

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF EVALUATING ) RESOLUTION NO. 88-888  
SOURCE SEPARATED RECYCLING )  
ALTERNATIVES ) Introduced by Councilors  
Gardner and Kirkpatrick

WHEREAS, The Council of the Metropolitan Service District has established Solid Waste reduction policies through adoption of Resolution No. 85-611A; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council has adopted a Solid Waste Reduction Program through enactment of Ordinance Nos. 86-199, 86-200 and 86-201; and

WHEREAS, The Solid Waste Reduction Program sets a goal of recovering 52 percent of the waste stream through implementation of reduce, reuse and recycling programs; and


WHEREAS, Various interested groups (Recycling Advocates, Oregon Environmental Council and the Sierra Club) have submitted suggestions for programs to achieve optimum recycling rates; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Executive Officer cause an evaluation to be made of the feasibility of the source separation alternatives set forth in Exhibit A attached.

2. That such feasibility report be submitted to the Council of the Metropolitan Service District prior to issuance of an Request for Proposal for the Metro East Transfer and Recycling Center(s), but this is not intended to delay the transfer station process.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 12th day of May, 1988.

  
Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer



# RECYCLING ADVOCATES

## PROPOSAL FOR EFFECTIVE RECYCLING SYSTEMS

This proposal is submitted to Metro by Recycling Advocates, Oregon Environmental Council, and Sierra Club.

We believe that Metro's goal for a 52% recycling rate can be achieved and should be retained in the Solid Waste Plan. However, Metro needs to make decisions now on the means to attain this rate. The particular source separation system chosen should dictate the type of materials recovery facilities planned and the design of the composting facility.

Following are alternative methods of achieving an optimum recycling rate. We ask that they be immediately evaluated. To ensure an in-depth study, we ask that Metro hire an independent consultant who is an expert in putting together recycling systems.

1. A two or three-can collection system

Under a two-can system residential and commercial customers would have separate containers for co-mingled recyclables (glass, metals, paper, plastics, and wood) and for non-recyclable garbage.

Under a three-can system customers would separate waste into dry recyclables (as above), wet recyclables (food and yard debris), and trash.

2. Significant enhancement of the present collection system with addition of lumber and yard debris components

Stackable container, weekly curbside collection, and/or mandatory source separation

Residents (including apartment dwellers) would receive 3 stackable containers to be collected weekly.

Source separated material and high-grade routes for commercial waste

Routes would be set up to obtain loads with one material (corrugated, glass, office paper) and loads with a high proportion of recyclables.

Lumber drop-off sites

Bi-monthly collection of yard debris (March-October)

In Addition to selecting a collection method, Metro needs to use its statutory authority to create economic incentives:

### Rate incentives

Metro should establish a rate differential (or disposal credit) at the landfill for haulers based on the ratio of materials sold for recycling compared to the waste dumped.

Metro should offer disposal credits for haulers who dispose of high-grade loads at materials recovery centers.

Metro should offer disposal credits for haulers who dispose of yard debris at processing centers.

### Grants

Metro should make grants available to private companies and municipalities for collection programs and for market development.

At the state level Metro's highest priorities should be these:

Lobby for a packaging tax with funds to be used for recycling programs and research; and

Lobby for tax credits, grants, or low interest loans to aid existing industries and to recruit new industries which use recycled materials in their products.

### Rate incentives

Metro should establish a rate differential (or disposal credit) at the landfill for haulers based on the ratio of materials sold for recycling compared to the waste dumped.

Metro should offer disposal credits for haulers who dispose of high-grade loads at materials recovery centers.

Metro should offer disposal credits for haulers who dispose of yard debris at processing centers.

### Grants

Metro should make grants available to private companies and municipalities for collection programs and for market development.

## EXAMPLES OF PROGRAMS WHICH INCREASE RECYCLING

### Two-can system

The southern half of Seattle is now using a two-can system for collection of recyclables. The 60 or 90-gallon wheeled plastic cans provided by the hauler are filled with glass, cans, scrap paper, and news and collected monthly. The co-mingled recyclables are transported in a regular compacter truck and separated at an intermediate processing center. After only one month 40% of the households are participating.

In New York, Connecticut, California, and New Jersey a number of communities are using variations of the two-can system. Typically only 2-3 items are comingled, but a few include plastics as well. These programs rely on an intermediate processing center where materials are sorted and packaged for marketing.

### Containers

When San Jose added containers to its curbside program on a test basis, the participation rate was 72% in those neighborhoods with containers compared to 35% for those without. Now that containers have been provided to all 60,000 households, the participation rate is 60-72%. Santa Rosa had a similar experience with participation rising from 35% to 70%. In an Urbana, Illinois pilot project the participation rate increased from 11% to 83%.

On the average containers increase participation rates 10-20 percentage points according to a 1987 report by Resource Conservation Consultants. Differences depend on the type of container, whether it is provided free of charge, and whether it is delivered to the household. In San Jose and northern Seattle 3 color-coded rectangular stackable plastic containers are brought to the resident but remain the property of the city or hauler.

Some container programs allow partial comingling. For example, in San Jose glass colors can be mixed in one container; tin and aluminum can be mixed in another. Separation is done on the truck. Diane's Recycling Service in Portland makes available to its customers a bin made out of recycled plastic. Customers are asked to keep newspapers and scrap paper separate in kraft bags but may mix glass, metal, and plastic items in the bin.

## Weekly Collection

A 1987 study by Resource Conservation Consultants of 41 curbside collection programs showed that monthly programs achieved an average participation rate of 24% while weekly programs achieved a rate of 53%.

## Mandatory Collection

Three states now require mandatory source separation: New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Connecticut (the latter to be effective in 1991). In addition many cities and counties have mandated separation on their own. The number of items mandated ranges from one--newspapers in Delaware County, Pennsylvania--to six--bottles, cans, news, scrap paper, yard debris, and oil in Camden New Jersey. In Philadelphia, Pennsylvania an ordinance mandating source separation of recyclables was passed in June. The regulations, to be phased in over a 2-year period, require residents and businesses to separate newspaper, plastic containers, glass, cans, and yard debris.

A Resource Conservation Consultants study of 46 recycling programs around the country found that mandatory programs had between 59-66% higher participation rates than voluntary programs. A 1979 EPA study of 177 curbside programs, 43 of which were mandatory, concluded that mandatory ordinances averaged a 30% greater participation rate.

## Commercial Source Separation Programs

There are three materials for which separate routes may be justified: corrugated cardboard, high grade office paper, and glass from hotels and restaurants.

Portage County, Wisconsin sends a packer truck to pick up corrugated at designated sites on a regular schedule throughout the county. In the City of Portage where municipal collectors operate a separate corrugated route weekly, separation by businesses is required. Santa Monica, California collects corrugated in city trucks. In Halton Region, Ontario, waste haulers are being informed that corrugated will soon be banned from disposal sites so that they will develop a separate system for collecting it.

New York City contracts with a company to organize office paper recycling in buildings. In San Francisco the city and county operate an office paper recycling program for government offices in over 50 buildings. These include hospitals and colleges as well as administrative offices. Desk-top holders are provided to employees who empty them into central containers located in various places in each building. A private contractor collects them. Participation is rated at 50%.

In Toronto, Canada, office paper collection is run by Youth Ventures Recycling, a company which provides work experience for hard-to-employ youth. High grade paper is collected from 200-250 clients using two 5-ton box trucks, one of which is fitted with a hydraulic loading system. Plastic wheeled bins are used for storage and collection in buildings where needed. Paper that is mixed will be collected from customers for a fee and then hand sorted at Youth Venture's warehouse.

In 1985 the City of San Francisco gave a disposal company a matching grant to establish separate glass recycling service for hotels, bars, and restaurants. Three hundred customers recycle 200 tons per month. Customers use 60 or 90-gallon plastic wheeled containers for glass only provided by the disposal company and receive rebates for the amount of glass recycled. A 22-cubic yard open truck with a loader fork collects the glass from a different part of the city each of the 5 week days. The most effective way of securing participants was having a representative visit those customers identified as generating large quantities of glass. In Anaheim, California haulers pay restaurants \$20 per ton for their separated glass.

In the Metro area some source separation is already occurring, and some high grade loads go to Oregon Processing and Recovery Center. The amount could be increased by economic incentives and outreach programs to targeted businesses.

#### Lumber drop offs

Urban Ore operates two sites in Berkeley, California for lumber. One is in front of the transfer station where a hauler can drop off lumber before entering the station. The lumber is sorted for different uses--from fire wood, to garden lumber, to structural lumber--and sold. Junk lumber is transported to another site where it is shredded for burning in boilers. The other is a building materials buy-back center where all kinds of reusable items coming out of buildings can be sold (doors, windows, molding, dimensional lumber, toilets, sinks, stoves, pipe, tiles).

#### Yard Debris

Davis, California, which uses a claw to collect limbs, leaves, and grass in a weekly curbside program, collects virtually all residential yard debris. Other communities, such as Ramsey County, Minnesota; Tenafly, New Jersey; and Brookhaven, New York, collect 75-90% of the yard debris generated.

An Oregon City, Oregon hauler who provides weekly curbside yard debris collection, reports an 85% participation rate. This material is composted at Grimm's Fuel and sold for ground cover.

The programs generating the most yard debris are paid for through a tax base or through a uniform garbage collection fee.

Another system is employed by West Linn. It opens a yard debris depot every Saturday (except Dec. and Jan.) where residents can drop off yard debris for a small fee. Two free days are offered per year to encourage wider participation. The debris is chipped and composted on site and sold back to residents. Approximately 60% of yard debris generated in West Linn is handled at the site.

Variations of the Oregon City and West Linn models could be used for the rest of the Metro region:

Curbside collection programs could be weekly, bimonthly, or monthly.

Depots could be established for every 20,000 residents. Options range from manned drop boxes or compactor trucks on public property available the first Saturday of every month to fenced sites open every Saturday.

#### Incentives

Some increased recycling will occur if disposal fees are doubled. However, maximum feasible source separation will not occur unless additional measures are taken by Metro. The 1985 Waste Reduction Plan contains measures Metro can take such as waste auditing services, grants and loans, certification of local collection services, rate incentives, institutional purchasing, and market development.

Hennepin County, Minnesota has set aside \$2.7 million to reimburse local governments for varying percentages of their recycling collection costs based on the percent they recycle. The State of New Jersey gives grants to local governments based on the tons they recycle. It also makes loans available to recycling companies for research and development. All government agencies must give preference to composted material in land maintenance. And at least 45% of paper products purchased by the state must be of at least 50% secondary fiber by 1989.





**METRO**

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

# Memorandum

Agenda Item No. 7.5

Meeting Date May 12, 1988

Date: May 4, 1988

To: Metro Council

From: Councilor Gary Hansen <sup>GH</sup>  
Chair, Council Solid Waste Committee

Regarding: SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE REPORT ON MAY 12, 1988, COUNCIL  
MEETING AGENDA ITEM

Agenda Item 7.5

Consideration of Resolution No. 88-888, for  
the Purpose of Evaluating Source Separated  
Recycling Alternatives

Committee Recommendation

The Solid Waste Committee recommends Council adoption of Resolution No. 88-888 as amended.

Discussion

Jeanne Roy of Recycling Advocates spoke in favor of Resolution No. 88-888 and urged Council adoption. She stated that Metro should determine what will be removed from the wastestream before the Council makes a decision on a transfer station. She addressed the major points from Exhibit A of the resolution.

Councilor DeJardin said he would like to hear from the hauling industry before any of the recycling proposals are actually implemented.

Councilor Van Bergen stated that Metro should not delay the RFP for the Metro East Transfer & Recycling Center until the feasibility report referred to in Resolution No. 88-888 is completed.

Councilor Gardner said that the intent of the resolution is not to delay the transfer station but to get the recycling feasibility report as soon as possible.

Councilor Van Bergen offered an amendment to the resolution which was approved 7 to 0. The amendment adds the following wording to the end of paragraph 2 of the resolved section -- "but this is not intended to delay the transfer station process."

Memorandum  
May 4, 1988  
Page 2

The Committee voted 6 to 1 to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 88-888. Voting aye: Cooper, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Kirkpatrick and Van Bergen. Voting nay: DeJardin. This action taken May 3, 1988.

RB/sm  
9486C/D1

Motion: Councilor Hansen moved, seconded by Councilor Cooper, to adopt the resolution.

Responding to Councilor Van Bergen's question, Councilor Hansen said the resolution had been reviewed by the Committee on April 20 and Councilor Van Bergen had voted in favor of recommending the Council adopt the resolution.

Motion to Amend: Councilor Gardner moved, seconded by Councilor Kirkpatrick, to amend the first "whereas" clause of the resolution to read: "The Metropolitan Service District has determined, as part of its Solid Waste Reduction Program adopted in Resolution No. 85-611, that up to 48 percent of the municipal solid waste in the Portland tri-county area could be allocated to alternative technology."

Councilor Gardner explained the language would be consistent with the language used in Resolution No. 88-866A and the adopted Solid Waste Reduction Program goals. Councilor Hansen concurred with the amendment.

Councilor Van Bergen asked if the amendment and the percentage requirement would have any bearing on Metro's contract with Oregon Waste Systems to operate the Arlington Landfill. Dan Cooper, General Counsel, said the resolution as amended would have no bearing on that contract.

Vote on the Motion to Amend: A vote resulted in all twelve Councilors present voting aye.

The motion to amend Resolution No. 88-867 carried unanimously.

Vote on the Main Motion as Amended: A vote on the motion to adopt Resolution No. 88-867 as amended resulted in all twelve Councilors present voting aye.

The motion carried and Resolution No. 88-876 was unanimously adopted as amended.

#### 7.5 Consideration of Resolution No. 88-888A, for the Purpose of Evaluating Source Separated Recycling Alternatives

The resolution's co-authors, Councilors Kirkpatrick and Gardner, introduced the resolution and explained its adoption would speed up the process for a recycling feasibility study. The Solid Waste Committee recommended the Council adopt the resolution.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved, seconded by Councilor Gardner, to adopt Resolution No. 88-888A.

REFERRED FROM THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

7.2 Consideration of Resolution No. 88-897, for the Purpose of Amending the Transportation Improvement Program for Transit Capital Improvements

Presiding Officer Ragsdale announced the resolution had initially been on the April 28 Council agenda but had been deferred because of certain objections to one of the funded programs raised by Councilor Waker.

Councilor Waker explained he originally had some minor objections but was now recommending the Council adopt the resolution.

Motion: Councilor Waker moved, seconded by Councilor Knowles, to adopt Resolution No. 88-897.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all eleven Councilors present voting aye. Councilor Collier was absent when the vote was taken.

The motion carried and Resolution No. 88-897 was unanimously adopted.

REFERRED FROM THE SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE

7.3 Consideration of Resolution No. 88-866A, for the Purpose of Suspending Memorandum of Understanding Negotiations with Combustion Engineering for a Refuse-Derived Fuel Facility, Pending Approval of a Facility Site

Councilor Hansen, Chair of the Council Solid Waste Committee, reported the resolution expressed a policy that staff had already implemented. The Committee had unanimously recommended the Council adopt the ordinance.

Motion: Councilor Hansen moved adoption of the resolution and Councilor Cooper seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all twelve Councilors present voting aye.

The motion carried and Resolution No. 88-866A was unanimously adopted.

7.4 Consideration of Resolution No. 88-867, for the Purpose of Continuing Memorandum of Understanding Negotiations with Riedel Environmental Technologies for a Mass Composting Facility

Councilor Hansen reported the Committee recommended adoption of the resolution.

In response to Councilor Waker's question, Councilor Kirkpatrick confirmed that adoption of the resolution would not commit the Council to any specific course of action.

Councilor DeJardin thought the resolution unnecessary because it did not commit the Council to take action.

Presiding Officer Ragsdale was concerned that adoption of the resolution could disrupt staff's workload. Councilor Kirkpatrick explained staff was in the process of responding to the Solid Waste Committee's inquiry about how the program would effect staff work. She also noted that staff had declined the Committee's offer for outside assistance.

Judy Dehen, 2965 N.W. Verde Vista, Portland, representing the Columbia Group of the Sierra Club, testified in favor of the resolution. She said there would be no "down side" for Metro if the resolution were adopted. The Council had adopted a waste reduction program in 1985 and no work product had resulted, she explained. Ms. Dehen thought the general public viewed Metro's number one priority for solid waste disposal as alternative technology facilities. Recycling programs had been ignored. She challenged the Council to advance recycling programs.

A discussion followed about whether the 52 percent recycling goal identified in the resolution and the Solid Waste Reduction Program was realistic. Councilor Van Bergen did not think the goal realistic. Councilor Kirkpatrick pointed out the goal had been adopted by ordinance and would not effect Metro's contract with Oregon Waste Systems. Ms. Dehen urged the Council to provide visionary leadership and work to meet the goal.

Vote on the Motion to Adopt Resolution No. 88-888A: A vote on the motion resulted in all Councilors present voting aye except for Councilor DeJardin. Councilor DeJardin voted no. No Councilors were absent.

The motion carried and Resolution No. 88-888A was adopted.

8. ORDERS

8.1 Consideration of Order No. 88-18, in the Matter of Contested Case No. 88-18, a Petition for a Major Amendment to the Urban Growth Boundary by BenjFran Development Company

Presiding Officer Ragsdale announced that at the April 28 Council meeting the Council heard a summary of the Hearings Officer's Report, testimony from the petitioners, testimony from the opponents and the petitioners' rebuttal of the opponents' testimony. The

Council then deliberated on the matter. A motion made by Councilors Hansen and Van Bergen failed to carry that would have remanded the matter back to the Hearings Officer for further proceedings to establish a basis to support adoption of the proposed Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) amendment (4/6 vote). Another motion made by Councilors Gardner and Kirkpatrick also failed to carry that would have adopted Order No. 88-18 in support of the Hearings Officer's findings (5/5 vote). The Council finally adopted a motion made by Councilors Knowles and DeJardin to defer the matter to the May 12 meeting (7/3 vote). When making the motion, Councilor Knowles requested he be given the opportunity at the May 12 meeting to ask questions of the petitioners and defendents.

Councilor Waker announced he would abstain from voting on the BenjFran matter because his engineering firm could gain financially if the UGB were amended in favor of BenjFran Development Company. The Councilor left the room and did not participate in deliberations concerning the matter.

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved, seconded by Councilor Kirkpatrick, to adopt Order No. 88-18 in support of the Hearings Officer's recommendation to deny BenjFran's petition to amend the UGB.

Councilor Knowles announced he had reviewed the evidence heard at the April 28 meeting and the materials provided by staff. He had no questions of the parties. He concluded the Hearings Officer's recommendation should be adopted. He did not think it proper for the Council to base its decision on whether BenjFran's proposal would create new jobs in the region. He thought the issue was whether land existed inside the UGB that could accommodate the needs proposed by BenjFran. He pointed out that BenjFran preferred the APS type industrial park but they had failed to meet the test of State Land Use Goal 14. The Councilor recalled that Dale Weight, BenjFran's Chief Executive Officer, had testified on April 28 that Metro could use the UGB amendment process to stimulate employment. He explained that if the Council actually made a decision in BenjFran's favor based on that argument, the Boundary would no longer have any meaning. He concluded that both sides had presented excellent arguments and the decision was a difficult one to make. He was very concerned about the uncertainty of the amendment process. No applicant, he said, should have to spend large sums of money and still not have certainty of an outcome.

Councilor Kirkpatrick explained she advocated planned growth but Metro's most recent vacant land inventory had indicated available land within the UGB that could be used by BenjFran. She was not satisfied BenjFran had demonstrated a need for the land in question.