

 Metro | Agenda

**Meeting:** Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee

**Date:** Thursday, February 17, 2011

**Time:** 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

**Place:** Room 401, Metro Regional Center

| TIME       | AGENDA ITEM   | PRESENTER  |
|------------|---|------------|
| 9:00 a.m.  | 1. Welcome and review of today's agenda   | Matt Korot |
| 9:05 a.m.  | 2. Food Rescue Policy<br><i>Objectives: (1) Complete discussion of policy; (2) Determine whether to move policy forward for Council consideration or defer until additional information is available.</i>   | All        |
| 9:25 a.m.  | 3. Public comment on Food Rescue Policy   |            |
| 9:35 a.m.  | 4. Carbon Pricing Policy<br><i>Objectives: (1) Review background paper and discuss policy; (2) Discuss whether the policy, as described in the paper, reflects SWAC's intent; and (3) Determine whether to move the policy forward for Council consideration.</i> | All        |
| 10:40 a.m. | 5. Public comment on Carbon Pricing Policy  |            |
| 10:50 a.m. | 6. Next steps   | Matt Korot |
| 11:00 a.m. | Adjourn   |            |

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**METRO SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)**

Metro Regional Center, Room 401  
Wednesday, February 2, 2011

**Members / Alternates Present:**

|   |                 |                         |
|---|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Matt Korot, Chair   | Bruce Walker    | Michelle Poyourow       |
| Rick Winterhalter   | Dave White      | Amy Pepper              |
| Susan Millhauser  | John Lucini     | Paul Ehinger, Alternate |
| Leslie Kochan (substituting for<br>DEQ rep. Audrey O'Brien) | Theresa Koppang |                         |

**Members / Alternates Absent:**

JoAnn Herrigel  
Adam Winston  
Scott Keller

**Guests and Metro staff:**

|                                 |   |   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Jennifer Erickson, Metro        | Matt Miller, Gresham Sanitary             | Vern Brown, ECR                               |
| Meredith Sorenson, Harvest Pwr. | Ray Phelps, Allied Waste                  | Will Elder, Metro                             |
| Segeni Mungai                   | Michelle Metzler, Waste Mgmt.             | Hannah Smith, Conkling,<br>Fiscum & McCormick |
| Dan Blue, City of Gresham       | Dean Kampfer, WMO                         | Mike Dewey, Waste Mgmt.                       |
| Pam Gilbert, ECR                | Alando Simpson, City of Roses<br>Disposal | Gina Cubbon, Metro                            |

**I. Welcome and Review of Agenda.....*Matt Korot***

Mr. Korot thanked the members for finding the time to come to the meeting, which was scheduled in order to take the place of the January date (which had a conflict). He previewed the agenda and noted that Scott Keller would be absent from the meeting.

**II. Food Waste Recovery Policies Discussion Paper.....*Matt Korot, All***

Mr. Korot told the group that comments from the previous meeting were looked at closely and incorporated into the supplemental materials provided prior to this meeting. The Committee began discussion on the first piece.

Policy 1 – Funding

Bruce Walker said it's unrealistic to think that substantial increases in food recovery programs can occur without investment in staff. If there's concern about impacts on the Regional System Fee (RSF), then Metro should look at whether funding this work from solid waste reserves is feasible. Dave White added that the Clackamas County haulers had discussed this the previous day. They feel there is a role for them to play in working with their customers that could supplement work of local government staff.

Rick Winterhalter commented that there will always be a cost impact from programs, and that from an economic standpoint it's not necessarily a bad thing if the cost of disposal goes up. John Lucini responded that the cost shouldn't go up on non-organics, so organics collection should be funded and implemented without raising the RSF.

Mr. White asked how funding might work; Mr. Korot responded that the recommendation could be phrased to reflect the way SWAC would prefer the money be spent. For instance, if the group agrees with Mr. Lucini that the system fee shouldn't be touched, include that in its recommendation.

Michelle Poyourow asked about other funding sources. Paul Ehinger replied that reserves could possibly be used (depending on tonnage), or perhaps budget cuts in other programs might free up funding for organics. Mr. Lucini suggested that organics disposal itself might help fund the program, and Mr. Korot added that funding currently going to local governments could possibly be reallocated to an organics program in those jurisdictions.

Mr. White proposed forwarding a recommendation to Council stating that a certain amount of money be set aside to fund staff at the local government level who would coordinate and promote organics programs. He further proposed that this should occur without an increase to the RSF and that Metro should look at other options, such as savings that could be transferred to this effort through the budget process. While there was some nodding agreement, Mr. Winterhalter said that he would prefer to keep the option of raising the RSF on the table.

Leslie Kochan asked if local governments would be consulted prior to any possible reallocations. Yes, Mr. Korot replied. Discussion continued, including about how decisions would be made regarding the amount of funding that might be given to each jurisdiction. Not all jurisdictions may be ready to implement a program by July 1, so that in itself would help narrow the decision, Mr. Korot commented.

Ms. Kochan suggested that the recommendation state that SWAC would prefer to not raise the RSF if adequate funding could be made available without jeopardizing the integrity of other programs. Susan Millhauser presented the example that it wouldn't necessarily cause layoffs of Recycle at Work staff, but an opportunity to talk to businesses about both programs.

Mr. Walker suggested: "We support funding for this program, and SWAC's priority would be to not increase the Regional System Fee." Mr. Korot summarized by stating that, based on the discussion, there appears to be consensus around this language.

A member asked when would the program sunset? Mr. Korot said that because this would be budgeted annually, it's possible to sunset any year. Ms. Kochan suggested tying it into the disposal ban option.

#### Policy 2 – Increase organics transfer capacity at Metro facilities

Should clarifications be included regarding whether the program applies to commercial and residential organic waste, or just commercial? Mr. White responded that commercial should happen first, because residential capacity could overwhelm the system at this point. Mr. Winterhalter agreed, saying that if Policies 1 and 2 are put together, it would make sense to begin with commercial. The Committee might even want to point out in the recommendation that commercial organics are a priority in the RSWMP.

Mr. Walker was concerned that stating "commercial" might be limiting, and potentially prevent residential material from being taken at Metro's facilities. He'd prefer the word "commercial" not be included. Mr. Ehinger agreed that it is better to keep the language broad since he has to plan to provide the services. There may be operational ways to accommodate both.

Amy Pepper commented that as these are multi-year policies, they should be kept general. The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan guides staff in how to implement the policies.

Mr. Korot reminded the group that Mr. Ehinger had previously told the Committee about possible modifications to Metro Central to improve its acceptance of organics, and some options to help make Metro South organics-ready. Mr. Walker suggested one language change: "Provide organics transfer

service at Metro South by pursuing options to divert dry waste loads or self-haul customers to other facilities.”

There was consensus on this item.

### Policy 3 – Disposal Ban

Mr. White stated there was no need for a disposal ban, and pointed to water usage as an example. There are no bans on certain showerheads or sprinklers, people are just becoming more educated on the subject and changing their behaviors. Focus on education and give the program a chance before going to “Plan Z,” he said. Countering, Mr. Winterhalter pointed out that substantial education has been done to keep plastic bags out of curbside recycling bins, with very little success. A ban is a useful instrument to move and force action. He’d prefer to keep the option of a ban, just move the timetable further out.

Mr. Walker said that he saw a strong rationale for the Metro Council to send a message to the region that there is a need to step up collection, transfer and processing efforts. It would be a strong statement. Ms. Kochan added that with the greenhouse gas implications of organics in the waste stream, we can’t wait ten years for progress; a ban needs to be out there as a real incentive.

The group discussed a suggestion by Mr. White to accept Part A, Option 2. Optimistically, Milestone 1 could be reached in two years. The idea of extending the deadline re-emerged, and Ms. Kochan pointed out that the feasibility study would add time.

The Committee agreed to change Part A, Option 2 of the Disposal Ban policy to read December 31, 2013; move the feasibility study to 2014, and an actual ban to 2016.

### **III. Food Rescue Policy Discussion Paper.....*Matt Korot, All***

Mr. Winterhalter remarked that food donation is consistent with the RSWMP and higher on the waste management hierarchy than recycling. Ms. Kochan agreed with supporting the infrastructure as laid out in the discussion paper. Mr. Walker said that he would support this policy if the amount does not exceed approximately \$100,000.

Further discussion included Mr. White’s concern that even if it’s a good program, funding would be one more thing placed on the back of the collection rate. Elected officials don’t have unlimited support for raising these rates, he cautioned. Mr. Walker suggested adding language about where the money could be best spent. He asked for information regarding specific capital needs. Mr. Korot told the group that Metro is conducting a barriers/benefits study to answer this question. The study will be complete in approximately six months.

Because of time constraints, this item was tabled until the next meeting (scheduled for February 17), and the meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by:

Gina Cubbon  
Assistant to the Director  
Metro Parks & Environmental Services

gbc  
T:\SWAC\_New\2011 meetings\2-2-11 meeting\SWAC020211min.docx  
Queue

**Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee**  
**Food System Policy Discussion Paper: *Food Rescue Infrastructure***  
**February 17, 2011**

*Revisions from the previous version are in italics and reflect SWAC's discussion at its last meeting on February 2, 2011.*

**Policy Identified by SWAC**

Support and expand the region's food rescue infrastructure.

**Purpose Relative to the Food System**

To increase the amount of edible food diverted from disposal and recycling to those in need.

**What would Council adoption of this policy do?**

*Metro staff will complete work by June 2011 to identify current gaps in the food rescue system and options for Metro's potential role in closing those gaps. SWAC may choose to endorse the general policy identified above now and then discuss more specific options later in the year, or make no comments now, pending that later discussion.*

**Context**

Oregon has historically been one of the hungriest and most food insecure states in the country. According to the Oregon Food Bank, in fiscal year 2008-09 more than 240,000 people per month ate meals from an emergency food box and 3.8 million meals were served by soup kitchens and shelters--an all-time high. Factors such as the reduction in Federal USDA foods, and the growth of secondary markets coupled with increased unemployment, medical expenses and the growing income gap, resulted in stocks of food declining at the same time as demand for assistance increased. Food rescue agencies are striving to source increased amounts of food.

There is precedent for Metro working in this area. In 1996, informed by input from the region's food rescue agencies, Metro implemented a grant program that assisted food rescue agencies with the purchase of equipment that helped them to safely collect, store and distribute fresh and perishable foods. Over a period of nine years, Metro granted more than \$950,000 for the purchase of refrigerated trucks, coolers, freezers and other equipment. A conservative estimate based on reports received from grant recipients, found that these grants enabled the collection and distribution of over 9,000 tons of food—worth \$30 million to a food rescue agency<sup>1</sup>. In 2002, Metro evaluated the program and found that the average benefit per dollar of grant funds distributed was \$31—illustrating a high level of return for the funds distributed.<sup>2</sup>

In addition, Metro conducted a barrier/benefit study in 2003 to better understand what compels businesses to donate surplus food as well as what they view to be the biggest barriers. In response to the findings of this study, Metro developed and implemented the “Fork it Over!” program. “Fork it Over!” is a peer-to-peer initiative that helps food businesses donate surplus prepared, perishable foods that have not been served, by showing that it is safe, simple and the right thing to do. It recruits food businesses to make commitments to donate food regularly. It also leverages partnership support from key industry leaders and associations to reinforce the social and cultural value of food donation, and provides regular reinforcement for participating through free publicity. To increase the convenience of donation, Metro also developed an interactive on-line tool for donors. The system asked donors to simply enter their location and the food they wished to donate, then it displayed the contact information for the closest food

---

<sup>1</sup>Based on \$1.67 per pound dollar value of the recovered food to a food bank, calculated by America's Second Harvest—now Feeding America, the nation's food rescue network.

<sup>2</sup>Calculations were based on avoided collection and disposal cost of \$125 per ton and a \$1.67 per pound dollar value of the recovered food to a food bank.

rescue agencies along with information about the agencies, who they served and if they would come to pick up the donation.

Metro's Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) outlines goals and objectives that guide the direction of key program areas to reduce the amount and toxicity of solid waste in the region. One of the key objectives in the organics sector is to support and increase organic waste prevention and diversion practices, primarily focusing on food donation.

### **Potential alignment with other efforts**

The Oregon Food Bank has recently convened a steering committee of food industry executives on which Metro has a seat. This group is looking at creative and constructive ways to improve the food rescue system in partnership with the food industry. OFB's desire is to maximize the fresh and perishable foods it receives and redistributes throughout the state in a strategic manner. The group is working to identify the gaps in the existing system and collaborate on ways to close them. *Metro is also currently conducting independent studies by revisiting the 2003 report, performing a gap analysis and collecting examples of best practices in place around the nation.*

### **Feasibility**

It would be highly feasible for Metro to implement a policy to support and expand the region's food rescue infrastructure.

### **Anticipated Effects**

#### Environmental Effects

- Diverting one ton of food waste from landfill disposal to reuse reduces greenhouse gas emissions by approximately one ton of carbon dioxide equivalent.
- Diverting one ton of food waste from composting to reuse reduces greenhouse gas emissions by approximately .01 ton of carbon dioxide equivalent.<sup>3</sup>

#### Economic and Fiscal Effects

- The current value of one ton of food diverted to reuse is estimated to be \$3,000<sup>4</sup>.
- Each \$100,000 of Metro expenditures to support the region's food rescue infrastructure would increase the Regional System Fee (applied to each ton of disposed waste) by approximately 10 cents.

#### Stakeholder Effects

- Direct benefit to food rescue agencies and those who utilize their services.
- Expansion of food rescue system capacity may allow new businesses to participate, with potential savings through decreased disposal costs and tax deductions for charitable donations.
- Program costs would be funded by regional solid waste ratepayers.
- Increased food rescue system capacity may lead to more requests from businesses to local government waste reduction programs for assistance with donation program implementation.

### **Metro Authority**

The Metro Council can appropriate funds to be used to support the food rescue infrastructure and the Chief Operating Officer has the authority to distribute these funds through agreements with food rescue agencies.

---

<sup>3</sup> Estimate is based on maximum emissions from compost piles representing 2.5 percent of the initial carbon and 1.5 percent of the initial nitrogen. If compost contains 75% organic matter with a C:N ratio of 30:1, one ton of carbon would evolve as methane for each 100 dry tons of organic matter. Emissions from well-managed and monitored aerobic composting operations could be an order of magnitude lower. Static pile compost systems have the potential to have greater GHG impacts. Source: Sally Brown & Scott Subler, Composting and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: A Producer's Perspective, Biocycle Magazine, March 2007.

<sup>4</sup> Based on revised food bank value of \$1.50 for every pound of food received. Source: Oregon Food Bank.

**Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee**  
**Food System Policy Discussion Paper: *Carbon Pricing***  
**February 17, 2011** (same version as used for November 18, 2010 meeting)

**Policy Identified by SWAC**

Advocate for a carbon price signal across the life cycle of products and materials, including imports. This price signal could be through an emissions cap and/or a carbon tax (*this policy is taken from the Oregon Global Warming Commission's Interim Roadmap to2020*).

**Purpose Relative to the Food System**

To reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with the production, transportation and end-of-life management of food products by using a price signal to influence producer practices and consumer decisions.

**Context**

The Portland metropolitan region is a national leader in arresting the rise in greenhouse gas emissions; however, our current efforts fall far short of what is needed to meet carbon reduction goals established in state law. Moreover, within 25 years, we can expect to be joined by one million new neighbors. Energy instability and climate change require us to rethink everything from where we live, to where we get our food, to how we get around.

To refocus the region's efforts to address climate change, the Metro Council adopted Resolution #08-3931 outlining the need to convene stakeholders for the purpose of developing greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies. Given the scope and complexity of this task, the Metro Council adopted Resolution #08-3971 in August 2008 designating the Climate Initiative as a Council project.

In order to identify where to focus the region's efforts, Metro conducted a Greenhouse Gas Inventory for the Portland metropolitan region. The inventory was intended to establish a snapshot of the region's greenhouse gas emission sources in order to make investment decisions that can have the greatest effect in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Fourteen percent of the Metro region's greenhouse gas emissions are associated with the production, transportation, and end-of-life management of food consumed by residents and business operators. Most food-related emissions result from the growing of food (especially feed for animals) and, to a lesser extent, food processing.

**What would adoption of this policy by Council do?**

- It would signal the Metro Council's interest in weighing in on regulatory options to reduce the carbon intensity of products.
- It would require Council to determine what its advocacy would actually look like, e.g.,:
  - Direct advocacy for state legislation
  - Direct advocacy for federal legislation
  - Direct advocacy for international agreements
  - Advocacy through the Governor or Oregon Congressional Delegation for federal legislation
  - Advocacy through the Governor or Oregon Congressional Delegation for international agreements

### **Potential alignment with other efforts**

The recommendation completely aligns with a key action identified in the Oregon Global Warming Commission's *Interim Roadmap to 2020* adopted last month. The *Roadmap* offers recommendations for how Oregon can meet its 2020 greenhouse gas reduction goal (10% below 1990 levels) and get a head start toward its 2050 goal (at least 75% below 1990 levels). The recommendations are addressed to the next Governor and Legislature, the Oregon Congressional delegation, local governments, businesses and Oregonians generally. They will be incorporated into the Commission's upcoming report to the 2011 Legislature.

The policy being considered by SWAC is drawn directly from the *Roadmap*, which states that:

A price on carbon across the full life cycle (resource extraction, manufacturing, transport, use, and end-of-life) offers the potential for significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions associated with the life cycle of products and materials. The Materials Management Committee did not evaluate the relative advantages and disadvantages of capping emissions (either via "cap-and-trade", "cap-and-dividend" or some variation) vs. taxing emissions. However, given the global nature of many supply chains, and keeping with the Committee's vision of not penalizing Oregon or other domestic producers (relative to foreign competition), it will likely be important to apply a "border adjustment mechanism" to help ensure a level playing field. This mechanism, often discussed in the form of a carbon tariff, adds to the price of products that are made in locations whereby some or all of their upstream emissions are not covered by a carbon cap and/or tax.

The Oregon Global Warming Commission identified the lead parties on implementing this recommendation as the Oregon Congressional delegation, Governor's Office, and the Commission itself.

### **Feasibility**

The action itself – advocacy – is highly feasible. The desired outcome of adoption of a regulatory framework, in which the life cycle costs of carbon are incorporated into the costs of products, is likely to be much less feasible over at least the short-term.

### **Anticipated Effects**

#### *Environmental Effects*

- No direct effect from Council advocacy.
- Implementing policies to incorporate a carbon price signal would potentially result in significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

#### *Economic Effects*

- No direct effect from Council advocacy.
- Implementing policies to incorporate a carbon price signal would impact the costs of producing food due to increased costs for energy used in production and fuel used for transportation.

#### *Stakeholder Effects*

- There does not appear to be either a high level of regional knowledge or consensus about policies to incorporate a carbon price signal, so there could be political implications for the Council in advocating for such policies.

### **Metro Authority**

The Metro Council has the authority to advocate for legislation.