Solid Waste Technical Committee April 23, 1992

Members Present:

Kevin Martin, Washington County
Estle Harlan, OSSI - Tri-County Council
Lynda Kotta, City of Gresham
James Cozzetto, Jr., Metropolitan Disposal & Recycling
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources, Inc.
Tom Miller, Washington County Haulers Association
Steve Schwab, Clackamas Co. Refuse Disposal Assn.
John Drew, Far West Fibers
Kim Roske, Multnomah County, Dept. of Transportation

Metro Participants

John Houser, Metro Council
Bob Martin, SW Director
Debbie Gorham, SW Department
Mark Buscher, SW Department
Terry Peterson, SW Department
Bill Metzler, SW Department

Guests Present

Larry Eisele, Washington County
David Ball, Gardner, Cosgrove & Gardner

Chair Bob Martin brought the meeting to order.

Updates

Mr. Martin briefly discussed the reformation of the former Planning and Development
Department. Mr. Martin told the committee that the information received from them was some of
the best and most concise information in the solid waste program and he envisioned no
substantive changes in the way the committee would function in the future and the types of things
it would be dealing with. Mr. Martin said he would try to give the committee a more integrated
approach with what the Solid Waste Department is doing operationally and in the planning realm.
Mr. Martin said the planning staff had been substantially reduced but they would endeavor to
carry forward with all of the planning projects. Mr. Martin said some things will not go forward
as rapidly as previously was the case, since we have fewer persons working on the projects.

Solid Waste Technical Committee Meeting of 4/23/92 Page 2

1

Mr. Martin asked if anyone had any questions with regard to the organizational changes.

Estle Harlan said it would be helpful if the committee were to receive an organizational chart with names, programs they are working on and telephone extension numbers.

John Drew wanted to know how often the committee would be meeting, what subcommittees were still active and who chaired them.

Mr. Martin said it was his understanding there were seven subcommittees when the reorganization occurred, and that some were active and some were not. The Hazardous Waste Subcommittee has been extremely active, the Land Use Subcommittee is active and is chaired by Jim Rapp; the Waste Reduction Subcommittee is still active and meet jointly to work on the model zoning standards for recycling facilities in multi-family and nonresidential (new) developments. The Facilities Subcommittee has been inactive since the conclusion of the Special Waste Chapter; the Yard Debris Subcommittee has also been inactive since the adoption of the Yard Debris chapter.

Mr. Martin said he would like to see the SWTC meet on a regular basis but he would leave it to the vote of the committee members as to the regularity of the meeting times.

The majority of the committee members expressed their desire to meet on a regular monthly basis, Thursday 9:30 a.m., on the 4th Thursday of the month.

Mr. Martin gave an update on the new Household Hazardous Waste Facility for the three months it has been operating. Mr. Martin said the facility was successful beyond anyones expectations, in the first two months; 2,500 users have been served. Those users brought in 50,000 containers, 60% of which was paint. Costs for disposal of those materials equaled \$16,000 per month. Staff time usage has exceeded anything planned for or budgeted for and a lot of overtime has been input. Mr. Martin said they were constantly learning to better manage the incoming types of materials and hopefully those costs will come down to a more reasonable level. The total proposed expenditure level for household hazardous waste management in the next fiscal year is \$2.9 million dollars which includes some capital costs for facility development of the second facility at Metro Central (\$1.3 million actual operating costs). Mr. Martin said that without a doubt we have the finest facility of its type in the nation at this time.

John Drew asked what the operating hours were and how many employees there were.

Mr. Martin said number of employees varied from day to day with the flow, anywhere from 3 to 15 persons at one time, in terms of the amount of hours, the first month of labor hours equaled 1,975, 500 of which were salaried personnel. The second month increased to 2,200 labor hours, and in the third month it has dropped to approximately 1,800 labor hours. Mr. Martin said we were beginning to realize some economies of scale and are hoping to get it down to a fairly

Solid Waste Technical Committee Meeting of 4/23/92 Page 3

reasonable level of operation. We are open Thursday, Friday and Saturday from 10:00 to 4:00 I believe. The days we are not open are spent identifying unknown, and bulking commodities, etc.

Mr. Martin said the final update was an overview of the budget process and where we are with that. He said the Solid Waste budget has been submitted to Council and we have completed three phases of review with the Metro Budget Committee and several phases of review with the Solid Waste Committee. The bottom line is that approximately \$600,000.00 worth of proposed expenditures of the administration's budget has been proposed to be cut with the idea of keeping our overall rate down to no more than \$75.00/per ton. There are virtually no increases in staff; we have trimmed some expenses from programs such as the 1% for Recycling program; we have cut some contractual related matters in the waste reduction which were primarily research oriented. The only budget area which was identified as an increase was in the household hazardous waste budget.

Presentation of the 1991 Regional Recycling Survey

Terry Peterson made a presentation of the 1991 Regional Recycling Survey. The survey was made for all materials recycled throughout the region. In 1991 about 600,000 tons of all materials were recycled in the region which compares to approximately 1,000,000 tons disposed (not counting contaminated soils), which produces a recycling percentage of 38%. This compares to 32% recycling level in 1990. Figuring pounds-per-person-per-day, we find 7.2 lbs generated, 4.5 lbs disposed and 2.7 lbs being recycled. If you compare the disposal figure of 4.5 to current literature, it would indicate that figure to be high, however, we are talking about all waste in the region including commercial, residential, construction demo -- anything which gets landfilled. Those items causing the recycling level to rise consist of: yard debris, construction materials, and glass -- paper rose slightly. The methodology change for calculating the recycling percentages accounted for a 1.7% increase.

John Drew read some statistics with regard to recycling from the American Paper Institute which showed recycling efforts on a national basis. Mr. Drew said the two important statistics used in the paper industry were: what was utilized in the production of new paper products in this country, and the recovery rate of all materials, whether it was utilized in finish paper product in this country or whether it was sent overseas. The utilization of recovered paper in this country was 23.5 million tons which represents a 29% utilization rate of paper. The recovery rate for the nation was 39% which includes what was recovered and the net difference between what was imported and exported in wastepaper.

Estle Harlan said the solid waste industry has noted that tonnages keep going up even in flat growth areas. Ms. Harlan said she would like to see a chart which eliminates select wastes which goes somewhere outside of our normal collection system, i.e., the 405 recycling wastestream.

Mr. Peterson said that type of data was difficult to obtain.

Ms. Harlan suggested they back out some of their data such as compost — to use a more common methodology — using what we typically could possibly divert.

Mr. Drew praised Metro for their efforts in reporting data.

Approval of the Regional Household Hazardous Waste Management Plan
Larry Eisele, Chairman of the Household Hazardous Waste Management Subcommittee,
presented the committee's draft which is to be incorporated into Chapter 2 of the Regional Solid
Waste Management Plan after adoption. Mr. Eisele said collecting data on hazardous waste was
very difficult because this was a new area, no one counted the material the same, the volumes,
material collected and how they funded and budgeted their programs were all different. The
committee endeavored to pick out the best components of what people were doing across the
nation and tried to adapt those to what they thought would work in the Metro region. Mr. Eisele
said they endeavored to keep the document flexible because this is a new field and things are
changing rapidly and because of the tremendous costs involved with the collection of hazardous
waste, it is doubtful that all portions of the plan will be implemented immediately. Mr. Eisele said
this document gives Metro an option to go beyond tipping fees to fund research.

Mark Buscher briefly discussed the information contained in the document. Mr. Buscher said the Plan is based on a program and facilities analysis conducted over a year and a half period. The purpose of the program analysis was to research other programs throughout the country. The facilities analysis was to look at what long-term level of service we would have for the region if we only had permanent depots at Metro South and Metro Central. The Plan recommends: distribution of information in schools, and at solid waste facilities, through our recycling information center and through mailouts. Specific programs recommended for household hazardous waste reduction are also outlined in the plan, one being waste exchanges at the facility, also information and/or education at the point-of-sale through cooperation of retailers, etc. The plan also looks at the potential banning of collection of household hazardous waste at the curb by haulers to help keep those materials out of the wastestream as well as putting the responsibility of disposal on the purchaser of the material. Another potential legislative proposal would be manufacturer/retail kickbacks of certain materials — for instance used tires, auto batteries. One other potential legislative item might be product bans. These are all common themes throughout the country in similar facilities. Mr. Buscher suggested monitoring actual participation, disposal rates at the hazardous waste facilities as well as monitoring trends and purchases of potential household hazardous wastes which could be used as a measure of effectiveness of the reduction activities.

Mr. Buscher said they conducted a cost analysis for additional fixed or permanent depots, as well as a mobile or "prefabricated" facility to serve Washington County and eastern Multnomah County. Mr. Buscher said the plan recommends a mobile depot for two reasons; cost estimates indicate a 15% reduction in operation costs; a mobile facility would be more flexible.





Mr. Buscher said that in addition to funding of the facilities through the regional tipping fee, there is a possibility of funding through DEQ (from their tipping fee). The committee wanted to clarify that if it is found that a user fee could be implemented without significantly impacting participation, a "per participant" fee would be levied.

With regard to the mobile facility, the plan has determined that DEQ and Metro should work together for procurement of that facility, whether it be purchased, leased or franchised.

Estle Harlan commented that she would be very reluctant to participate in the waste exchange program without complete assurances that all materials were thoroughly tested as to their contents.

Merle Irvine asked what type of liability Metro would be incurring if they implemented the waste exchange program.

Mr. Martin said Risk Management and our attorneys were also looking at this operation which has been designed to minimize our liability exposure.

Steve Schwab expressed his concern that the extensive testing of materials which would have to be implemented would necessitate a high price on the waste exchanged material.

Mr. Martin assured the committee that there were some simple tests (cheap and quick) to find out if a material is safe.

Mr. Martin excused himself from the remainder of the meeting because of a pre-scheduled press conference.

Mr. Drew, referring to Appendix B, page 3, Table 1, said it appeared that the plan is investigating a period of time on making cost assumptions based on a 10-year period and that under column 3, "participation" the statistics go from 2% to 15% and it appeared to him to be on the low side based on the information available on the present facility.

Mr. Buscher said the participation rate, region-wide was from 1-2%. Mr. Buscher said they used 15% because it represented a reasonable, feasible growth rate, and it provided a means of analyzing what the impact of increasing tonnages would be on the overall system cost.

Tom Miller distributed a letter addressed to Larry Eisele in his capacity as chairman of the household hazardous waste sub-committee from Washington County Haulers Association. Mr. Miller expressed his concern with language in the plan -- "... Metro procuring a collection system for this material..". In particular Mr. Miller was concerned that local jurisdictions might be pre-empted from being involved, unless they choose not to be involved.

Solid Waste Technical Committee Meeting of 4/23/92 Page 6

Mr. Buscher said he had met with individuals from Washington County Haulers Association and assured them that the plan only directed Metro to work with DEQ to develop a means of funding a mobile system from the standpoint of procuring it and in sharing its operation. How it is procured, who operates it, when it is operated are decisions which have not been made and will not be made during the planning process.

Charles is the fact of the Carlon

Estle Harlan moved for adoption of the Household Hazardous Waste Management Plan with the knowledge that Tom Miller was comfortable with the language in the plan relating to who would operate future Household Hazardous Waste facilities.

Tom Miller seconded the motion

The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously.

This concluded discussion of the agenda items and there was no new business to discuss.

The next meeting was scheduled for the 4th Thursday of the month of May (May 28) to begin at

Andrew with the second of the

The state of the s