

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

A RESOLUTION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ) RESOLUTION NO. 83-393  
AUTHORIZING THE RESIDENTIAL )  
RECYCLING PROGRAM ) Introduced by Regional  
Services Committee

WHEREAS, The Waste Reduction Plan adopted January 1981 states that Metro's recycling activities should include encouraging and assisting local jurisdictions in developing recycling collection programs; and

WHEREAS, In July 1982, the Metro Council approved \$78,000 for a "curbside recycling" program; and

WHEREAS, The Waste Reduction Steering Committee made up of local haulers, recyclers and officials recommended the program should focus on public awareness through promotion and education; and

WHEREAS, The cities of Beaverton, Gresham, Oregon City and Lake Oswego in cooperation with their franchised hauler have committed to conducting on-route residential recycling collection projects; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council hereby authorizes staff to proceed with implementation of the Proposed Residential Recycling Collection Program.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 24th day of March, 1983.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Officer

WC:bb  
8023B283  
3/14/83

## PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM

## RESIDENTIAL RECYCLING COLLECTION

INTRODUCTION

The Waste Reduction Plan was adopted by Council in January 1981. The Plan outlines goals and general programs to reduce waste. Metro has had several major accomplishments since the plan was adopted:

- created a new function within Solid Waste Department headed by a Waste Reduction Manager;
- started the Metro Recycling Switchboard which has received over 30,000 inquiries on recycling;
- funded drop-off centers and monthly recycling projects
- funded equipment for recycling operations through the Recycling Support Fund;
- partially funded and managed the Yard Debris Demonstration Project which lead to establishment of three processing centers;
- set-up recycling center at St. Johns Landfill;
- designed and constructed a recycling center at the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center in Oregon City; and
- enhanced public awareness about recycling through promotion and education programs.

Metro Council also approved of funds for a new project--residential recycling collection. The purpose of this summary report is to present information on the project and to recommend a work program.

Summary of Residential Recycling Collection Programs

Multi-material on-route residential recycling programs are being conducted in several cities throughout the country. In California, five programs in five cities were recently evaluated as case studies. All programs had pluses and minuses, but there were general findings that we should understand before conducting our project.

1. Set program goals or achievement standards at the outset.
2. Standardize baseline data from curbside projects that will receive funding.
3. Determine methods for reporting costs and performance at outset.
4. There are four areas of responsibility in conducting a residential curbside program:
  - a. Coordination and administration of the program
  - b. Collection of materials
  - c. Public Awareness activities
  - d. Processing/Marketing of materials

5. Programs are expensive to start and they require grants or subsidies to operate. Net annual costs of California projects were \$70,000 - \$335,000 with annual tonnage recovered ranging from 872 to 2,736 tons. A minimum surcharge on garbage collection and disposal bills should be considered to reduce the subsidy.
6. There does not exist a "best approach" to curbside programs. Programs should be established depending on the needs and characteristics of the community, amount of financing available and local government and citizen support.
7. A well developed and organized program should be developed at the outset. Implementation should be in "phases." Once the program has been established in one area and changes made to correct problems, the program can be expanded to serve other areas.
8. Public awareness and education efforts are critical factors which affect project success. A full-time person to coordinate and administer promotion efforts may be needed.

### Background

The Waste Reduction Plan states that Metro's recycling activities should include a residential recycling collection project as a high priority. Specifically, Metro should "encourage and assist local jurisdictions in developing and implementing multi-material curbside collection of recyclables." In July 1982, the Metro Council approved \$78,000 for a "curbside recycling" program.

There are several ways to start or enhance or start residential recycling collection. Funding could be used for collection or processing equipment or labor, promotion and educational tools or project and public awareness coordination.

A Waste Reduction Steering Committee made up of local haulers, recyclers and officials recommended focusing on public awareness through promotion and education. Although goals and objectives were not set by the committee, they recommended criteria for funding projects (Table 1, page 7). They also recommended to distribute the funds to several programs. In August 1982, Metro sent out requests for letters of interest to local jurisdictions with collection franchises. In September, Metro received letters from eight cities who were interested in participating in our project (Table 2, page 8). Some respondents requested specific promotional tools including flyers, mailers, uniforms, etc. At the time the proposals were submitted, the respondents provided various levels of recycling service to their customers. At that time, only one city (Lake Oswego) provided on-route residential recycling service. In late February 1983, two other respondents made commitments to start on-route residential collection of recyclables. Oregon City and Beaverton will start their projects within the next couple months.

Based on this information, Metro has a number of options to consider:

1. Assist jurisdictions who submitted letters of intent and who have made commitments to conduct on-route residential collection projects.
2. Assist all jurisdictions who submitted letters of intent so they can start a project or continue existing service.
3. Develop a formal proposal solicitation process to expand eligibility to unfranchised as well as franchised areas.
4. Award the funds for public awareness activities as recommended by Steering Committee.
5. Award funds to jurisdictions according to the needs of their projects.
6. Use funds as a way to obtain technical information with which to determine future Metro involvement in on-route residential recycling collection.
7. Develop a comprehensive program now, where Metro, the local jurisdiction and the hauler make long-term (3 - 5 year) commitments.
8. Develop a limited program where Metro makes a short-term (one-year) commitment with the local jurisdiction and hauler.
9. Require local jurisdiction receiving funds to mandate recycling collection service.
10. Do not fund residential recycling collection projects and look at other alternatives.

Staff has reviewed these options and we recommend pursuing options 1, 4, 6 and 8 for the following reasons:

1. Assist jurisdictions who submitted letters of intent and who have made commitments to conduct on-route residential collection projects.

Although there were haulers providing residential recycling services and haulers who wanted to start service in unfranchised areas, the Steering Committee recommended that only franchised haulers received funds. The Committee was concerned that funds given to unfranchised recycling collection operations, would create an unfair advantage to certain haulers. Staff supports the Committee's recommendation of assisting cities/counties with collection franchises.

The Committee wanted the funds to start a new project or expand an existing one. Two of the respondents recently made commitments to start projects within the next few

months and one has been conducting a project for sometime. Staff supports giving funding priority to the cities/haulers who have made commitments to provide service -- Lake Oswego, Beaverton and Oregon City. Some of the other jurisdictions are trying to develop on-route residential recycling collection projects. These other projects should be considered for receiving Metro funding when they have made the same commitment.

Another option is to conduct a new Request for Proposals or other solicitation process where all jurisdictions and haulers would be eligible for funding. This option would result in delay of awarding funds and could result in bad feelings of the respondents of the last solicitation. Staff supports continuation of the past solicitation process rather than conducting a new process.

4. Award the funds for public awareness activities as recommended by the Steering Committee.

The Committee felt that public awareness was the key to project success and that most (if not all) local projects were deficient in this area.

Another option is to award funds to jurisdictions according to their specific project needs (i.e., equipment, collection labor, processing capabilities, project coordination). This would be accomplished by renegotiating their proposals or conducting a new solicitation process. Staff concurs with the Committee recommendation for funding public awareness activities in the first year. However, in reviewing related literature of other projects, there is a general agreement that coordination and administration of public awareness efforts is also needed. In other projects (e.g., Boulder, Colorado Eco-cycle Project), the coordinator organized volunteers, neighborhood groups, and other creative labor efforts to distribute promotional tools, educate neighborhood leaders and citizens, and assist in collection of recyclables. Staff feels that these tasks are critical and, therefore, recommend that a part-time or full-time project coordinator should be a requirement to cities who receive funds for public awareness activities.

It is also recommended that if local projects had other needs in the first year, their requests for further funding should be reviewed and evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

6. Use funds as a way to obtain technical information with which to determine future Metro involvement in on-route residential recycling.
7. Develop a limited program where Metro makes short-term (one-year) commitment with the local jurisdiction and hauler.

Information obtained from these projects would be used to determine our future involvement in residential recycling. Local governments' input would be a necessary part of this project since they also need the time and experience to conduct a successful project. The funds for supporting promotion/education efforts in the cities would also "buy" information which could be valuable to other projects in the region. Some of the promotional tools, implementation and operational plans could be used for other upcoming projects.

The objectives of the program is as follows:

1. To obtain information with which to develop recommendations on a long-term comprehensive program.
2. To recover 800 tons of household recyclables in the first year (10 percent participation). Other expected results of the projects are in Table 3 (page 9).

If the recommendations are approved, the following list of major task elements would be completed:

1. Set up proposal evaluation committee and negotiate with representatives of Oregon City, Gresham, Beaverton, and Lake Oswego. Modify proposals as required (by April 15).
2. Develop scope of work (reporting forms, informational needs) and contract (by April 22).
3. Have contracts approved by Council contract committee (by April 28) local jurisdiction and hauler (by May 6). Monies would be available to local jurisdictions by June 1, 1983.

In FY 1983-84:

4. Manage contracts and participate in local jurisdiction committees.
5. Review public awareness program and tools. Provide technical assistance in promotion/education.
6. Compile data from projects and provide updates to Regional Services Committee.
7. Complete an evaluation report based on results of the first year. Make recommendations on future involvement on-route residential recycling collection.

Table 4 (page 10) contains a budget estimate to conduct the program.

TABLE 1

CURBSIDE COLLECTION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

CRITERIA

1. Joint application by city/county and collector.
2. To be applied in franchised areas, to start a new program or expand the services in an existing program.
3. Must make commitment to an ongoing curbside collection program.
4. Collector must have the ability to report number of participants and quantification of material.
5. Money to be used for promotion/education/advertisement only.
6. Curbside collection must occur on a special route at least once a month, except for newspaper which should be collected on a weekly basis.
7. Curbside collection must include multi-material, newspaper, glass (three types), tin, aluminum, optional items are kraft and motor oil.
8. Curbside collection must be offered to non-garbage customers also.
9. Curbside collection will apply to only urban areas within the Urban Growth Boundary.

TABLE 2

Summary of Letters of Intent

1.	Milwaukie	William McDonald Administrative Assistant	Interested in program
2.	Tualatin	Gordon Dawson Administrative Assistant	Interested in program
3.	Maywood Park	Donald Cobb Mayor	\$750 Mailer
4.	Fairview	Betsey Nicholson City Recorder	Interested, but will watch results of Gresham's experimental program.
5.	Gresham	Gresham Sanitary Service Harlen C. Lehl President Mike Miller General Manager	\$17,733.40 for promotion
6.	Clackamas County	Oak Grove Disposal Michael Borg Operations Mgr. Supported by Clack. Co. (Dave Phillips)	\$11,061.84 for promotion
7.	Lake Oswego	Rossman Sanitary Service, Inc. Lloyd F. Hodge General Manager Supported by C. H. Campbell, Mayor	\$12,084.68 for promotion
8.	Beaverton	Ann Schmidt Chairperson, Recycling Task Force Support by Jack Nelson, Mayor	\$4,319.40 for promotion
9.	Oregon City	Oregon City Garbage Richard Bloom, Sr. Supported by Gerald Pecinousky, General Manager (City)	\$7,461.40 for promotion

TOTAL

\$53,410.72



TABLE 3

Results

- Information which could be used for other programs in region:
  - Effectiveness of localized public awareness techniques;
  - How to mobilize volunteers and neighborhood coordinators;
  - Labor needs and how to use labor sources (probation department referrals, CETA, contract labor);
  - Effective marketing of recyclables;
  - Effectiveness of collection operations (crew size, curbside pick up or backyard; equipment; storage recepticals; frequency of pick up);
  - Equipment selection and assessment;
  - Effectiveness of prescribed performance recording and financial accounting methods (use of computer);
  - Program Economics (including start-up costs);
  - Training methods; and
  - Effectiveness of incentives used in program (labor incentives, citizen incentives, etc.).
  
- Materials which could be used for other programs in the region:
  - Promotional tools;
  - Implementation and operational plans; and
  - Formats for recording performance and financial accounting information.

WC/bb  
7783B/340

TABLE 4  
PROPOSED BUDGET

Metro Staff

	<u>Hourly Rate</u>	<u>Hours</u>	FY 1982-83 March- <u>June</u>	<u>Hours</u>	FY <u>1983-84</u>
<b>Solid Waste</b>					
• Engineer	\$12.39	100	\$1,239	968	\$11,993.52
• Public Info. Spec.	9.56	-		100	956
• Secretary	6.34	50	317	100	634
Subtotal (Staff)			\$1,556		\$13,583
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>					
<u>Contractual Services</u>			FY 82-83 \$58,000.		FY 83-84 \$100,000.
• Formats for Reporting Information			\$500		
• Four Projects (promotion/education)			2,083		32,917
• Project Coordinators 3 x \$10,000 if requested by jurisdiction (At least half-time)			2,500		27,500
Subtotal (contractual services)			<u>\$5,083</u>		<u>\$60,417</u>
			\$52,917 <sup>2</sup>		\$39,583. <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Monies set aside for funding new projects in FY 1983-84, more support of three existing projects or other waste reduction activities as a result of system planning efforts.

<sup>2</sup>The difference between the FY 1982-83 budget (\$58,000) and the amount to be spent in FY 1982-83

WC:bb  
7783B/340  
3/14/83