



METRO

A G E N D A

MEETING: REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday, March 22, 2000

TIME: 8:30 a.m.—10:30 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 the February minutes | Ed Washington |
| 5 min. | III. REM Director's Update | Terry Petersen |
| 70 min. | *IV. Transfer Station Service Plan <i>A continuation of the discussion from last month on policy issues and questions related to new transfer stations. Members of the Metro Council and their staff will lead a discussion on solid waste excise taxes, providing SWAC with the opportunity to give direct feedback and comment to Council.</i> | Doug Anderson |
| 35 min. | *V. Partnership Plan for Waste Reduction <i>A discussion of the framework for waste reduction work by Metro and local governments for the 2000-01 fiscal year. SWAC's recommendation will be sought.</i> | Jennifer Erickson |
| 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)
Alternate Chair: Councilor Susan McLain (797-1553)
Staff: Meg Lynch (797-1671) or Doug Anderson (797-1788)
Committee Clerk: Connie Kinney (797-1643)

S:\SHARE\Depl\SWAC\Agenda\032200swac.aga

Agenda Item No. II

APPROVAL: Minutes of February 23, 2000 SWAC Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Wednesday, March 22, 2000

Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
Meeting Minutes
February 23, 2000

Members

Councilor Ed Washington, Chair
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers
Glenn Zimmerman, Wood Waste Reclamation
Steve Schwab, Sunset Garbage Collection
Mike Miller, Gresham Sanitary Service
Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal Co
David White, ORRA, Tri-County Council
*Dean Kampf, Waste Management
Mike Misovetz, Clackamas County Citizen
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County
JoAnn Herrigel, Clackamas County Cities
Susan Keil, City of Portland
Lynne Storz, Washington County
Sarah Jo Chaplen, Washington County Cities
Chris Taylor, DEQ
John Lucini, SP Newsprint
*Tam Driscoll, East Multnomah County & Cities
*Vince Gilbert, East County Recycling
Frank Deaver, Washington County Citizen
*Tom Wyatt, Browning-Ferris Industries

Non-voting Members Present

Kathy Kiwala, Clark County
Terry Petersen, REM
Doug DeVries, STS

Members / Non-voting Members Not Present

Connie Winn, Multnomah County Citizen

Guests/Metro

Joe Wonderlick, Merina, McCoy & Co.
Frank Hammond, Ramis, Crew/WM
Ray Phelps
Easton Cross, ESM
Doug Drennen, DLS
Kent Inman, CRC
Dick Jones
D. Pritchard
Eric Merrill, WCI
Henry Mackenroth

Bill Metzler, REM
Meg Lynch, REM
Connie Kinney, REM
Doug Anderson, REM
Jim Watkins, REM
Steve Kraten
Roy Brower
Chuck Geyer
Tim Raphael, Celilo Group
Bob Hillier, REM

*Alternate Members

Chair Washington called the meeting to order.

Chair Washington announced that the previous Thursday in Fairview, the Metro Council officially named Terry Petersen as the Director of the Regional Environmental Management Department. He welcomed Terry and said that on behalf of the Council as well as himself, he looked forward to working with him in the future.

Chair Washington then introduced the newest SWAC member, who represents recycling end users, John Lucini. John has held various management positions in the field of recovered paper since 1974. At Chair Washington's request, SWAC members introduced themselves to Mr. Lucini.

Approval of the January 2000 Minutes

Mr. White moved to accept the January 17, 2000 minutes, Mr. Irvine seconded the motion. The committee unanimously voted to approve the minutes.

REM Director's Update

Mr. Petersen commented that, as part of the annual billboard art contest, art work by school children on recycling, waste prevention and composting is being displayed in the building lobby. He said the four winners will have their posters reproduced on billboards throughout the region.

Mr. Petersen said Metro receives tonnage data from all of the solid waste facilities throughout the region. He said this data has now been received for the calendar year 1999. He said the total amount of tonnage delivered to all solid waste facilities (landfills, transfer stations and fuel recovery facilities) through the last half of the calendar year 1999 was down 2.5% compared to the last half of 1998; the amount of waste delivered to landfills, however, is up 2%. He congratulated Mr. Tom Wyatt, of BFI, which operates Metro South and Metro Central transfer stations, for increasing recovery by nearly 14%, at the same time that total tonnage delivered to the transfer stations declined.

Ms. Driscoll asked if Metro has approached Tri-Met to see if some of the school children's art work could be displayed on the busses. Mr. Anderson replied that Metro has worked with Tri-Met in the past, but not this particular project; he thanked Ms. Driscoll for her suggestion and promised to pass it on.

Market Development

Mr. Anderson presented the committee with information on the new Market Development Fund. He said the Council has asked to see and approve of the criteria for evaluating proposals and releasing funds before launching the program.

He said that today he just wanted to introduce the program and provide SWAC members with information on it. He is soliciting questions, which he will answer; he is not seeking a decision or a recommendation. He said the program would be discussed further and decisions requested at the March SWAC meeting.

He said currently \$500,000 has been budgeted for market development uses, with authorization to spend \$250,000 this fiscal year and \$250,000 next fiscal year. The goal of the fund is to provide financial assistance to businesses that are utilizing recycled or reused content in making products. Financial assistance could be targeted to help new businesses start up (perhaps through deferred payment loans), existing businesses to expand (perhaps through low-interest loans) and struggling businesses to survive (perhaps through business retention loans).

Ms. Chaplen commented that some of the potential funding ideas are excellent, but she questioned the funding cycle of once yearly, because that cycle might not coincide with a time when a business is the most needy. Mr. Anderson said her comments were good, and staff might want to be more flexible than once a year.

Mr. Gilbert asked if these grants were geared more toward a manufactured finished product as opposed to manufacturing raw materials. Mr. Anderson said that was staff's initial idea, but he is open to suggestions. He said the idea is utilization to help stabilize markets or prevent crises.

Ms. Keil commented that the City is working with a company working with crumb rubber, which is not necessarily manufacturing a finished product, but providing an intermediate manufacturing service.

Ms. Herrigel asked what examples Metro has of potential partners with which it might work. Mr. Anderson said that without revealing names staff have chatted with non-profits that may not have our focus on recycling, but they are environmentally oriented. Some companies are looking at job creation. We have been talking to banks and other types of agencies with which we share a "social" interest.

Ms. Herrigel suggested using the financial assistance program to encourage the waste reduction initiatives (organics, construction and demolition debris, and commercial). Mr. Anderson said that from the comments he has been receiving both today and in previous conversations that applicants be weighted heavily if they are in line with a stated public purpose, such as the waste reduction initiatives. She asked whether businesses could reapply from year to year. Mr. Anderson said that possibility hadn't been ruled out, but the details of the program remain to be worked out.

Ms. Storz asked whether Metro as a funder has a liability if a business to which it has loaned or granted money fails. Mr. Anderson replied that he has a draft financial instrument that will protect Metro from liability.

Mr. Gilbert commented that he would like to see something that involves new players as opposed to the people that are already sitting at the table.

Ms. Storz suggested that since it is so late in the fiscal year, perhaps the money could be carried over to the following fiscal year and award \$500,000 in the 2000-01 fiscal year.

Mr. Anderson said the fund was set up so that it was possible to carry over funds from year-to-year.

Ms. Keil reiterated Ms. Herrigel's suggestion about focusing financial assistance on the three waste reduction initiatives, but added the suggestion that the focus include businesses that are sustainable, expandable and that handle lots of waste or troublesome waste. Mr. Anderson agreed, and added that he had received an e-mail from a SWAC member who was unable to attend today, stressing the value of using the solid waste hierarchy to target financial assistance

Mr. Schwab asked if this new fund was a replacement for the 1% for Recycling, or in addition to it. Mr. Anderson replied this would replace the 1% for Recycling.

Mr. Lucini asked if this was a "revolving" type fund. Mr. Anderson replied that the fund was set up as a revenue account so that the money used or not would remain in the account. He said for instance, if a loan was to be repaid, it would return to the same account.

Chair Washington asked what the amount of each grant would be? Mr. Anderson explained that in the past some of our grants were so low that low-impact proposals were pretty much guaranteed. He said right now a limit has not been imposed, but if it should become necessary in the future, that would be done. He said we want proposals that will make an impact and if that means loans of \$80,000, we might entertain such loans.

Mr. Gilbert commented that he thought the amount of the fund (\$500,000) is too low and should be increased to \$3 million, because one piece of processing equipment could cost more than the fund contains.

Ms. Keil responded it would give the program more strength if someone were to actually request a larger amount of money and could prove the need and impact on the region's recycling.

Transfer Station Service Plan

Mr. Anderson said that the basic questions that the subcommittee and staff have been working on for some time are, "Does the region need more transfer stations; if so, where should they be located; what kinds of obligations should they have, if any, once they are in the system; what are their roles; and how should they be regulated?"

Mr. Anderson said the recommendation from the subcommittee is to allow new transfer stations, which would not have tonnage limits if they stepped up to at least four basic obligations: Accept all customers, public and private, including public self-haul; accommodate or provide an area for household hazardous waste collection; accept source-separated recycling at no charge; and, provide material recovery – achieving 25% recovery from dry waste.

Mr. Anderson said one of the policy questions that has been asked is, "If we are to do this, how would it happen?" Mr. Anderson said he would like a discussion with the SWAC on the emerging "draft" recommendation as he described it. He said the SWAC would then return to the subject at the March SWAC for further discussion.

Policy Issues/Questions

Minimum recovery rate? How will it work?

Impact on existing facilities? Public response? (Cost per ton at Metro facilities will increase.)

What if a facility cannot meet obligations? (Example: A transfer station is required to accept all users (public and private), but land use regulations don't allow this use.)

Metro fees and taxes? "Front-door"? "Back-door"?

If there are savings, who all should share in benefits?

If there are costs, who all should pay?

Should the number or location of facilities be limited?

REM staff will prepare issue papers for SWAC to review before the next meeting, on the questions of Metro fees and taxes and the benefits of potential cost savings.

Mr. Anderson explained that if additional transfer stations were placed in the region, a tonnage impact on the system facilities would occur, with the biggest impact placed on the public Metro facilities.

Mr. Anderson discussed Metro fees and taxes, frequently referred to as "front door" vs. "back door." He explained this to the newer members to SWAC. If a hauler disposed of waste at a regional disposal site, i.e., Hillsboro Landfill, Metro fees would mean a regional system fee of \$12.90/ton, and excise tax is charged on the tonnage that arrives at that facility. Historically, if you are a recycling facility, you do not have to pay the regional system fees on the waste that comes in the "front door"; however, once material recovery has been accomplished, whatever residual passes through the "back door" has regional system fees assessed on it. Mr. Anderson said this approach worked very well when there was a distinct difference between a disposal site and a recycling site. However, most facilities are now conducting all of these activities under one roof. Mr. Anderson explained he would go into an in-depth discussion of fees at the March SWAC.

Mr. Deaver commented that wet waste was far heavier than dry waste and perhaps Metro should consider volume rather than percentage. Ms. Keil noted that it was true that Metro has historically considered tonnage vs. volume, but as pertains the 25%, we were discussing dry waste, not putrescible (wet) waste.

Mr. Murray commented that many businesses are already taking out so much of the recoverable materials that even getting 25% might prove difficult.

Mr. Irvine echoed Mr. Murray's statement. He said the committee stated the 25% figure as a starting point, but there certainly are no data to support it. However, his company is finding it harder to recover at the high percentage points it once did.

Ms. Keil said that as a member of the committee she believed they viewed draft recommendations as a work in progress. Yes, there are MRFs that are meeting something higher than 25%, and some that are definitely not meeting that percentage, but she believes this is a good number to look at initially, and she is very much interested in placing sanctions on those facilities that do not achieve the 25%.

Mr. Leichner said he is interested in knowing if the criteria described by Mr. Anderson will be open to all players, an even playing field, if you will? Ms. Keil answered she didn't believe the subcommittee had arrived at a conclusion. She said they had not talked about all of the economic issues or land use issues that could have a bearing on barriers to entry.

Mr. Gilbert suggested that whatever the recovery number, it should be an aggressive one in order to stimulate innovative ways to pull materials out of the waste stream before landfilling. He would like to see pressure applied to keep the recycling level increasing in as many ways as can be achieved within the region.

Mr. Winterhalter echoed what Mr. Gilbert suggested, and believed the 25% should apply to a facility's entire disposal, not just the dry side.

Mr. Metzler commented that the measurement has historically always been on just the dry waste.

Mr. White commented that whether Metro would site one or two transfer stations was an issue that was being looked at by a consultant with which Metro is working. He said they are looking at financial impacts on the region. However, he said that politically it may be that the Council would consider siting only two facilities. On the other hand, to keep a level playing field, perhaps the rules should say that anyone that can be found to meet the criteria that Metro sets forth can become a transfer station.

Chair Washington said that staff may have talked to the other two members of the REM Committee, but staff has not talked to him. He said he would never try to speak on behalf of another councilor, and perhaps one of the other councilors has a different opinion, but that he certainly has not made a decision and the committee as a body has not made a decision on this subject.

Mr. Metzler said that it hasn't been determined what it will take to fill the service gaps throughout the region, and if two transfer stations would accomplish that, that is what would be recommended.

Mr. Murray said that the equity issue is of great concern. He said that due to land use issues, he doesn't believe that more than two transfer stations could be sited. He said, on the other hand, if it is determined that two or more are needed to serve the region, the need should be the driving force, not politics.

Ms. Storz said she echoed what Mr. Murray was saying. She wants to be assured that the equity question is still on the table.

Ms. Keil said that Metro doesn't have to be concerned with economic issues. The economics are a private sector issue, and they will decide if the economics work, and Metro doesn't need to tell them how to do this.

Rick Winterhalter said he agreed with some parts of what Sue said.

Mr. Taylor asked how the costs of meeting all of the additional obligations for a newly sited transfer stations would be shared, and how these costs are being dealt with at present?

Mr. Anderson replied that, currently, existing transfer stations do not have to meet all of the obligations that are being proposed, and as to whether or not the existing transfer stations would have to meet these criteria or whether they would be grandfathered is a good question.

Ms. Herrigel asked what the time frame was for getting a proposal through the Council.

Mr. Anderson said that the staff was looking to get information to the REM Committee for a work session, or even open to public for input, and looking for a recommendation from SWAC in March. If this can be achieved, perhaps we can have action from the REM Committee in May.

Mr. Gilbert said that if Metro South or Central are not held to a 25% recovery, he is not sure we should impose a 50,000-ton cap on any new facility.

Mr. Cross (from the gallery) asked Mr. Anderson if the pending litigation would have an impact on this tonnage.

Mr. Anderson replied that it wouldn't have an effect on the study itself and he has no basis for speculating what impact, if any, the lawsuit would have on tonnage.

Ms. Keil commented that the SWAC and the subcommittee need not weigh politics into any conclusions they reach. She said Mr. Washington in particular has asked for our best advice, advice that is not laden with politics. She said the SWAC members need to give the best factual information that they are able.

Mr. Winterhalter suggested that the timeline may be a little too aggressive.

Chair Washington asked the committee members if they agreed with Mr. Winterhalter. The consensus was that it was too aggressive and perhaps it could be scaled back by perhaps a month.

Mr. Taylor asked if there was a discussion of the minimum recovery rate. Mr. Anderson said that on page 5 of the materials provided in the agenda packet, the first issue on the list is minimum recovery rate of 25%. He said the subcommittee and others have identified, as a minimum, what should be accomplished in order to preserve material recovery capacity and hopefully to actually increase capacity. He said a financial analysis is now underway and is focusing on two aspects: The fiscal impact on Metro and how to balance that fiscal impact with system savings. An important element in the analysis is to describe the impact and the needed balance in a way that the Metro Council can make an informed decision.

Mr. Geyer said the fiscal impact study is due three weeks from the date we sign the contract.

Ms. Keil said she believes there should be a minimum recovery rate of 25% on every dry waste facility. She added that she has never understood what capability Lynne has to set a recovery rate for Washington County's low-cost landfill.

Ms. Storz said the landfills have a low recovery rate, but that goes with the low tip fee. You look at operating costs and the return to owner, and one thing the County considers is that return to the owner. The material recovery portion doesn't cost a lot, and doesn't return a lot, so we can't reimburse the owner very much for the recovery part. So the tip fee stays low. This works against material recovery. So, from the material recovery side, we believe that dry waste must be processed before it goes to a landfill. We're not going to get there if we rely on the economics.

Mr. Drennen (from the gallery), a consultant representing Lakeside Landfill, commented that the discussion tends to give the impression that everything that goes out there is dry waste, which isn't the case. There are materials that could be processed, but there is also a lot of construction debris that has been source separated. Also, a great amount of reclamation that at Lakeside, i.e., concrete, pavement, and construction and demolition debris.

Mr. Gilbert said that speaking from the perspective of a dry waste recovery facility, he welcomes a high recovery rate. His concern is the self haulers, and Merle Irvine and Tom Wyatt could back him up in saying that currently more than 50% is recycled. He believes you need to put a high rate on the self haulers.

Mr. Anderson noted that there should be some discussion of a universal recovery rate. He said that maybe one size doesn't fit all, but to keep leakage from happening, all facilities need to have some recovery from dry waste or some type of standard, like Ms. Storz suggested. Mr. Anderson said that leakage is a real possibility, and that to focus on the facility could cause some disincentive to fully source separate upstream.

Mr. Irwin said he believes that if the rate is too high, operators will play games to encourage a mixed load vs. a source-separated load. He said he does not disagree with the 25%.

Mr. Kampfer asked what do we do with those marginal loads? The higher the number, the bigger impact on those loads. The facility can't afford to look at that because they won't be able to look at those loads.

Mr. Borg said he would like to generally comment that in the real world, as a hauler he doesn't have the opportunity to direct his loads to a facility based on the type of generator or recyclability of the waste.

Mr. Gilbert said his facility gets marginal and good loads and has to process both. He has had to come up with more innovative ways to recycle things. He said he agrees to keep to reasonable rate, but not one so low that it fails to stimulate the innovation needed to achieve better recycling of materials that are not being recycled now.

The 10 Percent – Criteria for Evaluating Proposals

Mr. Watkins gave a brief a history of how we got to this point in the procurement process. He said he wanted to discuss criteria; proposed weighting and key issues. Mr. Watkins said he would like a recommendation from SWAC to the Council on the three key issues that will help shape the weighting of the criteria.

He said that up until 1980, most of the waste from the region was going to St. Johns Landfill; and in 1990, Metro signed a contract that allowed 90% of the region's putrescible waste to Columbia Ridge Landfill in Arlington. In 1998, Waste Management, Inc. the owner of the Columbia Ridge Landfill, was bought out, allowing Metro to amend its contract so that the more tons sent from the region to the landfill, the lower the disposal rate charged at Columbia Ridge. Metro believes its disposal rate is competitive. The 10% of the waste not delivered to the Columbia Ridge Landfill equals about 85,000 tons, and in the past, was going to Forest Grove and Riverbend. This allowed a "safety net"; if Metro experienced a disaster in the region, or otherwise could not deliver to Columbia Ridge Landfill, the region would still have a place for disposal.

Mr. Watkins said the weighting on the proposal is proposed as follows:

| <u>Criteria</u> | <u>Weight</u> |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Material recovery | 45% |
| Cost | 35% |
| Develop Facilities | 10% |
| Alt. Transport modes | 10% |
| Competition | 0% |

Key Issues

Should Metro consider proposals that require lifting the cap of 50,000 tons on "direct haul" facilities or grant other facility-specific variances to current regulatory authorization?

Ms. Herrigel said there still needs to be a criteria applied in order to lift the cap. If you lift the cap, you should hold them to a recovery percentage.

Ms. Keil replied that we are talking about wet waste, and 25% recovery just doesn't square for her. She doesn't think it is necessary if your criteria is to split up the cost. The aggregation of the waste will reduce the cost.

Mr. Murray asked if the 85,000 tons (10%) still out the back door? Or maybe facilities could bring in more tonnage -- perhaps 100,000 tons?

Mr. Geyer commented that the 85,000 tons was in the front door.

Mr. Lucini asked: How do you measure that? What are you looking for? Will you have a penalty if the facilities don't achieve the proposed recovery percentage?

Mr. Watkins said the document is still being reviewed by staff and an outside consultant.

Mr. Irvine said you would want to look at proposals on a case-by-case basis. He doesn't believe you should put a 50,000-ton cap on it.

Mr. Watkins asked whether the committee was proposing we do away with the 50,000-ton cap?

Mr. Misovetz commented that if you lift the cap, he would suggest giving zero weight to trucking. There's an area in the 185th corridor that needs service; the procurement needs to request or specify that if that corridor isn't serviced, other restrictions could be made.

Ms. Herrigel agreed that trucking is not an alternative.

It was the consensus of the committee that transportation be given zero weight, and the 50,000-ton cap not be imposed.

The meeting was adjourned.

clk

S: SHARE Dept SWAC MINUTES 20000223SWAC.mln

Agenda Item No. IV
CONTINUATION: Transfer Station Service Plan Discussion
Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Wednesday, March 22, 2000

Transfer Station Service Plan Agenda Item No. IV
Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee
March 22, 2000

Introduction

This agenda item continues SWAC's discussion of policy issues that need resolution before the Transfer Station Service Plan can be completed. Readers are encouraged to review the background materials provided for last month's meeting.

The purposes of this agenda item remain: (1) Introduce and describe major policy issues that are emerging in the discussion about new transfer stations; (2) Initiate a dialogue with SWAC on these issues; (3) Begin to develop recommendations on these issues.

At February meeting, SWAC members asked that Council provide more time to complete this project. In response, the Council has agreed to move its target date for hearing the Transfer Station Service Plan ahead to June 2000.

Policy Questions

Last month, the following list of policy questions were introduced. Issue papers have been provided on the balance of the questions this month.

1. Will the minimum recovery rate standard meet stated objectives?
2. Facilities are required to take all customers.
3. Should an existing facility become a full-service transfer station if it cannot fully meet public obligations of a regional transfer station? (For example, due to local land use constraints, or if meeting the obligation is not demonstrably cost-effective.)
4. What is the impact on existing facilities' tonnage and customers? If there is an impact, should there be a public response?
5. If efficiencies and savings are realized, who should share in the benefits?
6. What fees and taxes should be paid, and how should they be imposed?
7. Is it in the public interest to limit the number and/or location of new transfer stations?
Note: no issue paper is provided on this question. as it will be discussed at the meeting of the subcommittee on March 16, and the materials will not be ready in time for mailing of the SWAC agenda packet.

Process

- ☐ Metro staff will introduce each issue and present background.
- ☐ Staff will lead SWAC discussions on each of the policy questions.
- ☐ SWAC will move toward recommendations on these issues.
- ☐ SWAC should treat the emerging recommendation as a draft, subject to modifications, additions, and deletions as it works through the issues.

Issue No. 1
Minimum Recovery Rate
(Incorporating Comments from the February SWAC)

Summary

Facilities that are authorized to (1) accept putrescible waste and (2) dispose of more than 50,000 tons per year, must demonstrably recover at least 25% (by weight) of their incoming non-putrescible waste streams. This is a new obligation of “big” facilities that would be added to the list of obligations currently in Metro Code Chapter 5.01.

Objectives

- ☐ Preserve material recovery capacity.
- ☐ Increase actual recovery of material.

Draft recommendation:

Transfer stations shall recover a minimum of 25% by weight from non-putrescible waste and waste delivered by public customers delivered to the transfer station

SWAC comments 2/23/00:

- ◆ In order to make this work, we need region-wide standards. This would mean minimum recovery rates on all facilities.
- ◆ Another option: require that all loads of construction and demolition waste be processed before being landfilled. Perhaps this requirement could be extended to all dry loads in the future.
- ◆ Disposal bans on selected materials would provide “teeth” to enforcing either option.

Issues and concerns:

Will this requirement meet the stated objectives? Considerations:

- ☐ *Leakage to landfills.* There are several low-cost alternative disposal sites within the region that compete for waste with transfer stations (examples: Hillsboro Landfill and Lakeside Reclamation). These facilities are not required to meet any minimum recovery rate. How can the stated policy objectives be effective in this situation?
- ☐ *Leakage to Material Recovery Facilities (MRFs).* Solid waste facilities that handle dry waste exclusively are not currently bound by minimum recovery standards. Should the 25% (or higher) requirement be imposed on material recovery facilities as well?
- ☐ *Impact on source-separation.* A minimum recovery rate might work against upstream recycling. The need for a “material-rich” waste stream at the facility might reduce the incentive to service source-separation programs.

SWAC comments 2/23/00:

- ◆ The 25% level was chosen to provide a good balance between a meaningful number, something that’s achievable by the facility, and yet is not enough to provide any disincentive for source-separated programs.

Issue No. 2
Requirement to Accept all Users
(Incorporating Comments from the February SWAC)

Summary

Require that “big” facilities accept all customers. To help meet local needs, hours of operation would be specified in Metro Code.

Objectives

- ❑ Improve service levels for users located at a distance from existing stations
- ❑ Maintain or improve service levels at existing stations

Draft Recommendation:

Affirm Metro Code 5.01.125(c)(1): transfer stations shall accept authorized solid waste originating within the Metro boundary from any person who delivers authorized waste to the facility. Establish that hours of operation shall be at least 8am to 5pm, 6 days per week.

SWAC comments 2/23/00:

- ◆ The subcommittee has discussed this, and the recommendation seems reasonable.
- ◆ REM staff needs to develop a recommendation on a course of action if external constraints prevent a facility from accepting the public—for example, land use.

Issues and concerns

- ❑ Are objectives better met by setting a specifying the hours of operation, vs. tailoring to local demand via performance measures. Given that this obligation is identified as a “public service,” who bears the cost if local demand is insufficient to bear the cost?
- ❑ Should an existing facility be denied “large” status if this obligation cannot be fully met? (For example, if not allowed due to local land use constraints)

Questions for Discussion

What policy will meet objectives?

What additional information do you need to help make a decision?

Issue No. 3
Inability to Meet all Public Obligations
March 22, 2000

Background and Summary

The *Regional Solid Waste Management Plan* recommends that the region capitalize on sunk investment in existing solid waste facilities before attempting to site new transfer stations. The emerging recommendation defines “transfer stations” as full-service facilities—accepting all customers, accommodating hazardous waste collection, performing material recovery and providing a recycling drop site. What should be the response if an existing facility cannot fully meet some of public obligations of a regional transfer station?

Objectives

- ☐ Provide public services throughout the region to improve accessibility
- ☐ Reduce reliance on the public sector for provision of these services.

Do you agree with these objectives?

Are there others you would add?

Draft Recommendation:

None. This issue remains under discussion.

Issues and options

- ☐ Should granting transfer station status be absolute; that is, only if all public obligations can be met?
- ☐ Could transfer station status be granted if a facility owner is able to propose and commit to an alternative delivery of service that meets the objectives?
- ☐ Should the full-service requirement be adopted only upon a showing of local need?
- ☐ Should the full-service policy hold for new facilities, but that consideration be granted to existing facilities?
- ☐ Could variances from the requirements be available upon a demonstration that external constraints prevent delivery of the service? For example, due to local land use, or if meeting the obligation is not demonstrably cost-effective.

Questions for Discussion

What options will meet objectives?

What additional information do you need to help make a decision?

Issue No. 4
Impact on Existing Facilities
(Incorporating Comments from the February SWAC)

Summary

Many existing facilities are likely to lose waste flow—in particular, the public facilities and non-vertically integrated private facilities.

Objectives

- ❑ “Protect competition, not competitors.”
(...a conventional tenet of economic regulation theory)
- ❑ Maintain the integrity of public facilities.
Do you agree with these objectives?
Are there others you would add?

Draft Recommendation:

None. This issue remains under discussion.

Issues and questions

- ❑ Should the public purpose serve to protect sunk investment in solid waste facilities?
- ❑ Or should the public purpose foster a competitive environment for solid waste facilities?
- ❑ Finally, should there be a difference in public policy toward private facilities and public facilities, given (in part) that the latter serve as disposal sites of “last resort”?

SWAC comments 2/23/00:

- ◆ Not sure if we have enough of a competitive environment any more to rely on competitive motives to realize our policies.

Questions for Discussion

What policy will meet objectives?

What additional information do you need to make a decision?

Issue No. 5
Beneficiaries of Savings?
March 22, 2000

Background

Metro's decision to approve new private transfer stations will be based primarily on the realization of savings—due to collection efficiencies and economies of scale, for example.

However, the approval of new transfer stations will cause Metro's unit costs to rise.

Preliminary analysis shows that the savings in the non-Metro portion of the system are greater than the losses at Metro.

Therefore, it appears that the solid waste system will net out at a lower operating cost if Metro approves new private transfer stations.

REM staff will be asked to identify who all will share in the benefits of these efficiencies and savings.

Objectives

- ☐ Decisions on facilities must be efficient for the whole system
- ☐ Cost savings primarily benefit the ratepayer

Do you agree with these objectives?

Are there others you would add?

Draft Recommendation:

None. This issue remains under discussion.

Issues and questions

- ☐ Will the local rate-setting process pick up the savings for the ratepayer? Under what conditions will the ratepayer see savings? Under what conditions won't they?
- ☐ How much of the net savings will be absorbed by the requirement to provide the public obligations (e.g., hazardous waste, material recovery, etc.)
- ☐ Should Metro consider a change in its rate model to decrease the impact on customers who continue to use the public transfer stations?
- ☐ How much (0 to 100%) of the savings should the facility owner be able to realize?

Questions for Discussion

What policy will meet objectives?

What additional information do you need to make a decision?

Issue No. 6
Metro Solid Waste Fees and Excise Tax
March 22, 2000

Summary

Metro Council is concerned with (1) the increasing complexity of Metro's system for levying solid waste fees and excise tax, and (2) whether the revenue system is aligned with key policy objectives to the fullest possible extent. The Council has identified a simple option for levying fees and excise tax, and has asked REM to solicit feedback from stakeholders on this option.

Background

Metro Solid Waste Fees and Excise Taxes

Metro levies 3 main fees or taxes on solid waste:

1. A Regional System Fee (RSF) on all waste that is landfilled. The RSF funds solid waste programs that serve a regional constituency or implement a mandate (recycling, hazardous waste, regulatory & enforcement functions, etc.). The RSF is currently \$12.90 per ton.
2. An excise tax on regional disposal enterprises. The excise tax goes into Metro's General Fund to help pay for the costs of general government (not solid waste programs). The solid waste excise tax is currently 8.5% of enterprise revenue.
3. The Metro Tip Fee, a user charge at Metro transfer stations that covers the cost of disposal services. The tip fee is currently \$62.50 per ton, which includes the RSF and excise tax equivalent to about \$5 per ton.

The RSF and excise tax are levied on all regional waste, while the Metro tip fee is charged only at Metro transfer stations.

How the Fees and Taxes are Levied; Exemption Policies

The RSF and excise tax are levied only at disposal sites (transfer stations and landfills). Around the region, this policy is conventionally termed "charging at the front door."

Recovery facilities (MRFs and composting sites) are exempt from levying Metro fees and taxes on wastes accepted at the facility, but incur these fees on any processing residual that is landfilled. Around the region, this policy is conventionally termed "charging out the back door."

The primary purpose of the exemption on recovery facilities is to support recycling. By exempting fees and taxes on deliveries, Metro avoids taxing recyclable materials.

The Increasing Complexity of the Revenue System

The old distinction between disposal sites and recovery sites has become blurred as many facilities now perform multiple activities under one roof—wet waste transfer, material recovery, etc.

As these distinctions have blurred, so too has the basis for exempting or not exempting a facility from Metro fees and taxes.

As a matter of practicality, Metro has extended exemptions to the new “hybrid” facilities—Pride Recycling, Recycle America and WRI—even as wet waste disposal has become a major component of their business. On the other hand, Metro Central remains a “front door” facility despite many elements in common with the private “hybrids.”

To make this exemption work for the hybrid facilities, the system has become administratively complex. Facilities must track wet, dry, special and source-separated incoming waste streams; and also track outgoing wet, MRF residual and recovery. At least four different rates or taxes apply to these various waste streams. Furthermore, these facilities are also eligible for fee credits against certain waste streams.

In all of this, Metro Council has observed that the original policy objective—a simple system that exempts recycling from taxation—has become lost. Accordingly, The REM Committee of the Metro Council has given the following direction to the department.

Directions from the REM Committee of the Metro Council

- ❑ Simplify the system
- ❑ Align rates with waste reduction goals
- ❑ Raise the necessary revenue
- ❑ Work with stakeholders to identify other policy objectives

An Option from Metro Council

The REM Committee has identified some key elements that they would like to consider in any revision of the solid waste revenue system. The Council has directed staff to obtain comments from SWAC on the effect of the following changes, if implemented. SWAC is encourage to provide any changes or modifications that best achieve the objectives.

The following elements are intended to frame a discussion only:

- ❑ Levy fees and taxes on waste destined for a landfill only.
(that is, fees and taxes are universally levied on waste “out the back door” rather than a mix, as now)
- ❑ Convert the excise tax to a per-ton rate.
- ❑ Set the fees and taxes to raise an identified amount of revenue.
(about \$5.7 million for the General Fund and about \$15.9 million for the solid waste fund, based on preliminary budget proposals for the next fiscal year)
- ❑ Set one rate, regardless of the type of waste.

The first point is a new approach to fees and taxes. The last three points mean that the excise tax would be calculated in the same manner as the Regional System Fee.

Performance of the Option on Policy Objectives

- ❑ **Simplify the system**
Conversion of the excise tax to a per-ton rate, always levied on “out the back door” tonnage, is clearly a simpler system.
- ❑ **Align rates with waste reduction goals**
A single per-ton rate will reduce the tax on putrescible waste, and raise the tax on dry waste, compared to current effective tax rates. A higher tax on dry waste (the more recoverable waste stream) provides more of an economic incentive to recover. Also, removing the tax from any “front door” facility that in fact performs material recovery would remove the tax from recyclables.
- ❑ **Raise the necessary revenue**
The rates would be based on budget requirements and tonnage projections. Tip fees would not enter into the calculation, as they do now, when the tax is based on a percentage of the transaction cost. As a result, excise tax collections would no longer automatically benefit from general inflation.
- ❑ **Work with stakeholders to identify other policy objectives**
This discussion at SWAC is the first opportunity to react directly to Metro Councilors on the outline above.

Questions for Discussion

What policy will meet stated objectives?

Are there other objectives you would add?

What are the effects on various components of the disposal system?

What additional information do you need?

Agenda Item No. V

RECOMMENDATION: Partnership Plan for Waste Reduction
Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Wednesday, March 22, 2000

DRAFT
Year 11 (FY 2000-01)
Metro and Local Government Partnership Plan for
Waste Reduction

December 22, 1999

Overview:

The recent State of the Plan Report for the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) evaluated the region's progress toward its waste reduction goals. Findings indicated that the region is well on track with regard to residential recycling programs, but is lagging behind in other critical areas. The report recommends a new and focused approach to cooperative waste reduction activities in the region and continued support and maintenance of our existing programs.

In rethinking the manner in which we plan and implement programs, Metro, DEQ and local government partners chose to take a true team-oriented approach to developing new programs and initiatives. Intergovernmental work groups were formed to plan the new strategies and will implement and measure these new strategies as a team—a truly regional approach. Local jurisdictions and Metro will continue to maintain and report on independent activities as well.

This plan brings together three integral pieces of the region's waste reduction and recycling system: New and focused efforts to recover more from the commercial, construction/demolition debris (C&D) and organics sectors; continuation of competitive grants for innovative waste reduction programs; and the maintenance of programs that form the foundation of the region's recycling infrastructure.

Plan Structure and Format:

The Year 11 Partnership Plan is divided into the following three program areas:

- Part I: New Initiatives in Commercial, C&D, and Organics
- Part II: Targeted Competitive Grant Program
- Part III: Maintenance Programs

Part I introduces three focus areas to the Partnership Plan: Commercial, C&D, and commercial organics. These new initiatives form the core of the work and activities to be implemented in the region. Each of the three programs was identified as lagging in recovery levels necessitating intensive, focused planning and implementation efforts over the next few years.

Part II provides competitive grant funds and a structure to target RSWMP practices that are not otherwise addressed in other program plans and for which other sources of funding are not available. This portion of the program also seeks to support creative methods for addressing solid waste issues. Each year, an area or areas of focus will be developed based upon targeted needs or regional priorities.

Part III tracks the established programs in the region that must be continually maintained by local government and Metro services. These programs form the foundation of the region's waste reduction and recycling system and include single and multi-family residential recycling services, regular outreach and education to all residents and businesses, school education programs, commercial recycling, household hazardous waste education and outreach, home composting programs, construction and demolition debris outreach and regional planning support.

Annual Work Plan Development and Approval Process Schedule:

The public input process and program plan development schedule are incorporated into the Year 11 Annual Plan as "Appendix A".

Link to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Recommended Practices:

The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan presents a set of recommended solid waste management practices designed to meet the overall goal of the RSWMP: Continue to develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Plan that achieves a regionally balanced, environmentally sound and publicly acceptable solid waste system. The recommended practices embody six broad integrated strategies:

- Invest in waste reduction before building additional transfer and disposal capacity.
- Expand the opportunity to recycle.
- Emphasize the waste reduction hierarchy.
- Maintain flexibility and encourage innovation.
- Set interim target dates, define roles and responsibilities, and focus on implementation issues.
- Advance cost-effective practices for managing the region's waste.

The RSWMP-recommended practices were developed for particular areas of the solid waste system: Residential waste reduction, business waste reduction, building industries waste reduction, solid waste facilities regulation and siting, and transfer and disposal facilities.

Specific activities in this annual partnership plan will be tied to the recommended practices through the annual State of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Report published by Metro at the end of each calendar year. The Year 11 Partnership Plan addresses all areas of the RSWMP recommended practices through maintenance of established programs, a new emphasis on commercial waste reduction and recycling, construction & demolition debris recovery, and commercial organic waste reduction and recovery.

Measurement of Progress:

Each of the three sections in this partnership plan for waste reduction has an independent progress measurement and reporting scenario tied to the specific tasks involved. At the end of fiscal 2000-01, progress reports for each section will be produced independently. These reports, combined with other important measures such as the State of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Report and the Annual DEQ Recycling and Recovery Report will be combined and used to assess regional waste reduction and recycling progress.

Part I: New Initiatives in Commercial, C&D and Organics

Overview:

The recent State of the Plan Report for the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, which evaluated the region's progress toward its waste reduction goals, indicated a need for new initiatives in three solid waste program areas. The need for new initiatives is predicated on the following issues:

- The recovery rate for the region has stalled, at about 43 percent.
- The easily accessible material in the waste stream has been recovered. Progress in retrieving additional recoverable materials will be much more difficult and more costly.
- Waste generation, fueled by a strong regional economy, has grown over the past years. This means that in order to meet our waste reduction goals, even higher amounts of recyclable and compostable materials must be diverted from disposal than earlier anticipated.
- Recovery from the commercial, organics, and construction and demolition sectors is lagging behind the residential sector, where recovery is strong and steady.
- Declining tip fees further complicate the recovery of materials from lagging sectors.

In December of 1998, a group of Metro and local government solid waste managers convened to address the issue of the region's stalled recovery rate and the need for new efforts in certain targeted sectors. As a result, three work teams comprised of Metro, local government and DEQ staff were formed to develop new strategies and initiatives in the commercial, construction & demolition debris, and commercial organics sectors. The teams' objectives included:

- Development of a new approach to the waste reduction planning process that results in unified, measurable, accountable and targeted work plans.
- Increase regional recovery by concentrating on the lagging sectors of commercial, organics, and construction and demolition (while continuing to support existing strong recovery from the residential sector.)

- Identify areas within these lagging sectors on which to focus cooperative waste reduction activities.
- Identify emerging issues in waste reduction planning that may need special attention; e.g., co-collection.
- Integrate the results of new initiatives into the State of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Report, DEQ Waste Composition Study and other recycling and solid waste data and studies.
- Determine the resources required for these new initiatives and measurement/reporting activities.
- Regular evaluation of the focus areas to ensure they remain relevant.

New Initiatives Program Plan, Administration and Timeline:

Each of the three work teams convened in June 1999 and independently developed three-year work plans for their respective focus areas. An overview of the work plans is presented below. The complete three-year plans are included with this plan as Appendix "B".

Commercial:

In order to reach regional recovery goals, the region needs to have recovered an additional 168,000 tons of commercial recyclables between the baseline year of 1995 and the target year of 2000. To meet this goal, about half of the available recyclable paper (including OCC), containers and scrap metal remaining in commercial waste would need to be captured.

Of the 20 actions identified by the Task Force, seven received a ranking greater than three on a five-point scale. These seven actions comprise the plan recommendations that follow. (Actions are listed in order of decreasing priority.)

1. *Market development:* Increase market development efforts, both regionally through Metro and statewide through the Oregon Market Development Council. Develop markets for new materials and local markets for recycled feedstock that might offer higher scrap prices.
2. *Assess disposal bans for selected materials:* This proposal needs greater review by stakeholders, including haulers, private recycling collectors, processors, markets, disposal facilities, businesses and the public. In particular, issues such as enforcement, market price impact and flow control need to be reviewed.
3. *Expand local governments' technical assistance to businesses on waste prevention, buy recycled and recycling:* The current technical assistance program of waste evaluations needs to be assessed for its effectiveness in increasing recovery tonnage. Data collection for future technical assistance programs needs to be standardized by local governments to allow easier monitoring. Staffing needs to be increased to provide greater follow ups at each business and to expand the number of targeted businesses.
4. *Implement design review ordinances for recycling collection areas in new buildings:* Some local governments have adopted an ordinance, but do not have

dedicated staffing to monitor submitted plans and compliance. Adoption of an ordinance and adequate staffing are needed to ensure that new construction in the region will have adequate recycling space to enable full participation in reaching the region's recycling goals.

5. *Promote commingling:* Mass media outreach programs were not generally seen as effective in reaching businesses as they are in reaching households. However, the development of commingled collection and processing capacity in the region was seen as an important shift in how recycling service was provided. Awareness of this new service level would be especially important to businesses facing space and resource limitations in implementing new or expanded recycling collection. In this case, a regional media outreach program was thought to be effective.
6. *Target outreach to promote waste prevention:* Specific outreach campaigns and technical assistance should target activities (such as double-sided copying) and packaging (reusable transport packaging) that increase waste prevention. Specific campaigns offer the greatest likelihood of implementing an evaluation system.
7. *Review regional commingled processing capacity:* Ensure the region has adequate commingled processing capacity for commercial recycling with equitable access by the region's collectors. Make certain these facilities are capable of meeting high standards for material quality.

Construction & Demolition Debris:

According to the revised RSWMP recovery rates, the region must recover 130,000 tons of C&D debris in order to meet its established goals. The Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery plan is composed of three tracks, designed to increase recycling and recovery in all sectors of the construction industry while adhering to the solid waste hierarchy of reduce, reuse, recycle, recover, landfill.

The first track emphasizes waste prevention through salvage and deconstruction. This practice has proven to be an effective way to prevent one of the largest sources of C&D waste, demolition waste, from entering the waste stream. As less undeveloped land is available, demolition will become an increasingly common activity in the future.

The second track focuses on ways to increase diversion through programs at material recovery facilities, dry waste landfills or transfer stations. The objective is to ensure that either source-separated recycling or effective post-collection recovery is available to all sectors of the C&D industry. An important component of these efforts will focus on educating the C&D industry about the different source-separated and post collection recovery service options available for construction and demolition activities. There are four components to Track 2:

- A. Promotion and education targeting C&D generators on source separated recycling methods and how to take advantage of post-collection recovery options.

- B. Recycling requirements: Require that certain C&D loads be processed before disposal. *(An extended stakeholder process will be undertaken before proceeding with this recommendation.)*
- C. Recycling Requirements: Ban the disposal of certain materials commonly found in C&D waste loads. *(An extended stakeholder process will be undertaken before proceeding with this recommendation.)*
- D. Create incentives through the Metro System Fee Credit Program for post collection recovery facilities to increase their recovery of recyclables from C&D loads.

The third track implements a market development program to target reuse and recycling of the materials prevalent in the C&D waste stream (wood, drywall, composition roofing and fiberglass insulation). The current markets for these materials are undeveloped, which represents a major barrier to reusing or recycling these materials.

Commercial Organics:

According to the revised RSWMP recovery rates, the region must recover 52,000 tons of organic waste in order to meet its established goals. This plan is designed to guide the region in the direction of increased recovery while adhering to the solid waste hierarchy of reduce, reuse, recycle, recover, compost, landfill.

This plan takes a two-track approach to organic waste management. The first track emphasizes waste prevention, donation and diversion. This is considered to be a least-cost approach, since preventing the generation of the material in the first place removes the need to manage it as a waste product. Donation is the highest end-use of food that is produced, and diversion to animal feed is the next step down in the hierarchy. Each of these approaches can be implemented in a relatively rapid fashion in that an existing infrastructure is present in the region, and outreach materials may be produced with short turnaround. While the food donation infrastructure does exist, some assistance and support will be necessary to enhance capacity to accommodate new and increasing flow of material.

The second track focuses on developing a processing system to accommodate organic waste that cannot be diverted to higher-end uses. Every effort will be made to utilize existing infrastructure and tailor generator and collection programs to fit within existing operations and regulatory systems.

Several pilot projects will be initiated within the next 18 to 24 months to determine the economic feasibility of a regional organics collection and processing system. If the pilots prove successful, the Regional Organics Team will move rapidly towards the development of a permanent collection and processing infrastructure. If the pilots prove that organic waste collection and processing are not economically feasible in the current solid waste environment, only Track 1 programs will be fully implemented and the group will revisit the issue at a later date. The decision to develop permanent collection and processing facilities is contingent upon economic feasibility. If feasible, and the

program determines that public participation is required to leverage processing capacity, then we may face a large, lump-sum budget request within the next two to three years.

During the first three years, the team has chosen to target efforts towards large organics-rich businesses and industries. These targeted businesses are:

- Large retail grocery stores
- Large restaurants
- Hotels
- Institutional cafeterias*
- Produce wholesale warehouses

(*Institutional cafeterias include food service operations in schools and universities, hospitals, large office buildings, corporate campuses, prisons, etc.)

Program Administration and Reporting:

Because these new initiatives require the work and the support of all regional partners, the day-to-day administration of the various tasks in the Commercial, C&D and Organics programs will be managed by the respective regional intergovernmental work teams that developed these plans. Individual team members will be assigned oversight of particular pieces of the plans, and will be responsible for reporting back to the team when they meet on an ad-hoc basis. Each work team will give a regular update at the monthly Local Government Recycling Coordinators Meeting and will solicit feedback from the group as well as inform the group of progress being made. Data collection, measurement and year-end progress reports will be the responsibility of the work teams. As part of the overall Year 11 Program Plan, each work team will be responsible for production of a year-end report on the progress made in the region.

Part II: Targeted Competitive Grant Program

Overview:

The competitive grant program is designed to supplement the program funding available through the Partnership Program. These grants are intended to assist local jurisdictions in targeting the RSWMP practices that are not addressed in other program plans, and for which other sources of funding are not available. This program also seeks to support creative methods for addressing solid waste issues.

Format and Structure:

Each year, Metro will specify focus area(s) or target(s) for this competitive grant program based upon RSWMP needs and priorities. Applicants will have the choice to:

- 1) Submit a proposal in the focus area(s), **OR**
- 2) Propose a project outside the focus area(s) and demonstrate that there is a true need for this approach that is not being addressed through new initiatives,

maintenance programs or other means. Alternative programs must also demonstrate that they contribute to meeting RSWMP goals.

Local jurisdictions interested in this program must submit an application for funds using a standardized form provided by Metro. Applications must include:

- A clear goal statement,
- A clear justification of need,
- A specific dollar amount requested,
- Concise and meaningful measurement tools and methods, and
- A description of intended results.

Applications must identify the specific practices of the RSWMP to which the funds will be applied, demonstrate clear benefits to the region, and should be transferable to other jurisdictions.

Local jurisdictions are required to provide at least a 50% match to funds requested. This match may be dollars, materials, in-kind services or a combination of these. Applicants are encouraged to cooperate or develop formal partnerships with nonprofit, volunteer agencies, business associations, chambers of commerce or other groups. In-kind matches may be provided in part by some or all partners.

Reporting:

A 90-day progress report as well as a final report due 30 days from the completion of the project must be submitted to Metro. Reports must demonstrate how the project has met the stated criteria and the impacts the project has had to the prevention, recycling and recovery of waste in the region.

Part III: Maintenance of Existing Programs

Overview:

Part III of the Partnership for Waste Reduction focuses on the maintenance of existing and established local and regional waste reduction and recycling programs. Significant progress in waste reduction and recycling has been made over past years through these existing programs. In order to maintain these successes, established programs must continue to be funded, staffed and maintained at the same time that new initiatives are introduced.

Maintenance Program Plan Format, Structure and Timeline:

The Maintenance Program format is intentionally simple and straightforward. Local governments and Metro will each complete the attached chart, detailing the outreach,

education and collection programs currently implemented and the efforts each will engage in to maintain these programs. This will provide a comprehensive regional picture of the existing programs implemented and maintained by local governments and Metro.

The reporting section is to be completed at the end of the fiscal year and submitted to Metro no later than August 1, 2001. This section will detail each task's actual implementation date, as well as relevant status reports, changes and noted results. The reporting section will serve as the basis for integrating existing program status and progress into the recommended practices of the RSWMP, as well as the required annual reporting to the Department of Environmental Quality.

Compliance with State Law and the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan:

All regional partners will continue to be required to comply with the provisions set forth in State Law (OAR 340-90-040) in addition to the tasks listed in the RSWMP. Metro will be the reporting agency for the region's three county area. Metro will also assume responsibility for integrating maintenance programs into the recommended practices set forth in the RSWMP. This integration will be illustrated in the Annual State of the Plan Report section titled Implementation Status of Recommended Practices.

Annual Allocation:

As in past years, the funding assistance provided to local jurisdictions for the maintenance of existing programs is allocated on a per-capita basis. Each jurisdiction receives an allocation based upon its percent of the region's total population.

The FY 2000-01 allocation for the City/County of _____ equals \$ _____. This represents _____% of the overall City/County solid waste and recycling budget.

Program Overview Narrative:

This section of the Plan provides a more descriptive and encompassing overview of maintenance programs. Local governments and Metro will each provide a short annual narrative describing the gamut of programs and the principles behind them.

PLANNED MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000-01

The Program Plan Table is divided into two sections: Planning and Reporting. The planning section lists program areas under the header marked "Tasks" which are to be completed in detail by Metro and local governments. All outreach, education, collection and other existing program efforts are to be listed under each task area with an associated implementation date noted under the heading "Planned Date." The section header "R/WP/B" identifies whether this particular program or activity is primarily recycling (R), waste prevention (WP) or both (B). This notation is to assist Metro in the collection of data for reporting to the Department of Environmental Quality on the region's waste prevention activities. The completed planning section of the table is due to Metro no later than June 1, 2000.

| PLANNING | | | REPORTING | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Tasks | Planned Date | R/WP/B | Implemented Date | Implementation Status/Results |
| Residential | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| Multifamily | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| Home Composting | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| Commercial | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| Construction & Demolition | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| Household Hazardous Waste | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| Regional Planning Support | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| School Outreach and Education | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |

Appendix A

Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Metro and Local Government Partnership Plan for Waste Reduction

PLAN DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

| Timeline | Annual Work Plan Process |
|----------------------------|--|
| September 30, 1999 | Metro and local government targeted sector work teams (Organics, C&D, Commercial) complete draft plans and associated budgets. |
| October 30, 1999 | Targeted sector plans and existing program maintenance plans combined and refined to create overall 2-3 year approach outline. Fiscal Year 2000-01 presented in a more detailed fashion. |
| December 30, 1999 | Draft overall framework developed by Metro and local government staff. Version 1 ready for public involvement process. |
| January – March 2000 | Regional public involvement: Public Comment and Metro SWAC review of drafts REMCOM Work session on drafts REMCOM public hearing on final version |
| March – April 2000 | Council approval process: Metro Council consideration and adoption. |
| April - May 2000 | Local and Regional Public Involvement: Local SWAC and other public involvement Metro budget hearings Local government budget hearings |
| June 1, 2000 | Local Government Participation Commitment Agreements Drafted |
| PLAN IMPLEMENTATION | |
| July 1 | Start of Fiscal Year - Implementation begins |
| Nov. 30 | Intergovernmental agreements for grant funding approved and funds distributed to local governments to support the maintenance of existing programs. |
| PROGRESS REPORTING | |
| Aug. 1 | Local government and Metro assess progress. |
| Nov. 30 | Metro publishes annual "State of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan" status report for the previous fiscal year period |

\\mrc-files\files\oldnet\metro1\rem\share\wr&ovmchall\year 11\draft yr 11 plan.doc

Appendix B

New Initiatives in Waste Reduction Draft 3-Year Plans

- **Commercial Organic Waste Recovery**
- **Construction & Demolition Debris Recovery**
- **Commercial Waste Reduction and Recycling**

DRAFT

Commercial Organics Work Plan November 15, 1999

Overview: According to the revised Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) recovery rates, the region must recover 52,000 tons of organic waste in order to meet its established goals. This plan, cooperatively developed by the Regional Organics Work Team comprised of Metro, DEQ and local government staff, is designed to guide the region in the direction of increased recovery while adhering to the solid waste hierarchy of reduce, reuse, recycle, recover, compost, landfill.

This plan takes a two-track approach to organic waste management. The first track emphasizes waste prevention, donation and diversion. This is considered to be a least-cost approach as preventing the generation of the material in the first place removes the need to manage it as a waste product; donation is the highest end-use of food that is produced, and diversion to animal feed is the next step down in the hierarchy. Each of these approaches can be implemented in a relatively rapid fashion in that an existing infrastructure is present in the region, and outreach materials may be produced with short turnaround. While the food donation infrastructure does exist, some assistance and support will be necessary to enhance capacity to accommodate a new and increased flow of material.

The second track focuses on developing a processing system to accommodate organic waste that cannot be diverted to higher-end uses. Every effort will be made to utilize existing infrastructure and tailor generator and collection programs to fit within existing operations and regulatory systems. Several pilot projects will be initiated within the next 18 to 24 months to determine the economic feasibility of a regional organics collection and processing system. If the pilots prove successful, the Regional Organics Team will move rapidly towards the development of a permanent collection and processing infrastructure. If the pilots prove that organic waste collection and processing are not economically feasible in the current solid waste environment, only Track 1 programs will be fully implemented, and the group will revisit the issue at a later date. The decision to develop permanent collection and processing facilities is contingent upon economic feasibility. If feasible, and the program determines that public participation is required to leverage processing capacity, then we may face a large, lump-sum budget request within the next two to three years.

A series of outreach efforts with a global message to the general public about the regional organic waste efforts will be planned for roll-out once programs are implemented. It is unknown what the specific concept or costs of such efforts will be at this time as they are dependent on the extent of the programs implemented. Additional funds to cover this effort will be proposed in future budget requests.

The following draft plan provides the details and the accompanying resources needed for the immediate implementation of a regional organic waste management plan. During the first three years, the team has chosen to target efforts towards large organics-rich businesses and industries. These targeted businesses are:

- Large retail grocery stores
- Large restaurants
- Hotels
- Institutional cafeterias*
- Produce wholesale warehouses

(*Institutional cafeterias include food service operations in schools and universities, hospitals, large office buildings, corporate campuses, prisons, etc.)

While this plan focuses on the commercial sector, the team may address the possibility of a residential plan in the future. At this time, however, the team feels that the commercial sector has the majority of clean, accessible and recoverable food wastes.

Organics Work Team Members:

- Jennifer Erickson, Metro
- Judy Crockett, City of Portland
- Wendy Fisher, Washington County
- John Foseid, Metro
- Matt Korot, City of Gresham
- Martine Roberts-Pillon, DEQ
- Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County

TRACK 1: WASTE PREVENTION, DONATION AND DIVERSION

Develop focused outreach and education programs for targeted food-intensive businesses to increase waste prevention, donation and diversion practices.

| A. Waste Prevention | FTE | 1999-00 Budget | 2000-01 Budget | 2001-02 Budget |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Research and development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research nature of each targeted business category to determine most suitable entry point for effective waste prevention messages. Determine number and location of each targeted business within the region. Research current methods used for information dissemination within each industry (professional or industry organizations, etc.) Research existing outreach and educational materials developed for use in targeted industries. | 0.16 Intern | \$5,000 | 0 | 0 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop partnerships with industry associations to create suitable and effective outreach messages, appropriate outreach methods, and to lend credence to the program (seek out sponsorships or endorsements.) | Organics Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Develop focused outreach and education on waste prevention coupled with on-site assistance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize research results and existing materials currently in use in the region to tailor specific materials for production. | Organics Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop effective outreach tools and methods based on results of research. (design and printing) | Contract or Metro | \$25,000 | 0 | \$2,000 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop distribution plan for materials developed. | Organics Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire temporary staff to distribute materials, provide on-site assistance, coordinate contacts with business groups, provide presentations, provide feedback to Regional Organics Team for future program changes. (total 8,000 hours = 16-20 hours per targeted business) | 2.0* | 0 | \$81,000 | \$81,000 |
| <u>SUB-TOTAL (Section A)</u> | 2.16 | \$30,000 | \$81,000 | \$83,000 |

*These FTE will also perform Track 2 outreach functions within the targeted business community.

| B. Donation | FTE | 1999-00 Budget | 2000-01 Budget | 2001-02 Budget |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Coordinate with charitable organizations to enhance donation infrastructure and build capacity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop grant program to provide funding to qualifying charitable organizations to increase their capability to collect, receive, store and distribute perishable foods. | Organics Team | 0 | \$200,000 matching grant fund | \$100,000 matching grant fund |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create an interagency work team that meets on a quarterly basis to assess outreach and coordinate messages between Metro, local governments and charitable agencies to ensure consistent and effective direction. Work with DEQ to provide statewide outreach and assistance programs that will supplement activities within the Metro region to increase capacity. | Organics Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Design, print and distribute educational and outreach materials for targeted businesses in coordination with charitable agencies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research targeted businesses' level of knowledge and comfort regarding food donation to identify barriers and opportunities. | 0.09 intern | \$2,500 | 0 | 0 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with agencies to refine message regarding Good Samaritan Laws, liability issues, "myths and realities" of food donation in all outreach materials developed (in tandem with waste prevention outreach and educational materials). Work with DEQ and other associations (such as AOR) to develop alternative vehicles for information dissemination regarding food donation and liability throughout the state to enhance knowledge. | Organics Work Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design and print educational materials. | Metro | \$1,000 | | \$1,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section B) | .09 | \$3,500 | \$200,000 | \$101,000 |

| C. Diversion | FTE | 1999-00 Budget | 2000-01 Budget | 2001-02 Budget |
|---|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Conduct market study to determine existing and potential options for increased diversion of acceptable, non-edible foods to animal feed uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research current animal feed options, facilities accepting food wastes, tonnage currently diverted, barriers to increased diversion, feedstock requirements, strength and viability of current animal feed market, etc. ▪ Research existing professional and industry associations, government agencies and others involved in regulating animal feed operations and disseminating information to those involved in the industry. ▪ Research current levels of land application of food wastes along with applicable laws and regulations. | Contractor | \$20,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Implement animal feed diversion program if research proves increased market capacity exists and can be utilized. | Organics Team | 0 | 0 | \$100,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section C.) | 0 | \$20,000 | 0 | \$100,000 |
| TOTAL (Track 1) | 2.50 | \$53,500 | \$281,000 | \$284,000 |

| TRACK 2: ORGANIC WASTE COLLECTION AND PROCESSING INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Develop a wide range of processing options using existing infrastructure to the greatest extent possible. | | | | |
| A. Generator Programs | FTE | 1999-00 Budget | 2000-01 Budget | 2001-02 Budget |
| 1. Target larger organics generators in concentrated areas and conduct research on willingness to participate in an organics collection program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focus on franchised areas that will not have mandatory separation programs. ▪ Identify physical and financial barriers. | Organics Work Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Research proportions of pre- and post-consumer food waste generated by each business type to best tailor separation and collection programs. | DEQ and Interns | \$60,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Develop specific educational materials focused on generator types, geographic area, hauler equipment, and end-use of materials collected. (design and print) | Contractor | 0 | \$10,000 | \$2,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section A.) | 0 | \$60,000 | \$10,000 | \$2,000 |

| B. Development of Collection Infrastructure | FTE | 1999-00 Budget | 2000-01 Budget | 2001-02 Budget |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Utilize information gathered by City of Portland organics collection and processing pilot project to determine feasibility of implementing Portland's organic waste recycling requirement ordinance. | Organics Work Team | \$10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Work with area haulers and businesses to determine feasible organics collection routes throughout the region. • Research hauler willingness/potential to develop collection cooperatives. | Organics Work Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Work with haulers to determine equipment needs, collection schedules and assistance required to implement routes. | Organics Work Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Determine true costs of collection to facilitate future planning decisions. • Conduct pilot projects throughout the region to assess costs. | Organics Work Team | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | 0 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section B.) | 0 | \$60,000 | \$50,000 | 0 |

| C. Utilization and Enhancement of Existing Infrastructure for Delivery and Processing of Organic Wastes | FTE | 1999-00 Budget | 2000-01 Budget | 2001-02 Budget |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| 1. Develop tip fee at Metro Central Station for the acceptance of organic waste for processing (currently in process). | Organics Work Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Build local infrastructure by working closely with facilities throughout the region to research potential and assist with the implementation of organics reload and processing. • Work with facility operators, local officials, etc. to research and determine feasibility and likelihood of varied degrees of delivery and reload of organics on a case-by-case basis. • Assist with the development of pilot projects to test feasibility of reloading for off-site processing or for acceptance of organic waste for potential of on-site processing. • Continue to utilize any currently-available existing processing options while working to develop local processing capacity. • Examine development of local options such as on-site processing at transfer stations and MRFs as well as local yard debris processors. • Consider the use of a short-term Metro subsidy to support organics collection and processing until more economically viable local options are developed. | Organics Work Team | \$50,000 | \$600,000 (pilot projects, infrastructure, grants, etc.) | \$500,000 (pilot projects, infrastructure, grants, etc.) |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|------------------|------------------|
| 3. Work closely with Metro transfer station operator (BFI/Allied) to develop organics delivery options. ▪ Develop protocols for acceptance reload and transport of organics to appropriate processing facilities. | Organics Work Team | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Investigate financial assistance opportunities such as state tax credits for recycling businesses. | DEQ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section C.) | 0 | 0 | \$600,000 | \$500,000 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| D. Organics Market Development | FTE | 1999-00 Budget | 2000-01 Budget | 2001-02 Budget |
| 1. Re-establish 1 FTE in Waste Reduction to implement a permanent and meaningful market development program focusing on organics, commercial, and C&D. | 0.25 | 0 | \$13,000 | \$13,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section D.) | 0.25 | \$0 | \$13,000 | \$13,000 |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| TOTAL TRACK 1 | 2.50 | \$53,500 | \$281,000 | \$284,000 |
| TOTAL TRACK 2 | 0.25 | \$170,000 | \$673,000 | \$515,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Tracks 1 and 2) | 2.75 | \$223,500 | \$954,000 | \$799,000 |
| Less Currently Budgeted Funds | | (\$240,000) | \$0 | \$0 |
| GRAND TOTAL: Estimated Funds Needed to Fully Implement | 2.75 | \$0 | \$954,000 | \$799,000 |

For future consideration:

- Identify potential generators who may benefit from on-site processing options.
- Consider public-sector purchase and development of processing facilities if existing infrastructure proves unsuitable.

**DRAFT
ORGANICS PLAN TIMELINE**

FY 1999-2000 Program Initiatives

The following Organics Program initiatives are scheduled to commence within the current fiscal year. Those tasks that span fiscal years have had their budgets adjusted accordingly to indicate each year's particular resource needs.

TRACK 1

Waste Prevention:

1. Research and development. BUDGET: \$5,000
2. Develop focused outreach and education on waste prevention coupled with on-site assistance. BUDGET: \$25,000

Donation:

1. Coordinate with charitable organizations to enhance donation infrastructure and build capacity for recovered food. Create inter-agency work team to assess outreach needs and coordinate messages. BUDGET: \$0
2. Design, print and distribute educational and outreach materials for targeted business groups in coordination with charitable agencies BUDGET: \$3,500.

Diversion:

Conduct market study to determine the existing and potential options for increased diversion of acceptable, non-edible food wastes to animal feed uses. BUDGET: \$20,000

TOTAL TRACK 1: \$53,500

TRACK 2:

Generator Programs:

1. Target larger organics generators in concentrated areas and conduct research on willingness to participate in an organics collection program. BUDGET: \$0
2. Research the proportions of pre- and post-consumer food waste generated by each business type to best tailor separation and collection programs. BUDGET: \$60,000

Development of Collection Infrastructure:

1. Utilize information gathered by City of Portland organics collection and processing pilot project to determine feasibility of implementing Portland's organic waste recycling requirement ordinance. BUDGET: \$10,000
2. Work with area haulers and businesses to determine feasible organic organics collection routes throughout the region. BUDGET: \$0

3. Work with haulers to determine equipment needs, collection schedules and assistance required to implement routes. BUDGET: \$0
4. Determine true costs of collection to facilitate future planning decisions. (begin pilot projects throughout region). BUDGET: \$50,000

Utilization and enhancement of existing infrastructure for delivery and processing of organic wastes:

1. Develop tip fee at Metro Central Station for the acceptance of organic waste for processing. BUDGET: \$0
2. Build local infrastructure by working closely with facilities throughout the region to research potential and assist with the implementation of organics reload and processing. BUDGET: \$50,000 (grants/contracts)
3. Work closely with Metro transfer station operator to develop organics delivery options. BUDGET: \$0
4. Investigate financial assistance opportunities such as state tax credits for recycling businesses. BUDGET: \$0

TOTAL TRACK 2: \$170,000

FY 1999-2000 TOTAL: \$223,500

Current FY 1999-2000 budgeted funds: \$240,000

DRAFT
FY 2000-2001 Program Initiatives

The following Organics Program initiatives are scheduled to commence within the next fiscal year. Those tasks that span fiscal years have had their budgets adjusted accordingly to indicate each year's particular resource needs.

TRACK 1

Waste Prevention:

Develop focused outreach and education on waste prevention coupled with on-site assistance. Hire 2.0 FTE temporary staff for 2 year positions to distribute materials, provide on-site assistance, coordinate contacts with business groups, provide presentations, provide feedback to Regional Organics Team for future program changes. BUDGET: \$81,000 (year 1)

Donation:

Coordinate with charitable organizations to enhance donation infrastructure and build capacity for recovered food. Develop a 2-year matching grant program to provide funding to qualifying charitable organizations to increase their capacity to collect, receive, store and distribute perishable foods. BUDGET: \$200,000 (year 1)

TOTAL TRACK 1: \$281,000

TRACK 2:

Generator Programs:

Develop specific educational materials focused on generator types, geographic area, hauler equipment, and end-use of materials collected. BUDGET: \$10,000

Development of Collection Infrastructure:

Determine true costs of collection to facilitate future planning decisions. (begin pilot projects throughout region). BUDGET: \$50,000

Utilization and enhancement of existing infrastructure for delivery and processing of organic wastes:

Build local infrastructure by working closely with facilities throughout the region to research potential and assist with the implementation of organics reload and processing. BUDGET: \$600,000

Local Organics Market Development:

Re-establish 1 FTE in Waste Reduction to implement a permanent and meaningful market development program focusing on organics, commercial and C&D. (organics work represents one-quarter of the FTE). BUDGET: \$13,000

TOTAL TRACK 2: \$673,000

DRAFT ESTIMATED FY 2000-01 TOTAL: \$954,000

DRAFT
FY 2001-02 Program Initiatives

The following Organics Program initiatives are scheduled to commence within fiscal year 2001-02. Those tasks that span fiscal years have had their budgets adjusted accordingly to indicate each year's resource needs.

TRACK 1

Waste Prevention:

1. Develop focused outreach and education on waste prevention coupled with on-site assistance. Begin second and final year of employment of 2.0 FTE temporary staff to distribute materials, provide on-site assistance, coordinate contacts with business groups, provide presentations, provide feedback to Regional Organics Team for future program changes. BUDGET: \$81,000
(year 2)

2. Update and reprint education and outreach materials. BUDGET: \$2,000

Donation:

1. Coordinate with charitable organizations to enhance donation infrastructure and build capacity for recovered food. Implement the final year of the matching grant program to provide funding to qualifying charitable organizations to increase their capacity to collect, receive, store and distribute perishable foods. BUDGET: \$200,000
(year 2)

2. Update and reprint education and outreach materials. BUDGET: \$1,000

TOTAL TRACK 1: \$284,000

TRACK 2:

Generator Programs:

- Update and reprint focused education and outreach materials. BUDGET: \$2,000

Utilization and enhancement of existing infrastructure for delivery and processing of organic wastes:

Build local infrastructure by working closely with facilities throughout the region to research potential and assist with the implementation of organics reload and processing. BUDGET: \$500,000 (year 2)

Local Organics Market Development:

Continue support of 1 FTE in Waste Reduction to implement a permanent and meaningful market development program focusing on organics, commercial and C&D. (organics work represents one-quarter of the FTE) . BUDGET: \$13,000

TOTAL TRACK 2: \$515,000

DRAFT ESTIMATED FY 2001-02 TOTAL: \$799,000

Draft Recommendations
Construction and Demolition Task Force

November 1, 1999

Task Force Members:

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| JoAnn Herrigel, | City of Milwaukie |
| Rick Winterhalter, | Clackamas County |
| Judy Crockett, | City of Portland |
| Christa Morrow, | City of Troutdale |
| Marcele Daeges, | Washington County |
| Bryce Jacobson, | Metro |

Overview

According to the revised Regional Solid Waste Management Plan recovery rates, the region must recover 130,000 tons of Construction and Demolition debris in order to meet its established goals. This draft plan, cooperatively developed by the C&D Task force comprised of Metro and local government staff, is designed to address shortcomings of the current RSWMP recommended practices for the C&D sector and guide the region in the direction of increased recycling and recovery while adhering to the solid waste hierarchy of reduce, reuse, recycle, recover, compost, landfill.

Statement of the Problem

Both the 1997 State of the Plan Report and the 1998 C&D generator study show that recycling and recovery of waste materials from the region's construction and demolition sites has not kept up with the amount of growth in the construction sector. The C&D sector is responsible for generating approximately a quarter of the region's waste. While up to 60% of this waste material could be recycled or reused, the fragmented structure of the industry and complicated nature of most job-sites has made it a challenge to divert materials into recovery programs.

Background

The RSWMP recommended practices for the C&D sector, as implemented, have not created the tonnage diversion that was originally expected. Among the recommended practices for the building industries, there are several that the task force identified as ineffective:

Recommended practice 2. a, states that *local governments will 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.* Haulers franchise agreements require them to comply with this recommended practice by offering recycling services, but the rate of compliance and the actual effect on recycling are thought to be low among task force members.

Recommended practice 1.b, *Metro and Local governments to perform on-site audits at construction and demolition sites to promote waste prevention.* Despite numerous

attempts to interest builders in this service, only a hand full of these have been performed since 1995. The concept may have value if it was used as a component of another C&D program, but as a stand alone item builders have not shown much interest.

Recommended Practice 1.a, *"Earth-Wise" building program to train builders about salvage, waste reduction, recycling, and buying recycled along with other environmental building practices.* Metro staff have found that organizations with a green building agenda are not willing to make waste issues a key concept in their promotions and education to the building industry.

Recommended Practice 4. *Develop regional dry waste processing facilities for waste from sites where separation and collection of recyclables is not possible.* The current system of post collection recovery options does not appear to draw in as much C&D waste as we had hoped for. The task force found that much of Washington County is under-served in terms of processing capacity, recovery facilities have trouble competing with the rates at local dry waste land fills and actual recovery rates have been lower than expected (down to 4% at one facility).

The 1998 C&D Generator Study found that the regions contractors as a group are not well informed about waste recycling issues and put little energy into making decisions about job-site waste. However, the study also found that they are open to assistance on recycling and waste issues if it comes in a format that they can use.

Work Group Objectives

In July 1999 the C&D Task Force had its first meeting to discuss the objectives that would guide the process of making our recommendations. The group agreed to the following objectives:

- Assess what is going on with C&D waste and recycling in the Metro region and around the country
- Identify areas where improvement is needed
- Develop and implement specific programs to address the problem areas
- Create incentives to keep unprocessed mixed loads of C&D material in the Metro region.

Draft Plan Recommendations:

This plan takes a three-track approach to increasing recycling and recovery in the C&D sector.

1. The first track emphasizes waste prevention through salvage and deconstruction. This practice has proven to be an effective way to prevent one of the largest sources of C&D waste, demolition waste, from entering the waste stream:
2. The second track focuses on ways to impact diversion through programs at material recovery facilities, dry waste landfills or transfer stations. The proposed incentives will ensure that either source separated recycling or effective post

collection recovery is available to all sectors of the C&D industry. An important component of these efforts will be the education and promotion of the different source separated and post collection recovery service options available to C&D sites.

3. The third track implements a market development program that targets reuse and recycling of the materials prevalent in the C&D waste stream: wood (22%), drywall (17%), composition roofing (11%) and fiberglass insulation (1%). The current markets for these materials are undeveloped or underdeveloped and this represents a major barrier to reusing or recycling these materials.

All of the following recommendations come with several caveats:

- Depend on initial research into the feasibility
- They each require different stakeholder involvement strategies.
- They are designed to either compliment each other or existing activities
- Budgets, tonnage impacts and schedules are speculative and should be seen as a starting point
- Further work of the C&D Task Force may be part of this. Our role is unknown at this point.
- As these recommendations are evaluated and piloted, it will become clearer which of the RSWMP mandated C&D activities we are doing now may need to be modified or phased out.

TRACK 1: WASTE PREVENTION, SALVAGE AND REUSE (B. Jacobson .25 FTE)

Develop focussed outreach and education programs on salvage and deconstruction practices for the regions contractors and property owners.

| A. Waste Prevention | Staffing | 1999-00 M+S Budget | 2000-01 M+S Budget | 2001-02 M+S Budget |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Research and development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform research on the messages, opportunities, possible partnerships, identify what the salvage community sees as needed and the best ways to promote/ educate on salvage. • Evaluate commercial or residential focus. • Evaluate need for a secondary focus on source-separated recycling • Utilize LGRC, REM Marketing Team and salvage community to evaluate data from research and identify best opportunities. • Create an implementation plan for education and promotion activities including timeline for project and identify methods of measuring effect. LGRC and Metro to approve. | Contractor w/ oversight by C&D task force | \$25,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Develop and Implement Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create an implementation plan for education and promotion activities including timeline for project and identify methods of measuring effect. LGRC and Metro to approve. • Contractor to work with Local Governments to custom tailor the messages and tools of the campaign to the specifics of each jurisdiction. • Begin implementing program mid-2000-01. | Contractor w/ oversight by C&D task force | 0 | \$50,000 | 0 |
| 3. Evaluate and measure effect <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue evaluating/measuring effect to determine benefit of continuing program. • Continue to use contractor to follow implementation plan, trouble shoot and fine-tune. | Contractor w/ oversight by C&D task force | 0 | 0 | \$50,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (SECTION A) | 0 | \$25,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| TOTAL (TRACK 1) | 0 | \$25,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |

| TRACK 2: C&D WASTE PROCESSING/DISPOSAL (B.Jacobson .5 FTE) | | Staffing | 1999-00 M+S Budget | 2000-01 M+S Budget | 2001-02 M+S Budget |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Develop a system to ensure that source-separated recycling or effective post collection recovery is available or provided to all sectors of the C&D industry. | | | | | |
| A. Require that specified C&D loads be processed before disposal | | | | | |
| 1. Research and development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compile information on C&D loads and C&D waste hauling to determine appropriate lower and upper threshold and load types effected, where the burden of responsibility should be placed, how processing will be defined, what enforcement efforts will be required. Identify legal issues involved with flow control, interstate commerce code violations and out of state waste. Identify potential effect in tons, identify methods for addressing the limited processing capacity in sections of the Metro region. This data gathering effort will be coordinated with local governments and other organizations as appropriate. • With direction from C&D task force, draft a project timeline | | Contractor w/oversight by C&D Task Force | 0 | \$25,000 | 0 |
| 2. Stakeholder involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With direction from the C&D task Force, draft a stakeholder involvement plan. In FY 00-01, implement this plan to find out if this concept can move forward | | C&D Task Force | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending stakeholder approval, begin limited pilots to evaluate the most effective methods of rolling this program out to all facilities | | Contractor w/ oversight by C&D Task Force | 0 | 0 | \$50,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section A) | | 0 FTE | 0 | \$25,000 | \$50,000 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| B. Ban the disposal of certain material(s) commonly found in C&D loads | | | | |
| 1. Initial Research and Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify, evaluate and report on disposal bans in other states. Compile this information and present report to local governments and Metro staff. | Contractor w/ oversight by C&D Task Force | \$10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Stakeholder involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metro staff will coordinate a disposal ban work group made up of key stakeholders and local government staff. Participants include ORRA, Tri-County haulers, AOR, ORMDC, Metro SWAC, facility operators and builder groups. If this group finds that this should be a statewide effort, pull in AOR to assist with the legislative concept. If a regional effort is preferred, develop an RFP for a consultant to look at options for a regional disposal ban. If this work group finds that a ban should be brought forward for further consideration by SWAC and Metro Council, The group will draft a project timeline. | Contractor w/oversight by C&D Task Force | 0 | \$10,000 | 0 |
| 3. Further Research and Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local information on C&D loads and C&D waste hauling to determine appropriate lower and upper threshold and load types effected, where the burden of responsibility should be placed, how bans could be enforced. Identify potential effects on material markets. Identify potential effect in tons. Identify potential methods of measuring the effect of the ban. Identify methods for addressing the limited processing capacity in sections of the Metro region. Identify if this should be a regional or statewide effort. This data gathering effort will be coordinated with local governments and other organizations as appropriate. | Contractor w/ oversight by C&D Task Force | 0 | \$25,000 | 0 |
| 4. Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending stakeholder approval, C&D Task Force will begin pilots. Create measurement methods, education materials and conduct facility staff trainings. Begin limited pilots to evaluate the most effective methods of rolling this program out to all facilities. Full implementation expected in FY 02-03 or 03-04. | 2 enforce. / ed. FTE at PA 1 level | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section B) | 2 FTE | \$10,000 | \$35,000 | \$25,000 |

| C. Educate generators on source-separated recycling and/or other methods to remain in compliance with disposal bans or processing requirements. | Staffing | FY 99-00 M+S Budget | FY 00-01 M+S Budget | FY 01-02 M+S Budget |
|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Initial Research and Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create messages that support source-separated recycling and promote service options that will facilitate a high degree of recycling from targeted C&D sites. • Secure partners such as industry associations and retailers. • Evaluate commercial or residential focus. • Test messages with building industry. Identify methods of measuring effect. • Create an implementation plan for education and promotion activities, create timeline for project. • Compile this information and present report to local governments and Metro staff. | Contractor w/oversight by C&D Task Force | \$28,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Develop and Implement Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin implementing program mid-2000-01. • Contractor to work with Local Governments to custom tailor the messages and tools of the campaign to the specifics of each jurisdiction. • As disposal bans or processing requirements come on-line, modify messages to support these programs | Contractor w/ oversight by C&D Task Force | 0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Subtotal (Section C) | 0 | \$28,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| D. Create incentives through the Metro System Fee Credit Program for post collection recovery facilities to increase their recovery of recyclables from C&D loads | Staffing | 1999-00 M+S Budget | 2000-01 M+S Budget | 2001-02 M+S Budget |
| 3. Research and Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget and Regulatory Affairs regulatory staff to identify and report on System Fee Credit Program modifications that may offer a stronger incentive for MRF operators to recover C&D materials. Consider implementing a preference or weighting for reuse and recycling over energy reclamation. • Involve the C&D Task Force, MRF operators and SWAC in this research effort | REM Regulatory Affairs staff | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a timeline and begin implementing changes and monitoring effect on tonnage | REM Regulatory Affairs staff | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Section D) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| TOTAL (Track 2) | 2 FTE | \$38,000 | \$110,000 | \$125,000 |
| TRACK 3: MARKET DEVELOPMENT (B Jacobson 0 FTE) | | | | |
| Develop a system of grants and loans to encourage the development of markets for both salvaging and recycling of C&D materials. | | | | |
| A. Metro to create a REM market development position to support the increased C&D recycling and recovery efforts | Staffing | 1999-00 M+S Budget | 2000-01 M+S Budget | 2001-02 M+S Budget |
| 4. Research and development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research other similar grant and loan funds, and market development efforts. Involve local governments and C&D Task Force as steering committee Research the program structure needed to develop reuse and recycling markets first and energy recovery markets second. Metro to appropriate funds, set priorities on materials and or sectors to be targeted and publicize fund Create implementation plan that includes consulting with finance professionals on the criteria for funding and identifying possible ways to piggyback on other private or public programs. | .5 FTE in market develop. position | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct market research on wood, drywall, composition roofing and fiberglass and other prevalent C&D materials | Contractor supervised by Metro | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start program and receive first applications. Continue to evaluate the effect on tonnage | | | | |
| SUB-TOTAL (SECTION A) | .5 FTE | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| TOTAL (TRACK 3) | .5 FTE | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |

| | Staffing | 1999-00 M+S Budget | 2000-01 M+S Budget | 2001-02 M+S Budget |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| TOTAL TRACK 1 | 0 | \$25,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| TOTAL TRACK 2 | 2 FTE | \$38,000 | \$110,000 | \$125,000 |
| TOTAL TRACK 3 | 0.5 FTE | \$20,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (Tracks 1,2 and 3) | 2.5 FTE | \$83,000 | \$165,000 | \$180,000 |
| Less Currently Budgeted Funds | 0 | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| GRAND TOTAL New Funds Needed | 2.5 FTE | \$43,000 | \$165,000 | \$180,000 |

S/share/jaco/99C&D team draft recs new format current

Draft Recommendations of Commercial Recovery Task Force

November 8, 1999

Task Force Members

Marcele Daeges, Washington County
Anne McLaughlin, City of Portland
Susan Ziolk, Clackamas County
Genya Arnold, Metro
Steve Apotheker, Metro

Overview

A Commercial Recovery Task Force comprised of local government and Metro representatives was charged with reviewing the Metro region's strategy for reaching its commercial waste reduction targets identified in the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). The task force began meeting in July 1999, and produced draft recommendations on policy and program options (including resource needs) for a three-year timeline. Members of the task force were Susan Ziolk, Chair, Clackamas County; Marcelle Daeges, Washington County; Anne McLaughlin, City of Portland; Genya Arnold, Metro and Steve Apotheker, Metro.

Statement of the Problem

Progress in commercial waste reduction is not keeping pace to meet the targets for waste prevention and recovery that have been set for this sector in the revised RSWMP. Because commercial waste makes the largest contribution to the Metro region's total waste, it is critical to achieve the waste prevention and recovery targets for businesses in order for the region to meet its recovery rate target for total waste of 52% in the Year 2000. The region's total recovery rate for 1998 was 43.3%, off at least four percentage points from where it should be if the region was on track to meet its goal.

Background

Commercial waste is the largest component of Metro's disposed waste, accounting for more than 50% of what is landfilled. Residential (including multi-family) and construction and demolition (C&D) wastes comprise the balance.

The RSWMP sets out commercial waste reduction goals for the Year 2000 of 11,550 tons of waste prevention and 168,000 tons of source-separated business recyclables, primarily paper and containers. These goals represent the increase in waste reduction that is needed relative to 1995 baseline levels set out in the RSWMP.

The RSWMP identifies implementation of several recommended practices to meet the waste prevention and recovery goals.

1. Waste evaluations or audits shall address waste prevention, recovery and buy recycled opportunities in targeted businesses that generate large quantities of paper and packaging.
2. Model waste prevention programs shall be developed for different types of businesses.

3. Coordinated regional and local media waste prevention programs shall be developed.
4. Model buy recycled procurement outreach campaigns and policies shall be developed.
5. Market development efforts shall look at how recycled feedstock shall be substituted for virgin materials in manufacturing processes.
6. Provision of appropriate recycling collection containers to all small businesses.
7. Implement business recycling recognition programs.

Metro has not identified a strategy to comprehensively measure the level of commercial waste prevention occurring in the region. Some data is available on diversion through certain programs, such as paint reuse and edible food recovery. And, this past summer an intern was hired to review existing efforts to quantify waste prevention and to determine the feasibility of applying these approaches at the local level to commercial waste generators. A final report is due in November 1999.

Metro also has conducted focus groups with businesses on how to develop regional media campaigns on waste prevention. The results of these interviews indicated that regional media campaigns could be effective if they provide a strongly motivational message. However, businesses made little distinction between waste prevention and recycling activities. A media campaign should not try to distinguish between these two activities. Also, businesses need to receive site-specific information to solve immediate problems, rather than the general type of knowledge received through media campaigns.

However, despite the lack of measurement of commercial waste prevention, the region has a program which focuses on commercial waste prevention. Local government recycling staff conduct site visits at businesses, during which businesses receive information about waste prevention actions and buy recycled opportunities, in addition to potential improvements in their recycling collection system.

In the area of commercial recovery, programs appear to be diverting only about half of the tonnage needed to reach the target for this sector. However, the available data and on-route collection practices make it difficult to isolate business recovery from efforts that occur at multi-family locations and construction sites.

Also, different local policies and approaches to commercial waste recovery provide different conditions and reporting requirements for haulers and private recycling companies that provide commercial recycling collection services. For example, the City of Portland allows each business to arrange independently for services from its 60+ waste haulers and 30+ independent recycling collectors. However, the city requires businesses to file plans on how they will divert 50% of their waste and requires all waste haulers to offer collection of all recyclable paper and many other materials.

Outside of Portland, local jurisdictions have created commercial waste franchises. Local governments set commercial waste hauling rates for the franchised hauler, which include recyclables in the rate schedule.

Despite difficulties in meeting commercial recovery targets, the commercial waste stream remains rich in marketable recyclables. About 25% of commercial waste is comprised of recyclable paper, including corrugated cardboard, high-grade paper and mixed paper. A Washington County survey indicated that 90% of all businesses generating corrugated cardboard had recycling collection.

Nevertheless, regional waste composition data show that waste compactors, such as those often placed at multi-tenant office buildings, still average more than 10% corrugated cardboard, which is twice the average from other regional waste generators. Mixed office paper is highly recyclable, yet only 55% of businesses generating this material have put recycling collection programs in place. Furthermore, another 12% of disposed commercial waste is made up of metal, glass and plastic containers, plastic film and other scrap metal – all of which are easily recoverable.

A Washington County survey of 599 businesses in August 1998 showed that the average number of recycled materials increased with the size of the business, as measured by number of employees. Similar results were found in studies done by the City of Portland in 1993, 1996 and 1999.

Commercial recovery lags in small and medium-size businesses, due to a lack of storage space and lack of staffing resources to implement recycling programs. Also, larger businesses that have recovery programs may not be collecting the full range of recyclables that are generated.

Task Force Objectives and Process

The Commercial Recovery Task Force met for three months, starting in July 1999, and identified the following objectives:

- Assess level of commercial waste prevention and recovery in the Metro region.
- Identify politically acceptable programs and policies that would help the region effectively and efficiently meet its targets for the commercial sector:
- Develop and implement specific programs and policies that were identified.

In addition to discussion by Task Force members, interviews were conducted with more than two dozen haulers and business associations regarding potential actions that could be taken to increase recovery and prevention.

Waste haulers were very comfortable in the role of providing recycling collection services when businesses requested those services and adequate financial compensation was available. However, haulers did not want to be in the position of advising their customers, the businesses, on when and how to set up waste prevention programs. Also, haulers were reluctant to initiate provision of new or expanded recycling collection, however, they were very willing to respond to their customers' request for such services. Strong economic incentives were the clearest motivator to increase

recycling for this group. This may be the most difficult in Portland, where rates are set by negotiation between hauler and customer, and not all customers yet place recycling service as a high priority.

Businesses were supportive of recycling; however, they did not want to spend a lot of time seeking out information on recycling, waste prevention and buy recycling actions. They wanted specific information on markets and materials handling solutions to be provided. This was especially true for smaller and medium size businesses that did not have the staffing levels to figure out how to implement recycling programs. Regulatory actions to increase recycling might be acceptable if convenient, cost-effective recycling collection services were provided.

Finally, local government solid waste and recycling staff are definitely comfortable with the role of providing technical assistance. However, resources are limited for field staff to provide the initial and multiple follow up contacts needed to ensure that recycling collection programs are implemented at businesses.

Also, local government solid waste staff(with the exception of Clackamas County), are not involved in the plan review process for ensuring that the design of new buildings includes adequate recycling collection space to meet regional recovery rates. Washington County has adopted a model ordinance for construction of commercial buildings, but there are no staff to implement it. The City of Portland has adopted an ordinance that applies only to multi-family units, but there is no oversight.

The Task Force developed a list of 20 potential actions. Task Force members, according to the following criteria, discussed each action:

- Political acceptance
- Program cost
- Potential new tonnage diverted
- Ability to institutionalize
- Ability to monitor and evaluate
- Problems addressed by the recommended action
- New problems created by the recommended action

Each action was then ranked on a five-point scale, with 1=Low and 5=High. Troutdale, Gresham, Portland, Clackamas County, Washington County and Metro submitted rankings, along with final comments.

Of the 20 actions identified by the Task Force, seven actions received a ranking greater than three. These seven actions comprise the draft recommendations being offered by this Task Force.

Draft Recommendations

Seven actions are recommended for implementation or further review, where needed.

1. Increase market development efforts, both regionally through Metro and statewide through the Oregon Market Development Council. Develop markets for new materials and local markets for recycled feedstock that might offer higher prices (Ranking 4.7)
2. Implement disposal bans for selected materials. This proposed policy needs greater review by a larger stakeholder group that includes haulers, private recycling collectors, processors, disposal facilities, businesses and the public. In particular, issues such as enforcement, market price impact and flow control need to be reviewed (Ranking 4.3).
3. Expand local governments' technical assistance to businesses on waste prevention, buy recycled and recycling. The current technical assistance program of waste evaluations needs to be assessed for its effectiveness in increasing recovery tonnage. Future technical assistance programs need to be designed to allow for easy program evaluation. Staffing needs to be increased to provide greater contacts and follow ups at each business and to expand the types and number of targeted businesses (Ranking 4.2).
4. Implement design review ordinances for recycling collection areas in new commercial and multi-family buildings. Several local governments have adopted an ordinance, but do not have dedicated staffing to monitor submitted plans and compliance. Adoption of an ordinance and adequate staffing are both needed to ensure that the new construction in the region will have adequate recycling space to enable full participation in reaching the region's recycling goals (Ranking 4.2).
5. Promote commingling. Commingling can result in fewer recycling containers, accepting more materials in less space, with less-complicated sorting instructions. The development of commingled collection and processing capacity in the region is seen as an important shift in how recycling service is provided. Awareness of this new service level would be especially important to businesses facing space and resource limitations in implementing new or expanded recycling collection. One element of a regional media outreach program might talk about the availability of this service. It is important to link any promotion of commingling with a prior inventory of commingled processing capacity in the region to adequate geographic distribution and access by all haulers as noted in recommendation seven below (Ranking 4.2).
6. Target outreach to promote waste prevention. Specific outreach campaigns and technical assistance should target activities (double-sided copying) and packaging (reusable transport packaging) that increase waste prevention. Campaigns that target a specific activity or material in a homogeneous population (e.g., offices for double-sided copying) offer the greatest opportunity to have their results tracked (Ranking 4.2).
7. Ensure the region has adequate commingled processing capacity for commercial recycling with equitable access by the region's collectors and that these facilities are capable of meeting high standards for recovered materials (Ranking 3.3).

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS ON COMMERCIAL WASTE PREVENTION AND RECOVERY - 11/9/99

| | Staffing | 1999-2000 M+S Budget | 2000-2001 M+S Budget | 2001-2002 M+S Budget |
|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| TRACK 1 WASTE PREVENTION Target specific activities for implementation and measurement. | | | | |
| A. Targeted waste prevention projects. | | | | |
| 1. Review commercial waste prevention measurement. | Intern and Contractor w/oversight by Commercial Task Force | \$4,000 | | |
| 2. Evaluate selected waste prevention activities. | | \$10,000 | | |
| 3. Implement first waste prevention project. | | | \$50,000 | |
| 4. Evaluate first project. | | | | \$10,000 |
| 5. Implement second waste prevention project. | | | | \$50,000 |
| Subtotal (Section A) | 0 | \$14,000 | \$50,000 | \$60,000 |
| Total Track 1 | 0 | \$14,000 | \$50,000 | \$60,000 |

NOTE: Track 2 B2 also includes waste prevention actions.

| | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| TRACK 2 RECOVERY Develop a system to ensure effective commercial recovery is in place. | | | | |
| A. Promote commingling. | | | | |
| 1. Include as part of, but not the focus of, a regional outreach campaign | Contract | \$225,000 | | |
| 2. Outreach campaign evaluation | | \$15,000 | | |
| Subtotal (Section A) | | \$240,000 | 0 | 0 |
| B. Expand technical assistance. | | | | |
| 1. Evaluate local waste audit programs | Contract | \$25,000 | | \$15,000 |
| 2. Local government waste audits, 6 FTE through contractors or staff includes waste prevention, buy recycled and recovery. | | | \$300,000 | \$310,000 |
| 3. Develop Web site and support material for recycling information | | | \$75,000 | \$50,000 |
| Subtotal (Section B) | | \$25,000 | \$375,000 | \$375,000 |

| | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| C. Implement disposal bans for selected materials. | | | | |
| 1. Stakeholder review to identify material and implementation issues. | | \$5,000 | \$10,000 | |
| 2. Study to review market and implementation issues of bans. | | \$5,000 | \$25,000 | |
| 3. Determine administrative rules. | | | | |
| 4. Hire enforcement staff. | 1 | | | \$55,000 |
| 5. Outreach to publicize new policy. | | | | \$75,000 |
| 6. Implement buy recycled program to increase market demand for banned material | | | | \$50,000 |
| Subtotal (Section C) | 1 | \$10,000 | \$35,000 | \$180,000 |
| D. Design review ordinances for recycling areas in new buildings. | | | | |
| 1. Technical assistance during review process by local governments | | | \$10,000 | |
| 2. Adoption of design ordinances and implementation rules by local governments. | | | \$5,000 | |
| 3. Funding for local government staff to implement. | | | \$75,000 | \$150,000 |
| Subtotal (Section D) | | \$0 | \$90,000 | \$150,000 |
| E. Ensure commingled processing capacity and standards. | | | | |
| 1. Develop inventory of different commercial commingled sorts and processing facility capacity. | Contract | \$10,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| 2. Stakeholder review of commingled processing standards. | | | \$5,000 | |
| 3. Implement recommendations for monitoring facility performance. | | | | \$5,000 |
| Subtotal (Section E) | | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| Total Track 2 | 1 | \$285,000 | \$510,000 | \$715,000 |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|----------|----------|
| TRACK 3 MARKET DEVELOPMENT Ensure adequate market capacity is available. | | | | |
| A. Increase market development efforts. | | | | |
| 1. Review market capacity for mixed paper, color-mixed and green glass, film plastic, rigid plastic containers. | | | \$25,000 | \$25,000 |
| 2. Look at market initiatives that would create higher value regional markets | | | \$25,000 | \$25,000 |
| 3. Staffing for commercial material market development, buy recycled and technical assistance | 0.5 | | \$27,500 | \$27,500 |
| Subtotal (Section A) | 0.5 | | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Total Track 3 | 0.5 | | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |

| SUMMARY Materials & Services | Staffing | 1999-2000 M+S Budget | 2000-2001 M+S Budget | 2001-2002 M+S Budget |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| TOTAL TRACK 1 | 0 | \$14,000 | \$50,000 | \$60,000 |
| TOTAL TRACK 2 | 1 | \$285,000 | \$510,000 | \$715,000 |
| TOTAL TRACK 3 | 0.5 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL (TRACKS 1,2 and 3) | 1.5 | \$299,000 | \$610,000 | \$825,000 |
| LESS Currently Budgeted Funds | 0 | \$279,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL New Funds Needed For Materials & Services | 1.5 | \$20,000 | \$610,000 | \$825,000 |

s:\share\dept\apo\comteamrev\sum991108.doc