Business & Regulatory Affairs
 Bill Metzler, Waste Reduction, Planning & Outreach (Project Team Leader)

Manager: Doug Anderson

Questions about the Service Provision Plan for Regional Transfer Stations should be directed to Bill Metzler, Senior Solid Waste Planner at 797-1666.

SERVICE PROVISION PLAN FOR REGIONAL TRANSFER STATIONS
Preliminary Draft Outline of Project Work Plan

PROCESS for Carrying out the Work Plan and Involving Stakeholders and the Public

- Develop and Implement a Stakeholder/Public Involvement Plan

PHASE 1- RESEARCH: Verify, Define, and Detail the Problem

- Problem statement, goals and objectives
- RSWMP Benchmarks
- DRC / GIS - Data assembly / mapping
- Establish level of demand for various services
- Conduct Surveys: Commercial haulers (City & County managers, Hauler Associations)
- City/County
 - Elected officials
 - S.W. Managers
 - Recycling Coordinators
 - Planning Departments/landuse impacts
- Metro
 - Council
 - Executive Officer
 - MCCI
 - REM Staff
 - 2040/Transportation/Consistency:Goals
- Industry (owners/operators)
 - Transfer stations
 - MRFs

PHASE 2 - ESTABLISH EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Establish evaluation criteria to compare, measure and select among alternatives
- Measures include: cost, net benefit, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, administrative ease, legality, political acceptability, and land use/traffic impacts.
- Rank importance of evaluation criteria (to various stakeholder groups)

PHASE 3 - IDENTIFY ALTERNATIVES

- Alternative Scenario Development
- Services to be provided/mix
- Public/private roles
- Location

PHASE 4 - EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES: ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON

- Use evaluation criteria from Phase 2

PHASE 5 – RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- Service Provision Plan DRAFT REVIEW
- Finalize Service Plan
- Next Steps
 - RSWMP recommendations
 - Metro Code/Administrative Procedure recommendations
 - Plans for monitoring and evaluation
 - Continued stakeholder process

(Agenda Item V, Page 2)