

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
Summary of the Meeting of 8/15/93

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ruth McFarland, Vice Chairperson
Susan Kiel, City of Portland
James Cozzetto, Jr., MDC
Delyn Kies, Washington Co.
Pat Vernon, DEQ
Susan Ziolko, Clackamas Co.
John Drew, Far West Fibers
Chris Boitano, East Co. Cities
Emilie Kroen, City of Tualatin
Robin Kordik, Citizen Rep.
Bruce Broussard, Citizen Rep.
Gary Hansen, Councilor, Multnomah Co.
Brian Carlson, Clark Co.
Ralph Gilbert, ECR
Carol Ann White, Yamhill Co.
Estle Harlan, OSSI/Tri-Co. Council
Jeanne Roy, Citizen Rep.
Kathy Kiwala, City of Lake Oswego

GUESTS:

Elenora Fielder, Citizen, Rate Review Committee
Carolyn Francis, Wastech, Inc.
Lexus E. Johnson, Oregon Hydrocarbon
Ray Phelps, Pacific/West Communications
Tom Zelenka, Schnitzer

METRO:

John Houser, Metro Council
Bob Martin
Terry Petersen
Debbie Gorham
Scott Klagg
Connie Kinney

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairperson, Ruth McFarland.

Chair McFarland asked each of the Committee members and alternates to introduce themselves.

Chair McFarland asked for a motion for adoption of the 6/24/93 Minutes. The motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the Committee.

Terry Petersen said the deadline for submittal of the RFP on the assessment of the system finance study is this week. Mr. Petersen said he would be assisted by Steve Schwab (hauling industry, joint membership on SWAC and RRC) and Pat Vernon (with DEQ, non-voting member of SWAC) on the selection of a consultant.

Mr. Petersen said he is interested in holding another joint meeting of the SWAC and RRC possibly in September. Mr. Petersen briefly discussed the work which has been done in Toronto towards financing their solid waste system. He mentioned Toronto had a severe financial problem when the tip fee rose to \$150/per ton. Their solution was to reallocate some fixed costs from the tip fee to a flat fee collected through property tax bills.

Chair McFarland said the solid waste department made a presentation to the Council Solid Waste Committee last night (Tuesday, August 17, 1993). As part of their presentation they attempted to explain why disposal rates must rise as a result of building a transfer station which was wholly funded by private financing. The projected rise of \$4.15 per ton is expected if the Wilsonville Transfer Station is allowed to be built.

Mr. Martin explained that there were three components involved with the \$4.00 per ton increase. 1) you will be taking waste out away from a transfer station that has lower per-ton costs. The new facility will not have "on-board" source-separation available on opening but will have the potential for source-separation at a time when it is financially able to do so; 2) Metro will have to hire new gatehouse people and purchase new equipment; and 3) the major portion of the remaining increase will be used to service the bond funding.

Ms. Keil asked Mr. Martin why it costs three times more to process garbage at Metro West (Wilsonville) than at Metro South.

Mr. Martin said Metro West is configured differently than Metro South and therefore it doesn't handle waste the same way. For instance it takes a much shorter time to dump everything into a pit and shove it into a compactor than it does to dump it on the floor and separate the pieces and then compact it. For another reason, Metro West will be handling a lot less waste than Metro South.

Chair McFarland asked if part of the reason the costs were higher at Metro West was because of the way it was constructed?

Mr. Martin said no, he was mainly talking about operating costs.

Ms. Harlan said part of the reason is that there will be more waste recovery at Wilsonville, and there is none at South. But if South were converted so they could recover more

materials, will that not also raise costs at South? She said it was her understanding that there is no diversion at South.

Mr. Martin said that present plans at Metro West do not include materials recovery in its current configuration (other than cardboard), but there are increased opportunities. Current construction and equipment allows for probably 1% of waste recovery in order to keep the building cost prices low. Metro West, however, is configured so that as market opportunities emerge, they have room and opportunity to take advantage of that. That is missing from Metro South. New facilities need to be cost effective.

Chair McFarland asked if there were any further comments or questions with regard to the Wilsonville facility. The discussion then led to the implementation of the Sheriff's Contract with Metro for flow control enforcement.

Mr. Martin said he had had two meetings with Sheriff's Office. Mr. Martin said they are currently looking at a start-up date of September 15. The Sheriff's office is recruiting new officers to replace the officers that will be placed in the flow control enforcement contract.

Mr. Broussard asked what type of investigation would the Sheriff's officers be making?

Mr. Martin said they would mostly be working in surveillance.

Ms. Keil asked if the program was geared to focus on haulers or self-haulers?

Mr. Martin said primarily enforcement would be focused on commercial self-haulers, but of course they would not limit their surveillance.

Mr. Boitano assured the Committee that the Multnomah County Sheriff's officers had state-wide police powers and they had surveillance aircraft available to them out of Troutdale.

Mr. Broussard commented that he was particularly concerned about those persons who were turned away at the landfills because they did not have the funds to dispose of their material so they just dumped it in a neighborhood on the way.

Chair McFarland introduced Scott Klagg who made a presentation of the Metro region's 1993 waste reduction assessment.

Mr. Klagg said the planning began with the 1988 System Management Study, the 1988 EQC Order, the 1989 Waste Reduction chapter to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP), 1991 additional chapter on Special Waste and Yard Debris. He said that in 1993 Metro and this Committee will work on updating that 5-year plan. The original 5-year plan covered the period 1990 through 1995, and the update will cover the period 1995 through 2000. Mr. Klagg then continued to discuss where we (the region) were going; where are we now; and, where should we be going.

Mr. Klagg said the RSWMP called for reaching a goal of 56% recycling by the year 2010, but at the region's current recycling rate we will have to come up with some very innovative recycling schemes to reach that lofty goal.

Mr. Klagg said that lumber recovery has been the most dramatic with a total of 2.4% more recovered than anticipated. Single-family recycling has made a .3% better than expected rate while multi-family recycling was behind .1% less than expected. The recycling activity for yard debris was 2.3% less than anticipated recovery rate.

Mr. Klagg said that where we go from here will be largely due to the innovativeness of our programs. He said that prior to 1988 the infrastructure had not been developed for Metro to study the wastestream and since that time we have been developing expertise and experience that will hopefully benefit us in understanding and developing better programs in the future to promote the recycling trend.

Mr. Klagg said Metro had conducted a waste audit in 1992 to determine where the waste was being generated and found the following: Residential = 23%, Commercial = 47%, Construction/Demolition = 13%, Industrial Waste = 6%, Special Waste = 7% and Events = 4%.

Mr. Klagg suggested that goals be based on a per capita or per employee basis and develop target programs to reduce those wastestreams.

Ms. Keil asked Mr. Klagg how they charted the multi-family recycling levels, and that the total he reached in the survey seemed very low in comparison to the City of Portland.

Mr. Klagg said he used a 1 to 4 units as single family residential.

Several of the Committee members including Ms. Keil said they defined multi-family differently.

Ms. Harlan asked Mr. Klagg if he was measuring the wastestream in a different manner than what they were reporting (the hauling and landfill industry). Ms. Harlan asked what Metro means by "presenting to the public new and innovative programs for waste reduction and recycling". She said that every time Metro introduces new programs, the public gets the mistaken impression that they are going to save them money and it ends up costing them.

Chair McFarland said the reality is that Metro can only address what happens at the transfer facilities. Metro is not in a position of control over those responsibilities that are in the hands of the haulers, processors and local governments. But that Metro can help by being the regional coordinator for implementation of waste reduction and related programs. The region cannot reach their goal with the current Plan. Chair McFarland also pointed out that Metro sponsors many resource-recovery programs but when those

programs become profitable, Metro loses it. She said this Committee with the assistance of the Rate Review Committee need to look at the current attitude on granting money to recycling activities, and if we intend to continue funding how much we want to give them, as well as when we will let the businesses assume full control of the profits and/or losses.

Ms. Keil agreed that Metro, as the regional coordinator did need to nurture those waste reduction and recycling programs in their infancy, but to turn them loose when they became profitable. This was good business for the region.

Chair McFarland said the Council Solid Waste as well as the Metro Council found the advice of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee and the Rate Review Committee to be extremely valuable, and relied on them to make decisions such as social values of the proposed business, amount of subsidy, if any, etc.

Mr. Hansen said he was more interested in disposed pounds per person. Mr. Hansen noted it was easier to measure disposed waste over recovery. Mr. Hansen was especially pleased that Metro had contracted for flow control enforcement measures and feels that is the key to Metro's lost tonnage.

Brian Carlson echoed Mr. Hansen's comments. He said Clark County was focusing more on waste generation avoidance through measures such as smart shopping. He said Clark County felt it was important to separate residential and commercial because in their area single family were paying the same rates as commercial and generating much less.

Mr. Gilbert commented that energy recovery should be elevated on the recycling hierarchy. He said hog fuel is looked on as very low priority and he feels it has a very important contribution to the system.

Ms. Vernon commented that the State of Oregon, DEQ was in the process of holding public meetings to develop a Solid Waste Management Plan which will be updated every two years. There will be one public meeting this evening in McMinnville, at the Community College and the next evening (8/19/93) in Beaverton at the PGE building. Ms. Vernon said they will be writing chapters on: Source Reduction, Material Recovery, System Management, and Disposal.

Ms. Kroen suggested quantifying the long-term benefit of subsidizing some projects even though they do not have an economic value. She said you need to weight these programs on an individual basis as to the good of the region, not entirely on financial rewards.

Mr. Broussard said he felt it was important to not be so absorbed in attaining the 56% goal. He asked about privatization of garbage.

Ms. Kordik said that she was involved in a program in Seattle where they found that they counted per capita disposal rate and the information was skewed. She believes you have

to look at the factors in your study such as perhaps type of household, number of persons in household, etc.

Mr. Boitano said local governments had an opportunity to be leaders in waste reduction and recycling and that East County governments was striving to be a leader in this regard. They were not waiting for Metro and were implementing their own programs.

Mr. Drew said it was important to see that goal of 56% to be just that -- a goal. In the year 1988 it was reasonable to believe that such strides were being made and that 56% could easily be obtained, but after further assessment we realize that is not attainable, we should readjust our goal. A goal is just that, something we hope to attain, not all important. Mr. Drew asked Ms. Gorham if it was her intention to have a new plan under consideration before the end of the year.

Ms. Gorham said she believed they could have a plan within this fiscal year.

Ms. Roy said that Metro has had four years of experience with which to study the wastestream and hopes they will go back and study their results. In other words, see what they did that worked and what programs didn't work, and then come up with a plan that can make waste reduction happen. Ms. Roy felt it was important for Metro to look at the region and use regional input as opposed to seeing what is going on on the national level because it was important that local governments be able to implement these programs.

Chair McFarland commented that educating the region on waste reducing and recycling was a big part of minimizing the wastestream.

Mr. Martin said he hadn't heard anyone around the table mention a very important factor, especially in the commercial sector and that was disposal fees. He would like to see an analysis of the role of disposal costs. And, do we want to subsidize disposal?

Ms. Kies said she would like to see a measurement of what effect that would have on recovery.

Mr. Hansen said it might be worthwhile to have a differential in disposal value. It costs more in terms of effect whether you dispose of batteries or inert material. Charge more to dispose of those items you wish to keep out of the landfills.

Chair McFarland said the Committee had run out of time and we would conclude our meeting. She thanked everyone for their attendance and their input, and reminded them how valuable their input was to the Council.

The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be held on September 15, at 8:30 a.m. in room 370A-B.