



METRO

A G E N D A

MEETING: REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: Monday, May 21, 2001

TIME: 3:00 p.m. – 4:40 p.m.

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

- 10 mins. I. Call to Order and Announcements** **Susan McLain**
Announcements
Responses to Issues from the April 16 Meeting
** Approval of April 16 Minutes*
- 10 mins. II. REM Director's Update** **Terry Petersen**
- 25 mins. *III. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Review** **Scott Klag**
Year 2000 marked the first major Periodic Review of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). This agenda item will involve (1) a presentation of conceptual plan amendments (including incorporation of the New Initiatives in Waste Reduction—organics, commercial, and construction & demolition—that have been presented to SWAC in the past; and (2) comments by SWAC. A formal action item will come before SWAC in the future, based on today's comments.
- 25 mins. IV. The Organics Waste Reduction Initiative** **Jennifer Erickson**
Results to date on one of the major new initiatives in waste reduction.
- 25 mins. V. REM's Strategic Plan Status and Research Tasks** **Janet Matthews**
A discussion of the research and strategy development
- 5 mins. VI. Other Business and Adjourn** **Susan McLain**
** Attachments are included with this agenda package.*

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: Lin Bernhardt (797-1640)

Alternate Chair: Councilor Bill Atherton (797-1887)
Committee Clerk: Connie Kinney (797-1643)

Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
Meeting Minutes
April 16, 2001

Members / *Alternates

Councilor Susan McLain, Chair
Councilor Bill Atherton, Alternate Chair
Dean Kampfer, Waste Management (disposal sites)
*Vince Gilbert, East County Recycling (disposal sites)
Lee Barrett, City of Portland
Tanya Schaefer (Multnomah County citizens)
Mike Leichner Pride Disposal (Washington County haulers)
Lynne Storz, Washington County
David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association (at-large haulers)
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers (recycling facilities)
Frank Deaver (Washington County citizens)
Jane Olberding (business ratepayer)
Mike Miller, Gresham Sanitary Service (Multnomah County haulers)
Sarah Jo Chaplen, Washington County cities
Dave Hamilton, Norris & Stevens (business ratepayers)

Non-voting Members Present

Doug DeVries, Specialty Transportation Services
Kathy Kiwala, Clark County, WA
Terry Petersen, REM

Metro and Guests

Tim Raphael, Celilo Group	Bill Metzler, REM
Leann Linson, REM	Paul Garrahan, OGC
Easton Cross, BFI	Dan Schooler, Waste Connections
Karen Feher, ASD	Connie Kinney, REM
Doug Drennen, DCS	Steve Kraten, REM
Greg Nokes, Oregonian	Jim Watkins, REM
Meg Lynch, REM	Roy Brower, REM
Janet Matthews, REM	Steve Engel, REM
Lin Bernhardt, REM	Jan O'Dell, REM
Doug Anderson, REM	Kevin Rauch, City of Troutdale

Call to Order and Announcements

Lee Barrett, City of Portland, announced they have reached their 54% recycling goal by the Year 2000. The Committee gave a round of applause to all involved for helping to reach this goal.

Chair McLain asked if there were any other announcements or items that anyone would like to bring to our attention. Chair McLain commented that if staff has promised to provide information and/or attachments to the agenda packet, and it has not been included, please bring it

to our attention in order that we can make it a priority at the next meeting. Chair McLain said a time will be set aside at each SWAC meeting to attend to this issue.

Approval of March 19 Minutes

Mr. Vince Gilbert made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. David Hamilton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REM Director's Update

Mr. Petersen announced that this April 21st is the SOLV event. He said Metro, along with SOLV and other sponsors, invite everyone to help in this year's clean-up. You can contact REM or Parks and they will direct you to any one of several clean-up sites.

Mr. Petersen reminded everyone that REM's new Latex Paint Facility has good quality paint for sale at an extremely affordable price in several colors. Mr. Petersen distributed a brochure on the colors available and mentioned that the paints could be blended to make custom colors.

Mr. Petersen suggested this paint is especially affordable to institutions such as schools, government agencies and non-profit organizations.

Mr. Petersen said that in conjunction with our Natural Gardening education program, Metro's demonstration garden in southeast Portland will be opening this spring. Mr. Petersen distributed a flyer on "Local Celebrity Series", a series of talks by local experts on natural gardening and alternatives to pesticides.

Mr. Petersen announced that compost in the State of Washington was found to be contaminated with some persistent pesticides, and killed the very gardens it was sold to help improve. He said these are incidents that can give composting a bad name. Compost is important for enhancing soil.

Mr. Petersen said Metro is considering an extension or change order to the operations contract currently held with BFI to operate our transfer stations at Oregon City and North Portland. He said this is a five-year contract, which expires in October of this year. Mr. Petersen said staff is currently considering whether to perhaps extend the contract for a certain time period, and if that is agreeable with BFI, staff could have a draft change order for the Council's consideration within the next few weeks.

Mr. Petersen said Metro is continuing in its effort to sponsor tire legislation to improve the market for recovery of tires. He said that currently 70% of used tires now go to the landfill. Mr. Petersen said, unfortunately, this legislation has stalled. The legislature has turned it into a study bill and sent it to the transportation committee. This process will include rewriting the legislation and working with Les Schwab and other members of the industry to be brought up before next year's legislation. He said our position is that we are not interested in prolonged discussion without a real commitment from all parties involved. Mr. Petersen said that if anyone has questions with regard to tire legislation, please contact Ms. Janet Matthews.

Chair McLain asked for questions, comments, or additions to Mr. Peterson's updates. There were none.

Developing REM's Strategic Plan

Chair McLain said the Council and REM are trying to get through the strategic planning process in an appropriate, thorough and timely manner. She said she felt it is very important to keep SWAC updated on this process and invite their responses from the beginning. She said this is initially a Metro staff proposal, which will be something the Council will be asked to act on. She said this endeavor is closely tied to the industry and to the markets and believes that any strategic plan that deals with our solid waste function needs to have some input and involvement from industry. Chair McLain said Ms. Matthews is going to make a presentation and then we will have some discussion. She said there will be additional opportunities in future meetings for members to give their input as well.

Ms. Matthews pointed out that copies of the overheads used in her strategic planning presentation at the previous SWAC meeting was included in the agenda packet, as well as the outline for today's work session.

Ms. Matthews said she has received some good direction from the Metro Council, particularly at the April 4, 2001 Solid Waste and Recycling Council Committee (SWAR) meeting. She said at that time they reviewed some high level components of the Strategic Plan: The vision, the mission and the goals. Ms. Matthews said they also revisited the 16 goals set forth in the RSWMP.

Ms. Matthews said the committee has selected two primary goals, as set forth in the handout just distributed. She said all of the bullets under the two goals are RSWMP goals and are encompassed within the two REM goals. She said they define what we continually seek to accomplish in the solid waste system.

Ms. Matthews continued with a discussion of what roles Metro should play in disposal service provisions. She said that depending on the answer to that question, we must ask how Metro's regulatory role should change. We must also ask what Metro's strategic role is in achieving the regional waste reduction goals.

Ms. Matthews said that the choices range from Metro selling the transfer stations and the system becoming 100% private, to maintaining the status quo. However, she said we could choose to be someplace in the middle where any number of options of a public/private mix could occur. She said that one important commitment came about as a result of the April 4th SWAR meeting; that REM will play a role in disposal services for the region. However, exactly what role Metro plays, the degree of public/private mix and service provision, the degree of regulation and the criteria for evaluating options is yet to be decided.

Chair McLain asked the committee if there were any questions regarding the handouts distributed for the purposes of discussion. None were received and Chair McLain asked for a discussion of the items listed on the last page of the handout.

Chair McLain invited the committee to comment on the REM goals.

Mr. White said one thing he hears about Metro is they have an internal conflict between keeping the system economical and cost efficient versus reducing waste. Mr. White said he sees that conflict expressed in the two goals.

Chair McLain said she appreciated Mr. White's comment and stated that the RSWMP also recognizes that same conflict. She said the Solid Waste & Advisory Committee has always recognized that when (or if) there was no longer a need for a solid waste system of the nature being discussed, Metro would indeed be successful and put ourselves out of business.

Chair McLain asked for an informal opinion on whether or not the committee felt the two REM goals as stated are the basis for REM's strategic plan and are agreeable to the industry and to the advisory committee. Committee members acknowledged this was agreeable to them.

Chair McLain said the next item of importance in the handout is the criteria for evaluating the feasibility of the service provision.

Chair McLain asked the committee if there was anything they would like to add and/or change on the list. Chair McLain said that in response to Mr. White's comment on the goals, i.e. the impact on the financial stability of Metro, that it is a very relevant concern with a lot of different layers and probably needs to be drawn out a little better.

Mr. White raised the concern over how complicated the system is, and asked if there is an opportunity to make the system less complicated. He said we recently talked about the credits, the regional system fee, and all the various credits that are employed, which has become quite convoluted.

Chair McLain said that the councilors had also raised the concern about simplifying the system.

Mr. Barrett said that he didn't see any comments with regard to recovery, only disposal. He said that under the question of cost effectiveness, he thinks the reference is to a tip fee. He said he would be interested in having some authority to increase recovery. He said Metro has already taken some steps through the implementation of the 25% requirement, but he believes there is room for a bigger commitment to recovery because he doesn't consider recovery as waste reduction.

Chair McLain said that for the record, the Council will take a closer look at the first item and look closer at waste recovery in the first bulleted item under REM Goal #1.

Mr. Gilbert said he felt it was important that the goals were laid out in a way that is fair to everyone participating in achieving the goals.

Mr. Petersen asked for clarification on Mr. Barrett's comment. He said this is a strategic plan for Metro's role. Mr. Petersen asked Mr. Barrett if he was suggesting that Metro's role should be focused on post collection recovery at the facilities rather than upstream waste prevention, recycling and source-separation programs.

Mr. Barrett replied that he felt Metro could do both: recovery at the facilities and the upstream education.

Chair McLain said that up to this point we have talked about development of the goals and we've agreed that the goals could use a little tweaking of the language. Also, we have reviewed the draft criteria and have agreed the basis is sound, but, again, the language could be tweaked a bit.

Chair McLain turned to Goal #3, REM's role in the system. She said SWAR agrees that Metro will have a role in the system and will at least include providing fairness and equity for the ratepayers. She asked the committee for their comments on the degree of public/private mix in service provision and on the degree of regulation.

Mr. Petersen added that he would like the committee to think about what options we should consider in the strategic plan.

Mr. Gilbert said the solid waste industry is an on-going experiment and Metro is involved in service provision, which he expressed as a control to the experiment. He said that in an experiment it is good to have a control that you can relate back to. He said that in light of that, he would like to see Metro involved in some sort of service provision in order to continue that control.

Mr. Hamilton said that on the question of whether Metro or private industry provides a service, he believes it should be based on the cost effectiveness for the end user. He would weigh this more on the cost per ton for each of the players. He said it has not always been his observation that government is not always the least-cost provider of services. He believes that private industry might possibly be more efficient and effective and Metro's role might serve better in an oversight or regulatory role.

Chair McLain replied that SWAR asked the same question, but added that even though private industry can sometimes provide a service more cost effectively, many times they have an opportunity to do things in a way that provides fewer options. She said Council believes services such as household hazardous waste collection and education, for example, must still be provided to the ratepayers.

Mr. Gilbert said one consideration to keep in mind is that private industry folks have a choice on what types of waste they handle and there are perhaps wastestreams that no one wants to deal with. At this point, Metro remains the facility of last resort.

Mr. Hamilton agreed saying the private sector is in it for a profit. If it is structured properly there can be a profit through the whole system, or we can keep Metro as the facility of last resort.

Mr. Gilbert said before Metro, we had private sector solid waste facilities only, and Metro came into being due to the problems that existed with none of the private industry folks wanting to handle certain wastestreams.

Mr. Hamilton said Metro can still exist as an administrator of the rules that private facilities have to abide by, and the rules could dictate that private sector facilities must take undesirable waste as well. He said business can be effective as well as being profitable if the guidelines and rules are simple enough to deal with.

Mr. Gilbert said it was his experience that the private sector doesn't necessary follow the rules.

Chair McLain said that what she did hear both Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Hamilton agree on is that Metro has a role and that role should be effective, efficient and cost efficient.

Mr. Murray said when he first started in the industry, Metro's main role was regulatory and oversight and not operations. He said there were some issues in the industry that caused Metro to step up to the plate and become a service provider.

Chair McLain said that was good information. She said Metro's role has not always been the same. She said Metro will need to take a look at the pros and cons on all levels of service provision, do a cost analysis, and take a look at the wastestreams.

Mr. White said with respect to his representation of the small hauler, they definitely feel Metro has a role whether it is protecting against monopolization or ensuring a level playing field. He said the comments he hears is that Metro should either be in and regulate, or be completely out. He said he most frequently hears that awarding a franchise to the first applicant and denying all others is not keeping a level playing field. He said he realizes that Metro has a difficult job balancing these issues, but it is important to understand that the small hauler appreciates the role that Metro plays. It is more important than Metro just being the disposal site of last resort, they should be given a choice as to where they take their loads.

Mr. Kampfer said that from another perspective, it is important that Metro be cautious of its role as a regulator and as a service provider so that their strategies and funding provisions don't reflect in their service provider pricing.

Chair McLain restated Mr. Kampfer's comment saying that if Metro is going to be a player in the market and we are going to remain a service provider, we need to make services available to everyone.

Mr. Kampfer said he meant that Metro not use its regulator ability to give themselves an edge in the market place. He said he does believe that Metro has a role in providing services that are needed in the region. He said even though his company could provide, for instance, collection of household hazardous waste, people would probably not come to them if they charged the true cost of service, which they as a company would have to do.

Mr. Atherton asked where the breakpoint would be if we used market forces. At what cost will citizen's behavior be shifted towards illegal dumping. He asked if there is a cost of service where the public is more prone to do that.

Mr. Murray said there is a potential for more waste recovery as the tipping fee goes down but he doesn't know if there is a magic number that makes the public more prone to illegal dumping.

Mr. Kraten replied that there have been a lot of things affecting it over time. He said that even in places where disposal is free, there is illegal dumping. Mr. Kraten said Metro has probably gone a small ways towards solving the problem but there will always be a problem with some people illegally disposing of waste.

Mr. Gilbert said he felt there definitely is a ceiling on the amount of the tip fee because if it exceeds a certain amount, the waste will go across the state line and leave the system.

Mr. Hamilton commented that the state of the economy will influence what people do with their waste. He thinks we need to take a look at the whole picture and the impact of an increased tipping fee at a time, such as now, when the economy is slowing down.

Chair McLain said there are two things she would invite the committee to discuss that haven't been addressed yet: Metro facility ownership and the public/private service mix issue.

Mr. Miller said the industry knows that Metro has a unique role since they give licenses to facilities and have the responsibility of setting rates. He commented that if Metro will retain the ability to grant licenses as well as to decide who will and won't be allowed to have a facility within the region, then you have to do one of two things. You have to regulate the price for all facilities so the playing field remains level, or get out completely and let the market dictate what facilities continue to be in business. Or if Metro is going to regulate the number of facilities that can be built, you have to regulate the prices.

Mr. Petersen restated Mr. Miller's comment saying that even under an option where Metro may continue to provide service, we still need to think about getting in or out all the way.

Mr. Miller said Metro is the one that allows facilities to be built, so under that scenario, there is going to be a finite number of facilities built, and Metro is affecting the market. In other words, who does or doesn't get into the market. So if Metro is going to stay in it, they need to regulate prices at all facilities to keep a level playing field. And if not, Metro needs to get totally out and let the market determine the price.

Ms. Matthews said some people would argue that simply being a player in the system impacts rates. That Metro's rates serve as the base or level for which other rates are set.

Mr. Miller stated that it still has to do with what companies Metro will allow to be vertically integrated.

Mr. White replied this was a subject talked about at Tri County Council. He said you could say you have a \$62.50 tip fee but what happens if a facility is built in an extreme area of the region? Then the question becomes the balance between driving to downtown Oregon City and the economics of doing that versus using a facility that is closer but charges a higher tip fee. Further, does that facility have the ability to charge themselves a lower tip fee? He said his group has

asked for language that says there should be no discriminatory pricing. He said even that issue became somewhat contentious. Our consensus was that at the least you could not be discriminatory on what you charge others and what you charge yourself. He said then the issue became how you enforce that.

Mr. Barrett said that a year ago he would have been in favor of Metro selling the transfer stations. But, he said that now that the City of Portland is trying to do recovery in the organics field, it is easier for him to deal with Metro and convince them to allow them to use some of their public facilities for the recovery of organics than it would be for him to approach a private sector facility and ask the same thing. He said that as far as recovery is concerned, he believes that Metro should continue to at least still own the two transfer stations, and perhaps try to recover some materials post-collection that might not be economical for a private sector operator to do.

Mr. Gilbert asked if finite licenses are granted by Metro to regional transfer stations. He asked Mr. Petersen if Metro considered all applications for a license.

Mr. Petersen replied that generally the policy has been that Metro would not, for example, restrict any dry waste recovery facility if the facility has acquired the proper land use permits and has the right qualifications. He said that is an example of where a dry waste facility must apply for an authorization from Metro, but Metro does not restrict the number of facilities. He said that with respect to a large regional transfer stations, the policy is that Metro will restrict the number of those types of facilities. He said there is a range based on the type of facility.

Chair McLain commented that that topic was also discussed at SWAR. She said the range should be discussed as well as the tonnage cap because it is perceived there are some inequities there.

Mr. Atherton said we are focusing in on the key issues: the range of facilities and what would be the natural saturation point. He asked the committee if there was another option rather than the one stated as Metro being either all in, or all out of service provision. He asked if we could come to an agreement that there are some basic elements of the overall system, i.e., hazardous waste, organics recovery, etc. We could agree these are a part of the system, and the system fee has to cover it. And then we let the natural wisdom of the market determine the number of facilities, but everyone pays the system fee. Then Metro will have to compete the same as any other facility for the business. He said some of that natural wisdom will be dictated by fuel prices, distance, ease of transportation and other natural economic factors that should be in play. He asked if that was an "in or out" or a mixed system in their mind.

Mr. Miller replied that his major concern is that there is a level playing field, and that is not affected by whether Metro is in or out. I think there are probably a lot of ways to answer that question. He said he thinks the question is valid, but how we answer that will take a lot of creativity. The bottom line is not whether Metro is in or out, but that the system is equitable.

Mr. Atherton asked Mr. Miller if the system that he described would level the playing field, where everyone pays the same system fee everywhere, and that Metro doesn't determine the number of facilities.

Mr. Miller said that basically he would say yes, but that is without seeing the plan.

Chair McLain said the record will show that Mr. Miller qualified his answer.

Ms. Matthews asked Mr. Atherton what he was defining the system fee as.

Mr. Atherton replied they are the costs of the depth of the existing system. The cost of hazardous waste, some of the education programs and continue to go down the hierarchy until we reach a cutoff point that we can all agree on.

Chair McLain said she would like the record to reflect that we definitely need to define what charges are encompassed in the Regional System Fee.

Ms. Schaefer commented that in addition to continuing the collection of hazardous waste, she believes it is equally important to continue the role of education that Metro does so very well. She said she believes that government definitely has a role to educate the public and that private industry cannot, or probably won't, provide that same function. She said she definitely doesn't want to see education go away.

Mr. Murray, commenting on Mr. Atherton's point, said that Metro controls how many and where, facilities can be built. It is difficult to site a transfer station. If Metro doesn't take a positive stand on a facility, most likely it isn't going to happen. In addition, Metro says one must prove that a facility needs to exist before a facility can even apply for regional transfer station status.

Chair McLain stated that a needs assessment is something you are addressing in that comment, and that's a good comment.

Mr. Hamilton commented that Metro doesn't need to keep a lid on what's available. If you get 10 people who want to build a facility, they all should have the ability to do so, because the market will dictate whether they can all survive.

Mr. Barrett said that Metro certainly should have a role in establishing some *minimum* standards for facilities. He said he could liken Metro's role for disposal facilities to the current education system. The government has decided it should build, create, staff and fund public schools for the education of its citizens, yet there is a lot of private and religious groups that decided they can do a better job on their own and set their own tuition fees. He said it probably costs more to go to Jesuit than it costs to go to Lincoln. But that is one example of how the private sector has determined they can offer a public service as well as the government can, but the state sets the standard on what those private groups have to offer. So, in the same way, if someone in the solid waste industry wants to gamble on building a business in the region, and they fail, that's their money and their concern to the extent that it doesn't undermine the basic service needs of the region.

Ms. Storz said she tends to agree with Mr. Barrett. She said she does believe there is a role for Metro and she is not positive it is in the role of a direct service provider, but there is a need for some fairly strong oversight of facilities. She said she's not sure whether Metro should continue regulating the tipping fee or continue to license and franchise facilities. But she believes that Metro needs to continue to "watch the shop" so there is no price gouging either for small or large haulers.

Mr. Murray said what is being proposed is that the costs be spread out to everybody, regardless of whether or not they use the public system.

Mr. Leichner said the general idea here is a good one. He said he sees Metro's role as that of setting criteria, and challenging you to conduct your business within that criteria. He believes that creates a level playing field for all in the industry. He said that as long as a business has acquired local land use permission, you should be able to build one facility right next to another. He said however, that currently each facility has a different standard.

Chair McLain said that was a good comment and gets to the very core of what Metro wants to improve. She said Council certainly doesn't want the variety to be inequitable, or to not allow a facility if they can make a profit.

Mr. Murray commented that putting back on his recycling hat, he is willing to support this change to Metro's policy because his company doesn't feel there is going to be that many new facilities built because the market won't support them, and because they are not that easy to site. But, he said he wants to make sure this is on record, we are not promoting that facilities should be built everywhere. There should be some regulation, and the opportunity should exist to build them if desired.

Mr. Atherton said he just wanted to paraphrase what he believes he hears Mr. Murray saying, and that is to remove the tonnage cap and enforce the rules and regulations we currently have. He asked how Metro is to deal with predatory pricing or if it will be dealt with by the natural system. He said that if you have a vertically integrated company and they charge different prices to some haulers and themselves than they do to the public in order to run the other competition out of business, how do we (Metro) deal with that?

Mr. Murray replied that that was a fair question. He said one idea is to allow Metro to still own the facilities, but allow the contractor running the facility more creative freedom so they can run it more like a business.

Mr. Gilbert added, if you aren't vertically integrated, you don't have a tip cap, but if you are vertically integrated, you keep a cap.

Mr. Atherton asked if Mr. Gilbert was sure he could track vertical integration.

Mr. Gilbert replied he wasn't sure, but that would be one solution.

Mr. White said that would solve one problem only to create another. He said if you had a system where Metro is the service provider of last resort (but no regulatory authority), the small hauler who feels he doesn't want to use the big company's facility still has the option of using Metro. However, Metro would have to charge \$150/ton because that's what the cost would be. He said the system fee being discussed (that spreads the costs of services that must remain to everyone throughout the region) will likely be very high because it will have to subsidize and cover the cost of the facility that Metro has to keep open. Otherwise, someone is going to end up paying a lot of money for disposing of the last ton. He said, going back to a comment from Mr. Miller, that perhaps Metro should keep their facilities to dispose of the wastestream that no one else will take, but get out of disposal. That way Metro gets out of regulating prices, and hopefully there are enough facilities out there to offer a choice of prices. Mr. White said that would work in a perfect system, but nothing is perfect. It is probably too difficult to get facilities sited, so there won't be enough of them. Not to mention that you are held hostage by land use and of all the other things that happen. And that is why we will continue to need a Metro facility.

Chair McLain said she would like to pause a moment and say that the comments that have been given today will be memorialized in the minutes and will ask that the Chair of the SWAR make them available to all of the Metro Councilors. Chair McLain asked that the minutes be submitted to the Councilors as soon as possible for their review of the comments received today.

Chair McLain asked the committee if everything had been provided in the packet or addressed at the meeting that was previously requested by anyone on the committee. There were no comments.

Mr. Atherton asked if there was a particular time of the year when local jurisdictions in the region reviewed their franchises and rates.

Local jurisdiction representatives commented that the rate setting process was reviewed in March of each year. They commented that franchise applications were an on-going process.

Chair McLain raised the issue of timing and said Council had asked staff to tentatively set timelines for completing the REM Strategic Plan. She said she has seen one draft thus far. Chair McLain said the research tasks will be completed in May, the first draft of the plan completed in June and the second draft completed in July. She said the draft plan will be reviewed by SWAR on June 13 and by SWAC on June 18th. Chair McLain said a final draft will go to the REM Director by June 28th and a final draft to the Executive Officer, Mr. Burton, on July 5th. She said the Council will submit a final draft to the SWAR on July 18th, with final full Council action beginning on July 26 and the final readings by the August 9th, 2001 meeting. Chair McLain said this is a very ambitious schedule and can hopefully be accomplished.

Ms. Matthews commented that she sensed a lot of skepticism at the last SWAC meeting concerning the July date for completing a draft of the strategic plan. She said that she believes everyone has a different vision of what a strategic plan is. She said she believes the July date is doable since we're not looking for another RSWMP. She said the Core Planning Group is looking for a very simple, user friendly strategic plan that can be used as the basis for the more complicated and more detailed implementation plan later.

Mr. Atherton said he has one final question. He asked if there is anything anyone can think of that should NOT be integrated into the regional system fee that has been talked about.

Chair McLain asked Mr. Atherton if that could be discussed at the next SWAC meeting so that everyone had a chance to think about it over the next few weeks. Chair McLain restated the question and asked if there was any service Metro is currently providing that should not be part of the regional system fee.

Mr. White asked Chair McLain if the committee could be provided with a cost list of what is currently included the regional system fee.

Chair McLain said staff would provide the committee with that information. (Attachment A)

Mr. Kampfer said the system fee should include the regional services, and that's it.

Chair McLain commented that the definitional problem here is what each individual perceived as a regional service that was necessary. She asked everyone to consider that question and be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting.

There being no additional comments, Chair McLain adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted:

Connie Kinney, Clerk

S:\SHARE\DEPT\SWAC\MINUTES\2001\0416SWAC SUM.DOC

Agenda Item No. III

Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Review

Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Review of Waste Reduction Elements

Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Review of Waste Reduction Elements

Background:

The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan provides direction for meeting regional solid waste needs through the year 2005. While the Plan review currently underway will address all aspects of the Plan, the year 2000 is an especially important milestone for the waste reduction elements of the Plan.

Monitoring of regional waste reduction performance over the past several years has shown progress in some sectors but provided early warning that the aggregate recycling and recovery targets for the year 2000 would not be achieved. Strong steps have already been taken to putting the region on track to reaching these targets through the creation and funding of the Waste Reduction Initiatives.

Much of the Waste Reduction Initiatives represent a stepped up level of effort to implement waste reduction strategies already contained in the Plan. However, some elements - especially proposals to consider disposal bans or mandatory recycling by certain classes of waste generators - would take the Plan in new strategic directions.

Issues for Presentation and Discussion

At the May SWAC meeting, there will be a presentation and discussion on:

- The goals and waste reduction strategies currently contained in the Plan;
- Whether the newly adopted waste reduction initiatives require major, minor or no amendments to the Plan;
- How, in concept, the Plan might be amended to ensure consistency with the new initiatives and to affirm the region's commitment to achieving regional recycling and recovery goals.

Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
Meeting Minutes
May 21, 2001

Members / *Alternates Councilor Susan McLain, Chair Councilor Bill Atherton, Alternate Chair Dean Kampfer, Waste Management (disposal sites) *Vince Gilbert, East County Recycling (disposal sites) Lee Barrett, City of Portland Tanya Schaefer (Multnomah County citizens) Mike Leichner Pride Disposal (Washington County haulers) Lynne Storz, Washington County David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association (at-large haulers) Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers (recycling facilities) Frank Deaver (Washington County citizens) Mike Miller, Gresham Sanitary Service (Multnomah County haulers) Sarah Jo Chaplen, Washington County cities Dave Hamilton, Norris & Stevens (business ratepayers) Steve Schwab, Tri County Haulers	Non-voting Members Present Doug DeVries, Specialty Transportation Services Kathy Kiwala, Clark County, WA Terry Petersen, REM Chris Taylor, DEQ Metro and Guests Maria Roberts, REM Scott Klag, REM Steve Apotheker, REM Paul Ehinger, REM Greg Nokes, Oregonian
---	---

Call to Order and Announcements

Chair McLain distributed a memo and survey to SWAC members and invited questions regarding an orientation for new SWAC members. There were no questions. Chair McLain asked SWAC members to complete the survey and return it to Connie Kinney at their earliest convenience.

Chair McLain asked members if there were any issues that they expected a response to that they did not receive in their packets. There was no response.

Mr. Murray announced a change on page 7 of the minutes from the April SWAC meeting and made a motion the minutes be approved with that correction. Mr. Petersen also asked for a clarification of the minutes on page 2, to state that not **all** of the compost in the state of Washington contained pesticide contaminants:

Mr. Hamilton seconded Mr. Murray's motion. The committee unanimously approved the minutes with the above-stated corrections.

REM Director's Update

Mr. Petersen acknowledged the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and more particularly Chris Taylor, for taking the leadership in an industrial waste exchange with King County, where different industries try to connect and exchange usable materials that might otherwise end up in the landfill. Mr. Petersen said that Metro will also be involved in this new program.

Metro sponsored its annual compost bin sale the weekend before last and sold 9,914 compost bins, which equals about 15,000 tons of diverted organic materials annually. Mr. Petersen

thanked Lynne Storz, Rick Winterhalter and Lee Barrett for their assistance, and that of their staff, in the bin sale.

Mr. Petersen announced that the City of Portland has recently enacted an ordinance specifying the use of Metro's recycled paint and all of the paint that it uses in their different projects. Mr. Petersen distributed two-for-one paint coupons to the committee.

On the 10th of May, Metro Council approved an assignment on Metro's Transport Contract from STS to CSU Transport. All of the contract terms, financial protections and prices carry over to the new contractor.

Mr. DeVries verified there would be no changes with the assignment to a new contractor.

Chair McLain introduced the comparison of revenue requirements and calculation of the Regional System Fee and asked for questions. Chair McLain invited members to bring their questions to the next meeting if they were not prepared to do so at this time.

Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Review

Mr. Klag said his presentation would include recapping the formal plan review process; what has or has not been working and how it might be changed; compare what is in the plan to the recent Waste Reduction Initiatives; and how we propose to change the plan to ensure we achieve the goals we have set for the year 2005.

Mr. Klag said that today he would like to narrow the focus of the discussion to the waste reduction aspect of the plan and compare the adopted plan with the initiatives and discuss some concepts for amending and positioning the plan for the future. The RSWMP (adopted in 1995) identified strategies designed to get the Metro region to a 56% recovery goal by the year 2005. Throughout the years, some of the RSWMP has been amended (i.e., hazardous waste management, illegal dumping, changes to the facility tonnage).

Mr. Klag said in terms of the waste reduction elements, the plan is currently structured with broad goals attached to descriptions of what the region was trying to achieve in the commercial and residential sectors. The plan sets forth recommended strategies to reach the goals (52% recovery by 2000 and 56% by 2005), as well as specific recommended practices and actions. Mr. Klag said the plan is sector-based – i.e., residential, commercial, commercial organics, construction and. The RSWMP is guided very strongly by the waste reduction hierarchy in terms of reduce; reuse; recycle; compost; recover for energy; and only then properly dispose.

Mr. Klag said the plan is very specific when describing actions over the first five years of the life of the plan and then describes activities in much more general terms. Mr. Klag said the more recent State of the Plan Report was for 1998-99 and showed that we are not on track to meet our recovery goals. By that point in time, recovery should have been at 48%, but was, in fact, 43.3%. The Waste Reduction Initiatives were designed to help boost recovery.

Mr. Klag said that with regard to commercial organics, the plan did not recommend that government step in and build organics processing facilities, but was fairly general and talked

about assisting market forces by conducting small pilots and research and development to support those efforts.

Mr. Klag said that in terms of amending the plan there are four areas: To affirm the commitment to the goals of the plan; to ensure that the waste reduction strategies are consistent with what is in the plan; to discuss new strategies; and to provide minor technical revisions to the plan format in terms of clarity and focus.

Mr. Klag explained that staff will also examine our programs in light of revised wasteshed goals enacted by the 2001 Oregon Legislature.

Mr. Klag said one concept discussed in the event the region was unable to reach the 56% recovery goal was that we might adopt strategies to require recycling for the commercial and C&D sectors. Required recycling might be requiring generators to recycle, mandatory processing or banning the disposal of particular types of materials for certain types of generators.

Mr. Taylor asked what the timeline for the implementation of these concepts was, and that he assumed that Council would be required to pass an ordinance for implementation.

Mr. Klag said Metro hopes to have the process completed by the end of the year and therefore would bring recommendations back to SWAC in late summer or early fall.

Chair McLain stated that Metro has had discussions with DEQ staff, who has stated they feel Metro is correctly reviewing the plan and assessing what additional steps are required in order to meet the goal. She stated that Metro is required to report the region's recycling rate to DEQ on a regular basis and DEQ has commented that an update of the RSWMP's strategies and concepts must take place. Chair McLain said she will request an Executive Summary that will set forth the details for the strategies and recommendations that will be distributed to SWAC and interested persons.

Mr. Vince Gilbert stated he had some reservations with "percentage" of recovery and believes tons should be tracked as well. Mr. Klag replied that tons were being tracked.

Mr. Barrett asked what the requirement was on the legislation being contemplated for the new wasteshed goals for 2005. Mr. Klag replied it would be the 56% recovery plus the 6% credit from DEQ. Mr. Barrett said that for the sake of SWAC members, the three elements comprising the 6% includes (2% of each of the three elements): backyard composting, reuse and waste prevention programs, with Metro and local governments. Mr. Barrett asked if there was any discussion of including other materials that would or would not count toward recovery, because the State of Oregon counts things differently than other states do and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has been trying to establish a national standard.

Mr. Taylor replied that DEQ is committed to examining "what counts," at least insofar as inerts.

Mr. White commented that the word "tweak" has been used when discussing the review of the RSWMP and it seems to him that if the region were "close" to its goal, this might work. He said

that currently City of Portland requires C&D recycling, and that in the city's survey, most generators were not aware of the requirement to recycle. Mr. White said that in view of the fact that it takes a lot of money to put these requirements into law, he believes you need to incorporate these undertakings into the rate system. He said there needs to be some very proactive thinking if you want to meet these kinds of goals, and it is not just a matter of tweaking. He said he doesn't want to appear negative, only realistic. He believes there is a lot of work that needs to be done in order to meet the goals.

Chair McLain said she didn't feel his comments are negative.

Mr. White said that someone has to step up to the plate to pay for services that are not now being provided but that are being requested, and it is not clear when you can charge for certain services. If it takes a change in state law, and if you want the generator to recycle, and you want the service to be provided, someone has to be able to charge for it, and right now we don't even know how much you can charge to put certain programs on the street.

Mr. Hamilton commented that if the question is "Who is going to pay for it?" it is clear that business is going to pay for it.

Mr. Gilbert said that although this comment is self-serving on his part, he believes all dry waste should be processed by materials recovery facilities before it gets landfilled. He said that if you separate it at the business level, you could make sure most of the dry waste would be recycled.

Mr. Hamilton commented that the costs could be quite expensive, and asked if we want to drive business out of the city.

Mr. Barrett said that 2005 is a long way away. He suggested that people at least think about whether being stuck with the 56% is such a great idea, because as things become more difficult to recycle, there will be a natural tendency to look for "heavy" items to go after and not necessarily those items that other factors should, in the scheme of things, factor in as more important to eliminate from the wastestream due to their toxicity or danger to the environment.

The Organics Waste Reduction Initiative

Ms. Jennifer Erickson provided an update to the SWAC on the Commercial Organic Waste Reduction Initiatives. As Scott Klag mentioned, the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan originally set out goals for organic waste recovery; however, the plan does have two shortcomings. First, there are lofty goals without associated powerful programs designed to reach those goals; and second, the plan recommends jumping right into food waste collection and processing, without first looking at upstream programs such as waste prevention and donation.

The Regional Organics Plan is one of three initiatives written by teams of regional partners and adopted in the fall and winter of 1999. The impetus behind these three initiatives was lagging recovery rates in three sectors (commercial, construction and demolition, and commercial organics) as reported by the State of the Regional Solid waste Management Plan Report. The goal of the plan is to recover an additional 52,000 tons of organic waste annually. The plan takes a two-track approach to organics recovery.

The first track focuses on:

- Understanding the food-generating businesses to tailor-make programs.
- Providing waste prevention education.
- Enhancing the existing food donation infrastructure to move surplus food to people not the landfill.
- Researching animal feed options.

Why promote food donation programs over collection and processing? Because 27% of food produced for humans every year is landfilled without even getting to people (48 million tons), at a cost of \$50 million annually. Oregon ranks highest in the nation for the prevalence of hunger – and Oregon landfills 385,516 tons of food per year. The region landfills over 190,000 tons of food annually, while Oregon Food Bank struggled to meet the needs of 500,000 hungry people by collecting 16,750 tons of food.

Metro has conducted research studies such as making 163 contacts to assess the best communication channels to use with food businesses and visiting 92 regional businesses to observe and track where waste is generated in different food businesses.

Metro has granted \$290,000 in two years to food rescue agencies (food banks and pantries). These funds have provided 41 refrigerators and freezers, trucks and outdoor canopies, and shelters for farmers' market-style distribution events, food resource development staff, and gasoline allowances for volunteer drivers. This effort amounts to approximately 5,000 tons of additional food recovered in the region that went to people, not landfills. This equates to \$620,000 of avoided disposal costs (figuring disposal and transportation). Second Harvest, a national food bank coalition, has a formula it uses to calculate the value of recovered food (\$1.67 per pound). Therefore, the 5,000 tons recovered with small, start-up programs in the region amounts to \$16,000,000 worth of food to food banks and an additional five million meals for the region's hungry.

A consultant is completing a research study on animal feed options as well. It is a less-expensive option than collection and processing of organics and there is an existing infrastructure for its collection. The problem is that Metro really had no idea how many farmers were out there or who currently collect food scraps. Although animal feed is an option, Metro is being cautious at this time due to diseases, such as BST (mad cow) and foot and mouth, that have devastated European livestock even though these diseases have not been detected or are not prevalent in the United States.

Ms. Erickson said that Metro has been involved with food donation for some time, and staff was on the original steering committee for the Oregon Food Bank's Harvest Share produce recovery program and have provided grants in its support. OFB Harvest Share program recovers produce from wholesalers that has never reached the market due to the fact that it does not have a ten-day shelf life (i.e., this food was originally garbage for produce wholesale warehouses). Now two million pounds of produce per year goes to the Food Bank.

Another example of an effective food recovery program is St. Vincent de Paul's FoodTrain, which currently recovers prepared food from hospitals, cafeterias and restaurants. Staff prepare about 4,000 frozen dinners per month for food box programs.

Track 2 programs focus on:

- Providing infrastructure development funds to help build processing options.
- Supporting pilot collection programs.

Infrastructure development primarily provides grants to help existing facilities beef up their ability to accept food waste or help new facilities come into town and take materials.

Ms. Erickson said that on July 1, 2001, \$500,000 will be available for infrastructure grants for recovery and processing of food. Metro has also dedicated \$600,000 and the use of Bay 2 at Metro Central Transfer Station to the City of Portland's RFP process for its food waste collection and processing program. Metro Central Station has been offered for a processor to come in and either use it as a reload facility or actually locate its processing on-site. Benefits of using Central are that the facility is already permitted as a solid waste use (though we will still need a still need a DEQ composting permit) and that a lot of the basic infrastructure, which can be extraordinarily expensive, is already in place.

Ms. Erickson said the City of Portland is concluding a pilot project to identify businesses that would benefit from a collection program, and additionally, ones that are too small or marginal to be involved in a food waste collection project.

Ms. Erickson said that the Metro region needs a facility that is capable of taking all food waste and soiled paper, because the region will not make progress unless all food waste can be recovered in some way, including meats and plate scrapings.

Ms. Erickson said that another facet of food waste recovery program are private sector initiatives, such as Mr. Gilbert's operation, Nature's Needs. Nature's Needs is a private processing facility in North Plains that accepts pre-consumer fruit and vegetable waste, currently recovering about 12,000 tons per year of vegetable waste, which has helped the region's food waste recovery numbers.

Ms. Erickson said that in addition, we have provided funds to DEQ for additional waste sorts for its 2000 waste composition study that will provide detailed information on food waste in the region. The waste comp study is sorting out food waste into 12 separate categories.

Ms. Erickson said that through this process Metro has learned that we need to base programs on the highest end-use, i.e., food as food, and not as garbage or feedstock for some operation. We have also learned that we need to build on the existing infrastructure, understand the businesses we are working with and what works for them, and look for ways to build creative unusual partnerships. It is very important to match our waste prevention and recovery programs with the way businesses conduct their day-to-day operations in order to be convenient and effective. The region needs to match the processing technology with the generator needs and the waste stream

we are looking at. And, finally, we need to facilitate some more understanding with some of the local government land-use officials.

Ms. Erickson said that the organic waste management plan is entering into its third year beginning July 1. Metro would like to evaluate the program as it exists, i.e., what type of impact it is having, whether our outreach is effective, how effective we have been in diverting more material to the food banks, and where we need to go in the future.

Ms. Erickson said the organics team will look at the potential for residential programs. An in-house, short-term research project will be conducted in order to ascertain what the rest of the country is doing in the residential collection system, how well it works and what it costs. Ms. Erickson said that in addition, larger facilities like the Nike campus and some of the hospitals would like to manage their food waste on-site and have questions on how this could be accomplished, which, if possible, could enhance the Metro region's recycling goal.

Ms. Erickson said that, in addition, there are storage and collection technology options that also need to be researched. She said these are things that we will be looking at during the course of the next three years in addition to continuing with our existing programs.

Mr. Taylor complimented Metro for its work in improving food donation and increasing food processing and composting.

Chair McLain complimented Ms. Erickson and the staff on the project and also made clear that Metro staff did not limit its research to studies, but they have actually conducted some on-the-ground projects.

Ms. Erickson also stated that she would be happy to mail or e-mail any additional information such as the three-year organics plan and a copy of the results to date to anyone who is interested. Please call her at 797-1647.

REM's Strategic Plan Status and Research Tasks

Ms. Matthews said she would like to convey some of the research tasks that will relate to barriers, constraints or options to consider as we develop our strategic plan and how that research will fit into the strategic plan.

Ms. Matthews said the two primary goals identified are to reduce the amount and toxicity of solid waste and to provide stewardship of disposal – i.e., to develop a disposal system that is efficient, economical and environmentally sound.

Ms. Matthews said the research tasks are focused mainly on fiscal management, provision of disposal services, and regulation.

With regard to disposal services, staff is reviewing bond obligations (for example, if there are restrictions on the use of transfer station property that would prohibit Metro from considering certain choices) and prepayment of bonds. Staff is also looking at a financial analysis of a possible sale of the transfer stations – the central question being whether the properties are worth the mortgage that Metro has on them. In addition, Metro has a mandate to the region to provide

for the safe disposal of household hazardous waste, and if we sell those properties, it would be more difficult to provide those services. And if ownership makes the most sense, what are the options that we would chart for the future; would it be business as usual?

Ms. Matthews said that REM currently has had discussions with a consultant reviewing a number of issues arising out of a central question, which is: If Metro's role as a market participant declines, would our role as a regulator need to increase? She said there are a variety of questions within that staff wish reviewed.

Ms. Matthews said in the final category, fiscal management, staff is reviewing the cost allocation of Metro's various fees and reviewing the Regional System Fee Credit and the management of REM's undesignated fund balance.

Ms. Matthews commented that by the next SWAC meeting, members should have a draft of the Strategic Plan.

Other Business and Adjourn

Councilor Atherton addressed the committee with regard to the rate review process. He said that the Regional System Fee is currently at \$12.90, and our costs are significantly above that. He said the Rate Review Committee will be addressing that issue shortly, and the SWAC will be informed as to when that meeting will take place.

The meeting was adjourned

CL
\\MRC-FILES\FILES\OLINET\METRO\1\REM\SHARE\DEPT\SWAC\MINUTES\2001\0521\SWAC SUM.DOC

Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
Meeting Minutes
June 18, 2001

Members / *Alternates

Councilor Susan McLain, Chair
Councilor Bill Atherton, Alternate Chair
Dean Kampfer, Waste Management (disposal sites)
*Vince Gilbert, East County Recycling (disposal sites)
Lee Barrett, City of Portland
Tanya Schaefer (Multnomah County citizens)
Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal (Washington County haulers)
Lynne Storz, Washington County
David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association (at-large haulers)
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers (recycling facilities)
Frank Deaver (Washington County citizens)
Jane Olberding (business ratepayers)
Mike Miller, Gresham Sanitary Service (Multnomah County haulers)
Sarah Jo Chaplen, Washington County cities
Dave Hamilton, Norris & Stevens (business ratepayers)

Non-voting Members Present

Doug DeVries, Specialty Transportation Services
Kathy Kiwala, Clark County, Washington

Metro and Guests

Tim Raphael, Celilo Group	Bill Metzler, REM
Leann Linson, REM	Paul Garrahan, OGC
Easton Cross, BFI	Dan Schooler, Waste Connections
Karen Feher, ASD	Connie Kinney, REM
Doug Drennen, DCS	Steve Kraton, REM
Greg Nokes, Oregonian	Jim Watkins, REM
Meg Lynch, REM	Roy Brower, REM
Janet Matthews, REM	Steve Engel, REM
Lin Bernhardt, REM	Jan O'Dell, REM
Doug Anderson, REM	
Eric Merrill, Waste Connections	Kevin Rauch, City of Troutdale

Call to Order and Announcements

Chair McLain called the meeting to order. Chair McLain announced that a SWAC orientation agenda and survey was again being distributed to the committee. Chair McLain invited all SWAC members to the orientation, and also requested that the survey portion of the document be completed and returned at their earliest convenience. Additionally, Chair McLain announced that the May 21 minutes are not available for distribution.

REM Director's Update

In Mr. Petersen's absence, Ms. Matthews presented the Director's Updates. Ms. Matthews announced that HB 3909 passed out of the Oregon Legislature and is waiting to be signed by the governor. This bill establishes the creation of an appointed task force to research ways to increase the reuse, recycling and recovery of scrap tires in Oregon. The task force will report back to the Legislature and the governor by September 2002. Metro's original bill to put a fee on new tires to be used to increase scrap tire markets was heavily lobbied against by tire king Les Schwab.

Ms. Matthews announced that an REM staff person, Joanna Karl, discovered that Metro has been overcharged for stormwater discharge fees by the City of Portland; these overcharges will now be credited to the Metro account.

Ms. Matthews said that Metro's free tour showcasing natural gardening techniques will take place on Sunday, July 15. If you want to attend or volunteer, call Therese Mitchell at (503) 797-1672.

Waste Management, Inc. has submitted an application for regional transfer station status for its Recycle America facility in Troutdale.

Draft REM Strategic Plan

Ms. Matthews gave a slide presentation updating the committee on the progress of the Strategic Plan (Attachment A). She said that a final draft will be presented to Mr. Petersen on June 28, 2001 and presented to Metro Solid Waste and Recycling Committee on July 18, 2001. Ms. Matthews concluded the presentation and stated that Plan reviews will be held annually.

Mr. Barrett mentioned there did not appear to be any mention of how medical waste will be handled. Mr. Brower responded that specific wastes are not mentioned, but items such as sludge, dredge spoils, etc., will be addressed in the implementation plan. Mr. Barrett said that since one of the RSWMP goals specifically speaks to toxic materials such as lead-based paint and medical waste, he believes that Metro should have some kind of a coordination role for these items within the region.

Chair McLain said Metro will probably look to the implementation plan for addressing specific issues such as sludge, dredge spoils, etc.

Mr. Vince Gilbert stated his concern about water quality, asking if it should be a Metro or a Oregon Department of Environmental Quality role. Councilor McLain said that was a good comment and stated that she believed there is a role for Metro. She mentioned that other departments are getting involved in related concerns such as clean water issues, and that Council members are trying to coordinate elements, plus provide resources.

Ms. Olberding made the suggestion that the department should work on take-out packaging and organics. Councilor McLain agreed.

Mr. Merrill suggested adding language stating that an explicit goal of the department is to continuously improve Metro partnerships with local governments and the private sector.

Mr. Taylor raised the concern that in the goals summary, Objective 8.3 appears to be at odds with the region's waste prevention goal. He also is concerned that Metro's goal to keep the tipping fee as affordable as possible may create recovery issues. Councilor McLain agreed, saying she was not comfortable with that either. Mr. Taylor added that tip fee pricing could jeopardize the region's ability to reach its recovery goals. Councilor McLain agreed that Mr. Taylor had made a good point.

Mr. Lucini commented that we must not lose sight of partnerships with end-use markets. Chair McLain agreed.

Mr. White observed that with regard to the vision statement, it reads as if Metro has a role in managing collection as opposed to disposal and waste reduction. He also asked how Metro is testing the statement that the region will evolve into the best in the nation.

Ms. Matthews replied that Metro's programs are emulated throughout the nation and additionally, that leadership cannot necessarily be measured.

Mr. Taylor suggested that staff might broaden the focus of the plan and look to the fact that the solid waste system is more than just collecting, processing and disposing or recycling; we also need to consider other tangible impacts, such as air quality and transportation.

Mr. White observed that on page 5, second bullet from bottom has to do with landfill disposal. He said this is confusing. Does it refer to all waste or hazardous waste? Ms. Matthews agreed that the language was confusing and would be revised.

Mr. Taylor disagreed with the statement that state resources have declined.

Mr. White stated that not everyone agrees with the statement that solid waste revenues are not keeping up with programs.

Chair McLain said it was important that the committee understand this is a Metro document and we believe the statements correctly reveal the way we see things.

Mr. White expressed his concern that the implementation of certain parts of the plan affects the industry. Chair McLain suggested his concerns would be more appropriately voiced before implementation of the plan.

Mr. While replied that for the record, he does not agree.

Mr. Murray commented that for the record, he does not agree either.

Mr. Barrett questioned whether including explicit language about accommodating self-haulers would just make it too easy to use the transfer stations rather than the existing collection system. He strongly suggested that catering to self-haulers is not an appropriate use of resources.

Mr. Lucini stated that with respect to Goal 9 it was unclear to him what exactly staff is looking at.

Ms. Mathews replied that Metro continues to be concerned about legal challenges and we want to make sure we are well positioned in the event Metro must defend its position. Metro is simply stating that its focus is based on industry standards and that certain fees are collected in accordance with the requirements of the law in the region and state. Ms. Matthews added that with respect to Issue 5, the Council has already addressed the issue of transfer station ownership, and it is currently assumed that Metro will continue to own the Metro Central and Metro South.

Mr. Gilbert stated that Metro should have full access to all recycling facilities within the region that are accepting any solid waste to ensure they are complying with all of Metro's regulations under their licensing agreements.

Mr. Murray said that a few short years ago he believes the committee added words to allow Metro access to any of the region's facilities. Mr. Anderson concurred that Metro does indeed have that language incorporated into the Metro Code.

Mr. Leichner commented that with regard to Section 6.2, he still needs to be convinced that Metro facility users are paying a disproportionate share of regional costs.

Chair McLain replied that this is an issue that the Rate Review Committee will need to review the regional system fee.

Mr. Kampfer suggests the words "flow control" should not be used to describe Metro's regulative authority. Mr. Lucini agreed that flow control sends up red flags, and he would rather see a more descriptive way of setting forth Metro's regulative authority. Chair McLain stated that the language would be clarified.

Ms. Matthews reminded the committee that she will update the committee on the Plan again on July 16. She asked members to please get comments to her no later than June 26th so she can incorporate them into her presentation to Mr. Petersen on June 28th.

Chair McLain asked the committee if there were any special items they wished to discuss or things they would like to review and have delivered with the July agenda. No special items were suggested.

Other Business and Adjourn

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.