

SOLID WASTE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

February 2, 1990

The following members and alternates were present

Rich Carson, Metro Planning Director
Renee Dowlin, Port of Portland
John Drew, Far West Fibers
Ed Druback, City of West Linn
Charlie Gray, Department of Environmental Quality
Merle Irvine, Wastech, Inc.
Lynda Kotta, City of Gresham
Bill Martin, Washington County
Tom Miller, Washington County Refuse Haulers Association
Dave Phillips, Clackamas County
Bob Wiggin, Citizen
Mark Williams, Citizen

The following members were not present

Michael Borg, Clackamas County Refuse Haulers Association
Dick Cereghino, Multnomah County Refuse Haulers Association
Jim Claypool, City of Portland
Joanne Garnett, Multnomah County
Joseph Glicker, Portland Water Bureau
Ed Gronke, Citizen
Dick Howard, Multnomah County
Gary LaHaie, Citizen
Dominic Mancini, Clackamas County
Tyler Marshall, Citizen
Jim Rapp, City of Sherwood
John Trout, Teamsters

Metro Staff

Rich Carson, Planning Director
Becky Crockett, Planning
Bob Martin, Solid Waste Director
Ron Nagy, Planning
Robert Newman, Planning

Guests

Scott Carrillo, Carrillo Enterprises, Inc.
Mike Greenholtz, Carrillo Enterprises, Inc.
Phil Newton, SCS Engineers

Solid Waste Technical Committee
March 2, 1990

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Protocols

The Meeting was called to order by Rich Carson. It was moved to approve the minutes from the February 2, 1990 meeting: the motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Updates

Becky Crockett began by giving updates of Solid Waste Planning activities. For system design, Ms. Crockett deferred to Bill Martin, who presented an update on Washington County Steering Committee transfer station siting activities. Mr. Martin reported that Washington County had hired a consultant to help expedite the conceptual plan process. Ms. Crockett added that Mark Buscher of the Planning Department staff had completed a comprehensive work program which includes the Washington County project. The work program, which addresses long-term system design, has already been reviewed by the Facilities Subcommittee and will be brought forward to the Technical Committee in April.

Ms. Crockett discussed the status of the Household Hazardous Waste Strategy Paper, which the Technical Committee reviewed at the February 2, 1990 meeting. The Strategy Paper and accompanying recommendations were reviewed and approved at the February 23 meeting of the Policy Committee. The Strategy Paper will be presented to the Council Solid Waste Committee on March 20. No action has been requested for that presentation.

The Technical Committee was also updated on financing issues. The Policy Committee has had two discussions on financing which were focused on the issues related to Waste Reduction Annual Work Programs for local governments. Bob Martin told Policy Committee members at the February meeting that the Solid Waste Department was budgeting for funds to assist local governments in offsetting the first year start-up costs associated with implementing state-mandated waste reduction programs. Availability of funds is contingent on Metro Council approval of the departmental budget, and the analysis for allocating the funds to local governments has been deferred until more information is available. The Policy Committee is also working with staff to develop guidelines for long-term system finance. The guidelines, which will ultimately be incorporated into the Financing Chapter of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, will address the long-term financial responsibilities of Metro and local governments for all aspects of the solid waste disposal system. The Policy committee will continue its discussions on system finance at the next meeting on April 13, 1990.

Bob Martin updated the Technical Committee on Solid Waste Department activities. The Metro East transfer station construction project is well under way and on schedule. The Metro South compactor installation has been completed and over 2000 loads of waste had been transported from Metro South to the Gilliam County landfill (GCL) without major transport-related problems. Operations at GCL are also running smoothly.

John Drew gave updates of Waste Reduction Subcommittee activities. He said that the Subcommittee last met on February 28, when they discussed processing and market capacity for yard debris compost. Mr. Drew said that the Subcommittee was following the directive of the Policy Committee by approaching processing and marketing capacity conservatively.

Mr. Drew said that Terry Moore of ECO Northwest did an evaluation of the yard debris plan. Mr. Moore focused on system measurement as well as scoring and weighting of the sixteen self-haul and eight curbside collection options. Mr. Drew said that the intent of the Subcommittee was to develop a matrix for grading the proposed collection options. Mr. Drew described the several scoring and weighting factors outlined in the Subcommittee's matrix. Included was a pass/fail criterion for marketing and processing capacity which was altered to describe whether an option was "adequate" or "promising."

Dave Phillips asked Mr. Drew if rating of collection options will disregard processing capacity. Mr. Drew replied that the alteration was made in order to fully examine all proposed options before elimination due to a single rating criterion.

Becky Crockett elaborated on the issue. She said that when staff was examining how to apply the pass/fail criteria, it became apparent that some programs would be disqualified based on numbers established by the in-house market study. It was determined that there was not enough confidence in the study's estimation of potential volume to disqualify collection options at this point in time.

Dave Phillips expressed that it was important to him that the Committee's recommendation not create a situation where the market capacity was exceeded. Ms. Crockett added that all options needed to be placed in a long-term context. She pointed out that staff was in the difficult position of balancing the Policy Committee directive to present a market-driven plan with DEQ's stand that avoided cost be a prominent factor in developing collection options.

The yard debris discussion ended with an agreement to combine the Technical Committee with the Waste Reduction Subcommittee for a meeting on March 28 in order to expedite recommendations. It is intended that recommendations will be approved at the April 27

meeting of the Technical Committee.

Select Waste

After altering the agenda by removing Select Waste Management Options as an action item, Rich Carson introduced Robert Newman, Project Manager for the Select Waste Plan. Mr. Newman was joined by Phil Newton of SCS Engineers, consultant on the project. Mr. Newman began by informing the Committee that approval of management options had been postponed in order to give staff more time for internal review and to give affected parties time to respond to the proposed options. He said that the present discussion would consist of a review of the Draft Select Waste Technical Report.

Mr. Newman began by discussing construction/demolition debris. He said that approximately 236,000 tons of material categorized as construction/demolition debris was produced in the Metro region each year. Problems associated with handling construction / demolition debris through usual means included damage to disposal equipment. Mr. Newman said that even though a great deal of the material has recovery potential, most is currently land disposed.

Merle Irvine asked Mr. Newman how he arrived at the high recovery facility capacity projection of 121,000 tons of construction /demolition debris per year. He said that, as the representative of Oregon Processing and Recycling Center (OPRC), he wished to clarify the information for the purpose of accurately estimating the waste flow as it relates to the facility's expansion plans. Mr. Newman answered by stating that, since the the construction /demolition debris waste flow was very sensitive to economic conditions, it was prudent to size a facility using a figure which represented roughly half of the waste flow.

Bill Martin asked Mr. Newman why Lakeside Reclamation Landfill was not included in the recommendations as a site for demolition and land clearing debris. Mr. Martin said that the site currently has capacity as a bulky wood shredder. Mr. Newman responded that there are a large number of options for bulky wood shredding. Mr. Martin asserted that using flow control to direct special wastes to facilities enters into the situation. He continued by stating that Washington County Commissioners have approved an increase in the collection rate structure for the purpose of increasing recycling at the facility.

Robert Newman continued with land clearing debris, which is mainly produced as the result of construction projects. He said that virtually all of this material is currently being landfilled, but there is a high potential for separating the organic fraction from the inert materials such as dirt and rocks.

Non-hazardous sludges were identified as a material which is currently landfilled at St. Johns landfill. Mr. Newman discussed

the need for de-watering sludges prior to disposition: in the near future Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) subtitle D requirements will greatly restrict free liquids in landfills.

John Drew asked about select waste volumes in a general sense. He asked about select waste facility requirements and stated that it is easier to expand capabilities of existing facilities rather than site new facilities. Mr. Newman responded that existing facilities could handle current volumes, but that expansion of existing facilities would be necessary in the near future.

Bob Martin asserted that there were a number of considerations which must be explored fully before recommendations can be brought forward. St. Johns Landfill will be closed February 1991: there are also waste acceptance standards both at transfer stations and at the Gilliam County Landfill. He also discussed the effect of new restrictions under RCRA subtitle D. He said there was also an increasing concern over conditionally-exempt generators of hazardous waste: this waste is currently entering the waste stream.

Bob Martin continued with his view of how Metro will approach the problems associated with select waste. He said that flow control will have to come into play in order to direct select waste to the proper facility. He voiced that there is a need for new select waste facilities and comprehensive select waste disposal criteria to provide regulatory certainty. Mr. Martin spoke of integration of regulatory programs and disposal needs with enforcement measures to insure that adopted regulations are followed.

Mr. Martin said that disposal rates for select wastes will increase to reflect the true cost of handling. He expressed that his approach would be to recover disposal revenues from specific materials which pose costly handling problems. He also indicated that it was the generator's responsibility to aggressively reduce waste volumes as well as prepare material through de-watering or treatment prior to disposal. Mr. Martin indicated that Metro will continue to coordinate development of options for select waste management.

Robert Newman completed his summary of the draft report. He indicated that the schedule for review and approval of the report had been pushed back by nine weeks. Dave Phillips commended Mr. Newman for producing a good report.

Scott Carrillo, a contractor involved in construction site cleanup, spoke to the Committee about problems he has encountered relating to franchised hauling areas. Mr. Carrillo expressed that he was committed to recycling construction and demolition debris from construction sites throughout Clackamas and Washington Counties, but has found that franchise agreements held by refuse haulers interfere with his ability to do business. Mr. Carrillo said that recycling efforts were impeded by franchised haulers who were not

source separating materials. The Technical Committee was unable to provide him with solutions to his particular problems. Mr. Carrillo distributed his business card to Committee members.

Having covered the all agenda items, and in the absence of new business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30. The next meeting was scheduled for March 28.