



Metro | Meeting minutes

Meeting: Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
Date: July 9, 2014
Place: Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

Members present

Dan Blue, City of Gresham
Paul Ehinger, Metro
Kathy Kaatz, City of Tualatin
Scott Keller, City of Beaverton
Leslie Kochan, Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality
Theresa Koppang, Washington County
Matt Korot, Metro
Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal
Susan Millhauser, City of Lake Oswego
Amy Pepper, City of Troutdale
Keith Ristau, Far West Fibers
Amy Roth, Association of Oregon Recyclers
Bruce Walker, City of Portland

Members absent

Alando Simpson, City of Roses Disposal & Recycling

Guests

Jennifer Erickson, Metro

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Matt Korot called the meeting to order and declared a quorum.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair Korot reviewed the meeting agenda and asked if the Committee had any questions or comments. He noted the Metro Council will consider a new name for the Committee, Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee, at its July 17 meeting. Chair Korot introduced Ken Ray, Metro Communications, who promoted several upcoming events in Metro's *Let's Talk Trash* series. Chair Korot asked if there were other comments or announcements from the Committee. Susan Millhauser announced she will be leaving the Committee and her position at Lake Oswego. Chair Korot thanked her for her contributions to the Committee and wished her luck in her future endeavors.

3. CONSIDERATION OF SWAC MINUTES FOR JUNE 11, 2014

The minutes of the June 11, 2014 SWAC meeting were approved as written. A motion to approve was made and seconded.

4. SOLID WASTE ROADMAP: FOOD SCRAPS PROCESSING CAPACITY PROJECT

Jennifer Erickson, Metro Resource Conservation and Recycling, discussed the food scraps processing capacity project, a continuation of last month's discussion. She also introduced Lyndsey Lopez from CH2M Hill, who is assisting with the project. Ms. Erickson gave a presentation introducing five alternatives for food scraps processing, and then Chair Korot led the Committee in an exercise to provide feedback on the alternatives related to: general thoughts, additions or refinements, red flags and residential impact. This feedback is recorded in the attached table. Ms. Erickson acknowledged a hybrid of the various alternatives may be considered.

Alternative 1 – Status quo

Alternative 2 – Food scraps disposal ban

Alternative 3 – Flow control and contracting

Alternative 4 – Metro builds facility

Alternative 5 – Wastewater treatment

In response to a question about whether Metro can use flow control authority to direct material to private transfer stations in addition to public ones, Marv Fjordbeck, Office of Metro Attorney, explained that Metro has the least amount of legal risk associated with flow control regulation under current law is if it directs waste to its own facilities. That doesn't mean that there are not other ways to implement flow control, but those may have higher risk. He pointed out that we need to be attentive to not confusing flow control legal authority with flow control contractual implementation. As long as contractual arrangements don't unduly favor a local entity over an out-of-state entity, and the procurement is otherwise properly done, then that procurement is likely to be upheld, but does entail a greater risk of legal challenge than that associated with directing flow to public facilities.

Ms. Erickson wrapped up the discussion by noting that the next steps are to refine the alternatives, incorporating SWAC's input, and apply the evaluation criteria. We may return to SWAC if the alternatives become substantially different than those presented today. The alternatives will be presented to the Metro Council for discussion and guidance in October [*Note: this has since been changed to a tentative date of Nov. 18*].

5. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO SWAC AGENDA ITEMS

Doug Drennen stated that looking at food scraps alone as a feedstock is one alternative, but suggested considering mixed organics because the technology is already there to handle this material. The San Jose digester is currently taking mixed organics.

6. PREVIEW OF THE NEXT MEETING'S AGENDA AND FINAL COMMENTS

Chair Korot thanked everyone for the valuable dialogue. Next month's discussion will be led by Doug Anderson, Metro Solid Waste Policy and Compliance, and will focus on context and introduction to the transfer system configuration project. Also, obtaining Committee input on DEQ's draft recovery goals for the region has been added to the September meeting agenda.

7. ADJOURN

Chair Korot adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee, July 9, 2014

Committee member comments in response to questions related to potential alternatives for food scraps processing in the region

QUESTION FOR COMMITTEE	ALL ALTERNATIVES	ALTERNATIVE 1 <i>Status quo</i>	ALTERNATIVE 2 <i>Food scraps disposal ban</i>	ALTERNATIVE 3 <i>Flow control and contracting</i>	ALTERNATIVE 4 <i>Metro builds facility</i>	ALTERNATIVE 5 <i>Wastewater treatment</i>
1. Thoughts on each alternative and the identified roles?	<p>Has the Metro Council determined that energy production is the highest and best use for food waste?</p> <p>To really evaluate potential for any option, need an understanding of the potential capacity opportunities, GHC emissions/impacts, and any other environmental impacts, as well as community acceptance.</p>	<p>Relies on voluntary participation. Almost impossible to create incentives for participation.</p> <p>Unstable, limited available capacity.</p> <p>Not an acceptable alternative to meet existing or future recovery rate. Food is critical material to address and programs are unlikely to be robust enough under this alternative.</p> <p>No economies of scale, limited efficiencies, low participation as a result.</p>	<p>Provides necessary material flows to build incentives.</p> <p>Add organics to required recycling (add as a principle recycling rather than banning disposal).</p> <p>Allows (but does not guarantee) for private sector development of processing capacity.</p> <p>Disposal ban (phased in over time to allow for infrastructure development and local government programs) is critical to driving development and insuring predictable tonnage.</p> <p>Supportive of a disposal ban on commercial food scraps to increase tonnage and increase participation.</p> <p>Who is responsible for enforcement of disposal ban?</p>	<p>Why the use of Metro Central and Metro South only for transfer? Current private transfer has capacity.</p> <p>Either Alternative 3 or 5, not both. Both would disperse tonnage too much and need tonnage to remain consolidated for economy of scale.</p> <p>If requiring all commercial food scraps to go to Metro Central and Metro South, how will that impact the facilities that are already accepting food?</p> <p>Would Metro need to require flow control to its transfer station?</p> <p>Private or public or both for processing capacity.</p> <p>Not sure why all commercial food scraps would need to go to Metro Central or Metro South. Can't other facilities be part of the mix?</p> <p>Metro South has limited footprint, what kind of throughput could that facility really manage?</p>	<p>If Metro finances and builds a facility, the public is on the hook for the cost. A private facility does not risk ratepayer money.</p> <p>Metro was not created to go into business.</p> <p>If requiring all commercial food scraps to go to Metro Central and Metro South, how will that impact the facilities that are already accepting food?</p> <p>Metro South has a limited footprint. What kind of throughput could that facility really manage?</p> <p>Disposal ban (phased in over time to allow for infrastructure development and local government programs) is critical to driving development and insuring predictable tonnage.</p> <p>Why the use of Metro Central and Metro South only for transfer? Current private transfer has capacity.</p>	<p>Only a small number of wastewater treatment plants could likely accept materials.</p> <p>If requiring all commercial food scraps go to Metro Central or Metro South, how will that impact the facilities that are already accepting food?</p> <p>Metro South has limited footprint, what kind of throughput could that facility really manage?</p> <p>Disposal ban (phased in over time to allow for infrastructure development and local government programs) is critical to driving development and insuring predictable tonnage.</p> <p>Why the use of Metro Central and Metro South only for transfer? Current private transfer has capacity.</p>
2. Additional alternatives or refinements to those presented?	<p>Any thoughts on possible transition to a wet/dry collection system? What implications would that have on infrastructure needs?</p> <p>Consider longer-distance haul options along with more local option (make sure to compare emissions impacts).</p> <p>Hybrid of Alternatives 2, 3 and 5.</p>					<p>Need to ensure that food scraps add to actual energy recovery and is not just off-gassed at WWTP.</p>
3. Red flags?	<p>How would you manage the contamination by non-food items?</p> <p>Would the disposal ban be a central landfill ban or a required recycling style rule similar to BRR? BRR style would be much more difficult to implement as it would require getting all the region's cities to pass ordinances.</p>		<p>60% of alternatives require processing through Metro's transfer stations – there's limited capacity and a lot of tons if recovery is high. Not sure if the region could rely on Metro's facilities – would require private sector transfer too.</p> <p>No guarantee of new capacity with ban.</p> <p>Chicken-egg scenario? No guarantee of flow will come from a ban.</p>		<p>Private industry opposition would be strong.</p> <p>Funding?</p> <p>Siting? Enormous opposition from neighbors of facility.</p> <p>Siting within the region is a significant barrier.</p>	<p>Mixing food scraps with sewage is a big problem for final disposition of solids. Strong reservations about WWTP unless it is a separate digester.</p> <p>WWTP operations, while capable of processing food through their AD technology, are currently outside the solid waste collection-transfer-processing system. It would require a significant culture shift.</p>

QUESTION FOR COMMITTEE	ALL ALTERNATIVES	ALTERNATIVE 1 <i>Status quo</i>	ALTERNATIVE 2 <i>Food scraps disposal ban</i>	ALTERNATIVE 3 <i>Flow control and contracting</i>	ALTERNATIVE 4 <i>Metro builds facility</i>	ALTERNATIVE 5 <i>Wastewater treatment</i>
<p>4. What would need to change if residential is included?</p>	<p>Don't overlook residential food scraps recovery. It will engage participation and ultimately support broader programs.</p> <p>Jurisdictions are looking to expand to residential food scraps. Metro needs to work with DEQ to permit yard debris processors to be able to accept residential food scraps and yard debris.</p>		<p>Is there capacity/facilities to take both?</p>	<p>Portland and Metro have worked very successfully to recover residential food scraps. Limiting residentially-generated food scraps at Metro transfer stations would be a huge problem.</p> <p>Where would residents take their yard waste/food scraps for drop off?</p> <p>I like the idea of a separate residential transfer facility and consolidation of residential food scraps/yard waste to keep costs down.</p> <p>We've been discussing capacity implications at Metro South and how to accommodate that material. How would that change plans for that facility if all commercial goes there?</p>	<p>Portland and Metro have worked very successfully to recover residential food scraps. Limiting residentially-generated food scraps at Metro transfer stations would be a huge problem.</p>	