



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

Tuesday, December 12, 2006

Members / Alternates Present:

Mike Hoglund
Mike Leichner
Bruce Walker
Paul Edwards
Rick Winterhalter
JoAnn Herrigel
Dave White
Janet Malloch

Vince Gilbert
Ray Phelps
Glenn Zimmerman
Lori Stole
Dean Kampfer
Wade Lange
Jeff Murray

Mike Miller
Audrey O'Brien
Matt Korot
Theresa Koppang
Steve Schwab
Anita Largent
Eric Merrill

Guests and Metro staff:

Janet Matthews
Councilor Susan McLain
Dan Blue
Terrell Garrett
Scott Klag
Tom Chaimov

Julie Cash
Lee Barrett
Vicki Kolberg
Roy Brower
Brad Botkin
Jim Watkins

Paul Ehinger
Marv Fjordbeck
Wendy Fisher
Mike Dewey
Steve Apotheker
Gina Cubbon

I. Call to Order and Announcements Mike Hoglund

- Sitting in for Councilor Park, who was in a Council meeting, Mr. Hoglund welcomed the attendees and announced that the order of agenda items III and IV would be switched (as reflected below). Additionally, Councilor McLain, former Chair of SWAC, would be stopping by to say a few words as the end of her term was approaching.
- The latest roster of SWAC membership was handed out; if there are any errors or changes needed, please notify Janet Matthews. Ms. Matthews noted that there are vacancies in the area of business rate-payer, Clackamas County citizen rate-payer, and in the position of alternate for Washington County's Theresa Koppang. Suggestions for filling those seats would be welcomed, Ms. Matthews said.
- Councilor McLain briefly addressed the group, noting that she was about to leave office after sixteen years as a Metro Councilor. She learned a myriad of things about the solid waste industry, solid waste issues and recycling in her time at Metro, she said. "I think there are a lot of challenges left ahead," she said, "but I think that this table, and a very strong private industry as well as an agency like Metro, [which] really cares like you do about public service and the price that they have to pay for the public service.... it's still really important for us to keep talking and checking each other [to make sure] we're doing what's best for our businesses and for the general public." Councilor McLain continued, saying she is proud of the many innovations the industry has developed, and of the region's recycling rate.

E-waste and plastics remain a challenge, and organics collection is still being researched, but the region is ahead of the curve. SWAC is vital to that, the Councilor said, and to keeping the process visible. The next Council will help bring about the next chapter with SWAC, and Councilor McLain said she will remain interested in its progress.

- Approval of minutes: The City of Milwaukie's JoAnn Herrigel moved, Mike Leichner of Pride Recycling and Disposal seconded. Approved as written.

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

Mr. Hoglund had staff hand out the most recent results of waste sorts being conducted at dry waste facilities (attached). "I think we're getting close to a set of regulatory standards that will work for [Metro], local governments, the DEQ, and the processors, to make for a better system." He hopes to have some progress made regarding the timing / phasing and implementation of EDWRP by the next SWAC meeting. The waste sorts are helping narrow down what recoverable residual level is feasible; it appears that the previously-discussed 15% will work.

IV. Curbing Residential Curbside Recycling Contamination Kolberg, Klag

(Switched with Agenda Item III.) Scott Klag introduced this item, and handed out hard copies of his PowerPoint presentation (attached). Vicki Kolberg reviewed the outreach campaign, noting that the two goals were to educate the public to separate glass from other recyclables, and keep plastic bags out of their recycling completely. Coates-Kokes was contracted to develop the advertising campaign television campaign (The correct total amount that went towards the purchase of media was \$157,063, broken down as follows: Metro - \$150,000; Clackamas County - \$75,000; City of Portland - \$20,000; Smurfit / DEQ order - \$20,000.) Metro has budgeted another \$150,000 for FY 2007-08.

Ms. Kolberg described the focus group process and what the public wanted, such as for haulers to leave a note describing how the resident is recycling incorrectly, if they are, and how they can correct the situation. The television campaign lasted just six weeks and included separate spots for glass and plastic issues. In addition, a traveling load of contaminated recyclables was shown in five locations around the region along with information about what causes recyclables to be landfilled. The City of Portland printed "Glass Only" stickers to coincide with the campaign. Forms for haulers to use in case of recycling mistakes were used differently depending on the jurisdiction, hauler, and driver. It was the "least systematic, integrated" piece of the campaign, Ms. Kolberg said. Metro's Recycling Information Hotline number was on the leave-behind pieces for residents; callers to that number asked mostly for clarification. Other callers, however, were upset that they hadn't heard about it from their hauler in advance; some felt they shouldn't have to provide their own rigid container for glass, and there were several complaints about containers being stolen.

Next, Mr. Klag presented the follow-up evaluation of the campaign, which consisted of visits to approximately 900 household curbsides before and after the campaign, and a telephone survey. He explained the methodology and results, as shown in the PowerPoint presentation. The telephone survey revealed some improvement to recycling habits, and that information from haulers is something people depend on. When surveyed, more people made a behavior change because of information from their hauler than any other source.

Mr. Klag went through each of the findings, and said that the next steps will include consulting with stakeholders, and consideration of options, such as repeating the television campaign, integrating those ads with messages from local governments and haulers, focusing simply on information left at the curb, or waiting until areas change over to roll carts.

The Committee asked questions and commented. Ms. Herrigel mentioned that she never saw any of the television ads, and consequently recycled incorrectly and got a slip from her hauler. She's noticed no change in her neighborhood, and suggested having haulers leave slips.

Dave White of ORRA commented that he felt there had been a communication breakdown – how were local government representatives advised about the campaign, and then how did they communicate the change to haulers, and the haulers to the drivers? He suggested a coordinated message that would move through that chain of communication.

From Waste Management, Dean Kampfer said that not enough people saw, understood, and implemented the campaign's message. Referring to Mr. White's statements, Mr. Kampfer said that some local governments were more communicative than others. Ms. Kolberg told the group that staff worked with some local governments on a subcommittee, and the intention was that they would then coordinate with their haulers. This worked in some areas, but smaller jurisdictions hadn't been directly involved, and others were understaffed. Ms. Herrigel commented that Ms. Kolberg and staff did a lot of outreach with local governments; if there was a disconnect with haulers, she felt it was not Metro's fault.

There was some confusion, too, Ms. Kolberg said, having people call Metro with comments rather than their local representation or hauler. "In trying to solve one problem [by providing Metro's number], we missed another problem," she explained. A lot was learned that can be used in the next round of funding for this campaign, Mr. Klag added.

To member comments that the campaign didn't address roll cart users, the City of Portland's Bruce Walker responded that this campaign was to try and get ahead of the roll cart curve, and had been based on work with Material Recovery Facilities (MRFs). He added that he supports the campaign, and asked MRFs for their opinions. Jeff Murray of Far West Fibers said that while he hadn't see huge results, his facility wasn't fully operational at the time because of fire damage. Regarding roll carts, however, Mr. Murray said there's been very little glass mixed in. He appreciated the campaign; summer may not have been the best time to run television spots, but as long as something was learned, it was valuable, he concluded.

Janet Malloch of Blue Heron Paper said that she appreciated the effort to reduce contaminants. She personally got feedback from her hauler, which worked.

Mr. Klag concluded the discussion, noting that most of the Committee's comments seemed to lean towards more integration of television ads with local government and hauler messaging. Clackamas County's Rick Winterhalter replied that as long as the campaign continues ramping up to keeping glass separate, it's good, "Just keep at it." Mr. Klag will strategize with local governments and haulers, while Ms. Kolberg continues to find the best ways to utilize this year's funding.

III. RSWMP Issues, Policies, and GoalsJanet Matthews

Ms. Matthews handed out an update of issues, showing the desired outcome for each, and how the issue would be addressed in the RSWMP. After outlining items that past RSWMP discussions have addressed, such as the Plan's purpose, Metro's role in its development and administration, and the roles of local governments and facilities / services, she gave a brief recap of the November 16 SWAC meeting. Ms. Matthews reminded the group that some planning issues (pricing, waste allocation) had been raised. While staff's intent afterward had been to provide some written issue papers that would provide goals, they realized the issues needed more analysis and Council input before policy direction could be defined.

Today’s agenda item would provide an overview of key planning issues recommended for inclusion in the first chapter of the Plan, and members would be asked for their feedback before words are committed to paper, Ms. Matthews said. She listed information the members will receive by January 10th for discussion at the January 25 meeting: A draft of the Plan Context for Chapter 1; draft Regional Policies for Chapter 3; and a list of policies / concepts that will not be carried forward from the original Plan. At the January meeting, each member will have a chance to comment.

Ray Phelps of Allied / WRI asked when Council will get the updated RSWMP; Ms. Matthews replied it will be taken to a work session in mid-February; Council is eager to have this project finished, she said.

Ms. Matthews expanded on the issues outlined in the handout, and asked for comments regarding the issues themselves, desired outcomes, or if perhaps something has been missed. General head-nods affirmed that the right track is being traveled. She reiterated that materials would be forthcoming for review more than two weeks prior to the next SWAC meeting, and asked that the members consider the information carefully for full discussion at that meeting.

From the audience, Terrell Garrett of Greenway recycling asked if a study has been done of dry waste capacity in the region. A general overview has been done, Mr. Hoglund responded, but not a conclusive effort.. Mr. Garrett voiced concern there may not be enough capacity once EDWRP is in full swing.

Mr. White said that, as a representative group, it’s very important that SWAC not “spend January talking about this stuff without going back to the people we represent, to make sure there’s [substantial] buy-in“ from the industry, haulers, and local governments on issues such as self-haul, pricing, mandatory programs. Additionally, he recommended that programs mandated by Metro (such as dry waste processing and commercial programs) need to be “brought up the chain of command” at local governments. “I would just like to say this is the opportunity to start running things up the flag pole, which I intend to do,” he concluded.

Mr. Hoglund said a list of solid waste issues coming up in the next year will be presented to MPAC (Metro Policy Advisory Committee, comprised of mayors and other elected officials from the local governments). “If there’s a local concern they see coming, [they may] elect to weigh in the issue,” he said. Metro Council won’t vote on the RSWMP until April or May at the earliest, Mr. Hoglund added.

V. Other Business and AdjournMike Hoglund

With no other business forthcoming, Mr. Hoglund thanked the attendees and adjourned the meeting at 3:35 pm.

Prepared by:

Gina Cubbon
Administrative Secretary
Metro Solid Waste & Recycling Department

gbc
Attachments: Residential Curbside Outreach Campaign Presentation

M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\2006\SWAC121206min.doc
Queue

**15% Residual Pile Waste Sorts at Dry Waste Facilities
October/November/December 2006**

Sampling procedure:

1. Visually inspect the residual pile.
2. Prior to sampling, estimate if the entire residual pile appears to have more than 15% recoverable wood, OCC and Metal. Take a photograph.
3. Randomly select the sample from two places in the dry waste residual pile. Try to get at least 500 lbs per sample.
4. Determine total sample weight by obtaining a heavy and lightweight on the sample and the box/truck/loader holding the sample.
5. Spread sample out on the sorting floor. Take another photograph
6. Using the wooden check boxes for recoverable sizes, sort the sample into four categories:
 - Wood: 12" or greater in any direction
 - OCC: 12" or greater in any direction
 - Metal: 8" or greater in any direction
 - All other materials
7. Record weights for all materials and back out the tares for each material container

Results To Date

Sample number Facility Date and Time Sorters	Pre-sort visual estimate of residual pile (appears to have less than or more than 15% recoverable wood, OCC, metal)	Sample size	Total recoverable lbs wood, OCC, metal	Percent of recoverable wood, OCC, metal
1. Metro South TS 10/25/06 7:30 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Much less than 15%	360.6 lbs	Wood: 8.1 OCC: 4.3 <u>Metal: 8.2</u> Total: 20.6	5.7%
2. Metro South TS 10/25/06 7:30 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Much less than 15%	543.9 lbs	Wood: 2.5 OCC: 7.6 <u>Metal: 13.8</u> Total: 23.9	4.4%
3. Troutdale TS 10/25/06 11:00 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett plus several TTS sorters	Less than 15%	1,340 lbs	Wood: 188.3 OCC: 11.2 <u>Metal: 49.1</u> Total: 248.6	18.6%
4. WRI 10/27/06 3:00 PM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson Jim Watkins	Less than 15%, possibly around 5-10%	780 lbs	Wood: 47.6 OCC: 8.35 <u>Metal: 74.6</u> Total: 130.55	16.7%
5. WRI 11/01/06 9:00 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Less than 15%, possibly around 5%	540 lbs	Wood: 35.3 OCC: 16.05 <u>Metal: 13.1</u> Total: 64.45	11.9%
6. ECR 11/01/06 10:30 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Well under 15%, likely under 5%	900 lbs	Wood: 10.25 OCC: 1.6 <u>Metal: 13.1</u> Total: 24.95	2.8%

Sample number Facility Date and Time Sorters	Pre-sort visual estimate of residual pile (appears to have less than <u>or</u> more than 15% recoverable wood, OCC, metal)	Sample size	Total recoverable lbs wood, OCC, metal	Percent of recoverable wood, OCC, metal
7. Troutdale TS 11/01/06 12:30 PM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Less than 15%.	520 lbs	Wood: 29.4 OCC: 2.8 <u>Metal: .85</u> Total: 33.05	6.4%
8. Troutdale TS 11/01/06 12:50 PM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Less than 15%	680 lbs	Wood: 77.4 OCC: 2.85 <u>Metal: 28.65</u> Total: 108.9	16%
9. Wastech 11/01/06 1:50 PM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	At least 20-25%, possibly higher	779 lbs	Wood: 296.05 OCC: 33.55 <u>Metal: 23.8</u> Total: 353.4	45.3%
10. Metro South TS 11/08/06 6:25 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Jim Watkins Penny Erickson	More than 15%, possibly 20%	1833 lbs	Wood: 334.95 OCC: 12.45 <u>Metal: 46.00</u> Total: 393.40	21.4%
11. Wastech 11/15/06 8:40 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson David McIntire	More than 15%, possibly around 20-30%	1000 lbs	Wood: 322.95 OCC: 95.6 <u>Metal: 1.95</u> Total: 420.5	42%
12. Wastech 11/15/06 930 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson David McIntire 3 Wastech sorters	More than 15%, possibly around 40%	1460 lbs	Wood: 843.25 OCC: 33.1 <u>Metal: 50.25</u> Total: 926.6	63.4%
13. ECR 11/15/06 11:30 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Less than 5%	660 lbs	Wood: 30.1 OCC: 9.3 <u>Metal: 18.3</u> Total: 57.7	8.7%
14. Pride 11/22/06 2:00 PM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Less than 10%	1240 lbs	Wood: 30 OCC: 14.75 <u>Metal: 5.5</u> Total: 50.25	4%
15. Pride 11/29/06 9:50 AM Sorters: Lee Barrett Bryce Jacobson	Less than 5%	1440 lbs.	Wood: 23.9 OCC: 11.5 <u>Metal: .8</u> Total: 36.2	2.5%

Residential Curbside Outreach Campaign



Evaluation Results

SWAC December 12, 2007

Agenda

1. Vicki
 - Background – why, what
 - Feedback
2. Scott
 - Field work results
 - Phone survey
3. Discussion



Outreach Campaign

- Background – why, what
- Feedback



Evaluation Methods

- Curbside Field Study
 - Put out glass and plastic bags?
 - ~ 900 HH's visited twice
- Phone survey
 - Glass and plastic bag recycling
 - Surveyed ~300 of 900 HHs visited
 - Called small sample of HH's with roll cart



Results – Summary

- Field study
 - Only marginal improvement on setting glass aside
 - But positive trends
 - More segregation of glass inside bins
 - More use of rigid containers
- Telephone survey
 - Better reported behavior regarding glass
 - Information from hauler may be a key



Curbside Fieldwork – Overview

- Number HHs visited
 - “Pre” - 980 HHs
 - “Post” – 884 HHs
- Comparability of visits
 - Percentage Pre / Post at curb
 - Garbage: 94% / 92%
 - Glass: 44% / 45%
 - Plastic bags: 11% / 9 %



Curbside Fieldwork – Results

- All HHs with glass
 - “Pre” 434 HHs
 - “Inside bin” **71%**
 - “Outside bin” **29%**
 - “Post” 400 HHs
 - “Inside bin” **68%**
 - “Outside bin” **32%**



Curbside Fieldwork – Results

- 263 HH's with glass both visits
 - “Pre”
 - “Inside bin” **70%**
 - “Outside bin” **30%**
 - “Post”
 - “Inside bin” **64%**
 - “Outside bin” **36%**



CF Results - *Inside Bin Behavior*

- All HHs with glass
 - “Pre” 309 HHs
 - Loose in bin **61%**
 - Segregated (bagged) in bin **39%**
 - “Post” 271 HHs
 - Loose in bin **53%**
 - Segregated (bagged) in bin **47%**



CF Results - *Outside Bin Behavior*

- All HHs with glass
 - “Pre” 125 HHs
 - “Rigid” container **15%**
 - “Post” 129 HHs
 - “Rigid” container **20%**



Telephone Survey – Overview

- Bin HH's
 - Targeted HHs visited in Field Study
 - 288 completed
- Roll cart HH's
 - Random selection from major roll cart areas
 - 79 completed



Telephone Survey – Results

- Bin HHs with glass: 268
 - “Inside bin” **59%**
 - “Outside bin” **41%**
- Roll cart HHs with glass:
 - “Inside cart” **14%**
 - “Outside cart” **84%**



TS Results - Ad Recall

- Bin HHs – 288
 - Glass Ad 19%
 - Plastic Bag Ad 8%
- Roll Cart HHs – 79
 - Glass Ad 15%
 - Plastic Bag Ad 5%



TS Results - Behavior Changes

“In last 3-4 months, changed the way you recycle glass?”

- Bin HHs – 277
 - Yes 22%
- Roll Cart HHs – 70
 - Yes 11%



TS Results - “What promoted this change?”

	<u>Count</u>	<u>%</u>
Newspaper story	1	1.7
Radio news story	1	1.7
Website	1	1.7
TV news story	5	8.3
Mailer or notice from City or County	5	8.3
TV ad	7	11.7
Other	8	13.3
Mailer from hauler	10	16.7
Notice left at curb from garbage hauler	22	36.7
Total	60	100%



Next Steps

- Consult with stakeholders
- Consider options



Options to Consider

- More TV time with message – repeat the campaign
- More integration of TV ads with local gov't & hauler messaging
- Just focus on the “leave behinds”
- Wait until an area is ready for roll carts – then do education



REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (UPDATE)

<i>Planning issue</i>	<i>Desired outcome</i>	<i><u>Ways in which issue will be addressed in RSWMP</u></i>
1. Waste generation	Slow the growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-going waste prevention strategies (TBD) New strategies from DEQ process
2. Landfilled resources	Reduce disposal of readily recoverable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require processing of all dry waste before landfilling Establish targets for increased recovery of business-generated recyclables in local jurisdictions
3. Toxics in the environment	Reduce use and improper disposal of HHW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education on non-toxic alternatives Continued collection of HHW at round-up events and permanent sites
4. System managed "end of pipe"	Product mfrs. share responsibility, e.g., e-waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritize product stewardship efforts based on environmental impact, barriers to recycling, and financial burdens to local govt. Work at regional, state, and national level to develop and implement policies and industry-wide agreements
5. Increase sustainability practices	Operations of the solid waste system are more sustainable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate, implement, report on progress in achieving system sustainability goals and objectives
6. Allocation of waste	Ratepayers benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (TBD) System Improvements workplan
7. Public/private pricing	Ratepayers benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rate transparency policy (TBD) System Improvements workplan
8. Self-haul services	Higher recovery of self-hauled material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (TBD) System Improvements workplan
9. Facility regulation	Clear entry standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (TBD) System Improvements workplan
10. Long-term goals (e.g., waste generation goal, recovery goals beyond 2009)	Add new target-based goals to RSWMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (TBD) Evaluate and recommend long-term goals for future Plan amendment