

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF MEETING OF 3/18/98

Members Present

Bruce Broussard, USA Waste
Tom Miller, Wash Co Haulers Assoc
Lee Barrett, City of Portland
Ralph Gilbert, East Co Recycling
Jeanne Roy, Portland Citizen
Ed Druback, DEQ
Steve Schwab, CCRRA
JoAnn Herrigel, City of Milwaukie
Frank Deaver, Citizen
Jeff Murray, FWF/Recycling Industry
Lynne Storz, Washington County
David White, ORRA/Tri-County
Merle Irvine, WRI
Garry Penning, Waste Management of OR
Mike Misovetz, Clackamas Co, citizen
Tom Wyatt, BFI
Tam Driscoll, City of Gresham
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas Co

Guests

Ed Gronke, Waste Generator	Dick Jones, Citizen
Dean Large, Columbia Resource Co.	Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal Co
Todd Irvine, Willamette Resources	Susan Robinson, BFI
Chuck Martin, Citizen	Doug Drennen, DCS
Easton Cross, ESM	Dean Kampfner, USA Waste
Kent Inman, American Compost	Diana Godwin, Esq.

Metro

Leo Kenyon	Paul Ehinger	Aaron Brondyke
Bruce Warner	Doug Anderson	Scott Klag
Meg Lynch	Ava Brooks	John Houser
Connie Kinney	Bill Metzler	

CALL TO ORDER & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Morissette deferred to Mr. Warner to preside over the meeting due to his having laryngitis. Mr. Warner welcomed the two new SWAC members: Fairview City Mayor, Roger Vanderharr representing East County Cities and Sally Fender, alternate representative for CCRRA.

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY MINUTES

Mr. Penning asked for a correction on pg. 6, second paragraph from the end. His statement "(2) you have the opportunity to ~~see~~ sell the recovered material . . .". Please check on statement by

Mr. Penning on page 7, it does not make sense. He believes he actually meant there was more of an incentive on the front end of the curve than on the back end of the curve.

Mr. White said that on page 4, the last paragraph where he mentions Mr. Leichner commented it says we (Washington County Haulers Association). It was Mr. White's understanding that he was talking about "we, the company" (Pride Recycling) not Washington County Hauler's Assoc. Mr. Schwab referred to page 12, top paragraph, it notes 7 members opposed and there are 9 names listed.

Ralph Gilbert attended the February SWAC meeting and was not listed.

Jeanne Roy was listed as attending and was not there.

Mr. Winterhalter asked for a clarification of the minutes as to the answer to Mr. Schwab's question on the comparison of costs between South and Central. *Mr. Ehinger replied it was about \$2.00.* Mr. Winterhalter also asked for a clarification to Mr. Penning's statement on page 7, (see above).

Mr. Penning moved that the minutes be approved with the corrections noted. Mr. Broussard seconded the motion and the committee unanimously approved the motion.

DIRECTOR'S UPDATE

Mr. Warner distributed a "Director's Update" sheet. Mr. Warner announced that USA Waste is in the process of merging with Waste Management of Oregon. He said this is one of the largest consolidations of a business in the history of solid waste. The merger is subject to the approval of the stockholders of each company and is expected to be completed this fall. As to what this may mean to Metro and how does it impact contracts, Mr. Warner and his staff will be communicating with some of the affected folks and will look at the issues.

Mr. Warner reminded everyone that the spring workshops and events are getting underway which include: annual composting and natural gardening workshops, hazardous waste events, compost bin sale and the Earth Day Billboard Contest. Mr. Warner announced that Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad's cable program is going to focus on the REM Department and its activities. Mr. Warner advised the committee that a spill occurred at Metro Central Transfer Station that was attributed to a chemical that is suspected to have been used in a drug lab.

Mr. Warner invited one and all to join Metro and others and help with the SOLV cleanup event on April 25th.

Hazardous Waste Survey

Mr. Klag said staff have developed a survey which looks at some of the broad policy issues about hazardous and toxic materials and has been sent to about 180 stakeholders throughout the community. Mr. Klag distributed the survey to the members and guests and provided a stamped self-addressed envelope with which to return it.

Update on Pilot Project for Organic Waste

Mr. Warner said he is very excited about this pilot project which is keeping organics out of the wastestream entirely by allowing it to be recycled for human consumption and the other being pilot projects with Oregon Soil and Waste Management of Oregon's composting projects. He introduced Bill Metzler, REM staff.

Mr. Metzler said he believes there are some interesting results coming from the pilot projects that Metro is sponsoring. Mr. Metzler passed around a sample of the compost from the Columbia Ridge Composting site. It is made up of vegetative food waste, paper, and yard debris from Safeway stores. The two contracts: Waste Management of Oregon uses long haul and a distant facility whereas Oregon Soils is a much smaller, local facility which utilizes vermi-processing using special red worms.

Waste Management is working with 37 Safeway stores and is utilizing a composting facility at Columbia Ridge that utilizes a special compost pad that collects and measures leachate. They are using aerated windrows that are about 6 foot tall, 16 foot wide and 100 feet long. They are providing Metro with extensive detail process control and monitoring records, which is being done on a daily basis, providing us with daily feedstocks and how they are managed. Thus far Waste Management has collected over 900 tons of food waste, waxed corrugated cardboard, floor waste and bakery waste.

Ms. Roy asked over what time period has the 900 tons been collected? Mr. Metzler replied this has taken place over the past 9 months. Mr. Penning replied May through February.

Mr. Metzler said the Safeway stores backhaul the food waste to a warehouse distribution center in Clackamas County. The food waste is consolidated at the center and then picked up by Waste Management where originally it was placed in two 40-yard rolloff containers with no compaction about three times a week and delivered to Metro South for consolidation and then long-hauled to Columbia Ridge. This first scenario was not working out for Waste Management partly because the loads were too light (containing about 70% corrugated cardboard), and they found they had to cut their transport costs per ton in half. Waste Management then retrofitted and installed a 30-yard compacting rolloff container at the Safeway distribution center. This program worked better, but there were still inefficiencies. They moved the reloading to Metro Central where they now have a dedicated staging area. Mr. Metzler said we are just now beginning to get some efficient payloads with the changes to Metro Central.

Mr. Metzler said further efforts include refocusing some of the efforts at the generator programs at Safeway to get them to maximize what they are doing; maximizing compaction and long haul efficiencies; other ways to find savings so that the haulers can realize a savings and in turn pass it along to their customer bases.

Ms. Roy said she had originally heard that the finished compost would be backhauled to this region and marketed. Mr. Metzler said it was his understanding that a marketing plan was still being looked at.

Ms. Herrigel asked if the final report would show the economics of Safeway versus a small market? Mr. Metzler said a limitation of this pilot is that it's focused on the Safeway backhauling. He said that the Oregon Soil pilot will look much more closely on those smaller markets.

Mr. Barrett said the City of Portland would be interested in knowing what the minimum size generator that the economics would work to collect this type of material. He said that although he knows the feedstock is different he wonders if Metro will apply the Earth-Wise Compost

standards to Waste Management's compost for comparison purposes. Mr. Metzler said that was in the plan.

Ms. Roy asked who the generators were that were referred to as being trained by Cloudburst. Mr. Metzler said he could get her a list. Ms. Roy asked when the committee might expect some feedback from Oregon Soil's pilot project. Mr. Metzler said he expected it would take a few months yet. Mr. Warner added that when Metro receives information valuable enough for sharing staff would do so.

Ms. Herrigel said a concern she expressed early-on in the pilot project is that she feels like Metro and some local government have been traveling on a parallel track of "we will remove organics from the wastestream." She believes Metro first needs to ascertain its economic feasibility, and how it will be accomplished. She said her perception is that to Metro, it is a foregone conclusion that organics will be removed from the wastestream, and that the ratepayers may have to pay a premium for it.

Mr. Metzler said Metro is focusing strongly on collection efficiencies to make sure they will be there. Mr. Warner said Ms. Herrigel's comments were well taken and that Metro was mindful of the economies that were needed in order to continue with the project.

Mr. Miller said he was curious about what accommodations Metro was making to make the transfer station more accessible. Mr. Metzler said it didn't take up a very large area and they simply made a small bay accessible for the organic material.

Mr. Warner said he would invite Jennifer Erickson to speak to the Committee with regard to the project with Oregon Food Bank which he feels is very important because it recovers material for human consumption prior to it going into the wastestream.

Ms. Roy asked if Metro would be involved in any on-site composting, i.e., the jail. Mr. Metzler said that would be something Metro would be looking at – to get it at the source and actually have it taken care of on site where appropriate. He said that in some cases it is just not cost effective.

Revision of Metro Code Related to Facility Regulation

Mr. Anderson used an overhead projector to illustrate the high points of the code revision. He said we are revising the Regulatory Code, Chapter 5.01 of the Metro Code for several reasons: 1) basically it is outdated; 2) there has been no comprehensive revision since 1981, 3) there have been several changes in the industry, 4) it is not positioned for the future, and 5) it does not reflect regional solid waste management plan's system management principles. The new plan reserves public initiative and procurement only for regional transfer stations and disposal sites, and relies on the private sector for basically all other types of facilities. Mr. Anderson said the conditions for "getting into the system" have not been clearly defined in the present code. He said that because of this each regulatory instrument is currently negotiated between Metro and each facility which often leads to an unlevel playing field. Mr. Anderson said the current code also does not recognize that multiple activities could take place in one facility.

Mr. Anderson said the new code will concentrate and be very explicit on performance once a facility operator is in the "system" which is where a lot of the public interest lies. He said Metro was especially interested in not overlapping those tasks currently accomplished by local governments and other entities. He said they want to address recovery goals, recycling, nuisances, but not prescribing how to do it.

Mr. Anderson then distributed a handout containing some draft code language as well as performance standards for implementation.

Ms. Roy asked for some more information about the statement that public initiative and procurement is reserved for major systems performance like transfer stations and landfills and that we rely on the private companies for the rest of the system. Her question is does that preclude Metro from taking initiative and procurement in the other facilities like various kinds of processing facilities? Mr. Anderson said the answer is no. Metro is concerned that services are in fact provided and if private initiatives do not provide them, Metro is required to do so by RSWMP.

Mr. White wanted to know how Metro will avoid redundancy if they are also going to be involved in policing, for instance, nuisance control? Mr. Anderson answered that in terms of potential redundancy this is not a code issue but a commitment that Mr. Warner wants to make. He wants local governments to know that Metro stands ready to assist them if they ask for our help as well as help determining if a solid waste activity would or would not be compatible with local land use decisions.

Mr. Miller said the difficulty with that process is that everyone wants to defer to the other party to be responsible and then no one takes the responsibility for siting/creating these facilities. Mr. Warner replied that he would like an agreement on a plan for the region that all agree to that the region needs certain components. Mr. Warner said there was a Model Zoning Ordinance devised in about 1993 which he would like to review.

Mr. Gilbert said he agreed with Mr. Miller and the problem is not unique to the Metro region. Mr. Gilbert said he believes Metro should be first in line to start the system, and last in line to review it.

Mr. Barrett said that one of the concerns of local governments is that after a facility has been sited, he personally would not mind Metro stepping in and help with enforcement if the operator is not complying with the rules. Mr. Barrett said that the City of Portland has a facility operator operating out of compliance and they are willing to pay the fine levied by City of Portland's enforcement unit to stay in business. He said the City's zoning office is buried with work and has been unable to help with the matter, so he would welcome any help Metro might be able to offer in helping with this type of problem. Mr. Barrett feels that if the organics collection is economical, we will definitely need new sites to process it because it is his opinion there are no sites currently accepting compost that could also accept food waste, at least not within the current standards they are operating under. He said the public is going to want to be assured that these facilities are run and operated appropriately.

Mr. Anderson said that Metro is in agreement with Mr. Barrett's assessment that the public will insist on knowing the facilities are run and operated appropriately. He said staff has drafted some standards which are set forth on the back of the distributed material.

Mr. Warner informed the SWAC that with regard to the 10% issue, he does not yet have language on how to resolve that but it is forthcoming.

Mr. White asked what the timeframe for that material would be? Mr. Warner distributed a schedule: March 27, a "cliff's notes" annotated summary of draft code revision would be released and comments requested, reporting forms and administrative procedures for the regional system fee credits, as well as some "trade-in" language for franchises; early April, entire code language distributed (comments requested within a week to 10 days), April 15th SWAC meeting can focus on comments from "cliffs notes" information distributed; following week REMCom briefing including concerns and issues SWAC present; April 23, first reading of ordinance by Metro Council, May 5th, REMCom hearing on ordinance. Mr. Warner said that if necessary, between April 15 and May 5th, he will hold special SWAC meeting to hammer out specifics. Mr. Warner anticipates that on May 14th Council will hold second reading and hopefully adoption. Hopefully by the 29th of May franchise agreements will be exchanged so that on June 1st, (effective date of new disposal rate) we will have new agreements in place, new regulatory code in place and the processes and procedures to allow operators to take advantage of the performance based curve.

Ms. Godwin asked if the draft documents being sent on March 27th includes the existing (but expired) designated facility agreements? Mr. Warner said that would not be part of the package but it will be discussed and thanked Ms. Godwin for the reminder.

Mr. Miller asked if existing applications would be a part of the package? Mr. Warner said they would be included in the conversion.

Mr. Houser said historically, that when franchises are substantially revised they are required to go to Council for approval. Mr. Warner said that one of the big changes proposed is to issue licenses instead of franchises so they will not be required to go before Council for their approval. He said the franchises will be still be used for the major system components. He said they would of course brief the Council on the new changes.

Mr. Miller asked that if we go through the process and everything is adopted, does Council have a requirement to act on applications, or staff or anyone? And will they be adhered to? Mr. Warner said there would be time limits. Mr. Warner said staff is trying to head towards clear and concise standards on these issues.

Mr. Broussard asked if a discussion on the issue of lobbying, and what effect it will have on the SWAC committee as a part of the next SWAC meeting.

Mr. Barrett said it may come that the City of Portland will have to develop facility standards for those facilities that curb-side co-mingled material will be sent. He says the City will then come to Metro to exercise authority over those facilities.

Mr. Anderson said that Metro does now have authority over clean MRFS, recycling drop centers, but has a long tradition of not exercising that authority and in fact exempting drop centers and clean MRFS from any purview. He said Metro is reluctant to change that attitude. Staff has contemplated a voluntary Compliance Certificate stating that a facility is achieving a certain percentage of recovery. This could be utilized as a tool by local governments such as the "Earth-Wise standards currently are.

Mr. Murray said their company had already discussed this issue and it was fine with them, however, he would check with the rest of the recycling industry at their meetings.

Ms. Roy asked if Mr. Anderson said the clean MRFS would voluntarily report their own recovery rate and there would be no inspection? Mr. Anderson said the details have yet to be fleshed out, but the idea is that Metro has developed measurement and monitoring regimens that include inspection for dirty MRFS, etc. It would be that same regimen that we would apply to them, but that once they accept that method, we would do it in a verifiable manner.

There was no other business and the meeting was adjourned.

S:\SHARE\KINNSWAC\0318\swac.sum.doc