



**METRO**

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

# *Agenda*

Meeting: SOLID WASTE POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: July 28, 1986

Day: Monday

Time: 4:30

Place: Rm. 330, Metro Offices

4:30-4:40 Approval of minutes from last meeting  
and announcements

4:40-5:00 Certification Presentation

5:00-5:30 Rate Incentive Presentation

5:30-6:30 Public Input and Committee Discussion

6:30 Adjourn

SOLID WASTE POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SWPAC

MINUTES June 16, 1986

Committee Members Present: Teresa DeLorenzo, Carolyn Brown, Craig Sherman, Delyn Kies, Pete Viviano, Shirley Coffin, George Hubel, Michael Pronold, Dave Phillips, Dick Howard, Ed Gronke

Committee Members Absent: Kathleen Cancilla, Robert Harris, Gary Newbore, Mike Sandberg, Bruce Rawls

Staff Present: Randi Wexler, Mary Jane Aman, Dan Durig, Wayne Rifer, Steve Rapp, Pat Vernon, Dennis Mulvihill

Guests: Steve Greenwood, DEQ; Bob Brown, DEQ;

Agenda Item: Call to Order, Minutes

Meeting was called to order at 12:03 by Chair Teresa DeLorenzo.

MOTION: Craig Sherman moved to accept the minutes as written.

Seconded by George Hubel, carried unanimously

Announcements/Reports

George Hubel reported on the Rate Review Committee. He described the function of the committee and the process by which they make recommendations to the Executive Officer concerning rate questions. Presently, the committee is reviewing the request for increase from KFD, and have determined the request as fair and reasonable as required by Metro Ordinance.

Randi Wexler, Metro Analyst, reported on the Hazardous Waste Task Force. This group will meet again on Friday, June 20 at 8:30. The Task Force is developing draft proposals for an action plan to handle disposal of the area's hazardous wastes. Some of the issues that have surfaced include:

- 1) Need for collection day where general public brings in paints, rose dust etc.
- 2) Co-ordinate all agencies that get calls regarding hazardous waste to insure they are all dispensing the same information about proper disposal.
- 3) Need for mechanism to provide economically sound disposal alternative for small quantity, unregulated generators.
- 4) Industry advocate, thru trade association or hired consultant.
- 5) Work with legislature to get permanent funding for collection days.

Delyn Kies, City of Portland, as a member of the Technical Review Committee reported that interviews are being held later this week with the respondents to the RFQ/I for alternative technology.

Teresa DeLorenzo updated SWPAC on the yard debris project, a consultant for the yard debris marketing survey will be chosen by the end of next week.

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>DEQ</u>	<u>Landfill</u>	<u>Siting</u>
	<u>Process</u>		

Steve Greenwood of DEQ provided insight into the landfill siting process currently proceeding. SB662 offers a map of how to deal with the problem of landfill siting:

- 1) Provides DEQ with authority to site landfill
- 2) Must accomplish by July 1, 1987
- 3) Must be done within aggressive waste reduction plan
- 4) Specifies DEQ must minimize any potential problems i.e. traffic, odor etc.
- 4) \$.50 per ton goes into fund for surrounding community.

The DEQ started with the largest list of potential sites they could garner, and ended up with 141 sites being evaluated with over 40 evaluation criteria. An announcement will be made tomorrow at a press conference on the 12-18 semi-finalist sites.

The next steps include public meetings, and narrowing down the number of potential sites to 3 by October. Detailed feasibility studies will be taken on the final sites and by July 1, 1987 a decision will be made. The current cost of DEQ siting process is at a minimum \$2.5 million.

Agenda Item

Rate Incentives

Steve Rapp, Metro Analyst, along with other Metro staff has identified rate incentive options and is discussing them with various public interest groups and local jurisdictions. Steve updated SWPAC on these meetings and will approach the committee at a later time with the results of these meetings in an effort to gain input from SWPAC on rate incentive recommendations for Council.

Agenda Item

Certification Report

Wayne Rifer, Metro Analyst reminded SWPAC that next month policy and yard debris standards will be on the agenda. The Waste Composition Study RFP will be going out shortly. Wayne has been meeting with effected interest groups, i.e. hauler associations, concerning certification.

Wayne asked for volunteers for a Task Force for Yard Debris. Dave Phillips, Teresa DeLorenzo, Dick Howard, Delyn Kies (tentatively) and Pete Viviano (tentatively) offered their time.

Agenda Item;

Public Affairs

Jan Schaeffer, Metro Public Affairs, continued from last meeting with information about Metro's advertising campaign. The impact of the present ads will be evaluated by monitoring RIC calls as well as a tele-pole in late September. The next segment of advertising will emphasize recycling. Fred Meyer has agreed to print GLASS, TIN OR NEWSPAPER on their grocery sacks to encourage people to use them for recycling.

A video of the television advertisement was shown, and the recording of the radio message was presented for the committee.

Meeting Adjourned 1:34

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, JULY 21

Submitted by: Pat Vernon, Metro Secretary

July 21, 1986

To: Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee

From: Wayne Rifer

Following is the text of a memo sent to the Tri-C (the group representing the haulers). These issues will be discussed at the meeting of July 28. PLEASE NOTE especially the final item which is a very sensitive and important issue.

-----  
A meeting was held in Metro offices on July 16 to consider some possible adjustments to the Certification Program which are responsive to concerns expressed by Tri-C. The meeting was somewhat hastily arranged due to impending meetings and vacation schedules. In attendance were Estle Harlan, John Trout, Tom Miller, Jim Cozetto, Steve Rapp (Metro), and myself.

Following is a synopsis of the options discussed.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT:** Haulers in the City could end up paying a rate penalty for a non-certified program while they have no control over providing the required services.

Possible approach: Where the jurisdiction decides to have an agent other than the hauler provide the reduction services (e.g., a contract recycler), the actions taken by that agent under its contract would not be considered in determining whether the collection service is meeting certification standards. It would only be required that the jurisdiction demonstrate a continuing good faith effort to have the service provided. If the contractor fails to perform, but the City moves to resolve the issue, certification would not be denied.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT:** Residential haulers should not have to be certified and receive rate incentives for commercial high-grade loading. Likewise, commercial haulers should not be certified for residential recycling or yard debris collection.

A way to address this concern has been suggested: The City, in cooperation with Metro, could, if it chose to do so, designate zones (certification units) which divide up the city according to predominately commercial and predominately residential areas. Certification standards could be applied only to zones for which they are relevant. Any hauler working in a zone, would have to meet the requirements for that zone. Under this approach high-grade loading could be required only in commercial districts and yard debris collection only in residential.

Haulers could be permitted to operate in each separate zone. It would then be possible to include the certification

requirements directly in the collection permit, or to provide the service separately, such as through contract.

PROBLEM STATEMENT: Haulers should have recourse to direct consideration for certification in the case that their local jurisdiction is non-certified. If the hauler can demonstrate that he/she is providing the service regardless of the actions of the rest of the jurisdiction, that hauler should be certified.

This issue was addressed in the earlier piece on certification units:

If an individual collector within a unit which is not certified has cause to believe that he/she is providing the required waste reduction services, that collector may either:

1. apply to the jurisdiction to be designated as a separate certification unit, or
2. apply to Metro for a hearing to show that required services are being provided to his/her customers.

If a collector applies to Metro for a hearing, SWPAC may grant such hearing and may recommend to the Metro Council that the individual collector be granted the certified disposal rate.

\* PROBLEM STATEMENT: In unfranchised areas rate differentials for certification will not work and will cause significant disruption of the hauling industry. The City of Portland does not have the capability to regulate haulers adequately to enforce compliance.

The following approach is presented for discussion. It is not recommended by staff at this time. If it can be demonstrated that rate differentials are not necessary to gain the cooperation of haulers and local governments -- that is, if all the concerned parties will come to the table in a positive spirit to work out mechanisms for reduction of yard debris and commercial recyclables -- then this option will be seriously considered.

Under this alternative Metro would not implement certification rate differentials at this time. As an alternative, Metro's waste reduction and solid waste management planning authorities (ORS 459.200 and 459.095) would be invoked and local jurisdictions would be directed to develop collection programs which carry out the waste reduction program. All other portions of the certification program would be developed as normal -- standards, certifying of units, etc.

Metro would formally adopt rate differentials as the approach which would be used only if needed. Consideration of its implementation would be postponed until January 1988, by which time the 1987 standards will have been implemented and the extent of compliance determined. Our intent would be to implement the rate differential at that time if our efforts to gain cooperation of local collection services is not effective.



# METRO

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

SWPAC

August 19, 1986

Gruetter Sanitation Service  
2416 N. Marine Dr.  
Room 110  
Portland, OR 97217

**Metro Council**

Richard Waker  
Presiding Officer  
District 2

Jim Gardner  
Deputy Presiding  
Officer  
District 3

Bob Oleson  
District 1

Corky Kirkpatrick  
District 4

Tom DeJardin  
District 5

George Van Bergen  
District 6

Sharron Kelley  
District 7

John Frewing  
District 8

Tanya Collier  
District 9

Larry Cooper  
District 10

Marge Kafoury  
District 11

Gary Hansen  
District 12

Executive Officer  
Rick Gustafson

Attn: Mildred

Dear Mildred:

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee meeting, held on July 28, 1986, to which area haulers were invited.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to phone.

Sincerely,

Steve Rapp  
Analyst



CITY OF

# PORTLAND, OREGON

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Dick Bogle, Commissioner  
John Lang, Administrator  
1120 S.W. 5th Ave.  
Portland, Oregon 97204-1972  
(503) 796-7169

RECEIVED JUL 3 1 1986  
July 29, 1986

TO: SWPAC Members  
FROM: Delyn Kies *DK*  
City of Portland SWPAC Member

After last evening's SWPAC discussion on the certification program and rate incentives, I believe that some information on the City of Portland's recycling collection program and planning process might be helpful before our next meeting on August 4 since most of the discussion seemed to focus on the City's program.

Attached to this memo are:

1. Description of the City's recycling collection program and costs.
2. Description of the City's planning and implementation process.
3. Suggestions for information needs and discussion for SWPAC.

Please call me at 796-7010 if you have any questions or comments. My sense is that we are all interested in developing workable programs that will increase recycling and be equitable for all parties. To do so needs not only a spirit of cooperation but also information on materials targeted and expected recovery rates, costs and benefits analysis, standards for measuring success of programs, market development strategies, and rate review methodology. I hope the attached information will help us move toward a effective and equitable program to reduce waste in the region.

DK:lld  
44:swpac

cc: Dan Durig, Metro  
✓ Wayne Rifer, Metro  
Steve Rapp, Metro  
Estle Harlan, OSSI and Tri-County Council  
Joe Cancilla, PASSO  
John Lang, City of Portland  
Steve Manton, City of Portland



## I. Description of City of Portland Recycling Collection Program and Costs

The method for providing recycling collection service selected by the Portland City Council on June 4, 1986 is a combination system involving garbage haulers and recycling contractors.

City of Portland permitted garbage haulers will be required under revised permits to collect newspapers for recycling from their customers. Paper will be set on or next to the garbage can by residents on their usual garbage collection day. Haulers will notify customers of this service, collect newspapers and keep them separate from garbage, and will sell them either individually or cooperatively.

Contractors will keep records of participation, volumes collected, sales, and contacts with non-participants. They will be responsible for distributing a yearly brochure and twice-yearly door-hangers, as well as answering questions from participants.

A sixth service area will include that portion of unincorporated Multnomah County which is within the City's Urban Services boundary under intergovernmental agreement with the County.

The system has a number of distinct benefits. It takes advantage of garbage trucks already on the streets for weekly collection of newspapers. About half of the 120 haulers permitted in the City already provide this service. Weekly collection should increase the overall recovery rate. While recycling contractors will also pick up newspaper, the smaller volume will allow them to be more efficient in collecting other materials.

Competitive bidding for contracts will give the City the lowest price. Contracts can be written to provide economic incentives for increased participation. Economies of scale and uniform promotion are also benefits of contracting.

A risk to the City might be few bids or inadequate performance by the contractors. Two service providers, a garbage collector and a recycling collector, may cause confusion to residents, requiring careful promotion and increased monitoring by the City.

Annual estimated program costs are shown below:

Contractor: Collection and processing	201,635
Administration, overhead, ROI	<u>178,995</u>
Subtotal	380,630

City Costs: Promotion	96,670
Administration	<u>50,840</u>
TOTAL COSTS	528,140

Annual Revenues:	
Recycling Contractor	92,276
Waste Hauler	<u>146,288</u>
TOTAL REVENUES	238,564

Annual Net Costs:	
Costs	528,140
Revenues	<u>238,564</u>
NET COSTS	289,576

Net Cost Per Ton:	
Collection	56.87
Promotion	14.44
City Admin.	<u>7.60</u>
Gross Cost	78.91
Revenues	<u>35.64</u>
NET COST	43.27

Average Cost per Household per Month is 19¢

## II. Description of City of Portland Recycling Collection Planning and Implementation Process

In the fall of 1985 the City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services, selected a consulting team to provide assistance in describing and evaluating the various methods of complying with the Opportunity to Recycle Act. To assure that the City's consideration of recycling collection alternatives was technically sound and considered the unique Portland waste hauling and recycling industries, a 24-member technical advisory committee was appointed by Portland Public Works Commissioner Dick Bogle. Members spent nearly 30 hours during 10 months in meetings carefully critiquing draft assessments and discussion papers.

The preliminary findings of the study were presented in seven public forums and three newsletters. City staff also made or assisted in presentations to various groups and organizations, including waste hauler associations, a recycling trade group, and a City Club committee. The Bureau's Citizen Advisory Committee reviewed the study's findings and provided advice.

The purpose of the consulting and advisory efforts was not to make a specific recommendation to the Bureau of Environmental Services or the City Council. The intent was to make sure that decision makers would be provided sufficient information in order to choose among options available to provide recycling collection services.

The project team, made up of the consultants, City Staff and the advisory group, developed the following targets of the Portland recycling collection program:

1. The recycling collection system must meet the requirements of state law.
2. It should build on the existing recycling system.
3. The program should be implementable and cost effective.
4. It should increase recycling.

On June 4, 1986 the City Council selected the combination system involving weekly news collection by garbage haulers and monthly curbside collection of recyclables by contractors. The Bureau of Environmental Services then began a six-month implementation process.

The first task was to submit a recycling report to the Department of Environmental Quality by July 1, 1986. The report described current recycling efforts in the City and the adopted plan to be implemented.

In July, the first meeting of potential bidders for recycling contracts was held to discuss suggestions for the bid process, service areas and contractor requirements and specifications. In August, draft bid documents will be developed and a workshop for potential bidders will be held. The City will also be preparing and soliciting requests for proposals for recycling promotion and education activities in August. Requests for bids will be issued in September and contracts for recycling collection awarded in October. Selected contractors will have 2 months to design routes, and acquire equipment and personnel while the City prepares promotion materials for the recycling program. We expect to have trucks on-route in January, 1987.

### III. Suggestions for Information Needs and Discussion for SWPAC

In order to make policy recommendations on the certification program and rate incentives, additional background information and data is necessary. Assuming that our objective for August 4 is to prepare such recommendations from SWPAC to Metro Council, the following suggestions for information and how to proceed are offered for discussion.

- A. Clear and written direction on the purpose and objectives of the certification program and rate incentives. For example:

### Certification Program

Purpose - To provide a mechanism for communication and cooperation between Metro and local governments to coordinate collection and disposal programs as a regional solid waste management system.

#### Objectives -

1. Mutual development of standards and expectations each year for programs which will increase recycling.
2. Mutual definition of evaluation criteria to periodically measure success and aid in revision of individual programs.

### Rate Incentives

Purpose - To provide direct economic incentive to generators, collectors, processors or end-users to encourage recycling and decrease disposal of waste.

#### Objectives -

1. Incentives targeted by type of material and based on volume currently disposed and dependability of markets for end use.
  2. Evaluation of size and effect of incentive to determine participation in recycling the material.
- B. Assessment of the cost-effectiveness of each proposed option. For example, how much increased recycling volume is expected at what estimated cost? This would show that while any option has costs, they may be valid in order to reach the goal of increasing recycling and decreasing waste disposal.
- C. Development of schedule and activities for Metro's rate study process and how it coordinates with implementation of certification program and rate incentives. If nothing more than general policy direction (described in Section A above and Metro's staff report) can be achieved by the August 14 Metro Council hearing, then it may be helpful to have a schedule that clearly defines actions and deadlines prior to expected implementation of rates on January 1, 1987. My recommendation would be to include ample time for SWPAC and public review of the rate study, including the information described above for comparison of the impacts of each of the proposed certification program alternatives and rate incentive options. It is my hope that public comment and SWPAC recommendations would be incorporated as the rate study is developed.