

A G E N D A



METRO

MEETING: REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: Tuesday, December 16, 2003

TIME: 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

PLACE: Rooms 370A & 370B, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

5 mins. I. Call to Order and Announcements Susan McLain
Announcements
Responses to Issues from the November 17th Meeting
*Approval of Executive Summary**

10 mins. II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update Mike Hoglund

70 mins. III. Next Steps for Recovery: Incentives & Requirements* Anderson/Barrett
Last spring Metro created two groups to examine different facets of material recovery policies and programs. Council President David Bragdon assembled the Recycling Credits Evaluation Task Force to provide an independent and objective look at the \$1.1 million Regional System Fee Credit Program, which provides operating subsidies to encourage post-collection recovery of mixed dry waste. The Task Force has examined questions of program efficiency, fairness, consistency with other waste reduction policies, and alternatives. They are now formulating final recommendations to Council. The second group, created by Metro Council when they amended the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, is the Contingency Plan Work Group. This group, appointed by Metro's COO, was charged with identifying required recycling and other policies that would help ensure the region reaches the 62% recovery goal by 2005. The RSWMP Contingency Plan Work Group is now ready to report its recommendations to Council on new policies that would increase material recovery in the region. This agenda item is intended to: 1) summarize recommended next steps for material recovery; 2) identify connections between the current incentive program and potential future "required recycling" policies; 3) summarize Metro Council's feedback to date; and 4) encourage SWAC's discussion and possible recommendation to Council on the group's outcomes.

5 mins. V. Other Business and Adjourn Susan McLain

** 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 Susan McLain (797-1553)
Staff: Janet Matthews (797-1826)

Alternate Chair: Councilor Rod Park (797-1547)
Committee Clerk: Michele Adams (797-1649)

Executive Summary

Solid Waste Advisory Committee November 17, 2003

I. Call to Order and Announcements

Susan McLain

Announcements: Mr. Gilbert announced that Nature's Needs was given a solid waste franchise by Washington County.

Approval of Executive Summary: Mr. Winterhalter made a motion to approve the Executive Summary dated September 15, 2003; Mr. Korot seconded the motion; none opposed; the Executive Summary stood as read.

II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update

Mike Hoglund

Mr. Hoglund advised that the Regulatory Affairs group has three primary matters of interest currently.

The Council will consider franchise renewals for Willamette Resources, Pride Recycling and Recycling America at the December 2nd work session and at the regular council meeting on December 4th. Staff has recommended that they be renewed for four years at a 65,000 annual tonnage cap.

Mr. Hoglund added that the Council would consider, at these same sessions, six wet-waste non-system licenses (NSLs). Four of the six NSLs under consideration (for Willamette Resources, Coffin Butte, Arrow Sanitary, and American Sanitary) count against the discretionary 10% allowed under the agreement whereby 90% of the region's putrescible solid waste will go to Waste Management Landfills. The other two NSLs are for Pride and Forest Grove.

Mr. Hoglund gave details about the fact that Metro published a "public notice" last week for Pacific Land Clearing and Recycling III (PLC III), which is seeking an amendment to its current license to become a dry waste material recovery facility (MRF). PLC III is proposing to take a large variety of materials. Currently, they only take yard debris, roofing and treated wood. The public comment period ends November 28th. Mr. Hoglund explained that the reason he brought this topic to the attention of the Committee is that under the new Chapter 5.01 and 5.05 Code changes, there has been some delegation of approval authority to the Chief Operating Officer with the contingency that there be a public comment period and an opportunity to respond when *license modifications are proposed*.

Mr. Hoglund went on to discuss the Requests for Proposals for operation of Metro's transfer stations. He explained that the contract with BFI will expire October 2004 and that an RFP is being prepared for a new contract. However, Council will have the option of extending the existing contract or considering the proposals for a new contract to operate both Metro South and Metro Central. The new proposals will be evaluated on issues of costs, material recovery, the approach for material recovery, and lastly, their operation and maintenance approach. Mr. Hoglund said that the operation and maintenance costs will be important because of recent compactor failures at the facilities. He did explain, however, that Metro is not looking at any significant capital improvement costs at either facility. Mr. Hoglund informed SWAC members that one of Council's main criteria was to operate in a sustainable manner. Mr. Hoglund explained that the SW&R Department would be initiating discussions with the Council over the next month to clarify different sustainability elements to be considered. Mr. Hoglund said that we will be issuing a request for letters of interest from vendors in an upcoming major solid waste publication and will be advertising widely for this RFP, if Council does not decide to extend the current contract.

Mr. Hoglund talked briefly about two committees which are looking at waste reduction opportunities for the Metro region: the RSWMP Contingency Plan Work Group (CPWG) and the Regional System Fee Credit Task Force. The CPWG is investigating ways to ensure that our region meets the 62% recovery goal. Mr. Hoglund explained that the group still has a number of contingency measures to consider and are not finished voting on the issues. Currently, the group is working on narrowing the list of recommendations they will provide to Council. Councilor McLain wanted to clarify that when Mr.

Hoglund used the word "ban" during his explanation of some of these contingency measures being considered and that there is no "ban" as yet, but that there were some suggestions. Councilor McLain explained that it is a situation where the issues being considered are items that are involved in a "task force"; they are only suggestions and are still being mulled over. Those suggestions will then go to staff and then subsequently will be presented to Council and also at the next SWAC meeting.

Mr. Hoglund then spoke about the Regional System Fee Credit Task Force. Mr. Hoglund explained that the questions being asked of both of these committees are very hard questions and, for that reason, the final report of the Regional System Fee Credit Task Force may be delayed. He said this task force hopefully would be coming out with a recommendation by mid-December. Mr. Hoglund said to make a long story short, the Recycling Credit Program will be maintained in the short term, although the committee is looking at trying to come up with some tweaks or fixes to it in the interim. The program as it stands now may not be the exact program implemented for the next couple of years.

Councilor McLain explained that the Council has asked to review the recommendations from each task force in an integrated fashion. She explained that there are some short-term expectations of the budget over the last few years that need to be handled, but that the Council is looking long-term as updates from these two committees become apparent.

On a final note, Mr. Hoglund talked about a resolution for \$300,000 for the Regional System Fee Credit Program. The Council will be discussing releasing that money which should ensure funding of the credits through until February 2004. The Council will more than likely start asking questions as to what happens in the next budget, and hopefully the budget process will answer those questions.

Councilor McLain asked for comments/questions. There were none.

III. Updating the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan

Janet Matthews

Councilor McLain then introduced this agenda item and explained that this is the first major update of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). She explained that the Council is very interested and concerned that this update prepares us for the 21st Century and all of the new ways that business is being done in both recycling and the solid waste disposal business. Councilor McLain credited Janet Matthews with doing a good job by putting together a timeline, concepts and ideas of how the update process will be managed.

Ms. Matthews talked about how the two plans that guide solid waste and recycling are different. She explained that the Strategic Plan is a short-term plan, which gives Metro direction in implementing roles laid out by the RSWMP, and it also recognizes emerging issues. Ms. Matthews said, in contrast, the RSWMP is a regional plan that has been referred to as a "functional" plan. Ms. Matthews explained that the RSWMP sets out roles and responsibilities and strategies for achieving the goals and relies upon the cooperation of a lot of parties in the public and private sector.

Ms. Matthews explained that the current plan expires in 2005 and therefore we need to embark on the planning process for updating the RSWMP. Ms. Matthews then referred the audience to the RSWMP Update Project schedule of Phases and Major Tasks and the Organization Chart. Ms. Matthews introduced Marta Conkle McGuire as the Assistant Project Manager. Ms. Matthews also introduced Paul Ehinger, Manager of Engineering & Technical Support Section, and Karen Blauer, Community Grants Coordinator for the Community Relations Section, as key members of this project update. Ms. Matthews said that even though this project will be a marathon effort, she was really excited about it.

Ms. Matthews then showed the SWAC members a PowerPoint presentation. During the presentation, she discussed the purpose of RSWMP, Metro's role, what is covered in the current plan, the scope of the update project; and what role will SWAC play in the update. Ms. Matthews covered the history of SWAC's involvement in the RSWMP. She indicated that the participation of SWAC is evident both as a group and probably also as individual stakeholders. The SWAC group will be asked to identify key planning issues, shape goals and objectives for the next 10 years, and review proposed strategies that will ultimately end up a part of the plan.

Ms. Matthews asked if there were any questions. She did mention that at the January SWAC meeting an agenda item may be expected which will unveil the plans for the public involvement portion of the plan. She said the project would really get underway in the months that follow.

Councilor McLain clarified the definition of "public outreach" by including the industry and other players in the system, but explained that it also includes the general public who either buy the services or expect the services that Metro SW&R is providing.

Mr. Hycke asked if the target date of December 3rd to have the Request for Proposal completed for the consultant was still the projected date. Ms. Matthews responded by saying that she was in the process of developing the RFP and that it was her goal to have it completed by December 3rd. Councilor McLain explained that there is going to be a lot of work that is done in-house, however, she would like to have whatever needed discussion about the proposed RFP before it "hits the street." Ms. Matthews explained that the primary purpose for the RFP is to hire a consultant that would be responsible for writing the draft and the final plan in a reader-friendly fashion.

IV. 2002 Regional Recovery Rate and Analysis

Steve Apotheker

Steve Apotheker, Senior Solid Waste Planner, Waste Reduction Section, started his presentation by thanking Mary Sue Gilliland and Peter Spendalov from DEQ for providing the information he would be talking about and also Julie Cash for assisting in assembling the information into a comprehensive fashion in a short period of time. Ms. Gilliland apologized for not providing the information about finding 4,000 more tons for Metro to Mr. Apotheker in a timely fashion.

Mr. Apotheker explained that the recovery rate this year was 48%, which is the calculated rate, and on top of that is 6% credits, for a total recovery rate of 54%. The region's goal is 62%. Mr. Apotheker referenced PowerPoint graphs (attached). He explained that he had left the 6% credits off and was only looking at the calculated recovery rate in terms of the curbside, commercial and C&D recovery programs. He explained that when you look at the trend in the 1990s, we were pretty flat, covering about 42%. However, we started to show some growth between 1999 and 2001 and then last year fell back about 1%. Of the growth between 2000 and 2001, probably about 1/2 of that growth was real program growth. A lot of the growth was attributed to wood recovery, the other half was due to more comprehensive reporting, in particular, getting some additional scrap metal dealers to report in. He also explained that DEQ added brick as a new material and that all of those factors contributed to program growth in wood in 2001. In 2001, one of the driving factors for increase in wood collection were energy prices which reached somewhat of a historic high, at least in the last 5 or 6 years and those prices came down somewhat in 2002. The other factor was that towards the end of 2002, one of the markets that were buying wood to be used in manufactured wood products had changes in ownership of some mills, and the policy became to use sawmill residuals instead of scrap wood. So again, he explained, when you have more wood on the market and less of an incentive due to lower energy prices, there's not quite as much recovery.

He explained the "trend line" that showed that if we continued our progress, we would miss our recovery rate goal of 56% by a little over 4 points. Mr. Apotheker did state that the good news is that between 1995, the beginning of the RSWMP, and today, we are recovering 250,000 tons more of recyclable materials, including yard trimmings, which reflects a definite increase in our programs to recover materials. However, he explained, the fact that the recovery rate isn't growing faster indicates that our increase in recovery is keeping up with our increase in consumption.

Mr. Apotheker then discussed the graph regarding the difference between recycling and composting and energy recovery.

Mr. Apotheker reviewed the "Winners for 2002" which included materials such as: yard debris, brick, plate glass, container glass, food waste, tires, lead acid batteries, textiles, etc.

Mr. Apotheker also reviewed the "Losers for 2002" which included materials such as: total metals, wood waste, roofing, gypsum wallboard, tinned cans/aluminum, rigid plastic containers, total plastic, carpeting (used), and used motor oil. Mr. Walker questioned if the figure for aluminum was a statewide figure.

Ms. Gilliland answered that it was. There was discussion between SWAC members regarding the Bottle Bill and the rationale behind the figures.

Mr. Apotheker examined with the group the "Metro Disposed Waste Composition" trends from 1998 through 2002 with items such as: food, recyclable paper, wood (all), non-recyclable paper, metal (all), yard trimmings, wallboard, mixed containers, and roofing (recyclable). He said, overall, the recycling programs are doing well.

V. Current Research

Paul Ehinger & Tom Chaimov

Paul Ehinger, Manager of Engineering & Technical Support Section for Metro, gave a Transfer Capacity Analysis PowerPoint presentation to the group. Mr. Ehinger discussed the Transfer Capacity Study by reviewing with the group the goals of the project, which, he stated was to provide an estimate of the region's existing capacity to transfer wet waste. The question to be asked, per Mr. Ehinger, is how much capacity do we have to get material out of town. Mr. Ehinger explained that the "total need" goal includes both wet waste and dry waste. He explained that there are two types of facilities in the region, those that handle both wet and dry waste and those that are limited to dry waste, however, they both use essentially the same equipment to get rid of the residue.

Mr. Ehinger gave an overview of what we can use the data for: (i.e., system planning such as the RSWMP update; to assist policy makers in decision making; etc.) and noted that these are capacity estimates, not maximum desirable operating levels. He explained that this data is "not capacity estimates that in anyway set some type of regulatory number or pick a set of magic numbers for any particular facility to operate in." He explained that these numbers are estimates based on a certain set of criteria. The purpose of these estimates are to give us a good planning level estimate of what our ability is to transfer waste. Mr. Ehinger clarified what "Transfer Capacity" means; "It is the lesser of either how much you can load into the facility over a period of time or, how much you can load out the back door to take to the disposal site." He informed the group that it does get more complicated because it cannot exceed the facilities' storage capacity.

Mr. Ehinger then went on to discuss how the engineers evaluate the receiving capacity, load out capacity, and storage capacity, using various factors. Mr. Ehinger explained that his total aggregate estimate is 2,061,000 tons of transfer capacity in the region and that we are currently disposing of 1.3 million tons in the region. He explained that at any reasonable time frame, we have a significant amount of unused capacity. He quantified that statement by stating this does not include all the facilities in the region, but only the mixed waste facilities.

Mr. Ehinger advised that the fieldwork has been completed on this project, the data has been gathered, and the initial calculations are finished. From these, he has preliminary estimates. He said that a draft report would be forthcoming in approximately three weeks for internal review.

Sarah Jo Chaplen asked how the unused capacity is considered during the "peak hours" and does the unused capacity stay the same during the peak hours. Mr. Ehinger answered by saying that "Yes, we do." He made clear his answer in engineering terms, and explained his formula for those calculations, which proved that the capacity would balance out during the peak times.

Steve Schwab asked if the flood of 1996 tested the capacity levels and why it was that Metro Central and Metro South got shut down. He remembered that the stations stopped all collections and they were forced to travel to Marion County. Mr. Ehinger answered that question by stating "absolutely not." Councilor McLain explained that it was an emergency systems issue and we were told to "hold" all receiving. Councilor McLain clarified that this reporting is not during an emergency situation and that there are other issues to be brought into the factoring during that type of event, such as the flooding.

Tom Chaimov, Senior Solid Waste Planner, Financial Management & Analysis Division presented an Activity-based Cost Model of Metro's Transfer Station Operations via a PowerPoint presentation.

He gave an explanation of the cost model schematics and went on to explain that this cost model is simply a way to characterize the costs of operating Metro Central and Metro South Transfer Stations. He said that the cost model is used for: good business practices; to inform contract-pricing structure; and to assess impacts of policy options. He said we currently have a contract with an operator and want to make sure that the pricing structure of the contract is fair and accurately reflects what it costs to provide services at the transfer stations. Mr. Chaimov went on to explain some secondary uses for this cost model, such as: knowing your customer, management of queuing, and other operational optimization. He explained that the model helps us to quantify better and know what kinds of materials come into our transfer stations in different loads. He said that there may be other operational optimization factors that would come out of this study, but definitely the management of queuing is an important one.

Mr. Chaimov clarified that the cost model will not predict hauler or generator behavior. If conditions change, for example, this model will not tell how others will react in the event of a policy change or some other change in the system. The model would not contemplate anything that has to do with operations of private facilities and would not model system costs. He said that this model is only a small piece of "system costs."

Mr. Chaimov explained to the group the timeline for this cost model. He said the model structure is essentially defined, but may have some small tweaks, and the input model is fairly well completed. He said that they are currently in the implementation stage of building this cost model by working on modeling the activities and the costs of various activities. The aggressive timeframe is to have a working model by Thanksgiving, and documentation will follow in December.

Councilor McLain said that both Mr. Ehinger and Mr. Chaimov introduced a lot of information to this meeting that would be very useful to the SWAC members and Metro.

VI. Other Business and Adjourn

Susan McLain

Councilor McLain closed by saying she felt the group has a couple of months of exciting agendas ahead with the Contingency Plan Work Group's report, the RSWMP update, and also some budget decisions that always cause a ripple effect. She said it is very important that the SWAC members be on top of these issues this year.

As there were no further comments or business, Councilor McLain adjourned the meeting.

Documents to be kept with the record of the meeting (copies available upon request):

Agenda Item III:

- RSWMP Update Project Phases and Major Tasks
- RSWMP Update Project Organizational Chart
- PowerPoint Presentation, "RSWMP Update Project"

Agenda Item IV:

- PowerPoint Presentation: Metro Region Recovery Rate, Recovery By Disposition, Per Capita Disposal, Recovery and Generate, Waste Reduction Initiative Targets, Winners/Losers in 2002, Metro Substream Disposal, and Metro Disposed Waste Composition (see attached)

Agenda Item V:

- PowerPoint Presentations: "Transfer Capacity Analysis" and "Activity-Based Cost Modeling"

Sm/mca
Attachments
M:\Remi\Od\Projects\SWAC\MINUTES\2003\111703redlines.Doc

Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Recycling Credit Evaluation Task Force Status Report
December 11, 2003

ISSUE

Credits provided by Metro against solid waste fees and excise taxes paid by material recovery facilities (MRFs) and local transfer stations. Do they serve their purpose? Are they economically efficient? Are they consistent with other waste reduction policies? Are they fair? Are there other options? An independent committee convened by Council President Bragdon, the Recycling Credit Evaluation Task Force, has been examining these questions since July.

BACKGROUND

Private solid waste facilities that recover recyclable material from solid waste (material recovery facilities, or "MRFs") were put at financial risk when tip fees began to fall in 1998. The lower tip fees were not sufficient to pay for MRFs' operating costs, compared with simply landfilling the waste. Metro responded by providing cost relief in the form of credits against the Regional System Fee and Excise Tax levied on the residual waste disposed by the MRFs. Dubbed the Regional System Fee Credit Program, these credits were originally intended to be temporary, while MRFs adjusted to the new economic climate. Until this year, the annual credits were typically in the vicinity of \$1.1 million.

In FY 2002-03, the Council shifted the policy focus of the program—from temporary cost relief, to a subsidy designed to "boost the regional recovery rate." Council adopted special findings to this effect, increased the size of the credits, modified the materials that could be counted in facilities' recovery rates, and eliminated the annual sunset provision.

The credits were called into question during the deliberations for the FY 2003-04 budget, in which Council President Bragdon requested a review of Solid Waste & Recycling Department discretionary spending in waste reduction and outreach. Ultimately, Council reduced the budget for the credits, and Council President Bragdon convened the Recycling Credit Evaluation Task Force to take an independent and objective look at the policy and program. Sometime after January 1, 2004, the Council will revisit the future of the credit program based in part on the Task Force's recommendations.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

- ☐ Eliminate credits
- ☐ Replace with an alternative approach
- ☐ Retain credit program in its current form
- ☐ Keep credits, but revise implementation.

DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS AND DRAFT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The options presented at this time are still under consideration by the Task Force. The implications and suggestions below are the Task Force's *preliminary* positions, as of December 10, 2003. The Task Force will continue its discussions in early January.

❑ Eliminate credits

The Task Force cannot justify outright elimination of a program which supports recovery, unless it is replaced by a program of equal or greater impact, and/or higher efficiency. This conclusion is based largely on the facts that (a) the region has a 62 percent recovery goal, (b) the region is lagging in its progress toward that goal, (c) their beliefs that the credits support some level of real recovery, and (d) there is no alternative program ready-to-go right now that could replace the credits.

❑ Replace with an alternative approach

It is outside the Task Force's charge to recommend specific alternatives to the credit program. There are other folks with more experience in solid waste that are charged with that task, including the RSWMP Contingency Plan Work Group convened by Metro's Waste Reduction Division to examine alternatives. The Task Force heard updates from the Work Group that helped shape its recommendations on the credits.

❑ Keep credits, but revise implementation.

The Task Force notes that the credits result in recovery that would not occur otherwise. As long as the region lags behind schedule in meeting the recovery goal, Metro should continue to provide credits or other forms of MRF-related incentives, unless certain conditions change, such as:

- Alternative program(s) are put in place that are better than the credits (*more efficient and/or result in more recovery*); or
- The Council and/or the State reduces the recovery goal.

The Task Force also notes that the current implementation results in certain undesirable side effects. For example, incentive to reject loads that may contain recoverable material due to the fact that credits are not available until the facility recovers more than 30 percent of its incoming dry waste, and concepts that are hard-to-measure or define operationally—such as what counts toward the regional recovery rate.

As of December 10, the Task Force was discussing a *draft* recommendation along the following lines:

- Continue Metro's "front door exemption" policy, in which fees and taxes are not imposed on tip fees at MRFs and other recovery facilities. Rather, the fees and taxes are imposed on the residual which is landfilled.
- Continue to offer credits against the fees and taxes on landfilling of MRF residual.

- Change the way by which credits are tied to performance. This is intended to eliminate or reduce the potential undesirable side effects noted above. The Task Force is discussing the merits of linking a credit or credit schedule to the qualities of the residual that is landfilled. For example, periodic sampling of residual for recoverable content. The Task Force sees this as a better and more direct measure of performance than the facility recovery rate, which is subject to definitional and measurement problems (e.g., “what counts”) and potential for various forms of manipulation.
- Metro should eliminate the credits in the long run. Establish a plan for doing so, considering the time needed for facilities to adjust. In particular, The Task Force notes that the RSWMP Contingency Work Group has recommended mandatory MRFing of construction debris; and eventually perhaps, of all dry waste. Economic incentives such as credits are unnecessary if behavior is mandated.

A Note

The Task Force’s deliberations, findings and recommendations are heavily influenced by the 62 percent regional recovery goal, and the current state of progress toward that goal. Some members of the Task Force point out that Council may wish to weigh in on the 62% waste recovery goal at some time in the future. At this time, Council is scheduled to discuss the goal as part of the RSWMP update in 2004.



Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Contingency Plan Work Group Summary and Recommendations

WORK GROUP PURPOSE

In August 2003, the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) Contingency Plan Work Group was convened to evaluate and recommend required recycling policies that could be implemented in the region if progress toward the 2005 regional waste recovery goal of 62 percent is not adequate.

BACKGROUND

Metro is the watershed representative to the state and is responsible for ensuring that the region meets its designated recovery goals of 62 percent by the end of 2005 and 64 percent by the end 2009. The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) provides a framework for coordinating solid waste programs within the region by establishing direction for resource management and the solid waste system, identifying strategies to increase recover, identifying roles and responsibilities, and fulfilling a state requirement that Metro have a waste reduction plan.

Amendments to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) in April 2003 established a contingency planning process to evaluate and recommend strategies to reach the 2005 recovery goal of 62 percent if sufficient progress is not being made. These strategies were to identify recycling policies to increase recovery for the sectors where the largest tonnage of recoverable waste remains: commercial, construction and demolition, and commercial organics.

The Contingency Plan Work Group met eight times from August 27, 2003 to December 3, 2003. The work group evaluated 12 potential strategies to increase recovery. Some members were divided on some of the strategies that were adopted or eliminated from consideration. As a package, however, the work group approved (by an 11 to 1 vote) a set of four contingency strategies to increase progress toward the 2005 recovery goal.

WORK GROUP CHARGE

The charge of the Contingency Plan Work Group, approved by Metro Council and SWAC, was as follows:

1. Identify required recycling and other methods of increasing progress toward recovery goals for three sectors: building industries; businesses; and commercially-generated organics.
2. Consider whether methods identified are best implemented through actions of local governments, Metro, the State of Oregon or a combination;

3. Determine whether adoption of these methods would be legally and financially feasible and would enable the region to meet its recovery goals; and
4. Recommend a contingency plan to Metro Council and the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee by January 1, 2004.

Although not directed by Metro Council and SWAC, the group was also asked to recommend “trigger points” for implementation of the proposed contingency plan if sufficient progress toward the region’s recovery goal is not reflected in recovery reports.

WORK GROUP COMPOSITION

Metro Chief Operation Officer Michael Jordan appointed a core group of 12 individuals who represent businesses, recyclers, local government and citizen interests to serve on the group (Table 1).

Table 1. Work Group Members

Name	Affiliation
Mark Altenhofen	Washington County (local government)
Jason Buch	R&H Construction Company (construction company)
JoAnn Herrigel	City of Milwaukie (local government)
Mike Huycke	WRI/Allied Waste Industries (processor)
Les Joel	Blue Heron Paper Company (end user)
Wade Lange	Ashforth Pacific (multi-tenant property management)
George Lundberg	Epson (large business)
Mike Miller	Gresham Sanitary Service (collector)
Jerry Powell	Resource Recycling Magazine (citizen)
Chip Sammons	Holistic Pet Center (small business)
Joe Keating	Sierra Club (environmental organization)
Bruce Walker	City of Portland (local government)

Lee Barrett, Waste Reduction and Outreach Manager, acted as the non-voting facilitator of the work group. Marta McGuire, Waste Reduction Planner, provided technical assistance and staffed the work group. Gina Cubbon served as the administrative secretary for the all work group meetings.

RECOMMENDED CONTINGENCY STRATEGIES

With the goal of reaching the 62 percent recovery rate by 2005, the Contingency Plan Work Group recommends the following strategies to be implemented by Metro and local governments:

Strategy #1: Metro should require all construction and demolition loads from the region to be processed before landfilling, beginning July 1, 2004. This strategy targets additional recovery in the building industry sector. Facilities that are franchised or licensed in the Metro region are currently required to perform recovery on construction and demolition loads at minimum rate of 25 percent. Designated Facility Agreements (DFA) with facilities outside the region would need to be revised to either: 1) require material recovery at the facility, or 2) require the facility to only accept material that has been processed (MRFed). It is recommended that Metro facilities be included under this requirement.

Strategy #2: Metro should require local governments to adopt mandatory business recycling requirements that require the recycling of specific materials. Metro should provide significant expansion of recycling assistance and outreach to businesses in the Metro region for jurisdictions that have adopted mandatory recycling with the following conditions:

- Beginning July 1, 2004, Metro should provide additional funding to local jurisdictions for expanded business recycling assistance and outreach.
- If by January 1, 2005, the development of a mandatory recycling program is not underway, jurisdictions should not be eligible to receive the additional funding for expanded recycling assistance and outreach.
- If by January 1, 2006, a mandatory recycling program is not in place, jurisdictions should not receive recycling assistance and outreach funding.

The Contingency Plan Work Group recommends that Metro provide additional funding for the Commercial Technical Assistance Program (\$400,000 per year) and commercial recycling outreach campaigns (\$110,000 per year) beginning in FY 04-05. The proposed funding doubles the FY 03-04 business recycling assistance program and commercial outreach budget. These strategies target additional recovery in the commercial sector, where the greatest amount of tonnage is needed to meet the 2005 recovery goal.

Strategy #3: Metro should require all dry waste loads from the region to be processed before landfilling. Dry waste does not include food or other putrescible waste. Typically recyclables in a dry waste load include paper, wood, metal, and glass. The work group recommends that this strategy be implemented after the adoption of mandatory recycling requirements and expanded business recycling assistance and outreach as a strategy to capture any remaining recyclables in dry waste loads. This strategy would be implemented in a similar manner as contingency strategy #1.

Strategy #4: Metro should evaluate organics contingency strategies in one year. The Contingency Plan Work Group strongly supports Metro's efforts and leadership in developing an organics collection program for the region. At this time, the work group feels it is premature to implement contingency measures and recommends evaluating the following strategies to increase recovery after one year:

- 1) Mandatory recovery of food waste from certain sized businesses; and
- 2) Residential organics collection (food waste collected with yard debris).

In this evaluation, factors for consideration should include: 1) a processor is located and operational; 2) at least two jurisdictions have organics collection programs established; and 3) at least 5,000 tons (over baseline of 12,000 tons) of organics are being recovered.