



# METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Agenda

**MEETING:** Solid Waste Technical Committee

**DAY:** Thursday

**DATE:** October 22, 1992

**TIME:** 9:00 AM to 11:00 AM

**PLACE:** Metro Council Chamber  
Metro Center  
2000 SW First Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97201

- |       |  |              |
|-------|--|--------------|
| I.    | Approval of September 24 Meeting Minutes   | Bob Martin   |
| II.   | Updates  | Bob Martin   |
| III.  | Review of Annual Waste Reduction Programs<br>for Local Governments               | Steve Kraten |
| IV.   | Review of Metro's Multi-Family Recycling Program                                 | Mike Huycke  |
| V.    | Present Proposed Changes to Metro's Neighborhood<br>Clean-Up Program             | Mike Huycke  |
| VI.   | Approval of the Proposed Restructuring of the<br>Solid Waste Technical Committee | Mark Buscher |
| VII.  | Set November Meeting Date  | Bob Martin   |
| VIII. | Adjourn  |              |

MB:clk

a:\busch\pct\TCAGD.022

**Solid Waste Technical Committee  
Meeting of:  
September 24, 1992**

**Present:**

**James Cozzetto, Jr.  
Delyn Kies, Washington Co.  
Emilie Kroen, City of Tualatin  
Steve Schwab, Sunset Garbage  
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources, Inc.  
John Drew, Far West Fibers  
Lynda Kotta, City of Gresham  
Dave Phillips, Clackamas County  
Estle Harlan**

**Guests Present**

**Doris Bjorn, Oregon Waste Systems, Inc.  
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling  
Gary Firestone, Haller, Ehrman**

**Metro**

<b>Bob Martin</b>	<b>Phil North</b>
<b>Terry Peterson</b>	<b>Roosevelt Carter</b>
<b>Debbie Gorham</b>	<b>Jim Watkins</b>
<b>Steve Kraten</b>	<b>John Houser</b>
<b>Mark Buscher</b>	<b>Todd Sadlo</b>
<b>Scott Klagg</b>	<b>Genya Arnold</b>

**Chair Bob Martin brought the meeting to order:**

**Approval of August 2, 1992 Meeting Minutes**

**Emilie Kroen moved the 8/27/92 Meeting Minutes be approved. Merle Irvine seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved unanimously.**

**Updates**

**Chair Martin gave a brief overview of the status regarding the Compost Facilities.**

## **Discussion of Issues Related to granting Designated Facilities Status to Four Out-of-Region Landfills**

**Chair Martin** began the discussion with a description of what was presently in the Metro Code Flow Control Ordinance, specifically that certain facilities (all presently existing) have been designated to receive waste from haulers of this region or from the generators of the region directly. Mr. Martin said there were a variety of arrangements with existing designated facilities. Mr. Martin continued to discuss existing facilities and Metro's relationship with those facilities.

Chair Martin gave some background on Metro's contract with Waste Management. He said that Metro is obligated to give them 90% of all acceptable waste generated in the region that Metro delivers to a general purpose landfill. Acceptable waste is basically all waste. Unacceptable waste is a very long list of materials including industrial process waste, special waste, a whole list of things. Essentially everything that comes through our transfer stations, and mixed with putrescible material, everything that has to go to a general purpose landfill, that we are sending or delivering to a general purpose landfill. They get 90% of it. We are not going to do business with another landfill for disposal of that material. But that leaves a lot of other materials out there. And increasingly other companies such as Rabanco, Sani Fill, Riverbend, and Hillsboro, are marketing their services to generators of this other waste. Some of it is construction demolition debris, some of it is simply industrial process waste. Some of it, in fact, is waste that until the efforts of some of these companies to market their services began, I don't think we knew anything about. And I don't think we knew where it was going. I don't think it was anything that was being dealt with by the system that we are managing here. But it was going somewhere, possibly to an industrial waste site. Possibly to a company-owned facility that we simply don't know anything about.

Chair Martin said some of these companies have asked what they have to do in order to make their services available to generators of waste in the Metro region? Some companies didn't know they had to do anything and they just started hauling waste to wherever they thought was a good place to haul waste. Some of those companies have found out that Metro doesn't like that and we have told them to stop doing that. And some of them are astounded that Metro has any interest in what they are doing. Or that Metro has any concern in what they are doing. And they are even more astounded when we say: not only are we interested, but we want \$19/per ton out of you for it. It doesn't make sense to a lot of generators. They don't understand why that's necessary. We have been trying to explain it, but there are a lot more generators than there are landfills.

Chair Martin said they had been attempting to identify those landfills or destinations for waste that are, in our judgment, environmentally responsible, and formalize a relationship with them so that if they are going to solicit business in the region, and be successful at getting business from the region, we at least have a relationship that defines what they can take and what they can't take, and to provide for record-keeping.

Mr. Martin said that basically "designating" facilities is an attempt to define a relationship with those facilities that are acceptable. Responsibly managed facilities that may be working in the region to market their services and acquire some of the waste from the region that is not already committed to our other facilities, contractually. And to make sure that we are collecting our revenues, and to make sure that the system is being managed correctly.

1) How does this proposal affect the revenues to Metro? I believe it will increase them substantially but I don't think we are going to know a lot about it until and unless we establish a relationship with those facilities.

We are doing some continuing research on the numbers. How much waste is out there? Where is it going? What do we think we are missing, and so forth? But my sense of it is that there could be as much as 100,000 tons that we may not be collecting revenues off of right now, that we should be. And we will be if we have the possible facilities that the waste is going to established with a formal relationship with Metro.

The people marketing those services are much more aggressive than I'm capable of being with my private investigator in following trucks around the region and trying to figure out who is generating what and where they are taking it. If I really hired the amount of investigative services necessary to do that completely, it would take a lot of the humor out of the article that recently appeared. It would cost a lot more. And were not being probably nearly as effective as the people who are out there, right now, marketing services for people that are finding waste. I get lots of calls -- every week I get calls from somebody who has found a customer that they would like to haul something to their facility for, that I don't think I would have known anything about if people were not out there marketing those services. So, I believe the first question is -- Will it or won't it affect our revenue picture. I think it will affect it positively and I think that will have a positive impact on rates. At least the increase won't be as high as it would otherwise have to be.

2) Secondly, the question has been raised as to whether this does or does not adversely impact recycling. He said he didn't believe all of the information was in on that, but one of the things there is a concern about is that this may provide a lower disposal cost for some kinds of waste thereby encouraging people to simply haul it to eastern Oregon or eastern Washington, rather than put the time and effort into recycling it, i.e., construction demolition debris.

3) Third does this, or doesn't it, conflict with our existing contract for disposal of mixed refuse, or acceptable refuse at the Columbia Ridge Landfill. That's a legal question that Waste Management's attorneys and our attorneys are going to have to thrash out. Right now, our intent is clearly to make sure that it doesn't conflict with that contract. We are defining the kinds of things that can go to these designated facilities in such a manner

that it doesn't overlap with any of the waste that we are contractually obligated to send to Waste Management.

That is a summary of the issue. Roosevelt is prepared to go down the Agreement that we are putting before Council at this time, and outline what is in that agreement for you.

**Estle Harlan:** But, I'd be real interested in, not necessarily the date, because I'm not sure your there, but tracking whether indeed agreement comes and where the differences remain. While these others are in place, we do have a contract with Oregon Waste Systems, so we have to understand whether we are in compliance or not in compliance. And, I'm not saying that I'm for or against, necessarily, the other players here, I'm just saying I'm interested in the legal status on that.

**Bob Martin:** That will be part of our staff report when we bring this to the Council, possibly on October 6th, if we've got all of our work done. I'm not going to recommend to Council, obviously, something I don't think is consistent with our contractual arrangements. The status of what this means with regard to the Waste Management Contract will be a part of the review when we bring it forward to Council. And, hopefully at that time, we will be able to say we and Waste Management are in accord with the way we have defined "designated facilities". But if we can't say that, then we will at least have outlined, to an extent, the differences that still remain.

**Dave Phillips:** North Wasco facility is receiving material from RLF, but I know that other demolition contractors are probably hauling directly to that facility from the Portland area. There is also probably waste from demolition contractors that goes south, as far down as Coffin Butte. Because Coffin Butte is actually closer than Columbia Ridge or Roosevelt or those other -- Columbia River type facilities. And you have a freeway pretty close to that one too. Are you going to try to work this out so that they are identifying these types of people coming in from the actual region?

**B. Martin:** We've had informal discussions with the Rabanco people, the Sani Fill people, operating northern Wasco County but haven't talked to the Coffin Butte people about how to identify customers from the region. Metro has to have "evidence" before we can do anything, and then we can fine them \$500.00 in civil penalties and reclaim fees that are otherwise owing to us. But we can't really do anything to the landfill operator. But if we have a relationship with those facilities that is valuable to them, then I think we have their cooperation in making their records available to us and in fact helping us police the whole system.

**John Drew:** I think it might be useful information, as a side issue here, to discuss what's happening in the Federal regulation of landfills and monitoring -- that we've been appraised of at the DEQ level to indicate that even the existence of limited purpose or select landfills will be changing in the near future as the Department tries to define how landfills are sited or if landfills are allowed to expand their activities. It appears from the Department's point of view, that their thrust is to have liners in all landfills in the State of

Oregon. They they haven't formally said that yet. Because it does fall in line with EPA guidelines. So, that has nothing to do with Metro collecting revenues, which seems to be the issue here, beyond the relationship that you want to establish, it appears to me that if you have a new cell in an existing landfill, then you are going to have to put a liner and monitoring in that cell. And that will eventually, if not immediately change the cost of providing that competitive service for that type of demolition material. So, that's an issue that is going on, and if you have any more information on that, you might make us aware of it, because that will be a mitigating issue as far as the competitive nature of special landfills.

**Bob Martin:** Several, I believe, are participating in that whole discussion with DEQ and I think that is an important trend. I think the distinction between limited purpose landfills, general purpose landfills, industrial waste fills, whatever they are, wood waste fills, and so forth is, in fact, evaporating or changing to the point where they are leveling out more, and I think that is good. To the extent that you've got a metropolitan region like this that has been required to go the full hilt with developing or securing landfill services that are designed with the care and integrity that Columbia Ridge is, and use facilities like that, and not require other landfills, perhaps on a periphery. Or other options that aren't as well environmentally developed to be available to generators of waste here in the region to where you've got really big cost differentials between sending something to Columbia Ridge versus sending something to, you know, a gravel pit somewhere that may be tolerated as a destination for construction demolition debris by the regulatory agencies. You create a lot of disincentive for places like this to manage their waste disposal affairs effectively. My statement to DEQ on this issue is that we ought to be seeking a system that brings the most waste under the best management possible, rather than seeking a system that requires the metropolitan region to have extremely high waste disposal rates and then let everybody escape the system -- it doesn't make sense. So those concerns are in part behind some of the things that I am saying. And if we don't correct this, our rates will continue to spiral because we will have fixed costs that are going to continue to be covered, and we will continue to see less and less waste.

**Estle Harlan:** Of the other four, we know Columbia Ridge meets the criteria but, of the other three who would also like to be named designated facilities, were talking about something more than just "C" and "D" waste here, which from what you say is going to Hillsboro, and Lakeside. We're really talking about bigger time stuff here. Especially this special waste which can get pretty dicey. And at this point, do all of the others? -- I'm asking a leading question, because I think I know the answer -- do all of the others meet the criteria?

**Bob Martin:** Well, at this point we are bringing forward only the two for Columbia Ridge and Rabanco -- some people call it the Roosevelt Landfill, which is right across the river from Columbia Ridge, we're bringing only those two forward. Because we've looked at those, we've inspected those, we know how their designed, we know what they've been taking, we know what they are taking, we know how they are managed and that sort of thing. So we are fairly comfortable with those facilities. We've been approached by the

Sani Fill people with regard to the northern Wasco County Landfill, and we've also been approached by the Finley Butte people about their facility. We don't know as much about Finley Butte. We haven't made a recent tour out there for the purpose of determining how that facility is configured and so forth, although it went through the same permitting hoops -- or at least it sure should have -- gone through the same permitting hoops that Waste Management had to go through with Columbia Ridge. So the expectation is that it is probably a pretty good facility. We have looked at the Northern Wasco County facility and it's not lined, it doesn't have scales, it's been in operation for a long time. Historically, I don't think anybody's prepared to tell us what all the wastes are that went in there, and where they all are, and that sort of thing. It doesn't appear to have leachate collection and leachate detection, and adequate groundwater monitoring. But there intention in the future, I'm told, is to essentially develop new areas there that are lined and that do have all these other protections. I guess I would believe that a facility that doesn't have the kinds of integrity that Columbia Ridge, the Rabanco one, maybe the Finley Butte facility has, you know are probably not in the running for designated facility status. Why would we want waste to go there when we've got so much environmentally better options available to us?

**Jim Cozzetto:** The Wasco County location is currently taking residual from the area though right now.

**Bob Martin:** Yeah, they have a historical relationship with regard to the residual from East County Recycling and I'm not sure how much life that agreement has in it, but I'm certainly hopeful that when and if that comes up for renewal, that that facility, does in fact, have a lined area that's better developed than what they are using right now. And, as you know, the Hillsboro Landfill, even though it is not a general purpose landfill, it has a liner in a portion of the landfill at least. The designated facility agreements that we've put together for these facilities is pretty much what I would envision being the new relationship with the limited purpose landfills as well. We essentially would seek to put those facilities on an even playing field.

**Delyn Kies:** I don't have a copy of the agreements that you are proposing.

**Bob Martin:** If you would like, Roosevelt can kind of go through those.

**Delyn Kies:** Because, I guess my question is what kind of ability do you have to require those sorts of controls -- to require that they do some processing of waste -- that they have some potential for recovery prior to going to those facilities?

**Bob Martin:** That's a good question. First of all, we're talking about a contractual relationship -- we can do anything we want in a contractual relationship if both parties agree to it. I think we've got plenty of ability to reach agreement around those things with the landfill operator. Secondly, the processors themselves here need to be franchised. Some of them only recently have come to that understanding, but they do need to be franchised. Their franchise agreements will also address this issue of where is your

residual going? What kind of records are you keeping on how much is being recycled versus how much is being disposed of, and so forth?. So, we essentially have records at both ends, independently, presumably. At both ends of the line on whose generating what and who is taking it where. So I think it is a fairly tight control as an exercise of our franchise authority one, and secondly to whatever contractual relationship we establish with the operators of the designated facility.

Why don't we have Roosevelt hit the highlights of what is in the agreement currently drafted. This went before our Solid Waste Committee September 1st and basically generated a lot of discussion.

**Roosevelt Carter:** As Bob said, I have two draft reports one for the Roosevelt Landfill and one for the Oregon Waste Systems Landfill. which are actually the same, just the names are different. The purpose is to establish an agreement much as Mr. Bjorn has outlined with all of these facilities for data collection, and so forth, to take this type of waste through these facilities and handle it in a manner that we don't believe is happening or taking place right now. We at least want to provide some kind of legitimate means for these facilities to handle waste -- something that would be fairly convenient for waste generators and disposers to operate under our Flow Control Ordinance. The duration of these agreements would be for two years, after which time we would re-evaluate what has gone out of the region. There are some record keeping provisions in these agreements that will give us more information on the types of waste that we believe are escaping the region right now that we know nothing about. These agreements would require the facilities to report to us, hauler information. They would be required to inspect the loads, tell us what kinds of waste is really coming into the facility and who is generating this kind of waste. As Mr. Martin explained, we would also require that the construction and demolition debris waste go through a processor prior to going to these facilities.

We have stated a figure of 150,000 tons per year maximum tonnages. Whether or not that is a reasonable figure we don't really know because we don't know how much waste is actually escaping the region. I have to tell you that we do not have any hard and fast evidence that that figure is accurate. The waste that can be accepted at the facilities, again, are those types of waste that will be exempted from -- or are not controlled by the provisions of the Oregon Waste System's Agreement.

We would require these facilities to keep detailed records and make those records available to Metro for our inspection on an at least an annual basis. We will require these facilities to conduct audits of waste and information they collect. They would also be required to collect all of the Metro fees. We are concerned about waste that is an actual "rate avoidance" as opposed to simply trying to keep all of the revenue in the region. Some waste is obviously escaping the region, which increases everybody else rates. We are also concerned about how the waste is being handled.

The usual modification suspension and termination provisions will be in the agreement. Another sector deals with compliance with law. Any waste that comes from franchise



sections of the Metro region, before haulers can take this waste, they would have to comply with all of the provisions that are in those franchise agreements. So some hauler can not simply go in and undercut somebody that is already operating there -- they would obviously have to comply with all of the provisions contained there.

The right of inspection -- I think I have previously covered. It contains the usual indemnification clauses. I believe that really covers everything in the agreement. I will make copies of these draft agreements available to the Committee members so that you can look at them in more detail. I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

**John Drew:** I would like to ask you a legal question about Metro's legal jurisdiction beyond this area. What if a facility does not want to cooperate with Metro and sign a regulation agreement and therefore accept specified waste or some kind of special waste from the metropolitan area. Would Metro's legal recourse at that time be to contact the generators of the material and regulate them?

**Bob Martin:** Obviously we can't compel anybody. What we are providing here is -- really an opportunity for people that want to market waste services in this region. Other than that, we would have to take action against generators and haulers, not against the disposal which is out of our jurisdiction. The State law requires or gives us the authority, however, to regulate the generators and transporters of all waste, basically, in the region.

**Roosevelt Carter:** One of the areas that is lacking in our database is the information on generators. By signing a designated facility ordinance, we begin to gain information on who is generating data and from year-to-year as waste shifts around the region, then we will have a better opportunity to follow-up with those generators to find out what happened to their waste. Whether or not they are generating the kind of waste that was reported in a prior period -- but right now we simply don't have that kind of information.

**Jim Cozzetto:** Would you then plan on regulating all either generators or haulers if they are not going through the franchise process?

**Bob Martin:** No, I don't think so, its an enforcement issue. We certainly are going to regulate the facilities with which we have formal agreements -- designated facility agreements will regulate our franchise processors or any other entity that we've franchised in the region. We don't have any authority to regulate waste collection as such, and are not seeking that. But what we do have is enforcement authority. Anybody that generates waste, anybody that hauls waste, is subject to our telling them where it has to go. And if they disobey those requirements -- which up to now have been pretty reasonable.

**Jim Cozzetto:** If somebody hauls to a designated facility from the area, would they not need some type of regulation from Metro? Or what would stop somebody that hasn't applied for any type of regulation to going to a designated facility, and maybe not going through the proper process as far as pulling out recyclables, that should be pulled out -- or making sure that they are paying applicable fees to Metro?

**Bob Martin:** Again, that would be an exercise of regulatory authority. But we would have the additional help of the facility operator as well. I would expect a responsible operator of a facility that is a designated facility to be contacting us about those kinds of issues. But that is what a designated facility is. If we've designated it, then what we are saying is that haulers are allowed to use the facility, consistent with the provisions of what that facility can accept and what it can't accept.

**Emilie Kroen:** Roosevelt, you've listed a whole lot of issues in a memo to us, and I've only heard maybe three of them responded to. Are you prepared to respond to any more of those at this point?

**Roosevelt Carter:** What I was trying to do in this memo was to simply list the issues that came up at the September 1, Solid Waste Committee meeting, and as Mr. Martin stated, I believe all of those issues are embodied in the three basic issues -- the economic issue, the recycling issue and the 90% OWS contractual issue. I did prepare a response to each one of those questions, but I don't know if you want to go through each and every one.

**Bob Martin:** I think Roosevelt is right, his longer list here is an attempt to identify all of the things that got asked, and my shorter list is an attempt to try to summarize the overarching issues that relate to this. If we can answer those three questions, I think that answers all of the rest of these as well.

**Emilie Kroen:** I don't think it answers the competition issue, at all. Our general waste that 90%, is going to one location now -- it has eliminated competition in that area and now we are looking at expanding the competition in the special waste area, and that seems, on the surface at least, to be contradictory to the way that Metro has approached its designation facilities in the past.

**Bob Martin:** I think it is certainly true that this would expand competition of some kinds of waste categories. Whether it is our job to encourage or discourage or remain neutral with regard to competition, I would say it is not our job to discourage competition. I'm not so sure it is our job to encourage it either. But, to the extent that you've got more facilities capable of competing with each other for the same waste, as long as they are all environmentally acceptable facilities, as long as they are all essentially working with the structure of the system and making sure that we are collecting our fees, and so forth. I guess, my answer would be that we would be fairly neutral to the competition field.

**Meggane Steele:** I would like to step back from the issue a minute and ask a broader question. And it stems from an impression I have that a key -- perhaps the overriding benefit that you see in designating these additional facilities is the ability to capture the revenues from tonnage which is escaping the currently approved facilities. And, so it seems to come down to having an effective system for the reporting of that tonnage there, and you are using this as an incentive approach to get the reporting from the facility. Are

there not any regulatory approaches which are available through DEQ or some other authority that can require, as a condition of continued operation, that those facilities provide reporting to Metro on who is using it and if so, couldn't we realize some of the benefit of capturing that tonnage? Bringing it back into the Metro facility and thereby having to contribute to a more evenly disbursed benefit of rate control or rate reduction from more revenues directed to Metro?

**Bob Martin:** My understanding -- I wish DEQ were here, but my understanding is that the reports that we all make to DEQ basically, do not include identification of specific customers. They are required to report tonnage that they have received and how much of it they receive from in-state and how much they receive from out-of-state for the purpose of calculating the DEQ fees. They also are required to report any other thing that gets recycled, and that sort of thing. DEQ has not really been asking landfill operators for customer lists as such, nor have they particularly sounded enthusiastic to me anyway about becoming a tool in our flow control regulation. So, I don't think that information is readily available from DEQ although I don't want to seem to be speaking for them and it is something that we probably ought to take up directly with them. The other aspect of this though, is that the facility in Klickitat County is certainly not subject to DEQ control. We would have to be dealing with the State of Washington in that case. I think, with what we've put together here, we've got to really positively and contractually establish, and have access to the region's generators, so the business opportunity that the generators of this region represent is valuable to those facilities, they'll protect that relationship. Again, we've got provisions that go well beyond anything in State law such as an annual financial independent audit, for example. Which is a pretty effective tool.

**Meganne Steele:** Thank you. I had one other request and that is, to make the draft contract available to Committee members. I am particularly interested in seeing if you can have an agreement to include reporting to the standards that localities may need for their revenue collection purposes, specifically in Portland.

**Bob Martin:** Yes. We've always been sensitive to the need to coordinate with most of the jurisdictions in the region in that respect. I agree with that.

The drafts have been made available in the original Agenda package for the Solid Waste Committee and we can furnish additional copies if you did not keep that agenda. But it is not a finished draft. Obviously this discussion and other discussions are going to result in some changes. But if you like, we can mail one out directly to you all.

**Steve Schwab:** I guess I don't understand why -- I assumed there was already a contract with Columbia Ridge. I understood, while being a member on the Rate Review Committee, we looked at specific or special waste which was flowing directly to Columbia Ridge already. I remember hearing something about, that it is material you really don't want through your transfer station anyway. Your collecting your \$19/ton on it and therefore this is already happening without this contract. Are they reporting that? Are we

collecting? Is that material going there? And does this firm up something that we don't have on paper? Or why is this needed?

**Bob Martin:** That's a real good question, Steve. And your exactly right. Some of this material is, in fact, already going there. It is going there under a "Non-System License". Which is another mechanism we have to identify people who have asked us for permission to haul things out of the region. The contract that we have with Waste Management covers all of the acceptable waste that we deliver to general purpose landfills. This other stuff -- whatever it is, and I don't think we have completed all of our discussions on what is in the contract and what isn't. But that stuff that isn't essentially contractually obligated to go to Columbia Ridge either needs, on a case-by-case basis, dealing with each generator and each hauler, a non-system license which can get kind of unwieldy. Or, the facility itself ought to be a designated facility to simply receive all of that material, which is a much more, administratively at least, easier approach, and probably more effective. So, they have been receiving some waste but its been under a non-system license, rather than the designated facility approach. So, your right, you didn't miss anything.

**Dave Phillips:** I only have, I guess, a couple of observations. One, what would this approach do to private in-region type industrial sites? Are you making any attempt to pull them in, have them start paying the \$19 too? Let me ask that question again.

**Bob Martin:** Well, are we currently trying to regulate in-region industrial waste sites? No, I don't think we are. We don't know much about them right now. What I am concerned about is -- and I have been working with DEQ on that, I am not convinced that environmentally those sites have the kind of integrity they ought to have to be handling waste. I also think they can be a control problem. My experience in enforcement issues has found that some of them have gotten out of control. I've had to close some of them in my past. From a regulatory standpoint -- because from my standpoint they had begun to receive some things that they weren't permitted to receive. So, I'm interested in that question, but I think its more of a question for DEQ right now, I just don't know that much about them.

**Dave Phillips:** Okay, that's fine, I think we share some common view points there. The other I guess observation that I would make is that once you get this system in line, you are going to have to do quite a bit of a notification process, particularly in the area of, you know, contractors, land clearers, demolition contractors, your generals, these types of people. To let them know that this is what is going on and what the requirements are. Because they are not being regulated on a local level. I mean we're not franchising demolition contractors, or land clearing people. So they are kind of tending to fall outside the loop even though they do generate some substantial waste. That takes a great deal of effort to try to run them all down and notify them. But I think they need to be notified and told that if you do a job in the Metro region, here is the list of facilities the stuff has to go to.

**Bob Martin:** I think that's a well taken plan. I think we do need to do a lot more and a lot better job of notifying people as to what their options are in dealing with waste issues. Although I would say that to the extent that you have competing waste management companies, marketing their services here in the region, they will in some degree help inform people as to what their options are too. We get help if we bring people into the scene through the designated facility agreement. But, I think you are exactly right. We do need to do a better job of making options known to people.

**Dave Phillips:** I think even with legit designated facilities and companies going to those, they are not always going to those. They are not always necessarily going to be identifying themselves as the transporters of waste from within the region. Because there is a \$19/ton incentive to say nah, I got that just across the line. They need to be notified and told that and also so that they are on notice when you catch them -- when your investigator pounces on them, that you got em. And they are going to get got.

**Steve Schwab:** Well, wouldn't the advantage then be to avoid that \$19/ton to go through a processor who would pull as much out as possible -- and they are not paying the front door and just the back door prices, which may end up going out the front door, if some of us get our way. Therefore you would designate processors and this material would not go directly to those designated facilities but would have to go through a franchised Metro approved processing center of some sort. Unless its pure dirt or pure concrete, but if there is wood waste or steel or some of that stuff, which is what the whole goal is, I think. I mean I don't know if I missed the big picture, but its obvious to get this stuff processed, recycled, pulled out -- to divert material not to allow it to go somewhere cheaper because its cheaper to just send it "as is". Which is part of the system cost. The system goal is to not send this stuff to a landfill, whether its designated or not designated.

**Bob Martin:** Yes, if its got recoverable, recyclable content, the goal is to get as much of that recovery locally as possible and then send the residual on to a facility. And as I say, we've got tools at both ends of the line possibly to enforce that goal.

**Jim Cozzetto:** Also, without notifying those people, they are probably going to go to a non-designated facility. Unless they are told where they have to go then, I'm sure, price wise, that's going to make their decision on where to go.

**Bob Martin:** I think the point is really well taken. We do need to do a better job of getting notification out. If they go to non-designated facilities then we need to do a better job of enforcement.

**Dave Phillips:** So, that leaves me with one question. And that is, we local governments catch one of these guys that we -- you know a demolition contractor that is demolishing a building in downtown Portland and hauling it to Clackamas County and dumping it in a ravine. Which is definitely not a designated facility. And don't pay \$19.00 and in fact don't pay no dollars -- quite often -- other than a promise to bring a Cat in and fill that Wetland up for the farmer. You going to nail that guy -- or gal?

**Bob Martin:** We'll work with you on those kinds of problems. If people are clearly dumping stuff into ravines that is in fact waste, subject to our control -- that means not inert waste. There are some things that don't need to go to approved disposal sites. They aren't necessarily allowed to be placed into swamps either, but that's another issue. But to the extent that you have problems with people dumping waste into ravines, we'll work with you on that.

**Emilie Kroen:** You referred to catching it at both ends, is that in reference to the fact that we're going to start asking for some kind of permit process? Asking what they are going to do with their either demolition or building materials that are scrap?

**Bob Martin:** No, its in reference to the possibility, that I know several companies are working on. Some of them got a little ahead of themselves, in fact. To put in dump-n-pick type operations, that would have to be franchised by us. And you can bet that one of the franchise conditions is going to be, maintenance of records, availability of records to Metro, probably audits on a periodic basis. Then we will be able to compare -- at this end -- what got processed and what got shipped and where it got shipped and compare with the other end of who receives what. If they don't add up then we've clearly got some places to investigate.

**Emilie Kroen:** I can see where local government can help in that flow of information to what is an acceptable disposal site in that solid waste plan or permit process.

**Bob Martin:** Yes, I think there is a lot of opportunity for intergovernmental coordination on these issues. And of course, that is what Metro is all about.

Watch for that, again, on the Agenda on the 6th and if we've got it buttoned down, or if we feel we've got it buttoned down by then, it will be on that agenda, and if we don't it might not be. But, that's what we've aimed at.

If you are ready then, Genya has a video that she would like to present to you on recycling in the Metro region.

Genya Arnold introduced the video "Reduce, Reuse, Recycle: Three Rs for the Office", which Metro (Genya personally solicited funds of over \$30,000 from private businesses in the region) together with Pacific Standard Television produced. The film features Actor Barry Corbin, who plays Maurice Minnifield on the CBS television series "Northern Exposure."

This motivational video focuses on ways businesses can minimize the waste they produce and conserve resources by:

- Reducing the amount of paper they generate;
- Reusing paper as many times as possible;

- Recycling paper they can no longer use, and;
- Buying recycled paper to complete the recycling loop.

Reducing, reusing and recycling office paper plays an important role in decreasing the amount of paper that must be landfilled and conserving resources.

You may order a copy of the video by: calling Pacific Standard Television at 1-800-776-1610 or write Recycle, P.O. Box 339, Portland, Oregon 97207. Cost is \$19.95, plus \$2.00 shipping/handling charge.

After the video presentation, the meeting was adjourned.



**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Ave.  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
(503) 221-1646

# Memorandum

**DATE:** October 14, 1992

**TO:** Solid Waste Technical Committee

**FROM:** Steven Kraten, Solid Waste Planning Supervisor  
Debbie Gorham, Waste Reduction Manager *Debbie Gorham*

**THROUGH:** *Bob Martin* Bob Martin, Director of Solid Waste

**RE:** Progress of Annual Waste Reduction Program For Local Governments

Most of the region's waste reduction and recycling programs are coordinated under the umbrella of the Annual Waste Reduction Program For Local Government. This program for developing and implementing consistent region-wide programs was initiated in FY 1989/90. At the same time, the Metro Council adopted the "Metro Challenge" grant program to help local governments fund the administration of these waste reduction efforts. With the help of these companion programs, the region has been able to comply with the 1991 Oregon Recycling Act and to make substantial progress toward reaching our recovery target of 45 percent by 1995.

Attached is the program activity list for FY 1991/92. Following this list is a table that summarizes how completely each local government has implemented its program with regard to these activities.

Also attached is the current fiscal year's activity list along with a summary table that shows how each local government intends to comply.

The final attachment is a table that shows compliance with the 1991 Oregon Recycling Act (SB 66.) Each local government is required to implement a, b, and c, plus a fourth activity of their choice. Curbside yard debris collection is the fourth activity for most Metro area local governments.

Presently, staff is working with local governments to formulate the FY 1993/94 activity list.

SK:ay

cc: Rena Cusma, Executive Officer



PROGRAM ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR TWO OF THE  
ANNUAL WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAM FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1. Regulate residential garbage collection through franchise, license, or other means that will enable the local government to fully implement a uniform and comprehensive weekly curbside recycling program with containers.
2. Regulate commercial garbage collection through franchise, license, or other means that will enable the local government to implement a uniform commercial waste reduction and recycling program that includes collection standards, waste audits, and economic incentives.
3. Regulate multi-family garbage collection<sup>1</sup> through franchise, license, or other means that will enable local government to implement a multi-family recycling program that gives apartment owners\managers an economic incentive to promote recycling while allowing haulers to recover the costs of providing recycling services.
4. Implement in-house recycling programs to include as many materials as practical at all city and county facilities.
5. Expand local expertise on the part of haulers, recyclers, and/or recycling coordinators to perform commercial waste audits for a variety of different kinds of businesses (i.e., offices, supermarkets, hospitals). Document the completion of, at a minimum, ten commercial waste audits or waste audits for one percent of the businesses in the commercial sector, whichever is less. Develop a plan for a more comprehensive commercial waste audit program to be implemented in year three.
6. Provide schools with the opportunity to participate in waste audits and encourage them to implement waste reduction and recycling programs.
7. Begin developing language to insert into design review and/or site plan review procedures to facilitate the incorporation of recycling at commercial facilities and multi-family dwelling units.
8. Develop a plan to install recycling container systems in multi-family residential units.
9. Plan and implement a yard debris collection program that meets at least the minimum requirements of the regional yard debris recycling plan.
10. Complete an Annual Report Worksheet for year one of the Program. Submit this worksheet to Metro by September 30, 1991.

SK:gbc  
YearTwo.dgm

---

<sup>1</sup>Multi-family units generate solid waste that is residential in composition but commercial in terms of the way it is collected.

**COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT FOR METRO'S WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAM  
FY 91-92**

Local Governments	Regulate Residential Garbage	Regulate Commercial Garbage	Regulate Multi-Family Garbage	Implement In-House Recycling	Commercial Waste Audits	Recycling Programs in Schools
<b>Washington Co.</b>						
-All Areas	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise	\$	Ø	Ø
<b>Multnomah Co.</b>						
-Fairview	License	License	License	\$	\$	\$
-Gresham*						
-Troutdale	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise	\$	Ø	\$
-Wood Village	License	License	License	\$	Ø	\$
-Maywood Park	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise	\$	\$	\$
-Portland	Franchise	License	License	\$	\$	\$
<b>Clackamas Co.</b>						
-Unincorporated	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise	\$	\$	\$
-Gladstone	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise			
-Oregon City	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise			
-West Linn	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise			
-Johnson City	Franchise	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
-Lake Oswego	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise	\$	\$	\$
-Milwaukie	Franchise	Franchise	Franchise	\$	\$	\$
-Rivergrove	Franchise	N/A	N/A	\$	N/A	N/A

\$ = Substantial Compliance  
 Ø = Does Not Meet Requirements  
 \* = No Summary Received

**COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT FOR METRO'S WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAM  
FY 91-92**

Local Governments	Recycling Programs in Design/Site Review	Multi-Family Recycling Plan	Implement Yard Debris Collection Program	Annual Report Worksheet	Metro Recommendations
<b>Washington Co.</b>					
-All Areas	\$	\$	\$	\$	Proration be applied to Beaverton, Tigard, Tualatin, Hillsboro and Wilsonville Until 1% or 10 waste audits are conducted.
<b>Multnomah Co.</b>					
-Fairview	\$	\$	\$	\$	Prorated for delayed implementation of yard debris program and for late submittal of AWRP.
-Gresham*					
-Troutdale	\$	\$	\$	\$	Prorated for delayed implementation of yard debris program and for late submittal of AWRP.
-Wood Village	\$	\$	\$	\$	Prorated for delayed implementation of yard debris program and commercial waste audit program.
-Maywood Park	\$	\$	\$	\$	Receive full amount of allocation.
-Portland	\$	\$	\$	\$	Receive full amount of allocation.
<b>Clackamas Co.</b>					
-Unincorporated	\$	\$	\$	\$	Receive full amount of allocation.
-Gladstone			\$	\$	Prorated until AWRP approval
-Oregon City			\$	\$	Prorated until AWRP approval
-West Linn			\$	\$	Prorated until AWRP approval
-Johnson City	N/A	N/A	\$	\$	Receive full amount of allocation
-Lake Oswego	\$	\$	\$	\$	Prorated for delayed implementation of yard debris program.
-Milwaukie	\$	\$	\$	\$	Receive full amount of allocation. "Recycling Rules and Regulations" amended.
-Rivergrove	N/A	N/A	\$	\$	Receive full amount of allocation.

\$ = Substantial Compliance

Ø = Does Not Meet Requirements

\* = No Summary Received

**ACTIVITIES FOR FY 1992-93  
ANNUAL WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAM**

**1. Continuation of Ongoing Programs**

Local Government Activity:

Continue to maintain, promote, and enhance the activities begun in years one and two of the Annual Waste Reduction Program. Maintain yard debris collection program.

**2. Commercial Waste Audits and Recycling**

Local Government Activity:

Implement a comprehensive commercial waste audit program and designate a contact person for the program. Such a program should enable businesses to receive waste audits upon request. Keep records on the number of audits performed. Promote the use of existing waste exchanges and other recovery options. Work with Metro, DEQ, fire marshals, and haulers to eliminate impediments to commercial recycling

Metro Support:

- Conduct a limited number of waste audits (local governments will have primary responsibility to make waste audits available to businesses.)
- Train Recycling Coordinators and others in how to conduct waste audits.
- Make available a Metro-produced commercial recycling video.
- Provide industry specific information, including a waste generation profile on businesses within each wasteshed.
- Provide updated information and workshops on how to set up school-wide recycling.
- Provide information on how to buy recycled.

**3. Construction/Demolition Recycling and Recovery**

Local Government Activity:

By the end of FY 92/93, require completion of a brief waste disposal/recycling form when a structure is built or demolished. The purpose of the form will be to urge the permittee to explore waste reduction and recovery options. The permittee should identify disposal/recycling facility to be used in order to help assure proper disposal and avoid illegal dumping.

Metro Support:

- Provide technical assistance to processors.
- Provide comprehensive information to processors, haulers, and others on pending permits.
- Provide information regarding recycling and recovery options.
- Develop and distribute a brochure on "clean building."

**4. Building Design Review**

Local Government Activity:

Incorporate into building design review/site plan review procedures, language that specifies the incorporation of recycling areas in new multi-family, commercial, institutional, and industrial developments. Such recycling areas must provide space and access to facilitate effective recycling on the part of building users and efficient recycling on the part of haulers.

Metro Support:

- Provide technical information regarding placement of and access to recycling systems.
- Develop model ordinance.

**5. Home Composting**

Local Government Activity:

Promote proper home composting to complement other yard debris recycling programs.

Metro Support:

- Maintain home composting demonstration sites.
- Conduct home composting workshops at demonstration sites.
- Extend home composting education programs through Compost Corps.
- Provide home composting brochure.

**6. Household Hazardous Waste**

Local Government Activity:

Promote the concept of minimizing the use of products and containers that must be disposed as hazardous waste. Promote the use of Metro's new household hazardous waste disposal

facility. Coordinate with Metro to help find appropriate sites for a temporary mobile collection site if needed.

Metro Support:

- Public affairs campaign to promote hazardous waste minimization.
- Extend educational programs through coordination with established networks such as Extension Home Economists to integrate HHW into their programs.
- Sponsor seminars on HHW.
- Maintain a household hazardous waste depot at the Metro South transfer station.
- Provide educational brochures on HHW.
- Include information on HHW in presentations given to Grades 9 through 12.

**7. Support Depots**

Local Government Activity:

Promote the use of recycling depots that accept non-curb-side materials or that serve rural communities. Such depots include temporary depots that collect materials such as phone books and Christmas trees.

Metro Support:

- Provide Information about depots through Recycling Information Center.
- Facilitate the coordination of phone book recycling programs.

**8. "Precycling"**

Local Government Activity:

Promote the concept of minimizing the use of products that are excessively packaged or that are packaged in materials that are not readily collected for recycling in the Metro area.

Metro Support:

- Public Affairs campaign to promote waste reduction.
- Provide presentations that include precycling to Grades 9-12.

## **9. Multi-Family Recycling**

### Local Government Activity

Actively support<sup>1</sup> and promote<sup>2</sup> the implementation of recycling systems in multi-family units. Elements of such systems should include prominently placed, readily accessible containers of an acceptable type and quality, training of apartment managers in the effective management of such systems, and promotion/education for tenants. Plan a program to offer recycling to all multi-family complexes by FY 93/94 such that every unit is served by June 1994.

### Metro Support:

- Provide technical information on recycling container systems.
- Coordinate training programs for apartment owners/managers.
- Provide partial funding for multi-family container systems and/or training in the management of such systems.

## **10. Buy Recycled**

### Local Government Activity:

Expand purchases of recycled materials such as yard debris compost, paper, tires, oil, paint, and building products whenever possible.

### Metro Support:

Provide specifications and technical information on recycled materials and products with recycled content.

## **11. Assess Viability of New Curbside Materials**

### Local Government Activity:

Include additional materials in curbside collection programs as warranted by volumes of material available, technical and economic feasibility of collection, and adequacy of markets.

---

<sup>1</sup>As used throughout this document, "support" may include, but is not limited to, actions initiated by formal resolutions, funding for an activity, and the work of Recycling Coordinators in facilitating the implementation of programs.

<sup>2</sup>As used throughout this document, "promotion" includes the posting of signage and flyers, distribution of newsletters and other mailings, news releases, and the use of any other print or electronic media to educate and encourage participation in waste reduction programs.

Metro Support:

- Monitor performance of existing curbside plastic and magazine collection programs.
- Provide technical information on curbside collection systems.

**12. Record Recycling Tonnage**

Local Government Activity:

Monitor and record recycling tonnages and participation in such a way that the data can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of recycling and waste reduction programs.

Metro Support:

- Compile and analyze data to better manage solid waste system.
- Provide statistics to local governments and haulers.
- Submit annual report to the DEQ.

SK:gbc  
October 14, 1992  
MINACT.YR3



**LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANS FOR METRO'S WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAM  
FY 92-93**

<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENTS</b>	<b>Continuation of Ongoing Programs</b>	<b>Commercial Waste Audits &amp; Recycling</b>	<b>Construction/Demolition Recycling &amp; Recovery</b>
<b>Washington Co.</b>			
-All Areas	Maintain current recycling programs, continue to provide education and promotion of waste reduction activities, provide funding to maintain programs.	Designate a contact person for the program, develop waste evaluation criteria and form, conduct audits, and develop comprehensive commercial recycling education plan.	Develop presentation for construction community, develop form requiring users to identify disposal/recycling facilities, evaluate effectiveness.
<b>Multnomah Co.</b>			
-Fairview	Continue to provide all recycling services begun in years 1 and 2.	Include Fairview's commercial sites in Gresham's waste audit program.	Incorporate waste disposal/recycling form into Building Permit process.
-Gresham *			
-Maywood Park	Maintain, promote and enhance activities begun in years 1 and 2.	Designate contact person, implement waste audit program and maintain records.	Not Applicable
-Portland	Continue implementation of various elements of residential program, provide extended promotional campaign, monitor yard debris program, perform financial analyses & audits	Update and enforce Administrative Rules, provide information to customers regarding SB66 requirements, receive training on conducting audits, provide audits upon request.	Develop educational materials and make available through Bureau of Building permit and presentations, work with BOB to implement use of recycling form.
-Troutdale	Maintain, promote and enhance activities begun in prior years. Continue IGA with Gresham and SWCAC. Yard debris collection and Spring Clean-Up day.	Implement a waste audit program with hauler. Develop and promote additional commercial waste audit resources. Utilize Metro's audit training/program materials.	Work with City Development to produce review form, with the goals of SWCAC and waste minimization in mind. Utilize Metro's Const. Site Recycling handbook.
-Wood Village	Maintain, promote and enhance curbside and yard debris recycling programs, as well as institutional purchasing/recycling program.	Develop commercial recycling plans, train Recycling Coordinator to conduct waste audits upon request.	Develop a building permit form that identifies disposal and recycling procedures for construction waste products.
<b>Clackamas Co.</b>			
-Unincorporated	Continue producing recycling brochures and displays, presentations to public groups, possibly alter yard debris services for exemption	Develop waste audit forms, brochures and signage, conduct waste audits and training sessions with Fire Chief, Metro and DEQ.	Develop information brochure and disposal/recycling form, distribute along with building permits.
-Gladstone **			
-Johnson City	Continue and promote yard debris recycling with annual recycle day and weekly pick-up.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
-Lake Oswego	Maintain previously implemented activities, distribute promotion, add magazines and yard debris to curbside, inverted commercial rates, increase in-house recycling.	Perform waste audits, promote audits through city newsletter, business license application and local newspaper, distribute "This Business Recycles" stickers.	Consider using Metro's model ordinance and distributing Metro's brochure, request that forms be filled out with building permits applications.
-Milwaukie	Haulers to continue distributing periodic educational information to existing recycling customers, send info. to all new customers.	Develop waste audit format, contact person, meetings with haulers, Fire Chief & Public Works, random audits, reports for results.	Use model ordinance to design disposal/recycling form, consult with Fire Chief, public works, haulers, existing reqmnts.
-Oregon City **			
-Rivergrove	Continue and promote yard debris recycling.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
-West Linn **			

\* Program has not been submitted; \*\* Program has not been approved

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANS FOR METRO'S WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAM  
FY 92-93**

<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENTS</b>	<b>Building Design Review</b>	<b>Home Composting</b>	<b>Household Hazardous Waste</b>
<b>Washington Co.</b>			
-All Areas	Facilitate the implementation of model zoning ordinance into building design/site review process.	Promote home composting through the use of existing display and educational information.	Develop educational display, promote proper disposal, provide scheduling coordination for mobile collection vehicle, incorporate HHW into school education.
<b>Multnomah Co.</b>			
-Fairview	Design review criteria will require the incorporation of recycling areas in developments.	Continue exemption option of yard debris service to encourage home composting.	Distribute HHW Facility information through city newsletter.
-Gresham *			
-Maywood Park	Not Applicable	Hold a clean-up day for yard debris drop-off	
-Portland	Use model ordinance for incorporating solid waste & recycling areas in new construction, incorporate site/design review, clarify threshold of regulation to apply to remodeling	Distribute Metro's home composting brochure, include information on one of the quarterly info. pieces, explore potential to sell home composters through local stores.	Distribute Metro's HHW brochure to garbage service customers and at special events. Work with Metro to ensure that HHW facility can accommodate more use
-Troutdale	Incorporate into review procedures requirement for recycling areas. Look to Metro for results on Multi-family pilot.	Promote home composting through newsletter. Encourage home composting by providing a credit to home composters.	Provide educational materials on HHW facility and proper disposal. Proposing HHW collection at fire stations.
-Wood Village	Design review procedures requiring recycling areas to be included in building design/site planning process, provide technical info.	Support Metro's demo sites. Implement exemption from yard debris program and conduct inspections on home composters.	Support and promote the use of a HHW disposal facility. Assist Metro in finding mobile collection sites if needed.
<b>Clackamas Co.</b>			
-Unincorporated	Format design/site review procedures for inclusion of zoning ordinance amendments.	Sponsor booth at Co. Fair, work with Metro to plan and implement workshops/brochures.	Design informational displays and handouts, research alternative uses (non-haz).
-Gladstone **			
-Johnson City	Not Applicable	Plans to include composting information in recycling reminder fliers.	Publishes materials promoting Metro's HHW facility.
-Lake Oswego	Consider incorporating model ordinance into revised development codes, design reviews to include recycling areas, informational flier.	Offer home composting workshop, promote with informational fliers, advertisements, yard debris brochure and Metro's brochure.	Promote concept of HHW minimization in schools, public displays, and newspaper, coordinate mobile collection site.
-Milwaukie	Multi-family ord. has been addressed. Develop ordinance for commercial, institutional and industrial developments using model ord.	Distribute mailer to yard debris participants, hold compost clinic, display and make available compost brochures and related info.	Print HHW information on water bills, informational brochures made available, HHW presentation in schools.
-Oregon City **			
-Rivergrove	Not Applicable	Publish home composting information in monthly newsletter.	Promote use of HHW facility through monthly newsletters.
-West Linn **			

\* Program has not been submitted

\*\* Program has not been approved

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR METRO'S WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAM  
FY 92-93**

<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENTS</b>	<b>Support Depots</b>	<b>"Precycling"</b>	<b>Multi-Family Recycling</b>
<b>Washington Co.</b>			
-All Areas	Evaluate funding for depots in rural areas, promote permanent and temporary depots through brochures and newsletters, evaluate need to expand or enhance depot system.	Incorporate a precycling component into the existing educational programs for both the general public and schools.	Set targets of 60% by 7/93 and 100% by 7/94, develop database, administer grants, provide education and technical assistance, evaluate progress.
<b>Multnomah Co.</b>			
-Fairview	Continue Spring Clean-Up, promote proper disposal practices and depots locations.	Promote the concept of minimization of non-recyclable or over-packaged products.	Continue to implement program in conjunction with City of Gresham.
-Gresham *			
-Maywood Park	Not Applicable		Not Applicable
-Portland	Investigate ability to print depot location on back of material preparation forms, promote recycling of non-curb-side materials such as phone books and x-mas trees.	Produce fact sheet on source reduction for quarterly information piece, develop a "How to Reduce Your Garbage Bill" fact sheet.	Service 250 complexes, offer 4 training sessions (attendance required), distribute handbook & tenant flier, require hauler to inform landlord, develop plan (1994).
-Troutdale	Participate in phone book and x-mas tree collection events.	Provide educational material on "precycling" & packaging form letters to send to retailers.	Continue pilot with Gresham. Produce educational materials with SWCAC.
-Wood Village	Support and promote all efforts to collect non-curb-side recyclables, may include temporary depots for phone books, x-mas trees.	Support and promote concept of minimizing excessive or non-recyclable packaging.	Use results of pilot project to develop final recycling program with Gresham, approve and implement by July 1, 1993.
<b>Clackamas Co.</b>			
-Unincorporated	Support collection days, coordinate phone book and x-mas tree recycling campaign, assist in promotion and upkeep of depots.	Develop educational campaign on wise purchasing, distribute posters and displays to public, research certification programs.	Continue implementation of programs, conduct training seminars, develop and distribute promotional materials.
-Gladstone **			
-Johnson City	Promote x-mas tree recycling and non-curb-side recyclable materials.	Promote concept of "precycling" to residents.	Not Applicable
-Lake Oswego	Promote current Portland Recycling Team depot, consider operating depot along with x-mas tree and phone book collection days.	Promote concept of "precycling" in schools, informational displays and newspaper articles.	Implement Multifamily Recycling Plan to meet July 1994 deadline, coordinate training workshops, tenant info material.
-Milwaukie	Promote and support depots that collect non-curb-side materials.	Coordinate and perform an in-school presentation addressing the "precycling" concept.	Conduct site audits, continue to implement programs so that all apartment complexes are serviced by June 1994.
-Oregon City **			
-Rivergrove	Promote x-mas tree recycling depots through monthly newsletters.	Promote concept of "precycling" through monthly newsletter.	Not Applicable
-West Linn **			

\* Program has not been submitted

\*\* Program has not been approved

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANS FOR METRO'S WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAM  
FY 92-93**

<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENTS</b>	<b>Buy-Recycled</b>	<b>Assess Viability of Materials</b>	<b>Record Recycling Tonnage</b>
<b>Washington Co.</b>			
-All Areas	Promote "buy-recycled" concept, provide purchasing information to local governments, utilize Metro resources.	Evaluate addition of scrap paper, milk jugs, and yard debris to curbside program.	Collect monthly recycling tonnages, monitor outcome of DEQ's method of uniform waste reduction reporting.
<b>Multnomah Co.</b>			
-Fairview	Continue and expand "purchase recycled products" program, encourage employees.	Study feasibility of additional curbside materials in conjunction with Gresham	Haulers will continue to monitor and record tonnages collected and recycled.
-Gresham *			
-Maywood Park	Not Applicable	Include additional materials in curbside programs when economically/technol. feasible	Monitor and record recycled tonnages to evaluate the effectiveness of programs.
-Portland	Research current purchasing practices, develop objectives for expanded purchasing of recycled materials, distribute Metro directory.	Monitor markets for non-curbside materials, develop work program for scrap paper to go curbside, provide input to legislative efforts.	Require quarterly reports from haulers on recycling tonnages, receive Metro reports, develop method to increase partpn.
-Troutdale	Continue to recycle all possible materials and purchase recycled products.	Continue to pursue the addition of new materials in curbside program.	SWCAC will conduct rate study using Uniform Reporting Form listing tons.
-Wood Village	Continue to purchase recycled products when applicable, including tires and compost.	Consider new materials for collection based on technical, economic and market feasibility	Monitor and record recycling tonnages reported by hauler and inform Metro.
<b>Clackamas Co.</b>			
-Unincorporated	Continue and expand purchasing/usage of recycled materials in county projects & offices.	Evaluate feasibility of incorporating additional material into curbside program.	Continue to facilitate hauler reporting, obtain data on depots & other recyclers.
-Gladstone **			
-Johnson City	Not Applicable		
-Lake Oswego	Continue established recycling purchasing guidelines, expand purchasing of recycled office paper and re-refined oil.	Add magazines to curbside recycling, evaluate possibility of adding plastics to program.	Hauler is planning sampling techniques to collect data on tonnages and participation levels for program evaluation.
-Milwaukie	Adopt a purchase agreement expanding purchases of recycled materials when possible.	Add additional materials to curbside program if economically feasible.	Continue to collect and monitor tonnage reports, establish performance standards.
-Oregon City **			
-Rivergrove	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
-West Linn **			

\* Program has not been submitted

\*\* Program has not been approved

**COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR OREGON RECYCLING ACT**

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	
	Recycling Containers	Same Day Service	Education-Promotion	X-Family Recycling	Yard Debris Collection	Commercial Recycling	Recycling Depots	Rate Incentives	Alternative Method
<b>Washington Co.</b>									
-All Areas	♦	♦	♦	Implementing Program	Depot System	Conducting Waste Audits		∅	
<b>Multnomah Co.</b>									
-Fairview	♦	♦	♦	Pilot Project w/ Gresham	♦	Conducting Waste Audits		∅	
-Gresham									
-Troutdale	♦	♦	♦	Pilot Project w/ Gresham	♦	Conducting Waste Audits		∅	
-Wood Village	♦	♦	♦	Pilot Project w/ Gresham	♦	Conducting Waste Audits		∅	
-Maywood Park	♦	♦	♦	All Units Serviced	♦	N/A		∅	
-Portland	♦	♦	♦	Implementing Program	♦	Conducting Waste Audits		∅	
<b>Clackamas Co.</b>									
-Unincorporated	♦	♦	♦	Implementing Program	♦	Conducting Waste Audits		♦	
-Gladstone	♦	♦			♦	Conducting Waste Audits			
-Oregon City	♦	♦			♦	Conducting Waste Audits			
-West Linn	♦	♦			Depot System	Conducting Waste Audits			
-Johnson City	♦	♦	♦	N/A	♦	N/A			
-Lake Oswego	♦	♦	♦	Implementing Program	♦	Conducting Waste Audits		♦	
-Milwaukie	♦	♦	♦	Implementing Program	♦	Conducting Waste Audits		∅	
-Sandy									
-Rivergrove	♦	♦	♦	N/A	♦	N/A		♦	

♦ = Full Compliance

∅ = Does Not Comply

Plain Text = Does Not Comply

= Need More Information



# METRO

2000 S.W. First Ave.  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
(503) 221-1646

# Memorandum

DATE: October 14, 1992

TO: Solid Waste Technical Committee

FROM: Mike Huycke, Associate Solid Waste Planner *MH*  
Debbie Gorham, Waste Reduction Manager *DG*

THROUGH: Bob Martin, Solid Waste Director *BM*

RE: Update on Multi-Family Recycling Program

Metro's Multi-Family Recycling Program is in its fourth year of implementation. Each year, Metro has provided funding to local governments for the purchase of recycling containers, promotional materials and other cost associated with implementing multi-family recycling programs. Metro has funded the program as follows:

FY 1989-90	\$150,000
FY 1990-91	\$251,716
FY 1991-92	\$ 43,574
FY 1992-93	\$100,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$545,290</b>

This funding, along with matching funds from local governments, has established recycling systems in approximately 35% of all multi-family units throughout the region (see Attachment A).

Local governments' monetary contributions have funded areas such as container purchases, decal orders, staff time, and promotion and education materials necessary to ensure the success of these systems (see Attachment B). It is proposed this year to exclude staff time as an eligible match. This would require local governments to invest equal funds into the purchase of containers, decals, promotion and education materials, and any expenses related to on-site preparation.

Limiting the match to these areas will assure that Metro's funding will be utilized specifically for container hardware and the materials necessary to promote and educate multi-family tenants to recycle.

MH:ay

cc: Rena Cusma, Executive Officer

**Summary of Multi-Family Units with Recycling Programs  
(as of July 1, 1992)**

<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>Units with Recycling Programs</b>	<b>Percent of Total Units*</b>
Clackamas Co.	4,234	73 %
Lake Oswego	3,828	100 %
Milwaukie	1,098	62 %
River Cities	777	41 %
Portland	19,074	36 %
Gresham	1,239	19 %
Washington Co.	4,905	17 %
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>35,155</b>	<b>35%</b>

\* This percentage is calculated using 1990 census data and does not account for multi-family units constructed in 1991 and 1992. Including those units would lower percentage.

**Summary of Matching Funds by Local Governments**  
**(as of July 1, 1992)**

<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>FY 1991-92 ALLOCATION</b>	<b>LOCAL GOV. MATCHING FUNDS</b>
Clackamas Co.	\$22,769	\$20,666 County Match (Containers 41%, Staffing 57%, Promotion 2%)
Lake Oswego	\$7,180	\$12,590 Hauler Match (Containers 100%)
Milwaukie	\$4,594	\$6,805 City Match (Containers 55%, Staffing 29%, Promotion 15%)
River Cities	\$9,499	\$706 City Match (Containers 43%, Promotion 57%)
Portland	\$122,000	\$139,511 City Match (Containers 8%, Staffing 74%, Promotion 7%, Misc. 12%)
Gresham	\$18,892	\$19,357 City Match (Containers 60%, Staffing 39%, Promotion 1%)
Washington Co.*	\$66,692	\$19,929 County Match (Containers 73%, Staffing 12%, Promotion 15%)
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$251,716</b>	<b>\$219,582</b>

\* Has not spent all of FY 91-92 allocation.





**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Ave.  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
(503) 221-1646

# Memorandum

**DATE:** October 14, 1992

**TO:** Solid Waste Technical Committee

**FROM:** Mike Huycke, Associate Solid Waste Planner *MH*  
Debbie Gorham, Waste Reduction Manager *DG*

**THROUGH:** *BM* Bob Martin, Solid Waste Director

**RE:** Changes in Annual Clean-Up Program

Since FY 1989-90, Metro's Annual Clean-Up Program has provided funding to local governments to help defray disposal costs at neighborhood and illegal dumpsite clean-up events. Funding has been, and will continue to be, allocated on the basis of population as shown on Attachment A. During FY 1991-92, funds were applied to disposal costs at illegal dumpsite and neighborhood clean-ups only.

This year, it is proposed that money be made available for preventive measures which include signage, fencing or barricades that can be put in place to deter illegal dumpers. FY 1992-93 funds may be used for any combination of disposal costs at annual neighborhood clean-ups, illegal dumpsite clean-ups, or preventive measures at illegal dumpsites. Due to the recent implementation and development of various curbside yard debris programs, "yard debris only" clean-up events will not be eligible for program funding.

Funds will be issued as reimbursements for half of actual disposal costs and the full cost of preventive measures. Local governments will bill Metro by submitting an invoice for half of total disposal costs (with disposal receipts attached) and the full cost of preventive measures (with purchase receipts and staff time invoices attached). Reimbursements will be issued up to amount allocated to each jurisdiction.

It is anticipated that this year's changes will give local governments additional options for utilizing available funding for annual clean-up related projects.

SK:ay

cc: Rena Cusma, Executive Officer

<b>Metro Annual Clean-Up Program Allocation Summary</b>			
WASTESHED	FY 91-92 ALLOCATION	AMOUNT SPENT	FY 92-93 ALLOCATION
<b>Washington County</b>			
Unincorporated	\$3,890	\$471.12	\$3,707
Beaverton	\$1,390	\$1,390.00	\$1,353
Hillsboro	\$978	\$978.00	\$933
Tigard	\$765	\$0.00	\$728
Tualatin	\$391	\$57.20	\$383
Forest Grove	\$354	\$0.00	\$327
Wilsonville	\$185	\$0.00	\$207
Cornelius	\$160	\$0.00	\$150
Sherwood	\$81	\$0.00	\$78
King City	\$54	\$0.00	\$50
North Plains*	\$0	\$0.00	\$50
Durham	\$50	\$50.00	\$50
Gaston*	\$0	\$0.00	\$50
Banks*	\$0	\$0.00	\$50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$8,298</b>	<b>\$2,946.32</b>	<b>\$8,116</b>
<b>Multnomah County</b>			
Gresham	\$1,786	\$1,992.00	\$1,710
Troutdale	\$206	\$0.00	\$197
Wood Village	\$74	\$74.00	\$70
Fairview	\$63	\$0.00	\$62
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,129</b>	<b>\$2,066.00</b>	<b>\$2,039</b>
<b>Clackamas County</b>			
Unincorporated	\$4,122	\$833.59	\$3,840
Lake Oswego	\$789	\$583.20	\$747
Milwaukie	\$482	\$482.00	\$460
Oregon City	\$379	\$379.00	\$397
Gladstone	\$262	\$0.00	\$406
West Linn	\$428	\$0.00	\$247
Sandy*	\$0	\$0.00	\$101
Molalla*	\$0	\$0.00	\$86
Estacada*	\$0	\$0.00	\$50
Happy Valley	\$50	\$0.00	\$50
Johnson City	\$50	\$0.00	\$50
Rivergrove	\$50	\$456.00	\$50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,612</b>	<b>\$2,733.79</b>	<b>\$6,484</b>
<b>Portland</b>			
City of Portland	\$11,421	\$4,850.60	\$10,852
Uninc. Mult. County	\$1,675	\$0.00	\$1,458
Maywood Park	\$50	\$0.00	\$50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$13,146</b>	<b>\$4,850.60</b>	<b>\$12,360</b>
<b>TRI-COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$30,185</b>	<b>\$12,596.71</b>	<b>\$28,999</b>

\*Not previously included in program.

**METRO LOCAL GOVERNMENT CLEAN-UP PROGRAM SUMMARY**  
**FY 91-92**

JURISDICTION	METRO'S INITIAL ALLOCATION	METRO'S ACTUAL CONTRIBUTION	TOTAL DISPOSAL COSTS	AMOUNT RECYCLED (In Tons)		AMOUNT DISPOSED (In Tons)
				Yard Debris	Other	
Beaverton	\$1,390	\$1,390	\$3,914.48	160.92		42.53
Clackamas Co.	\$4,122	\$833.59	\$1,667.18	1.65	.43 tires	15.12
Durham	\$50	\$50	\$386.24		.5 scrap metal	5.68
Forest Grove	\$354	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gresham/Troutdl.	\$1,992	\$1,992	\$15,690	464.75	.1 scrap metal .1 glass .1 newspaper .1 cardboard .15 mag. 80 lbs. plastic 26 gal. used oil	156
Hillsboro	\$978	\$978	\$10,525.56	261.49	17.25 scrapmetal 5.23 tires 1.3 cardboard .83 plastic 200 gal. used oil	82.18
Lake Oswego	\$789	\$583.20	\$1,166.40	67.5		
Milwaukie	\$482	\$482	\$3,964.99	117.25	7.5 scrap metal 2.28 tires	99.75
Multnomah Co.	\$1,675	\$0; SOLV paid disposal costs	\$1,866		5.06 scrap metal 16.22 tires	13.13
Oregon City	\$379	\$379	\$5,551.27		7.23 tires	69.59
Portland	\$11,421	\$4,850.60	\$14,254.92	338.90	.5 scrap metal 12.18 tires	240.64
Rivergrove	\$50	\$456 (Metro Challenge)	\$456	7.48		
Tualatin	\$391	\$57.20	\$114.40	1.25		1.05
Washington Co.	\$3,890	\$471.12	\$942.24		24.4 scrapmetal	18.81
Wood Village	\$74	\$74	\$841.16	13.85	.25 scrap metal 10 lbs. tin 15 lbs. glass 50 lb newspaper 26 lbs cardboard 166 lbs. plastic	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$28,037</b>	<b>\$12,596.71</b>	<b>\$61,340.84</b>	<b>1,435.04 tons Yard Debris + 101.88 tons otherRecyclables = 1,536 tons Recycled = 67%</b>		<b>744.48</b>

All tonnages were calculated using the following conversion ratio:

Loose Yard Debris 250 lb. per yard; Chipped Yard Debris 650 lb. per yard; Compacted Yard Debris 700 lb. per yard; Scrap Metal 250 lb. per yard;  
Tires w/o Rim 100 per ton; Tires w/ Rim 71 per ton; Mixed Solid Waste (Drop Box) 350 lb. per yard; Mixed Solid Waste (Compacted) 750 lb. per  
yard; Tin 235 lb. per yard; Glass 750 lb. per yard; Newspaper 475 lb. per yard; Plastic 55 lb. per yard.



**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Memorandum

**DATE:** October 15, 1992

**TO:** Solid Waste Technical Committee

**FROM:** Bob Martin, Solid Waste Director

**RE: Proposed Restructuring of the Solid Waste Technical Committee**

Metro is considering restructuring the Solid Waste Technical Committee in order to broaden representation to better reflect the region's diverging solid waste management needs. The proposed restructuring would not result in any active member on the Committee losing their position.

The structure of the Technical Committee is set by resolution. Therefore, the method of revising Committee membership is via another resolution. Before submitting a resolution to Council, we would like the recommendation of the Technical Committee on the proposed restructuring.

## BACKGROUND

Resolution #87-785-"A" initiated the development of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) and established the Policy and Technical Committees to advise the Council on the development of the Plan. At the time the solid waste planning process was being developed, the major solid waste planning issues facing the region centered around siting major solid waste facilities and developing regional consensus on an approach to managing solid waste. As a result, the structure of the Technical Committee weighed heavily toward representation from local government. Local governments were awarded 13 of the 22 Committee positions. The four largest local governments, the City of Portland and the three counties were given two memberships each. This allowed the Committee to include both solid waste and land use planning professionals so the Committee could give advice on facility siting and Plan development issues.

The policy framework and major chapters of the RSWMP have been adopted by the Council and are now being implemented. The significant issues related to facility siting and consistency with local government plans have previously been addressed by the Council and its advisory committees. The major solid waste planning issues facing the region today focus on efficient management of the region's solid waste system that includes the solid waste hauling industry, a large recycling industry, solid waste processing facilities and transfer stations and landfills.

The need for land use planners on the region's advisory committees has been replaced by a need for increased representation from the solid waste industry. Participation by local land use planners on the Technical Committee has declined after the passage of the Washington County System Plan and revisions to Chapter 16 of the RSWMP. When contacted by the Solid Waste Department, the local land use planners on the Committee concurred that their direct involvement in Metro's solid waste planning functions was no longer necessary and that their positions could be utilized to provide better representation from the solid waste industry.

## PROPOSAL

The proposed restructuring of the Solid Waste Technical Committee would occur by reducing the number of committee members from Portland and the three counties from eight to four. The committee members that would give up their memberships are local land use planners who are no longer attending meetings. Three of the four positions would be used to add additional members from the solid waste industry to the Committee. There are currently six positions dedicated to the solid waste industry. The recycling industry and facility operators are under-represented under the current Committee structure. The proposed resolution would add three industry positions and specify that they be divided as follows:

- Solid Waste Hauling Industry                      4 members
- Solid Waste Recycling Industry                      2 members
- Solid Waste Facility Operators                      3 members

The one remaining vacated membership would be used to add a single at-large land use/solid waste planning professional to the Technical Committee so that the Committee can continue to provide input on plan consistency and land use issues, should they arise.

BM\MB:clk  
c:\busch\pcto\restruc.mem