BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPDATING THE REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO INCLUDE NEW OPTIONS FOR MANAGING THE REGION'S ORGANIC WASTE	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 94-1915A INTRODUCED BY RENA CUSMA EXECUTIVE OFFICER

WHEREAS, The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan includes a mass solid waste composting facility as part of the Metro solid waste system; and

WHEREAS, Metro entered into a Mass Composting Service Agreement with Riedel Environmental Technologies in 1989 to implement these provisions of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Riedel Mass Composting Facility, which was expected to process 185,000 tons of mixed waste per year, or 17 percent of the wastestream, is no longer operational and the service agreement with Riedel Environmental Technologies is now null and void; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, in continuing to recognize and support the state hierarchy (ORS 459.015) for managing solid waste, specifies landfilling as the least preferred option; and

WHEREAS, A public process composed of a series of workshops and a regional conference was held to examine new options for managing organic waste in the Metro region, whose participants included waste generators, waste haulers, waste processors, business leaders, government officials and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, The public involvement process demonstrated a broad base of support for organic waste management options that are likely to be more cost-effective and environmentally sound than landfilling; and

WHEREAS, The resolution was submitted to the Executive Officer for consideration and was forwarded to the Council for approval; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Riedel Mass Composting Facility is no longer a part of the Metro solid waste management system and references to this facility should be removed from the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and Metro Code, and
2. That the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan should be revised to include new options for reducing the amount of organic waste being landfilled. Such revisions should be incorporated into the ongoing updates of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Chapter 5, Facilities and Chapter 1, Waste Reduction.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 10th day of March, 1994.

Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer

WM:aey/gbc
SHARE\METZ\ORGANICS\SW941415.RSA

ATTACHMENT A

METRO

Organic Waste Planning Project

Recommendations to the Metro Council

As Part of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update

February 1994

Solid Waste Department
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736
(503) 797-1650
Fax (503) 797-1795

Table of Contents

ORGANIC WASTE PLANNING PROJECT

SUMMARY

This report summarizes recommendations that have been received from the public regarding best management practices for organic waste. Taken as a whole, these recommendations form a general strategy for managing organic waste in the Metro region. They are also a starting point for revising the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

Key recommendations are:

1. Management methods applied by Metro should be diverse and emphasize reduction and recovery with priority given to those that involve source separation.

2. New recovery programs should target food-related businesses where significant quantities of organic waste are generated. Recovery of *segregated* organic waste from these businesses is likely to be a cost-effective and reliable alternative to the current practice of landfilling and should be pursued by the Metro region.

3. Any soil amendment product that results from organic waste processing must be a marketable and reliable commodity with high quality control and product standards.

4. Metro should employ a phased implementation plan. The next phase should be to confirm costs and reliability of various management options and their applicability to the Metro Solid Waste management system.

5. Metro should establish a focus group consisting of stakeholders from the public and private sectors. This focus group should help resolve issues related to marketing, collecting and processing organic waste.

INTRODUCTION

There is currently no integrated system for managing food and other non-recyclable organic waste in the Metro region. In cooperation with others in the region, Metro is developing an organic waste management strategy as part of a larger planning effort to re-evaluate and update the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP).

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to forward recommendations regarding organic waste management to the Metro Council. These recommendations are the result of an extensive public involvement process that included discussions with the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, two workshops attended by delegates from industry, government, and the public, and a conference on organic waste management at which the recommendations in this report were reviewed and compared to management practices in other regions.

Taken as a whole, the recommendations form a general strategy for managing the region's organic waste. Staff will examine a number of recommendations in sufficient detail to prove their feasibility. Once fully developed, the strategy will be incorporated into the ongoing revisions of the waste reduction and facilities sections of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. These revisions will be presented to the Metro Council for review and adoption during late 1994.

WHAT IS ORGANIC WASTE?

In the broadest definition, organic waste includes all biodegradable material that is discarded after use. This would include:

1. Organic waste that is currently targeted by existing recycling programs. Examples include corrugated paper and newspaper.

2. Organic waste that is currently targeted by existing composting[1] programs. Examples include backyard composting of residential yard debris and curbside collection and composting of yard debris at one of the existing commercial composting facilities.

3. Non-recyclable organic waste that is not being targeted by existing composting programs. Examples include food waste and non-recyclable scrap paper (e.g., tissue paper and waxed corrugated paper).

The primary focus of this project was to develop a management strategy for the third type of organic waste.

[1]For the purposes of this report, "composting" means any processing technology that produces a usable soil product from organic waste. This includes vermiculture.

Estimated annual quantities of organic waste landfilled by the Metro region are shown below.

Estimated Tons Per Year Disposed[2]:

	Residential Sources	Non-residential Sources
Recyclable Paper		
Corrugated [3]	28,900	81,700
Newspaper [3]	12,400	11,800
Office[3]	4,600	17,200
Magazine [3]	4,300	4,000
Book [3]	6,200	9,000
Other [4]	9,000	19,400
Total	65,400	143,100
Non-recyclable Organics		
Paper		
Food container	5,800	8,500
Corrugated[5]	9,600	27,200
Newspaper[5]	4,100	3,900
Office[5]	1,500	5,700
Magazine[5]	1,400	1,300
Book[5]	2,000	3,000
Other[6]	9,000	19,400
Subtotal	33,400	69,000
Food	28,500	30,900
Total	61,900	99,900
Yard Debris Total	92,800	33,000

Note: Table does not include construction and demolition wastes (e.g., wood)

[2]Tonnages are based on composition percentages from the 1989/90 Metro Waste Characterization Study. Changes in waste composition are likely to have occurred since this study was conducted. Metro is now conducting a new waste characterization study.

[3]Represents 75% of total disposed, assumes 25% of total is non-recyclable due to food or moisture contamination.

[4]Assumes 50% of total disposed in "other" paper category is recyclable mixed waste paper.

[5]Represents 25 % of total disposed due to food or moisture contamination.

[6]Assumes 50% of total disposed in "other" paper category is non-recyclable paper.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In 1989, the Metro Council adopted an aggressive, but achievable, goal to recover 56 percent of waste generated by the year 2010. Organic waste composting and energy recovery was an essential element of the overall solid waste management plan for the following reasons:

1. Certain options for recovering organic waste were considered to be more cost-effective than landfilling.

2. Because organic waste represents such a large part of the region's waste, achieving long-term waste reduction goals was recognized as being difficult without composting or other recovery alternatives.

3. Landfilling is the least preferred method of waste management in the hierarchy adopted by both the state (ORS 459.015) and Metro (RSWMP Policy 1.0).

4. There are large volumes of organic material available for recovery.

Metro entered into a Mass Composting Facility Service Agreement with Riedel Environmental Technologies in 1988. Riedel was to design, construct, own, and operate a mass composting facility for mixed municipal waste. The intent was to direct mixed waste to the facility with no source separation of organics by the generator or special collection routes by haulers.

The design capacity of the facility was 185,000 tons per year (600 tons per day). This represented approximately 17% of the 1.1 million tons of all waste landfilled each year by the region.

Waste deliveries to the facility began in April 1991. Plant operations were problematic resulting in vigorous complaints from neighbors about odor. Enforcement actions by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality required Riedel to make significant and expensive plant modifications to abate the odor nuisance. Riedel was unable to construct the required modifications and subsequently requested that waste deliveries to the facility be suspended on January 31, 1992. Operations ceased shortly thereafter. The Riedel facility has not been a functional part of the Metro solid waste management system since waste deliveries were suspended.

The Riedel facility was purchased by Credit Suisse, the bank that had provided financial backing for the project. Credit Suisse was unable to find a new owner/operator and the service agreement was terminated on April 9, 1993. As a result, the region lost a major option for managing organic waste.

THE ORGANIC WASTE PLANNING PROJECT

Recognizing the continuing need to address organic waste and in preparation for revising the facilities and waste reduction sections of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, an Organic Waste Planning Project was initiated by the Solid Waste Department in mid-1993.

The project had the following objectives:

1. During the first two quarters of FY 1993-94, identify key issues regarding organic waste management that are of concern to the public, industry, and other governments.

2. Present recommendations to the Metro Executive Officer and Council on best management practices for organic waste that were received during the public involvement process.

3. Revise the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and implement recommendations that are approved as part of future Metro Solid Waste Department budget proposals.

In addition to periodic presentations to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, the following series of meetings was used to obtain public input.

Workshop I (September 22, 1993)

Delegates discussed various options for managing source-separated organic waste, "high-grade" organic waste that has minimal contamination by other material, and "low-grade" organic waste that is essentially municipal solid waste as currently delivered to transfer stations.

Workshop II (December 8, 1993)

Delegates evaluated several strategies that were developed by Metro staff based on input received from Workshop I.

Organic Waste Management Conference (January 12, 1994)

Conference participants reviewed the recommendations from the workshops and compared them to work discussed by featured speakers from other communities in the United States and Canada.

PROPOSED STRATEGY FOR MANAGING ORGANIC WASTE

Participants suggested that the general strategy for the Metro region should be to implement flexible, efficient, and reliable practices for managing organic waste in the Metro region.

Key recommendations are:

1. Management methods applied by Metro should be diverse and emphasize reduction and recovery with priority given to those that involve source separation.

2. New recovery programs should target food-related businesses where significant quantities of organic waste are generated. Recovery of *segregated* organic waste from these businesses is likely to be a cost-effective and reliable alternative to the current practice of landfilling and should be pursued by the Metro region.

3. Any soil amendment product that results from organic waste processing must be a marketable and reliable commodity with high quality control and product standards.

4. Metro should employ a phased implementation plan. The next phase should be to confirm costs and reliability of various management options and their applicability to the Metro Solid Waste management system.

5. Metro should establish a focus group consisting of stakeholders from the public and private sectors. This focus group should help resolve issues related to marketing, collecting and processing organic waste.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Participants in the workshops and conference offered many suggestions and recommendations on how organic waste can best be managed. The following is Metro staff's summary of what appeared to be the consensus recommendations of the participants.

Recommendations regarding general waste management practices are:

1. Reduce or recycle organic waste before recovery.

Recycling markets and technology currently exist for much of the organic waste that is currently being disposed. One of the best examples is residential "scrap" paper. Participants believed the region's goal should be to expand recycling programs for this type of waste rather than composting or recovering it through alternative technologies.

There are also opportunities for reducing organic waste before it enters the waste stream. One of the best examples is on-site composting of yard debris by households. Participants believed that reduction practices can play a significant role in reducing the quantity of yard

debris and food that is disposed. There was strong support for expanding the home composting programs.

Also, many participants firmly supported the waste management hierarchy adopted by state legislation (ORS 459.015) and by Metro policy (RSWMP Policy 1.0 and 1.4) prioritizes management practices as follows: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recover energy, and dispose. Metro was urged to follow this hierarchy to the maximum extent possible in planning and implementation.

2. Feasible alternatives exist for recovery of commercial organic waste if it is source-separated (e.g., composting and vermiculture processing technologies).

Participants agreed that there are feasible options for recovering and processing non-recyclable organic waste (e.g., food, non-recyclable paper) from targeted businesses *if* it is first segregated from other waste.

Businesses and haulers agreed that a commercial composting facility could be competitive with landfilling and perhaps even reduce disposal costs for targeted businesses. This targeted waste stream is a significant portion of all organic waste disposed by the region.

The recommendation is that options for composting food-related business waste be pursued by Metro. This recommendation appeared to be nearly unanimous, probably in large part because of the successes in other communities[7]. More detailed suggestions on how this recommendation should be implemented in the Metro region are described in the sections on "Specific Recommendations" and "Recovery Recommendations (pp. 8-9).

3. Economic incentives and voluntary participation are preferred to legislative bans.

Participants in the workshops and conference generally believed that considerable advances in waste reduction and recovery can be made without bans. The recommendation was to first rely on economic incentives, education, and voluntary participation. If these are not successful in meeting the region's waste reduction goals, then Metro or other governments should reconsider the use of bans.

4. Markets are a key consideration for any commercial recovery program.

Product quality is the critical factor for a successful recovery program. It was universally held that soil products should not pose a threat to the environment or to public health. A majority also agreed that soil products should be produced to meet a demonstrated market demand. In this regard, high quality products were favored because high quality will satisfy a wide range

[7]For example, a pilot project conducted by the Waste Management Authority of Alameda County, California has demonstrated that co-composting source-separated food waste from businesses with yard debris results in a high-quality product at a cost of $40 to $50 per ton.

of market demands whereas lower quality products are not so versatile. Participants recommended that Metro assist in the development of product quality standards and guidelines, while establishing a network of potential buyers throughout the region.

5. Responsiveness to changing technologies and markets is important.

Waste management technologies and markets are constantly changing. Metro should help develop a system of managing organic waste that is capable of responding quickly and effectively to these changes. This can be accomplished by implementing a diversity of management options and not relying on a single "fix".

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommended practices and programs are:

REDUCE

1. Continue to emphasize home composting of organic waste.
2. Examine opportunities for reduction (or reuse) of commercial organic waste.

RECYCLE

1. Provide recycling opportunities for businesses that generate recyclable paper.
2. Expand residential recycling programs for recyclable paper.

RECOVER

Composting / Vermiculture

1. Emphasize processing (composting, vermiculture) of source-separated organic waste from targeted businesses.
2. Confirm the costs and reliability of processing organic waste from targeted businesses.

Recover Energy

1. Pelletized boiler fuel. Energy recovery is a viable alternative for organic waste that remains after source separation.

RECOVERY RECOMMENDATIONS

Large quantities of organic waste continue to be landfilled despite waste reduction efforts. Because of the inherent nature of these organic wastes (putrescible food waste, food contaminated paper products), typical waste reduction efforts are not suitable for diverting large volumes from the landfill. However, segregation, collection and processing of these wastes is proving to be a very effective management option.

Groceries, restaurants, and other food-related businesses generate a significant proportion of all food and food-contaminated paper waste[8]. Metro should help establish a system of collection, transport, processing, and marketing for source-separated organic waste from these businesses.

The cost-effectiveness and technical feasibility of composting source-separated commercial organic waste has been demonstrated in other areas[9]. Prior to implementation, Metro should confirm the costs and reliability of commercial processing of targeted organic wastes for the Metro solid waste system.

The specific steps recommended to do this are:

1. Metro should coordinate focus groups of affected parties. The project focus group will consist of stakeholders from the public and private sectors. This group will assist resolving issues related to generation, collection, processing and marketing of organic wastes. This process will help ensure an integrated and cooperative approach for organic waste recovery programs.

2. Conduct small-scale test projects demonstrating the feasibility of organic waste recovery. This will include test methods for source separation, collection, transport and processing. Confirming the marketability of the soil products will be a key objective.

3. If feasible, implement phased recovery and processing practices for commercial source-separated organic waste that are demonstrated to be cost-effective and reliable.

4. Expand the recovery operation to include organic waste from households and other businesses *only* if demonstrated to be cost-effective and consistent with the waste management hierarchy.

---

[8]Recent Metro studies indicate that over 100,000 tons per year of food and non-recyclable paper are disposed by approximately 3,000 food-related businesses in the Metro region. In contrast, if similar organic wastes were to be targeted for recovery from the residential sector, organic waste collected from over 300,000 individual households would only account for approximately 60,000 tons of disposed material each year.

[9]Numerous source-separated commercial organic waste composting programs are already in operation. For example, a facility in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, composts source separated organics from a town of 40,000 people. The regional waste authority in that area has approved a Waste Management Plan that includes a larger facility to compost 160 tons per day of source-separated organic waste. Seattle has demonstrated the feasibility of collecting and composting food waste from food stores. American Soil in New Jersey just received approval to expand its food composting program to a full-scale operation.

SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES:

1. **Clear and objective standards for siting solid waste facilities.**

   Siting a facility to process food and other organic waste will be one of the main obstacles to implementing the recommendations. Metro will need to continue to discuss siting issues with local governments to ensure appropriate zoning for planned solid waste facilities and the adoption of clear and objective standards for siting them (RSWMP Policy 16.2). Urban farmlands are a viable option which should be examined an explored.

2. **Regulation of solid waste facilities that accept food, yard debris, and other organic waste.**

   Compared to existing composting facilities that process clean wood or yard debris, any solid waste facility that processes food will require greater regulatory control to minimize odor and other environmental problems. The revision of the Solid Waste Management Plan should specify what the regulatory role of Metro and other governments will be regarding solid waste composting facilities.

   Specific suggestions regarding facility regulation were:

   a. Metro should franchise or license yard debris and other composting facilities.

   b. Part of the franchise agreements with composting facilities should include product standards.

   These issues need to be examined in more detail as part of the ongoing update of the Facilities Chapter of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

SUMMARY

Large quantities of potentially recoverable organic waste continue to be landfilled each year. Because of the inherent nature of these wastes, current waste reduction efforts alone are not sufficient to divert significant quantities from landfill disposal. Collection and processing of these organic wastes may prove to be the best management option.

A primary concern when considering recovery and processing as a method for organic waste management is the *marketability* of the end-product. In the past, organic waste management practices relied primarily on the mass composting of municipal solid waste (the Riedel Mass Composting Facility). This composting method focused on processing large quantities of mixed waste, which tends to yield an end-product that has limited marketability.

In contrast, this project takes a new management approach. The strategy will focus on recovering organic wastes from the most concentrated sources (restaurants, grocery stores). These relatively pure loads of recovered waste should provide an exceptionally clean feedstock for processing, thereby ensuring a significantly more marketable end-product.

Important work in organic waste management has begun in other communities throughout North America and Europe. Metro can capitalize on these advances to save both time and money.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Metro thanks the following people for their participation in the organic waste management workshops.

David Allaway, Harding & Lawson
Dave Anderson, American Association of Landscape Architects
Lori Aunan, Oregon State Public Interest Research Group
Domonic Biggi, Oregon Agricultural Products
Nancy Bond, East County Haulers Organization
Bill Bree, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Bruce Broussard, Cad Tech
Roger Buchanan, Metro Councilor
Larry Campbell, Clackamas County
Jim Cozzetto Jr., Metropolitan Disposal & Recycling
Charles L. Dannar, CL Dannar Nursery
Jack Deines, Clackamas County Refuse Disposal Association
Pat Elsberry, Oregon Food Bank
Mike Gates, Metro Councilor
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
Vince Gilbert, East County Recycling
Rick Ginter, Blitz Weinhard Brewing Company
Jeff Grimm, Grimm's Fuel
Rob Guttridge, Association of Oregon Recyclers and KB Recycling
Gary Hansen, Multnomah County
Sandi Hansen, Metro Councilor
Holly Halvorson, Washington County
Estle Harlan, Oregon Sanitary Service Incorporated
Jerry Herrmann, John Inskeep Environmental Learning Center
Dan and Jane Holcombe, Oregon Soil Corporation
Patricia Honeycutt, National Public Lands Restoration Task Force
Steve Jessop, Scott's Hyponex
Randy Johnson, City of Portland Leaf Compost
Dean Kampfer, Portland Association of Sanitary Service Operators
Susan Kiel, City of Portland Industrial Solid Waste
Kathy Kiwala, City of Lake Oswego
Lynda Kotta, City of Gresham
Ron Lapotin, Oregon Garden Products
John Lewton, Oregon Department of Transportation
Meg Lynch, Resource Recycling Magazine
Darrell Lyons, City of Milwaukie
Betty Malone, Northwest Christmas Tree Association
Theresa Marquez, Oregon Tilth
Cherrie Mathison, Newberg Garbage Service
Ruth McFarland, Metro Councilor

Dan McFarlane, McFarlane's Bark
Susan McLain, Metro Councilor
Pat Merkle, Citizen
Jeff Murray, Far West Fibers
Nanette Newell, Oregon Biotechnology Association
Brian Ostlund, Northwest Christmas Tree Association
Wm. S. Ostrie, Burger King Restaurant Management Northwest
Debbi Palermini, Palermini & Associates
Bob Rice, Oregon Restaurant Association
Dale Richwine, Unified Sewerage Agency
Wayne Rifer, Harding & Lawson
Jeanne Roy, Recycling Advocates
D. "Smokey" Satterlee, Consultant, Retail Grocers
Marvin Schneider, Newberg Garbage Service
Steve Schwab, Clackamas County Refuse Disposal Association
Ken Speigle, Clackamas County Solid Waste
Bill Stewart, W & H Pacific
Wm. W. Von Segen, USDA Forest Service
Dennis L. Wade, Oregon Waste Recyclers Incorporated
Ron Waldren, Nature's
Ed Washington, Metro Councilor
Mark Zinnikey, Oregon Environmental Technologies Association
Susan Ziolko, Clackamas County

02/22/94
METZ\ORGANICS\ORGANIC1.RPT

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 94-1915 FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPDATING THE REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO INCLUDE NEW OPTIONS FOR MANAGING THE REGION'S ORGANIC WASTE

Date: March 1, 1994

Presented by: Terry Petersen
Jeep Reid

PROPOSED ACTION

The Riedel Mass Composting Facility is no longer a part of the Metro solid waste management system, and there is currently no integrated plan for managing organic waste in the Metro region. There are feasible options for managing organic waste that need to be fully developed and integrated into the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. Resolution No. 94-1915 directs Metro staff to revise the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and Metro Code to include new options for managing organic waste.

BACKGROUND

In 1989, the Metro Council adopted an aggressive, but achievable, recovery goal of 56 percent of waste generated by the year 2010. Organic waste composting and energy recovery were an essential element of the overall solid waste management plan for the following reasons:

1. Certain options for recovering organic waste were considered to be more cost-effective than landfilling.

2. Because organic waste represents such a large part of the region's waste, achieving long-term waste reduction goals was recognized as being difficult without composting or other recovery alternatives.

3. Landfilling is the least preferred method of waste management in the hierarchy adopted by both the State (ORS 459.015) and Metro (RSWMP Policy 1.0).

Metro entered into a Mass Composting Facility Service Agreement with Riedel Environmental Technologies in 1989. After some months of operation of the plant, enforcement actions by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to correct operational problems required Riedel to make significant and expensive plant modifications to abate a nuisance of odor emanating from the facility.

Riedel was unable to construct the required modifications and subsequently requested that waste deliveries to the facility be suspended on January 31, 1992. Operations ceased shortly thereafter. The Mass Composting Facility Service Agreement was subsequently terminated April 9, 1993.

The Riedel facility has not been a functional part of the Metro solid waste management system since waste deliveries were suspended. As a result, the region has lost a major option for managing organic wastes.

The Organic Waste Planning Project

In preparation for revising the facilities and waste reduction sections of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, an Organic Waste Planning Project was initiated. The first phase of this project involved extensive public participation. Discussions were held with the Solid Waste Advisory Committee and two workshops were attended by delegates from industry, government and the public. A regional conference on organic waste management was held so the recommendations from the workshops could be compared to management practices in other regions. Taken as a whole, the recommendations form a general strategy for managing the region's organic waste. The accompanying document entitled Organic Waste Planning Project summarizes the first phase of the project.

During the second phase, staff will confirm the costs, feasibility and reliability of various management options. Confirmed options will be incorporated into the revisions of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. These revisions will be presented to the Metro Council for approval during the latter part of 1994.

Implementation of options in the approved Regional Solid Waste Management Plan will constitute the third and final phase of the project.

Summary

Participants in the workshops and conference suggested that the general strategy for managing organic waste in the Metro region should be to implement flexible, efficient, and reliable management options.

Key recommendations are:

1. Management methods applied by Metro should emphasize reduction and recovery with priority given to those that involve source separation.
2. New recovery programs should target food-related businesses where significant quantities of organic waste are generated. Recovery of *segregated* organic waste from these businesses is likely to be a cost-effective and reliable alternative to the current practice of landfilling and should be pursued by the Metro region.
3. Any soil amendment product that results from organic waste processing must be a marketable commodity with high quality control and product standards.
4. Metro should employ a phased implementation plan. The next phase should be to confirm costs and reliability of various management options and their applicability to the Metro Solid Waste management system.

5. Metro should establish a focus group consisting of stakeholders from the public and private sectors. This focus group should help resolve issues related to marketing, collecting and processing organic waste.

Large quantities of potentially recoverable organic waste continue to be landfilled each year. Because of the inherent nature of these wastes, waste reduction efforts alone are not sufficient to divert significant additional quantities from landfill disposal. Separation and collection of these organic wastes for processing may prove to be the best management option.

In contrast to previous recovery plans (the Riedel Mass Composting Facility), this strategy suggests a new management approach. The strategy will focus on recovering organic wastes from the most concentrated sources (e.g., restaurants and grocery stores) by segregating out the organic fraction and processing. These relatively pure loads of recovered waste should provide an acceptably clean feedstock for processing, thereby ensuring a significantly more marketable end-product. Under this scenario, the critical issues of collection, processing and marketing will be addressed before implementation.

RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 94-1915 for the purpose of revising regional plans for managing organic waste.

WM:ay/gbc
SHARE\METZ\ORGANICS\STAF0301.RPT

SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 94-1915, FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPDATING THE REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO INCLUDE NEW OPTIONS FOR MANAGING THE REGION'S ORGANIC WASTE

Date: March 2, 1994 Presented by: Councilor Monroe

Committee Recommendation: At the March 1 meeting, the Committee voted 4-0 to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 94-1915. Voting in favor: Councilors Hansen, McFarland, McLain, and Monroe. Councilors Buchanan and Wyers were absent.

Committee Issues/Discussion: The demise of the Riedel Composter Facility occurred during Council consideration of the FY 93-94 budget. As a result of this action, the Solid Waste Department proposed and the Council approved the dedication of 1 FTE for the development of new options or strategies for dealing with the organic wastestream.

Jeep Reid, staff for the organic wastestream project, reviewed this resolution which presents the results of phase one of the project. During this phase, public workshops were held and data gathered related to the organic wastestream. This work is summarized in the attached document "Organic Waste Planning Project" which includes general and specific recommendations. The resolution would authorize staff to initiate Phase Two of the project which would include revisions of the RSWMP to incorporate strategics for managing the organic wastestream. This work would include an examination of the costs, feasibility and reliability of various management options.

Reid noted that the resolution included a "whereas" clause that assumed Council adoption of Resolution 94-1892, which failed at the February 24 Council meeting. Reid recommended, and the committee adopted an amendment to remove this clause.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPDATING THE REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO INCLUDE NEW OPTIONS FOR MANAGING THE REGION'S ORGANIC WASTE	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 94-1915A INTRODUCED BY RENA CUSMA EXECUTIVE OFFICER

WHEREAS, The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan includes a mass solid waste composting facility as part of the Metro solid waste system; and

WHEREAS, Metro entered into a Mass Composting Service Agreement with Riedel Environmental Technologies in 1989 to implement these provisions of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Riedel Mass Composting Facility, which was expected to process 185,000 tons of mixed waste per year, or 17 percent of the wastestream, is no longer operational and the service agreement with Riedel Environmental Technologies is now null and void; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, in continuing to recognize and support the state hierarchy (ORS 459.015) for managing solid waste, specifies landfilling as the least preferred option; and

WHEREAS, A public process composed of a series of workshops and a regional conference was held to examine new options for managing organic waste in the Metro region, whose participants included waste generators, waste haulers, waste processors, business leaders, government officials and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, The public involvement process demonstrated a broad base of support for organic waste management options that are likely to be more cost-effective and environmentally sound than landfilling; and

~~WHEREAS, Resolution No. 93-1892 authorized the revision of Chapter 5, Facilities and such other elements of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and Metro Code as may be necessary to prepare a new facility plan, and Chapter 1, Waste Reduction of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan is also in the process of being revised; and~~

WHEREAS, The resolution was submitted to the Executive Officer for consideration and was forwarded to the Council for approval; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Riedel Mass Composting Facility is no longer a part of the Metro solid waste management system and references to this facility should be removed from the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and Metro Code, and
2. That the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan should be revised to include new options for reducing the amount of organic waste being landfilled. Such revisions should be incorporated into the ongoing updates of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Chapter 5, Facilities and Chapter 1, Waste Reduction.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____, 1994.

_____
Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer

WM:aey/gbc
SHARE\METZ\ORGANICS\SW941415.RES

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPDATING THE REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO INCLUDE NEW OPTIONS FOR MANAGING THE REGION'S ORGANIC WASTE	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 94-1915 INTRODUCED BY RENA CUSMA EXECUTIVE OFFICER

WHEREAS, The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan includes a mass solid waste composting facility as part of the Metro solid waste system; and

WHEREAS, Metro entered into a Mass Composting Service Agreement with Riedel Environmental Technologies in 1989 to implement these provisions of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Riedel Mass Composting Facility, which was expected to process 185,000 tons of mixed waste per year, or 17 percent of the wastestream, is no longer operational and the service agreement with Riedel Environmental Technologies is now null and void; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, in continuing to recognize and support the state hierarchy (ORS 459.015) for managing solid waste, specifies landfilling as the least preferred option; and

WHEREAS, A public process composed of a series of workshops and a regional conference was held to examine new options for managing organic waste in the Metro region, whose participants included waste generators, waste haulers, waste processors, business leaders, government officials and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, The public involvement process demonstrated a broad base of support for organic waste management options that are likely to be more cost-effective and environmentally sound than landfilling; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 93-1892 authorized the revision of Chapter 5, Facilities and such other elements of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and Metro Code as may be necessary to prepare a new facility plan, and Chapter 1, Waste Reduction of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan is also in the process of being revised; and

WHEREAS, The resolution was submitted to the Executive Officer for consideration and was forwarded to the Council for approval; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Riedel Mass Composting Facility is no longer a part of the Metro solid waste management system and references to this facility should be removed from the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and Metro Code, and
2. That the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan should be revised to include new options for reducing the amount of organic waste being landfilled. Such revisions should be incorporated into the ongoing updates of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Chapter 5, Facilities and Chapter 1, Waste Reduction.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____, 1994.

_____
Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer

WM:aey/gbc
SHARE\METZ\ORGANICS\SW941415.RES