METRO SOUTH STATION STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP MEETING NOTES

December 12, 2013
11:00 AM – 2:00 PM
Metro, Room 301

Attendees:	
Metro Staff:	Chuck Geyer, Penny Erickson, Paul Ehinger
Project Team:	Alex Cousins, Deb Frye, Olivia Williams, Doug Zenn
Stakeholders:	Dan Blue, Dean Kampfer, Rick Winterhalter, Blaine Colvin, Shane Endicott, Amy Wilson, Dave White, Michael Leichner, Dan Walsh, Joe Connell, Theresa Koppang, Ray Kahut, Jim Winterbottom, Martin Montalvo, Bruce Walker

Overview:

Options for potential on- and off-site improvements to Metro South Station (MSS) were presented to a range of stakeholders at this facilitated, three-hour workshop on Dec. 12, 2013. Participants included commercial waste operators, government agencies, small businesses and not-for-profits. Based on input from Metro staff, a stakeholder survey and interviews, three general approaches for the facility were presented to the group:

- Operational modifications only
- Facility retrofit (onsite only)
- Facility retrofit with offsite improvements.

These notes detail the presentation and discussion that followed.

Doug Zenn called the meeting to order and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to review draft options for South Station improvements and narrow down the number of options for further development. The project team wants feedback from the group regarding the options presented. A diverse group of stakeholders was invited to ensure broad perspectives. The ultimate goal is to narrow down the options to a single facility concept for Metro Council consideration.

After a round of introductions, **Olivia Williams** with HDR reviewed the **existing facility and its operations**. MSS currently provides many more services than it was originally designed to manage. Specific site challenges include traffic congestion and flow from the mix of commercial and self-haul vehicles; inefficient material handling – the layout of the facility requires multiple material processing and handling; and inadequate space for the separation of materials and storage. Despite these challenges, MSS remains a highly popular and well-used facility, particularly for the self-haul clientele. Self-haul represents 70% of the MSS customer base but only 18% of the material received.

Alex Cousins of HDR then provided an overview of the **stakeholder outreach** that has been conducted to date. Stakeholders include commercial haulers, self-haul customers, local governments, Metro staff, operations staff from Metro and Allied, facility neighbors, and a variety of other private and non-profit customers. Outreach methods included phone interviews, individual and small group meetings, on-site surveys and email surveys. People were

asked about their frequency of facility use, the type of materials they bring, why they choose it relative to other options available, satisfaction with the services provided and whether they think anything on site should be changed.

Key takeaways from the outreach findings indicate that customers appreciate and highly value the “one stop shop” service offerings they receive on site, such as recycling, organics and household hazardous waste. A vast majority of self-haul customers choose to visit MSS even though they have home garbage and recycling services and are aware that other disposal options are available to them; they do so because they consider MSS to be convenient, better able to receive their non-curbside materials, and cheaper than other options available. Many have been coming to MSS for so long that they simply don’t consider other options.

Additional space for receiving organics, household hazardous waste (HHW) and material recovery were the top needs identified by customers and operations staff alike. Also of interest is increasing safety and operational efficiency by separating commercial and self-haul traffic and providing more consistency in how various areas within MSS are used. Drivers who visit daily/frequently prefer not to share the same space with slower/less frequent customers who take more time. More flexible, adaptable space, a better sort line, and more options for self-sorting recyclables would be valued improvements.

There appears to be much interest in maintaining the MSS waste collection and recycling facility at its existing location. Opinions about what services might be relocated, if any, varied according to who was being asked. The optimum outcome might be to reconfigure the facility to better accommodate all existing uses since MSS’s services, location and convenience are appreciated by all users. The high level of overall satisfaction with the facility (approaching rates of 90%) would suggest maintaining the location and most current services of MSS.

Following a Metro staff workshop in August 2013, and a stakeholder survey in September, a list of nine prioritized **facility needs** was developed based on six established Metro values from the Solid Waste Roadmap. The needs are as follows in priority order:

1. Household Hazardous Waste
2. Commercial Organics
3. Residential Organics & Yard Debris
4. Self-Haul Waste
5. Space for sorting Recyclables & Wood Waste
6. Commercial Waste Deliveries
7. Customer Education
8. Minimize Queue Times & Provide Wayfinding
9. Source-Separated Recyclables

Deb Frye of HDR then reviewed a series of charts depicting **total tonnages** and **projected diverted materials** at MSS in 2018 and the space needs that will be required to handle them. Residential organics is projected to grow to 54% of total volume, followed by wood waste at 20% and commercial organics at 13%. There is presently very little room to separate, store and process these materials on site. Total tonnage collected (all material) is anticipated to climb from 204,628 tons in 2012 to 281,778 tons in 2019. This is based on a conservative growth estimate for the region, which planners feel is most likely.

The existing facility offers 48,800 square feet for material processing and handling. Facility space requirements show that 53,400 to 66,500 square feet of space will be needed in the future to handle expected volumes of waste, or

another 4,600 to 17,700 of new space will be required. Creating this additional space with efficient traffic movement on the existing site footprint is a challenge.

Next, Olivia and Deb went over the **draft facility concepts**. Three categories were considered:

1. Operational modifications only
2. Facility retrofit (onsite only)
3. Facility retrofit with off-site improvements

For **Category 1**, none of the operational modifications-only options were deemed sufficient to accommodate future needs. There simply is not enough space on-site to reconfigure operations to gain enough efficiency in diversion and recovery to rely on that method alone. Therefore, this category was dismissed from further consideration as a standalone option.

Category 2 – Facility Retrofit

Option 1: Organics Storage adds 6,500 square feet of additional space for organics by extending Bays 3 and 4 to the north with a small building addition. Doing so would remove an existing storage shed and some trailer parking. This addition would serve residential customers. Minor traffic pattern adjustments would be needed.

Option 2: Additional Processing Line adds a 25,000 square foot addition to Bays 3 and 4 on the east side of the existing building. This would require extensive earth work and columns to support the tipping floor due to site topography. The addition essentially doubles the size of the facilities for self-haul customers and provides space for additional bays and a new processing line. The columns below the new addition would need to accommodate commercial trucks accessing the compactor in Bays 1 and 2. As with Option 1, minor traffic pattern adjustments would be needed.

Option 3: Full Build-out is an extensive site modification of the existing facility. Both Bays 3/4 and 1/2 would be connected with a new structure containing new bays, processing line and floor space for material separation and storage. The compactor would be removed and replaced with floor space in this scenario. Traffic patterns would change significantly, with transfer trailer traffic accessing the site from the existing Washington Street entrance to a new driveway to the north of the facility. Commercial traffic and self-haul customers would also be separated from each other using the existing Washington Street entrance to the south. Extensive modifications to Bays 3/4 and 1/2 would be required under this scenario.

Options 1 and 2 could be phased in to an Option 3 build-out, to maintain operation of the existing facility during construction.

Category 3 – Facility Retrofit with Offsite Improvements

Option 4: Offsite Self-Haul could be an addition to on-site facility improvements mentioned above. Under this scenario, self-haul activities would be relocated to a new, yet-to-be-determined location in the region.. Referred to as an “eco-depot,” the concept portrayed a 35,600 square foot structure for self-haul drop off, plus 3,800 square feet for recycling and additional space for HHW collection and administrative offices. This option assumes 10-15 acres of available industrial land would be needed for adequate space.

Stakeholder Questions & Comments

Project Background and Facility Concept Information:

Clarifying Questions / Comments

- **Comment**: 2009 figures show that 52 percent of self-haulers use MSS. Is that figure based on transaction or weight? **Response**: believe that is based on trip counts, but would have to double check the reports to verify.
- **Comment**: self-haul customers comprise 18 percent of tonnage received at the station. Commercial-haulers account for over 80 percent of tonnage received at the station. Customer base information is skewed a bit because Monday – Friday numbers would be higher for commercial-haulers and the weekend numbers would be higher for self-haulers. **Response**: Monday tends to be the busiest day for combined usage from self-haulers and commercial-haulers.
- **Comment**: does self-haul include contractors? **Response**: Yes – small vehicles.
- **Comment**: please give an explanation of what you mean by commercial customer. **Response**: commercial customers use the facility as a function of their business, rather than for personal reasons.
- **Comment**: Metro and regional values are being used to benchmark all Solid Waste Road Map Projects. They will be a part of Metro's guiding principles for MSS also.
- **Comment**: what is the difference between the values ranking and three stars from the online survey slide? **Response**: stars show the top three values selected during the stakeholder survey, which was a very small sample from six questions. The nine values were generated from a 2-hour discussion and polling exercise conducted with Metro.
- **Comment**: would re-usables be considered a part of space for sorting recyclables and wood waste? **Response**: Yes. That is anything you can divert, recycle or reuse.
- **Comment**: Metro does not currently take commercial organics at MSS. Tonnages shown were just a projection per Metro based on low economic growth recovery.
- **Comment**: City of Portland is pleased with the responsiveness of the Metro staff to open up facilities for the residential food scrap program. If other agencies looked to do a similar program, the current assumptions would be well short of what would actually be received. **Comment**: immediate modeling is based on current policies, which encourages commercial organics coming online before residential organics. That is what was taken into consideration for the projections provided.
- **Comment**: is residential organics coming from the City of Portland program? **Response**: there was some growth, but it would have to be a new program to cause a large increase.
- **Comment**: if new programs came online, would that reduce numbers of wet waste? **Response**: there could be more of a shift from wet waste to organics, yes.
- **Comment**: would it make more sense to build projections on high economic growth? The work being done no may not meet future needs. **Response**: Metro did not believe the other forecast of the medium and high economic growth models were viable. Metro felt that the figures derived from the low economic growth model are more realistic for what we can expect.
- **Comment**: the problem with self-haul is that it is hard to recover from and takes up a great deal of space. How does Metro's view of self-haul fit into this plan? **Response**: Every jurisdiction Metro has researched has similar issues with self-haul customers. It appears there will be a significant self haul demand for quite some time that Metro needs to take care of. Metro needs to be able to respond to that customer base. The model being shared reflects what Metro believes needs to be addressed.

- **Comment**: Metro could look at pricing more realistically and self-haul numbers may change (decline) with education and outreach. **Response**: based on the revenue return per customer, it seems that self-haul is essentially paying their way.
- **Comment**: are they paying their way in regards to the planned improvements of the facility? **Response**: that will be something we will take a look at in the future.
- **Comment**: does Metro know the breakdown of who uses the facility? **Response**: yes, based on ZIP code, it comes from all over South Metro area and beyond. Clackamas County customers would seem to be first and it would be difficult to say after that.
- **Comment**: is the far end of the site the end of the property? Theoretically the building in Option 1 could be extended further if there was another site for trailer parking. **Response**: the site starts coming to a point which creates limited space to extend operations.
- **Comment**: the yellow addition in Option 1 is for residential only? **Response**: that is correct.
- **Comment**: any options for taking the exit out a different way? **Response**: yes, that is a part of the goal with Option 3. The self-haulers would have to re-weigh, so they would still have to use the current exit.
- **Comment**: there is limited green space; has the design team calculated what will happen with additional storm water run-off and how to accommodate that? **Response**: not at this stage. This will be considered if planning moves forward on a particular option.
- **Comment**: are you looking at the offsite station (Option 4) being in the same area? **Response**: somewhere in the general vicinity, but that has not been defined. Right now Metro is figuring out what makes sense to do. The hope would be to find a place that would be as easy to find as MSS. Tthese options are to identify what some of the improvements might cost and the benefits they provide. Right now we are looking to figure out what types of things we can do that will make sense.

Discuss Concepts:

Option 1

- **Comment**: there are a lot of public and transfer trailers crossing each other – safety concerns in that situation. Also, it is important to have trailers parked on site for such reasons as fluctuation in waste and weather conditions.
- **Comment**: I agree that safety is an issue.
- **Comment**: it should be taken off the table, because it does not address the issues. As a piece of the solution it could work, but not as the primary option.
- **Comment**: is limited and would like to see much more robust approach. If it were coupled with a potential new site, that may work.
- **Comment**: the addition displaces something. Where would that existing storage shed be relocated to?

Option 2

- **Comment**: if we are taking out the pit, where would you store waste? There should be storage available for MSW. **Response**: MSW would be stored on the floor and removal of the pit would minimize residue.
- **Comment**: still want to have some storage available for MSW for weather and other various reasons. **Response**: the minimum amount of storage space would still be maintained for MSW.

- **Comment**: What type of constraints would pillars pose on truck access to the compactor? I do not see how that would work.
- **Response**: it depends on how far you are asking trucks to back up.
- **Comment**: this design would work if there is a compactor.
- **Comment**: I am concerned about increasing impervious area and there are storm water and water quality issues. There is also an environmentally sensitive area to the immediate south. It will probably be difficult to get any funding if that area is impacted. Ditto comments to Option 3.
- **Comment**: Options 2, 3 and 4 give great reuse and recovery options. And that should be looked at in a greater way. This is a direction we all need to go. There will be costs associated with reuse of materials and that needs to be passed on to self-haulers bringing materials. If it is separated, they could be provided reductions in their charges.
- **Comment**s: I agree with previous comment.
- **Comment**: not convinced that organics separation is a good addition. It would be helpful to do a cost benefit analysis.
- **Comment**: likes Options 2 and 3 if there is room to move around.
- **Comment**: could you use a different surface – pervious pavement– that provides stormwater improvements? **Response**: it would not be used in an industrial area due to material durability and maintenance issues.
- **Comment**: Structural columns required would be expensive.
- **Comment**: There would likely not be funding available for anything that impacts environmentally sensitive areas.

Option 3

- **Comment**: every truck turning radius on these diagrams does not look like it will support truck turning. **Response**: when the options are narrowed down further, truck turning analysis would be done to accommodate the necessary turning radii.
- **Comment**: there is a need for storage space for trailers on site.
- **Comment**: any alterations to primary and secondary exits will impact traffic patterns on Washington St. Additional turn lanes would be required and that would bring concerns to Oregon City.
- **Comment**: make as much opportunity for trailers to maneuver. Feels like it maximizes the use of the facility and meets the needs.
- **Comment**: Options 3 and 4 provide the best waste diversion opportunity which should be more heavily weighted.
- **Comment**: Costs for increased diversion should be passed down to customers. Incentivize presorting materials.
- **Comment**: Make it as big as you can to maximize diversion.

Option 4

- **Comment**: I like this option.
- **Comment**: I like option 4. Would like to see how the existing MSS would be utilized/reconfigured with this Option. But I need some answers regarding proportional cost in order to really evaluate. Is Option 3 about the same cost as Option 4 at the end of the day? **Response**: Costs have yet to be determined. Will be part of next stage of evaluation.
- **Comment**: is it even feasible politically?

- **Comment**: it makes sense to put the self-haulers at a different location. It provides greater opportunity for recovery and reuse.
- **Comment**: Metro is going to have a difficult time with the local community if they are trying to expand their footprint. If there was some option of trying to use the old landfill site that may be feasible, but using the old landfill site may not be easy because the driving range in that location has a 99-year lease that it will not likely just give up. **Question**: Would Oregon City care if Option 4 was located away from the community? **Response**: Probably not.
- **Comment**: it is important to look at county use.
- **Comment**: if the idea was campaigned around job creation, quality of life and thrift operations, siting a new facility will become part of the social fabric and people will begin to feel connected. Economic growth and environmental benefits may even help to see Metro bonds and taxes put towards the support of such an effort.
- **Comment**: I agree with the previous comment. It should be on the table and let the community get involved in the dreaming.
- **Comment**: Outside of political issues I have to deal with, I like Option 4.

Additional Conversations Regarding Options

- **Comment**: where do these options get you in meeting the needs/goals projected by 2019? **Response**: Option 3 gets Metro the closest to meeting the projected needs of 2019. Option 1 gives Metro a little more space, but does the least; however, it is also the least expensive. Option 2 helps with separation and processing, but still requires the operation of two facilities.
- **Comment**: why do you have options on the table that do not fully meet the goals? **Response**: to see how close we can get to our goals with a range of options.
- **Comment**: it would be helpful to have a percentage of goals that will be achieved with each option in relation to 2019 projections. This group is more technical, so the numbers would help. **Response**: that will be done in the next stage. This was intended to be a high level exercise with more detailed matrices and tables in the next meeting.
- **Comment**: like to see how issue of engaging commercial-haulers will be addressed. Would like to see an earned income stream incorporated with efforts. Residential-haulers can rent a vehicle that can be rented empty and dropped off loaded.
- **Comment**: People want to get in and get out quickly and safely. The site used to be a transfer station and is now a station that serves everyone. Whatever you do, it should be efficient and safe.
- **Comment**: several stakeholders in this meeting are involved in drafting a regional plan for Disaster Debris Management. What efforts does Metro have in place or is planning for an eventual disaster event? **Response**: Metro has looked at using the transfer station in the event of a disaster. Metro calculated how much could be stored and processed to get out. It really depends on what happens, but obviously this facility has its limitations. Metro is looking forward to the regional disaster plan.
- **Comment**: the committee for the disaster debris management should be made aware of plans to improve operational efficiency of this facility. **Response**: it really depends on the kind of disaster. The role for these facilities would be to provide capacity for normal waste streams because that must get back in service as soon as possible. On top of that, the facility could possibly handle some extra waste, such as spoiled food, due to loss of power. The transfer facility could not handle a major event, though.
- **Comment**: I am on the disaster preparedness task force. The task force is asking Metro to identify sites for disaster staging.

- **Comment**: this goes back to Option 4 and goals. This is one more reason to build out the facilities.
- **Comment**: looking between Option 2 and 3, maybe there is a phase 2 ½ for the build out – something that could be phased.
- **Comment**: How about an Option 5 – have commercial traffic come in the entrance from left lane and turn Bays 3 and 4 into a transfer facility; fill the pit in Bays 1 and 2 and have that become the self-haul and recover materials? This would possibly isolate everyone by putting in a secondary exit on the north side by the ODOT right-of-way.
- **Comment**: agree that separating customers would help to ease confusion and congestion.
- **Comment**: what conversation has Metro had with ODOT to utilize ODOT right-of-way? **Response**: There have been no conversations to date. **Comment**: the trucks would not be able to make the turn if such an exit was put in place.
- **Comment**: Metro needs to keep public and commercial users on separate sides. This will create the least amount of problems.

Final Thoughts

Doug went around the table and asked each person to provide their final assessment of the options and if they have a favorite.

- **Comment**: outside of the political considerations, I'm in favor of Option 4 for public safety and efficiency. Do not believe the 2019 goals are achievable without separation of commercial and residential customers. Anything that is done on the existing property would not be a problem for us. Taking away the limited property we have available by siting a new facility would be a challenge.
- **Comment**: Option 5 was a great 'out of the box solution' because it separates commercial from residential. Not sure it could be done though. I like Option 4, but not sure if there are budget constraints.
- **Comment**: I like the sound of Option 5.
- **Comment**: not too excited about the first 3 options because they do not meet the needs. I feel Option 4 represents the ability to meet the long term capacity needs of the facility and regional customers. Would love to be involved in designing Option 4
- **Comment**: I think Option 4 presents better opportunities for separating customers.
- **Comment**: Metro is dealing with the wrong property to try to accomplish its goals. Option 4 is the best option.
- **Comment**: Option 4 gives best possibility of meeting needs and increasing recovery.
- **Comment**: I agree with the previous comment regarding Option 4 giving the best opportunity for reuse and recovery. I feel Option 3 is good also.
- **Comment**: I like Option 4, but I feel it is not politically feasible. I see the potential for Option 2 and 3, but it depends on building design and spacing. I feel Option 5 has a lot of merit too.
- **Comment**. Does Option 4 assume the existing facility becomes commercial only? **Response**: Yes. **Comment**: I feel like optimizing a site is best. I really like Option 3 for that reason. Option 4 would require a big lift on the politicians' part.
- **Response**: one of the thoughts on Option 4 is that by only dealing with small vehicles it will reduce the impact of the facility, thereby increasing the possibility of public acceptance. Everything would be to people scale to include the building. Everything is done inside. Minimal impacts on the neighborhood.
- **Comment**: Option 4 is good but I have the same concerns mentioned regarding the likelihood of getting another local government to accept it, but it should be explored. The current site is so

conveniently located; I would be surprised if Metro could find another location with the same level of convenience. However, I think it should be explored with the Metro Council to see if it is feasible. There needs to be recovery and reuse; they are a real strong driver. Option 5 was creative and addresses everyone's concerns about safety.

- **Comment**: I like Option 4. The statement regarding the new site being people scale makes it more feasible. It helps to make Option 4 more palatable. Haulers do not want the wash rack to be removed though!
- **Comment**: Going to have to find another location in order to accommodate the projected growth of the facility. That impact will have to be shared. I don't see how a new site is going to work long term without fragmenting the responsibilities.
- **Comment**: Option 4 will require more transport trucks. So it may not be getting the great safety value because transport truck and commodity mixers will have to mix with self-haulers at the new site to pick up waste.

Chuck Geyer noted that the feedback that was provided today will be digested by Metro and the team. This group will be invited back to help further refine the options that the design team comes back with. Paul added that the feedback was constructive and helpful. It will be taken into consideration.

Alex thanked everyone for coming to the workshop. The team will go to work refining the options further based on the discussion and will come back in February for another round. The goal will be to narrow down the options to a single, preferred concept that will be forwarded to the Metro Council for a decision later in the year.

Meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.