

Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
Meeting Minutes
March 22, 2000

Members/*Alternates Present

Councilor Ed Washington, Chair
David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association (at-large haulers)
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources, Inc. (disposal sites)
Lynne Storz, Washington County
Sarah Jo Chaplen, City of Hillsboro (Washington County cities)
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County
Mike Misovetz, Clackamas County citizen
Scott Bradley, Waste Management, Inc. (disposal sites)
Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal (Washington County haulers)
Steve Schwab, Sunset Garbage Collection (Clackamas County haulers)
Glenn Zimmerman, Wood Waste Reclamation (composters)
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling (disposal sites)
*Tam Driscoll, City of Gresham (East Multnomah County and cities)
Susan Keil, City of Portland
Joann Herrigel, City of Milwaukie (Clackamas County cities)

Non-Voting Members Present

Terry Petersen, REM
Kathy Kiwala, Clark County, Washington
Chris Taylor, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Guests/Metro

David Bragdon, Chair, Metro Council, Dist. 7	Douglas Anderson, REM
Rod Park, Metro Council, Dist. 1	Paul Ehinger, REM
Dean Kampfer, Waste Management	Maria Roberts, REM
Easton Cross, ESM Consulting	Leann Linson, REM
Dan Schooler, Columbia Resources	Roy Brower, REM
Ray Phelps, WRI	Steve Kraten, REM
Joe McKinney, Oregon City PW	Aaron Brondyke, REM
Tim Raphael, Celilo Group	Tom Chaimov, REM
Cherie Yasami, Finance, Metro	Meg Lynch, REM
John Houser, Sr. Analyst, Metro Council	Connie Kinney, REM
Tom Wyatt, Browning-Ferris Industries	

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Ralph Gilbert asked to have the February 23, 2000 minutes amended. Mr. Gilbert said that on page 7, Mr. Vince Gilbert is quoted as saying that "if Metro Central and South are not held to a 25% recovery, he is not sure we should impose of 50,000-ton cap on any new facility." Mr. Ralph Gilbert asked that the words "**is not** sure we should impose a 50,000-ton cap on the facility," be changed to ". . . **is** sure we should impose . . ."

Mr. Irvine would like the minutes amended to report he was present at the meeting.

Mr. Schwab would like the minutes to reflect that his alternate, Mr. Mike Borg, was present at the meeting.

It was moved and seconded that the February 23, 2000 minutes be approved with the above amendments. The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

REM Director's Updates

Mr. Petersen reminded SWAC members that the Operations Division and Engineering Division of REM had been combined during the search for a new REM Director. Mr. Petersen announced that Mr. Jim Watkins will continue to be the permanent manager of the combined divisions.

Mr. Petersen stated that he will be distributing a new REM organizational chart as soon as one can be put together.

Mr. Petersen announced that Mr. Aaron Brondyke, inspector for REM's facility regulation program has resigned to move to Vermont. Mr. Petersen thanked Aaron for the splendid job he has performed in getting the inspection program up and running. He said a recruitment for that position will begin shortly. Mr. Gilbert congratulated Aaron for the excellent job he has performed as the inspector for facility regulation, and wished him luck in his new endeavors.

Transfer Station Service Plan

Mr. Petersen stated that the agenda packet included some materials on issues that have arisen as the SWAC and SWAC Subcommittee have been examining the transfer station service plan. One of those issues is how Metro charges its taxes and fees. He said this is important because under Metro's current system, the fees and taxes are assessed "at the front door" (any waste coming into the facility). He said a decision must be made about whether this is a system we want to keep or change.

Mr. Petersen said that some of the Metro Councilors, particularly Councilor Park, believe that since Metro is assessing the service plan at this time, this might also be a good time to look at restructuring the excise tax system. Mr. Petersen said that Mr. Anderson will do a quick background on the current excise tax and fees system, followed by a presentation from Councilor Park, Councilor Bragdon and Councilor Washington.

Mr. Anderson used the assistance of some overhead projections (a copy of which is included with these minutes). He said that fee issues and where they are imposed is a major concern as we are moving through the transfer station service planning process.

He presented some slides to accompany his comments (see Attachment A). He said there are basically three rates Metro charges on solid waste. The Regional System Fee (the solid waste rate) of \$12.90 per ton is dedicated solely to solid waste programs and raised about \$15 million dollars per year for hazardous waste programs, waste reduction, etc. The second fee (the excise tax) is currently 8-1/2% of the transaction value (not a per-ton rate) and is levied on all waste. The excise tax raises about \$5.7 million annually from the solid waste portion of the system and

funds Metro's general government, e.g., the Metro Council.. The third fee is the tipping fee, a user charge at Metro transfer stations, which pays for direct disposal costs (operating the station, transporting and disposing of the waste). The tipping fee is currently \$62.50 per ton and includes the regional system fee (\$12.90 per ton) and the excise tax (at approximately \$5 per ton); other fees, such as the DEQ fee, are also included in the tipping fee.

Mr. Anderson gave examples of how the current excise tax per ton is applied at transfer stations, landfills and material recovery facilities, and how the amounts differ depending on what type of waste is being disposed (putrescible waste, mixed dry waste, processing residual waste).

Mr. Anderson said that some Metro Councilors have expressed concerns about the current excise tax and fee system. He said that when they look at the different effective rates for the same waste, the question of equity arises. He said that whenever inflation or deflation affects the tipping fee, the excise tax revenues move as well, because it is a tax on value. He said the concern is that the agency's revenues are not tied to the agency's needs; revenues rise and fall with the general inflation. He said it also appears that the agency is "rewarded" if recycling falls, i.e., if the region disposes (rather than recycles) more material, the agency gets more tax revenue.

Mr. Anderson said that Councilor Bragdon and Councilor Park would like to hear a reaction from SWAC to some suggested changes that would align the tax assessment more closely with policy goals. He said that the first suggestion is to set the agency's revenue needs in the Metro Code, rather than have the 8-1/2% set in the code. This will mean that the revenue is tied to agency needs and that revenues will not fluctuate based on the economy. Mr. Anderson said this means that if recycling rises (i.e., we get less waste at the transfer stations), the excise tax rate per ton would go up, thereby giving a proactive, positive price signal that would be in line with Metro's recycling goals.

Mr. White said he believes you have to deal with citizen perception that even though they are recycling more, they are paying more per ton for tax, even though more tax would not be paid on the whole, on a per-ton basis. He said he believes one must be aware this is a potential public relations situation that will have to be explained to the customers of the region.

Chair Washington said he would like to set a tone for the presentation that Councilor Park and Councilor Bragdon were about to make. He said that they have been working with staff, as well as other members of the REM Committee and other councilors, and have developed a creative approach for addressing Metro's tax system and the need to improve the region's recycling effort. He said they believe it is an idea worth pursuing.

He said that he and the other councilors deeply value the opinions of the SWAC's collective discussion and input concerning the proposal the councilors are about to make. He said that, in addition, their doors are always open to any of the members and concerned citizens who may want to discuss this proposal or any other ideas and/or opinions. He said that as valuable as SWAC input may be, he, the SWAC and the other members of the council must finally be responsive to the wishes of their bosses – the general public. He said they must be able to present a proposal that is simple, fair and provides a benefit that the general public can easily see and understand. He said the ultimate test is not whether the proposal is good for Metro, or the

companies or governments of the members of SWAC, but that it is good for the citizens of the regional community.

He said he believes the proposal has merit, but that the devil is in the details, and he looks forward to working out those details with members of the SWAC, staff, and members of the REM Committee and the full council. Chair Washington said that working together, he believes they can develop a proposal that can help jump start the region's recycling rate and provide stable funding to meet Metro's Charter-mandated responsibilities. He said this proposal is a change, but one that needs to happen. Chair Washington said he appreciates the work Councilor Park has devoted to this subject and knows that Councilor Park has talked with several of the members of SWAC and staff.

Councilor Park said he was trying to put a business perspective into this proposal that is intended to make the system work differently than he sees at present. He said he sees a lot of regulation put in place, but he does not see the purpose for some of it. He said all of us have seen changes in the solid waste industry, e.g., vertical integration. He said that recycling, reduction, reusing have become the watchwords for the region, and he knows that some of the business representatives at SWAC have businesses outside of Oregon, and they may not see the same push for waste reduction there. But that dissimilarity is one of the things that makes Oregon different, a difference he is proud of.

He said that it is fact that Metro needs money to accomplish its Charter-mandated functions, and 70% or better of that revenue comes from the activities of the solid waste industry. As the region moves toward its mandated goal of 52% recycling, Metro has a perceived disincentive, by some, because increased recycling will limit revenues to the agency. He said how do we both achieve the recycling goals we have set as a region and maintain the revenue that Metro needs to accomplish the other things Metro is charged to do? He said that Council, REM and legal counsel have developed the early stages of an ordinance to address both needs. He said it is interesting that as you move to try to make this a simpler process, the mechanics become a little more difficult.

He said, hopefully, the newly crafted ordinance will be read at the next Council meeting in April. He said the ordinance has several basic goals: 1) Most important in terms of the business sense, to move this into the budget process. He said that presently the rates are set according to a projected collection of waste in the region, then it goes into the budget, instead of determining what we need and thus what we should have in our tax. We want to provide additional tax incentives to encourage recycling. 2) To ensure that Metro's tax system does not hamper achieving our recycling goal, but actually acts to assist achieving our goal. 3) To provide funding for Metro's current Charter-mandated programs based on the Executive Officer's proposed budget. He said he wanted to assure everyone up front that this proposal is revenue-neutral. He said the part Metro needs to work out is how does this proposal affect the individual waste-handling facilities. 4) To provide a simple method of calculating the annual tax rate.

He said the context of the proposed ordinance is to convert the percentage to a per-ton tax. He said that to accomplish this, we need to establish a methodology of calculating the tax rate annually, based upon forecasts of solid waste tonnage and an aspirational percentage recycling

goal. He would like to set the initial tax rate for this fiscal year at a level that will be equal to the current percentage tax, which is about 5.05% per ton. He would like to put the amount raised in the ordinance and allow the amount to be increased by the Consumer Price Index, so that everyone will know when it will be increasing because it is indexed to inflation.

The initial amount will be \$5.7 million dollars, which is in the current budget. He said that if the amount exceeds the amount calculated under the ordinance (because we do not achieve the recycling goal and, thus, revenues are higher), all the excess funds will be placed in a special account and spending from this account will be subject to specific action by the Council. He perceives this to be a part of the budget process. He would like to establish a tax credit at recycling facilities sufficient to encourage additional recycling.

Councilor Park said he sees this as a two-step process. First, we need to disconnect the actual tonnage and percentages through the per-ton rate in order to get to the next step, which is to be innovative and creative on recycling and the other issues. He said that as long as we have this inherent conflict, it makes it very difficult for us to think out of the box, and he believes that is what will be required to help us get there.

Councilor Park asked for a discussion from the committee members.

Mr. Gilbert said that if he stayed "status quo," this will increase the money he will pay in excise tax, but if his business continues on course, his company will reduce the amount of waste he delivers to the landfilled considerably. He said if he is able to do that, Councilor Park's ordinance will actually be a help to him.

Mr. Irvine agreed with Chair Washington's remark that the devil was in the details, but conceptually he does not have any problem with the proposal. He especially liked the idea of setting, in the Metro Code, the amount of money needed to accomplish Metro's charter-mandated responsibilities.

Mr. Winterhalter said he agreed with Councilor Park. He said that conceptually he agreed, but also agreed with Chair Washington that the devil was in the details.

Ms. Keil said she likes the flat tax also and believes that waste going to the landfill, is just that, waste going to the landfill. She said the concept of providing some incentives to divert more is exactly what we are after and is consistent with the RSWMP. She said the predictability for Metro and the facility operators is beneficial.

Mr. White restated what he thought he understood. He said that it was his understanding that the solid waste program still resides within the tip fee. So when we talk about the excise tax, we are talking about funds for Metro's general government functions. So we would be involved in the budget process, but only on whether the agency should or shouldn't spend portions of that excise tax money on green spaces, or planning, or something outside the solid waste program? But we would not come in to say we think you should put more money into market development, or recycled materials, etc. He asked if that was correct.

Councilor Park said it could actually be either or both; for instance, if you believed the excise tax was actually injuring some programs you would like to see in solid waste.

Mr. Taylor said he would agree with what has previously been said that the idea of treating all waste going to a landfill equally for tax purposes is a good waste reduction incentive. He said he was appreciative of Councilor Park's effort to suggest this approach.

Ms. Herrigel asked Councilor Park if she understood correctly that he is proposing placing the per-ton rate in the ordinance? Councilor Park said he proposes putting the \$5.7 million dollars required to fund the budget in the ordinance.

Ms. Driscoll commented that presumably, every year, there would be a period of time to determine that dollar amount to be pulled into the ordinance, and that each year, there would be a process to assess the budget needs before determining a dollar amount.

Councilor Park replied that the dollar amount would begin at \$5.7 million, and would be tied to the CPI, so it could increase, theoretically, if needed.

Mr. Gilbert commented that you would not actually have to rework the ordinance every year. You have a base of \$5.7 million and add to it whatever the CPI is. He asked if that was correct.

Councilor Park said that was correct, unless the Council decided on a special project that needed funding above what the budget allowed.

Mr. Leichner said the flat tax has a lot of merit, but his concern is what the real impact on recycling would be. He said, essentially, if you use all of the money saved trying to remove that last bit of waste from the wasteshed, you have financially lost all of the incentive to recycle. In other words, if the residual goes down because now a recovery facility is at 26% or 28%, your rate per ton has to go up on that flat tax. He asked what if the flat tax goes up \$200 over the total residual. He said he would have to be convinced that is not going to happen.

Mr. Schwab said he believes in the flat tax also, but his concern is that Metro has other revenue sources that have a non-flat tax, and they will want one also. He said that if the zoo wanted to raise its gate fee by \$1.00, and it has to give seven cents to Metro as an excise tax, the zoo is naturally going to want to have the whole dollar, not just ninety-three cents.

He said you are affecting other facilities the same way you are affecting haulers and facility operators. In other words, any increase in the excise tax can't be kept by haulers or facility operators, because Metro is taking a percentage of the increase (or decrease). That is one issue. He said the other issue is that because he is on the Rate Review Committee, he has noticed that tonnage forecasts are sometimes good, but most usually low, so there is always a windfall. If you are talking about putting the overage aside, you will most likely have a lot of excess money set aside, and what are you going to do with it, and how do you get it out of the special fund? Mr. Schwab said he would like to see the rate reflect only the cost of service.

Ms. Kiwala asked where the recycling tax credit comes from. Councilor Park said it would come from the \$5.7 million, similar to the current system.

Mr. Petersen said Councilor Park is referring to the current credit that is in place for the regional system fee at the material recovery facilities, which can receive a credit (based on their recovery rate) against their payment of the regional system fee. The higher recovery they do, the more credit they receive, and the less they pay toward the regional system fee. He said the regional system fee pays for solid waste programs. He said in next year's budget, \$500,000 has been set aside for that credit program. He said he believed Councilor Park is suggesting a similar kind of mechanism for the tax that is assessed.

Councilor Park said he is looking at the curve, because he realizes the higher you go up the recovery ladder, the harder you have to work to remove the higher percentage tons, and that the lower hanging fruit is gone.

Mr. Zimmerman said he wants to tie into what Mr. Schwab said and asked if the \$5.7 million number was negotiable?

Councilor Park said that with the current proposed budget, the \$5.7 million figure was revenue-neutral.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to respond to some of the things that have been said that he disagrees with. He thinks that the stability issue is a red herring. He said under the current program, it is already subject to instability, and you can't actively project it. So he doesn't believe there is an argument against the proposed system, because it is certainly no worse than the current system. He also said that figures within the relative range of \$5 per ton are not going to have a discernable impact, at least on residential can rates. He said we all know that the cost of service, at least for residential, is relatively small, so unless that increases by an order of magnitude, he does not see the proposed approach driving people into illegal dumping activities. He said as far as what to do with the excess, should there be one, you could actually factor it into the next year's rate.

Mr. Phelps said that under the current rate, the solid waste programs are currently being funded, and the \$5.7 million is simply restating the programs Metro is currently providing. He says this tax is actually the old sound-bite test. You are taxing what is going into the landfill, and people like to tax "bad" things, like the polluter pays.

Ms. Keil said she would rather say (instead of taxing polluters) that we are taxing people who are properly disposing of their waste. But she agrees, an excise tax is currently being charged, so it is not an additional tax.

Councilor Park thanked the committee members for their positive discussions and suggestions, and said the Councilors would continue to work out the details with the legal department and REM staff. He said he is looking at a timeline near or after July, but that should not make any difference, because this is revenue neutral.

Councilor Bragdon commented that the intent of this program is to simplify the system, not have our revenue fluctuate with something that is not related to the agency's needs, and, at the same time, to promote the good things happening to our waste stream. He said that in terms of the schedule, it is pretty much as Councilor Park described; procedurally, it needs to be introduced in Council, and he as the Presiding Officer will send it back to the REM Committee. That committee will take as much time as necessary to work out the details. He said there is no reason to rush it.

Mr. White said that for the future, discussions should include questions (either under the present system or the one being proposed) about when the tax is paid, who collects it, and how do you avoid what may present itself as double taxing. He said he doesn't understand exactly when this tax will be collected under the current proposal.

Councilor Park said that, conceptually, you would theoretically want to go to the back door. Taken to its logical (but absurd) conclusion, whoever is disposing the last ton of garbage, would pay \$5.7 million dollars. He said that obviously that won't happen, but there would be the theory that as you continue to improve the region's recycling, you would have fewer tons to tax; consequently, the excise tax on those tons would go up, with the price pressure to go more toward recycling. He said those are the numbers they must deal with to see where it makes sense for the curves to break, and he is sure Mr. Anderson has some thoughts on that and will be a help in this process. The point is to drive the excise tax through economics toward recycling rather than through regulation, which is something we would like to avoid. He said he believes the industry would like to avoid regulation as well.

Ms. Keil said that just because there is more tonnage going in, we shouldn't assume that we have failed on our recycling efforts. She believes the economic vitality in the region has been chiefly responsible for that growth. There is still more that we can do, and she believes we are aiming at the right parts of the wastestream to do that. She said she believes it is important to remember that Metro may end up with excess dollars or more tons simply by virtue of a very healthy economy, and she would hope the committee would view that as a good thing.

Mr. Bradley said that he hesitated to ask the question, but how does the Metro Council know that the agency needs \$5.7 million in its budget to run its programs. Who determines that?

Chair Washington replied that the present Council was elected to set the policy, and the citizens of the region should exhibit a degree of trust. He said that based on their best estimate, the agency needs \$5.7 million. If anyone feels differently, his door is always open, and he welcomes your comments.

Councilor Park commented that observers should "trust, but verify," and that is what he would like to see the solid waste industry do – verify that Metro needs whatever monies the council decides it needs to accomplish its charter-mandated responsibilities. Councilor Park said he hopes the industry will become players in the budget process so there will be a better dialogue and so Council will be able to explain to the public what is happening. He said that because of inflation, excise tax rates will increase, but he hopes that by revising the process, the council will be able to explain why.

Chair Washington thanked the committee, the staff and the other councilors. He asked the committee members if they would be willing to come to a special SWAC meeting if the councilors could put together a proposal by that time. The special meeting (devoted solely to the excise tax) would be set for April 12th. The question was asked whether we would still meet for the regular April 19th date. Chair Washington replied we might not.

Mr. Anderson said a continuation of the discussion on the Transfer Station Service Plan would commence at the next regularly scheduled SWAC meeting.

Partnership Plan for Waste Reduction

Ms. Erickson distributed a short sheet stating the background of the plan, as well as comments from the public (see Attachment B). She said staff is requesting that SWAC recommend that the REM Committee approve the Partnership Plan for Waste Reduction.

Ms. Erickson said that the current fiscal year is the 10th year of the plan; the plan under consideration today for the 11th year (the 2000-01 fiscal year). The plan has been changed significantly, for several reasons, chief among them is what Metro and local government staff learned from last year's State-of-the-Plan Report, which suggested we are falling behind in recovery in three key areas – commercial, construction and demolition debris, and commercial organics. Ms. Erickson said the basic plan was expanded to include the three new initiatives. Ms. Erickson said three work teams formed in July of last year and looked at these issues and actually developed independent plans to deal with each of the three key areas. She said implementation of these plans is already underway.

Ms. Erickson said another part of the plan includes maintenance programs, which continue to need some level of support and maintenance. She said the plan also provides a small pool of grant funds for public agencies in the region to support that wouldn't otherwise be supported in either the new initiatives or the maintenance programs.

Ms. Erickson said inquiries as to interest in the plan process was sent to 450 interested parties, 61 of which responded affirmatively. Copies of the plan were sent to these individuals and comments were received from three of those individuals. She commented that none of the comments resulted in changes to the plan.

Ms. Erickson asked the committee for a discussion or affirmation of the plan to take the REM Committee in April.

Ms. Keil said she appreciated that the plan targeted the categories that will make a difference. She said she did not happen to write a comment indicating the plan was done just right, but in fact, she does think it is done just right and is very supportive of it.

Ms. Storz commented that she agreed with Ms. Keil, and said she wanted to commend staff on what was an extremely good process and involvement of all of the local government and Metro solid waste staff in producing this document. She said a lot of hard work and energy went into it

and would also like to thank Ms. Erickson and Ms. Lynch, as well as the whole staff, for their efforts.

Ms. Herrigel made a motion that the plan be forwarded to the REM Committee with the SWAC's approval that it be approved. Ms. Keil seconded that motion. The SWAC unanimously passed the motion.

There was no additional business and the meeting was adjourned.

CLK
S:\SHARE\Dept\SWAC\MINUTES\2000\0322SWAC.min

**Partnership Plan for Waste Reduction
Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee
March 22, 2000**

Action requested

REM staff request that the SWAC recommend approval of the Partnership Plan for Waste Reduction by the Metro Regional Environmental Management Committee.

Background

Each year since 1990, Metro staff and local government staff prepare a work plan for the region's waste reduction activities in the upcoming fiscal year. The plan is designed to provide a regional framework for programs to lend continuity throughout the region as well as to partner in our efforts to meet state requirements and work towards reaching regional goals.

The plan for the 2000-01 fiscal year has been significantly revised in response to slower-than-anticipated recovery rates in the region, to Council concerns about the focus of joint waste reduction efforts and to local government desires for simplified reporting requirements.

The new plan now includes three program areas: maintenance, targeted competitive grants, and new initiatives in commercial, construction and demolition debris, and organics recovery.

- *Maintenance* provides baseline support (on a per capita basis) for the foundation of regional recycling through a joint work plan and funding for established local and regional waste reduction and recycling programs. Reporting requirements by local governments are simplified.
- *Targeted competitive grants* supplement maintenance funding by helping local governments to target Regional Solid Waste Management Plan practices that are not addressed elsewhere and for which other sources of funding are not available, especially for "lagging" waste sectors. Local governments provide matching funds.
- *New initiatives in waste reduction* for the commercial, construction and demolition debris and organics sectors will receive increased focus. The State-of-the-Plan Report completed last year found that significant amounts of recoverable materials are present in those sectors and that recovery in these sectors was lagging. Three work groups, one group for each sector and comprised of Metro and local government staff, developed separate work plans for the 1999-2000, 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 fiscal years.

Public comment

Over 450 interested parties were solicited and offered the opportunity to comment on the plan. Sixty-one people from the original list expressed interest in reviewing the plan and its contents. Staff received comments from three people, all of whom responded favorably to the plan. Comments did elaborate on some elements of the new approach, but none were negative.

Council Review

On December 21, 1999 copies of the first draft of the plan were distributed to all Metro Councilors for their review and comment. No comments were received and the public input period was then initiated. The Council REM Committee will hold a work session on April 5 to review the plan and then will vote on April 19. Full Council is expected to vote on the plan April 27.

SWAC Review

REM Staff and local government partners are in need of your final review and approval to take with us to the Council REM Com work session.

**Year 11 Public Comment
March 2000**

The following comments on the Year 11 Plan (first draft) were received during the first round of public input due March 1, 2000.

Comment	Source	Response
1. Place more emphasis on multifamily dwellings. (tenants groups, property managers)	Citizen	The region has reached its goal of providing recycling services to 85% of multifamily units. Local governments and Metro continue to provide resources to multifamily complexes, and may consider some additional outreach in the coming year.
2. Promote vermiculture to multifamily residents, many who do not have room to compost food scraps otherwise.	Citizen	Local governments and Metro Recycling Information provide vermicomposting information including sources of supplies as well as do-it-yourself bin building instructions.
3. Develop a worm exchange to provide worms from overpopulated bins to new starter bins.	Citizen	While this is a novel idea, it is too specific and detailed for this plan. This plan is designed to provide a large-scale and broad-based planning framework. This would perhaps be better approached as a community-based initiative..
4. Educate the commercial sector via residential outreach (connect resident to their employment to motivate).	Citizen	The Commercial Work Team has been considering this very idea among others to design effective outreach for the commercial sector. A survey and focus group of businesses was conducted to help Metro and local governments tailor effective outreach methods. An outreach plan will be developed within the next six months.
5. Fund some fun waste reduction competitions to get motivation up.	Citizen	Metro and local governments employ a wide range of messages and methods with which to deliver these messages. We have had several fun reduce, reuse, recycle community outreach events and local jurisdictions provide creative outreach at County Fairs and other public events. Because people are motivated differently, we need to continue to vary our messages and methods.
6. Promote truth in packaging—reusables or refillables need to be actually so and sold side by side with the necessary parts.	Citizen	Metro hopes to have a market development staff person on board in fiscal year 2000-01 to help build markets and to look at other issues such as packaging and recycled products purchasing.
7. Recycling opportunities for “ordinary items” such as magazines, are not readily available to businesses.	Citizen	One of the goals of the Commercial Work Team in implementing the new commercial waste reduction initiatives in the Year 11 Plan is to ensure that all businesses have access to easy and convenient recycling for as many materials as possible.
8. There is a need for someone within each	Citizen	Very true. We try to influence this as much as possible, and local

<p>business to take a vested interest in recycling and making sure it is done. Keep this in mind when designing plans.</p>		<p>governments stress this when visiting businesses during waste evaluations. It is important that there be someone in the company who is either assigned to ensure the business' program works or who is interested in its success. It is ultimately up to the businesses to decide how much effort they are willing or able to devote to their programs, but we will continue to provide the information support needed.</p>
<p>9. Favor the use of fees, fines, whenever needed to change behavior, especially with businesses. May require this level of motivation to get results out of businesses.</p>	<p>Citizen</p>	<p>The region has intentionally chosen to emphasize cooperative compliance with regard to waste reduction and recycling programs. The City of Portland however, has mandated that all businesses recycle. The Commercial and Construction & Demolition Debris Work Teams may consider the selective use of disposal bans for particular materials. This is a new area, but it is not beyond the realm of consideration.</p>
<p>10. Interested in the extent of public involvement will be involved in plan implementation?</p>	<p>MCCI</p>	<p>There are opportunities for public involvement throughout the planning and implementation of this framework. Not only do we have public input into the framework itself, but each local jurisdiction carries their implementation plans through public hearings at their Councils and Boards before they are approved and implemented.</p>
<p>11. How will applicants for the targeted competitive grant be chosen?</p>	<p>MCCI</p>	<p>The applicants are chosen based upon the criteria set forth in the competitive grant application form.</p>
<p>12. Is there a need to include citizens not connected to any agency on the special work teams for the new initiatives?</p>	<p>MCCI</p>	<p>Not on a regular basis at this time. All of the teams have invited either industry groups or others into the planning process on occasion to lend assistance. However, due to the specific nature of the plans, it is important that those involved have knowledge or expertise in the particular areas of commercial recycling, construction & demolition debris, and organic wastes.</p>
<p>13. What does "politically acceptable" mean (p.36-Commercial Task Force Objectives and Processes)?</p>	<p>MCCI</p>	<p>"Politically acceptable" was the criterion used to assess the level of support for a specific recommendation by affected stakeholders, such as local government, Metro, businesses and waste haulers.</p>
<p>14. The easiest goal to attain the commercial sector plan would be a massive effort focused on the use of both sides of printed material.</p>	<p>MCCI</p>	<p>The Commercial Recovery Work Team did not select the specific materials or activities that would be the focus of a waste prevention campaign. However, double-sided copying and reusable transport packaging are two activities that were specifically mentioned by the several task force members to be included in the selection process.</p>

15. Cost projections for the new initiatives are listed, but are the funds adequate?	MCCI	At this point, we feel that the funds are adequate. Once budgets have been finalized we will know what funds are available. Cost projections will be adjusted as we implement the programs and learn more about the financial resources required.
16. Information on waste prevention should be aimed at the public in general.	MCCI	The region has implemented several general public outreach campaigns about waste prevention. We have found that people do not often differentiate between recycling and waste prevention activities, so approaches to promotion must be carefully crafted. We intend to continue to promote waste prevention to the general public in a variety of ways.
17. Promotion of commingling will need a large public outreach for acceptance.	MCCI	Our studies so far tell us that commingling has received general acceptance. There is always a period of time that is necessary for people to adjust to new practices and methods and local governments and Metro have provided printed materials and radio ads to help ease the transition and reduce the level of confusion any new program can bring.
18. The tremendous amount of work in this plan is greatly appreciated.	MCCI	Thank you! We appreciate your support and interest.
19. Is this document to be considered a public involvement plan?	MCCI	No. This document is a framework plan for program design and implementation. The plan does, however have a public input component; one in which you are currently participating.
20. Delighted to see that usable food waste will go to the needy people in the community first.	Citizen	Yes, we are pleased as well that our partnerships with non-profit food assistance programs such as the Oregon Food Bank are helping us to move usable food to those who need it before considering some other sort of processing option.
21. Pleased that we will be prioritizing C&D as a source of waste reduction (sees lots of dumpsters being hauled from construction sites).	Citizen	C&D has been a tough nut to crack, especially with the region's amazing building boom over the last few years. It is important for us to target these recoverable waste streams.

Three Metro Rates on Solid Waste

Regional System Fee

- **Levied on all waste**
- **Funds solid waste programs (haz. waste, etc.)**
- **\$12.90 per ton**
- **Raises ~\$15 million**

Metro Excise Tax

- **Levied on all waste**
- **Funds Metro general government (Council, etc.)**
- **8½% of transaction value**
- **Raises ~\$5.7 million from solid waste**

Metro Tip Fee

- **Charged at Metro stations only**
- **Pays for direct disposal costs**
- **\$62.50 per ton**
- **Includes:**
 - ◆ **Regional system Fee (\$12.90)**
 - ◆ **Excise Tax (\$5.00)**

Application of Excise Tax Two Examples

Landfill A Tip fee \$30 per ton

- **10 ton load @ \$30/ton = \$300**
- **8½% of \$300 = \$25.50 excise tax**
- **Effective rate: \$2.55 per ton**

Landfill B Tip fee \$40 per ton

- **10 ton load @ \$40/ton = \$400**
- **8½% of \$400 = \$34.00 excise tax**
- **Effective rate: \$3.40 per ton**

Current Excise Tax Effective Rates Per Ton

Transfer Stations \$5.05 per ton (putrescible waste)

- ◆ Metro Central
- ◆ Metro South
- ◆ Forest Grove
- ◆ non-system licensees
- ◆ Pride
- ◆ Recycle America
- ◆ WRI

Landfills \$3.83 per ton (mixed dry waste)

- ◆ Columbia Ridge
- ◆ Finley Buttes
- ◆ Roosevelt
- ◆ Hillsboro
- ◆ Lakeside
- ◆ non-system licensees

Material Recovery Facilities \$2.28 per ton (processing residual)

- ◆ ECR
- ◆ Wastech
- ◆ non-system licensees
- ◆ Pride
- ◆ Recycle America
- ◆ WRI

Current Excise Tax

Currently, 8.5%, set in Metro Code

Council's concerns:

- **Different rates for the same waste**
(Is this equitable? What's the policy?)
- **Tax revenue automatically rises with tip fee**
(Revenues not tied to needs)
- **Tax revenue is “rewarded” if recycling falls**
(Tax policy is not aligned with recovery goals)

Excise Tax Option

Set revenue needs in Metro Code

Rate:

- **Same rate for all waste**
- **Tax rate set to raise set revenue**
(Revenue tied to needs)
- **Tax rate rises if recycling rises**
(Provides positive price signal;
Amount of tax revenue does not change.)