



METRO

A G E N D A

MEETING: **REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

DATE: Wednesday, March 17, 1999

TIME: 8:30 a.m.—10:30 a.m.

- NOTE NEW TIME -

PLACE: Room 370, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

- I. Call to Order and Announcements** **Ed Washington**
- 5 min. *II. Approval of February Minutes** **Ed Washington**
- 10 min. III. REM Director's Update** **Bruce Warner**
- 10 min. IV. Disposal Contract: Status and Next Steps** **Bruce Warner**
A status report on Metro's negotiations with Waste Management regarding the disposal contract. Also, a briefing on the issues and decisions that will remain after Council takes action on the contract changes.
- 10 min. *V. SWAC Membership & Organization** **Doug Anderson**
Membership for at least 12 of the 21 voting members is due for review—most because of length of service. Prior to performing this review, staff will solicit options for adjusting the committee's membership to reflect changes in the solid waste and recycling field.
- 40 min. VI. Transfer Station Service Plan** **Bill Metzler**
The Service Plan project team (introduced at the February meeting) is currently scoping out the question: does this region need more transfer station services—and if so, how many, where, and what services should be provided? During last year's code revision, SWAC identified a number of facility-related issues and problems including access times, service to public customers, waiting time, and so forth. During this work session, SWAC is asked to identify facility-related issues and problems that will help answer the questions above.
- 40 min. VII. Regional Waste Reduction Goals** **Steve Apotheker**
A working session to follow-up on February's State of the Plan Report, in which staff indicated that we are not on track to reach our Year 2000 waste reduction goals.
- 5 min. VIII. Other Business and Adjourn** **Ed Washington**

* *Materials for these items are included with this agenda.*

All times listed on this agenda are approximate. Items may not be considered in the exact order listed.

Chair: Councilor Ed Washington (797-1546); Staff: Doug Anderson (797-1788); Committee Clerk: Connie Kinney (797-1643)

S:\SHARE\Dept\SWAC\Agenda\0317swac.aga

REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

February 17, 1999

The Solid Waste Advisor Committee's new Chair, Councilor Ed Washington introduced himself to the committee. Chair Washington noted that it was his desire to bring the committee together from 8:30 until 10:30 instead of the previous meeting time. Chair Washington urged the committee to call him if they desired to share any thoughts, ideas or concerns with him instead of the group. He advised them to call his Assistant, Pat Emmerson, 797-1537 to make an appointment. Chair Washington stated that if a private conference is desired he would respect that and their privacy.

Introductions of all the committee members was next.

ATTENDEES

Voting Members

Ed Washington, Chair, Metro Councilor
Jeanne Roy, Citizen, City of Portland
Merle Irvine, Willamette Resources
Garry L. Penning, Waste Management
Mike Leichner, Washington County haulers (alternate), Pride Disposal
Dean Kampfner, Multnomah County haulers (alternate), Waste Management
Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County
Tom Wyatt, Browning Ferris Industries
Ralph Gilbert, East County Recycling
David White, Tri-C/ORRA
Susan Keil, City of Portland

Non-Voting Members

Bruce Warner, REM Director
Rob Guttridge, Clark County (alternate)
Marti Roberts-Pillon, DEQ (alternate)
Doug DeVries, Specialty Transportation Service

GUESTS

Dave Kanner, Washington County
Todd Irvine, WRI
Jerry Rust
Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Co.
Easton Cross
Dick Jones
Kent Inman, American Compost

(Other guests not identified on Sign-In Sheet)

METRO

Doug Anderson
Scott Klag
Sarah Adams

Steve Kraten
Aaron Brondyke
Connie L. Kinney, Clerk to the Committee

Jan O'Dell
Tom Imdieke

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Sue Keil requested the minutes be corrected to show that the City of Portland was represented at the November 16th meeting with Mr. Lee Barrett, and with that correction requested the minutes be approved. Mr. Dave White also asked the minutes be corrected to reflect that he was in attendance at the November 16th meeting. Mr. Garry Penning seconded the motion for approval. The committed voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

Director's Update

Mr. Warner distributed REM Director's Updates and briefly discussed each item.

Mr. Penning questioned whether REM's new budget Performance Measures would be instituted at the beginning of the fiscal year. Mr. Warner replied they were a part of the budget package but REM has already begun instituting those measures.

State of the Plan Report

Mr. Anderson said the "State of the Plan" is a periodic review of our Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. He said that today's presentation will focus on waste reduction because that is where some of our greatest challenges lie. Mr. Anderson acknowledged four persons for their contribution to the information in the report: Steve Apotheker, Meg Lynch, Jennifer Erickson, and Scott Klag, all of his staff. He said comments will be gathered throughout the next 2-months. He said the report is available at the conclusion of today's meeting. Mr. Anderson then presented a series of slides covering the following topics:

Mr. Anderson said the Report is a status report on the region's waste reduction efforts and whether it is on track with the Goals and Recommendations of the RSWMP. The plan also satisfies state law on the progress of waste reduction efforts reported to DEQ.

Mr. Anderson presented a flow chart for the periodic review, illustrating SWAC's advisory role. The report covers solid waste recovery disposal facilities, illegal dumping, disaster debris management, system financing, and plan management itself. Mr. Anderson said the Plan addresses the qualitative and quantitative performance of the system and it makes appropriate recommendations.

Chair Washington questioned how hard it was actually going to be to reach 52% in the Year 2000, when we are currently so far behind our estimated waste reduction efforts.

Mr. Guttridge said new programs will have to be instituted to reach 52% by the Year 2000. Mr. Guttridge asked Mr. Anderson if the figures he was using included all tonnage within the region and Mr. Anderson replied that it included all but hazardous, industrial process, and special waste (such as petroleum contaminated soil and auto fluff).

Ms. Roy commented she would like to discuss the disposal fee: She said she looked at recycling rates since 1989 and then the disposal fees. The disposal fees go up until 1992, and then they are flat until 1996. The recycling rate follows the tipping fee very closely until 1992. She said you can see very clearly that increasing disposal fees increased recycling, and decreasing the disposal fees has a different type of impact.

Ms. Keil said the City of Portland has also done some analysis and it is their opinion that there is not a correlation between the recycling rate and the disposal fee but rather a correlation with the state of the economy.

Councilor Washington told committee members he would appreciate their input on how we should proceed in the future so that we can make the 52% recycling projection.

Mr. Gilbert asked Mr. Anderson how many tons the region would have to dispose of in order to reach the 52% mark. Mr. Anderson said that topic would be discussed further on in the presentation.

Ms. Keil said the City's numbers show that commercial recycling has increased dramatically, 49% in just the recycling rate on the commercial side. She said the tough part to count is the waste reduction portion of that. She said it could be 10-15 points higher based on some different modeling due to the waste reduction.

Easton Cross, from the gallery commented he has not heard any discussion on the prices of recycled products declining in the industry.

Mr. Kanner asked what is the rationale for using disposal recovery per capita when measuring success or failure. Mr. Anderson replied that it was only one of several measures, and we don't rely on just one. We try to look at the weight of the evidence that several measure provide us. Mr. Apotheker added that the per-capita rate is helpful when you are trying to measure effectiveness. There was continued discussion on the per capita method used to measure the tonnage.

Mr. Irvine said a bigger indicator is that we started at \$75/ton, and it is now \$62.50, coupled with what Mr. Cross said about the prices on recycled materials.

Mr. Anderson, in concluding the presentation, said that in answer to Chair Washington's question on how tough it would be to reach the 52% stated we have identified several factors: disposal costs, price of recycling materials, price of disposal collection relative to the price of recycling collection, regional growth, many factors that all present challenges.

We welcome comments from SWAC on the information we have given you.

Mr. Anderson requested that at the next meeting SWAC would be asked to reaffirm Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) goals. He said he would convene a task force to work on proposals and programs to achieve the goals. These would come back to SWAC for comment. They also may require plan revision, a work plan to achieve this and funding issues.

Mr. White commented that during the time the RSWMP was being prepared the subcommittee talked about the incremental cost of getting that last piece of recycling out of the wastestream and how expensive that might be compared to the expense of removing it from the first ton of solid waste. He said it will be expensive to get to 52%, that people are working hard on

educating the public. Mr. White questioned what we as a society are willing to pay to meet the 52% goal. That is an important piece of the puzzle.

Ms. Roy said she was also a member on the subcommittee that Dave was on, and she doesn't think we are anywhere near the point where the cost is too high to get the tonnage we need to reach the 52%. Ms. Roy thanked the staff for doing the State of the Plan report and said they had done an excellent job.

Transfer Station Service Plan

Mr. Anderson introduced Mr. Metzler, who will describe a process for answering questions left over from the code revision last year. Last year, when the SWAC subcommittee discussed the need for transfer stations, we didn't come to full closure on how to deliver the full range of services that are typically provided at regional transfer stations. For example, what is the regional policy toward serving public customers? The current 50,000 ton definition is in place partly to mark the point at which a transfer station is big enough to "step up to the plate" and provide a full range of disposal services. However, Metro also committed last year to investigate this issue and explore other options. Metro has assembled a project team to do just that. Mr. Anderson introduced the four people that will be managing this project: Chuck Geyer, Penny Erickson, Sarah Adams Lien, and Bill Metzler.

Mr. Metzler said the purpose of the project is to determine whether more regional transfer stations are needed in the region. And if the answer to that question is "yes," the project team will recommend the optimum number of stations, what services these transfer stations should provide, how they should be provided, and where they should be located. He said the RSWMP states there will be no new transfer stations in the region. He said it does allow them as an alternative practice, and it lists criteria for looking at that. It says we can look at a case by case basis if there is a need. It asks that we look at a review of the service levels to determine a need. That is pretty much what is driving this project. There is a perception that because of the region's growth, excessive travel time, access, costs, that some areas in the region may be very under-served.

Mr. Metzler described the main areas of the project tasks (which was included in the agenda packet). He said there would be meetings with stakeholders, as well as SWAC work sessions throughout the process.

Mr. Warner said this would be a continuing agenda item for this group as we move through the process and we will seek concurrence from SWAC at each phase of the project to get buyoff from the committee.

Mr. Penning asked what the timeline for the various phases of the project were.

Mr. Metzler said he hoped to have the project completed by the end of the Fiscal Year.

Other Business:

There was no further business. The meeting was adjourned.

s:\share\dept\swac\minutes\1999\0217swac.sum.doc

SWAC Membership and Organizational Representation

Summary

Membership for 12 of the 21 voting SWAC members is due for review—most because of length of service. In addition, Metro has received comments that, due to changes in the solid waste system, SWAC is not fully representative of the solid waste interests that are necessary to fulfill SWAC's mission.

Membership. Pursuant to the SWAC Bylaws, Metro needs to review SWAC memberships in the near future. Metro will seek SWAC comment on the timing of this review.

Organization. Options for changing the representative structure of the committee are described below. Additional options from SWAC will be solicited for consideration. At the SWAC meeting on April 21, 1999 Metro will ask SWAC to approve a reorganization plan, together with a plan to phase-in this new organizational structure during the next year or so.

Background

SWAC's Mission. The Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) is a Metro committee responsible for advising the Metro Executive Officer and Metro Council on:

- a. Policy options regarding regional solid waste management and planning, and implementation of existing solid waste plans and policies;
- b. Recommendations concerning compliance with the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP), alternative solid waste policies and practices, need and opportunities for citizen involvement, and building regional consensus for the management of solid waste.

Terms and Eligibility. Voting members of SWAC are appointed according to SWAC Bylaws and are subject to review by the Metro Executive Officer every four (4) years. In addition, the Bylaws allow for the Executive Officer to request the resignation of inactive members (defined as 4 or more absences during a calendar year). For reference, the SWAC Bylaws, and current SWAC roster and membership status are attached.

Membership

Ten of the 21 voting members have been seated for more than 4 years. In addition, one member is "inactive" and another seat is vacant. Therefore, a total of 12 of the 21 voting members is subject to review under the SWAC Bylaws.

To comply with the Bylaws, Metro needs to review SWAC memberships in the near future. Metro will seek SWAC comment on the timing of this review.

Organizational Representation

Metro regularly receives comments that the composition of SWAC should change if Metro wants an advisory committee that is more representative of current solid waste issues. The comments tend to follow three themes: (1) SWAC is dominated by the disposal industry—8 of the 21 voting members represent haulers or disposal facilities; (2) with the increase of vertical integration, the interests of many haulers and owners of disposal sites are becoming blurred, and these groups have an increasing motivation to vote as a block; (3) SWAC does not have sufficient

ratepayer representation—especially business interests. Metro has also heard on occasion that the committee may be too large to operate efficiently.

Options for Reorganization. In the table below, Metro staff have summarized two options for reorganizing SWAC to address the issue of representation.

Option 1. This option reduces the size of SWAC to 17 members. A “composting” representative would be added to the “Industry” category, and “hauler” and “facility” representatives would be reduced from 4 of each to 2 of each, to balance industry representation. One “citizen” representative would be eliminated (leaving one citizen to be drawn from each of the 3 counties), and 3 Business Ratepayers would be added. Governments would be reduced from 7 to 4: one representative for the governments in each of the three counties, plus one representative from the City of Portland.

Option 2. This option leaves the size of SWAC at 21 members. The differences from Option 1 are as follows: hauler and facility representatives would be reduced from 4 of each to 3 of each (rather than 2); and only the Multnomah County representative would be eliminated from the “Government” category.

Options for Changing Representation on SWAC
(Voting Members)

<u>Current Organization</u>	<u>Reorganization Option 1</u>	<u>Reorganization Option 2</u>
Chair (Metro)1	Chair (Metro)1	Chair (Metro)..... 1
Industry9	Industry6	Industry 8
<i>Recycling (1)</i>	<i>Recycling (2)</i>	<i>Recycling (2)</i>
<i>Hauling (4)</i>	<i>Hauling (2)</i>	<i>Hauling (3)</i>
<i>Disposal (4)</i>	<i>Disposal (2)</i>	<i>Disposal (3)</i>
Citizens.....4	Citizen-Ratepayers.....6	Citizen-Ratepayers.....6
	<i>Citizens (3)</i>	<i>Citizens (3)</i>
	<i>Businesses (3)</i>	<i>Businesses (3)</i>
Governments7	Governments4	Governments..... 6
<i>Cities (4)</i>	<i>City of Portland (1)</i>	<i>Cities (4)</i>
<i>Counties (3)</i>	<i>County areas (3)</i>	<i>Counties (2)</i>
TOTAL	21	17
	17	21

Recommendations for Reorganization. Metro recommends that SWAC adopt one of the options above, a modification of one of these options, or an alternative developed by SWAC that addresses the issue of representation.

Metro also recommends that the new roster be phased-in over a period of approximately 1 year. The phasing would be accomplished by reclassifying certain vacancies as they occur, and appointing a new member from the appropriate group. For example, assuming that government representation is reduced, the next “government” vacancy could be reclassified as the “composting industry” seat, and a new member solicited from the composting industry.

Metro will ask SWAC to vote on a new representational organization at the April 21, 1999 meeting of SWAC. Comments will be solicited, beginning at the March 17 meeting.

METRO
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
BYLAWS

(As Amended by the Committee on Nov. 20, 1996)

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Evaluate policy options and present policy recommendations to the Metro Council and Executive Officer regarding regional solid waste management and planning.
2. Advise the Metro on the implementation of existing solid waste plans and policies.
3. Provide recommendations concerning the solid waste planning process to ensure adequate consideration of regional values such as land use, economic development, and other social, economic and environmental factors.
4. Provide recommendations on compliance with the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and applicable state requirements.
5. Provide recommendations on alternative solid waste policies and practices developed by subcommittees of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.
6. Recommend needs and opportunities to involve citizens in solid waste issues.
7. Recommend measures to build regional consensus for the management of solid waste.

MEMBERSHIP

Voting Members (21 total):

Metro Council, Committee Chair (1)
Clackamas County (1)
Multnomah County (1)
Washington County (1)
Clackamas County Cities (1)
Multnomah County Cities (1)
Washington County Cities (1)
City of Portland (1)
Solid Waste Hauling Industry (4)
Recycling Industry (1)
Solid Waste Facilities (4)
Citizens (4)

Non-Voting Associate Members (6 total):

Metro Regional Environmental Management
Director (1)
Department of Environmental Quality (1)
Port of Portland (1)
Clark County (1)
Marion County (1)
Yamhill County (1)

Additional associate members without a vote may serve on the Committee at the pleasure of the Committee.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

1. Representatives from the Counties shall be appointed by the Chairperson of the County Board.
2. The representative from the City of Portland shall be appointed by the Mayor of Portland.
3. Representatives of Cities within a County shall be appointed by consensus of those Cities.
4. A pool of candidates for the citizen representatives shall be nominated by the participating jurisdictions, SWAC members, and by civic and business groups. Candidates may also submit their names directly to the Metro Executive Officer. The Metro Executive Officer shall appoint one citizen member from Clackamas County, East Multnomah County, Washington County, and the City of Portland as available.
5. Industry candidates shall be solicited from the industry and appointed by the Metro Executive Officer. Solid Waste hauling industry representatives shall include one from each of the three Counties.
6. Terms of Office - The Executive Officer may review the status of the Committee Membership every four (4) years and appoint new members as needed.
7. Appointment of Alternate members - Alternate members shall be specifically named for industry, facility and government positions and shall be appointed in the same manner as Committee members. Alternates can vote in the absence of the regular Committee member and have full rights and responsibilities of the Committee member in his/her absence. Upon resignation of an Advisory Committee member, a new member shall be appointed in accordance with this section of the Bylaws.
8. Attendance - It is expected that members will be present and participate at all regular meetings. Members who are absent from four or more regular meetings in one calendar year may be asked by the Executive Officer or Committee Chair to resign. Industry, facility and government representatives who send alternates to attend in their absence will be counted as present.

OFFICERS

1. The permanent Chairperson of the Committee shall be a Council appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.
2. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Committee shall be chaired by the Vice-Chairperson which shall be a Councilor appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Subcommittees may be established by the Chairperson as necessary upon request of the Committee. Membership composition shall be determined according to mission and may include individuals who are not members of the Committee. All such subcommittees shall report to the Committee.

MN:clk

s:\share\p&ts\swac\bylaws\byl0197.2

**SWAC Roster
As of March 1999**

Voting Members (21 Positions)

Committee Member	Representing	Affiliation	Appointed
Committee Chair			
Ed Washington		Metro	1/99
Recycling Industry (1 position)			
John Drew*		Far West Fibers	4/93
Hauling Industry (4 positions)			
Steve Schwab*	Clackamas County area	Sunset Garbage	4/93
<vacant>	Multnomah County area		
Tom Miller*	Washington County area	Miller's Sanitary Service	4/93
David White*	Region-wide	ORRA/Tri-County Council	1/95
Solid Waste Facilities (4 positions)			
Garry Penning		Waste Management	10/96
Ralph Gilbert*		East County Recycling	4/93
Tom Wyatt*		BFI	4/93
Merle Irvine		Willamette Resources	1/97
Citizens (4 positions)			
Michael Misovetz	Clackamas County		1/97
Barbara Miller**	East Multnomah County		1/97
Jeanne Roy*	City of Portland		4/93
Frank Deaver	Washington County		1/97
Local Governments (7 positions)			
Susan Keil*	City of Portland		4/93
Rick Winterhalter	Clackamas County		4/98
JoAnn Herrigel	Clackamas County cities		1/97
Gary Hansen***	Multnomah County		1/94
Cathy Butts	Multnomah County cities		3/99
Lynne Storz*	Washington County		4/93
Loreen Mills	Washington County cities		1/96

Non-Voting Members (6 positions)

Committee Member	Representing	Affiliation	Appointed
Bruce Warner	Metro		12/96
Ed Druback	DEQ		5/96
Jim Sears***	Marion County		4/93
Ellen Ries***	Yamhill County		4/93
Carol Devenir-Moore	Clark County		1/96
Brian Campbell***	Port of Portland		4/93
Doug DeVries	associate member	STS	7/98

* Over 4 years served ** Not active *** Over 4 years served & not active