



Meeting minutes

Meeting: Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee (SWAAC)
Date/time: 10:00 - 11:30 a.m., Wednesday, Dec. 12, 2018
Place: Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

Members in Attendance:

Peter Brandom, City of Hillsboro
Reba Crocker, City of Milwaukie
Theresa Koppang, Washington County
Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal
Audrey O'Brien, Oregon DEQ
Mark Ottenad, City of Wilsonville
Keith Ristau, Far West Recycling
Alando Simpson, City of Roses Disposal/Recycling
Bruce Walker, City of Portland
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County
Matt Korot, Metro

Members Absent:

Paul Downey, City of Forest Grove

1. Call to order and declaration of a quorum

Matt Korot brought the meeting to order at 10:06 AM, declared a quorum, and previewed the agenda.

2. Comments from the chair and SWAAC members

No comments were made at this time,

3. Consideration of SWAAC minutes for Oct. 10, 2018

Rick Winterhalter requested that the word "model" be changed to "system" in Dean Kampfer's public comment at the Oct. 10 meeting. Motion to approve with this revision by Bruce Walker, seconded by Mark Ottenad. Minutes were approved as amended.

4. Draft 2030 Regional Waste Plan

Marta McGuire (Metro) presented a review of the 2030 Regional Waste Plan planning process and the following next steps for plan adoption and implementation:

- Public comment period: November 20 – December 21, 2018
- Public comment report: January 2019
- MPAC draft plan review: January 23, 2019
- Metro Council work session: February 5, 2019
- Metro Council hearings: February 21 and 28, 2019
- Work on 3-year implementation plans
- Propose development of a new committee: Regional Waste Plan Implementation Committee

Ms. McGuire presented the following questions and requested input from the committee on the draft 2030 Regional Waste Plan:

1. Do you have comments on specific goals and actions that you'd like us to consider integrating into the final version of the plan?

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

2. Do you have broader comments on the plan, and/or the process by which Metro developed it, that you'd like us to share with the Metro Council?

Peter Brandom (City of Hillsboro) thinks the plan includes too much for 10 years. The ambitions and objectives are almost all good, but it is just too much in that impacts to the ratepayer have not been assessed. Mr. Brandom explained that some of the actions will likely have significant impacts on ratepayers. He asked if anyone has assessed progress on the current plan (2008 Regional Solid Waste Management Plan). Ms. McGuire responded that Metro performed a mid-term review to report out the progress and status toward the 2008 plan's actions. This progress was reported to SWAAC and DEQ.

Mr. Korot thinks the draft 2030 Regional Waste Plan is an ambitious plan, but it's not so ambitious as not to try. He thinks the plan is conceptually doable. Mr. Korot agreed that once work plan development begins, we will really see what we can achieve and there may be changes over time. Mr. Korot added that there are a number of actions in the plan that are representative of work that is already done in the region.

Mr. Brandom commented on the current plan adoption process. He thinks this is a critical juncture and that three weeks is not enough time to review the plan and be fully informed, especially as MPAC is scheduled to review the plan on Jan. 23, 2019. Mr. Brandom would like to request an extension of the comment period and asked what drives the MPAC and Council timeline.

Mr. Korot explained that his perspective from the start was that the plan's development has been an iterative process. There is very little new content that has not gone through informal and formal review processes. All sections of the plan were presented to SWAAC, MPAC and Council. From Mr. Korot's view, there has been adequate time. The draft goals and actions were distributed to SWAAC in Sept. 2018.

Ms. McGuire responded that Metro structured the process so that local governments and other stakeholders wouldn't wait to see the final product until the end. She explained that the driving force behind the adoption timeline is an accountability to the Equity Work Group and community members that have been involved for the last two years. The original timeline has been delayed three months to provide additional opportunities for engagement. Ms. McGuire thinks that delaying the timeline more would be a hardship to relationships with community.

Mr. Brandom commented that elected leadership turnover and the holidays present a challenge. He added that just because this plan was reviewed before in parts does not mean we won't want to review it again.

Mr. Korot asked for a suggested timeframe, which Mr. Brandom said was to push the comment deadline out one month.

Theresa Koppang (Washington County) shared that Washington County will have three new elected members of the Board of Commissioners in Jan. 2019. Ms. Koppang will try to get Washington County leadership to review the plan in January. Ms. Koppang loves the draft plan, but explained that at this point, any comments about it should come from leadership and the policy team. She added that one of the Washington County Commissioners who was involved in the plan's



Meeting minutes

development is leaving the Board. Ms. Koppang would feel a lot better if the incoming elected officials had input on the plan early on.

Bruce Walker (City of Portland) commented that the draft plan sets a really high bar, and there has been tremendous work going into this. There were extensive comments provided in the Oct. 2018 SWAAC minutes and Mr. Walker asked for confirmation that those comments had been considered.

Mr. Walker commented that the plan's emphasis on equity is very important, and he is pleased to see this called out. Mr. Walker is hopeful that Metro will take specific actions in its own contracting with respect to equity. The City of Portland is taking action in its contracting to offer not just an invitation to bid, but instead bringing in COBID companies to provide services. Metro has enormous contracts – are there ways to do Metro's contracting to bring in more a diverse and equitable reflection of the region's workforce? He views this as a challenge that needs to be followed through with action.

Mr. Walker noted the emphasis on multifamily-related actions in the plan, and that most of the local government directive actions are focused on multifamily. "Yikes!" Mr. Walker explained that this is a high priority area, particularly with almost 40 percent of Portland residents living in multifamily housing. At the same time, the City of Portland's staff is nowhere near 40 percent focused on multifamily issues. This is a huge challenge and needs to be addressed. Mr. Walker referenced the multifamily workgroup from several years ago, and commented on the need to carry forward these services and improve communication with tenants and property managers. He thinks the elements of the plan related to food composting and the ordinance already adopted by Metro Council is a very high-level important part of the plan.

Mr. Walker commented on Actions 14.1 and 14.7. The City of Portland shares rate information every year with customers; Mr. Walker wondered how much more information they should share. He explained it does not seem valuable to provide line item components of customers' bills. Mr. Walker asked for clarification of the goal or purpose of conveying this information to customers.

Mr. Korot responded that the existence of an action does not necessarily mean there is a problem. The actions are intended to hold the region accountable and will reflect some work that is already underway. Through many engagements, Metro heard from community that they want transparency and consistency. Mr. Korot explained that across the three counties and 24 cities, there is inconsistency in how rates are talked about and developed. Residents often move from one jurisdiction to another, experiencing these differences in rates and services.

Mr. Walker thinks the plan sets a positive, comprehensive, and challenging work plan. He believes we'll be able to work on it and be successful. Mr. Walker concluded by mentioning a recent conversation with Mr. Ottenad about the need for more Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) work related to plastics.

Rick Winterhalter (Clackamas County) greatly appreciates all of the work that has been done. He shared comments about the following goals and actions:

- Actions 6.3 and 6.5: "Residences," "households" and "businesses" are frequently mentioned; should the plan also reference "schools," or should these be included with "institutions?" This could recognize some of the technical assistance and infrastructure work going on at schools (i.e. Eco-Schools Network).



Meeting minutes

- Action 6.3: Should this be broader? The language could be changed to “reduce the use of products” rather than “single-use products.” The term “single-use” could lead to confusion, as something like a toothbrush might be considered single-use.
- Action 6.5 might be the right place to include recognition programs for work to reduce food waste or other waste at businesses. Mr. Winterhalter does not see acknowledgements of recognition programs anywhere in the plan.
- Action 6.6 seems very specific and feels like a task rather than an action.
- Goal 7: There is no specific reference of EPR (referencing Mr. Walker’s comment) or recycled content legislation. Mr. Korot clarified that EPR shows up in Goal 5 because it is intended to emphasize the upstream elements of EPR, however he recognizes it also has management elements. EPR is located in the upstream section because that is the priority.
- Action 10.6: This might be an action that could be expanded to businesses and institutions, not just multifamily housing. Mr. Bandom suggested that the term could be changed to “customers” rather than “residents.” He added that there are many design standard issues related to commercial properties.
- Action 15.2: Should we change the phrase “curbside recyclables” to “curbside materials” because some items that end up in the garbage may have high environmental impacts?
- Mr. Winterhalter added that he appreciates Mr. Walker’s previous comments about the rate transparency issue.

Audrey O’Brien (DEQ) complimented Metro on the update from the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) to the Regional Waste Plan (RWP) and the process used. The plan’s focus on equity is setting standards that DEQ would like to emulate. Ms. O’Brien likes that the RWP works more for the community. Ms. O’Brien explained that DEQ supports the plan being more aspirational, especially as DEQ’s own implementation plan is very aspirational. She also likes that the plan is iterative. DEQ will not be able to carry out its very aspirational plan by itself. Ms. O’Brien thinks that other agencies will need to help carry out the plan – this is a very good way to think bigger about upstream activities and materials management, not just end of life management. There is not one group that can come up with the solution to recycling market issues.

Theresa Koppang (Washington County) asked for clarification on whether the comments made in the meeting would be used in the public comment period. Mr. Korot replied that general comments would be shared with the Metro Council and specific comments would be incorporated into the public comment record.

Ms. Koppang asked if “partnership agreements” refers to intergovernmental agreements. Mr. Korot replied that yes, this would include IGAs with local governments as well as formal partnerships with nonprofit organizations.

Ms. Koppang continued, commenting that Washington County is delighted that disaster debris response is highlighted in the plan. Disaster response is so overwhelming that not just one jurisdiction can tackle it. She then commented on the following actions and goal areas:

- Action 16.5: Washington County is happy to be partners with Metro in the prospect of a Washington County public transfer station.
- Goal 14: Ms. Koppang welcomes transparency, but wonders if the goal should be about adopting consistent services, rather than consistent rates. She thinks we have consistent

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

services, but we have inconsistent rates throughout the region. Many people who move across jurisdictions in the region report changes in rates and services.

Mr. Korot responded, clarifying that Action 14.1 speaks to process and Action 14.3 speaks to consistency in rates, both at facilities and for commercial services. Mr. Korot thinks that for most collection services around the region, they would meet the requirement for consistency for like services. This action is looking for big outliers. When it comes to transfer stations, there are big outliers when it comes to rates. Metro wants to respect differences in costs, however Mr. Korot wonders if it is reasonable to expect that there won't be dramatic swings in rates from one facility to another.

Ms. Koppang requested that a Metro staff person (preferably Ms. McGuire) come to the Washington County Board of Commissioners and speak about the 2030 Regional Waste Plan.

Ms. Koppang asked committee members representing local governments about their progress in sharing the draft plan with their jurisdictions. Mr. Winterhalter answered that Clackamas County Commissioners are aware of the plan. Mr. Brandom would like Hillsboro's incoming Chair to be aware. Ms. Crocker thinks Milwaukie is well-versed in the draft plan and has no questions or issues. Mr. Walker said the City of Portland Mayor's office has been aware of the planning process, but he has not felt the need to do a full presentation. Portland City Commissioner Amanda Fritz serves on the Metro Policy Advisory Committee and has been very engaged.

Mr. Winterhalter appreciates and wants to acknowledge the inclusion of the equity section preamble. In the disaster debris section, there is no mention of policies that would prevent buildings from being destroyed in a disaster. Mr. Winterhalter asked if there should be a recommendation to adopt more stringent seismic requirements for all buildings in the region, not just garbage and recycling facilities.

Mr. Brandom stated that he would be following up with more detailed written comments. On Actions 14.1 and 14.3, Mr. Brandom suggested defining what is meant by "consistent." The City of Hillsboro's rate sheet is just three pages long, however this might be because they don't have rates for some things other jurisdictions do. Mr. Brandom asked if the objective is to define categories that should have set rates, or should there be a certain describable similarity in the way rates are presented.

Mr. Brandom shared that Paul Downey (absent from the meeting) thinks Action 14.4 should be up to local governments to decide to implement rate assistance and how to do so. Mr. Brandom suggested the action use the term "explore" or "provide a framework."

Mr. Korot responded that the project team spent a lot of time discussing the verbs used in the actions. There was a strong sentiment from the Equity Work Group and the community at large that Metro give strong consideration to what other utilities do with respect to rate assistance. Action 14.4 is a non-directive action. Mr. Korot explained that if no progress is made on a non-directive action, stakeholders may be brought in to consider next steps.

Mr. Walker asked what was trying to be accomplished in Action 14.4 and explained that the City of Portland's requirement for single family is for the owner to pay the bill. In some cases, this may



Meeting minutes

mean owner-occupied low-income households. Mr. Walker would be very concerned if cost savings were passed on to landlords and does not think this would be a good approach.

Mr. Brandom had not seen all the plan indicators before. He asked if these are viewed as flexible or adaptable over time. Ms. McGuire answered yes, there is built in flexibility for the indicators. One of the first implementation actions will be to set a baseline, and this will help determine the feasibility of the plan. Mr. Brandom suggested clarifying this level of flexibility.

Mr. Brandom commented that the “Requirements for local governments” section does not seem comprehensive. Mr. Korot responded that this section on page 113 of the draft plan is a summary of all the directive actions in the plan. Ms. McGuire explained that this section was in response to requests for the directive actions to be made very clear in the plan.

Mr. Brandom commented on Action 10.1: this action requires a complete system infrastructure that is not yet in place for us. He thinks Action 10.1 should be explicit in stating that it will require a complete system infrastructure.

Mark Ottenad (City of Wilsonville) thinks it is a very comprehensive and aspirational plan and that we need to have aspirational goals to stretch and reach. Mr. Ottenad commented that cities are very reliant on their county partners for sustainability resources. He wants to echo Mr. Walker’s comments about multifamily-related actions. In Wilsonville, over 50 percent of residents live in multifamily housing. The idea of residential food scraps collection becomes even more complicated with respect to multifamily housing. Mr. Ottenad thinks issues related to multifamily dwellings need to be a very high priority. He then commented on the following goals and actions:

- Goal 10: Mr. Ottenad understands the mention of “collections” to mean “enclosures.” He thinks guidance from Metro on how cities create ordinances will be very helpful.
- Goal 14: Some aspects of rates are controlled by franchise agreements with local haulers. Rate transparency will take a lot of work. Mr. Korot explained that the example list of what is included in rates (page 88) is simply intended as an example and is not meant to be prescriptive.
- Goal 3 and Action 3.4: Mr. Ottenad commented that businesses often have fluctuations in workload that require the use of temporary and contract workers. Overall he thinks this goal area has worthy objectives.

Mr. Ottenad suggested an appendix be added to identify the goals that relate to similar subjects. For example, the issue of plastics recycling could include Goals 5, 10 and 15. Mr. Ottenad asked if Metro’s legislative agenda might consider work to make plastic recycling and use consistent at the state level. He thinks that haulers, manufacturers and others would favor this work in the long run.

5. Public comment on the draft 2030 Regional Waste Plan

Mr. Korot invited public comment on the draft 2030 Regional Waste Plan and reminded audience members that the public comment period extends through Dec. 21, 2018. The plan as well as channels for public comment are available at oregonmetro.gov/regionalwasteplan.

There were no public comments on the draft 2030 Regional Waste Plan at this time.

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

6. Development of tonnage allocation administrative rules

Roy Brower (Metro) presented an overview of the plan for developing tonnage allocation administrative rules. The recently adopted framework for tonnage allocation will take effect late February 2019. The next step is establishing the administrative rules, which provide a more detailed methodology for the tonnage allocation process. The goal is to adopt these administrative rules by May 1, 2019. Metro staff is working with a consultant to incorporate parking barns and break routes into the allocation model.

In the presentation slides, the “Summary of Engagement” icons were clarified to represent the following: Metro, Consultant, Local Governments, Stakeholders, and the Public. The committee was encouraged to ask Metro staff Alan Snook or Molly Vogt for more information about the development of tonnage allocation administrative rules.

There were no questions or comments from the committee at this time.

7. Public Comment on Agenda Items

Mr. Korot invited public comment on agenda items. No comments were made at this time.

8. Preview of the next meeting agenda and final comments

Mr. Korot thanked members for their participation in the committee over the last few years. Mr. Korot shared that Metro would be developing a concept for a new Regional Waste Plan Implementation Committee over the next few months.

With no further comments from the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.