

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
Summary of the Meeting of 10/15/93

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Judy Wyers, Chairperson
Susan Keil, City of Portland
James Cozzetto, Jr., MDC
Pat Vernon, DEQ
Susan Ziolkowski, Clackamas Co.
John Drew, Far West Fibers
Chris Boitano, East Co. Cities
Emilie Kroen, City of Tualatin
Bruce Broussard, Citizen Rep.
Gary Hansen, Commissioner, Multnomah Co.
Brian Carlson, Clark Co.
Delyn Kies, Washington Co.
Brian Heiberg, OSSI/Tri-Co. Council
Jeanne Roy, Citizen Rep.
Shirley Coffin, Citizen-Recycler, Rate Review Committee
Steven L. Miesen, BFI/Trans Industries
Tom Miller, Washington Co. Haulers
Steve Schway, Clackamas Co. Haulers
Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste System
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources

GUESTS:

Lynda Kotta, Alternate City of Gresham
Victoria Kordilik, Alternate Citizen Rep.

METRO:

John Houser, Metro Council
Bob Martin
Terry Petersen
Scott Klag
Doug Anderson
Steve Kraten
Debbie Gorham
Connie Kinney

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson, Judy Wyers. Ms. Wyers announced that Chairperson Roger Buchanan was unable to attend the meeting due to recent dental surgery.

Approval of the 9/29/93 minutes

Mr. Coenen asked for an amendment of the minutes to reflect that he was in attendance at the 9/29/93 SWAC/RRC meeting. The minutes were accepted as written with the amendment as indicated.

Updates:

Mr. Kraten gave an update on the flow control enforcement program. Mr. Kraten said the program is up and running and consists of one Metro coordinator, and three Multnomah County Sheriff's deputies and a corrections officer. He said there were two major functions of the unit: 1) investigation of solid waste violations, and 2) illegal dump cleanups. The cleanup portion of the program is slated to clear out the worst of the chronic dump sites aided by the corrections officer and inmates who have volunteered to assist in this program. Mr. Kraten said the most important task in this program is to identify where the "missing" tonnage is going. In the case of illegal dumping, where the illegal dumper has been identified, they are required to clean up the site.

Mr. Broussard asked if the Sheriff's deputies were scheduled to go to each of the counties in the region to explain the program's goals and objectives?

Mr. Kraten said all local governments had been contacted so that efforts could be coordinated and that in fact they had received tips from some of those same local governments.

Ms. Roy asked what was the cost to Metro for the illegal dumping program and can someone provide the total cost to the region if you calculate Metro's costs plus the city and county's costs.

Mr. Kraten said he could not give the cost for illegal dumping alone, but the major emphasis is to track down the waste that is leaving the region. The cost of the program for the first year is \$357,000 which includes one-time start up costs of \$150,000.

Mr. Martin said that figure should be compared with the revenue loss which we believe is occurring from the flow that is not tracked, an estimated \$2,000,000 in revenue.

Ms. Kiel, City of Portland said they have tracked some categories of costs: Maintenance Bureau, \$40,000 cleaning up; out of Franchise fees, \$280,000 to Bureau of Buildings to deal with nuisance issues -- not all of which is illegal dumping, and this does not cover any of the "call response" types of matters.

Mr. Broussard wanted to know if the program would publicly identify the violators?

Mr. Kraten said the program had only just gotten underway and they are working closely with local governments to apprehend violators and in fact local governments have given them tips on violators. Mr. Kraten said they have had a lot of cooperation with regards to violators cleaning up their dump sites and he certainly did not want to jeopardize that cooperation.

Mr. Martin said that before the program was implemented one of the provisions was that a cost accounting would be furnished Council on a regular basis. Mr. Martin felt it was a bit premature to indicate at this point the tons recovered, prosecutions, etc.

Chair Wyers felt they should explore the question of whether or not violators were identified publicly. She said the pros and cons needed to be discussed first.

Mr. Miller suggested it would not be necessary to name names but it might act as a deterrent if it was announced that "16 illegal dumping violators were apprehended today." this would indicate to the citizens of the region that the program was working.

Mr. Heiberg asked if there was any follow-up on the violators: *i.e.*, if they needed a license, etc.

Mr. Kraten said they required proof that they disposed of the illegally dumped material legally and they were keeping a database to see if they were repeat violators.

Organic Waste Management:

Mr. Jeep Reid gave a presentation on the Second Organic Waste Workshop for management of organic waste to be held on November 10, 8:00 at the Portland Conference Center. Mr. Reid said that all of the delegates at the first conference for the most part favored finding a way to avoid landfilling of organics. Mr. Reid said the next workshop will focus on four strategies, each of which will present a different level of change from the existing system.

Ms. Roy said she would like to know what kind of time-frame we were talking about in the institution of an organic waste management system, *i.e.*, within the next 1 or 2 years or 5 or 10 years, because it would make a difference to her as to what type of scenario she would choose.

Mr. Martin said Metro was looking at a strategy that would serve us well in the long term, not just a short fix.

Ms. Kies said that one thing that was pointed out at the National Recycling Conference that markets were still the most important consideration and recycling had to be fitted into the economy. That the way that recycling was going to be successful was to implement economic development.

Options for Redirecting Haulers to Reduce Tonnage at Metro South:

Mr. Martin said this issue has arisen as a consequence of the debate over whether or not to build the Wilsonville Transfer Station and whether or not it was needed from a capacity standpoint. Mr. Martin said it was pointed out by both Clackamas County Commission and the City of Oregon City that Metro has a commitment to pare back the tonnage to around 700 tons per day on a monthly average, which was required under the original conditional use permit granted when the site was allowed to become a transfer station in the early 1980's. Mr. Martin said there has not been a hard and fast decision to actually implement redirecting tonnage to Metro Central,

but he does want to show how it could be done and what some of the options are as well as impacts and/or benefits.

Mr. Martin said one benefit to Metro is that the more tonnage redirected to Metro Central, the more money Metro will save. Under the present (short-term) contract arrangements any tonnage redirected will amount to approximately \$4.00 per ton in savings to Metro. He said that is offset, however, to impacts on the haulers. Assuming that all haulers are making rational decisions about where they haul tonnage, on the basis of travel time, if you shift a hauler from the facility they are presently using to another, that arguably could involve some additional travel time inconvenience or logistic problems for the hauler.

Mr. Martin said we essentially have a "put or pay" contract at Metro Central of 35,000 tons per month and we want to shift enough tons from South to Central so we will always take advantage of that 35,000 tons per month capacity. In that case we would have to shift about 67,000 tons from South to Central. Because tonnage varies substantially throughout the seasons, it is not quite that simple, however. This would be the "low tonnage" approach.

Mr. Martin said the "high tonnage" approach might make a tonnage maximum at South of 2,000 per day. That would result in shifting about 129,000 tons. Mr. Martin then directed everyone's attention to maps on the wall and described how the colors indicated travel times and how Metro might propose which haulers were to deliver material to South and which to Central. Mr. Martin also spoke about the possibility of using a directed use order, identify franchises and shift those franchises as needed to achieve the tonnage objectives. A second strategy might be to offer vouchers to haulers which would allow them to use Metro South up to a certain tonnage limit and then everything else has to go to Central. A third strategy might be to financially encourage haulers to make the shift, since that Metro will realize a savings on all tonnage being shifted to Central. This would allow haulers to make the management decision on which, if any, tonnage will be diverted. This strategy would be the most difficult for Metro to implement.

Mr. Martin said that none of the programs would be implemented until after they have been thoroughly discussed with the haulers. After a review of various options, a meeting with all franchised haulers in the region, and consideration of input from the haulers, Metro will proceed as Metro Code directs with the directed use orders which would identify those haulers who will have to shift. Metro will schedule hearings for appeals, on the basis of hardship, review those appeals and make final determinations on the shifts. It looks as though the earliest implementation could begin in January.

Mr. Heiberg asked if this would only affect franchised haulers, *i.e.*, if you are an independent contractor who has a charge at Metro, you will not be affected.

Mr. Martin said that it really depended on the implementation strategy, but primarily because Metro can identify franchised haulers, that will be their target. If, however, we were to go to a system of vouchers or a system in which we offer some financial inducement for people to shift, then it wouldn't matter whether they were franchised, commercial, non-commercial, or whatever.

Mr. Heiberg asked if he were directed to Metro Central, would all of his drop-box accounts also have to go to Central as well?

Mr. Martin said the drop box material was a difficult call.

Mr. Heiberg said he felt if drop box customers were not included, the drop box customers that were not franchised would have an advantage of franchise haulers.

Mr. Petersen said that the scenarios they have identified did consider the drop box tonnage -- it was built-in.

Mr. Martin said as they begin considering all of the scenarios, Metro will equitably administer it and not unduly interfere with the competitiveness of the companies. Mr. Martin said Metro will undoubtedly encounter problems which by no means are all sorted all out at this point. That is why we want to meet with the haulers in a formal setting to sort some of these things out.

Ms. Keil said she felt that the voucher system definitely had some appeal for a jurisdiction because it tended to offset in some way the additional operating cost.

Mr. Cozzetto suggested that they again survey the haulers because he felt that within some of the boundaries Metro has suggested be dedicated to Metro South, the haulers have voluntarily taken to Central.

Mr. Martin said that was a good suggestion.

Mr. Boitano said he liked the idea of using Metro's savings as a short-term incentive to stimulate buy-in, and particularly to help diminish the impact on the end rate payer.

Mr. Martin said if we were to devise some way to return some of our savings back to haulers, that would require Metro Council action. This strategy would take longer to implement, if possible, than implementing a directed use order.

Mr. Miller asked if the real issue we are working with, tons and dollars? Or is the real issue, with respect to Clackamas County, the number of trips and activity around the facility?

Mr. Martin said that Oregon City/Clackamas County has quite clearly said they would like to see us reduce the tonnage at that facility. We have discussed other issues and we have taken steps to diminish the delay times at South, and I don't think the traffic situation is too impactful to either Oregon City or Clackamas County. The number of self-haul customers have increased 20%. And a question has been asked of this committee as to whether or not they are paying their way. The committee might want to consider the rate for self-haul and perhaps self-haul drop-off centers.

Mr. Miller expressed the desire for the haulers to meet with Metro because the newspaper made it sound as if Metro had already made up its mind on how it was going to proceed. He said the

haulers had some alternative ideas and he was sure they could come up with something that was equitable for everyone.

Mr. Martin said he wanted everyone to understand that Metro will talk exhaustively with people before any program is implemented.

Ms. Ziolko said that Oregon City and Clackamas County was indeed concerned with traffic and tonnage totals as well as the fact that recovery capabilities were almost nonexistent at South due to space.

Mr. Schwab asked when the contract with Metro Central would be up for renegotiation, and were we looking at, for instance, a nine-month fix?

Mr. Martin said we could keep the contract at Metro Central where it currently is for as much as five years, or as little as three. The three years would be up in October 1994. The Metro South contract will be up for bid at the end of 1994, with an optional extension of 2-1/2 years. We are not suggesting doing this from the standpoint of savings or we would have done it a long time ago.

Mr. Heiberg said it still was not clear to him whether the shift was being implemented due to the tonnage or the traffic, or is it due to the desire of diverting more waste out of the stream and the facility is not capable of doing that because of the number of vehicles using it?: So I feel we first need to identify what the problem is.

Mr. Martin said there were a variety of concerns that go beyond tonnage and traffic, but as I suggested earlier, we will get together with the haulers and we will examine all of the options and explore the suggestions that haulers might bring to the table.

Mr. Heiberg said that as a hauler he was encouraged in Metro's commitment to communicating with haulers as to what will work.

Mr. Miesen said that one thing haulers might want to think about is whether there was something they (Trans-Industries) could do to induce them to bring their material to Central rather than South.

Mr. Schwab asked if there was a reason for not allowing haulers to use the short road in to Central?

Mr. Martin said the reason it was signed to go down Kitteridge and down Front was because it was a concern of the City when that facility was permitted that that was their preferred route because of the way in which Front St. has been designated as a "truck route". Their concern is that if a lot of heavy trucks start using streets like Balboa and 61st, they would have continuous maintenance problems. They have made it clear that if they have maintenance problems, Metro does also.

Mr. Miller pointed out that the City was particularly concerned that the railroad traffic would hold up truck traffic and it would cause a line-up on St. Helen's Road.

Chair Wyers said perhaps a question on how things could be improved at Central could be included on the questionnaire for the haulers.

Mr. Cozzetto also commented that the train is a big issue there and they sometimes tie up the track for as long as a half-hour at a time.

Chair Wyers introduced the next agenda item: Targeted Generator Diversion Strategies.

Mr. Klag distributed a handout to put into perspective where we think we are at -- at the end of the second phase when we start to talk about what programs will be in the mix, how we might structure that in the planning process to come up with a final plan.

Mr. Klag said in interpreting these scenarios, he began with the "status quo", or present analysis and in each scenario raised the efforts by, *for instance in the first scenario, 5%, etc.* Mr. Klagg said the figures used in each of the categories were approximate and not an issue. More important, he said are to look at what is feasible in terms of programs and what level of effort would be required to develop things in different areas.

Mr. Drew said this was a very good approach, especially if we are going in the direction of house per capita per day. He felt it was important to point out to Metro Council that, as Scott said, this is an example for the purpose of discussion and that we are not guaranteeing, nor do we have a concept or program in mind to improve participation that will automatically result in a certain amount of tonnage reduction per annum. He felt that Council has in the past taken work accomplished by both staff and committee too specifically and they should understand this is but an example.

Ms. Kroen stated she felt this was a great model. One concern is that a market evaluation be conducted to establish the potential, and that the cost to the rate payer be considered when we begin to establish the five-year goal, and whether that cost is worth the amount of material that is being diverted from the wastestream.

Mr. Martin said we would probably need some help from local jurisdictions as to how to translate our cost increases into curbside rate increases.

Mr. Heiberg agreed that the model was excellent and added that he would like to see some cost association with each scenario as to its cost effectiveness.

Ms. Kroen added that a value need to be added. She said there were some things that you couldn't put into dollars and cents but there was some long-term economic value to making a change.

Ms. Kordik asked if there was a particular reason why the word "recycling" in the title for the five-year plan. She is particularly concerned that when this is presented to the public they may view this as something other than recycling.

Ms. Kies felt diversion, waste reduction and recycling could be used.

Ms. Vernon said she felt that the correctness of words such as "diversion", "waste reduction", and "recycling" were a matter of taste. The bottom line was that we are trying to keep this material out of the landfill. Ms. Vernon wanted to know how Mr. Klagg's document set forth the roles of Metro vs. local government vs. state government (if there was one).

Mr. Klagg said that the scenarios set forth in his model assumed that within each category those roles had already been ascertained. So our role now is how do we get to the point in the model.

Mr. Martin said that initially we wanted to concentrate on how much progress we can make irrespective of institutional constraints and later we can focus on various agency roles.

There was more discussion on the correctness of the words recycling, or waste reduction.

Mr. Martin said he would favor getting away from all of those descriptions and use the term "landfill diversion". He said the real significant and measurable indication of progress is what is the amount of waste going to the landfill and what is the trend? That is the real measure of success.

Ms. Roy said that further to Mr. Martin's comments, she said her feeling for the reason for the hierarchy is because landfill diversion is not our only goal, that the more important goal is conservation of resources.

Mr. Drew said he felt that it might be important to have all of the agencies have the same message. At this time DEQ is pronouncing it "source reduction" and in that way you are not discounting the value of recycling but you are saying that you are going beyond recycling.

Ms. Vernon said actually DEQ was calling their project "resource and residual management". Meaning that what is being removed from the landfill is a resource and hopefully conserving energy.

Ms. Gorham made a short presentation on the public participation process. She said they are looking at the possibility of holding a half-day session in the late spring for residential sector discussions. The thought is to pull together homeowners, apartment dweller, DEQ participant, local government, haulers, environmental community and Metro to engage in a round-table type discussion in groups of 7 or 8 persons. We could then have 2-1/2 hour sessions with retail trade, wholesale trade, industry, construction demolition to discuss the result of the round-tables discussions. The results of these discussions could then be brought before this committee to be refined again.

Ms. Kies said she would very much like to be involved in the workshops especially in helping to frame what the issues are.

Mr. Anderson recapped for the committee the results of the Revenue System Work Group meeting of October 6. Mr. Anderson noted that attached to the agenda was the information the committee had requested concerning sources and uses of Metro's excise tax.

Mr. Anderson said that a parallel process to the Revenue System Work Group is being implemented through the efforts of Judith Mandt of the Solid Waste Department. Ms. Mandt will be organizing a public involvement strategy, to explain what Metro does, why we do it, why we charge what we are charging to interested and affected parties.

Mr. Anderson said the work group has been asked to think about and comment on several options for financing the solid waste system. Some of these options included combining taxes with fees, universal service, manufacturer's fee. Two general concepts emerged: a two-part fee system and unpacking services. Mr. Anderson explained how these concepts might work, as recapped in the agenda documents.

Mr. Anderson distributed some illustrations showing examples of how the numbers work for a two-part fee. Mr. Anderson cautioned the committee that these were illustrations only and were not to be confused with actual proposals which might be forthcoming.

Mr. Coenen commented that the work group had not conclusively chosen a two-part fee system as the only answer.

Ms. Roy commented that she was particularly adverse to lowering of the tipping fee. Ms. Roy also commented that she was interested in advanced disposal fees on household hazardous waste.

Mr. Drew was interested in seeing examples of what other cities in crisis are doing under similar circumstances.

There were no communications from citizens. The meeting was closed.