

**SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY OF: February 21, 1996**

Voting Members Present

Committee Chair: Ruth McFarland, Metro Councilor
Hauling Industry: David White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc.,
Tri-County Council
Dean Kampfer, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Assoc.,
Clackamas County Haulers
James Cozzetto, Jr., MDC/ERI
Solid Waste Facilities: Steve Miesen, BFI/Trans Industries
Doug Coenen, Oregon Waste Systems
Citizens: Jeanne Roy, Recycling Advocates
Merle Irvine, United Disposal
Government: Debbie Noah, Mult. County Cities (Gresham Commissioner)
Loreen Mills, Washington County Cities (Staff, City of Tigard)
Susan Keil, City of Portland (City Staff)
Lynne Storz, Washington County (Staff, Washington County)
Recycling Industry: Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling

Alternate Members Present

Recycling Industry: Jeff Murray, Farwest Fibers
Government: Lynda Kotta, Mult. County Cities (Staff, City of Gresham)*

Non-Voting Members Present

Government: Dave Kunz, DEQ
Carol Devenir, Clark County, Washington (Staff, Clark County)

Voting Members Absent

Hauling Industry: Steve Schwab, Clackamas County Haulers Assoc.
Recycling Industry: John Drew, Far West Fibers
Bruce Broussard, Cad Tek
Government: Gary Hansen, Multnomah County (County Commissioner)
Bob Kincaid, Clackamas County Cities (Staff, City of Oregon City)

Guests Present

Easton Cross, Consultant
Debbie Fromdall, Sanifill NW
Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.
Michael Sievers, Pacific/West Communications
Loretta Pickerell, Recycling Advocates
Dick Jones
Lexus E. Johnson
Steve Emmons, TPS Technologies, Inc.

Metro Staff Present

Bern Shanks	Kelly Shafer Hossaini	Connie Kinney
Debbie Gorham	Jim Goddard	Sarah Adams
Marie Nelson	Scott Klag	

1. Updates and Introductions

Regional Flood Debris Management

Jim Goddard, Recycling System Development Supervisor, gave the Committee an update on regional flood debris management efforts. He said that most local governments were not ready to make decisions about services they would provide their residents for flood debris until the weekend of February 10, after the water had crested in some areas. Gresham opened a temporary dumping site for flood debris during the weekend of February 10. Other jurisdictions began providing the same kind of service beginning on Tuesday, February 13. Metro set up temporary flood debris accounts for local governments at the Metro-owned transfer stations. Local governments could then have appropriate loads charged to this account, and billing would be held until FEMA reimbursement could be sought by the local government. A voucher system was implemented for flood debris loads that were certified to be charged to a local government account. He then informed the Committee that the voucher system would be in place through March 3.

Jimmy Cozetto said that he thought that, from a hauler standpoint, communications were lacking. He could not get answers to questions he had. He also said that another issue was an alternative site for dumping waste with the potential closure of the transfer stations. He got the message that the transfer stations would be closing two hours before they were scheduled to close. Mr. Goddard asked if the hauler hotline that was established during the flood was helpful. Mr. Cozetto said that it wasn't for the questions that he had.

Dave White said that he had questions about the operations end of flood debris management. For example, when haulers should cease to collect waste and what alternatives for dumping would be when the established choices weren't available. Mr. Goddard said that those kinds of questions would be best for Terry Petersen, Regional Environmental Services Manager, to take up and that he would make a note to that effect.

Loreen Mills asked if the vouchers could be accepted through March 4, to make it easier for haulers to get all of the drop boxes in without having to go into a lot of overtime. Mr. Goddard said that would make sense and would have the deadline extended.

Jeanne Roy then asked how much recovery of flood debris was occurring. Mr. Goddard replied that mud and sandbags were staying out of the solid waste system, some yard debris was going to processors, white goods were being picked up by recyclers, and some paint would be recycled.

Sue Keil thanked both Jim Goddard and Scott Klag for the excellent jobs they did in helping Portland manage their flood debris. She also said that the hazardous waste facilities set up at some of the Portland temporary sites were overkill. She said that a level of service somewhere inbetween non-existent and full mobile event was probably the most appropriate.

Lynda Kotta said that at the Gresham site people were bringing in a lot of hazardous waste that was not flood-related, because they were misreading the announcements in the paper. She said that next time we should be really explicit about accepting flood-related hazardous waste only.

Dean Kampher asked what alternatives Metro had for disposal if access to the Columbia Ridge landfill is cut off due to a disaster. Bern Shanks replied that a formal, long-term disaster debris management planning effort has been underway and it will address just those issues. He said that this recent flood has been a good dry run for that planning effort.

Forest Grove Transfer Station Bid

Jim Watkins, Engineering and Analysis Manager, then addressed the group about the Forest Grove Transfer Station bid. He said that a Request for Bids had been developed for the transfer of waste from the Forest Grove Transfer Station. It will be sent out for review, and the Committee would see it in the next couple of weeks.

2. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the SWAC minutes from the January 17, 1996 SWAC meeting. The Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

3. Organic Waste Processing Demonstration Project - Phase 2

Jim Goddard, Recycling System Development Supervisor, gave an update to the Committee about the organic waste processing demonstration project. He reminded the group that in November he had brought the Phase 1 Request for Proposals (RFP) to SWAC, and that phase is currently being finished up. Ten proposals for collection and five for processing were received. Interviews for Phase 1 proposals will be completed February 22. One change to the draft RFP for Phase 2 is that the award is being opened to more than just one processor/hauling team. Mr. Goddard said that it is likely there will be a number of proposals for Phase 2 and the money is there to try more than one approach. Phase 2 proposals will be due April 19, 1996, and the contract will run through June 1997.

Jeanne Roy commented that the requirement that targeted businesses be clustered within a relatively close geographic area didn't seem necessary, especially for a pilot. Mr. Goddard said that it was a preference, but not a hard requirement. He explained that it fits in with the direction in which the region is moving with Region 2040, and that it is a more efficient collection pattern. Sue Keil then commented that while that requirement is probably well-founded, it should not be government managed. She said that the private sector will figure this out on their own anyway. Mr. Goddard agreed to remove the requirement from the Phase 2 RFP.

Doug Coenen asked if the potential use of a transfer station as a drop-off point could be included in the Phase 2 RFP. Mr. Goddard said that was acceptable and would be added as an option.

Mr. Goddard then told the Committee that he would make the changes, as agreed, and have it brought before REMCOM at their next meeting in two weeks. Chair Ruth McFarland said that if anyone on the Committee wanted to comment further, they should go to the REMCOM meeting and discuss their concerns there.

4. 1995 Compost Bin Distribution Program - Results of Program Evaluation

Debbie Gorham, Waste Reduction and Planning Services Manager, introduced the program evaluation that was done for the 1995 Metro Compost Bin Distribution Program by Market Decisions Corporation. She said the purpose of the survey was to determine whether purchasing a compost bin changed the buyer's composting behavior.

Sarah Adams presented the results of the study to the Committee. She said that the survey sampled 750 of the approximately 8,000 residents that purchased a bin, and 175 people who did not purchase a bin. The survey measured the awareness of the bin program, the effect of the bin on purchaser's composting behavior, and the diversion rates for food waste and yard debris.

Ms. Adams said that the survey estimates that approximately 750 pounds of waste per household per year can be diverted through composting. She also said that 49% of bin owners who are now composting food scraps were not doing so prior to the purchase of the Metro bin. As well, 44% began composting yard debris after the new bin purchase.

Ms. Adams also told the Committee that many of those who were composting before they bought the bins increased the amount of food scraps and yard debris they composted after receiving the bins.

Sue Keil asked if there was any economic or financial analysis of the cost of this program versus the cost of providing curbside yard debris collection. She was also concerned that there may be no net diversion gain, only a movement of material from curbside collection to backyard composting. Ms. Adams replied that a cost-benefit analysis with the data gathered has not been done but is possible, however it will take some time. She also said that the study found that there was an actual increase in diversion, but that may not be obvious by the information included in the SWAC packet. Chair McFarland asked that a full copy of the report be sent to everyone on the Committee so that the full extent of the information would be clear to those interested.

Jimmy Cozetto asked if the organic waste diversion through backyard composting was eligible for use towards waste reduction goals for the region. His concern was that a lot of material placed at the curb and currently being counted toward recovery goals would be lost if it moved to backyard composting. Dave Kunz replied that the DEQ recognizes that home composting is a good waste reduction tool and that Metro will be able to consider it in their recovery rate. He also said the DEQ is giving more consideration to moving toward a per capita disposal rate instead of a recovery rate so this kind of waste reduction would not be lost.

Sue Keil asked if there was some way of determining what people were disposing before they bought the bins and then afterwards so there would be some good diversion estimates. She said it would be a good piece of information to give the DEQ. Debbie Gorham replied that it would probably be possible and could be set up before the pilot this year.

Jeanne Roy expressed concern that the people who seemed to be buying the bins were the ones who were already composting and the target population should be the people who are not.

Loreen Mills expressed concern about the results of the survey saying that we don't know how long the bins have been out and how long the survey respondent has been using them. She would like to see a follow-up survey done after some time has elapsed to see how the results change.

5. Tentative Meeting Agenda for March 20

Marie Nelson, Planning Services Supervisor, reminded the Committee that the next meeting would be on March 20. At that meeting there will be a report on Metro's enforcement unit and a solicitation of Committee comments on some associated policy issues. There will also be another update on the flood debris management in the region. The Committee will also be asked to approve the Year 7 Local Government Work Plans at that meeting.

6. Other Business/Citizen Communications

Lex Johnson introduced Steve Emmons, Marketing Director of TPS Technologies and asked that he be considered for membership on SWAC. Chair McFarland asked Marie Nelson to make a note of that and put him on any list she was keeping for that purpose.

7. Adjourn

S:\SHARE\P&TS\SWAC\MINUTES\SWAC0221.SUM