

## **Solid Waste Advisory Committee Meeting Summary January 26, 2003**

### **Attendees:**

Susan McLain	Mike Hoglund	Wade Lange
Terry Waddell	Vince Gilbert	John Lucini
Doug DeVries	Tom Badrick	Jeff Murray
Glenn Zimmerman	Mike Miller	Bruce Walker
Matt Korot	Sarah Jo Chaplen	Mark Altenhofen
Mike Leichner	Dave White	Cheryl Whilhelm
Lee Barrett	Barb Disser	Jan O'Dell
Karen Blauer	Matthew Cusnia	Easton Cross
Ray Phelps	Dan Schooler	Marta McGuire

### **I. Call to Order and Announcements**

**Susan McLain**

- Councilor McLain convened the meeting at 3:05 p.m. and asked if anyone had announcements. There were none.
- Approval of December 16, 2003, Meeting Summary: Ms. Sarah Jo Chaplen motioned to approve the summary; Mr. Mark Altenhofen seconded the motion; there were none opposed; the Meeting Summary passed as read.

### **II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update**

**Michael Hoglund**

- Mr. Hoglund announced that Metro has accepted American Compost's \$16,000 fine settlement offer. Metro believes this is a fair amount because American Compost did not make a profit on the lentils transaction.
- The Organics Work Group has recommended granting infrastructure funding to Threemile Canyon Farms. Staff calculated a tip fee of \$41 per ton for organics at Metro's transfer facility.
- The Regional System Fee (RSF) Task Force had its final meeting. The group concluded that there should be some incentive in place for material recovery, at least in the short term. It recommends monitoring how mandatory dry waste MRFing would be implemented and how that relates to the RSF credit program and MRFs being able to recover costs. The credits should boost recovery and the program should be evaluated on that criterion. In addition, if regulatory approaches are successful, then the RSF credit program could be phased out. Council, SWAC and others will have a chance to review and comment on Task Force recommendations after the committee's report is drafted. Mr. Vince Gilbert asked if material recovery provisions in Metro's transfer stations operations request for proposals mirrors this RSF credit program in any way. Councilor McLain responded with an explanation of the material recovery credits portion of the RFP – it provides incentives to achieve a high recovery rate, and penalties if this target rate is not achieved.
- Mr. Hoglund's final announcement was that the Council directed staff to proceed with the sustainability elements of the transfer station operations contract RFP. One of the sustainability elements is the recovery goal; Metro is asking proposers to estimate the amount of recovery they think they can achieve. If the recovery goal is exceeded, there is a bonus; if it is not reached there is a penalty. The goal is to increase recovery from 16 percent by another 4 percent or 5 percent. Another sustainability measure concerns clean air. About half of emissions on the site are currently coming from the station's vehicles. Council is interested in evaluating proposals for clean air ranging in cost from \$20,000 to \$100,000. In addition, they will evaluate using up to \$15,000 per year of green tag energy. Mr. Hoglund said the resolution authorizing release of the RFP would be first read by Council the next Thursday. Draft copies

are available on the internet. In addition to the RFP, the Council will also have to consider a request by BFI to extend the current contract.

### **III. Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update**

**Matthews/Blauer**

After a brief introduction by Chair Susan McLain, Ms. Janet Matthews began her presentation by explaining the role of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). During the RSWMP update process, SWAC will be asked to review the Plan's goals and objectives, help Metro assess the Plan's performance to date, and identify and discuss planning issues. In addition, Metro will likely convene small working groups for particular subject areas. SWAC will also be reviewing the first and final drafts.

Ms. Matthews explained that there is a core plan development group working on this project in addition to a \$70,000 budget for public involvement and technical writing consultants. The project will take eighteen months, with a first draft ready in September 2004. Council adoption is anticipated in July 2005. The Department is currently in the preliminary planning stage; a draft public involvement plan is nearly complete.

The goal is to deliver on time a reader-friendly plan that is acceptable to a broad range of internal and external stakeholders. There are five assumptions going into this RSWMP update project: this is a priority for the department; the current plan will be the starting point, from which to make updates and amendments; the feasibility of waste reduction goals will be reviewed; disposal issues will be more prominent; and, recommended practices and strategies should be feasible and enforceable.

Ms. Matthews began reviewing the current Chapter 5 of RSWMP. She noted that the expected outcome for this agenda item is simply to flag issues for future discussion. Ms. Matthews summarized the vision of the Plan, "waste is a resource, and we want to save resources." Councilor McLain emphasized that a lot of time was spent developing this vision and the goals; the update should reaffirm them.

Ms. Matthews briefly summarized the overall goal of the Plan (i.e., to achieve a solid waste system that is regionally balanced, environmentally sound, cost effective, technologically feasible and acceptable to the public.)

Ms. Matthews summarized each of the sixteen goals in Chapter 5. Goal 1 is essentially the guiding policy for solid waste management in the region and emphasizes the waste hierarchy. Goal 2, concerning education, states that residents and businesses will be informed of waste reduction opportunities and we will aim for standardization of waste reduction services in the region. Goal 3 – economics, says that system cost is going to be the principle measure of evaluating the economics of alternative waste management practices. Furthermore, Metro will support a higher system cost for waste reduction practices that are technologically and economically feasible in order to accomplish the regional recovery goal.

Ms. Sarah Jo Chaplen asked if these goals could be changed after input from stakeholders. Ms. Matthews replied, "yes."

Ms. Matthews continued with Goal 4 – adaptability, summarized as a diverse, responsive and competitive system with a mix of public and private facilities except for source separated recycling facilities which should remain privately owned. Government regulation should be at a minimum necessary to protect the environment and public interest. Chair McLain reiterated that there was a lot of time and input invested in these goals and there are many concepts embodied in that Goal.

Ms. Chaplen mentioned that she, and others around the table, were not involved in the development of the current plan. Mr. Jeff Murray added that he understands the concerns of Chair McLain because he was around for development of this Plan and he remembers the amount of time and effort that went into crafting this language.

Ms. Matthews then summarized Goal 5 – performance, as measurable benchmarks will be reviewed on an annual basis. This goal will be reviewed further when Plan performance is discussed. Goal 6 – plan consistency, was summarized as making sure RSWMP is integrated with State and local planning efforts and consistent with Metro policies and plans. Goal 7, waste reduction, includes the regional waste reduction goal of 62 percent as defined by State statute (as updated in 2003 to reflect the 6 percent waste reduction credits). This goal will be reviewed based on assumptions at the time the goal was developed, empirical evidence and feasibility during the update process. Chair McLain noted that the Council is interested in the feasibility of the 62 percent recovery goal and hopes the solid waste industry will be a cooperative partner in analyzing this issue. Mr. David White observed that the feasibility of projects often comes up, and this is usually a question of the cost to benefit analysis and factors other than financial. This larger picture needs to be considered when determining feasibility.

Ms. Matthews continued with Goal 8 – opportunity to reduce waste, stating that participation in waste prevention and recycling should be convenient for households and businesses in all portions of the region. As an aside, she added that as Metro and local governments are considering required recycling for some sectors, this goal could be impacted as a shift away from a strict opportunity model. Goal 9 – sustainability, is about making more reuse, recycling and recovery economically viable by adding externalities or indirect costs to the direct cost of goods and services and by support of market development for marginal recyclable materials and/or for reuse and recycling enterprises. Goal 10 – integration, is summarized as the preference of source separation waste reduction techniques, but adds that waste reduction systems should include other forms of recovery, including post-collection.

Mr. White, referring back to Goal 8, notes that there seems to be a movement shifting away from the opportunity model to a regulatory/mandatory model. He cited the City of Portland's mandatory commercial recycling requirement and the contingency plan options. Mr. White questions if this shift fits in Goal 7 or 11. Mr. Gilbert spoke in agreement with Mr. White, but noted that very few stakeholders support mandatory programs and that current sentiment is not for growing government. Chair McLain noted the need for further discussion. Mr. White added that this philosophical shift away from the opportunity model has been brought about by the desire to reach the 62 percent recovery goal. He believes that goals should consistent within the RSWMP.

There was discussion about the avenues and timeline for input. Ms. Matthews assured the group that it would have several more opportunities for comments, and that she will take comments throughout this discussion, as well. Mr. Murray expressed an interest in working within a focus group model, rather than individual stakeholder groups.

Ms. Matthews continued with Goal 11 – accessibility, saying that there should be reasonable access to transfer and disposal services. Goal 12, concerning recovery capacity, states that capacity should be regionally balanced, cost effective and with adequate service provided. Mr. Gilbert stated a preference for the wording to be “equal” service to all generators rather than “adequate” service to all waste generators.

Ms. Matthews summarized Goal 13 – toxics reduction, as promoting education as a means of reducing or eliminating risk to the environment, workers and other citizens from hazardous materials; as a means of getting people to use non-toxic alternatives; managing hazardous waste consistent with the solid waste hierarchy; and providing convenient and safe disposal services for hazardous waste. Goal 14 – disaster management, says that the regional system should be prepared to respond to a disaster by restoring normal collection and recycling services and

potentially disposing of enormous amounts of debris. Chair McLain recalled coordination being an important element of this goal.

Ms. Matthews continued with Goal 15 concerning facility regulation that says Metro will ensure the acceptable operation of disposal and processing facilities through franchising, contracting, owning or licensing. There is one system goal, Goal 16 – revenue equity and stability, which states that there must be adequate revenue to fund the cost of the system and help achieve the RSWMP goals.

Mr. Walker stated that the RSWMP has helped with direction in the past decade, but that it is time to review and update it. One necessary change is to add an emphasis on toxics in Goal 1. In particular, there should be language concerning electronic waste and product stewardship initiatives. Toxics are not just a hazardous waste issue, as covered by other goals.

Chair McLain stated that the Metro Council supports education that is necessary, supportive and unique, rather than redundant of other programs. In response to a question by Mr. Murray, Ms. Matthews replied that she could distribute her speaking notes but that her summaries of the goals were only intended to expedite discussion, rather than capture each of the objectives. Mr. Phelps mentioned that he has many comments, but would like to review the concepts in a more disciplined manner. Chair McLain suggested that Ms. Karen Blauer's presentation on the public involvement plan is responsive to this concern.

Ms. Blauer asked how SWAC would like to be involved in the update process. Would members prefer to be consulted as a group, or discuss issues in narrow functional groups, or both? Ms. Chaplen expressed a preference for larger groups in order to get a more balanced perspective. If narrow focus groups are used, there should be check-in points. Mr. Murray concurred that although discussions can become heated, it is important to have that interaction of the various perspectives. Mr. White remembered many meetings last time this plan was developed, and noted that it will take SWAC more than one discussion per month to get this done.

Ms. Blauer summarized that she was hearing a preference for a deliberative approach with group meetings to talk about trade-offs and figure out what works best, as opposed to having groups develop wish lists. Chair McLain urged this deliberative approach be used, as well. Mr. Tom Badrick asked if industries would still have opportunities to comment on issues of concern to them. Chair McLain clarified that the deliberative approach would allow each voice to be heard by all so that the final product doesn't come as a surprise.

Ms. Blauer noted that there was a brief outline of the draft schedule in the agenda packet. She stressed that involvement is key – there will be many opportunities for involvement throughout the process and confidentiality will be honored. Metro is committed to educating stakeholders throughout the process so that they may participate in a meaningful way and discuss trade-offs and costs. The Department is also committed to helping the Council understand stakeholder preferences, and must also respond to legal obligations for public involvement. The public involvement plan aims to elicit different perspectives. Ms. Blauer reviewed the summary of the projected schedule and tasks.

Mr. Walker asked if DEQ would be involved throughout the update process, or if it would receive the end product, which they then may or may not accept. Ms. Matthews replied that DEQ would be involved through SWAC and also as a stakeholder group.

Mr. Lucini asked if preliminary reports would be drafted after each phase and distributed on a rolling basis. Chair McLain replied that the Council would prefer to see preliminary reports after each phase. Ms. Blauer added that there might be need for additional stakeholder interviews to probe key issues. In addition, Ms. Blauer stressed the importance of having a transparent process and key to that is creating reports so stakeholders can see how their comments were interpreted. These reports will also help Metro staff to consider all stakeholders viewpoints. Ms.

Matthews clarified that the summary report at the end of phase II will summarize all stakeholder comments. This in turn will inform the draft update. There will also be a stakeholder process for reviewing the draft document, and there will be a summary report of this process. Mr. Ray Phelps stated that his preference is for the report at the end of phase II be a status report and the summary report come at the end of phase III because there will be different types of input at each phase. Mr. Lucini cautioned that whatever is in the first report should have already been thoroughly discussed. Chair McLain added that Metro is committed to seeking out opportunities to solicit input from end-users, including citizens.

#### **IV. Other Business and Adjourn**

**Susan McLain**

Councilor McLain reminded everyone that the third Monday next month is a holiday, thus the February SWAC meeting will be the last Monday of the month. The usual third Monday schedule will resume in March. As there was no further business, Councilor McLain thanked the group for its comments and adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

---

#### **Documents to be kept with the record of the meeting (copies available upon request):**

##### Agenda Item I:

- Meeting Summary of the December 16, 2003, SWAC meeting

##### Agenda Item III:

- RSWMP Public Involvement Plan Projected Schedule and Tasks
- RSWMP Goals and Objectives (Chapter 5)

mca  
M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\MINUTES\2004\012604.DOC

From 1/26/04  
presentation

## RSWMP UPDATE PROGRESS REPORT

### RECAP

What RSWMP is: framework for coordinating sw progs w/in the region; direction for the solid waste system; identifies roles and responsibilities; fulfills state requirement that Metro have a wr plan

Why it is being updated: 10 year timeframe

Stages of the update process:

- Review current RSWMP direction
- Identify potential discussion issues for RSWMP update
- Regional discussions of narrowed issues list
- Draft RSWMP update
- Discuss draft
- Final
- Public hearings on final/DEQ & Metro consideration

Recap (Where we've been)

- SWAC agenda: Review of goals and objectives (Chapter 5)
- SWAC agenda: Review of recommended practices/strategies (Chapter 7)
- 6 Stakeholder group discussions w/local and national industry, local governments, environmental advocates, recyclers, end-use markets (some SWAC members involved)
- SWAC agenda: Suggest issues to discuss during update process
- Post SWAC comment opportunity:

### COUNCIL WORKSESSION (3/23)

- Summary of stakeholder (including SWAC input) received to date
- Council brainstorm of issues for RSWMP update (some duplication, some non-issues)

### SERVICE USERS FOCUS GROUP

- Last facilitated group in phase 1 (7<sup>th</sup> group); report from all phase 1 focus groups will be completed this week.
- Service Users focus group was held April 12<sup>th</sup>
- Composition of participants: 13 people from 3 county region; age and gender variations; most have been users of solid waste facilities at some point (public and private); or accessed info and education about solid waste and recycling services, or are business representatives or neighborhood assn. leaders
- They were asked to speak candidly about their experiences using solid waste system facilities, services and programs.
- Meeting topics covered 6 categories: System services, programs and facilities; current RSWMP vision and goal; Education; Waste reduction goal, cost of garbage service; Access to services; and New Frontiers/Potential regional issues

- Summary of results:
  1. participants are very satisfied with the current solid waste system, describing it as comprehensive, well-organized, progressive and helpful;
  2. majority of participants had used transfer stations, recycling centers, yard debris and haz waste facilities.
  3. participants agree the plan vision and overall goal expresses their values and how the system should be grounded.
  4. participants were very supportive of current levels of education and made specific recommendations about how to improve or enhance education levels. They recommend increasing recycling, improving distribution of information, using haulers to educate the public, increasing awareness of Metro responsibilities and decreasing confusion about what materials can be recycled.
  5. participants were enthusiastic about the 62% waste reduction goal. They recommend sharing the goal with the public and asking for greater recycling support. Many participants say they would be willing to pay more to increase recycling efforts, but they feel they do not represent residents as a whole.



Service user focus group participants were not asked identical questions as other stakeholder focus group participants. Therefore, a direct comparison of meeting results can not be made. Still, similar and differing areas of opinion arose for the updated plan. Similar meeting results include the following topics:

Differing opinions include:

- Regional Waste Reduction Goal. Four stakeholder groups recommend the goal be reevaluated. One stakeholder group recommends the goal be increased. The service user group reflected support of the goal and a desire to achieve 62% waste reduction.
- Recovering Food Waste. Four stakeholder groups recommend further analysis of the benefits of recovering food waste. One stakeholder group and the service user group support the idea of making composted food waste and yard debris more available to residents and businesses.
- Lead to Where in the Future? Five groups suggest this topic should remain an issue to be discussed. Two stakeholder groups are less in favor of remaining a leader in waste reduction efforts, while the remaining stakeholder groups and the service user group feel the region should continue its efforts to remain a leader in this area.

## NEXT STEPS

- Discuss guidelines for narrowing issues list with Council
- Determine how SWAC might be involved in the months ahead
- Produce discussion guide for phase 2 regional meetings
- Hold meetings
- Draft updated RSWMP
- Discuss draft RSWMP