

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
Meeting Minutes May 27, 1993

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Roger Buchanan, Chair
Judy Ashley, Yamhill County
John Drew, Far West Fibers
Chris Boitano, Gresham City Councilor
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
Bruce Broussard, Citizen
Ralph Orrino, BFI
Tom Miller, Washington County Haulers Assn
Delyn Kies, Washington County
Susan Keil, City of Portland
Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste Systems
Jerry Morse, Clark County
Jeannie Roy, Citizen
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources
Estle Harlan, OSSI-Tri-Co. Council
James Cozzetto, Jr., Metropolitan Disposal Co.
William R. Bree, DEQ (alternate)
Emilie Kroen, Tualatin
John Drew, Far West Fibers
Merle Irvine, Citizen
Jerry Morse, Clark County
Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste System

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Gary Hansen, Multnomah County
Bob Kincaid, Lake Oswego
Ken Spiegle, Clackamas County
Steve Schwab, Sunset Garbage Collection
Jim Sears, Marion County

GUESTS:

Keri Painter, Columbia Resource Co.
Jerry Yudleson, Regional Disposal Corporation

METRO STAFF

Terry Petersen, SW Dept.
Steve Kraten, SW Dept.
Connie Kinney, SW Dept.
John Houser, Metro Council

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE

Actions:

1. Citizen Communications will be asked for at each SWAC meeting.
2. SWAC Bylaws were passed as written with the following amendments:

A. Appointment of Members, #4

A pool of candidates for the citizen representatives shall be nominated by the participating jurisdictions and the Metro Executive Officer shall appoint one citizen member ~~for~~ from each County if available; or otherwise appointed by the Executive Officer.

B. New #6

The Executive Officer may review the status of the Committee Membership every 4 years and appoint new members as needed.

C. New #7

D. Regular members are encouraged to appoint alternates to serve in their absence. Alternate members shall be specifically named and shall be appointed in the same manner as committee members. Alternates can vote in the absence of the regular Committee member and have full rights and responsibilities of the Committee member in his/her absence. Upon resignation of a Policy Committee member, a new member shall be appointed in accordance with Section II of the Bylaws. [*language from SW Advisory Committee Bylaws*]

3. Committee members requested they be kept informed as to actions of other committees and subcommittees, *i.e.*, Rate Review Committee.
4. Yard Debris Recycling Evaluation was tabled until the next regular meeting of SWAC.

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Chair Roger Buchanan. Chair Buchanan asked each of the Committee persons to introduce themselves and to briefly discuss the goals they have in mind in terms of the work the Committee might accomplish.

Mr. Petersen briefly outlined the committee bylaws as they were presented to Council as an attachment to the resolution forming the Solid Waste Advisory Committee. Mr. Petersen asked for comments.

Mr. Coenen asked if SWAC related to any other committees and should that be addressed in the statement of responsibilities in the bylaws. Mr. Coenen said that as agenda items from other committees developed he would propose that SWAC have the opportunity periodically to keep track of their developments.

Ms. Harlan suggested that language could be added to say we [SWAC] will communicate or share information from other standing committees within the Solid Waste Department.

Chair Buchanan asked Ms. Keil to explain some of the functions various committees involved with solid waste at the City of Portland.

Ms. Keil said the major emphasis in the coming year is to work on commercial recycling because residential recycling was doing well. She said they would be working on removing more yard debris and scrap paper from residential waste. The City will continue to fine-tune the rate setting process. Ms. Keil said the Bureau Advisory Committee oversees both sewers and garbage recycling as well as a solid waste subcommittee which interlocks with the bureau advisory committee.

Mr. Petersen advised Committee members that the Rate Review Committee had two members that served on both the Solid Waste Advisory Committee and the Rate Review Committee which should help to provide a link between the two. Mr. Petersen suggested that since Connie was the clerk on both of those committees that it be her duty to forward agendas and/or minutes to SWAC members.

Ms. Keil suggested adding a sentence to No. 5 of the Bylaws: and other committees dealing with solid waste and recycling issues.

There was much discussion as to whether or not the By-laws intended that a committee member be appointed from each of the three counties. It was unanimously suggested that the language in no. 4 be changed to read: ~~for~~ from each County if available; or otherwise appointed by the Executive Officer.

Ms. Roy asked how long each committee member was to serve on the SWAC.

Mr. Petersen suggested that committee members serve on the committee as long as they are willing to do so, and that was how it had been done in the past.

Ms. Keis asked if it might be a good thing to appoint alternate committee members which could attend and vote in a member's place if they were unable to attend. She suggested language be taken from the previous by-laws as it referred to alternate members.

Committee members were in agreement with Ms. Keis suggestion.

Committee members were also in agreement as to term limits. The committee suggested that language be added giving the Executive Officer the opportunity to review all nominations on a four year term basis but that committee members could continue to serve if requested. It was also pointed out that elected local government members automatically had terms set.

Mr. Coenen suggested that each meeting begin with a request for comments from interested citizens.

Mr. Petersen asked each of the committee members to contact Connie with regard to who their alternate would be.

Ms. Harlan made a motion that the Committee accept the By-laws as amended. Ms. Roy seconded the motion.

Chair Buchanan asked for a vote of the Committee on the By-Laws as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Buchanan asked Committee members to comment on the date and time selected for the monthly meetings. There was considerable discussion. It was noted that with the exception of Gary Hansen, the appointed member from Multnomah County Board of Commissioners, (who is unable to attend any of the meetings as the time now stands), the day and time now set was adequate.

Mr. Petersen presented a project update on long-term financing. Mr. Petersen advised members that there were copies of the Solid Waste Management Plan notebook available for those without them. He said that in that plan two chapters remain blank: the chapter on rates and the chapter on financing. Mr. Petersen said Metro has, in the past, relied on per-ton fees at the transfer station. He said the Committee needed to look at what the consequences of continuing that practice might be, in other words continue to fund all of Metro's activities, all of our costs through per ton charges at transfer stations and landfills. Some alternatives might be: including the cost of disposal in the price of products. Mr. Petersen said we have recently done a much better job of defining goals and problems. We are currently projecting costs and what tipping fee might be in 5-years. We need to determine what costs are tonnage dependent and which are not. Mr. Petersen has asked Metro's legal counsel to look into what Metro's authority to establish and assess different types of fees on different haulers, i.e., haulers, generators, or even the manufacturer's of products, in terms of Metro's new Charter. Metro staff is currently surveying what other communities are doing around the country as far as financing. Mr. Petersen said he would like to hire an outside consultant to look at the financing issue. He said the Solid Waste staff is currently collecting data to help make an economic analysis on such issues as what are the current rates being paid throughout the Metro region.

Mr. Petersen said he hoped to present to the Committee at the June SWAC meeting a staff report on what staff found around the country with financing and rate setting. Mr. Petersen suggested it might be possible to bring in some local government persons to present their local programs. Mr. Petersen said he hopes to have a "scope of work" available for the SWAC committee members to review. Finally, he will invite Metro's legal counsel to speak on the terms of Metro's authority on rate setting and assessing tax.

Mr. Petersen said he envisioned the SWAC membership submitting a recommendation to be passed on to the Rate Review Committee for the rate setting process. Ultimately, Mr. Petersen would like the committee to complete the two blank chapters in the Solid Waste Management Plan.

Mr. Steve Kraten presented an evaluation on progress of local governments toward yard debris recycling. Mr. Kraten asked for a discussion and feedback on the report as presented. Mr.

Kraten said that yard debris represents approximately 16% - 18% of the nation's solid waste stream; and about 1/4 of the residential waste stream. Mr. Kraten said the Metro Planning Department made a very involved plan of the yard debris system in the region as well as estimating generation rates, potential recovery rates and finally generating a Yard Debris Recycling Plan for the Region which has been incorporated into the Solid Waste Management Plan.

Mr. Kraten said the Plan laid out a number of alternative types of yard debris collection systems: different types of depots, high density and low density and permanent and temporary, curbside collection programs of various frequencies. He said the local governments were given the latitude of choosing different options with the ultimate goal being weekly curbside collection. Mr. Kraten said that one concern throughout the yard debris planning process was that there might not be sufficient processing and marketing capacity for yard debris in the event all jurisdictions in the region adopted weekly curbside yard debris collection at the same time. The plan set dates for reassessment of processing and marketing capabilities in order to invite the remainder of local jurisdictions into the weekly collection system. Mr. Kraten said that because the program didn't get under way the first year and because of the "drought year" conditions experienced last year, Metro's data is very limited. Mr. Kraten said those processors handling yard debris other than for compost were not included and therefore the figures stated in the report is probably understated. Mr. Kraten said in evaluating the information he received on yard debris was evident that yard debris depots would still be a very necessary part of the system whether or not all jurisdictions participated in a weekly curbside yard debris collection program.

Mr. Kraten said that in the evaluation of each jurisdiction's program they looked at the entire collection system including municipal leaf collection and community yard debris collections. Mr. Kraten said their evaluation found that participation varied depending on the type of container used and/or furnished.

Mr. Kraten said he wanted to make a change -- on page 33, the last paragraph should be stricken. Mr. Kraten said the figures stated required a lot of interpretation. The results should not be interpreted as comparisons among jurisdictions but rather as comparisons among different types of programs.

Mr. Kraten said the conclusions reached were that there is sufficient processing capacity for any and all yard debris collected; there is sufficient marketing capacity; and a stepped up collection system be implemented by both Washington County and City of Portland (City of Portland has already announced they will increase their program).

Ms. Harlan made some comments and suggestions: On page 20-21, Clackamas County's program implemented January 1992; Tualatin's program was implemented October, 1991; Lake Oswego's program was implemented October, 1992; and due mainly to the "drought year" the yard debris volume collected thus far in 1993 is double that of 1992. Ms. Harlan said it was worth noting that Gladstone's program has always been funded from the General Fund Revenue and is not included in the rates; the programs are no longer being managed by the "contractor" and Gladstone is proposing to pull out of River Cities; and City of Portland's collection will be on an every-other week program beginning July, 1993; Gresham, Troutdale and Wood Village's program was implemented October, 1992.

Ms. Jeanne Roy commented on page 1, last paragraph, referring to the original DEQ rules requiring 60% and that Division 60 rules were rewritten. Ms. Roy said DEQ changed rules as it applied to Metro Region because it had adopted a regional yard debris plan. On page 18, last paragraph refers to landscapers continuing the use of compost as long as the quality stays high. Ms. Roy said that in the past Metro has periodically tested compost from McFarlanes and Grimms and there are even more composting facilities at the present. Ms. Roy would like to insure that the same high quality remains and is concerned that with the budget restraints placed on the budget this may not happen.

Ms. Leigh Zimmerman, Market Development Manager in the Solid Waste Department said she was in the process of meeting with a group that would be adopting yard debris composting standards with the idea of formalizing those ideals that Metro has in the past tested for. She said that group would consist of processors as well as local government representatives.

Ms. Roy said that on page 27, referring to a survey Metro made in 1991, she wondered how long the survey lasted, *i.e.*, 1 month, 12 months and which month(s). Ms Roy's concerns were that depending on which month or months the survey was made the yard debris could have consisted of more or less individual or commercial yard debris dependent on the time of year.

Mr. Gilbert said self-haul has vastly increased especially in the east county area just lately.

Ms. Kies said that she does not disagree with the conclusion in terms of Washington County and the depot system and they are going to do more curbside collection in Washington County, but there were a few more things she wanted to have included in the report before it went to Council Solid Waste. Ms. Kies said these were items she and Mr. Kraten had discussed in the past. Ms. Kies said she was talking about corrections in terms of rate structure and a few other things that were "not quite accurate."

Ms. Kroen commented that it was unfortunate that Tualatin's yard debris program was not mentioned at all, *i.e.*, Tualatin has weekly curbside yard debris pickup and they have furnished roller carts for collection purposes. Ms. Kroen said Tualatin virtually eliminated yard debris from the solid waste in the garbage cans when weekly curbside collection was implemented. Ms. Kroen said she did, however, agree with the conclusion of the report. Ms. Kroen said she would have preferred a report which compared programs and not geographic areas. She said governments wanted to know how much yard debris is being collected out of the yards (by household) and by what type of program.

Mr. Kraten said he had originally used data including figures from Tualatin's program but that the Waste Shed Group opposed highlighting any particular jurisdiction's programs. He said that the consensus of the group agreed the figures should be aggregated.

Ms. Roy said she would be interested in the report giving information as to where the region now stands with relationship to the goal the Plan has established. She also said she felt it was important to let the communities know where they stood in relationship to the goal.

Mr. Kraten said he wanted to point out the this report had a limited scope; it was meant to evaluate the programs, make conclusions about the marketing capacity and the processing capacity. We want to make this report available to affected local governments as soon as possible so they can gear up, plan and put together a program by next year. Mr. Kraten also pointed out that the numbers in the report do not coincide with the recycling yard debris survey only recently presented and part of the reason was that it was done on a different basis and included different things.

Mr. Bree suggested including information pertinent to the Tualatin yard debris collection program without comparing their "totals" thereby giving affected local governments the opportunity to see the comparison of what works well and what only delivers mediocre results. He also suggested the Committee add their recommendations of what should happen with the yard debris collection and processing programs within the region -- not to change the report -- only to add what the committee wants to recommend.

Mr. Orrino suggested the report add what Metro collects at its own facilities, as a depot and as a processing facility.

Mr. Kraten said he had received that suggestion previously and the reason it had not been included was because the information included only facilities that compost rather than those that produce fuel.

Mr. Morse suggested the report include some reference to facilities in Clark County as well.

Mr. Drew said he was confused by what Ms. Kies said. In his previous conversations with Ms. Kies she said she disagreed with the recommendation and he disagrees with the recommendation. Mr. Drew said he had some basic challenges with some of the data presented today. Mr. Drew said that as he interpreted the recommendations they seek a uniform solution or improvement to bring Washington County in compliance with the region. He believes that Washington County is in compliance and that they want to retain the relationship with DEQ to be separately permitted to have an improved yard debris plan separate from Metro's plan.

Mr. Kraten responded explaining it was not his desire to rush through a report with erroneous information, but did not want to take additional time expanding the scope of the report inasmuch as what the report contained could go forward and be implemented.

Ms. Harlan suggested the committee defer presentation of the report until the solid waste advisory committee has further opportunity to discuss the conclusions and recommendations presented in the report.

Chair Buchanan suggested that if there were no further critical questions or comments that the issue of the yard debris report be continued to the next meeting.

The meeting was thereupon adjourned.

The next Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for June 24 (Thursday) at 9:00 a.m. to be held in the Council Annex.