



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Agenda

Meeting: Solid Waste Technical Committee
Date: March 2, 1990
Day: Friday
Time: 9:00 AM to 10:30
Place: Metro Council Chambers
2000 SW First Ave.
Portland, OR 97201

I. Updates Carson/Crockett

II. Yard Debris Plan:
Update and discussion Becky Crockett

III. Action Item:
Select Waste Management Options;
Approval of Facility Subcommittee
select waste recommendations Robert Newman

IV. Next meeting: April 27, 1990

SOLID WASTE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

February 2, 1990

The following members and alternates were present

Rich Carson, Metro Planning Director
Pam Christian, City of Troutdale
John Drew, Far West Fibers
Ed Druback, City of West Linn
Joanne Garnett, Multnomah County
Estle Harlan, OSSI
Lynda Kotta, City of Gresham
Bob Martin, Metro Solid Waste Director
Bill Martin, Washington County
Tom Miller, Washington County Refuse Haulers Association
Dave Phillips, Clackamas County
Jim Rapp, City of Sherwood

The following members were not present

Michael Borg
Dick Cereghino
Jim Claypool
Sebastian Degens, Port of Portland
Steve Greenwood, Department of Environmental Quality
Dick Howard, Multnomah County
Merle Irvine, Wastech, Inc.
Dominic Mancini, Clackamas County
John Trout, Teamsters
Bruce Warner, Washington County
Bob Wiggin, Citizen
Mark Williams, Citizen

Metro Staff

Rich Carson, Planning Director
Becky Crockett, Planning
Debbie Gorham, Solid Waste Reduction
Sandy Gurkewitz, Planning
Pamela Kambur, Solid Waste
Steve Kraten, Solid Waste
Bob Martin, Solid Waste Director
Ron Nagy, Planning
Robert Newman, Planning
Mark Turpel, Planning
Gerry Uba, Planning

Guests

Charles Gray, DEQ
Peter Spendelow, DEQ

Solid Waste Technical Committee
February 2, 1990

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Protocols

The Meeting was called to order by Rich Carson. It was moved to approve the minutes from the October 28, 1989 meeting: the motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Updates

Bob Martin presented updates on Solid Waste Department activities. He discussed the greater than anticipated amounts of waste which were passing through the Metro South transfer station. The probable reasons cited were: the recent closure of the KFD landfill; a higher moisture content of waste delivered; and an unusually high level of construction activity in Clackamas County.

Mr. Martin discussed scheduling and logistical problems which led to a contract amendment for Jack Gray Transport (JGT) to haul loads of waste to the St. Johns landfill. He also discussed the fact that the compaction process and transport from Metro South transfer station to the Gilliam County Landfill was improving with time.

Dave Phillips asked Mr. Martin if there had been problems with the compactor recently installed at the Metro South transfer station. Mr. Martin acknowledged that the compactor may need modifications.

John Drew commented that the fact that the peak period for recyclers was November through January may also have had an influence on the increased level of waste seen at the Metro South station. He also asked Mr. Martin how many loads per day were being transported to Arlington. Mr. Martin responded that it varied. Mr. Drew asked if Mr. Martin knew how many tons per day was being transported, to which Mr. Martin responded that the monthly tonnage was approximately 3000 tons.

Mr. Martin went on to discuss rates. He said that the Solid Waste Department was presenting their proposal on the revised rate structure to the Council Solid Waste Committee on February 6. Mr. Martin said that the revised rate structure took a more rational approach which was in synch with the annual budget process. He said that revision of the rate structure placed a high priority on fair distribution of charges.

Rich Carson gave an update on the Local Government Model Annual Work Programs which were recently distributed by Waste Reduction staff. He also announced that Waste Reduction staff would be holding a workshop on the Work Programs for local governments February 7. Bob Martin added that the topic of financial support

for local government waste reduction programs would be addressed at the workshop.

Becky Crockett gave updates on the Washington County system design project, the Model Zoning Ordinance / Mitigation Agreement, and discussions with the DEQ about respective roles in hazardous waste management.

Ron Nagy gave an update on system finance. He referred to the summary of Policy Committee discussion, which centered on the more immediate need for local governments to finance waste reduction requirements outlined in the Annual Work Programs. Dave Phillips asked for clarification of the Policy Committee's discussion on use of general fund revenues to pay for waste reduction. Mr. Nagy responded that members of the Policy Committee discussed the pros and cons of use of general fund revenues and that the discussion was inconclusive. He said that the Policy Committee will be discussing the issue further at their February meeting and that the Technical Committee will be updated when information is more concrete.

John Drew gave a summary and update on the yard debris project. He said that the Waste Reduction Subcommittee has held about 20 meetings and staff has generated large amounts of data on yard debris in an effort to determine both the scope of the project and the best possible management strategies.

Mr. Drew discussed the methodology for the project and directed the Committee's attention to Attachment B of the update, which outlined conversion factor for yard debris. He said the update also contained an estimate of market capacity for yard debris compost.

Mr. Drew also pointed out that land for siting yard debris compost facilities was a significant discussion item. He directed the Committee's attention to page 8 of the update, which stated that maximum processing capacity has to do with profitability and system efficiency. Mr. Drew continued with a discussion of collection options for yard debris and said that the Subcommittee stopped short of addressing financing but, as previously outlined in policy directions, generators will pay the bill.

Estle Harlan commented that user fees will be the most likely funding option. She added that Oregon City is initiating a proposal to pay for yard debris collection by adding a fee to resident's water bills.

Becky Crockett asserted that a conclusion of yard debris compost marketing studies was that price regulation was a factor. Steve Kraten also pointed out that the major question for marketing yard debris compost was "How much, and at what price?" He said that marketing studies were not based on hard data, as none exists. But the studies were based on reasonable assumptions, which is the best

best that can be done at this time.

Tom Miller stated that it was his impression that processing fees will exceed the cost of disposal of yard debris. Mr. Kraten responded that demand for the final product has nothing to do with processing.

Sandy Gurkewitz presented a strategy paper on Household Hazardous Waste. She said that the paper outlined a proposal for two depots which would be located at transfer stations. The depots would be open for operations three days per week and would accept only household hazardous waste. She discussed a list of materials which would be excluded from disposal and that some on-site testing of materials would be necessary. She stated that the intention was to recycle materials such as oil, batteries, and antifreeze.

John Drew asked about the categories of household hazardous waste identified on ppg. 5-6 of the strategy paper. He asked if inclusion of a list of items identified as household hazardous waste was considered. Ms. Gurkewitz said that the list was prohibitively long and that it probably was not going to be included. Mr. Drew stated that the list should be available for educational purposes.

Bill Martin inquired if, given the current status of the Washington County transfer station siting process, a household hazardous waste depot was feasible. Rich Carson responded that the state mandates that depots are geographically dispersed. Tom Miller asked how use of the depots would be encouraged and how residual would be handled. He asked further if household hazardous waste was going to be banned from landfills when depots are on-line. Becky Crockett responded that promotion of use of the depots was part of the program and that at Metro East every effort will be made to eliminate household hazardous waste from that which is transported to the Gilliam County Landfill for disposal.

Dave Phillips asserted that there is a need for a long-term approach to handling household hazardous waste, but there is also a need to address conditionally-exempt small quantity generators.

Motion and vote

Rich Carson responded that the first step toward that goal was for the Committee to approve the strategy paper. Dave Phillips moved and John Drew seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Robert Newman presented an update of the select waste project. He said that the draft report, which will include recommended management options was currently under preparation and would be made available to the Facilities Subcommittee and then the Technical Committee for review and discussion. Mr. Newman said

that he would return to the Technical Committee with the report by March.

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 February 23.



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

DRAFT

Date: 2-23-90
To: Technical Committee
From: Richard Carson
Re: Draft Select Waste Recommendations

Enclosed please find a copy of the "Select Waste Substream Characterization and Management Options for the Portland Tri-County Area Report". The purpose of the report is to establish appropriate management strategies for problem waste streams within the Portland metropolitan region. The special management concerns posed by these waste streams arise from their unique characteristics such as bulk, liquids content, potential for harmful air emissions, and odor. Because each waste stream presents unique problems and risks, each waste stream has been carefully evaluated to determine the most appropriate management options.

The objective for our March 2 meeting is to approve the Select Waste Technical Report and approve the recommendations on pages 15-21 in the report as modified below by the Facilities Subcommittee.

A. Construction/Demolition Wastes and Land-Clearing Wastes:

Estimated 1989 volume = 250,000 tons.

Short-term management strategies proposed through 1995 are the continuation of current and proposed practices. Current practices include the continued landfilling of material at existing limited-purpose landfills. In addition, the region may choose to use the St. John's Landfill through 1994 as a limited-purpose landfill so that the facility can obtain necessary contours for closure. Proposed practices include the processing of limited amounts of "high-grade" construction and demolition wastes at existing or currently contracted facilities. In addition to the above activities Metro will conduct a salvageable building materials depot demonstration project at the St. John's Landfill for a period of 6 months. Data will be collected to determine its productivity and cost effectiveness.

Long-term management strategies after 1995 include the development of a high-recovery construction/demolition waste

processing facility which receives 121,000 tons per year and a limited-purpose landfill for those materials which cannot be processed or recycled. The preferred means to acquire adequate limited purpose landfill space is through the continued expansion of existing limited purpose landfills.

B. Non-Hazardous Industrial Sludges:

Estimated 1989 volume = 2,700 tons or 750,000 gallons.

With the stricter regulations proposed under RCRA subtitle D, the closure of the St. John's Landfill, and the ban on disposal of free liquids at the Gilliam County Landfill, Metro should move immediately to develop dewatering capability within the region for all non-hazardous industrial waste sludges by early 1991. Residual material (93% by weight) should be disposed at either a limited-purpose landfill if permitted or the Gilliam County Landfill via the transfer station.

Some of the wastes may be amenable to reuse or recycling through a waste exchange. In addition, technical assistance provided to industry by Metro may encourage on-site dewatering.

C. Non-Hazardous Industrial Dust and Ash:

Estimated 1989 volume = 900 tons.

Due to the small quantity involved, the development of special facilities for waste dusts and ash does not appear to be cost effective. Therefore, the primary method for managing this material would be through disposal at a limited purpose landfill, such as the one used for construction/demolition and land clearing wastes. Approximately two-thirds of this waste stream could be disposed at a limited-purpose landfill. The remaining 100 to 300 tons of material should be disposed at the Gilliam County Landfill via the transfer station. At the transfer station this material would be directly loaded into top-loading containers for separate shipment, rather than placed on a tipping floor or in a pit with other wastes.

A large amount of this waste stream consists of foundry sands which may have recovery potential via a waste exchange.

D. Sewage Sludge and Grit:

Estimated 1989 volume = 5,000 tons.

This waste stream consists of two different types of materials; sludge and grit. Grit which is primarily inorganic makes up 95% of the total, sludge is primarily organic and consists of residuals that accumulate in digesters. Through early 1991, the St. Johns Landfill should continue to be used. In the long term, the Gilliam County Landfill should be used. Because of aesthetic and handling problems, the sludge and grit should be transported

directly from the individual waste water treatment plants to the GCLF.

E. Non-Hazardous Petroleum Sludges:

Estimated volume = 450 tons.

Metro should ban the disposal of this material within the regional solid waste system with the intent of encouraging recovery. Currently petroleum sludge is processed within the region to recover hydrocarbons. The hydrocarbons are removed from the sludge through gassification and made into alternative fuels. The recovery process may charge anywhere between \$1.00 to \$2.50 a gallon versus the current \$.25 a gallon for disposal at the St. John's Landfill. Recovery of hydrocarbons from petroleum sludges would allow recycling of a valuable resource and should decrease future risks to the environment.

F. Soils Contaminated with Petroleum Products:

Estimated volume = 16,000 tons.

There is little that can be done currently with petroleum contaminated soil except disposal through landfilling. This practice should continue at the St. Johns Landfill till early 1991, afterwards limited amounts should be delivered to an existing limited purpose landfill capable of handling this material.

Due to the decreasing availability of suitable land disposal capacity within the region for this material and the risks associated with its handling at a transfer station Metro should focus immediately on establishing treatment methods for contaminated soils. However, until the region can rely on such new technology land disposal will remain as the only viable technique.

G. Asbestos:

Estimated volume = 1,400 tons.

In the short term Metro should continue to land dispose asbestos at the St. John's Landfill. After the closure of the St. John's Landfill in early 1991 the material should be brought to the Gilliam County Landfill or a permitted out-of-region landfill via separate handling at the transfer station. One factor to consider is the need for Metro to receive confirmation from Oregon Waste Systems that they will obtain the necessary permits from the Department of Environmental Quality in order to handle asbestos waste.