

The meeting was brought to order .

Approval of the minutes

Ralph made motion fo accept the minutes

**Introduction of David White replacement of Estle Harlan**

Overview of the budgets and rrc. We will have 7-1/2 excise tax, discussed lowering the rate, however

We will use rate review to

Then we will take our recommendation forward early

\$75.00 ton and 7-1/2% excise tax was forwarded to the Council.

Update on

**New director starting May 1, who is known as Bern Shanks.**

Update on increasing theft of high value recyclables.

Jeff Murray - 8 phone calls with regard to people removing recycling from dumpsters.

Ralph Gilbert sees older couples who are removing these items..

Lynda Kotta: Most older people don't realize that material in dumpsters have ownership Public needs to be educated. In the past anything "thrown away in a dumpster" was garbage and was free for the taking.

Fred agrees with that to a point. Send flyers out saying these things are owned.

Petersen: Put a

Steve Meisen wanted to know if there was any law with regard to items in dumpsters.

Lynda: Local govts have ordinances.

Jeff Murray: It goes to the state level too. there are laws against it.

Kvistad: Maybe work with Debbie to form a subcommittee with a view towards education ..... how does the committee feel.

The committee agreed.

We have prepared a packet and we would like you to write your comments on the handouts.

1st page.

pg. 4 of handout.

no questions about 4

pg. 5. may have touched on this. Want to stress regional priorities not priorities for any individual city or hauler. A basis for identifying regional concerns.

What are 10-yr. facility needs?

Key issue is particular how should SW activities be funded?

Fourth is needs to have some type of implementation giving dates for measurement, etc.

DEQ wants a provision indicating enforcement issues.

Kvistad: Keep in mind we are a kinder gentler council now.

no questions on 5.

pg. 6

wherever possible depend on private sector for new processing facilities.

no questions

Report from planning subcommittee.

Tom Miller: We (subcommittee) was concerned that they didn't have a mechanism to measure the alternatives. So we start off with recommended practices and then we started getting off onto alternatives and then we came back to -- if these are the recommended practices, these are the ones that we would really like to stress, if we can demonstrate "comparable performance" in an alternative that is acceptable but we are not going to promote the alternative. We are going to allow the alternatives to demonstrate compliance on their own merits rather than suggest a lot of alternatives -- we are going to suggest recommended practices and then the alternatives need to be developed by either a jurisdiction or industry to meet those standards.

Mr. Petersen: Which is kind of the point in number 3 - this flexible implementation. We spent a lot of time in the subcommittee talking about the need to have flexibility on behalf of haulers and cities in the region. Getting back to the Performance Assessment. The plan, again, needs to have some way of measuring performance over time so we know how successful the programs have been. Then the process for any problem solving or correcting actions -- enforcement if necessary.

Page 9 -- Proposed implementation process and then a quick overview of the recommended practices.

We divided this into 3 phases -- this process of getting the Plan adopted, implemented and monitored. The first Phase being acknowledgment and adoption; the second Phase being the implementation and the third Phase being monitoring the assessment.

Page 10: Phase I -- Adoption and Implementation: the suggestion is that acknowledgment be through participation rather than through any formal adoption process, and we have listed some tools or mechanisms by which we get that participation. Finally, there be some type of adoption by Metro Council. We are on track to have this, hopefully adopted, by the Metro Council, this Summer. I believe our new Solid Waste Director will want to spend some time getting up to speed and looking at this but I believe we can still meet this schedule.

Page 11: More detail on public involvement process. Distribute the Status Report: We now have that ready and we have copies available for you. The subcommittee has looked this over. We have copies of this available to you now. Please look it over. We have talked about doing a road show. I don't think we need to do anything as elaborate as the region 2040 plan, but we will get out to some of the local governments. We will be talking to Councilor Kvistad and try to coordinate some of those meetings.

Kvistad: I feel this is important. That we take some of these issues out to the jurisdictions where they put a face with it and it makes it so much easier down the road when we do experience some problems or something comes up.

Kroen: My concern is that it is March and some of these dates need to be set pretty quickly, Councils have lots and lots of issues and solid waste issues don't get real high on the priority list. So to get a work session together with Councils it takes time and I am concerned that we don't have much.

Kvistad: We will put that together quickly, bring it back to the first available SWAC meeting where everyone has a chance to comment and get it right into the process.

Keil: Different than Emily's condition, solid waste is a hot item in ours. And I would expect a fair amount of people from Metro to show up at ours, besides our Council so I would encourage you to lock a date and

deal with what's in the presentation second to that. And Emily has an even bigger issue with trying to bring in other jurisdictions within Wash. County together.

Petersen: Emily, I think the month of May is when we will want to do the majority of this kind of work. And I understand your wanting us to get some of those dates firmed up. And we will count on some of you to facilitate our getting in on some of those agendas.

Pg. 12, second phase of this process will be some type of implementation program. This is really the hard part of any implementation program is how we are actually going to get these recommendations implemented. Some of the things we have talked about in the subcommittee is to implement these through our annual Local Government/Metro Work Plans and they are already well established things that we do for waste reduction activities. Also, the Regional work groups that we work on and put together should continue to play a role in getting things implemented. Metro's role would be to help coordinate some of those regional implementation efforts. And a point that has been discussed, to make sure there is some kind of evaluation component built into the implementation process. The more specific dates and actions are not going to be in this Regional Plan, they will have to be built into annual plans and as we start to implement this. I think we are still a little fuzzy on how much detail is going to be in this Regional Plan in terms of dates and specific actions and how much is going to be left for annual work plans. I am sure we will know what the appropriate level is when we see it. There will be some detail that is left to the implementation process.

Pg. 13: In terms of monitoring, we've talked a little about regional benchmarks. The subcommittee has grouped those into three types (now these are regional benchmarks): General benchmarks such as the regional recycling rate (now that's a regional benchmark) not the recycling rate of the City of Portland or Lake Oswego but the whole region. Facility benchmarks which are particularly important to Metro as we look at how many tons are delivered to transfer stations and then what the subcommittee is calling disposal benchmarks. These would be things like amount of yard debris per household per week being disposed. So those are the three types of benchmarks that the subcommittee has been talking about. In addition to those quantitative benchmarks, monitoring would involve tracking of service levels: what programs are actually being implemented at the City, the County, the hauler level. I don't think that we have talked about trying to monitor at each one of those local levels, the recycling rate or the amount of waste disposed per household at a very local level. Those would be monitored more at the program level, at the service level.

Keil: I'm not sure I understand, what do you mean: the Program level, the Service level versus the City or unit.

Petersen: Picking on yard debris again, the one thing that we can do in terms of monitoring yard debris programs is things like collection frequency by individual cities. What kinds of services are being provided at each city. On the other hand, the one thing we can't do is go out and measure how much yard debris, on the average is in garbage cans in each of the 24 cities we have in the region. It just doesn't seem very practical for us to be able to do that. But at a regional level, we could say: how much yard debris is being disposed by households throughout the whole region.

Keil: And by disposed you don't mean set out for collection, but are you talking about in the garbage can.

Petersen: Right.

Keil: So for instance you would say a regional sort would be the determination.

Miller: Part of this discussion came about as the result of the concern that maybe not all jurisdictions were participating at a level that they could, yet the region was approaching reaching their goal, so maybe we can do better than the established goal if everybody was on-line. But the other side of that is: We could

take the example of perhaps say Cornelius where they don't have a yard debris program, but on the other hand without any program at all, they have less yard debris in the garbage can than any other jurisdiction in the region and the reason is that they can stick a match to it. Why pay for a program that is not functional. So we wanted to be able to review programs that were implemented by jurisdictions to help assure that people were at least making an effort. On the other hand we wanted the ability to look at what they were or weren't doing to see if that had any impact. So, the discussion kind of came about as: Is every body doing their share to make the goal, or is one large major jurisdiction having to go way beyond the call of duty in order to get the region into compliance.

Keil: Well that helps characterize the individual differences: One jurisdiction may not have the ability, just by demographic circumstances of business concentration or whatever in order to give a lot of help to the regional results in a particular area but they may have the ability to provide some help in another area and so you're looking at that blend across the region to achieve the results.

Miller: Almost the measurement of effort as opposed to specific program.

Keil: Is this where you also looked at the cost of recommendation, etc. No, it's in another section, okay.

Petersen: This monitoring section would be monitoring performance in the future. I think you are raising a little different question there. Does this plan expect all cities to implement the recommended practices -- all counties, region-wide? That's different than how were going to monitor..

Petersen: The second point is assessment. The thing that stood out for me in the discussion we had on assessment -- and I don't think the Subcommittee came to any conclusions yet and any firm recommendation on this was what will these benchmarks play in the assessment process? And I think some of the subcommittee members felt like the Plan ought to clearly say what action will be taken if these benchmarks aren't met. If we don't meet our regional goals for yard debris recycling, what will be the action that will be taken after that. Will we automatically go to a mandatory recycling of yard debris -- a ban in yard debris if a voluntary recommendation doesn't get there. That could be one approach to build into this plan. Another approach would be to say that we have these regional benchmarks, if we don't meet the benchmarks -- what will be the action taken if goal is not met? Will we go to automatic ban on yard debris in garbage? There are members of the subcommittee who think we ought to spell out more clearly what action will be taken if we don't meet the regional benchmarks. Jeanne, is that what you were saying?

Jeanne: I don't think that characterizes what I was saying. I said that I think there should be some clear performance standards in the Plan and as the Plan stands right now, there are recommended practices, but there is nothing that says what's to be done. So my point of view is that there should be some standards that need to be met.

Keil: Standards in terms of what program needs developed or the results?

Roy: One could be programs -- that certain programs could be implemented or if they aren't then an approved alternative, that is a model that I am familiar with, that DEQ uses.. Another might be that certain rates need to be met by certain dates. Or we could talk in terms of tonnages, if you don't want to talk in terms of programs, we could talk in terms of tonnages. But my main point is that we have some standards in the Plan and not just make that a part of on-going discussions by work groups, I think it needs to be in the Plan.

Petersen: And maybe that's the point that I was trying to address there, Jeanne, on page 14 is your point that: if the performance standards are very clear, what happens if we don't meet those standards, and that's the issue that is still kind of up in the air here.

Debbie Noah: I wouldn't be in favor of having the cities or counties that meets the standards be penalized for that. In other words that's kind of like making everyone stay after class because one person was late.



Keil: The performance standard is not having a program in place, but it is that residual waste, or the recycling or something -- for me the bottom line is the residual waste. That you don't have an incidence higher than such and such of yard debris (for the sake of discussion) or that you have seen this kind of a trend in your waste disposed -- its the actual result. It's not having the pickup of milk cartons in your program.

Petersen: Lets continue and we will get back to this. This is one of the questions that staff has identified that we want to spend more time on discussing here when we get further into this.

Pg. 15: The subcommittee has come up with a preliminary list of recommendations for waste reduction practices and disposal practices. If we don't do anything new, and the amount of waste being disposed by households and the amount of waste being disposed by businesses remained exactly as it was today, and growth is as being forecasted by our Region 2040 process, page 15 gives you a picture of how many tons we would have landfilled, tons going to transfer stations, the amount of waste disposed of by households and businesses would be and what the recycling rate would be. We may want to portray a more optimistic base case in terms of waste reduction than what this page actually shows. I would like to know what the maximum tonnage we can expect from Metro South if your programs don't come on line like you expect them to.

Kroen: Current programs have room to increase the recycling in them, because some of them are fairly new.

Pg. 16 Highlights of recommended practices. In the agenda packet mailed out there was a matrix. We are not going over this in detail, but if you have some questions that we don't cover on it, we will have time at the end to bring these up. We have tried to emphasize the management hierarchy in terms of waste prevention first, then recycling, then landfilling. We have tried to strengthen some of the efforts we are doing on waste prevention, targeted the business sector for new recovery efforts, recommend that we do expand some of the existing programs, particularly the home composting, regional weekly yard debris or equivalent, regional scrap paper program. And, given all that the subcommittee is headed towards a recommendation that says no new transfer stations for the next ten years. To put the emphasis on waste reduction practices rather than building new transfer stations. I will want to hear back if that is the general direction that you think we ought to be headed.

Pg. 17: We've added one column -- that if this matrix is adopted and is effective, the last column on here would be the result.. The recycling rate would grow to 43%, overall recovery would level, which includes burning, the recycling rate does include the burning and would go to 48%, the amount of tonnage that we are landfilling in the Year 2005 would be roughly the same as it is in the year 1995. I think it is instructive to look at these refuse disposed. These recommended practices that we've been looking at would only reduce the amount of waste being landfilled per household by about two pounds per week. That gives you a sense of the magnitude of the recommendations that we are looking at. We can do yard debris, scrap paper, add plastics, but in terms of weight, there is not going to be a huge drop in the amount of waste per household per week being landfilled. And these are real preliminary numbers.

Kroen: What is the significant change in multi-family, because I didn't see anything in current practices other than the expansion of the current programs. That's assuming that there are some complexes without services now.

Petersen: Currently I think we are at about 60% of the apartment complexes in the region that currently have recycling. So there is room to move on multi-family. I think this included adding scrap paper with multi-family.

Anderson: (inaudible)

Gilbert: I believe that can be reduced considerably from what it is, and maybe I am wrong, that is from my own experience. I think the way you do it is that we start in about the second grade and have an education program in place.

Petersen: And it may be that we have not come up with a very good estimate of what the effect of those education programs could be. Maybe we've been too conservative here.

Gilbert: I don't mean waste reduction education on a sometime basis, but every day you talk recycling in class and that will produce results.

Keil: I think that your waste comp studies provide a great deal of information about what's there to get and it looks to us that, certainly in the commercial sector, but in the residential sector as well, that the contaminated paper -- its too bad that the composter didn't work because that is where we would have pulled major portions out.

Petersen: That's a good point that up to 30% of the residential waste is food waste or food contaminated paper waste and these recommended practices that the subcommittee is coming up with didn't say anything about organics from residential and that's a big chunk of why we are not having a huge impact on that residential.

Keil: So maybe that all plays into this discussion of cost and technology and so on. And certainly look at strategies on the commercial side. I noticed in the chart that you want to discuss later that the organic waste component is one of the recommended strategies for commercial and I would hope that we would fulfill that in a way that makes some sense in the residential component as well.

Petersen: And we will get back to that. Any other questions on these numbers? Okay. I want to give you some sense on what the subcommittee looked at when they came up with these recommendations.

Pg. 18. The idea was to look at the direct costs and I mean the collection, the hauling, the processing, material sales, transfer, transport and disposal. And try to quantify that on a regional level but not try to put a dollar number on the indirect cost and benefits, i.e., air pollution, traffic impacts. Those are things that we felt we weren't going to address.

Pg. 19. The idea was to come up with a per ton cost for the waste that is currently in the system. The system being the curbside collection of recyclables, and the waste that is being landfilled. Then to compare the alternatives on a per ton basis to that cost. The cost to handle, say, yard debris is what we are calling the program cost compared to the system cost being the overall per ton cost for all waste. We've estimated that the overall per ton cost for all waste is about \$150/per ton and that includes collection, hauling, transfer, transport and disposal. Then we compared that to some of these alternatives. What would be the per ton of a home composting program where the cost of the bins is included and that is quite a bit cheaper - \$45/ton. Compared to a residential organics program that would cost more than \$300/per ton as we specified it. Those were separate routes for collection of food waste and as we specified it looked like quite an expensive program. Not to say that there may be ways to make that cheaper and lower the cost on that. Residential plastics is another example that the subcommittee didn't recommend because of this high per ton cost. If you include the cost of the compactors, the cost of a plastic recovery facility, like the one down in Salem, if you include all those costs, you are going to have a very high per ton cost. I think, Sue we are going to talk more about what that means in terms of collection rates, that doesn't say anything about what the impact may be on collection rates. We may still be able to do plastics for a very low impact on your collection rate but it still may have a high per ton cost. And we want some feedback from the SWAC on what is the best evaluation criteria. There may be reasons to include some of these for other reasons.

Keil: My question is not just about plastics but in general. I understand what I guess are distributed costs - is not included in this. That, to put it simplistically when we look at the per ton cost, we are talking about it as if it were a ton sitting there to be collected. Not the number of stops that it takes to pickup that ton of stuff.

Anderson: (inaudible) We didn't attempt to estimate . . . We are open to having those numbers examined . . . because its very difficult to . . . an estimate for the whole region.

Keil: Okay I think that issue is a significant one and the issue of recognizing system capacity currently. By that I mean extra space that's on the truck already to add the material, having to currently offload materials so that if you are going beyond the capacity on the truck you are having two materials, one material the existence of compactors for yard debris or for any other kind of material -- those kinds of issues need to be built into your cost.

Petersen: I think we recognize that we are not going to be able to -- given the variety of collection programs that exist in this region, it would be very hard for us to say what would be the per ton cost for the City of Portland, or Lake Oswego. Keep in mind that these were intended to be gross type of estimates. Relative measures, not real fine tuned figures, not fine tuned collection cost estimates.

Keil: I understand that but we blend across 60 haulers. And without probably a great deal more effort than you guys put into blending across all the jurisdictions, and there are more similarities than there are dissimilarities in regard to that. And I think we need to get a lot closer than this. When we put out these kinds of numbers, if we are off by 50% because of what we call distributed costs, or system capacity, that's a fairly good sized mistake.

Petersen: The high cost, well we will talk about plastics in a minute, Sue, but I think, and Doug, you can correct me if I am wrong, but I think the high cost of the plastics program was primarily because we included the cost of the processing capacity down in Salem, is that right?

Doug: Sue really has the answer Are w. . . All of the organics programs and plastics programs did not capitalize on existing infrastructure. So when we set this up, for example plastics compactors are beginning to emerge into the system, and we want to look at the cost of doing plastics programs to use that as an example, capitalizing on that instead of . . . . (inaudible)

Keil: So the assumption, when you turn that crank, kicks that number out.

Petersen: What I want to do at this meeting today, specifically when we get to the plastics, is decide that when we look at the cost of say the plastics program, that we should not include the processing cost. Additional infrastructure cost. And I'd like to come to some conclusion on that at this meeting today. Because that will dramatically changes these cost numbers.

Miller: I should know this because we've been through these numbers about sixteen different directions, and these three bullets are the system cost per ton for all waste, is that the current system including the recycling program now in place, reflective costs -- that's the entire program current, is that correct?

Anderson: Just the curbside, (in the current system cost)

Miller: But the on-going current program including curbside and any other waste reduction that the jurisdictions are doing -- those are in there. Which includes a lot of programs, by the way that are significantly higher than \$150 and a lot that are lower than \$150, so one of the problems that we have here is that we don't have an integrated -- we don't have a composite rate, we do on the studies and if we get in to it further, we can add these programs back in, what is the resulting system costs rate. One of the reasons for plastic being so high per ton is that it takes this room full to make a ton of plastic. I mean in milk jugs for example. And they are out there, ounces at a time and so the logistics of collecting a ton of plastics is

very expensive. But the number of tons that are out there are very low. So if you look at the cost benefit ratio, is, I think, what we need to look at and determine, is there enough material there at this rate per ton to go after. And what does this do to the overall rate?: Maybe it raises it a nickel, or two cents, or ten cents. But when you integrate that into the existing structure, it doesn't cost \$335.00 a ton. None of these programs cost what it says here, it only costs that if you do them selectively and individually.

Keil: Did I hear you right that this \$150/ton does not include the hauling cost -- the private hauling cost?

Anderson: It does include the curbside programs, it does not include the Weyerhaeusers -- it is the solid waste \_\_\_\_\_ cost but not recyclers

Miller: In other words, it does not include expense or revenue from the "for-profit" recycling community.

Petersen: It does include the hauling costs of your franchised haulers.

Keil: Distributed?

Petersen: Yes.

Gilbert: What does this calculate?

Doug: We got some estimates from basically what it costs to \_\_\_\_\_ based from single-family residences like the suburban area of the city, and we make the assumption that say its picked up from (inaudible). We've got a fairly tight grid of the types of wastes and types of generators in the region (inaudible), what it costs to pull that ton through the disposal facility, the cost of processing, the cost of landfill, and add back in the revenue from (inaudible)

Gilbert: Nothing in there for "fee for profit."

(Discussion here between Gilbert and Andersen)

Miller: But, I think its fair to say that these numbers are based on modeling and maybe not on actual. And what we're trying to do is not deliver to you what the actual number and numeric cost is, but a relationship between what a model generated cost for the existing system looks like and a model generated cost for the modified system or these recommended practices looks like so you can compare the two and that is not to say that either one of them is a direct reflection of reality or actual cost on the street. And maybe that's where we're getting a little confused here and that's been my concern as we go along. We start putting dollar signs and numbers down and people start doing arithmetic in their heads saying, okay so this is what its going to cost. And the only thing we can do is do modeling on information that we don't have. We're trying to develop something that represents -- maybe instead of saying \$150/per ton, we should say "A per ton" and for composting .32A, but it's really hard to work with it that way. So, I think that if you understand that its a relationship between the two and not necessarily actual, specific costs, its our best guess, but its not actual. Maybe that helps in clarifying what's going on here.

Keil: I am ultra sensitive about -- not to the plastics one actually the garbage one. Because, I assume in the jurisdictions around us, the generation rate, say on your residential is about the same as ours. Somewhere around 1,550 pounds a year for a residence. When we look at programs across the country, and this cost per ton indicator is applied and you've got cities that are generating, and this is not way off the deep end, 2,800 pounds annually per residence, it takes a whole lot less stops to get a ton than it does at 1550 pounds per stop. So you get penalized for lower generation rate. In order to make these numbers look good, we should tell people to throw away more. No that's loony. So, this is going to come back to bite us. So, lets get real about what we're projecting in terms of the number.

Petersen: Sue, I think we've got a pretty good handle on the garbage. When we say that it's about \$150 per ton region wide, I think we've got a pretty good handle on that, on a per ton basis. Now the effect of the adding the new programs, you know, what is the effect of adding a new plastics program. I think that's where we are on a little bit of thin ice. But right now on the current system, what is the per ton cost of collecting the material and transferring it and transporting it, out to Arlington, I think we've got a pretty good handle on that. Now I don't know how it compares to other cities. I think we've also got to keep in mind what Tom says. I think what the intent of the subcommittee was to come up with some relative measures that could be a first screening criteria and that as it says on page 20, this SWAC may want to come up with different recommendations based on different criteria. We might want to say well it looks like you've screened plastics on a high per ton cost, but there is still reasons to include it. So that's what we want to do. We want to make sure that we look at other reasons for making recommendations or not making recommendations. So that's all I have in terms of a report from the subcommittee.

Kvistad: We will take a 5-minute break now.

Petersen: Staff has gone through these recommendations and we have come up with 9 questions that we specifically want to address. I suggest that we spend about 5 min on each one. Just enough time for a couple of you to make comments, and again, we have space for you to write comments. If you feel strongly about something and you don't have an opportunity to express yourself, please write them down and leave them on the table, do not take them with you.

Keil: Do you have a per ton cost on incremental the increase on yard debris program? My guess is that 65% of the region is not on a weekly program. Maybe 75% is not on a weekly program? Do you have it? In your system cost figures, you don't show a yard debris one.

Anderson: I hope this answers your question. The base case includes an estimate of bringing the region up to \_\_\_\_\_ from the standpoint of \_\_\_\_\_.

Petersen: Sue, I think the short answer to your question is yes, we have gone through the process of estimating the per ton cost of going to weekly regional yard debris programs.

Miller: Or equivalent,

Petersen: No, the cost estimate was for weekly service.

Keil: Well, in your recommended procedures, you know, you looked at these, I think, against your recommended procedures, or whatever -- your first category. So it would have to be weekly. Your recommended one is not equivalent is not an alternative. Anyway.

Miller: The current system cost is the system, correct me if I'm wrong guys, the system cost per ton always is the current system as it exists today.

Anderson: The subcommittee asked to add scrap paper to weekly yard debris, so that's in addition.

Miller: As the base case, not as a recommended practice, because it's being done in most jurisdictions now?

Keil: But, it's not. In Washington County and in Portland, you don't have a weekly program. And that must be 70% of the region, isn't it? Or close -- 65%

Petersen: When we get to the yard debris: (pointing to the map) The green are the parts of the region that has weekly service, the blue are the parts that don't currently have weekly service. The red is the burn ban. It's the year around DEQ burn ban. So that there are areas outside the burn ban that don't currently have weekly yard debris collection. There is, outside the burn ban out in Gresham, that do have weekly yard



debris service. This is one of the questions that we want to talk about when we get to the yard debris thing, discussion about the burn ban.

Petersen: Sue we do have some work to do on the costs numbers, clearly. And we need to get these kind of questions pinned down before we take these out to a larger group and which we haven't done yet.

Keil: Okay.

Petersen: Starting on page 22, we have 9 questions here. This thing is organized by the first page being a little more detailed summary of the sector that is being addressed, like the residential, commercial business, and so on and then on the second page is a question and issue that we want to talk about at the SWAC meeting. Starting with the residential on page 22. The key concept here is that the subcommittee has been talking about is that we've already got effective residential programs in place and basically we're building on those that already exist. On page 22 there is a list of four key elements that we've pulled out of the recommendations. Again, we've already talked about this, but go on to weekly collection of yard debris, scrap paper, recycling containers to all multi-family. Again, I think we're at about 60% region-wide right now, multi-family, and this would be getting it up to essentially all complexes. Regional promotion of the education campaigns, the strategy of identifying and targeting neighborhoods or parts of the region that are low participant areas. Rather than in the past where we've taken a blanket approach, this would be trying to identify a little bit more about what neighborhoods are not participating and target those groups. And expanding the home composting program.

Page 23, one of the issues that keeps coming up is this idea of regional uniformity of service. And we've talked about this a little already. There certainly are advantages to having region-wide uniform residential recycling programs. On the other hand there is the disadvantage that there is not that local flexibility. And the question that we want to talk about here is what priority does this Solid Waste Advisory Committee put on uniformity of service as a regional priority in this Solid Waste Management Plan. Is that something that as a policy we should adopt in the RSWMP. If not, how do we address this whole issue. Does someone want to start and say to what degree you think this ought to be a regional priority as a policy --this uniform levels of service.

Gilbert: Are you talking about getting the region on a weekly basis?

Petersen: Ralph, we are going to talk a little later -- this is in general. I know its hard to talk about this without talking specifics, but we are going to talk about the materials later. But, in general, as a policy direction, is this something that we want to put in this plan?

Gilbert: Well, I think that as a policy, you have to take the policy and address the individual items. You can't address as a broad policy, you have to take, yard debris, plastics, etc. And address them as an individual item on the regional policy.

Keil: Terry, I guess from my perspective, what are you trying to do with this, I mean what is the outcome that you are looking for as a result of this? If this is reduce, promotion and education costs, if it is better diversion because of higher understanding, it might be a difficult one to measure, but -- and I guess that would tie back to your promotion and education aspect. Does this do that? The follow-up question is this the best approach to have -- this sort of broad scale kind of promotion and education effort -- or is it more like the targeting low participant neighborhood with special promotion and education that would net you the better result. So, it sort of to me, a cost benefit analysis of what you would do if you had that policy in place versus what you would do if you didn't and your expectations for changes in performance.

Petersen: There are two things that the subcommittee has talked about and one is the advantages in terms of regional promotion and education and the other thing that I've heard is reporting requirements. Particularly from the haulers. If there was more uniformity, maybe there would be more uniform reporting requirements. The first one is probably a bigger issue, I would think. But those are the things that I've

heard. What we would be trying to accomplish with this is regional policy would be the advantages of promotion and education. But your point is, Sue, is this the best approach? Maybe that's not the best approach. Maybe the better approach would be to emphasize local promotion and education of individual programs.

Miller: Well I think, Terry, you accomplish both. Because if you can consolidate your efforts from the standpoint of promotion and education, likely you could reduce redundancy in the system. And use that saving to promote or hit the areas that need the greater attention. With the same type of material perhaps, but at a more intense rate. And I think you can accomplish both with the same effort. Because one of the things that we run into all the time is the confusion among programs. Its getting less because programs are getting more uniform. But when KATU or KGW or KPTV runs a recycling promotion for the City of Portland, for example, it reaches the entire valley. And not everybody has that programs. But they are watching TV and oh yeah, the next thing you know, this new program appears everywhere, and there is nothing you can do about that, except that if you had uniform programs, when it appeared everywhere, it would be taken care of everywhere and it wouldn't create any confusion. So you can take your promotional dollar and not divide them up into a bunch of different programs, then I think they go further, and then the areas that need more, shall we say, tutoring, you have some funding available to maybe provide that.

Kroen: I'm not sure local govt is willing to give up their ability to design effective programs that meet the requirements -- the results requirements, I'm not sure they are willing to give them up to, say Metro is going to mandate what our program looks like at the curb

Keil: Or at the business.

Kroen: Well, this happens to be residential under the category.

Petersen: But maybe we should talk about in general.

Kroen: I would rather see uniformity be related to the results and maybe the materials and not to how the results are gotten. I believe that is a local issue.

Keil: The question you might run into also, we have brought on a material earlier because of, perhaps market conditions, or ability to process a certain amount. I mean we've brought magazines on fairly early because we need the commitment to take those magazines. If we would have been put in a position to wait for the rest of the region to come along on that it would not have come on as early as it did, because the market that we found for it could not accommodate much more than what we brought into it at the time. Someone brought milk cartons on in Clackamas County for some time, if they would have had to bring us on also at the time, I don't think Tetra Pac would have been ready to take the whole City. Now were into smaller increments of bringing stuff out of the system, except for maybe scrap paper, that is a big increment. You might have a depressing effect in bringing on those new materials. And potentially some of the learning curve that is associated with it within the region by saying everyone's got to do the same thing at the same time. You have to look at the increments available to bring on new materials -- the markets ability to process.

Petersen: When we are talking about weekly yard debris, should that be a uniform standard, region wide, that we expect uniformity of service, or not?

Irvine: Well, on your form up here, your saying here's your recommended practice, and your allowing jurisdictions to come up with any alternative, so I don't see how you are going to have uniformity, because your setting your program up not to have uniformity.

Petersen: Well, that's precisely the conflict that we have here. We've talked about flexibility, but we've talked about the advantages of having uniformity. It sounds to me the sense that we're getting back here is that the flexibility is more important than regional uniformity, as a policy goal.

Keil: But the standard, I think Emily capped for you just right. It's the standard that is uniform -- the results.

White: I think you were going to ask this question later and address it, -- but does that set up the situation, how do you judge the alternatives, and does that set up the system where regional govt is constantly running to Metro and saying we have a plan, we have an alternative. If you're the judge, therefore do you try to let them do it first and then someday down the line look and ask them to show that they've done well, or

Petersen: Your right, were going to talk about what that means. How we actually implement these alternatives.

White: It's hard to argue that it seems to work in general, conceptually, is it a good concept that there is a regional -- I mean there are good reasons why conceptually the words -- that's like the federal system versus the state system. If you know your system is great, and it works for everybody equally, and there are no changes that need to be made, then it's great. But you never then get a chance to test the system and say well, we've got an idea over here we'd like to try. Or this works particularly well in our location. And so you get the advantage, really of say the City of Portland saying well were going to try something new. And then that kind of trickles out to everybody else because it works. Or is everybody going to say, it's just too darn expensive -- say mil jugs. All of a sudden somebody tries it and it works. So you have to have that flexibility because conceptually, it's better to have a uniform, promotable system conceptually. You have to have that flexibility to do that.

Lynda: Probably not, it's my feeling that probably what we need is a combination of these two things. One, is (inaudible) and we have to be responsive to the needs of our own communities. But on the other hand I think were going toward this (inaudible) recognizing that there are parts of the program that should be uniform, for example, all jurisdictions are required to collect the principle recyclables at the curbsides, we know that, so that's a given. But were not dictating, down to the detail, in order to do this you shall have a blue truck. But I do think that if you are really rigid about that uniformity, what you do is you impede the programs. There are some jurisdictions that are not going to take the leadership and if their standards are low there will be no encouragement to increase that. And quite frankly, somebody going out first and then trying it and then we can look at those results and say yes, we can fit this into our program, as Portland did on scrap paper, it was market driven. We could not really all come on at the same time, but we really needed somebody to take the lead so we would have some data and some experience in order to expand it to the region. I think we need to look at this in two parts. Perhaps some of the parts of the program should be implemented, I think standards by which we measure definitely need to be.

Miesen: Following up on what Lynda just said. On standards. I promote no. 5. give them an annual report card via SWAC. Because I think somewhere in this whole process someone has to say, that's a great effort, you did a great job. And you are on-line, you are making the right progress. Or someone along the process has to say, gee, it doesn't look like you are pulling your fair weight. And the alternative plan you came up with just does not seem to be working. And to me, that's part of this whole, being a nice guy, Metro enforcement policy. More acting as a consultant and but having somewhere there is a forum. And I think that SWAC is an excellent forum for that in order to the judge. It also becomes an interesting news article, later that gives you the public perception to say who is an "A" recycling community, who is a "B", and who is incomplete. I think it will raise some eyebrows, you know. In some ways it's your function, because for instance, no. 3. That's basically what that would do. It doesn't say how do you target them, it doesn't say how do you shame them, or maybe pat them on the back and say well done, well done. All these extra enhancements -- liken it to buying a car and deciding whether you want electric windows, or the moon roof, or some of these other things, they are all nice things to have, but they all cost a little extra. And I think we have to recognize how you can get some of these things by making them as a standard in

the car. It just becomes a standard in the price instead of always an extra -- that you incorporate as you manufacture it, like you incorporate it into your planning phase and expanding your programs.

Miller: Or take it one step beyond that is we still have a determination on how sophisticated we want our automobile, but still when that is all said and done, some people don't want Goodrich tires, they want Goodyear, and so they go to the tire store and they change them. Or they want a custom set of wheels and all of that can be done after the fact without changing the integrity of the original automobile.

Miesen: Keep adding these little things to it without really becoming

Miller: But when General Motors are selling, they are selling the car, and when Metro is selling, they are selling the program plan. And they are doing the promotions for selling the program. And the improvements on the program need to be sold by the local jurisdictions, if they wish to go beyond. And Emily, don't get me wrong, you guys have some fantastic programs over there, Tigard has some great programs and if everybody was at that level.

Kroen: But then Tigard and Tualatin have different programs.

Miller: Yes

Kroen: And that is where I think there needs to be the room for the difference in the way the program is

Miller: And I don't argue that point. What I am saying is that there must be a yard debris program, for example, and your program and Tigard's program are different, but you both have a yard debris program and we can promote yard debris is available in Tigard. Yard debris is available in Tualatin. And that -- when I say uniformity, I say uniformity of programs must be accomplished and how you do the program, not necessarily uniform, but the fact that you are doing it.

Kvistad: This might be a good transition into these specific programs

Kroen: But is program a definition of material collected or is it a definition of yard debris weekly.

Keil: For the same day as garbage.

Kroen: That's right, where does that definition of program stop. Now my understanding from everything we've talked about so far, using yard debris as an example, which we keep doing, is yard debris, weekly, curbside, same day as garbage as part of the definition of program? Now maybe, that's not the case. Maybe if you are defining yard debris as a material that is collected as being a definition of the program, then that uniformity to me is acceptable.

Miller: And that's the way I picture.

Kvistad: Two questions and then we will get to the actual yard debris questions. Lets move into the specifics, and then we can get into the general right at the end, because I think that will really target in on where we need to go.

Kotta: Just a comment. I think when your talking about okay, the intercooperative things that everybody shall have a yard debris program. And we could say the standard is weekly, ta da.

Kroen: Standard is the results we get from that.

Kotta: I think we can become task oriented and instead we should say you need to have a program that when you do a \_\_\_\_\_ you have this amount of yard debris in the garbage can, that's the real thing that we are trying to achieve.. If you can pick it up once a year and it never goes in there and doesn't cause



your community any problems, you probably have really achieved the goal, and I think we have become really task oriented and we forget what were really about. So we need to always include that and that also opens the door for doing the program a different way. If I can demonstrate to you that you know, I can collect yard debris in some much different way and my results are as good as the weekly thing, why should I be punished if it works for my community.

Kvistad: And that's a real good point and that gets right to the core of what were trying to do, is how do you develop a system with a set standards and yet build in the flexibility for all the different jurisdictions and programs that are out there. I mean that is the dilemma. But I think we are getting there with this kind of debate. So lets move into page 24 here and go into the collection of plastics.

Petersen: A little more specific on potential programs. We've already talked about plastics. Page 24 gives you a little bit of background at the top there on plastics. There is only 7700 tons based on our last waste characterization sort of these plastic containers. I understand these are being considered for curbside collection programs. 2% of all residential waste by weight. The thing to keep in mind is the second bullet point that -- I was talking to Emily Kroen at the break and she was talking about how Senate Bill 76 was probably a good example of how legislation has helped promote and market for plastics in this case. But, we are all aware that this is now being challenged down in Salem right now, so that is something to consider. We understand that there is a lot of interest among customers right now in having plastics picked up at the curb. We have already talked about a per ton basis could be expensive. And there is also this last bullet point that the region as a whole may be able to provide enough plastics to reach some kind of break-even point for a plastics recovery facility that any individual jurisdiction that puts a program on line might not be able to achieve. The question then is, the subcommittee has not recommended this as a regional priority, but does the SWAC think that there are other reasons that we should, as a priority, include plastics in the curbside programs?

Gilbert: Do you want me to get up on my soap box

Petersen: I would like a yes and/or a no. Because we've only got 5 min.

Gilbert: No. It takes a room this size, a half a ton. But the primary thing is we've got to stop the hoax of the plastic manufacturers -- the industry here in Portland. Why did they locate that plant in Salem? When they could have located a non-profit organization right here in Portland, and they located it in Salem, so they won't get too much of the stuff. They get a lot of publicity out of it, and they don't have to deal with a lot of politics. And to me, the biggest hoax that has ever been put on the public is the advertising of all the numbered plastic bottles, where you can recycle all -- I think we should make a statement to the industry and say, and go to the press with it, and say you guys are actually perpetuating something on the public that doesn't work, can't work and if it were to work, you' would have located your non-profit thing in the City of Portland.

Petersen: Jeff, is this a yes?

Murray: It is also a no, along the line that this is where local govts have a chance to experiment and the other ones can wait to see how it works, see if the whole system works. I don't know if Ralph is aware of it or not, but we did set up a system for the metro area and you can take material to them and then we take it down to Salem.

Gilbert: But you still have to take it down there, you miss my point. They located it where it is difficult for the majority of people to be serious about it.

Murray: My point is that a local jurisdiction such as Washington County, City of Portland, can see how the system works.

Petersen: Does anyone want to speak in favor of plastics as a regional priority -- curbside plastics?



Ziolko: If the industry goes its way, having a required item (inaudible) you have to pick up.

Keil: I got more involved in this than I ever intended to. I think that was kind of a backlash kind of thing because it didn't look like they were going to get what they were interested in which was the release from the requirements to recycle, or recover or any of the reduced packaging kinds of requirements. I don't think this should be a regional priority. I think it's a customer response issue. Far and away the largest requested item for our customers. In weight it's not much. And the 2% is a per ton kind of figure. In bulk, fairly substantial. Obvious to the customer. I agree with the comment that there is some processing capability here locally and I think on the commercial side, that's working rather well. I also agree with Ralph that it irritates me that they put it some place outside of Portland and it seems to me that it is exactly as you suggest. That that was one more strategy of the plastics industry to not deal with this in the most efficient way possible. On the other hand, because it is, in our case, something that can be accommodated, virtually across the system, on existent vehicles, the addition of these other plastics to our program would roughly double what we are picking up now, with just the milk jugs, most of the haulers, far and away, most of the haulers -- maybe 80% or better have a compactor on the truck, can handle it, are offloading currently, with at least one of their bins because they fill up too quickly. So if plastics were an issue, they could dump at the same time without much incremental expense associated with it. It could be accommodated at a small cost and since it is something the customer wants, and probably would be willing to pay for it, and maybe the savings wouldn't have to pay for it additionally, at all, it may be something that is good to do.

White: I have a question as part of my learning process. Is the no because it's such a small amount say 2%, rather than if it was 25%. and the costs are so high theoretically to add it? Because the alternative is to say it's a small amount and were not going to try to get it out of the wastestream and it's going to end up in the landfill, or I don't understand what the alternative . . .

Petersen: The subcommittee had two reasons for saying no. One was the low tons and the other was the high cost. I think we've heard some other things here from Ralph and others why they think there should be no, also. Speaking for the subcommittee, those are the reasons -- tons and costs.

White: You don't want to shoot the system in the foot, if it's good to do it, even though we don't like your motivation, and it seems to me the reason is that it's only 2%. And then maybe if the public and I heard this back when I was working in Bob Koch's office, I remember this whole plastics thing and it seems to me that in education, there is a perception that plastic is bad, but there is a whole lot of it, so maybe if the citizens are really pushing hard to have this plastic program, it is because of the perception that it's 1) bad and 2) there is a lot of it. And the alternative is that it's not very much, so maybe you could not have it in the system, now but there is an education component that someday needs to be said that there really isn't that much and we have all these other things like paper, and yard debris where we need to spend our money.

Petersen: Of course the plastic industry would tell us that we are using the wrong yard stick to measure the importance of this when we look at just weight. They suggested amount of material per packaging unit -- there is a whole different measuring unit.

Kvistad: Everybody just take one second and write down a quick response under these, we will give everybody about 30 seconds after each discussion to jot down any comments.

Pg. 25 - Yard Debris. There is a general underlying question we've raised here about what is equivalent and I think that is what we're trying to get at here. Rather than the specifics of the yard debris. We are using the yard debris as an example, but the general question is what's an equivalent practice and what ought to be the criteria for judging an equivalent practice. There are 28,000 tons of yard debris now being landfilled out of the residential sector, that's closer to the -- rather than 2% on plastics, that's closer to 8% on residential. Certainly higher in some parts of the region than in others, lower in Clackamas County, higher out in Washington County (except for Tualatin), weekly or equivalent. Some parts of the region don't have service. I don't know if you can see this map but again, the green are areas that have weekly

curbside, the blue is no weekly, the burn ban is on the red, the year-round burn ban is in the red. Okay, the question is should the hierarchy be the basis for equivalent so that when we say: weekly yard debris collection or equivalent, is it simply the amount of yard debris that's in the garbage can and it doesn't matter if that yard debris is managed by burning, by curbside recycling or illegal dumping, that the equivalent standard is going to be what's in the garbage can. Or, is it equivalent in terms of the management hierarchy? That if the standard was set on the basis of recycling composting yard debris, then that's what's expected in terms of equivalent practice, not burning, not illegal dumping.

Miller: I can tell you that those people who live in the burn ban area and those who used to live in an area -- or now live in an burn ban area where it wasn't and those that live that is not a burn ban -- anyway, those people who cannot burn anymore do not consider a cost per service collection program an equivalent to what they had before -- which was burning and was whatever a book of matches cost. What I am saying is that we need to have some basis for equivalency that makes sense to the consumer. And that was the biggest argument when the burn ban went in was -- hey, your yard debris program is not equivalent to what I had before, I'm sorry.

Keil: I think the standard for what's left in garbage is what needs to be the uniform standard. And I think you run into real problems on the generation rate per household kind of issue because of varying lot sizes and Lynda has quite a large exemption area out there that would play into the number, for instance. Also on the home compost is exceedingly difficult to measure. And I mean you talk about the cost of information -- that would be just killer. So, the thing that you can actually measure in a cost effective way by some sampling, you know, maybe its seasonal sampling or what not if you need to get better than just getting it at high season which is your highest potential for having it in the garbages -- will tell you whether you are making the grade or not.

Gilbert: I get confused on the tonnage. Don't we use multi-family and the residential waste or do we only use residential? I think there are more tons of yard debris than that.

Petersen: I'm pretty comfortable with the tonnage number, Ralph, based on our recent waste sort. The 7.9%, I hope is of single family waste only. Doug, is that right?

Anderson: That is what it should be, yes. Landfilled, not curbside, this is what is landfilled.

Keil: But don't you measure it out of the truck, the residential truck?

Petersen: Yes.

Roy: Early on in the meeting on pg. 18, we talked about system wide analysis involving direct costs and then we talked about indirect costs and benefits where we are really not measuring quantitatively. So, its the solid waste hierarchy that attempts to measure those indirect costs and benefits. And thats why the waste reduction and recycling and composting are at the top of the hierarchy because they have the benefits of saving resources and energy and avoiding more pollution than those things at the bottom of the hierarchy. So the problem that I have with just looking at whats left in the garbage can is that that does not consider those things, at all. Its only looking at what we keep out of the landfill, and thats the only criteria. So thats why I would say yes to this question of should the waste management hierarchy be the basis for equivalency, because otherwise it doesn't get taken into the consideration at all.

Kvistad: Okay, does everybody feel comfortable to moving to the written portion on item #3?

Keil : Would you explain to me what that means, I mean get specific, what would that mean in terms of the waste management hierarchy.

Petersen: Well, lets be real specific, who, you read Forest Grove at the Council meeting?

Keil: No, I wasn't there.

Petersen: I know our Councilor McLain is following this issue very carefully out in Forest Grove, that is out in her district. And, the results of this, if we said that burning is equivalent, we are only using the yard debris in the garbage can as a standard, then we are going to have a situation where these areas out here are saying well, our yard debris in our garbage can is as low as the rest of the region, but we're burning it, therefore we set part of the Solid Waste Management Plan. And the Metro Council, when asked, well, that's consistent with our plan because your yard debris in your garbage can is as low as the standard as we set.

Keil: Step inside, I mean that's a pretty obvious one. What difference would it make in the -- Tualatin's got the big roll cart --

Kroen: What about Sherwood next door to us:?

Keil: In what -- I mean a depot program versus a bi-weekly program, does any of that play into that evaluation:?

Petersen: Not to that specific question, because that's being managed in the same way according to the hierarchy -- it's still all being composted, right. So this question is not

Keil: So you'd only be aiming at the burning, with this one?

Petersen: Well, composting is an interesting one too because that's in a way prevention.

But do we know they are not home composting in Forest Grove?

Kvistad: We are actually going to be doing a survey of that in terms of going forward with the third phase of our compost bin program. We just had a general discussion. So Debbie's going to be coming forward with some suggestions on how we can get some basic measurements on how that program's affecting the wastestream and how to go forward with it. So we will be getting some general numbers. It won't be giving us everything we need, but I think it will be helpful.

Kroen: I'd like to say one thing about the hierarchy as it relates to burning and the results. I'm a firm believer that the results of what's in the can is what we have to measure. This is the Solid Waste Plan. This is not the Plan for environmental air quality. And if in fact burning is not acceptable, that is someone else's issue, in Forest Grove, that is not a Solid Waste issue, for the Metro Council.

Ziolko: How are we going to measure in jurisdictions.

Kvistad: Well, it may be a Metro issue in terms of the air shed. So it does fit within our

Kroen: Yes, but not this

Kvistad: What I'll do, right before I ask you to write your comments, I'm going to ask you, just as a general policy, like at the very bottom: Should the boundary for burning extend to the whole Metro Region, Yes or No. Just right at the bottom of your page on this one. Because it would be very interesting to get your feedback.

Kiwala(?): How are we going to measure and compare jurisdictions. \_\_\_\_\_ lack of illegal dumping and then meeting the pounds left in the cans and plus, having the least amount for household picked up on the collection program, because that's what you have to do, take care of it at home and then you wouldn't have these programs. So we want to discourage them from using the collection program, and discouraging them from illegal dumping, and discouraging them from putting it in the can, but I am not sure that any of us can afford. . . .

Kvistad: Okay, everyone seems to have their wheels turning, so let's write down some responses for about 30 seconds or so.

Lex Johnson: If you were to incorporate the entire Metro region for ban on burning, thereby generating additional orchard prunings, etc., would it make sense that that could be an additional fuel source for a co-generation plant?

Kvistad: I don't want to put everybody on the spot with that one because it is a real incendiary issue, so to speak. But, sorry, it was cheap and I had to go for it, but what I kind of wanted to do is to get an idea. Because it is something that we are dealing with and it is something you people are very familiar with so it would just be interesting to get the response, you will not be held accountable, other than I would appreciate that kind of response in terms of our being able to develop a policy on air shed in terms of where you are with understanding the system and its ramifications. They are different and they are weighted differently, but that's a personal request.

Lynda: Talking about developing a policy on air quality -- if we are talking about expanding the burn ban, it's my understanding that -- we looked at some changing in our rules a couple of years ago and it's my understanding that not only is that a DEQ responsibility, but it takes legislative action. And it happened because of the particular way that law was written.

Kvistad: What it is is very integrated, so it's not really anything we can do anything about however we have to deal with it when we are dealing with air sheds. You know, we've got ice tea requirements and DEQ requirements. So it would just be helpful for me because we know that that's a situation in the solid waste area -- it would be interesting. Are we about ready to go on to the next one?

Pg. 27. The subcommittee is ready to come up with some recommendations regarding the commercial sector and there will be some standard recommended practices in there. They are listed in the matrix. For one question that continually keeps coming up is this issue of fair market value. It doesn't make sense to write a Regional Solid Waste Management Plan that asks local governments to do something with their franchised haulers in terms of commercial collection when there is uncertainty about who has the legal rights to those recyclables. It seems to be a big obstacle that we don't seem to be able to get around. And I guess what we've done here is cite ORS 459A075 which defines or exempts recyclable materials if they are source-separated, if they are purchased for fair market value. Does this committee believe that this is such a big obstacle that is going to prevent major increases in the commercial sector, and if so, is there anything that this region can do about this issue?

Keil: This is one that I'll probably be on the opposite side from the haulers. I think there may be a depressing effect on the results generated for purposes of recycling by not having it open to other recyclers besides the franchised hauler. In areas where there is a regulated rate you have the reverse effect that in fact it's going to cost your customer more to not have the high value recyclables in your franchise system, because the revenue generated by those reduces your overall costs, if you're building your rates on cost of service basis. So this one almost varies by the rate structure in jurisdictions. If you set up with a regulated rate and a geographically franchised territory, you save your customer money by the exclusion. I'm not sure that based on federal law that you can limit the access anyway. But where you do not have a regulated rate, and I believe the customer is the focus, you give your customer a better shake by an open system. And I think you improve your recycling.

Petersen: So your answer is no Sue? You don't think this is going to be a -- okay. Anyone on the other side of the coin? No.

Ralph: No. All I want to say is that the commercial thing that -- business is looking for every opportunity to reduce their costs, so they are going to be looking for people to take these recyclables -- it's market driven.

Petersen: Well, someone speak up that thinks this is a problem. Lynda, go ahead.

Kotta: I think the answer to that question depends on who you are representing or what perspective you take. If you look at the whole system, probably not for the reasons that have been stated. However, keep in mind that a lot of what we are dealing with here is requirements that come down through the regional plan to local governments and were dealing with a franchised system. We have to be careful but we don't regulate that all of the burdens fall on or demand that all of the burdens fall on the regulated system and the free market or private piece of this gets all of the benefits. However I do believe that there are ways to operate successfully within those systems and I think its going to take some new ways of looking at how we do business. I feel a regulated system can \_\_\_\_\_. But also, if the private recyclers, for instance in Portland, are going to be involved in this some way, it seems like they have to assume some of the responsibilities and some of the reporting so that we can get that into the system. Because if its happening and they are not reporting it we may be at our goal and not even realize it.

Gorham: I think we do that information when we survey all of the end users.

Kotta: We do if it goes here locally, but what if they take it out of state? Do we get it then?

Petersen: In theory, yes.

Kroen: In theory.

Petersen: Okay two more comments and then.

Kroen: Did we get a yes?

Petersen: A quasi yes.

Kotta: A kind of a maybe.

Kroen: I don't know where this issue when to but fair market value and how different jurisdictions define it differently has been an issue every time I've ever sat at a table. And so I don't understand why somebody isn't saying that it is. It happens to be that our city attorney looked at all the information and came up with a definition that we use in the City of Tualatin. And it happens to be independently the same thing that \_\_\_\_\_, and he said well this is the definition and this is how it works. And he says doesn't everybody operate that way. And I said no, in Washington County, every one of our jurisdictions do not operate with the same definition of fair market value and it has created a problem every time we've tried to address commercial recycling. Why and how, I can't explain, somebody else can, but somebody at the State level needs to define it, clearly so that we all operate under it with the same way. And certainly in a franchised environment, it has had an impact.

Kotta: We have requested over the years -- I sat on a committee with a whole group of people about two or three years ago trying to come to a conclusion about this. It did not happen. And when you talk about purchase \_\_\_\_\_ or exchange by the generator, and when does that really happen? We've never had a clear definition of when it crosses the line and there are many interpretations. There has been a request, numerous times to DEQ to see if we can straighten this out and have asked the Attorney General to give us a clear definition of -- and this has not happened.

\_\_\_\_\_: How do you judge the alternatives. I think its HB3055 the flow control bill for businesses. The other thing is that and it isn't a problem for us, for our franchised haulers, in particular some of the things that Sue talked about, with franchising, but we have problems with the commercial businesses, that recycling programs go through waste audits and that sort of thing, and they go through all that expense and put programs together only to lose a particular element, like cardboard, or something of that nature and they're upset about that, you know, because they are losing actually a revenue for the work that they are



putting in to it. And also for the other things that they are taking that aren't quite as valuable. So it is a problem from the franchise standpoint. And we've always had a problem with this since SB405. And so one mechanism that we use to try and cover this is the recycling business license that people have to get. But even with that, its only for purposes, primarily of reporting what they are actually taking out of the wastestream so we can get back to the other agencies on it. But that is still not a very satisfactory solution to it, from the franchisees point of view.

Petersen: We do have a DEQ rep. here. Is DEQ listening to this.

Keil: The question we are supposed to answer is that one: Do you think it has an effect?

Petersen: More importantly, what, if any action, should this region take, and be spelled out in this plan, if anything. We've identified that the state can do some things, they can help clarify some definitions. Is there anything that ought to be built into this plan as a recommendation? Maybe not, maybe there is nothing we can really do regionally.

Pg. 29. Business Organics. A lot of organic waste, 115,000 tons per year, our last waste sort estimated. Most of this is coming from small restaurants, stores, small grocery stores, its not coming from the large food processors in the region that have drop boxes of food waste. Most of it comes into the landfill and mixed in with other waste in packer trucks. The subcommittee is very much recommending a market driven system, private sector, responsible for processing capacity. No public financing, no exclusive franchises by Metro facilities, no guaranteed flow control. Very much a private driven, private market kind of system. At the same time we know the economics of this are very marginal and that it could be that we end up with only a fraction of this 115,000 tons actually being recovered, if its an entirely market driven system. The question is do you agree with the subcommittee's recommendation that there should be very little government involvement in this recovery of organic waste.

Keil: Yes, I do, but very little is a relative term. If I knew that we had a processing facility as were working with businesses on this required recycling plan dealing with the generator, and asking them to tell us what the four categories or the four items are that they generate the most of, organics would be one of the items on that list and I suppose we could get to the point of requiring that organics be one of the items that they recycle. Because there is quantity in the business. I also think, from some information that I've had shared by a couple, three suppliers, that the economics can work out on this high-grade routes. And the restaurant industry, a number of years ago, had been looking at this as a strategy for reducing their waste and heavy garbage costs. So I would not naturally assume you need a bunch of government intervention to make this happen. It seems to me the processing capability has got to be there and not down in Salem, to use Ralph's point. I mean this one really needs to be right where the stuff is.

Gilbert: That's a difficult thing to try and do.

Keil: Maybe not with the current technology. There is better technology than used to exist.

Gilbert: Well, I've been looking for a piece of property and its extremely difficult.

Petersen: Okay, Sue, your answer you agree with the subcommittee that we shouldn't have gov't intervention in the form of flow control, exclusive franchising, okay. Jeff, did you raise your hand?

Murray: Well, I'm pretty much in agreement with what Sue is saying. At NBC we are in the process of rerouting and (inaudible) we've had a substantial effect.

Petersen: But we don't have that facility right now. So, is there anyone speaking for more gov't involvement.

Roy: Well, I'm not sure whether I'm on the other side or not because it all depends on what you mean when you say no public financing. Where I'd like to see Metro have a roll is similar to the way that the yard debris processing got started. It seems to me that the key here is the siting and what type of process is used for this food waste. And I can remember back before there was any yard debris processing, Metro had a grant program. As I recall a \$350,000 program where they provided some money for I think it was three different processors to get started and to test some things. And I'd like to see the same kind of thing happen for the food. So you can get it going and you can find some sites and you get some processes you know will work and then collection will follow because there should be a savings.

Ziolko: The assistance needed is in siting.

Keil: You bet.

Ziolko: To make sure there is a viable site that the neighbors will not object to, no smell, no one is upset.

Kvistad: One thing too to remember, we are starting a program for business recycling grants and were going to start reviewing those proposals today. I don't know if any of them take care of that, but what it is is to encourage people to actually start with programs in the private sector that might take care of some of these. But I don't know if this is directly addressed, but I do know we are going into that process now and there could very well be a program now or if we continue the program on,

Gilbert: I don't believe in these grants. Because we've established ourselves without any of these grants. And that's the reason we are successful doing what we do. I think you should leave it to the private sector. They may need help on siting, other than that let them develop their own and pay for it. I think govt getting into these grants is wrong. Its increasing our budget and we don't need it. Let the people who are willing to put the risk dollars in there do that. Metro is not in a risk position as far as I'm concerned.

Kvistad: I understand where your coming from. My thing is that I've inherited a grant program which we start today to go through, so I'm just letting you know that if indeed there is something there that might encourage private .

Keil: I would really like to strengthen that siting part of it. I'd like to say Metro will site a private sector..

Petersen: What do you mean by that? Metro will help site, specifically. What do you mean Sue, what could Metro do?

Keil: Well, I think you play into City and DEQ kinds of issues on this. So, for me its putting pressure on govts to get that job done. And I don't even know enough to be as dangerous as I should be, but.

Gilbert: Yeah, I'm going through quite a bit of that, but in Land Use Planning, don't get the Environmental Impact Statements so it sits around for a year and a half to two years without being reviewed. And this could happen, because its happened to me here the last five years.

Keil: Or help identify property that is in appropriately zoned or -- if we put it next to a transfer station, I'm kidding, but where you've already got those same kinds of issues that you are dealing with, you may shorten that process up a good deal. Maybe there are things we can do in terms of making property available through different governmental authorities, or something or other, if that makes sense. Some of that type of stuff and then taking a lead position. Not letting a Ralph Gilbert or Steve Miesen kind of twist out there in the wind. You know we are in lock step with them when we go to that City, to the Planning Commission, to the DEQ, you know we buy into the overall objective here, and then help then get to a position.

Kvistad: That's a good point of contact between the other side of this agency, in terms of -- as we move forward, now that were done with moving towards the end of the 2040 and into regional framework

planning, it is very possible that some of us have been pushing for -- you know, not only an environmental impact study, but business impact statements as well on some of these -- you know, what's going to happen to the businesses involved is also taken into account in land use decisions. Which has not been done yet. And I think this would be a good point of reference to just footnote and I can make sure to carry that forward into the actual 2040 and actual framework planning as a specific which might be helpful. It at least puts it into the debate that we need to make sure that we can site for all of the different things that we need in the community. And that solid waste is just as important.

\_\_\_\_\_: Just before we move on, you used the words "flow control", are you talking post collection, or are you saying how it will be collected?

Petersen: Post collection:

\_\_\_\_\_ and I just wanted to make sure that when that comes up in some document, that it doesn't imply that your trying to choose but that it really is the correct use of the word.

Petersen: When the Reidel was open, Metro directed packer trucks to that facility. That is the only example where we've actually practices flow control.

\_\_\_\_\_ This bill just brought up in Salem right now says: Flow Control is not only where it goes, but it also how it is collected. And I want to make very sure that flow control is flow control.

Petersen: I think we want to get away from talking about flow control.

Kvistad: Lets move to the response phase and then we'll get on to the next one. We've only got a couple left.

Pg. 31. I want to mention this transfer station one. The general direction that the subcommittee is headed is to put the priority first into waste reduction practices. Hopefully then that will alleviate the need for any new transfer stations in the future as this region grows. There's going to be a lot of growth, we know that. But put the priority as policy first into waste prevention, recycling, as our planning direction. You all are aware of this, you've probably seen this map before, but right now we've got three transfer stations in the region: one out here at Forest Grove, one at Metro Central and one at Metro South. This shows the travel time to those transfer stations. Relative travel times. We've got areas here that are not as well served. Does this committee that access is sufficient reason to proceed, to look at building transfer stations. I keep hearing also that perhaps we ought to build transfer stations to reduce traffic impacts. From the long hauls that we have. I'd like a sense from the committee on whether or not you agree with what the subcommittee has come up with for the transfer stations.

Kvistad: I support my Washington County fully, Terry.

Petersen: okay, heres a yes.

Keil: Is that a yes or a no?

Kvistad: Well, I think Councilor Kvistad would agree that our first priority should be in reducing waste, but there probably still is a reason to build transfer stations.

Kvistad: I like to be proactive and leave my options open.

Keil: I think those operational costs associated with the greater distances are real. I couldn't quantify them, but I suspect they are quantifiable. And since we are building a system, there may be a need to recognize those higher operating costs for those most distant from our sited transfer facilities in rates that are charged either at the transfer station or somehow managed in fees in some way. It looks to me, from

everything that I know, that there is sufficient capacity at the transfer stations, maybe with some improvements. But there is sufficient capacity, but you might, for those more distant areas, recognize their extra costs in another way.

Miller: I think your example of how to improve the system is really quite appropriate. Reload facilities that may serve one or two hauler companies located in an area that, particularly if that material does not stay on-site, but simply is a central location for, satellite, if you will, for and they are not satellite because some of them are pretty large vehicles, but if they have a short distance run we can reduce traffic impact, we can reduce trips, we can reduce road wear and tear and all of that sort of thing. And maybe consolidate some of the areas where we go to empty the trucks. And by moving larger loads over long distances, we can be far more efficient. And those are things that right now, quite frankly, are very difficult to get through the process. Not only Metro but in local jurisdictions, and other areas. And so encouraging, perhaps, the siting or utilization, of reload and may processing facilities that addresses the amount of material coming in and the amount of material going out and reduces the trips and there is low traffic.

Gilbert: There are some places where you have increased hauling costs, but we should also analyze at the same time, densities. Some of the places they not only increase hauling costs, but the densities, even though they are increased hauling costs, the densities don't justify any more consideration than they have right now, but the ones that do have the densities then those should be considered.

Keil: So really, its kind of a cost benefit analysis and I think you have to add transportation into that as well.

Miller: And what I am referring to, strictly private capital at risk, and it doesn't have an overall system impact because its a publicly owned and operated facility. So Metro does not absorb the cost, if any, of any of these systems going on-line. Yes, somebody could go broke doing it. But in the process, its not going to affect the rate payers overall, as if we decided on a large facility that was publicly operated and it wasn't necessary. Because that is going to add incrementally to the system cost.

Irvine: As you know transfer stations is near and dear to me. Looking at the numbers that Terry and the staff have come up with if the programs are successful, and I agree, I don't think another transfer station is necessary, based on these assumptions. If there are needs for additional capacity, I think you really should look at existing facilities, because I think you could probably modify those reload facilities, your processing facilities, and things of this nature at little or no cost to the system. And achieve that reduction in overloading at transfer stations both in tonnage and traffic. That's a low risk for Metro, and just take advantage of existing systems. I think that is really appropriate.

Petersen: Write your comments real quick and we will go on to the next one. I've got one more that I want to cover and then we will stop there and leave it open to any other questions. I want to talk about pg. 34.

Loreen Mills: I'm with City of Tigard and I just want to comment on the concern that there is no population in that area. The majority of the City of Tigard and the majority of the City of Beaverton is very densely populated, it is right in the middle of that bright green area. Out in the Scholls area, a very dense population, that area does, in fact, all of that Aloha, Beaverton corridor and Tigard is very, very, highly densely populated. I just want to make that clear.

Kvistad: Trust me, I let them know every day exactly where my district is.

Pg. 34. We had a program that addressed this adoption and implementation process and it reminds me of the board game that my daughter plays at home with all these little squares on it. I want to turn to page 34. What I'd like to do is get some feedback from you on what role you think this committee ought to play in the implementation of these alternatives. Remember the plan will have some recommended practices. Lets use an example: If Forest Grove, as an alternative, we are going to rely on back yard burning. Does this

committee want to have a chance to review those kind of major alternatives that are going to be implemented by the region? Or not? Should that be handled in another way? Or should staff try to bring back to this committee a reminder of here's what was recommended by Solid Waste Management Plan and this is what is being proposed by some City or County, as an alternative, does this committee agree with that, that it will be equivalent. I'm assuming the answer to this question is yes, that you'd like to have some -- for the major alternatives that are being implemented like that, you'd like to be able to have some say in some assessment of whether or not it is an equivalent practice. Is that right?

Gilbert: The name of the committee says it. The Solid Waste Committee. It can't be a committee unless it does that.

Kroen: I would prefer that staff handle the equivalency and if that can't be worked out, that possibly we would be involved in an appeal item process only. It seems to me that that is a staff issue to deal with.

Keil: Well, I thought that at an earlier part we said that it was the standard.

Kroen: Meeting the standard

Keil: Meeting the standard.

Kroen: So that should be quantifiable.

Keil: So you are predetermining on the front end that something is equivalent or not without regard to trying it.

Petersen: This is before implementation.

Keil: That's right.

Miller: I've got another question. If the jurisdiction implements a recommended practice, and it doesn't make the standard, then what do you do?

Petersen: Well, that was one of my other questions here. What role should the SWAC plan in that.

Miller: And then more to Jeanne's point, if we are going to have a recommended practice and if we are going to allow an equivalent, then we set the standard that says that's how you get there, but you have to get there. Then we have to be able to demonstrate our recommended practice will get there, because if it won't, then were poking something.

White: That seems to be the question. If you are going to recommend a practice, are we saying these are recommended and we're not even sure they can meet the task. It seems if you are going to recommend a practice, you should be pretty confident that this is pretty good. Otherwise, we will just have a whole list of options and you can basically choose your option and then someday we're going to see if we met the test. That's the question I asked the last subcommittee meeting. If we are saying its a recommended practice, isn't our collective wisdom and if we have any of that, that's a pretty good way to get where we want to go. and if there is an alternative, a 5% or 10% or 50% of the jurisdictions want to try the alternative or come up with their own, maybe they can come up with something in 5 years or 10 years from now that we haven't even thought of, then that's okay too, but we at least have to have some confidence on what we're recommending, otherwise why is the alternatives and recommended practices?:

Petersen: I think that you are right. We have enough confidence in the recommended practices to recommend them and estimate what there effect would be. I'm leaning towards Ralph. What I guess I'm basically doing as staff, is saying that staff would like to have some help in assessing the equivalency of these programs, and we've got a lot of wisdom around here. Now, Emilie, maybe there are some things



that are minor or can be worked out individually, but there is a lot of question when it comes down to it, even when we've gone out and we've tried to assess it. Is a bi-weekly yard debris program equivalent to a weekly, in terms of yard debris in the can. That's not an open and shut case. And there is some interpretation of data that has to take place. What I'd like to see is to be able to come back to the Advisory Committee with staff's work on those kind of things and have some feedback.

Kroen: Now, see I was picturing something different. Let's say our standard is that you have, I don't know, .03 yard debris left in your can. That's what's equivalent to Tualatin's program. Now, and so Tigard is going bi-weekly, and they are putting a lot more emphasis into education and promotion and they think they can meet that with their bi-weekly program and they come to you and say that by doing this, and this, and this, I can quantify what my expected result is going to be and it is going to be equal or better than the standard. It seems to me that if you believe -- if staff believes that those are logical assumptions and the way that its quantified makes sense, that you could say okay, go for it Tigard. It makes sense that you might be able to reach it the way your going about it. I don't think that we at SWAC need to be involved with that if you can come to some agreement. If you say well, those assumptions don't make a lot of sense, I thought you were talking about each of us coming to SWAC and selling all our individual alternative programs. I can't see that happening.

Kvistad: Well, you've got to remember too that we've got the policy decision that has to be made by the region. You know, the Council has go to make a policy decision, so we need to know where are the touch points. Because we're not going to be able to come in as 7 people on this. We have to rely on you to come up with a way for us to set a consistent policy that's not overly regulatory but gives us and allows us to set the standards to where everybody is working from the same page. Because that is where we are trying to get to when we go to implementation. So I guess that's what I am looking for as well as -- you know we're going to have to reach an equilibrium there. I don't know where it's going to be yet.

Keil: Terry, it strikes me, and a lot of this discussion goes back to that monitoring issue. We keep a lot of information on ourselves, sometimes to the chagrin of our haulers, so that we know how we are doing in particular aspects. And if we are lagging behind what our projection is in scrap paper, then we can goose that program. If we are lagging or are doing exceptionally well, then we can pull back on, for instance, contamination. That is one of the rubs we have with DEQ and send it out quarterly kind of thing, is that we have very little contamination. The customers have got it. They know what materials are there, they know how to do it and they are permanent day after day. So the monitoring kind of thing -- I am surprised that other jurisdictions, and maybe its just because were bigger and we can spend the time doing it, don't need that kind of information to manage their efforts, so maybe in the monitoring kind of deal -- there is some role that Metro could play relative to data that could be fed back to Tualatin or something where they don't collect it. So that they can fine-tune and meet that standard or can come in and make a case that says, okay, were not doing as much as regionally might happen in this scrap paper thing, but because we have a depot sited at our place that is pulling it out, but we are doing better in yard debris. So that you are looking at it in sort of a gross total overall kind of way that says we are contributing in this one and because of this, its not showing up in our numbers or some variation of that idea. Maybe it plays into that equation.

Petersen: Okay, write any comments that you have down there. That's the last question that I have that I want to address Councilor. Maybe during the last few minutes here you have some things that have not been brought up or comments.

Kvistad: I really appreciate everyone staying to go through all this material. This is going to be very very helpful.

Petersen: Please do leave the questionnaire on the table when you leave.

Kvistad: What you might want to do is to take the last page off -- which are extra comments and FAX them in to us so that you don't have to sit here and finish.

Petersen: 797-1797

Roy: You said now is the time to bring up other questions. Well, one of the things that I wanted to bring up was the recycling rate, let me find the right page -- page 17. The way that the Plan stands right now it gives us a recycling rate of 43% by the year 2005. That takes us back from our recycling goal that Metro has right now. It also would not get us to the State recycling goal of 50% by 2000. And also I'm just guessing that if our recycling level is going to be 40% by the end of 95 that only gives us three more points in the next 10 years, and for me, that's not enough and I would like to see this committee have the planning committee research some ways of increasing that.

Kvistad: Why don't you write that on the comments that you would like us to touch base on here, when you send it in and we will take those specifics and plug them into our work plan.

Kvistad: The next meeting: third Wed in April. April 19, 1995, 8:30, Room 370A/B.

clk

s:\kinn\swac\swac0315.sum