



METRO

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

MINUTES OF THE METRO SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COMMITTEE (SWAC) MEETING

Metro Regional Center, Room 370A/B

Thursday, September 28, 2006

Members / Alternates Present:

Councilor Rod Park, Chair
Mike Hoglund
Mike Leichner
Bruce Walker
Paul Edwards
Eric Merrill
Rick Winterhalter
Dave Garten

JoAnn Herrigel
Vince Gilbert
Ray Phelps
Glenn Zimmerman
Lori Stole
Jeff Murray
Dean Kampfer
Andy Kahut

Anita Largent
Mike Miller
Audrey O'Brien
Matt Korot
Theresa Koppang
Steve Schwab
Janet Malloch

Guests and Metro staff:

Janet Matthews
Brad Botkin
Bryce Jacobson
Easton Cross
Paul Garrahan
Wendie Kellington
Barb Disser

Doug Drennen
Lee Barrett
Joel Sherman
Steve Kraten
Tom Chaimov
Jeff Gage
Steve Apotheker

Ron Roycer
Kevin Six
Terrell Garrett
Julie Cash
Roy Brower
Corianne Hart

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

- Councilor Rod Park began the meeting at 10:03 a.m., introducing the new DEQ representative, Audrey O'Brien.
- Approval of the minutes was moved by Waste Management's Dean Kampfer. JoAnn Herrigel from the City of Milwaukie seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by those present.

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

- Mr. Hoglund explained that a new cost-savings directive from COO Mike Jordan will bring about changes to Metro meeting minutes, including streamlining the information given and eliminating minutes from some meetings altogether. (Public meetings such as SWAC, Rate Review, and the various PAC meetings [MPAC, JPAC, etc.] are required to have minutes.) In addition, recordings will eventually all be done digitally.
- Metro has renegotiated the final 3+ years of the CSU transport contract, moving to a retainage option that will bring about incentives for keeping the fleet maintained through the end of the contract. A Resolution is being brought to Council for approval.

- A new recycling education project has been launched in connection to the Recycle at Work campaign, Mr. Hoglund told the group, called “RE:” (as in REcycle, REthink, REsources, etc.) The project includes a website, business waste sorts (upon request), displays throughout the area, and sidewalk chalkings. The goal is to recover more paper from businesses with more education. Over 40% of people surveyed didn’t know they can recycle paper that has staples or tape on it, for instance.
- Enforcement Actions: Mr. Hoglund said that the Regulatory Affairs Division has issued Notice of Violations and monetary penalties for operating a MRF without authorization. Another unauthorized MRF, Urban Vision Corp. has been cited as well. Two companies are being issued substantial fines (USA Contractors - \$104,000; Avila Drywall - \$58,000) for sending waste to Riverbend Landfill without a non-system license and paying neither regional system fees nor excise tax. The City of Portland’s Bruce Walker commended the Division on its work.

III. Pumping Up Dry Waste Recovery Lee Barrett

Councilor Park introduced Waste Reduction & Outreach Division Manager Lee Barrett, who spoke about “EDWRP” – the Enhanced Dry Waste Recovery Program. Mr. Barrett gave some history behind the program, which has been in development for several years. He stressed that the SWAC would not be asked to vote on the merits of the program today; this was simply an informational presentation and discussion.

EDWRP will require that all dry waste loads within the region be processed at a MRF before the residual can be sent to a landfill. It will replace the current system (Regional System Fee Credit Program). Currently, 120,000 tons of recoverable dry waste is disposed in local landfills annually.

Mr. Barrett explained proposed changes and the comments / concerns raised at the work group meetings and in written comments. These comments, and Metro responses to them, are attached.

Mr. Kampfer expressed that while his firm is supportive of dry waste recovery, they have several concerns. Therefore, Waste Management does not support the Ordinance as currently written. Key among these is the timeline – more time is needed to get equipment needed, etc. Several members commented that Metro transfer stations should be held to the same standards as private facilities, and suggested an economic analysis. Jeff Murray of Far West Fibers stated that there may be some unintended consequences to the current wording. He’d like to meet with Metro staff at a separate time to discuss these.

Councilor Park and Allied Waste’s Ray Phelps briefly discussed the difference in waste streams between Metro transfer stations and private facilities. Metro is considered the transfer station “of last resort,” but Mr. Phelps maintained his facility is not allowed to take self-haul, as Metro is. The Councilor noted he has heard this argument before, but not a definitive answer.

Theresa Koppang of Washington County pointed out that the two landfills the program will likely affect the most are in her area. She supports increased recovery, but needs more time for due diligence regarding siting and other issues. Councilor Park said he’s willing to discuss it further with Ms. Koppang and Mr. Hoglund. Mr. Walker added that he’d like to work with Metro on the facility standards and help in increasing recovery.

Mr. Hoglund noted that the discussion seemed to be focused on issues pertaining to the MRF standards, whose group has only met once. He asked for recommendations from the Committee members regarding how to increase dry waste recovery, the matter at-hand. Mr. Phelps said that Allied supports dry waste recovery, but there’s no financial benefit to the program as laid-out. While he agrees mandatory recovery

is good, this ordinance is insufficient. Mr. Walker said he has heard concerns about a financial downside, adding that a simple review of financial implications would be helpful.

Mike Miller of Gresham Sanitary commented that the 15% allowable residual is described too vaguely. Councilor Park would like to know what the best equipment would be for facilities planning to add or become MRFs, and would be interested in seeing the financial piece of that. What Council wants, he said, is to see how many more tons can be pulled, or diverted to source-separation.

On behalf of Lakeside Reclamation, Wendie Kellington said that their landfill operations are close to closing. As such, they have significant funding obligations based on a particular wastestream and its history. Mandatory MRFing, as proposed, will cause Lakeside's wastestream to be foreclosed, and cause the company to fail meeting those federal and state law obligations for closure and post-closure of a landfill, she said. The only facility significantly impacted by the Ordinance is Lakeside. If EDWRP goes into effect, it's essential that the region provide an assurance of a wastestream so they can close on schedule, or some way to mechanism to not affect Lakeside until some point in the future.

Doug Drennan of URS Corporation added that he sees a fundamental problem in that there are a lot of facility operators who want to make a profit from recycling, and he therefore suggested using rate incentives. Lakeside is willing to reload loads that are recoverable, and suggested that they and Metro stations embark on a pilot program utilizing the existing infrastructure.

IV. Concluding DSP, Phase I Mike Hoglund

Mr. Hoglund announced that Metro Council has directed Solid Waste & Recycling staff to move forward with a Resolution stating Metro's intention to retain ownership of their transfer stations. The all-public model (versus an all-private model, and a mixture of private / public) had actually been rated highest because it would have more control over programs, fees and taxes, as well as simplicity in greening the system. However, there was a huge risk associated with that model, including finding facility owners willing to sell, how to handle current license expirations, and whether to build new transfer stations, or condemn current facility properties. Conversely, the all-private system scored lowest, so considering all risks and goals, a mix of the two scored highest in the end.

The Resolution was included in the agenda packet, Mr. Hoglund pointed out. Council is scheduled to take action on legislation October 12. Regarding future waste transport (after expiration of the contract with CSU), staff will be working to bring on a new carrier by 2010 or sooner. Plans are to look closely at multi-modal transportation, as well as learn about fuel consumption for each type (barge, train, truck), siting, and the capacity of river (locks) and rail options. Rate-setting, license renewals, sustainability standards, all of these issues and more are being looked into as part of Phase 2.

Representing Clackamas County, Rick Winterhalter said that the conclusion (noted on page 2 of the Staff Report to Resolution No. 06-3729 in the agenda packet) that beginning a discussion of disposal system planning, intended to discuss disposal facilities, with a comment such as "collection accounts for 81 percent of the cost for residential disposal" is a distraction to the report, does not address the facility role and the number is not supported. Examining the County's residential collection costs (2005) cost of disposal has a tremendous impact on the system – it's 50% of the direct costs of collection, he said, and this bullet point simply confuses the issue. Mr. Winterhalter therefore suggested that the first bullet point be removed. Councilor Park agreed to take a look at the idea.

V. Concluding the RSWMP UpdateJanet Matthews

Policy & Program Manager Janet Matthews reported that on August 17, Council approved the Interim Waste Reduction Plan that SWAC and various workgroups had helped develop. Half of the Draft RSWMP update is now completed, including the RSWMP vision, regional values, waste reduction policies, and the goals for the program areas and services in waste reduction, hazardous waste, education, and product stewardship. She showed a PowerPoint presentation outlining what remains to be done (attached.)

Ms. Matthews talked about specific areas for guiding direction in RSWMP to possibly address and develop. SWAC will be looking at various topics over the next few meetings. Ms. Matthews asked if the Committee had a preference to look at the topics with the whole group, or create subgroups. There was mixed reaction; Councilor Park suggested working as a group and tasking out to subgroups as necessary. Ms. Herrigel commented that if the whole group isn't utilized, the topics still end up coming back to the whole group for discussion anyway. Ms. Matthews agreed, and suggested meeting twice per month to accommodate the schedule shown in the PowerPoint presentation.

VI. Other Business and Adjourn..... Rod Park

Councilor Park thanked the attendees, asked for any additional business (there was none), and adjourned the proceedings at 11:53 a.m.

Prepared by:

Gina Cubbon
Administrative Secretary
Metro Solid Waste & Recycling Department

gbc
Attachment: "Finishing the RSWMP Update Project"
M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\2006\SWAC092806min.doc
Queue

Finishing the RSWMP Update Project

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
September 28, 2006

Presentation Summary

- Background of the project
- Role of SWAC
- Areas for further development/discussion
- Schedule

RSWMP Purpose

- Provides framework for regional coordination
- Establishes direction (vision, policies, goals, strategies)
- Identifies roles and responsibilities
- Fulfills state requirement for waste reduction plan

Metro's Role in Update Project

- Lead public process
- Prepare Plan
- Adopt Plan
- Administer Plan

Role of SWAC

1. Identify key planning issues
2. Review/recommend/propose goals & objectives
3. Review/recommend/propose policies
4. Recommend Council action on RSWMP update

Contents of RSWMP

- Current system, roles in the system
- Current services and programs
- Recovery and disposal trends
- *Vision, regional values, policies*
- *Waste reduction plan (goals and obj.)*
- *Facilities and services (goals and obj.)*
- *Implementation and monitoring*

Areas of Discussion Ahead

Policies, Goals and Plan implementation

- Facilities
- Regulation
- Services
- Rates

Specific Areas to Address?

Public services

Market entry standards

Capacity

Facility zoning

Recovery incentives

Waste allocation

Collection

System finance model

Sustainability practices

System ownership

Facility regulation

Competition

Access to services

User fees/host fees

System performance

Rate transparency

Rate regulation

Waste transport

Schedule 06/07

October through December – Development and review of Facilities, Services, Rates, and Plan implementation sections (Staff, SWAC, Council)

January through March - Public comment period

April & May - Final revisions, reviews, recommendations, approval (Staff, SWAC, Council)