



METRO

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

MEETING SUMMARY
Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Metro Regional Center, Council Annex
January 27, 2005

Members / Alternates Present:

Councilor Rod Park, Chair
Mike Hogle
Bruce Walker
John Lucini
Rick Winterhalter
Heather Hansen
Dave White

Dean Kampfer
Mark Altenhofen
Mike Lechner
JoAnn Herrigel
Anita Largent
Mike Miller

Mike Huycke
Ray Phelps
Eric Merrill
Paul Edwards
Susan Ziolkowski
Vince Gilbert

Guests and other Metro staff:

Janet Matthews
Easton Cross
Roy Brower
Todd Hubbard
Jim Watkins
Ken Adams

Marta McGuire
Lee Barrett
Scott Klag
Marv Fjordbeck
Kathryn Schutte
Jan O'Dell

Karen Blauer
Karen Feher
René Eyerly
Lori Stole
Gina Cubbon

I. Call to Order and Announcements.....Rod Park

- Councilor Rod Park convened the meeting, introducing himself as the new committee Chair. He welcomed everyone present, and referenced a memo to members from outgoing Chair, Councilor McLain.
- Members were asked to consider the list of potential SWAC work plan items that was included in the agenda packet. The Councilor encouraged members to get in touch with Solid Waste & Recycling Director Mike Hogle or SW&R's Program and Policy Manager Janet Matthews with comments, additions, etc.
- Minutes from the December meeting were approved unanimously.

II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update..... Mike Hogle

- Mr. Hogle updated the group that the contract for transfer station operations has been signed by BFI and will take effect after March, when the current contract extension expires.
- A proposal for the Dry Waste Recovery / Mandatory MRFing program is being drafted by Lee Barrett and Doug Anderson of SW&R. A lot of good comments have come in over the last few months, Mr. Hogle said, regarding effects the program could have to the system. The proposal will try to account for those as best as possible.
- The report from "Let's Talk Trash" for business recycling has been sent out to interested parties via e-mail. Copies are available; contact Mr. Hogle or SW&R Administrative Secretary Gina Cubbon. Meetings were held with area businesses to get their perspective on different

recycling options, such as mandatory versus incentive-based systems. Overall, respondents were mostly interested in education and rate incentives. The next step will be to present a report to Council before instituting a program.

- Continuing, Mr. Hoglund presented some regulatory updates. The deadline for Columbia Environmental's transfer station application has been extended while SW&R staff works with Columbia to address specific questions from Council. A work session is tentatively scheduled for late February.
- The application from USA Junk to operate a reload facility has been denied because they failed to obtain a conditional use approval from the City of Portland. They plan to apply for that approval and try again at a later date.

III. 2005-06 Budget: Themes and Process Mike Hoglund

Mr. Hoglund briefly highlighted Metro's 11-month budget process. At this time, SW&R has submitted a proposed budget to Council President Bragdon for his consideration. Revisions are due from departments on February 25. A draft budget calendar containing key dates was handed out to attendees. Work session budget discussions with Council will take place in March; Council President Bragdon will release a full budget proposal to the public in April. A final budget hearing will take place on May 5; Council will then approve the budget. The Oregon TSCC audits the approved budget prior to formal adoption by the Metro Council on June 16. Rate changes take effect 90 days after budget adoption.

Councilor Park noted that the Council "has been going through a very intensive strategic planning process, not just about the Solid Waste [and Recycling] Department, but about all of Metro." He said the Council has been looking at many issues that the Council President can take into consideration before moving the proposed budget forward to the full Council. Councilor Park feels this process is much more efficient than previous methods.

As for the proposed budget from SW&R, Mr. Hoglund said the Department is "holding the line." \$1.3 million in cuts were made in 2003-04, and \$1.2 million last year, with five less FTEs budgeted, and four FTEs restructured. He handed out and briefly explained a draft entitled "Review Framework for Programs, Projects, Activities and Initiatives for the FY 2005-06 Budget." This piece shows the themes of the next budget, such as completing the Regional Solid Waste Management (RSWMP) update.

Another theme is continued waste reduction. The Contingency subgroup of SWAC asked for a larger Commercial Technical Assistance Program (CTAP) budget; accordingly, some funding has been moved to add \$250,000 to that program, which will be targeting increased business recycling.

Metro's latex paint recycling operations are moving to a larger facility, on Swan Island in Portland. Retail sales will begin from the new building on February 1; processing will be up and running by April. There is a new program in SW Washington with Rodda and Miller paints that will deliver their paint to Metro, as well.

Regarding Metro's Hazardous Waste Program, Mr. Hoglund noted that it's been a very popular program, but staff will be evaluating the current system. For example, whether it's too easy to use, and therefore doesn't actually help reduce use of toxic products. Councilor Park commented that the program is not currently a user-pay proposition. He'd like to look at how to make it more fair, perhaps by point-of-purchase fees.

Councilor Park introduced his new assistant, Kathryn Schutte. Ms. Schutte handed out a working draft entitled, "Metro Council Goals and Objectives" from the Council's strategic planning process. Councilor Park reviewed the piece briefly, saying that some goals are met by multiple departments, showing that there's a lot of interaction and perhaps duplication. This may lead to some reorganization, such as what SW&R did not too long ago.

IV. RSWMP Update: Shaping the Plan Vision and Values..... Janet Matthews

Ms. Matthews gave a quick background of the RSWMP project for those who have not attended previous meetings. The draft update will be ready in Spring 2005, she said; SWAC has been deeply involved in the update progress. Asking the group to open their agenda packets to the RSWMP draft outline, Ms. Matthews said this piece illustrates that much of the current plan will remain in place. Some of the organization has changed, "Primarily just to improve the flow of the direction-setting chapters," she explained. An Executive Summary will be included, which is a change from the original document. SWAC and the Council will spend the most time helping staff shape Chapters 3, 4, and 5, which set the direction for the entire Plan.

Ms. Matthews directed attention to the agenda piece about the "Vision Statement" that will be included in the RSWMP update. "We are defining 'vision' as a long-term ideal and ultimate aspiration," she noted. "That's what we think a vision statement is intended to be. The plan vision is probably the one thing in this plan that is not intended to be accomplished in the ten-year duration of the Plan. It is something that we aspire to in the future."

Three vision statements were presented as part of the agenda packet; the current statement (1995-2005 RSWMP), and two proposed statements, Ms. Matthews continued. The commonality of the three pieces, she said, "...is an attempt to articulate the region's arrival at a more sustainable future." She briefly reviewed each proposed vision statement. The first (and current statement), Ms. Matthews said, is somewhat impenetrable in its phrasing. It does touch on the fact that in the future, waste should be viewed as a resource to be managed, and the need to change consumption and build upon sustainability. It links integrated waste management and the conservation of resources.

The two proposed vision statements share an opening thought, "The protection of our environment requires changes in consumption of resources." Both aim for sustainability in the future; and mention that consumer choices will help achieve that goal.

Proposed vision #1 is a more general picture, Ms. Matthews continued. "If you go to [proposed vision #2], you'll see that it is a specific description of a system in the future." Consumers make choices, producers take responsibility for impacts of their products and packaging, businesses reuse discarded materials, and government will curtail its role in disposal as solid waste is virtually eliminated, she explained. "It tries to get at a more specific vision of the future...as opposed to the previous one, which articulates a sustainable future in a more general fashion."

Turning the floor over to the members, Ms. Matthews solicited opinions. "Do you like one? Why is that? Do all three of them stink?" she asked frankly. "We need to get a plan vision statement that is readily understandable by just about every reader. It really should be accessible; people should be able to understand where it is we really want to go in the future."

Councilor Park commented that although Council was supposed to have looked at these options, "...our ranks were disseminated by the flu, so we haven't looked at them. You guys get first shot." His first thought, however, was that the term "changes in consumption" in both new proposals

doesn't necessarily mean less consumption, though that's staff's assumption. "That isn't necessarily the general society's choice, yet."

Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association's Dave White commented that he would like to see a modified version of the current statement rather than either of the proposals. It acknowledges, he said, "...that we generate waste, and this says that that waste needs to be managed." Mr. White said that while Statement Proposal #2 envisions zero waste, "...I can't imagine we'll ever get to the point where you'll buy just the right amount of food to put on the table for your family, and there are no scraps left over ...". The current statement, he said, takes into account that the region is looking towards sustainability, and he feels that the link between management of waste and conservation still needs to be stressed.

Regarding the last portion of Statement Proposal #2, Mr. White articulated, "It really bothers me to think that government is going to curtail its role in disposal. I think somebody doesn't understand that if we ever get to a point of zero waste, we still will have recycling, we still will have composting, we still will have stuff that goes somewhere, and I think we'll still need to manage it.... Government will still have a role, whether we're trying to get to 62% [recovery], or whether we're trying to develop markets, or trying to convince producers to work in a more sustainable way. There will be a role for government." In summation, Mr. White reiterated that he likes the current statement, with modifications for readability.

Clackamas County's Rick Winterhalter agreed with the sentiment of Mr. White's comments, that there will still be waste of some sort for government to manage. East County Recycling's Vince Gilbert said that alternative funding for Metro would need to be considered if it stepped out of its role in solid waste.

From the audience, WRI's Ray Phelps said that he, too, likes the current statement better than the proposals. In particular, the sentence "The protection of our environment requires changes in consumption of resources.." doesn't settle well with him. "I'm not so sure change is *required* so much as change will evolve," he asserted. He felt that the phrasing referred to restrictions rather than motivations to change behaviors. Mr. Phelps continued, "I'd like to remove the words 'protect' and 'require changes' – not to dilute or make this statement meaningless, but to make it more positive and proactive." Councilor Park suggested "...requires a more efficient utilization of our natural resources."

"I find it interesting," Mr. Winterhalter countered, "...that Mr. Phelps connotes changes with being negative, when changes can, indeed, be positive. I would say that yes, in order to protect the environment, it is going to require changes.." He felt that the sentence works fine as-written.

Next, Waste Management's Dean Kampfner spoke up, saying that he, too, prefers the current vision statement to either of the suggested alternatives. He sees the phrase about "protection" as a move towards the hierarchy of reduce, reuse, etc. "I think the change they're talking about there is trying to shift that from disposal up to reduce."

In answer to a question from Councilor Park regarding if the original vision statement was meant to address the entire system, Eric Merrill of Waste Connections said that the intent had been to have a vision statement that "...had long-term implications, but encapsulated what we were trying to accomplish in the short to mid-range." He said they chose words that incorporated the essence of what the group was trying to do at that time, including "...manage, conservation, natural systems, sustainability, conservation of resources, the link between integrated waste management and conservation resources.... and that is the way we created the vision statement." The intent was to address how RSWMP would affect the system, but also the world at-large. Councilor Park

commented that he wants to be sure the final vision statement is broad enough to encompass unknowns, such as drastic changes in the price of fuel.

The City of Portland's Bruce Walker remarked that all three statements hold key points he feels are interconnected and can be positive in a long-term vision. The current one, he said, seems very direct from a system that evolved from dumping into landfills to one moving into recycling programs and solid waste management. "The current statement is too limiting, Mr. Walker said. "We need to get beyond that, but I think Janet is absolutely right: Putting out suggestions will generate lots of discussions." He'd like to see a push for more emphasis on sustainability in the update.

Councilor Park attempted to steer discussion away from wordsmithing and more towards overall concept.

Mike Huycke, of Allied / Waste Control Systems, offered that while he did like the current statement, a change could be made to the last sentence. He liked the first portion, "In order to build a sustainable future together..." but felt that the next section wasn't pro-active and could be better crafted.

Susan Ziolk of Clackamas County spoke in favor of Proposal #2, saying that it's much clearer for a member of the public. It's important to consider who the ultimate audience is. "As the general public, [Proposal #2] tells each person what their part is. It specifically pulls out the parts of the different players." Mr. Winterhalter agreed, and also likes the fact that the words "solid waste" do not appear in that statement.

John Lucini of SP Newsprint agreed with Mr. Huycke, noting that when the original statement was written over ten years ago, it applied well. However, he said, when it comes to recognizing the link between solid waste management and resource conservation, "I think we've moved beyond that; we have a system in place now that more than recognizes that link. Maybe some language that would say we continue to manage, or optimize the relationship between those two items." There will always be something to dispose of, he said. Additionally, don't lose sight of economic impacts while approaching "zero waste." Keep "economic prosperity" as a part of the updated statement.

Giving a citizens' perspective, committee member Heather Hansen sided with the new statements. "The two new ones somewhat define what sustainable development is – that's a term that's often thrown around but people have different understandings of it," noting the phrase "preserving options for future generations." Ms. Hansen also liked that the new versions address citizens understanding the impact they have on the solid waste system – she felt that was very important and missing from the current statement.

Washington County's Mark Altenhofen didn't have a clear choice, but noted that vision statements often become "...too cumbersome and complex; you get a lot of vernacular in there that the general public doesn't really understand." Much of that, he continued, is spelled out in the Plan itself. He strongly encouraged staff to, "...boil this down to one or two sentences, something very simple, very easy to understand. All the details and everything else can be brought out in the Plan – the goals, the economics, sustainability, environmental impacts..." Looking at Statement Proposal #1, Mr. Altenhofen suggested the second sentence might be enough, "The Plan envisions a future in which knowledgeable and engaged residents have, and make, choices that preserve options that future generations will need to secure the quality of life we enjoy."

"How important is it to maintain options for future generations, or is it not important?" Councilor Park asked.

Mr. Merrill agreed with the concept of simplifying, but felt that is more important to a mission statement than a vision statement. He felt a vision statement should state "...the goal and some idea of how you get there." What is missing from the two new proposals, in Mr. Merrill's mind, "...is the idea that it's a managed process or that we manage the waste stream until we get to the point of zero waste, although I hate that term," he added parenthetically.

Mr. Gilbert commented that he did not like the very sentence that Mr. Altenhofen mentioned earlier. "It leaves out a whole bunch of people who aren't knowledgeable and engaged in the system. I want to be careful with that type of language not to have a vision statement that doesn't include the people who couldn't care less. They're a big part of the region."

The City of Milwaukee's JoAnn Herrigel acknowledged what Mr. White had said about the current vision statement, and wondered, "If you took the current vision statement and you changed the language so it has the same concepts in it but the language is more open...." She said that the current wording is all present tense rather than looking toward the future. Applying the type of language used in Statement Proposal #1 to the current statement may result in a compromise everyone could live with, Ms. Herrigel suggested. "You want the concepts of economic viability, and management and system and cost – all those things, but how you want it to be in the future, not what we know now."

Councilor Park spoke about Statement Proposal #1, noting wryly that it calls for "the elimination of toxicity," a term that the Councilor pointed out is technically impossible. Toxicity, he pointed out, is a matter of quantity – almost everything is toxic in large amounts. That aside, he asked the group if they felt there should be something about reducing the use of toxic / hazardous products in the statement. Mr. Kampfer responded that while such a concept is not spelled out, it is implied by "...conserving natural resources, consumption of resources, etc." Mr. Huycke agreed that it needn't be spelled out but kept broad. "This [vision statement] is more of a 30,000 ft. level thing. The toxicity of waste is an issue we want to encompass, but I don't know that we necessarily want to specifically address it [in the statement]." Mr. Lucini agreed, and Mr. White felt the issue is implicitly a part of "protection of our natural systems" in the current statement.

Continuing, Mr. White said he felt that Statement Proposal #1 (and to some degree, both proposals), "...focuses on one element of management; that is environmental protection, which is important. What it doesn't speak to me about is what John [Lucini] mentioned, the economic aspects of the system, and it doesn't talk about how you manage the system as a whole." He still preferred the current statement, finding it a more balanced statement.

Councilor Park mentioned the EESE test (environmental, economic, social, and energy) used by some Metro staff that is used to find such a balance. The Councilor said that EESE is a good yardstick for balancing concepts.

Mr. Walker suggested the group step back, list concepts and where they'd like to see the system headed. "Maybe there are things we need to have in here that aren't listed, such as economic prosperity. I tend to agree that's very important."

Councilor Park asked members to e-mail ideas for issues they would like to look at incorporating; staff will take them into consideration, rework the statement and present it to Council. He spoke, too, about the difficulty in getting citizens engaged in the process. "Governing people who aren't engaged is the hardest thing to do; they know they don't like it, but they can't explain why they don't like it. We do spend a lot of money on education programs; we need to make them more effective. Like they say: You educate with facts and motivate with emotion." The Councilor told

the Committee that a redraft of the vision Statement would be sent out prior to the next SWAC meeting.

Ms. Matthews suggested sending out revised options (plural), because of so many conflicting opinions voiced. “Those of you engaged in the day-to-day business of solid waste, I’m hearing that you prefer the current vision statement, because it does say ‘solid waste.’ Those on the more policy side of things – local government and some rate-payer reps – want to push the envelope a little bit.” Mr. White reiterated that blending the two factions might be the best solution.

“The current vision statement,” Ms. Matthews said, “...talks about waste as a resource to be managed. I want to point out that in the last vision statement, #2, that’s what that whole process was getting at. [The statement envisions that] Before material becomes waste – that is the producer-responsibility end of things. But after materials are discarded, they go into a system where they are actually a resource to be managed, and there’s very little left to dispose compared to what we know today. I just wanted to point out that the ‘waste as a resource to be managed’ theme does carry into the last proposal. It’s not like it expects nothing will ever be disposed again – it envisions much, much less disposed.”

Mr. Hoglund added that he hadn’t heard anyone say any of the proposals were bad, just that they wanted to consider emphasizing other aspects, such as managing, and refining the economic aspect. He agreed with Ms. Matthews assertion that Statement Proposal #2 does encompass those things; he said he and staff will take another look at it and work on saying things more proactively and incorporate the opinions expressed at this meeting. Personally, Mr. Hoglund said he liked the way Statement Proposal #2 laid out roles and responsibilities. Perhaps the portion about phasing out government was overstated, but over all he liked the concepts stated. He also said he liked Mr. Altenhofen’s idea of shortening the statement as much as possible, so a long and short version may be presented to the Committee.

From the audience, SW&R’s Scott Klag pointed out the agenda packet piece entitled, “Potential Regional Values.” He suggested people look over the list, keeping in mind that the vision statement should reflect what the highest values are in the document.

Ms. Matthews then presented a new piece for the RSWMP update – the list of values mentioned by Mr. Klag, which Ms. Matthews explained are referred to as “regional” because they are meant to be values that are largely shared throughout the Metro region.

“Values to us seemed a bridge between a more lofty vision and the more down-to-earth policies, goals and objectives that would follow [in the update],” Ms. Matthews continued. The piece is still in a rough draft format, she explained, with the bulleted items illustrating what will describe each specific value in the RSWMP narrative. She asked the group’s opinion of using a set of regional values to articulate the Plan, as well as any specifics.

In the general discussion that followed, Ms. Hansen noted that economic vitality is not addressed in the list. “Economics / business practices and the environment - those goals are not necessarily mutually-exclusive,” she stated. A value about improving the environment and the economy would be a good addition, Ms. Hansen concluded.

Mr. White would like a statement about “environmentally appropriate collection and disposal” within the Public Health and Safety value. “That’s the key to the franchise system, that we collect the [waste] that’s putrescible, we take it to an appropriate place and it’s handled through transfer stations and disposal sites, etc., in an environmentally and healthy manner.”

Customer service isn't included in the list, Mr. Merrill noted.

Following-up on Ms. Hansen's comments, Mr. Huycke suggested that Value #6 could be modified to "Performance and Economic Stewardship," and add "cost effectiveness" to the last bullet under that value.

Mr. Lucini would like a competitive aspect to be included, to show the region as "...a place for people to want to live and also for a place for businesses to locate... to be competitive in a more global marketplace." Councilor Park referred back to the Council goals, with the thought that the #1 goal listed there, "Great Places: Goal – Residents of the region enjoy vibrant, accessible, and physically distinct places to live, work, and play" encompasses the ideas Mr. Lucini voiced.

Concluding the item, Ms. Matthews said she would take the members' ideas and return next month with a narrative version for their consideration. She noted that there seemed to be no opposition to the concept of including regional values in the RSWMP update.

V. Other Business and Adjourn.....Rod Park

Ms. Matthews handed out a revised list of SWAC members and alternates. She asked for help recruiting interested parties to fill the vacancies noted.

Councilor Park concluded the meeting with some interesting figures / comparisons about the Metro region's waste reduction efforts that Steve Apotheker related to him in response to a request from a writer recently:

- The Metro region recycled 405,000 tons of paper in 2002, which is the equivalent of stacking paper on a football field to a height of 2/3 mile.
- Recycling 405,000 tons of paper reduced air emissions equivalent to taking 194,000 cars off the road for one year. The air emissions tracked were carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons.

Councilor Park thanked the group for their attendance, and adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

**Next meeting:
Thursday, February 24, 2005
Room 370 A/B**

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

- DRAFT: Review Framework for Programs, Projects, Activities and Initiatives for the FY 2005-06 Budget
- Metro Council Goals and Objectives (working draft)
- VISION – A long-term ideal and ultimate aspiration
- Solid Waste Advisory Committee membership as of January 25, 2005

gbc
M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\Minutes\2005\SWAC012705min.DOC
Queue