

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
Meeting Summary of August 24, 1994

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Councilor Ruth McFarland, Chair
Jeff Grimm, Grimm's Fuel
Estle Harlan, OSSI/Tri-C
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources
Kathy Kiwala, City of Lake Oswego
Lynda Kotta, City of Gresham
Doug Coenen, OWS
James Cozzetto, Jr., MDC/ERI
Pete DuBois, Clark County
Jack Deines, Deines Sanitary

Emilie Kroen, City of Tualatin
Dave Kunz, DEQ
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers
Jeanne Roy, Citizen
Lynne Storz, Washington County
Ken Spiegle, Clackamas County
Gary Hansen, Multnomah County
Chris Taylor, OSPIRG
Steve Miesen, BFI

GUESTS:

Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.
Greg Token, Oregonian

METRO

Terry Petersen, Solid Waste Planning and Technical Services Manager
Marie Nelson,
Doug Anderson, Senior Management Analyst
Jeff Stone, Senior Management Analyst
Scott Klag, Senior Solid Waste Planner
Aletta Yantis, Administrative Assistant

The meeting was called to order by Terry Petersen at 8:35 a.m.

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes were postponed to the next meeting.

2. Updates

Terry Petersen

The Illegal Dumping Ordinance was passed at the last Council meeting.

The Flow Control Resolution was passed to support the broad intent of the Federal legislation.
There is no intent to control source separated recyclables.

At the Council meeting August 25 there is an Ordinance on the agenda to reduce the Excise Tax, add the Construction Tax and reduce the tip fee to \$73.00 per ton.

3. Disaster Debris Management

Gerry Uba

Update on the activities of the Regional Emergency Management Policy and Technical Committees. The purpose of the Committee is to plan for emergency measures in the event of a major natural disaster. One of the components is dealing with the regional disaster debris, how will the debris be disposed of? Since Metro already has a structure in place, the Regional Emergency Management Committee has decided to start by presenting to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee next month some of the figures on how much debris would be generated so this committee can develop and incorporate into the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan a Disaster Management Plan. This plan would also go back to the Regional Emergency Management Committee for incorporation into the Regional Emergency Management Plan.

Question: Has Metro consulted with other areas that have had disasters? Jim Goddard has been to Hawaii and Los Angeles and has worked on Disaster Management teams. He has also developed presentations on disaster debris management.

4. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan

Terry Petersen

A. Terry Petersen reviewed the purpose of the Original Solid Waste Management Plan. Initially the plan was developed by Chapters.

Goals are broad value-based statements about what is desirable to achieve in the long run.

Objectives are more focused milestones on the way toward a goal

Performance criteria are measurable characteristics of the solid waste system used to monitor success or failure.

The Council has specifically asked that the Waste Reduction, Hazardous Waste, Facilities, and Rate Structure chapters be reviewed. It has been suggested that the entire plan be updated and the entire plan be presented later.

Merle Irvine, commented that the committee originally wanted to take the plan back to the Council by the first of the year. The subcommittee felt it would be appropriate to take the timeline and extend it. The time should be taken to review the entire plan and make sure it is. The Chapters do not stand alone, they all reflect on other parts of the plan. The Council that needs to adopt the plan needs to be the Council that adopts it.

The decision will be made by the entire Council. John Houser stated that there are Councilors who are interested in certain parts of the update and would want to see the information before the budget process begins.

Terry Petersen reviewed why the update is necessary.

1. Much of existing plan is out-of-date.
2. Current issues require an integrated approach that:
 - Considers all management options (prevention, recycling, recovery, disposal).
 - Involves private businesses, citizens, haulers, cities, counties, DEQ, Metro.

Legislative Reasons:

1. State waste reduction goals are for the tri-county region.
2. State and federal planning requirements.

Many different plannings involved -- need a road map to the goal for state recycling mandates.

Key elements of the RSWMP

1. Regional goals and objectives related to solid waste.
2. The overall level of investment in programs and facilities needed to serve the region to the year 2005.
3. Regional priorities for improving the solid waste system to the year 2005.
4. Endorsement of the interrelated roles of investments in disposal capacity and waste reduction.
5. Identification of those parts of the solid waste system that are of regional interest.
6. Performance-based benchmarks with flexible implementation options.

Jack Deines commented that the people who set the benchmarks are not the ones who have to implement them. To set them on performance based goals is not always realistic, i.e., you set a goal for collection of so much yard debris, if home composting takes off those goals will not be attainable. The 50% recycling goals were based on the composter being on line. It isn't yet we are still trying to meet that goal.

Commissioner Hansen stated that the County just went through a benchmark system. The most important thing is to develop the measurement so it is realistic. So much data is collected, the measurement should be done with existing systems.

Doug Coenen stated that there is nothing wrong with leaving blanks, saying we don't know, the committee needs to think about what benchmarks need to be set and maybe leave the goals blank until all the information is in.

Linda Kotta, the important thing is to focus on the goal not get bogged down with the measurements.

B. Terry Petersen introduced Marie Nelson who is going to help coordinate the planning. Given the task that is at hand to accomplish two goals update the four plan elements and the integration into the plan, the schedule builds the Planning subcommittee's review into the SWAC meetings. The proposal also integrates public involvement. From January on the additional chapters will be scheduled.

Jeanne Roy suggested that each time the subcommittee presents the plan part to the SWAC there should be the time incorporated into the schedule for subcommittee to discuss and integrate the new ideas into the plan.

Estle Harlan stated do not go to the public at this time. Not realistic to expect that the plan to be developed to a stage that it will be ready for presentation for public input.

Terry Petersen stated that the public input element is really necessary for public buy-in on the whole plan.

Lynda Kotta, December is the worst time to try for public input. The perception is that, since it isn't convenient, the plan was to exclude the public.

Kathy Kiwala asked what is the plan for presentation, what format?

Terry Petersen stated the staff will work with the subcommittee to develop, survey, questionnaires, roundtables, actually there is no set plan at this time, it really depends on the issues that emerge. This isn't as involved as the 2040, just need to get some feedback.

Dave Kunz stated that when the state developed their plan there were 13 work groups around the state, they met only three times but they had a survey on how they felt about the elements of the plan.

Terry Petersen stated we need a target schedule to develop the plan for the four elements requested by the Council for update.

Doug Coenen commented that the schedule presented is very aggressive and not realistic.

John Houser, there will be concern on the part of the Council if the elements that require some type of major budget impact are not developed. It is important that the plan be in place before the budget deadlines.

Merle Irvine, a big rush to develop a plan may not be right. The schedule is too tight and does not allow for integration of the rest of the plan.

Lynda Kotta asked for the deadline for budget requests, is the new Council going to approve the new budget?

Ruth McFarland stated that the present Council would like to have a budget in place by January 1. The problem is that there is a feeling that the 13 member Council should not adopt the plan that the new 7 member Council will need to implement.

Lynda Kotta, there may be some need for budget decisions, something needs to be to the Council soon after the new Council is in place. Is it possible that the subcommittee present a proposal for a one year budget package that would give the Council an idea of what will be needed in the budget process?

Jeanne Roy, is the budget issue mainly the Hazardous Waste plan? Could the Committee be specific in the development of that chapter?

Councilor McFarland, any five-year plan should be reviewed every year. The consensus seems to be that this is too fast. We can take that message back to Council.

John Houser stated that there was a budget note in this year's budget that the Hazardous Waste Plan be in place so the collection systems be in place for collection in Washington County and eastern Multnomah and Clackamas County.

Jack Deines, is this schedule driven by political reasons? If this is the case it is the worst reason to meet the schedule.

Councilor McFarland stated that staff assured the Council that the schedule could be met.

Jeanne Roy, the four elements requested for update may be possible. The immediate solution would be to present to the CSWC the problems that have arisen in attempting to revise the four elements.

Doug Coenen, if the committee recommends that there are certain items that need to be assessed.

Certain elements that demand immediate attention can be worked in.

Estle Harlan, Hazardous waste needs staff analysis. The other elements of waste reduction and rate structure need to be given further study. Don't saddle the committee with a plan that is based on incomplete

Ruth McFarland, no law that doesn't have the support of the public is going to be enforceable. Don't want to throw a monkey wrench into the system by saying that you have to buy into a plan that there isn't public input for. The one question is, if Terry Presents it and John staffs it who else would like to be present. Merle Irvine will be present at the September 6, 1994.

C. Jeanne Roy presentation of the planning subcommittee Goals and Objectives. Chapter 2 page 2. Take the present goals and objectives and integrate the policies. The new Regional Solid

Waste Plan Goals and Objectives. There is vision statement. The goal is the same. Dave Kunz suggested updating the goal to say continue to develop and implement.

Goal number 1 has to do with the solid waste hierarchy
education
costs
keeping the system flexible
measurement

Following those are system wide goals
facilities
waste reduction
system revenue
hazardous waste

The intention is that this would replace the sections of the present goals for these four elements.
Suggest that the goals and objectives be the same the revenue study done previously.
Objective should be used rather than program options.

The solid waste revenue should be adequate to fund the system.

Doug Coenen, Hazardous waste needs to be in here. In the section of facilities goals and objects should also include services.

Dave Kunz, which goals ties in the concept that waste reduction efforts will relate to facilities

Doug Coenen, System goals are broad
waste reduction
facilities and services
revenue

Kathy Kiwala are these chapter specific?

Jeanne Roy what services are you referring to?

Doug Coenen, any service that is being contemplated to fulfill the overall objectives of the plan. This helps to crystalize the differences between public-private,

Jeanne Roy, these will replace the goals and objects for the four chapters. They will no longer mesh with the other policies.

Terry Petersen, the committee need to go back and expand goal statements

Dave partially integrated

Ruth if we take too much time with the broader plan there won't be a plan in place. We are on the fifth year of the plan, staff will have a hard time getting a budget passed without a plan in place.

Jeff Murray suggested that there be a fifth year added every year.

Jeanne Roy, even though this is a ten year plan there would be changes made each year on the work programs.

Emilie Kroen, under goal objective number 3, how high? Accomplishing the goals not the general, ad a cap? Goal number 6 two parts, cooperative goals part two should be under education. Objective 2 of goal four what does it say?

Dave Kunz, it says regulate but don't interfere with private business.

Emilie Kroen, goal 4 objective 4 take out "if compatible".

Kathy Kiwala, goal 3 objective 4 add handle and process.

Terry transfer stations also process and handle source-separated materials.

Merle Irvine add except transfer stations.

Jeanne Roy what is the intent of the objective?

Emilie, Intent of object 4 is to integrate local solid systems.

Estle, the benchmark goal doesn't have an objective, need direction that it is all right to allow these to be developed as the system progresses.

Doug Coenen, need to tell the Council that this is tough issue, focus can change.

Who is going to fill in the blanks?

Terry, the intent was that the holes will be filled in during the process.

Estle, don't want to guess what these goals are going to be in five years

John Houser, include some statements in the benchmark section on revisiting the issues annually.

Councilor McFarland, need a five-year plan, each year add a new fifth year so there is no longer a problem coming up with needing a new five-year plan. Leave it with numbers

Dave Kunz, it is important to tie the benchmarks back to the local government plans each year.

Councilor McFarland, the people setting up the plans need to know the direction they need to go.

Doug Coenen, Goal 3, objective 3, important to talk about cost and benefit to minimize risks. Goals such as save the planet, change the system, recognize that if you add up the cost and benefits it does not necessarily give you the intangible differences.

Jeanne Roy, that is the reason it is here -- the hierarchy isn't enough. It is important that the governments reach a goal.

Emilie Kroen, it could be as simple as adding a percentage to the goal.

Councilor McFarland, someone who is already saving is penalized because he can't save more.

Gary Hansen, using it as an overlay, every cost that comes up needs to be balanced by cost effective and environmentally sound.

Dave Kunz, Goal 2 under waste reduction is redundant, recycling is included in waste reduction, waste prevention has been used at the state level.

D. Merle Irvine gave an update on the technical evaluation of the various alternatives. There were 15 alternatives developed. The subcommittee presented this to Sound Resources who developed assumptions. Staff is assessing the assumption and the subcommittee will review and do costing and analysis. How much are these alternatives going to cost.

Doug Anderson presented the actual alternatives as follows:

Waste Management Alternatives

August 24, 1994

Waste Prevention

- I.A Home Composting
- I.B Commercial Waste Prevention

Source Separated Recycling

Residential

- II.A.1 Expand Curbside
- II.A.2 Selective Commingling
- II.A.3 New Collection Technologies

Commercial

- II.B.1 Expanded Source Separation
- II.B.2 Commingled Collection

Construction & Demolition

- II.C On-Site Source Separation

Mixed Waste Processing/Recovery

- III.A Mixed Dry Waste Processing
- III.B.1 Food Business Organics Recovery
- III.B.2 Residential Organics Recovery

Transfer & Disposal System

Existing System

- IV.A.1 Modify Design and/or Operation
- IV.A.2 Managed Flow

New Facilities

- IV.B.1 Transfer Station(s)
- IV.B.2 Reload(s)

4. Other Business/Citizen Communication

Emilie Kroen, the last meeting update of the HHW. Washington County has been solicited by the Hazardous waste group for events to occur in the County. Need to know the parameters and definition on how they are getting equity of service.

Lynda Kotta understanding at that meeting that the jurisdictions are going to be involved in the planning the HHW

A letter needs to be sent regarding what kind of sight qualifies, cooperation with the local governments is necessary. The Washington County cooperative would like to have input into the sights and times that are best for the citizens of the jurisdictions.