

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF MEETING OF June 21, 1995

MEMBERS

Ken Spiegel, Clackamas County	Susan Ziolko
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources	Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste Systems
David White, ORRA	Jeanne Roy, Citizen
Lexus E. Johnson, Oregon Hydrocarbon	Steve Schwab, CCRRA
Tom Miller, Wash. County Haulers	Steve Miesen, BFI
Jim Cozzetto, Jr., MDC	Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
Dave Kunz, DEQ	Lynda Kotta, East County Cities
Lynne Storz, Washington County	Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers

GUESTS

Bob Martin	Keri Painter, Columbia Resource Co.
Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.	Debra Fromdahl, Sanifill, N.W.
Ray Phelps, OWSI	

METRO

Jon Kvistad, SWAC Chair	Marie Nelson
Ruth McFarland, Metro Council Chair	Jennifer Ness
Debbie Gorham	Deborah Adams
Doug Anderson	

1. Approval of May 17, 1995 Minutes - Action Item

Jeanne Roy requested that page 3, paragraph 5, first sentence, be amended to read: "Ms. Roy did not think that staff had not-fully evaluated the estimated cost and tonnage impacts of practices described in the draft as "additional key elements." The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

2. Updates and Introductions

Lex Johnson introduced Ed Keenen to the Committee. Mr. Johnson announced that Oregon Hydrocarbon had reorganized and merged management of its Tacoma and Portland facilities. Mr. Keenen would manage the two facilities and Mr. Johnson would serve as a consultant to the organization during the next year before retiring.

Terry Petersen reported the Metro Solid Waste Department was undergoing reorganization. Sam Chandler, former Operations Division Manager had resigned. Rather than hire a new Operations Manager, the operations functions would be assumed by existing managers. Reorganization decisions will be announced at the July SWAC meeting, he said.

3. Multi-Family and Status Report

Jennifer Ness, Metro Solid Waste Planner, reviewed highlights of a printed summary which had been included in the agenda packet. She explained that the region's goal to implement recycling systems for 85% of the region's multifamily complexes was ambitious. Because of continued population increases and more complexes being built, the region had fallen short of that goal. Although the region is currently at 70% completion, a few jurisdictions had already exceeded the 85% goal. She explained the 1996 goal was a more realistic assessment would allow local governments and waste haulers to catch up with the backlog. The region's future plans were consistent with SWAC's Regional Solid Waste Management Plan recommendations, she said.

4. Yard Debris Waste Reduction - Status Report

Jim Goddard, Recycling Manager, presented highlights of a written report entitled "Analysis of Yard Debris Recycling System." One of the report's significant findings was that the region's rate of yard debris disposal had decreased significantly since 1987 and that the region had met the 1993 goals of the Yard Debris Recycling Plan. He pointed out that the new 1995-2005 Regional Solid Waste Plan (RSWMP), currently being developed by SWAC, would replace the former RSWMP, of which the Yard Debris Recycling Plan was a part.

Goddard explained that an estimated 47,000 tons of yard debris a year is still disposed. Much of this waste is disposed by self-haulers and through residential drop-box activity. Programs will be designed to divert this yard debris from disposal. Overall, he said the benchmark will be to divert 17,000 tons of yard debris from disposal by the year 2000.

Ms. Roy was concerned that yard debris disposal tonnage in the draft RSWMP were not consistent with the figures used in the Yard Debris Waste Reduction Status Report. Mr. Goddard and staff analyst Deborah Adams explained that the RSWMP tables would be adjusted to reflect an update to Metro's Waste Characterization Study analysis. The two documents would then be consistent.

Ms. Roy supported staff's proposal to develop waste diversion and recycling programs for residential self-haulers. Mr. Goddard said a work group would be formed to determine an action plan. The work group would be represented by the appropriate local governments, waste haulers, processors, and other parties. Ms. Roy said she also wanted to propose some language changes in the report. She and Mr. Goddard agreed to meet to work out these changes.

5. Licensing of Yard Debris Processors - Action Item

Bill Metzler, Solid Waste Planner, presented the recommendations of a regional work group of yard debris processors, local government representatives and others.

- Metro implement a licensing program for new and existing facilities, with a process to ensure coordination and problem solving with processors and local governments.
- Local governments amend zoning ordinances and development codes as needed to: 1) include clear and objective zoning standards; 2) require facilities to have a Metro license as a condition of land use approval; and 3) amend collection franchises to ensure that yard debris collected at curbside is delivered to only licensed facilities.

Mr. Metzler explained that Metro was asked by some local governments and processors to help develop effective, region-wide solutions for managing facility siting and operational concerns. The regional work group investigated various management options and after exploring a local government model ordinance approach, the group concluded that the licensing program would be the most effective option.

Lynne Storz relayed the concerns of Washington County about directing haulers to specific licensed facilities. She also indicated that the county nuisance control program could resolve potential issues relating to facility odor problems

Sue Kiel asked about the relationship of the licensing proposal to the yard debris product quality standards program. Mr. Metzler explained that currently they are separate issues. The licensing program deals primarily with operational issues that influence the physical impacts of facilities. The product quality program is now voluntary, but may be folded into the licensing program.

The proposed annual licensing fee of \$300 was discussed and it was suggested that this amount would not be sufficient to administer the program.

Todd Sadlo discussed the licensing standards dealing with enforcement, financial assurance and indemnification. He explained the language similar to existing Metro Code language for facility franchising. He would consider proposing some modifications to these Code sections at the request of the regional work group.

Lynn Storz asked who would enforce the standards, and under what authority. Mr. Sadlo explained that the Metro Code was the authority and that Metro Solid Waste Enforcement Unit could be part of the process, if required, and that the.

Mr. Johnson thought that licensing was not the right term, rather it should be a franchise. Discussion followed about the differences between franchising and licensing yard debris processing facilities.

Sue Kiel suggested the work group focus on the end product, not the process. She expressed concern about too many layers of government, given that local government, DEQ and OSHA would all be involved in regulating the processors..

Dave Kunz explained that the DEQ dealt with odor issues on a complaint basis, and that currently, there was no funding for further DEQ involvement in managing these types of facilities.

Ken Spiegel discussed the siting and facility concerns in Clackamas County. The public wanted further assurances that facilities be managed appropriately, he said. The County asked for Metro's help and supported the licensing approach.

Further discussions included the need to complete the licensing standards sections that are under revision and to clarify program costs and administration procedures.

The licensing program proposal was tabled until SWAC's concerns were addressed, including revisions to the unfinished sections. Mr. Metzler thanked the committee for their comments and, and he would return with the necessary revisions.

6. Survey of 1,000 Households Regarding Recycling, Disposal, and Other Solid Waste Practices - Status Report

Deborah Adams, Solid Waste Analyst, reviewed highlights of a written report on the results of a recent telephone survey conducted by Metro. The survey objectives were to:

- Solicit opinions from a broad cross-section of the region's citizens, particularly those not normally involved in solid waste issues;
- Receive feedback on general questions relating to Metro's current update of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan;
- Compare the results from a previous survey completed in 1990; and
- Gather information that would be helpful in designing education and promotion programs.

Highlights of survey results included: 86% of those responding said they used residential curbside recycling collection programs regularly or periodically; Only 6% reported to dispose of yard debris with regular garbage compared to 28% in 1990; 92% of the responding households said they subscribed to garbage and recycling collection services; 43% said they had used Metro's household hazardous waste disposal sites or collection events at least once; and 54% said they would support an advance disposal fee to help support the cost of household hazardous waste management.

7. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan - Action Item

Marie Nelson, Solid Waste Planning Supervisor, summarized the actions requested of SWAC at this meeting:

- Review the May 17, 1995, "Discussion Draft" of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) and make revisions as necessary;
- Release a "Preliminary Draft" RSWMP for public review and comment;
- Instruct staff to return to the SWAC on July 19 with the Preliminary Draft RSWMP and to provide an additional opportunity for SWAC to revise the draft based on public comments received through early July.

Ms. Nelson then reviewed changes that staff and SWAC members had requested be made to the draft RSWMP (based on review of the May 17 Discussion Draft):

Page 5-4

Goal 5, Performance

Add the words "on an annual basis" back into the sentence.

Performance will be compared annually to measurable benchmarks, although not all measurement studies will be conducted annually.

Page 7-21

2nd bullet, Key Elements of Alternative Practices

Delete the second sentence.

The example proposed to be deleted could be perceived as favoring dry waste processing over source separation. No disposal fee break has been proposed for recyclers, for example.

Page 7-22

2nd bullet, Roles and Responsibilities, 3rd paragraph

Change the last sentence to read: "Metro will consider what public actions might be taken to pursue RSWMP goals ~~arrange for or directly provide more processing service.~~

This language is consistent with page 7-17, 3rd bullet, 3rd paragraph.

Page 7-24

2nd bullet, Key Elements of the Recommended Practices

Delete paragraph a)

Paragraph a) is redundant and not necessary. Paragraph b) addresses the development of performance standards.

Page 7-25

1st paragraph, item 5

Delete the words "moved to next page."

The sentence was not moved to the next page. Rather, the concept was reworked and included on page 7-25, item e).

Page 7-27

4. Reload Facilities, Key Concept and Approach

Change the first sentence to read: "The recommended practice is to allow the siting of reload facilities for consolidation of loads hauled ~~sited, owned and operated by haulers for hauling~~ to appropriate disposal facilities."

Since Metro will review proposals to site reload facilities on a case-by-case basis (see item b) below), the key concept should not be worded to place arbitrary restrictions on siting.

Pages 7-8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, and 21

Bullets titled "Key Elements of Alternative Practices"

The last sentence of each "Alternative Practices" section should be dropped. This sentence, wherever it appears in Chapter 7, should now read: "Other alternative practices may be adopted that achieve the same performance as the recommended practices. ~~See Chapter 8, "Monitoring the Plan," for expected performance in terms of tons of waste disposed.~~"

This paragraph confused two issues. It was intended to say that alternative practices should meet the same performance standards as recommended practices. However, Chapter 8 addresses how to monitor the system, not how to establish the equivalence of recommended practices and alternatives.

SWAC agreed to all the above language changes. In addition to the above changes, the following amendments were made to the document:

Page 5-4

Objective 3.3 should be changed to read: "After consideration of technical and economic feasibility, Metro ~~and local governments will~~ support a higher system cost for waste reduction practices to accomplish the regional waste reduction and recycling goals.

Lynne Storz recalled that at an earlier SWAC Planning Subcommittee, it had been agreed to delete the "local government" reference from this objective. Staff concurred.

Page 7-2 and 7-3

Last bullet, last sentence, change to read: "Practices that would likely be more costly in the current system, such as the collection of residential food waste, are included as recommendations contingent on ~~the future development of new techniques that would reduce the costs of the practice~~ cost effective collection and processing techniques.

Jeanne Roy proposed this amendment.

Page 7-7

First bullet, first paragraph, last sentence, change to read: "The media efforts will be patterned on current recycling campaigns ~~with inventive story lines~~ and will use radio, television, and print media."

Lynda Kotta proposed this amendment in order to simplify the description of the recommended practice.

Page 7-22

First bullet, item (e), key element to the recommended practice of developing dry waste processing facilities: add a new paragraph describing Metro's current policy on vertical integration.

There was considerable discussion about whether SWAC should deliberate what Metro's policy on vertical integration should actually be in this context and forward that recommendation to the Executive Officer as part of the draft RSWMP. However, due to time constraints, SWAC decided not amend item (e) at this time but to add a

new sentence that would clearly state the current Metro policy on vertical integration. Staff acknowledge that SWAC would participate in the deliberation process when Metro revisited its current vertical integration policy.

Page 7-23

Item 1, Yard debris processing system: replace all references in this section to "licensing" with the words "franchising or otherwise authorizing."

This amendment was proposed by Doug Coenen because SWAC had not yet decided to recommend whether yard debris processors should be licensed.

Page 7-31

First bullet, "Key Concepts," changed to read: "Household hazardous waste collection services are expensive to provide. The minimum \$5 handling fee currently charged at the two permanent facilities covers a small portion of operating costs. ~~As disposal fee revenues decrease due to effective waste reduction and recycling programs, new revenue sources must be secured to pay for HHW collection. Costs have been paid primarily by all garbage generators through disposal fees. A more appropriate source of funds would be from those who purchase the hazardous products.~~"

Amendments to this section were proposed by both Jeanne Roy and Lynne Storz to more accurately describe the key concept.

SWAC voted to accept the revisions described above. The revisions were unanimously accepted. SWAC then voted unanimously to instruct staff to incorporate these revisions into the May 17 "Discussion Draft" RSWMP and to release a "Preliminary Draft" RSWMP for public review and comment.

8. Other Business/Citizen Communications

None.

9. Adjourn

There being no further business, Chair Kvistad adjourned the meeting. The next SWAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 19, 8:30 a.m.