



**METRO**

## **A G E N D A**

**MEETING: REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**DATE: Wednesday, February 23, 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**  
*Introduction of new SWAC member.*
- 5 min. \*II. Approval of the January minutes** **Ed Washington**
- 5 min. III. REM Director's Update** **Terry Petersen**
- 15 min. \*IV. Market Development** **Doug Anderson**  
*Metro has established a fund for reuse/recycling market development. Before launching the program, the Council must approve the criteria for evaluation of proposals and release of funds. Draft criteria will be presented to SWAC today, with further discussion next month—at which time SWAC's recommendation will be sought.*
- 45 min. \*V. Transfer Station Service Plan** **Doug Anderson/Bill Metzler**  
*A recommendation is emerging from the SWAC subcommittee on transfer stations. However, implementation of any recommendation requires decisions on significant policy issues. Today, these policies will be presented in the context of the emerging recommendation, followed by discussion.*
- 45 min. \*VI. The 10 Percent – Criteria for Evaluating Proposals** **Jim Watkins**  
*A presentation and discussion of the criteria to be used for evaluating proposals for the disposal of 10 percent of the region's waste that is not covered by Metro's contract.*
- 5 min. VII. 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)

Agenda Item No. II  
**APPROVAL: Minutes of January 19, 2000 SWAC Meeting**  
Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, February 23, 2000

**Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**  
Meeting Minutes  
January 19, 2000

**Members/\*Alternate Attendees**

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  
Scott Bradley, Waste Management  
Mike Misovetz, Clackamas County Citizen  
Connie Winn, Multnomah 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  
\*Tam Driscoll, East Multnomah County & Cities  
\*Tom Wyatt, Browning-Ferris Industries  
\*Vince Gilbert, East County Recycling

**Non-voting Members Present**

Carol Devenir-Moore, Clark County  
Terry Petersen, Metro, REM  
Doug DeVries, STS  
Doug Anderson, Metro, REM

**Members / Non-voting Members Not Present**

Frank Deaver, Washington County Citizen  
Chris Taylor, DEQ

**Guests/Metro**

Kathy Kiwala, Clark County	Bryce Jacobson, REM
Todd Irvine, Willamette Resources, Inc.	Bill Metzler, REM
Dean Large, Waste Connection, Inc.	Meg Lynch, REM
Ray Phelps	Connie Kinney, REM
Easton Cross	Vicki Kolberg, REM
Diana Godwin	
Steve Apotheker, REM	
Scott Klag, REM	

Terry Petersen called the meeting to order, stepping in for Chair Washington, who was delayed slightly. Mr. Petersen asked for a motion to adopt the November and December 1999 meetings. JoAnn Herrigel moved the minutes be adopted, Mike Leichner seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously. Councilor Washington arrived shortly after the meeting began.

Mr. Anderson reminded the committee that during Spring 1999, SWAC deliberated over reorganizing the SWAC, and, in addition, appointing new members. He said staff have been busy recruiting for new members and reappointing some existing members. Mr. Anderson welcomed the members: Steve Schwab, Sunset Garbage, Clackamas County haulers; Mike Borg, Clackamas County haulers alternate; Mike Miller, Gresham Sanitary Service, Multnomah County haulers, Bryan Engleson, Multnomah County haulers alternate; Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal, Washington County haulers; Tim Hamburg, Washington County haulers alternate; David White, ORRA, Tri-County Council, at-large haulers; Brian Heiberg, at-large haulers, alternate; Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers, recycling facilities; Andy Kahut, KB Recycling, recycling facilities alternate; Glenn Zimmerman, Wood Waste Reclamation and Composting Council of Oregon, composters; Kent Inman, composters alternate; Scott Bradley, Waste Management, disposal sites; Dean Kampfer, disposal sites alternate; Ralph Gilbert, ECR, disposal sites; Vince Gilbert, ECR disposal sites alternate; Connie Winn, Multnomah County and Cities ratepayers.

In addition, Mr. Anderson welcomed Mike Misovetz (Clackamas County ratepayers) and Frank Deaver (Washington County ratepayers) as returning citizen representative whose terms have not expired. Mr. Anderson said the recruitment for three business ratepayer representatives continues. Mr. Anderson welcomed Lynne Storz (Washington County) and Susan Keil (City of Portland) for second terms. Non-voting members welcomed were Chris Taylor, DEQ; Dave Kunz, DEQ alternate; Carol Devenir-Moore, Clark County, Washington; Kathy Kiwala, Clark County, Washington alternate; Terry Petersen, Metro; Doug Anderson, Metro alternate. Mr. Anderson said a list of members (voting and non-voting and alternates) and contact information for them was being circulated; he encouraged the members to peruse the information and provide any additions or corrections to Connie Kinney, Clerk to the committee.

Mr. Anderson announced that Meg Lynch would be conducting an orientation session soon for the SWAC membership, covering items such as the purpose of the committee, bylaws, the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and some of the relevant processes at Metro.

### **REM Director's Update**

Mr. Petersen welcomed the committee and stated he looked forward to working with them in the coming year. Mr. Petersen stated that the REM Committee will be reviewing two important topics this afternoon. One is Round Two of the excise tax ordinance dealing with solid waste. The REM Committee will be looking at whether or not the flat excise tax should be converted to a per-ton excise tax even though the overall amount of excise tax revenue is not going to be increased. The new rate would be \$5.02 per ton, plus a credit of \$1.19 for dry waste that goes to a limited purpose landfill, and a further credit ranging from \$0.15 to \$1.50 for material recovery facilities, based on recovery at the facility, but no less than 20% recovery.

Mr. Petersen said the second topic was what to do with the 10% of the region's putrescible waste that was not committed to Waste Management-owned landfills. Mr. Petersen said a procurement option is being discussed. He reminded the committee that staff had discussed evaluation criteria with SWAC members for a procurement. He said after the committee has decided what the actual criteria should include, staff will draft a procurement proposal to deliver to the council in late February.

Mr. Petersen said the residential recycling campaign is in full swing and asked Vicki Kolberg, Recycling Education and Outreach Supervisor, to bring the committee up to date on the progress of this project. Ms. Kolberg said the campaign was launched January 16, 2000 in *The Sunday Oregonian*. She explained that the campaign was aimed at encouraging residents who don't currently participate in curbside recycling to begin, and to encourage those who recycle to put out more recyclables at the curb. Ms. Kolberg said the eye-catching and attention-grabbing promotion will play on selected radio spots, TV and newspaper advertising. The two radio ads were played to the committee. The total expended on this particular campaign was \$144,000, of which \$115,500 went directly to the media buy. Ms. Kolberg stated that pre- and post-campaign surveys are being conducted to measure the effectiveness of the campaign. She said any feedback from any source is welcomed, including ideas for future campaigns. Ms. Kolberg said that in the Spring a campaign to reach business sector the will be launched.

Ms. Keil noted that recycling tonnage in the City of Portland is up 17% during the previous two months. She said it would be interesting to see the impacts sorted out.

#### **Partnership Plan for Waste Reduction**

Jennifer Erickson, Senior Solid Waste Planner, introduced the Partnership Plan by noting that in 1989 DEQ had required a Waste Reduction Plan for the region. Since then, the plan has been modified in many ways. Among them is the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, which was developed and approved in 1995 and which changed the annual planning process significantly. The next fiscal year (2000-2001) marks Year 11 of the annual planning process.

The planning process for Year 11 focused on two objectives: simplifying reporting requirements and improving recovery in three key areas: commercial, construction and demolition debris, and organics.

Part 1 of the Year 11 plan incorporates the new initiatives in the three areas, and includes maintenance programs for curbside and yard debris recycling, waste reduction consultations with businesses, in-school programs for students and teachers, and hazardous waste outreach and education. Ms. Erickson distributed draft copies of the plan. She said the draft plan has been distributed to Metro Council, as well as interested parties throughout the region. She noted this is the first of a three-year cycle. She said staff will be soliciting comments over the next couple of months, which will be incorporated into a second draft; the third draft is considered the final that will be submitted to the REM Committee and the full Metro Council for approval. After Council approves the plan, local jurisdictions submit their individual plans by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Driscoll asked about the timeframe for submitting the third draft. Ms. Erickson responded that staff expected to submit the third draft in March or early April.

Ms. Keil asked the preferred method for submitting comments. Ms. Erickson replied that comments can be written, e-mailed or phoned, whatever is most convenient.

### **Household Hazardous Waste Plan**

Scott Klag, Senior Solid Waste Planner, reminded committee members that he had distributed some draft proposed language at an earlier meeting and had asked for comments. He said staff has written new language, based in part on the comments received. He then explained the new draft language.

Mr. Klag said comments fell into four or five main categories; he proceeded to go through them. He said the basic comment received was that there should be stronger emphasis on the importance of not just reducing and eliminating risks, but in educating the public on alternatives to hazardous products. Other comment areas include the desirability of shared product responsibility section; comparisons of the new plan and the old plan; the issue of costs; and efficiency and effectiveness. Mr. Klag remarked that if the committee found the plan to be basically complete, members could vote to take the plan to the REM Committee and on to the Council.

Ms. Keil commented that the City preferred not to emphasize anything that might add hazardous materials to the sewer system. She said that perhaps staff's case for alternatives could be stronger and perhaps give the public real practical choices. As a practical matter, the City tries not to transfer waste from the garbage can into the sewer system, because hazardous wastes are especially bad for our treatment system. Emphasizing this aspect would be good for the City. She said the message to the public is most effective if it is targeted to specific items that are troublesome to the waste stream.

Mr. Klag noted that under "shared product responsibility," initial draft language might have been too wordy and didn't talk enough about the principle behind, for instance, the paint program. So the language was changed to talk about responsibility, impacts on society and costs to the disposal system. Section 3, last bullet, now includes some language about the financial side.

Mr. Klag said that staff felt it was not Metro's role to get into major discussions with the public how to use pesticides, but if there are issues about use, we will look at them on a case-by-case basis.

Chair Washington commented that on the issue of shared responsibility, how do we get this message out to the people, and get their involvement before the fact? Chair Washington also said he wants to insure that we receive all sides of an issue before we embark on a campaign.

Mr. Petersen replied that Metro's Paint Smart is one example of how the paint industry is partnering with DEQ/Metro. This has become a good program, one with the buy-in, interest and support of the industry.

Mr. White said that Metro's involvement with state legislation concerning some products, i.e., phosphates in soap, and for a time, pool chlorine, etc., is an example of how if you create the motivation, the industry will come to the table, talk about it and be interested in participating.

Ms. Keil commented that the Metro/business partnership is such a good thing, and she would encourage bringing the haulers into that forum.

Mr. Gilbert stated it would be helpful to have a list of the main targeted hazardous waste we are looking at and volumes generated in the region, if you have that data and prioritize the list. He said this way we will know which ones we are working on and which have the most effect on the region.

Mr. Klag replied that was in our plan. He said he could distribute a list of what we are taking in now; it seems reasonable to target this heterogeneous stock piles first, then identify more specific products, based on the cost to the system.

Mr. Zimmerman mentioned that Marion County's collects latex paint program at its curbside program, as well as at the transfer stations.

Meg Lynch, Waste Reduction & Planning Supervisor, commented on Mr. Gilbert's request because she felt it was a good one. She said that what Metro has data on is what is already coming out of the waste stream and is currently being recovered at the Hazardous Waste Facilities, and, to a certain degree, what is being disposed. She said what we don't have data on, and we don't know how to get the data, is what people are storing in their garages and basements right now. She said staff suspects there is a lot of material there, but the amount and types of those hazardous wastes won't be known until we do something successful enough to pull it out.

Chair Washington asked whether Metro staff had received any type of feedback from manufacturers when we offer alternatives to pesticides?

Mr. Klag responded that the manufacturers' presence is felt and if staff were to, for instance, make a statement that one product was less toxic than another and staff had not done their homework, the manufacturers would be quick to respond.

Mr. Klag said the objective as stated in Section 13.3 is to talk about convenient, safe, efficient and environmentally sound disposal services -- over time.

Mr. Petersen clarified that the language being discussed is intended for the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, and is, therefore, somewhat general. He said that should Council decide to proceed, a couple of the things that stand out in his mind are 1) education, 2) shared responsibility, 3) increased convenience, 4) continued funding, 5) no new regional facilities, and 6) hazardous waste drop-off services as a condition of any new regional transfer stations.

Ms. Keil noted that the plan as presented today includes elements we have talked about that can be fixed. She felt the committee would be willing to vote today on whether to take this plan to Council. Ms. Keil made a motion to recommend adoption of the Hazardous Waste plan as

presented. Mr. White seconded the motion. The committee voted unanimously to pass the plan on to Council.

**Other Business**

Chair Washington said that on behalf of the committee, he wanted to welcome all the new members and alternates to the SWAC committee.

The meeting was adjourned

S:\SHARE\DEPT\SWAC\MINUTES\2000\0119\SWAC MIN.DOC



**Agenda Item No. IV**  
**Market Development**  
Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, February 23, 2000

**Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
Recycling Business Assistance Program  
February 23, 2000**

**Introduction**

Metro has established a fund for market development. Before launching the program, Metro Council must approve the criteria for evaluation of proposals and release of funds.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce the proposed program, and to provide the general criteria that staff is considering.

Metro staff will place this subject on the agenda for the March SWAC for full discussion, and provide more information at that time.

**Mission**

- ❑ The basic goal of the Recycling Business Assistance Program (RBAP) is to foster demand for reusable and recyclable materials generated locally, and thereby help to “close the loop” on markets for these materials.
- ❑ RBAP will provide financial, marketing and technical assistance to reuse and recycling businesses that would not generally have access to these services.
- ❑ RBAP will offer a variety of financial instruments not generally available, but tailored to the needs of businesses that utilize reusable and recyclable materials in their products or services.

**Initial Funding and Activities**

Metro has initially budgeted over \$500,000 for this program. Appropriation of these funds is to be spread over a two-year period, with approximately \$250,000 approved for expenditure this year, and a similar amount next year.

Metro staff has been involved in discussions with potential partners in this program. The goals of such a partnership would be to: (a) make more funds available, (b) leverage dollars among the partners, (c) share risk among the partners, and (d) make available a wider range of financial instruments and services than any one of the partners could provide alone.

The criteria that are presented below are intended to apply whether Metro “goes it alone” with the program, or whether a partnership is formed. If, however, a market development partnership were to become a reality, it is to be expected that additional criteria would be required to address the additional needs of the partnership.

### **Expected Operation of the Program**

If Metro “goes it alone” REM expects to offer assistance on an annual basis through a competitive process. This process could result in one or more grants, recoverable grants or loans to eligible applicants. Under a partnership with additional funds, it would also be possible to accept applications on a flow basis.

### **Eligibility**

Applicants and applications would have to pass a set of eligibility requirements. First, they would have to demonstrate the project is in the public interest in that it responds to an unmet need in a reuse or recycling market. Second, they would have to demonstrate that the use of public resources does not substitute for privately-available resources.

Applicants would have to demonstrate that their proposal develops demand for reusable or recyclable materials through at least one of the following program objectives:

- Develop markets for locally recovered materials.
- Nurture local industries that use recovered material.
- Aid businesses introducing recycled content.
- Improve the efficiency of existing businesses using recycled content.

Applicants would have to demonstrate:

- That the use of the public program does not substitute for existing private resources (for example, bank lending).
- They have exhausted all reasonable private avenues of assistance.
- Private resources are only available at a price that renders the project infeasible.
- That the use of the public program does not duplicate activities currently provided by the private sector (for example, newsprint recycling).

### **Examples of eligible applicants**

- Business start-up  
*To allow a new reuse/recycling business to get off the ground.*
- Business expansion  
*For example, if an existing business could capitalize on new opportunities in reuse or recycling*
- Business Retention  
*For example, if a reuse or recycling business is in danger of folding, and it would be able to survive if financing a “gap” due to a short-term condition is available.*
- Technology assessment or demonstration  
*For example, assistance with bringing a device to patent stage or demonstrating that recycled material could replace virgin material in an existing product.*

### **Documentation**

Applicants that successfully pass a screen for eligibility must then demonstrate that their proposal does not rely on a perpetual public subsidy. In particular, the applicant must provide:

- A complete, documented business plan.
- Financial pro forma that supports the business plan, documented by market research or other supporting information.
- Demonstrate knowledge and experience in all phases of operation that are crucial to the success of the business plan.
- Able to pass a due diligence scrutiny equivalent in scope to conventional lending practice.

Agenda Item No. V  
**Transfer Station Service Plan**  
Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, February 23, 2000

**Transfer Station Service Plan**  
**Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee**  
**February 23, 2000**

**Introduction**

Since 1997, a number of stakeholders have suggested that Metro's policies and objectives regarding solid waste disposal facilities, as stated in the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP), are in need of revision. In response, a team of Metro solid waste staff has been working to answer the following questions:

- Does the region need more transfer stations?
- If so:
  - ✓ Where should they be located?
  - ✓ What are their obligations/what roles should they play in the solid waste system?
  - ✓ Should they be regulated; and if so, how?

**Progress and Purpose**

A recommendation that addresses these questions is beginning to emerge. However, implementation of this (or any other) recommendation requires additional decisions on significant policy issues. Both the emerging recommendation and the most significant policy questions are summarized on the following page. Examining the emerging recommendation and finding resolution to the policy questions is the primary purpose of this paper and this agenda item at SWAC.

**Today's Agenda**

In particular, the purposes today are to:

1. Introduce and describe the major policy issues in the context of the emerging recommendation.
2. Initiate a dialogue with SWAC on these issues.
3. Begin to develop recommendations on these issues.

## **Transfer Station Service Plan**

### **Emerging Recommendation**

Allow new transfer stations within the region. These stations shall not be limited as to the amount of waste they accept, process or dispose of, except to the extent this is limited by local regulations.

These stations shall provide the following solid waste services:

1. Accept waste from all customers (commercial and public).  
Hours of operation shall be at least 8am to 5pm, 6 days per week.
2. Provide an area for collecting household hazardous waste from residential generators.
3. Accept source-separated recyclable materials without charge.
4. Recover a minimum of 25% of material from non-putrescible waste and waste delivered by public customers.

### **Policy Questions**

- Will the minimum recovery rate standard meet stated objectives?
- What is the impact on existing facilities? If there is an impact, should there be a public response?
- What is the fall-back position if an existing facility cannot fully meet the obligations listed above? (For example, due to local land use constraints, or if meeting the obligation is not demonstrably cost-effectively)
- What fees and taxes should be paid, and how should they be imposed?
- If efficiencies and savings are realized, who should share in the benefits?
- Is it in the public interest to limit the number and/or location of new transfer stations?  
*Are there other policy questions you would add?*

### **Process**

- Background to these issues is provided on the following pages.
- Following that, some of the key issues are discussed in more detail on separate pages. Additional issue papers will be provided for future discussions.
- Beginning today, 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.

## **Background**

### **RSWMP Policies Related to Transfer Stations**

The Plan addresses two factors related to solid waste:

1. Capacity to handle waste (throughput). The Plan states that the 3 regional transfer stations (Metro Central & South, and Forest Grove) have sufficient capacity to handle the future demand for transfer services. Accordingly, the Recommended Practice is to build no new regional transfer stations.

A new transfer station could be authorized upon a finding that (a) the regional waste reduction program has not performed as expected, or (b) regional growth has outstripped the capacity of transfer stations to meet demand.

2. Accessibility to disposal sites. Although the Plan assumed there was sufficient waste-handling capacity, access to disposal sites was also addressed. The Plan recommends that problems with access be addressed by the development of small-scale “reloads.” These were to be located in areas with a “service gap,” and perform simple consolidation of waste for delivery to Metro Central or South.

### **What’s Changed?**

What has changed, since adoption of the plan, that has motivated stakeholders to suggest that the policies and objectives above are in need of revision? The answer is, basically, accessibility has continued to be a problem, and reloads are not an efficient solution. Reloads provide savings only from a short intra-regional haul, they provide limited economy of scale, they require specialized investment (short-haul transfer trucks), they are as difficult to site as a large solid waste facility, and ultimately, the waste is handled twice: once at the reload and again at the transfer station.

### **Partial Solution in 1998**

In 1998, the Metro Code was revised in a manner that partially addressed these concerns. The revised Code authorizes solid waste facilities to accept putrescible waste and directly haul this waste to an appropriate landfill. The Code defined a difference between “small” and “large” facilities (disposal of less or more than 50,000 tons of waste per year, respectively), and imposed certain obligations on “large” facilities. Under the assumption that 50,000 tons confers sufficient economy of scale, “large” facilities are required to provide certain public services—acceptance of public self-haul customers, hazardous waste and a free recycling drop-site—to help reduce service burdens on the regional transfer stations.



After the 1998 revision, “small” transfer station status was granted to three solid waste facilities. These facilities are allowed (but not required) under the code to meet the obligations above. No conflict with the RSWMP was found with any of these applications.

However, the revised Code also requires a finding of consistency with the RSWMP in order to confer “large” transfer station status on a solid waste facility. As it is difficult to demonstrate either RSWMP condition—failure of the waste reduction program or unanticipated regional growth—no “large” station status has been granted to date.

However, the three new facilities do not fully solve the accessibility problem that the Plan intended them to address. Many haulers cannot be accommodated under the 50,000 ton cap, and these haulers continue to incur longer commute times to regional transfer stations—unable to capitalize on haul-time efficiencies afforded by the closer facilities

### **Decisions Needed**

The main purpose of Metro staff’s current effort is to complete the work that was begun in 1998, and address solutions to issues of need for more transfer stations.

If we come to a regional consensus that more transfer stations are needed, then any conditions and impacts—such as the ones identified in this paper—must be addressed. Among other changes, staff anticipates that the RSWMP will have to be amended to accommodate new transfer stations outright. This is the present dialogue that REM staff seeks with SWAC.

On the following pages, three of the key issues are outlined for discussion. Additional issue papers will be developed for discussion during the next month.

**Issue**  
**Minimum Recovery Rate**

**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.

*Do you agree with these objectives?  
Are there others you would add?*

**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*

**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.

**Questions for Discussion**

*Does the draft recommendation meet objectives?  
If not, how should it be modified?  
What additional information do you need to make a decision?*

**Issue**  
**Impact on Existing Facilities**

**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”?

**Questions for Discussion**

*What policy will meet objectives?*

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

**Issue**  
**Requirement to Accept all Users**

**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

*Do you agree with these objectives?*

*Are there others you would add?*

**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.*

**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?*

Agenda Item No. VI  
**Criteria for Evaluating Proposals for the  
Disposal of 10% of the Region's Waste**  
Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, February 23, 2000

BACKGROUND  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
FOR THE DISPOSAL OF TEN PERCENT OF THE REGION'S WASTE

*Current System/Tools*

Metro is responsible for the disposal of solid waste generated within its jurisdictional boundary. In fulfillment of these responsibilities, Metro has entered in several agreements. One of these agreements, entitled *Waste Disposal Services* (December 1989), contains a guarantee for Metro to deliver to the contractor's landfills "...a minimum of 90 percent of the total tons of acceptable waste that Metro delivers to any general purpose landfill during the calendar year." Disposal services for the remaining 10% will be provided as a result of this request for proposals. The amount of waste represented by the 10% was approximately 85,000 tons in 1999.

The majority of the region's waste to be disposed at a general-purpose landfill is collected and delivered to either a transfer station or a direct-haul facility. Two of these transfer stations (Metro South and Metro Central) are owned by Metro. The third (the Forest Grove Transfer Station) is owned by a private firm that operates under the conditions of a Metro franchise.

The three direct-haul facilities in the region (Recycle America, Willamette Resources Inc. and Pride) are also privately owned and operate through a franchise issued by Metro. These facilities are limited in the amount of waste -- 50,000 tons annually -- that can be transferred from each facility to a general-purpose landfill.

Historically, the 10% of the region's waste not covered by the *Waste Disposal Services (WDS)* agreement, was taken from the Forest Grove Transfer Station to a landfill in Yamhill County outside the Metro region. However, due to a change in ownership of this landfill, waste from the region flowing to the landfill is included as part of the 90% guarantee under the *WDS* agreement.

More recently Metro has granted Non-System Licenses to haul waste outside the Metro boundary for disposal at a landfill not included in the *WDS* agreement. Waste covered under this license (approximately 36,000 tons annually) is included as part of this procurement. The licenses can be revoked upon execution of an agreement(s) resulting from this RFP.

One other tool available for disposal of waste generated within the Metro boundary is a Designated Facility Agreement (DFA). A DFA is an agreement between Metro and a disposal site that sets the terms under which the disposal site may accept waste coming from within the Metro boundary. As with a Non-System License, a DFA specifies the procedures for collecting Metro fees and the type of activities allowed.

*Project Purpose*

The purpose of the project is to further the regional goals and objectives for managing solid waste as prioritized in the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). This plan emphasizes waste reduction activities as the way to manage increases in the solid waste stream, as well as to reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal. The RSWMP also sets forth policies

regarding the provision of facilities needed to provide efficient disposal. The programs and strategies contained in the plan are designed to produce a regional recovery rate of 56%.

In late 1999, Metro's Regional Environmental Management Department (REM) began to consider how to utilize the remaining 10% waste disposal tonnage to further RSWMP goals. REM began this effort by consulting with its Solid Waste Advisory Committee, which examined and ranked a number of criteria to be used in shaping the project's outcome. The criteria were then presented to the Regional Environmental Committee of the Metro Council for discussion.

This process resulted in the development of criteria (see attached) to be used to evaluate proposals to dispose of the remaining 10% of the region's waste. These criteria address regional goals regarding cost, competition, materials recovery, facilities development and the use of non-truck transport methods.

#### *Project Summary*

Metro is soliciting proposals to dispose of 10% of the region's waste, while providing other goods or services to further regional solid waste goals as reflected in the evaluation criteria. The main emphasis of the criteria is to provide for the reduction/recovery of materials that are currently being disposed. In addition, the cost effectiveness of proposed solutions will be evaluated, in relation to the current solid waste system, as well as to other proposals.

As identified in the RSWMP and reflected in the work of the Service Provision Planning project, there exists, a need for additional facilities in the region -- both general and specialized materials recovery facilities, and transfer facilities for underserved areas. Proposals that address these needs of the solid waste system will receive greater consideration relative to other proposals.

**SWAC Meeting  
February 23, 2000**

**Discussion of Criteria for Evaluating Proposals  
for the Disposal of 10% of the Region's Waste**

**Background:** Metro's Disposal Services Contract guarantees that 90% of the region's waste delivered to general-purpose landfills be disposed at landfills controlled by WMI. Disposal services for the remaining 10% (approximately 85,000 tons annually) may be obtained through a separate procurement.

**Purpose:** Metro has the option to use the 10% to further goals related to cost, materials recovery, competition, facilities development, and the use of non-truck transport methods. Competitively procuring disposal capacity for this remaining waste may increase the agency's influence over development of the solid waste system in a manner consistent with regional goals.

**RFP:** The REM Department is recommending the use of a request for proposals (rather than low bid) to obtain disposal services for the 10%. A RFP allows Metro to use evaluation criteria reflecting Metro's multiple goals when comparing proposals. An exemption from the competitive bid process will be required to use a RFP.

**Key Assumptions:** The REM Department recommends two key assumptions: 1) A contract term of seven years and; 2) No firms will be excluded from submitting a proposal.

**Proposed Evaluation Criteria:** Presented below is a description of the criteria and the main issues associated with them. A table follows the description and shows the weight and ranking of the criteria.

1. Cost- Proposals will be compared on their impact on costs within the solid waste system.

*Issue:* The number of points allocated to this criterion reflects Metro's priorities in relation to the other criteria.

2. Encourage Materials Recovery- Proposals to dispose of the 10% will be evaluated based on their approach to increase materials recovery in the region.

*Issue:* Should the disposal of waste be used to leverage recovery? The REM Department recommends that it should and that materials recovery should be allocated the highest number of points for evaluating proposals.

3. Improve Competition in the System- Use the 10% to increase the presence of other participants for waste transfer, transport and disposal.

*Issue:* Should Metro use this procurement to increase the number of, or allocation of waste to, participants in waste transfer, transport and disposal? The REM Department believes adequate competition already exists in these areas. Discussion at SWAC also considered collection competition. Metro does not regulate collection, and the REM Department believes it is inappropriate to use this procurement to influence waste collection.

4. Promote Development of Needed Facilities- Utilize the 10% to provide additional facility capacity to users of the solid waste system.

*Issue:* By being able to receive this additional waste, existing or new facilities could provide needed services such as transfer services in under-served areas. The REM Department recommends that Metro consider proposals that require lifting existing tonnage caps.



5. Develop Alternative Transportation Modes- Use the 10% to obtain transportation modes other than truck.

*Issue:* There has been ongoing interest in utilizing transportation modes other than trucks to transport waste, to minimize environmental and traffic impacts and provide transportation flexibility in the event of a disaster. Proposals to use barge or rail transport would receive all available points.

### Discussion of Criteria for Evaluating Proposals for the Disposal of 10% of the Region's Waste (cont'd)

#### Weighting of Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	The REM Department's Proposed Weight	SWAC Ranking*
Materials Recovery	45 %	1
Cost	35 %	3
Develop Facilities	10 %	2
Alternative Transport Modes	10 %	5
Competition	0 %	4

- Scale of 1 to 5: 1 being highest priority

#### Key Issues for Further Discussion

1. Should Metro consider proposals that require lifting the current cap of 50,000 tons on "direct-haul" facilities?
2. Is the strong emphasis on materials recovery appropriate for this procurement?
3. Should competition be given evaluation points in order to give small or new firms an advantage, and/or should WMI be prohibited from the procurement since it already controls 90% of the waste?