



METRO

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

Agenda

MEETING: Solid Waste Technical Committee

DAY: Thursday

DATE: December 17, 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 October 22 Meeting Minutes

Bob Martin

II. Updates

Bob Martin

III. Discussion of Committee Reorganization

Terry Petersen

IV. Discussion of Proposed 1993 Committee Agenda:

1. Review of Methods and Assumptions Used by Metro to Forecast Solid Waste

Terry Petersen

2. Update of Chapter 1 of the Solid Waste Management Plan "Waste Reduction"

Debbie Gorham

- Assessment of existing programs
- Development of 5-yr strategies

3. Chapter 9 of the Solid Waste Management Plan "Franchising, Contracting, Licensing"

Terry Petersen

4. Completion of the CEG section of Chapter 2 "Hazardous and Medical Waste"

Terry Petersen

V. Adjourn

TP:clk

s:\metz\pete\TCAGD.128

Solid Waste Technical Committee

Meeting of:

October 22, 1992

Present:

James Cozzetto, Jr., MDC
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, OSSl, Tri-Co. Council
Pat Vernon, DEQ
Meganne Steele, City of Portland
Tom Miller, Washington County Haulers
Bob Kincaid, City of Lake Oswego

Guests Present

Jerry Yudelson, Regional Disposal Co.
Fred Coccodrilli, Bogle & Gates

Metro

Bob Martin
Mark Buscher
Terry Petersen
Steve Kraten
Mike Huycke
Debbie Gorham
Sam Chandler
Ron Nagy
Jim Watkins

Mr. Martin brought the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes: John Drew moved to approve the Minutes from the September 24th meeting, Mr. Dave Phillips seconded the motion. Ms. Meganne Steele stated she was not listed as having attended the meeting. With that correction, the minutes were approved unanimously.

Updates:

Mr. Martin gave a status report on the Compost Plant. Mr. Martin said the bank is now negotiating with a firm to put the plant back into operation and expects to complete the transaction within a month. The firm, a joint venture is called OTVD/Ryan. OTVD (french), is a very large, essentially private utility company in Europe. They supply drinking water for the City

of Paris, as well as waste water treatment and approximately 30 solid waste composting plants in Europe, some of which have been operating for 30 years. Ryan is an engineering firm based in the mid-west. OTVD/Ryan has one operating MSW compost plant in the United States (Truman, MN) and is considerably smaller than what is planned here.

OTVD/Ryan proposes to change the process considerably. They propose to do the separation of compostable from non-compostable material by using a series of mechanical separation equipment including trommels and magnetic separators, screens, etc. They will also use channels with paddles moving continuously through them while continuously pumping air into the process, as opposed to the static pile concept.

With regard to the odor problem, they will enclose the structures and collect air within the facility which will be forced through a multi-stage scrubber system and then discharged through a tall stack.

If negotiations are successful, it is expected the necessary modifications will take approximately a year.

John Drew asked Mr. Martin to explain any additional costs and how it would relate to rate payers.

Mr. Martin said that information was central to the negotiations that are now occurring. Mr. Martin said Metro did tell the bank they were willing to look at changing the currently existing service agreement only to the extent that it would not cause any additional costs to be reflected in the rates.

Mr. Martin said Metro is in the process of constructing the second Household Hazardous Waste Depot at Metro Central. The target completion date is late February or early March, 1993. Mr. Martin said the existing HHW facility is so successful that our targeted capacity has been exceeded to the extent that operating costs have risen beyond our budget. He said they would propose a budget amendment to the Council before the start-up of the new facility suggesting three options. Briefly, one option would be to recycle less and dispose more (no bulking, and special handling), hire additional personnel and duplicate the current HHW facility (this method is the most cost effective) or to work with what we currently have been budgeted. Mr. Martin said we are currently receiving at least three times more waste than what we were budgeted to handle.

Mr. Martin said they would suggest to the Council that at least a modest service fee be charged. Mr. Martin said they did not want to discourage use, but defraying some of the costs would be helpful. Mr. Martin said Mr. Chandler was present and would entertain questions from Committee members.

Delyn Kies mentioned that there was an amount of materials collected at the HHW that were "inappropriate" for the facility -- things not hazardous for instance. Ms. Kies asked if they were part of the volume problem.

Mr. Chandler said she was correct but that they were making some progress in this regard, *i.e.*, they are receiving more manageable containers, less plastic bags and they will continue those efforts. Mr. Chandler said the full items were being sorted at the front end and most of that material is going to the reuse program in Clackamas.

Ms. Kies asked what types of events were scheduled for community HHW gathering days, and the second facility was to be a mobile unit as she understood the Management Plan.

Mr. Martin said the Plan calls for two fixed facilities and then a system for serving the region in a mobile fashion, but the Plan is sketchy as to how exactly that goal is to be reached.

Mr. Chandler said there were examples set forth in the Plan (King County's mobile facility which was extraordinarily expensive) but no definitive action prescribed. Mr. Chandler said Metro was trying to find the least-cost way to provide the service called for, and given the limited funds DEQ has very generously provided, that "one-day events" were the most effective. Mr. Chandler said these events can include the participation of haulers, fire departments and perhaps waste water people, and any other volunteer effort to defray costs. Mr. Chandler said the region just cannot afford to have a mobile facility sit and collect the volumes of materials that our customers are bringing to the HHW facilities -- the participation is extraordinary.

Mr. Drew asked Mr. Chandler if he was aware of the program in Corvallis at the Coffin Butte Landfill and Albany Sanitation with regard to their remote unit. Mr. Drew said they were going to try and estimate cost based on their new unit -- cost on two levels: purchasing and providing and explosion proof mobile building. Another cost analysis will be on how much volume they will experience.

Mr. Martin said we had helped provide some training for them as they were approaching the construction of these facilities. Mr. Martin said Metro would continue to keep in touch with them.

Ms. Kotta wanted to know that when the reassessment of the HHW was completed, would it be resubmitted to the subcommittee on Household Hazardous Waste and then on to the SW Technical Committee, or would it be handled on a staff level.

Mr. Martin said the details of how the Plan is executed would still be reviewed with the SW Technical Committee. Mr. Martin said he did feel a need to send the assessment back to the HHW subcommittee and talk about additional supplements to the Plan. Mr. Martin said there have been some changes in Federal policy and regulation with regard to conditionally exempt small quantity generators and how those are handled structurally.

Mr. Martin reminded the Committee that everything Metro did would have a strong focus on how it would impact the rate. Mr. Martin said we have essentially our "full system" in place with the exception of the Wilsonville Transfer Station and the need of the region is to have stability in the rate structure and we will continue to hold the line on changes which have major impacts on the rates.

Ms. Kies wanted the record to reflect that Washington County wanted to continue to be in a working relationship on any committees which might consider changes in policy implementation regarding Household Hazardous Waste programs, *i.e.*, level of service, distance to facilities, what types of materials, how it will be promoted, etc.

Ms. Kotta agreed with Ms. Kies concerns as to participation on any policy issues which might be up for discussion as regards Household Hazardous Waste facilities.

Mr. Martin said he had one additional update. He said that with regard to the designated facilities issue, that after considerable testimony before Council, the Solid Waste Department has recognized that they were trying to do too much with the original proposal. Mr. Martin said they will be looking at policy considerations -- what kinds of factors we will use to decide to "add" or "delete" businesses/persons from the current designated facility status. After the policy has been established, the policy will be applied to pending applications for designated facility status. These policy determinations will be a Council action item. Mr. Martin said these policy issues may be heard by Council as early as their next scheduled meeting.

Review of the Annual Waste Reduction Programs for Local Government was presented by Steve Kraten, Solid Waste Recycling Program Manager.

Mr. Kraten said Metro was in the third year of the Annual Waste Reduction Program. He said the third year programs were to have been submitted (by local government participants) July, 1992. Mr. Kraten said as part of the report from local governments, Metro had asked how they had implemented the previous years' program. Mr. Kraten said with the exception of Gresham, Gladstone, Oregon City and West Linn, which are combining their efforts under the name of River Cities, have submitted their programs. Mr. Kraten said that in many cases, local governments had not conducted as many commercial waste audits as the program called for, but that they had conditionally approved the programs with the provision that those waste audits would still be conducted. Mr. Kraten said curb-side recycling had, in many cases, been delayed from its July 1, 1992 start date, and in those cases the Committee decided to pro-rate the Metro Challenge money for those local governments, due to the importance of the program.

Mr. Kraten said programs have been submitted by local governments for the current year but that in some cases the programs were sketchy in the areas of promoting Household Hazardous Waste facility, promoting use of yard debris compost sites and have asked those local governments to provide more detail in the ways they will promote these activities.

Mr. Kraten said one of the changes to the program this year was the inclusion of cities outside the Urban Growth Boundary. Nearly all of the cities contacted have decided to participate in the program with the exception of Gaston.

Mr. Kraten said he was currently working on next year's activity list which will be submitted to the Solid Waste Technical Committee for approval and input.

Ms. Kies said she had a question with regard to the chart showing compliance requirements for the Oregon Recycling Act. Specifically Ms. Kies wanted to know why most local governments were shown as not in compliance on the rate incentives portion.

Mr. Kraten replied that local governments had to comply with A, B, C and one other of their choice. Mr. Kraten said that from this point forward, he will be asking local governments to inform him as to which choice they had made, but because he was forming an opinion based on what he gleaned from the programs, he made a determination based on the knowledge he had. Mr. Kraten explained what he understands DEQ's rate incentive policy to be: if you charge \$10.00 for a 1-can customer, you must charge at least \$20 for a 2-can customer. A question is, however, if you have a rate for a recycling bin, do you have to double that price as well (if you

had 2 bins)? Mr. Kraten said he has been informed that you do have to double the price. Mr. Kraten said he would like to hear from local governments on this issue.

Meganne Steele mentioned that in the course of commenting on the proposed rules for SB 66 and Division 90 rules, the City of Portland did address the section related to rates and she concurs with Mr. Kraten's interpretation. Ms. Steele said that although the City believes it has a variable rate structure, it is not in compliance with what that option would require. Ms. Steele invited other cities concerned with this ruling to go on record and perhaps join together to submit some legislation adjustment to that particular section.

Mr. Miller expressed his concern with regard to waste audits being conducted in business parks. He said that in some instances his office had contacted the owners and/or haulers for the business park to assist them in implementing a waste reduction program only to find that Metro had contacted a single business within the same business park. Mr. Miller felt this effort was counterproductive and that Metro's efforts created confusion for the business park and the local governments. Mr. Miller would like to see coordination of efforts between Metro and local governments.

Mr. Martin said Metro would put some effort into better coordination of the commercial waste audit program.

Mr. Kraten said he would look into the situation.

Mr. Buscher presented a proposed restructuring of the membership of the Solid Waste Technical Committee.

He said 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 SW Technical Committee on the proposed restructuring.

The full Technical Committee membership is currently as follows:

City of Portland	2 members	Washington County Cities	1 member
Clackamas County	2 members	Port of Portland	1 member
Multnomah County	2 members	Dept. of Env. Quality	1 member
Washington County	2 members	Solid Waste Industry	6 members
Clackamas County Cities	1 member	Citizens	3 members
Multnomah County Cities	1 member		

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. 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.

The revised Technical Committee membership would be as follows:

City of Portland	1 member	Port of Portland	1 member
Clackamas County	1 member	Dept. of Env. Quality	1 member
Multnomah County	1 member	S. W. Hauling Industry	4 members
Washington County	1 member	S.W. Recycling Industry	2 members
Clackamas County Cities	1 member	S. W. Facility Operators	3 members
Multnomah County Cities	1 member	At-Large Land Use Planner	1 member
Washington County Cities	1 member	Citizens	3 members

Estle Harlan moved for approval of the restructuring plan.

Mr. Kincaid said as he understood it, that with the suggested increase of members on the industry side and a suggested decrease on the government side, that if industry were to vote in a "block", they would be able to out vote local government.

Mr. Buscher said Metro was trying to accomplish diversity of interest within the industry related committee members so that example would not happen.

Ms. Harlan said the haulers were too involved in working with their individual governments to become a "block" for dissent against local governments.

Linda Kotta said she approved of the changes. Ms. Kotta asked if any membership changes were being proposed for the SW Policy Committee.

Mr. Martin said there were no changes that he was aware of.

Mr. Martin suggested that if any of the Committee members had suggestions for the proposed vacancies, that they submit them to either himself or Rena Cusma.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to redefine the positions of the Solid Waste Technical Committee.

Mike Huycke presented a review of Metro's Multi-Family Recycling Program. Mr. Huycke said that Metro was in its fourth year of implementation of this program, including total funding in the amount of \$545,000. As a result of this program, Metro and local governments have established recycling programs throughout the region.

Mr. Huycke stated that the table presented in the agenda packet reflected units which have been set up with recycling programs which have been funded by both Metro and local government.

Ms. Kotta suggested an additional column be added to the table reflecting the total number of units which are receiving recycling services aside from the services maintained through matching funds.

Mr. Miller stated he felt the information reflected in the table was considerably out of date, that as of July 1, there was a considerable increase in the number of facilities which are co-sponsored as well as other services.

Mr. Huycke said systems have been implemented with the cooperation of local governments, apartment managers and haulers. He said that matching funds from local governments have come from areas such as container purchases, decals, promotional educational materials and staff time necessary to coordinate, install and monitor the programs.

Mr. Huycke said that in 1991-92, staff time accounted for approximately 55% of all local government matching funds. However, he said this year staff time would be excluded as an eligible match, but that staff time would continue to be needed for coordination, install and monitor the programs as well as to host and participate in the manager training orientation workshops.

Mr. Martin complimented Lake Oswego for having 100% participation.

Ms. Harlan said that Rossman contributed a matching figure to Lake Oswego.

Ms. Steele said the City of Portland was interested in getting a better profile of those units which are yet to be served by the City/Metro program so that they can develop an effective strategy for serving them and asked if Metro was developing information in that regard.

Mr. Huycke said he had inquired of local governments for that information but had met with unsatisfactory results.

Ms. Kies said she wanted to be on record that Washington County did not agree that no County match funding should be spent on staffing.

Ms. Kotta echoed Ms. Kies dissent.

Mr. Huycke said that Metro realizes these programs require a lot of staff time, not only on the part of the City and County but by haulers and apartment managers as well. However, the Metro Challenge funds were primarily intended for the implementation of the programs.

Mr. Martin said that Council would be requesting a clear review of what the Metro Challenge funds accomplishes on its review of the Solid Waste budget, and how to make sure that that program gets the whole region the most for its money.

Mr. Drew questioned the usefulness of the figures as presented, and felt they might, in fact be damaging to cities and counties if they were not interpreted correctly. He also wanted to know at what point Metro would be comfortable that it has satisfied multiple family dwelling recycling is at 100%.

Mr. Huycke said that originally they had set a goal that 100% of the units be serviced by 1994, so although the 100% figure is still the goal, he said the target date would be adjusted after further research of the figures available.

Ms. Kroen commented that she was proud to be a part of Washington County's cooperative program and noted that Tualatin also has 100% participation. She also wanted to commend the haulers in Tualatin for their support and participation.

Mr. Kraten added that if a local government chooses multi family recycling as one of its program elements to fulfill the requirements of the Recycling Act, then 100% would be the target. Mr. Kraten said he did not believe that any local governments were actually choosing that as one of their elements.

Mr. Huycke presented proposed changes to Metro's Neighborhood Clean-Up Program. He said that Metro has provided funding to local governments to help defray expenses at neighborhood based and illegal dump site cleanups, separate from the SOLVE-IT events. He said that allocations had been based on population within each local government. Some changes in the program will provide for one-half the cost of disposal, as well as monies for the purchase of preventive measures at illegal dump sites (signs, fencing, barricades) and the funds will be issued as reimbursements. However, funding will not be available for yard debris only cleanups but will be an eligible disposal cost at cleanups which include other materials.

Ms. Steele said that the City of Portland felt this was a very positive approach and supported the program.

Ms. Kies voiced her opinion that due to the unpredicted volumes, that providing only one-half the cost of disposal might place a burden on some local governments.

Ms. Kroen said that "for the record" Tualatin's amount recycled belonged in the "other" category and it was 1.05, and they did not collect yard debris because they have a curb side program.

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Martin suggested the next meeting be conducted on November 19th as opposed to Thanksgiving day, and suggested December 17th as opposed to Christmas eve.

The Committee agreed to both of these suggestions.

There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned.