



# Metro | Agenda

**Meeting:** Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
**Date:** Thursday, October 21, 2010  
**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.  
**Place:** Room 501, Metro Regional Center

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER
9:00 a.m.	1. Welcome and review of today's agenda	Matt Korot
9:05 a.m.	2. Food Rescue Policy Discussion Paper <i>Objectives: (1) Discuss content of paper; (2) Determine whether the policy, as described in the paper, reflects SWAC's intent; and (3) Identify if any additional information is needed before SWAC can determine whether to forward this policy option to Council.</i>	All
9:30 a.m.	3. Public comment on Food Rescue Policy	
9:35 a.m.	4. Carbon Tax Policy Discussion Paper <i>Objectives: (1) Discuss content of paper; (2) Determine whether the policy, as described in the paper, reflects SWAC's intent; and (3) Identify if any additional information is needed before SWAC can determine whether to forward this policy option to Council.</i>	All
10:00 a.m.	5. Public comment on Carbon Tax Policy	
10:05 a.m.	6. Food Waste Recovery Policies Discussion Paper <i>Objectives: (1) Discuss content of paper; (2) Determine whether the policies, as described in the paper, reflect SWAC's intent; and (3) Identify if any additional information is needed before SWAC can determine whether to forward these policy options to Council.</i>	All
10:40 a.m.	7. Public comment on Food Waste Recovery Policies	
10:45 a.m.	6. Next steps	Matt Korot
11:00 a.m.	Adjourn	

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**METRO SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)**  
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers  
Thursday, September 16, 2010

**Members / Alternates Present:**

Matt Korot, Chair	Bruce Walker	John Lucini
Scott Keller	Amy Pepper	Michelle Poyourow
Adam Winston	Rick Winterhalter	Susan Millhauser
Dave White	JoAnn Herrigel	

**Members / Alternates Absent:**

Audrey O'Brien  
Theresa Koppang  
Paul Ehinger, Alternate

**Guests and Metro staff:**

Jennifer Erickson, Metro	Alando Simpson, City of Roses	Jerry Green, Washington Cty.
Meredith Sorenson, Harvest Pwr.	Dan Blue, City of Gresham	Mike Dewey, WMO
Tom Chaimov, Metro	Dean Kampfer, WMO	Ray Phelps, Allied Waste
Will Elder, Metro	Dick Stringer,	Roy Brower, Metro
Rich McConaghy, City of Vanc.	Meg Lynch, Metro	Gina Cubbon, Metro
Holly Stirnkorb, Tabor Consult.	Leslie Kochan, DEQ	

- I. Welcome and Review of Agenda.....*Matt Korot***
- II. Introduction to Metro's Solid Waste System Roadmap Project..... *Tom Chaimov***

Tom Chaimov, Senior Solid Waste Planner, introduced himself and explained the project's background. The goal is to map out a five to ten-year plan for actions that need to be taken by 2020. A large study of the system was conducted in 2005-06; some (but not all) of its recommendations were implemented. This project will bring the subject back to Council's attention.

By the end of 2019, Mr. Chaimov reminded the group, all Metro's major solid waste contracts will expire, including the contract for waste disposal that requires sending a significant portion of waste to a single source. Decisions need to be made regarding whether to keep that provision, what issues are important, what changes Council would like to see. The issues include reconfiguration or repurposing of Metro South Transfer Station, product stewardship, rate transparency, among others. While the project is still too fluid to be able to give a real status report on, Mr. Chaimov encouraged anyone who would like to talk about it to contact him directly.

The original timeline was to finish the Roadmap this year; however, with the departure of Council President Bragdon, the project has slowed slightly. Information about discussion of the project at Council Work Sessions can be found on Metro's website: <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=21730>

- III. Review and Discuss Results of Food System Refinement Exercise.....*Facilitator: Jennifer Erickson***

Ms. Erickson told the group that she and Mr. Korot reviewed all the information gathered from the original exercise and winnowed the action areas down into those that would require action by the Metro Council. Regarding education / promotion – these are really embedded within all of the ideas so don't need to be separate; also, local and sustainable agriculture were combined into one topic.

She walked the group through a PowerPoint presentation (attached) which outlined each policy-related action (taken directly from members' suggestions). Next, the criteria for narrowing the focus was revisited; the third section of the PowerPoint showed the results of running each idea through the criteria.

In discussion, Ms. Erickson mentioned that the topic of worker health and safety only had one item that Metro could take action on: to ensure those working in any capacity for Metro (contractor and subcontractors' employees, for instance) be treated fairly. Also, use of the word "processing" is meant to encompass more than just composting. Energy technologies or other uses are also in the mix.

**IV. Prioritization of Food System Actions.....All**

The members were asked to discuss and begin to prioritize the list of ideas. Discussion included whether the intention is to pursue Metro-specific policies, or ones that would reach throughout the region (can be either and hopefully both). The goal is to give the Council items to consider; even items that don't go to Council in the end will help inform staff at a program level. Guest Leslie Kochan added that another criteria could be if / how Metro actions may affect the state's plan, which includes material specific items.

Dave White asked if Metro might be able to use some of its parks or open spaces for local farming. Ms. Erickson replied that while there are definite limitations due to the stipulations of the bond measure, there is some farming already occurring on Metro-owned properties with a goal to look at more where it can happen. Mr. White also asked that staff look into whether other jurisdictions are already working on any similar ideas that could make this work redundant, or with which we could partner.

How would Metro define "edible"? There are existing regulatory parameters for the term. Does Metro have the authority to institute bans? The Metro Attorney has looked at the issue to confirm that the basic answer is yes; there are other issues involved, but for the sake of this exercise, the group was asked to assume yes. Adam Winston voiced concern that any kind of ban would be unworkable and unenforceable, but JoAnn Herrigel added that the idea of banning anything is to encourage donation. She said it would be best to treat it like a ban, without an actual ban. Set up a system for pick-up and distribution of the edible food. The group discussed and developed language for this item.

The group continued to dig into the recommended actions, taking out some options and giving others further consideration. The item concerning carbon taxes elicited particularly note-worthy ideas (thus their inclusion in the notes), including concern about carbon taxes being approached in a "piece-meal" manner; Michelle Poyourow preferred the idea of advocating for a carbon tax that would include food, fuel, clothing and more. Amy Pepper pointed out, however, that at this time there's not even a state methodology to track the carbon. Bruce Walker suggested state legislation to have labels include GHG information as related to the product, to encourage better choices. It might be a more palatable option. Another member brought up the fact that labeling could get very complicated with products from national and international manufacturers.

After debating all the areas, the group voted on their prioritizations. The results were compiled and are attached.

**V. Public Comment .....All**

Dick Springer, of the West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District, introduced himself with a synopsis of his experience in the solid waste & recycling field and explained the efforts underway to locate a bio-energy facility on Sauvie Island. He encouraged the SWAC members to contact him if they were interested in additional information about the project.

## **VI. Next Steps**

Staff will take the four top priority policy actions defined by SWAC and develop draft policy papers for discussion and consideration at the October meeting.

## **VII. Adjourn**

The Committee discussed whether this day and time will work for meeting monthly. They gave head-nodding approval for Leslie Kochan to replace Audrey O'Brien, who cannot attend on Thursday mornings, pending Council approval.

Mr. Korot adjourned the meeting at 11:02 a.m.

Prepared by:

Gina Cubbon  
Assistant to the Director  
Metro Parks & Environmental Services

gbc

Attachments

T:\SWAC\_New\2010 meetings\9-16-10 meeting\SWAC091610min.docx

**PRIORITIZED FOOD SYSTEM POLICIES**  
**METRO SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SEPTEMBER 16, 2010**

At the September 16, 2010 meeting, SWAC members discussed and clarified potential food system policy actions and then prioritized them based on the following questions:

- Will this policy have a more significant impact on the sustainability of the regional food system relative to other policy options?
- Is there a near-term need for this policy?
- Is Metro the right agency to enact this policy?

The outcome of this exercise resulted in identification of four priority actions that will be developed into draft policy proposals for SWAC review, discussion and refinement. **Highlighted** actions are those SWAC deemed to be of the highest priority, numbers next to each action represent the High, Medium and Low votes received.

**A. Food rescue**

Action	High	Med	Low
Ban the disposal of edible food generated in the region.	0	1	2
Require all local governments to donate edible food generated from their facilities.	0	1	2
Require all Metro facilities to donate edible food generated at their facilities.	0	0	0
<b>Support and expand the region's food rescue infrastructure.</b>	7	3	1

**B. Packaging**

Action	High	Med	Low
Advocate for product stewardship legislation for food service packaging	0	2	3
Require that all food service products designed for one-time use be replaced with one-time use products that are either compostable or recyclable.	3	1	2

### C. Foster local and sustainable agriculture

Action	High	Med	Low
Establish a sustainable food policy to direct and guide Metro actions to include use of Metro land for sustainable agriculture and Metro's food purchasing guidelines for its own facilities.	0	0	3
Provide in-kind and financial support for sustainable agriculture production and distribution.	0	2	1

### D. GHG Reduction

Action	High	Med	Low
Enact carbon taxes on food products sold in the region based on the relative carbon intensity of classes of foods and packaging.	0	1	3
Advocate for state legislation to enact carbon taxes on products (including food) sold in the region based on the relative carbon intensity.	4	2	2
Provide financial assistance to transporters of food products (including food rescue agencies) for conversion of their vehicles and fleets to alternatives that reduce associated greenhouse gas emissions.	0	3	1
Advocate for labeling on foods or food products to illustrate the total carbon impacts of that food choice.	0	1	1

### E. Toxics reduction

Action	High	Med	Low
Advocate for state-level legislative approaches to eliminate or reduce the use of selected pesticides and herbicides used in the production of food.	0	2	0
Enact a regional ban on the use of selected pesticides and herbicides for the production of food on land within the Metro boundary	0	4	1

**F. Divert more non-edible food waste from disposal**

Action	High	Med	Low
<p>Either (a) ban the disposal of food waste generated in the region or (b) require local governments to ensure the provision of food waste collection services to commercial generators or commercial and residential generators</p>	3	3	1
<p>Build the food waste processing infrastructure in consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide financial incentives or direct financial assistance to private companies for the construction and operation of food waste reloading and processing facilities.</li> <li>• Build publicly owned food waste reload and/or processing facilities to ensure sufficient and equitable access for the entire region.</li> <li>• Advocate for DEQ to allow yard debris processors to accept mixed yard debris and food waste loads from residential generators.</li> <li>• Establish a regulatory framework that enables greater local processing opportunities (development of standard local zoning that permits solid waste use outright in industrial zones, assist existing facilities with land use changes)</li> </ul>	11	0	1

T:\SWAC\_New\2010 meetings\9-16-10 meeting\SWAC\_DotExerciseResults091610.doc

## **Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee - Agenda Item 2**

### **Food System Policy Discussion Paper: *Food Rescue Infrastructure***

#### **October 21, 2010 Meeting**

#### **Policy Identified by SWAC**

Support and expand the region's food rescue infrastructure.

#### **Purpose Relative to the Food System**

To increase the amount of edible food diverted from disposal and recycling to those in need.

#### **What would adoption of this policy by Council do?**

This policy would likely be adopted through Council approval of funding for grants to food rescue agencies.

#### **Context**

Oregon has historically been one of the hungriest and most food insecure states in the country. According to the Oregon Food Bank, in fiscal year 2008-09 more than 240,000 people per month ate meals from an emergency food box and 3.8 million meals were served by soup kitchens and shelters--an all-time high. Factors such as the reduction in Federal USDA foods, and the growth of secondary markets coupled with increased unemployment, medical expenses and the growing income gap, resulted in stocks of food declining at the same time as demand for assistance increased. Food rescue agencies are striving to source increased amounts of food.

There is precedent for Metro working in this area. In 1996, informed by input from the region's food rescue agencies, Metro implemented a grant program that assisted food rescue agencies with the purchase of equipment that helped them to safely collect, store and distribute fresh and perishable foods. Over a period of nine years, Metro granted more than \$950,000 for the purchase of refrigerated trucks, coolers, freezers and other equipment. A conservative estimate based on reports received from grant recipients, found that these grants enabled the collection and distribution of over 9,000 tons of food—worth \$30 million to a food rescue agency<sup>1</sup>. In 2002, Metro evaluated the program and found that the average benefit per dollar of grant funds distributed was \$31—illustrating a high level of return for the funds distributed.<sup>2</sup>

In addition, Metro conducted a barrier/benefit study in 2003 to better understand what compels businesses to donate surplus food as well as what they view to be the biggest barriers. In response to the findings of this study, Metro developed and implemented the *Fork it Over!* program. *Fork it Over!* is a peer-to-peer initiative that helps food businesses donate surplus prepared, perishable foods that have not been served, by showing that it is safe, simple and the right thing to do. It recruits food businesses to make commitments to donate food regularly. It also leverages partnership support from key industry leaders and associations to reinforce the social and cultural value of food donation, and provides regular reinforcement for participating through free publicity. To increase the convenience of donation, Metro also developed an interactive on-line tool for donors. The system asked donors to simply enter their location and the food they wished to donate, then it displayed the contact information for the closest food rescue agencies along with information about the agencies, who they served and if they would come to pick up the donation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Based on \$1.67 per pound dollar value of the recovered food to a food bank, calculated by America's Second Harvest—now Feeding America, the nation's food rescue network.

<sup>2</sup>Calculations were based on avoided collection and disposal cost of \$125 per ton and a \$1.67 per pound dollar value of the recovered food to a food bank.



Metro's Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) outlines goals and objectives that guide the direction of key program areas to reduce the amount and toxicity of solid waste in the region. One of the key objectives in the organics sector is to support and increase organic waste prevention and diversion practices, primarily focusing on food donation.

### **Potential alignment with other efforts**

The Oregon Food Bank has recently convened a steering committee of food industry executives on which Metro has a seat. This group is looking at creative and constructive ways to improve the food rescue system in partnership with the food industry. OFB's desire is to maximize the fresh and perishable foods it receives and redistributes throughout the state in a strategic manner. The group is working to identify the gaps in the existing system and collaborate on ways to close them.

### **Feasibility**

It would be highly feasible for Metro to implement a policy to support and expand the region's food rescue infrastructure through grants to food rescue agencies.

### **Anticipated Effects**

#### *Environmental Effects*

- Diverting one ton of food waste from landfill disposal to reuse reduces greenhouse gas emissions by approximately one ton of carbon dioxide equivalent.
- Diverting one ton of food waste from composting to reuse reduces greenhouse gas emissions by approximately .01 ton of carbon dioxide equivalent.<sup>3</sup>

#### *Economic and Fiscal Effects*

- The current value of one ton of food diverted to reuse is estimated to be \$3,000<sup>4</sup>.
- Each \$100,000 of Metro expenditures to support the region's food rescue infrastructure would increase the Regional System Fee (applied to each ton of disposed waste) by 10 cents.

#### *Stakeholder Effects*

- Direct benefit to food rescue agencies and those who utilize their services.
- Expansion of food rescue system capacity may allow new businesses to participate, with potential savings through decreased disposal costs and tax deductions for charitable donations.
- Program costs would be funded by regional solid waste ratepayers.
- Increased food rescue system capacity may lead to more requests from businesses to local government waste reduction programs for assistance with donation program implementation.

### **Metro Authority**

The Metro Council can appropriate funds to be used to support the food rescue infrastructure and the Chief Operating Officer has the authority to distribute these funds through agreements with food rescue agencies.

M:\rem\wr\staff\jke\Food waste infrastructre policy paper for SWAC OC12010 draft.doc

---

<sup>3</sup> Estimate is based on maximum emissions from compost piles representing 2.5 percent of the initial carbon and 1.5 percent of the initial nitrogen. If compost contains 75% organic matter with a C:N ratio of 30:1, one ton of carbon would evolve as methane for each 100 dry tons of organic matter. Emissions from well-managed and monitored aerobic composting operations could be an order of magnitude lower. Static pile compost systems have the potential to have greater GHG impacts. Source: Sally Brown & Scott Subler, Composting and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: A Producer's Perspective, Biocycle Magazine, March 2007.

<sup>4</sup> Based on revised food bank value of \$1.50 for every pound of food received. Source: Oregon Food Bank.

## **Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee - Agenda Item 4**

### **Food System Policy Discussion Paper: *Carbon Taxes***

#### **October 21, 2010 Meeting**

#### **Policy Identified by SWAC**

Advocate for legislation to enact carbon taxes on products, including food, based on relative carbon intensity.

#### **Purpose Relative to the Food System**

To reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with the production, transportation and end-of-life management of food products by using a price signal to influence producer practices and consumer decisions.

#### **Context**

The Portland metropolitan region is a national leader in arresting the rise in greenhouse gas emissions; however, our current efforts fall far short of what is needed to meet carbon reduction goals established in state law.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, within 25 years, we can expect to be joined by one million new neighbors. Energy instability and climate change require us to rethink everything from where we live, to where we get our food, to how we get around.

To refocus the region's efforts to address climate change, the Metro Council adopted Resolution #08-3931 outlining the need to convene stakeholders for the purpose of developing greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies. Given the scope and complexity of this task, the Metro Council adopted Resolution #08-3971 in August 2008 designating the Climate Initiative as a Council project.

In order to identify where to focus the region's efforts, Metro conducted a Greenhouse Gas Inventory for the Portland metropolitan region. The inventory was intended to establish a snapshot of the region's greenhouse gas emission sources in order to make investment decisions that can have the greatest effect in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Fourteen percent of the Metro region's greenhouse gas emissions are associated with the production, transportation, and end-of-life management of food consumed by residents and business operators. Most food-related emissions result from the growing of food (especially feed for animals) and, to a lesser extent, food processing.

#### **What would adoption of this policy by Council do?**

- It would signal the Metro Council's interest in weighing in on legislative options to reduce the carbon intensity of products. It would at least implicitly represent an endorsement of a taxing strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emission over voluntary actions or alternative regulatory approaches such as cap-and-trade.

---

<sup>1</sup> In order to reduce the impact on global climate change, the State of Oregon has established greenhouse gas reduction goals, which call for arresting the growth of greenhouse gas emissions by 2010, reducing emissions to at least 10 percent below 1990 levels by 2020, and reducing emissions to at least 75 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

- It would require Council to determine what its advocacy would actually look like, e.g.,:
  - Direct advocacy for state legislation
  - Direct advocacy for federal legislation
  - Direct advocacy for international agreements
  - Advocacy through the Governor or Oregon Congressional Delegation for federal legislation
  - Advocacy through the Governor or Oregon Congressional Delegation for international agreements

**Potential alignment with other efforts**

In its September 2010 report to the Oregon Global Warming Commission (OGWC), the Materials Management Technical Committee of the OGWC recommended nine key actions for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. One of these is:

Advocate for carbon price signal across life cycle of products and materials (either by an emissions cap and/or a carbon tax), including imports (border adjustment mechanism/carbon tariff if necessary).

In support of this recommendation, the Committee wrote:

The Commission should advocate for policies that incorporate a carbon price signal across the life cycle of products and other materials. A price on carbon across the full life cycle (resource extraction, manufacturing, transport, use, and end-of-life) offers the potential for significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions associated with the life cycle of products and materials. The Materials Management Committee did not evaluate the relative advantages and disadvantages of capping emissions (either via “cap-and-trade”, “cap-and-dividend” or some variation) vs. taxing emissions. However, given the global nature of many supply chains, and keeping with the Committee’s vision of not penalizing Oregon or other domestic producers (relative to foreign competition), it will likely be important to apply a “border adjustment mechanism” to help ensure a level playing field. This mechanism, often discussed in the form of a carbon tariff, adds to the price of products that are made in locations whereby some or all of their upstream emissions are not covered by a carbon cap and/or tax.

The Committee identified the lead parties on implementing this recommendation as the Oregon Congressional delegation, Governor’s Office, and Oregon Global Warming Commission.

The Global Warming Commission has not yet responded to this recommendation.

**Feasibility**

The action itself – advocacy for legislation – is highly feasible. The desired outcome of adoption of a regulatory or taxing framework, in which the life cycle costs of carbon are incorporated into the costs of products, is likely to be much less feasible over at least the short-term.

**Anticipated Effects**

*Environmental Effects*

- No direct effect from Council advocacy.

- Implementing policies to incorporate a carbon price signal would potentially result in significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

#### *Economic Effects*

- No direct effect from Council advocacy.
- Implementing policies to incorporate a carbon price signal would impact the costs of producing food due to increased costs for energy used in production and fuel used for transportation.

#### *Stakeholder Effects*

- There does not appear to be either a high level of regional knowledge or consensus about policies to incorporate a carbon price signal, so there could be political implications for the Council in advocating for such policies.

### **Metro Authority**

The Metro Council has the authority to advocate for legislation to enact carbon fees on products, including food, based on relative carbon intensity.

T:\SWAC\_New\2010 meetings\Policy Papers\Carbon tax policy paper for SWAC Oct2010 draft.docx

## **Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee - Agenda Item 6**

### **Food System Policy Discussion Paper: *Increasing recovery of food waste***

#### **October 21, 2010 Meeting**

#### **Policies Identified by SWAC**

Build the food waste processing infrastructure (demand-side) and either ban food waste disposal or require local collection programs (supply-side).

More specific options within these broad policies:

##### Demand-side

1. Fill geographic gaps in transfer and/or processing capacity by developing public facilities if those gaps are not filled by the private sector by a date certain.
2. Fill geographic gaps in transfer and/or processing capacity by providing financial assistance to private companies if facilities are not otherwise developed by a date certain.
3. Council takes a leadership role in advocating for private facilities that are in land use and permitting approval processes.
4. Require the four franchised private transfer stations to provide organics transfer services.
5. Advance system-wide objectives by strategically using Metro's authority to determine where to send organics received at Metro Central.
6. Use the processing contract for organics received at Metro Central to influence pricing for organics reload and processing.

##### Supply-side

1. Require local governments to ensure the provision of collection services for source-separated organics if local programs are not established by a date certain.
2. Implement a disposal ban on organics if local collection programs are not established by a date certain.
3. Implement a disposal ban on organics if collection programs are determined to be insufficiently effective at diverting organics from disposal.
4. Provide flow guarantees by directing collected source-separated organics to specific facilities.

#### **Purpose relative to the Food System**

Increase the amount of organics (food waste and compostable paper) diverted from disposal to recovery.

#### **What would result from Metro Council action(s)?**

Depending on the specific actions, an increase in either or both the supply of source-separated organics and the reload and recovery capacity for this material.

#### Context

Metro's Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) outlines goals and objectives that guide the direction of key program areas to reduce the amount and toxicity of solid waste in the region. One of the key objectives in the organics sector is to enhance access to organic recovery services throughout the region while utilizing as much of the existing solid waste infrastructure as possible.

The region disposes nearly 250,000 tons per year of organics, representing approximately 19% of all material disposed as garbage. Approximately 55% of the organic waste stream is generated by the commercial sector—primarily retail grocery and restaurants.

## Potential alignment with other efforts

There are a number of related efforts, including:

- Current, planned and potential private sector development (or joint public/private in some cases) of food waste reload and processing facilities.
- Existing commercial sector food waste collection programs and Portland's residential food waste collection pilot program.
- Planning for commercial food waste collection programs by suburban jurisdictions in the region and Portland's plan to make organics source-separation mandatory for commercial generators.
- Planning for the expiration in December 2011 of Metro's contract for transport and processing of organic waste from the Central Transfer Station.

## Feasibility

### Demand-side

1. Fill geographic gaps in reload and/or processing capacity by developing public facilities if those gaps are not filled by the private sector by a date certain.

*Difficult: expensive, complicated and Council would need to be convinced of the appropriateness and need for Metro to enter the market as a service provider.*

2. Fill geographic gaps in reload and/or processing capacity by providing financial assistance to private companies if facilities are not otherwise developed by a date certain.

*Moderately difficult: may be expensive and Council would need to be convinced that investment in a private facility is needed and an appropriate use of public funds.*

3. Council takes a leadership role in advocating for private facilities that are in land use and permitting approval processes.

*Easy to implement, but there may be political risks.*

4. Require the four franchised private transfer stations to provide organics transfer services.

*Moderate: franchise instrument allows for this type of requirement; may be opposed by transfer station operators.*

5. Advance system-wide objectives by strategically using Metro's authority to determine where to send organics received at Metro Central.

*Moderate: challenge would be in defining how system-wide objectives could be met through Metro's decision on where to send the organics that it controls; relatively easy to implement through procurement process.*

6. Use the processing contract for organics received at Metro Central to influence pricing for organics reload and processing.

*Moderate: relatively easy if cost-based pricing at Central influences tip fees at private facilities, as appears to be the case with garbage; may be politically more challenging if Metro "subsidizes" rate.*

### Supply-side

1. Require local governments to ensure the provision of collection services for source-separated organics if local programs are not established by a date certain.

*Moderately difficult: there is precedent for this approach in the regional Business Recycling Requirement, but it requires extensive coordination and consultation with all 28 jurisdictions in the region and could be contentious.*

2. Implement a disposal ban on organics if local collection programs are not established by a date certain.

*Moderately difficult: there is precedent for this approach in the regional Enhanced Dry Waste Recovery Program. Would likely be opposition from haulers or private facility operators if responsibility for compliance fell to them. Implementation and enforcement protocols will be complicated to develop.*

3. Implement a disposal ban on organics if collection programs are determined to be insufficiently effective at diverting organics from disposal.

*Moderately difficult: there is precedent for this approach in the regional Enhanced Dry Waste Recovery Program. Would likely be opposition from haulers or private facility operators if responsibility for compliance fell to them. Implementation and enforcement protocols will be complicated to develop.*

4. Provide flow guarantees by directing collected source-separated organics to specific facilities.

*Unknown; need to first determine legal authority.*

### **Anticipated effects**

#### *Environmental effects*

- Reduction of the greenhouse gas emissions caused by decomposition of organics in landfills.
- Production and subsequent use of compost products reduces need for chemical fertilizers, builds soil health, increases capacity of soil for carbon sequestration, improves water quality through reduced runoff of sediment and fertilizers, and reduces need for irrigation.
- Non-composting processes with energy production, such as anaerobic digestion, may offset some need for additional fossil-fuel based energy production.
- New collection routes for organic waste may result in a net increase of some air emissions.

#### *Economic and fiscal effects*

- Policy actions requiring Metro expenditures will increase the Regional System Fee (applied to each ton of disposed waste) by approximately 10 cents for every \$100,000 of additional expenditures.
- Diverting 100,000 tons of food waste from the Metro transfer stations toward recovery would increase Metro's solid waste disposal tip fee by approximately \$7.00 per ton as operations and Regional System Fees costs are spread across fewer tons. An additional \$1.20 per ton would need to be added to make up for reductions in excise tax revenues resulting from the diverted tons.
- The economic value of the environmental benefits of diverting organics from disposal to composting is approximately \$9 million (data is not yet available for comparable analysis of anaerobic digestion for energy recovery).

- System users will incur the costs (permitting, capital and operational) for new reload, transfer and processing facilities for organics.
- System users will incur the costs for collection of source-separated organics. These costs may be partially offset by reduced garbage collection costs.
- Fully developing an organics reload, transfer and processing infrastructure will allow for establishment of more stable fee and rate structures.
- Additional time and resources will be needed by local governments to implement organics collection programs.
- Additional time and resources will be needed by Metro to provide regulatory oversight of facilities.

*Stakeholder effects*

- Increasing recovery of commercial organics implements a key provision of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and would represent a significant step in the region’s efforts to meet its statutory recovery goals.
- Actions to either require the provision of organics transfer services or enforce a disposal ban would have significant impacts on private transfer stations. One of the transfer stations, WRI, is already handling significant amounts of organics and plans to increase its capacity. Waste Management’s Troutdale facility is accepting a small amount of mixed yard debris and food waste from Portland’s residential pilot program, and Pride is reloading a small amount of commercial food waste.
- Implementing local collection programs would increase the workload of local governments and require the establishment of rates for these programs.
- Participating generators, whether through voluntary or required programs, would need to establish systems for separation of their organic waste.
- Additional time and resources from Metro to regulate and enforce new system requirements.

**Metro Authority**

Metro appears to have the authority to implement all of the options described in this paper, with the exception of the “flow guarantees” policy that has not yet been examined.