

**Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**  
Meeting Minutes  
April 19, 2000

**Members / \* Alternates**

Councilor Ed Washington, Chair  
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling (disposal sites)  
David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association (at-large haulers)  
Steve Schwab, Sunset Garbage Collection (Clackamas County haulers)  
John Lucini, SP Newsprint (recycling end users)  
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources, Inc. (disposal sites)  
Tanya Schaefer, Multnomah County citizen  
JoAnn Herrigel, City of Milwaukie (Clackamas County cities)  
Susan Keil, City of Portland  
Dave Hamilton, Norris & Stevens (business ratepayers)  
Mike Misovetz, Clackamas County citizen  
\*Kent Inman, Columbia Resource Co. (composters)  
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers (recycling facilities)  
Sarah Jo Chaplen, City of Hillsboro (Washington County cities)  
Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal (Washington County haulers)  
Tom Brewer, Tanasacres Nursery (business ratepayers)  
Lynne Storz, Washington County  
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County  
\*Tam Driscoll, City of Gresham (East Multnomah County and cities)  
Mike Miller, Gresham Sanitary Service, Multnomah County haulers  
\*Dean Kampf, Waste Management (disposal sites)

**Non-voting Members Present**

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

**Guests/Metro**

Doug Anderson, REM	Kathleen McFarlane, McFarlane's Bark
Bill Metzler, REM	Easton Cross, Easton Cross Consulting
Meg Lynch, REM	Doug Drennen, DCS
Roy Brower, REM	Vince Gilbert, East County Recycling
Chuck Geyer, REM	Adam Winston, Waste Management
Steve Kraten, REM	Todd Irvine, Willamette Resources
Tim Raphael, Celilo Group	Connie Kinney, Metro

Chair Washington called the meeting to order. He announced that he had to leave the meeting at 9:15 a.m. and would ask one of the SWAC members to chair the remainder of the meeting. SWAC members, alternates and attendees introduced themselves.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Gilbert made a motion to approve the minutes of March 22, 2000; the motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Chair Washington introduced the two new members representing business ratepayers to SWAC – Tom Brewer and Dave Hamilton – and reintroduced Tanya Schaefer, who represents Multnomah County citizens.

### **REM Director's Update**

Mr. Petersen thanked everyone for taking the time to serve on the committee. Council is looking at the proposed budget for the 2000-2001 fiscal year. On April 27, the full Metro Council will take up the budget. REM has proposed an expansion in our hazardous waste programs. The Council has asked that the region be very aggressive in waste reduction, especially in the fields of commercial, commercial organics and construction and demolition debris recovery.

Mr. Petersen said he has a completed REM organizational chart, which will be distributed before the end of the meeting.

Chair Washington said he appreciated the effort of putting together an organizational chart, and was sure that when there are changes, it will be updated for SWAC members and alternates.

### **Transfer Station Service Plan**

Mr. Petersen gave a short introduction to the project. He said a SWAC subcommittee has been putting together a plan for dealing with the region's underserved areas. Metro currently has two facilities: Metro South and Metro Central. In addition, there is a privately owned transfer station in Forest Grove.

The subcommittee has determined the region does need additional facilities for the region's underserved areas. A plan has been formulated on the criteria to be used to evaluate new transfer stations. This type of information would allow Council to assess any application to create a new facility within the region against a set of criteria that would apply to all applicants. It was noted that the RSWMP currently states there will be no new transfer stations.

Mr. Petersen then introduced Bill Metzler, the subcommittee project coordinator who in turn introduced each of the subcommittee members and thanked them for their hard work and diligence in developing the Transfer Station Service Plan:

Jeff Murray  
Vince Gilbert  
Tom Wyatt  
Merle Irvine  
David White

Dean Kampfer  
Susan Keil  
Rick Winterhalter  
Lynne Storz

Mr. Metzler described the recommendation of the subcommittee to the Council for proposed code amendments, as well as criteria for evaluating new transfer station applications. He said he would describe some of the recommendations and criteria and would come back to SWAC on May 17, unless the committee is ready to approve today. As it is scheduled currently, the first reading to Council would be June 8, and then on to REM Com June 21, for a final Council hearing June 29.

Chair Washington asked for extensive discussion of this project. He stated it was his hope that staff will make an effort to discuss the proposed changes in public hearings in all three counties: Washington, Clackamas and Multnomah.

Mr. Metzler said that the subcommittee tried to set up framework and criteria so that applications for new transfer stations can be assessed fairly. Some of the criteria included: Does the region need new transfer stations; what are their obligations; where should they be located; and what services would they provide? The subcommittee recommends that Metro authorize new transfer station(s), with material recovery standards, where they provide a net benefit to the regional solid waste system. Such a new transfer station or stations should:

- Provide a full range of public services.
- Continue existing requirements.
- Accept all customers.
- Accommodate HHW collection events.
- Provide a recycling drop site.
- Achieve a minimum material recovery rate of 25%.

Existing materials recovery facilities and direct haul facilities would be required to meeting the minimum 25% material recovery rate.

Mr. Metzler says these changes would mean:

- More full service transfer stations will serve the Metro region.
- Tonnage will flow away from Metro transfer stations.
- Metro unit costs will go up \$1 - \$2 per ton, (depending on the assumptions).
- A planning level system cost analysis shows a system savings of \$1,282,000 if two new regional transfer stations are authorized. (Note: On-route savings are not considered in the calculation, therefore the analysis may be conservative.)

Mr. Vince Gilbert asked what the system savings are and if those savings will be rebated to paying customers?

Mr. Lucini asked whether the cost analysis reflects increased material recovery.  
Mr. Metzler said it was.

Mr. Metzler continued with his presentation. Applicants would have to meet Metro Code requirements, including but not limited to:

- Demonstrating consistency with the RSWMP.
- Meeting all standards required of transfer stations (e.g., Metro Code, administrative rules, performance standards, franchise agreement requirements, state and federal laws, and land use approvals).

The recommendations set up a process for Metro to accept and evaluate applications for new transfer stations in the region.

Remaining issues include:

- Enforcement method for the 25% recovery rate.
- Financial penalties: Fines, disposal surcharge, others.
- Regulatory penalties: Restriction or revocation of the franchise.

Ms. Storz asked if there is a provision in the plan requiring that the Metro code stipulate uniform rates throughout the region? Mr. Metzler replied that he believes it talks about non-discriminatory rates. Mr. Anderson stated there was nothing in the current code about a uniform tip fee. Metro has a long-standing policy, but nothing that Metro enforces.

Ms. Storz said she has a concern that facilities may charge different haulers different prices for the same materials.

Mr. Vince Gilbert said he would like to hear some discussion on what the SWAC feels about a minimum recovery rate of 25%. He said he is still concerned about the level of system savings the consultant came up with.

Ms. Keil said that local governments set rates, using a variety of components. If hauler costs go down, it will be reflected in the rates. She said local governments have enough of an audit trail back through the hauler records that we are clear about the cost associated with distance of transfer stations and waiting times and other things going into the decision of new transfer stations. We will see a change in Lynne Storz's area and Ralph Gilbert's area.

Mr. Vince Gilbert said it was his opinion that the minimum 25% recovery recommended is quite low. He said that currently WRI is the closest to the type of facility we are discussing. He would like to keep the bar as high as possible to encourage innovation.

Mr. Winston (from the gallery) stated that higher recovery requires a lot of innovation. He said he believes that we need to move forward and that 25% is a fair number at this time.

Mr. Ralph Gilbert stated that the 25% minimum recovery is very achievable, and, in fact, his facility is heading toward 50% already. As for source-separated materials: cardboard is as high as it has ever been, and in municipal solid waste loads, we are seeing more cardboard than we ever have. It is not coming in as source-separated.

Ms. Kiwala asked if a 25% recovery rate is achievable with floor picking or if a facility needs a more sophisticated sorting system. Mr. Ralph Gilbert says floor picking can achieve 25% recovery.

Ms. Keil stated that 25% is reasonable as a minimum. The rate structure is an interlocking issue with this. The incentives, both on excise tax rebate and system savings are enough to keep recycling moving forward. She said she believes it is wise to have serious sanctions such as losing a franchise or a license for not meeting the 25% minimum. The recovery rate needs a good reporting and measurement system.

Mr. Kampfer stated the minimum percentage rate is critical. The minimum has a larger impact on source-separated, upstream collections. He said his company will be picky on what loads come into their facility. The tip fee will have to adjust with the leaner loads.

Mr. Drennen asked if the 25% applies to all nonputrescible waste? He asked what if more co-mingling occurs? Mr. Anderson replied that whether it is co-mingled or divided into categories, it is still nonputrescible. If changes need to be made, Metro will revisit that.

Mr. Taylor stated that the language says facilities will have to take all waste, so how could one facility choose not to accept certain loads? Mr. Kampfer said the facilities could price their tip fee based on what the load looks like. Mr. Ralph Gilbert said that he has no control over the types of loads that come in and that it's not a problem.

Ms. Keil said that the hauler is, in effect, a consultant to commercial customers to help them choose the most effective combination of disposal and recovery and to guide them toward recovery options.

Mr. Leichner said that 25% is an acceptable number to start with. He said that originally, material recovery facilities had to reach 45% recovery, but it became more difficult to reach that percentage. The Regional System Fee Credit program was an incentive to reach the higher percentages. He believes expanding beyond the 25% at the onset may be a problem.

Ms. Herrigel asked whether public facilities must also meet the 25%? Mr. Anderson said they were not subject to that requirement. Ms. Herrigel said they should be.

Mr. Lucini said that he assumes that setting the minimum recovery at 25% is to increase recovery. Where is the region now? Will the suggested changes increase recovery, maintain the status quo, or prevent backsliding? Mr. Anderson said that the region's facilities are all over the map; some are doing less than 25%, some are doing more. WRI is at 40%, East County Recycling at 40%-50%. Maybe the public facilities need to raise their recycling activity.

Mr. Hamilton stated that it appeared as if we are looking at individual scenarios of the segment. He believes we need to look at the picture as a whole.

Ms. Keil said that Mr. Hamilton's point was valid. As businesses get better at source separation, there is less to recover.

Ms. Driscoll (named chair for the remainder of the meeting) asked whether SWAC members agree that the 25% is a good figure?

Mr. Taylor asked if the 25% should be for all facilities?

Ms. Driscoll repeated the question: Should it apply to all facilities? Should it be 25%?

Ms. Keil introduced a motion that 25% recovery be the minimum recovery required under the transfer station plan. Mike Leichner seconded the motion. The Committee unanimously passed Ms. Keil's motion that there be a 25% minimum recovery required under the Transfer Station Service Plan.

Ms. Herrigel asked if the 25% recovery rate be applied to both public and private (existing) facilities, basically all facilities?

Mr. Cross (from the gallery), asked if it was alright if the public facilities have the same rate for all loads?

Ms. Keil stated that she would like to hear from the operations people and Mr. Petersen on the ability to do that and what modifications or capital investment will be necessary in order to reach the 25% minimum recovery rate.

Mr. Cross asked why they think it important to have a differential rate in order to achieve 25%? He said that because Metro facilities get the loads with very low recovery potential, they lack the ability to compete financially. There has to be a level playing field.

Mr. Petersen acknowledged that Metro facilities accept all comers. Metro does get less recoverable loads than Willamette Resources. He said he thinks the 25% is probably achievable. We are close at Metro Central, and improvements are being made at South; he is optimistic we will be able to get to 25%. The bigger issue is the Forest Grove facility.

Mr. Kampfer stated that one has to look at where the Forest Grove transfer station sits relative to the community, what its purpose and niche was. The facility design is such that significant recovery may not be achievable. The land use application that the facility was built under is different. It would be a potentially negative impact.

Mr. White asked if the Metro facilities have a rate for wood; if so, does it attract more material?

Mr. Petersen stated that after talking to its customers, Metro instituted a differential rate of \$38 per ton for clean wood and yard debris; other waste is \$62.50 per ton.

Mr. Winterhalter agreed that public facilities should meet the 25% minimum recovery rate.

Mr. Vince Gilbert said that there are going to be facilities that fail to meet the recovery requirements, so what happens if Metro South doesn't make the 25%? Mr. Petersen said that Metro South obviously wouldn't stop operating, but he was unsure how failure to meet the recovery rate would be enforced against a public facility.

Mr. Petersen commented that the committee needed an implementation schedule. He said that as it now stands, Mr. Metzler has put forth a very aggressive time schedule, and that we may be unable to meet it.

Mr. Taylor suggested, that for Metro facilities, maybe some of the savings that Mr. Metzler described could go into facility upgrades. He asked if 25% recovery for Forest Grove was a virtual impossibility.

Mr. Kampfer explained that yes, the loads go almost directly into a reload destined for the landfill.

Ms. Keil said that perhaps we could use a consent agreement with the public facilities as a way to discuss how to increase recovery, like the City of Portland does with public sewer users.

Ms. Herrigel said that her intent is to cut down on some of the redirection of loads. All regional facilities should be able to achieve 25% recovery. She said the schedule could allow a modified schedule for public facilities to meet the minimum recovery.

Ms. Herrigel made a motion to require a 25% recovery rate on dry waste delivered to all facilities, and where there is a hardship in terms of meeting the recovery rate, to start a process for implementation. The motion failed to receive a second.

Ms. Keil proposed that the committee get additional information about the costs associated with achieving 25% recovery. She said that although she is not conceptually opposed, she does want more information.

Ms. Driscoll asked whether SWAC needed more information on costs for the May meeting. Mr. Anderson said yes.

Mr. White strongly emphasized the need for consistency in language and definitions, because there seems to be a lack of clarity about such terms as “small,” “regional” and “local.” He is also concerned that we are talking about imposing 25% on the small transfer stations. He said he is concerned about the small hauler who wants to reduce his costs and wants to reload it at his facility and haul it to Riverbend. Does that hauler now have to try to recover 25%, because he infrequently has dry waste in the loads? Perhaps we make an exemption on residential wet loads.

Ms. Kiwala said her biggest concern is allowing discretionary pricing, because waste would likely be diverted to public facilities. She suggested that maybe we need a regulation on pricing.

Ms. Keil said that Mr. Cross' comment on public transfer stations' need for a differential rate for dry waste was an interesting variation and perhaps we need to look at that.

Ms. Driscoll noted there were still questions to be resolved, among them Mr. Winterhalter's question on whether Metro staff should be present at private regional transfer stations (in particular, the scalehouse).

Mr. Winterhalter said he wants staff to explore the issues around Metro staffing at new transfer stations.

Mr. Kampfer noted that if Metro is a presence at the private scalehouse, there would be a cost associated with that. He would like to know what is trying to be achieved by putting Metro in all scalehouses in the region, and what the issues are.

Mr. Anderson said staff will examine those questions and return to the next SWAC meeting with more information.

Mr. White stated that haulers in the tri-county region want more transfer stations, but worry that the costs and requirements may be too onerous. If that is the case, then we may need to go back and revisit the 50,000-ton cap.

Mr. Gilbert asked whether the savings were calculated on the hauling end or transfer end of the business?

Mr. Metzler answered that the cost analysis didn't look at on-route or business-to-business savings, because the subcommittee decided these savings were too difficult to quantify. Our consultant looked at it from the end of the route, i.e., those costs and savings to get to the transfer station and to transport to a disposal site. Despite the difficulty of quantification, there is a potential for on-route savings; therefore, the cost analysis numbers should be viewed as conservative.



Mr. Geyer explained that the consultant looked at what happens when waste gets to new transfer stations and how the waste gets split. There were different calculations on wet and dry waste. About half of the costs are route-to-route transportation costs and marginal transfer costs. The majority of the remaining costs is disposal of the dry weight fraction.

Ms. Driscoll asked staff to include the savings in the next month's packet. She said the next meeting will have repeat discussion on the three remaining questions.

Mr. Metzler asked the subcommittee if they would be willing to reconvene before the next scheduled SWAC. There was a consensus that they would meet.

Mr. Anderson summarized the staff work that SWAC has requested:

- The implications of a 25% recovery rate at all facilities.
- Objectives of and costs associated with a Metro presence at scalehouses.
- Enforcing and administering the recovery requirement.
- System cost analysis, and Metro fiscal impact.
- Standardized definitions and terminology, especially distinguishing among reloads, small transfer stations and large transfer stations.

### **Other Business**

Mr. Petersen reminded attendees that there will be an Orientation Session for new members after the next SWAC meeting on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Keil commented that she especially appreciated the participation from the new members at today's meeting.

The meeting was adjourned

clk

\\MRC-FILES\FILES\OLDNET\METRO1\REM\SHARE\DEPT\SWAC\MINUTES\2000\0419SWAC.MIN