

# A G E N D A



METRO

MEETING: **REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

DATE: Monday, July 26, 2004

TIME: 3:00 p.m. – 4:50 p.m.

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

**5 mins. I. Call to Order and Announcements Susan McLain**

Announcements

Responses to Issues from the June 28th Meeting

\*Approval of Minutes

**10 mins. II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update Doug Anderson**

**15 mins. \*III. Fork it Over! Food Donation Campaign Jennifer Erickson**

Most owners, managers and employees of food businesses know that Oregon has one of the highest hunger rates in the nation, yet edible food often goes to waste because decision-makers and staff don't have the best information about how to donate in a way that is safe, legal and convenient. Metro's FORK IT OVER! campaign is designed to reduce waste and encourage increased donation of excess prepared foods by restaurants, catering companies, institutional kitchens and grocery stores. The aim is to educate decision makers in these businesses about the safety and legality of donating these foods to charitable agencies, and to help establish connections between food businesses and charitable agencies to make the process of donating easier.

**75 mins. \*IV. RSWMP Issue Discussion: The 62% Goal Susan McLain**

One of the region's big challenges in years ahead is to make further progress in waste reduction. The current RSWMP and state law identify a waste reduction goal for the region of 62% in 2005 and 64% in 2009. How were those figures arrived at? Where are we now? Do the current goals make economic sense? Why do goals matter? A panel of four speakers will address these and other issues associated with the regional goal. SWAC members will be asked to weigh in on what promises to be a lively discussion.

Panel: Mary Sue Gilliland, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Doug Anderson, Metro Solid Waste & Recycling Department  
Jerry Powell, Resource Recycling magazine  
John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute

**5 mins. V. Other business and adjourn Susan McLain**

*\* 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 Susan McLain (797-1553)  
Staff: Janet Matthews (797-1826)

Alternate Chair: Councilor Rod Park (797-1547)  
Committee Clerk: Michele Adams (797-1649)

**Solid Waste Advisory Committee Meeting Summary**  
**June 28, 2004**

**Attendees:**

Vince Gilbert	Mark Altenhofen	Mary Sue Gilliland
Dean Large	Mike Misovetz	Glenn Zimmerman
Mike Leichner	Sarah Jo Chaplen	Bruce Walker
Mike Miller	David White	Dean Kampfer
Steve Schwab	Matthew Cusma	Easton Cross
Marta McGuire	Bill Metzler	Lee Barrett
Karen Feher	Barb Disser	Dan Cutugno
Jeff Murray	Michele Adams	Mike Hogle
Susan McLain	Janet Matthews	

**I. Call to Order and Announcements** **Mike Hogle/Susan McLain**

- Mr. Mike Hogle convened the meeting.
- Approval of April 19, 2004, Meeting Summary: Mr. Vince Gilbert motioned to approve the summary; Mr. Mike Leichner seconded the motion; all responded aye; the Meeting Summary passed as read.
- Councilor McLain mentioned that Metro has a new food donation program, Fork It Over, to encourage restaurants, institutions and grocery stores to donate usable food.

**II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update** **Mike Hogle**

- Mr. Hogle announced the four proposers for the operation of Metro's transfer stations are Oregon Resource Recovery (ORR), BFI, NorCal and Waste Management. An evaluation committee evaluated the proposals, allocating up to 50 points for cost, 25 points for recovery and 25 points for operations and maintenance. Metro will soon begin negotiations with the highest scoring proposer, ORR.
- Mr. Hogle said that three proposals were received for transportation, processing and composting services for organic wastes. Metro will enter into negotiations with Cedar Grove Composting, the highest scoring proposer.
- Mr. Hogle mentioned that a letter regarding Metro's new rates effective July 1, and September 1, was sent to all haulers and facilities.
- Mr. Hogle announced that due to lots of uncertainty surrounding food waste and yard debris composting, Metro would coordinate an all-day seminar on these issues, probably in September. Specific issues that will be addressed include cradle-to-grave handling of these materials, processing techniques, regulations and future direction of the industry.
- Mr. Hogle congratulated Metro staff and SWAC members for awards presented at the AOR conference including: Freda Sherburne, Recycler of the Year; Metro's paint program, Alice Soderwell Waste Prevention Award; Gresham's Great Business Program; and Pride Recycling, Processor of the Year.

### III. RSWMP Planning Issues

Janet Matthews

Ms. Matthews explained that this is SWAC's opportunity to preview staff's recommendations on key planning issues to be addressed in the update of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) before these recommended issues are presented for Council consideration. She reviewed the handouts provided to SWAC about identifying key planning issues for the RSWMP update. Ms. Matthews stressed the importance of the key planning issues, as they will constitute the meat of the plan update development discussions and will be the areas of concentrated allocation of staff resources. Decisions on the key issues will ultimately lead to a set of regional priorities for the next decade and affirm or modify current RSWMP policies. They may also guide investments in certain programs or facilities.

Ms. Matthews reviewed the key issues categories identified during the last plan update in 1994-5: waste reduction; service provision; revenue, equity and stability; and collection and technology changes in solid waste facilities. Ms. Matthews reviewed the RSWMP Planning Issues Matrix and explained that staff applied certain guidelines to this matrix to narrow issues into the four key planning issues proposed for this update: regional waste reduction goal; increasing sustainability; public services; and system regulation. Councilor McLain asked if this list of key planning issues implies a reordering of priority?

Mr. Dean Large asked how the 56% waste recovery goal was arrived at? Ms. Matthews explained that the RSWMP appendix contains a set of calculations and other detail about the expected results of strategies in waste reduction; those calculations were used to determine the 56% recovery goal. She added that SWAC could expect a presentation on the waste recovery goal at an upcoming meeting. Ms. Mary Sue Gilliland briefly explained how the State legislature directed the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to set a statewide recovery goal and DEQ arrived at a goal to recover 50% statewide.

Mr. David White remarked that the underlying theme for this update might be behavior modification, because citizens' current commitment has reached a plateau, and the question is how much money and time can be spent to modify people's behavior. He said that without behavior modification, Metro would have to completely regulate recycling and rates in order to reach the waste recovery goal.

Mr. Murray observed that when quantity is stressed, quality can suffer, and cautioned against losing sight of quality.

Ms. Sarah Jo Chaplen voiced agreement with Mr. White regarding the need for behavior change. Mr. Vince Gilbert also agreed and added that there is a fine balance between higher tip fees encouraging alternatives to disposal and increases in illegal dumping. Mr. Bruce Walker agreed with these views, but added the perspective that this region is struggling along, but at one of the highest recovery rates of any metropolitan area in the country. Many things have been accomplished, but improving coordination and the way things are done, such as in the multifamily recycling program and in collection, could further the region's accomplishments.

Mr. Steve Schwab agreed with the previous comments and added that people will not be pleased if a tip fee is artificially raised so more money can be thrown at the issue. Mr.

Schwab observed that two citizens on a committee does not constitute public opinion, and said citizen support of a waste reduction goal and the funds required to achieve it must be gauged. Mr. White said he is not advocating artificially inflating the tip fee, as this would only irritate people unless their behavior is modified to the extent that they believe waste reduction and sustainability are important.

Committee members discussed the region's garbage bills compared to other metropolitan areas and concluded that some are higher and some are lower, but that disposal is probably more expensive here.

Mr. Mike Hoglund said that a discussion guide is being prepared that will be used to stimulate discussions with citizens on the regional waste reduction goal.

Ms. Matthews reviewed the primary discussion groups during development of a draft RSWMP update: Council discussions; recycling policy development discussions; RSWMP project team, including public outreach; and, SWAC review and discussion of all issue areas prior to Council's review of the draft Plan. She added that more review committees and processes would probably be added, as necessary.

#### **IV. Developing Potential New Recycling Policies**

**Lee Barrett**

Mr. Lee Barrett said Council directed staff to engage various parties in a public involvement process to further develop two strategies to increase dry waste recovery. The contingency plan work group recommended that Metro consider requirements that all construction and demolition (C&D) loads generated in the region be MRFd and if that does not work, then all dry waste loads generated in the region should be MRFd. Council recommended combining those approaches. Mr. Barrett said staff believes a requirement that all dry waste loads be MRFd will essentially only affect two landfill facilities – Lakeside Reclamation and Hillsboro Landfill – and generators and haulers in Clackamas and Multnomah counties will not be impacted. This requirement will be facility-based and will not require haulers or generators do anything different. This requirement is a stopgap measure to recover material that has not been source-separated. He explained that staff are organizing a committee to review program concepts and evaluate whether they are viable. A key question for this committee will be how to measure recovery – by percentage or by commodity. Mr. Barrett said staff recognize this requirement has the potential to affect rates by requiring capital expenditures at the two landfills. After committee review, and with their recommendations, a program design will be presented for Council consideration.

Mr. Jeff Murray asked for clarification on Council's expectations. Mr. Barrett, Mr. Hoglund and Councilor McLain explained that Councilors considered the pros and cons of the two options for increasing dry waste recovery, then directed staff to develop a program whereby all dry waste would be MRFd. In part, this will avoid the issue of how to define what a C&D load is. If that does not work, the program can be scaled back to only require that all C&D loads be MRFd. Mr. Murray said that it should not be hard to define what a C&D load is; they are easy to identify.

Mr. Vince Gilbert agreed that it should not be difficult for all facilities to recover 25% of dry waste, but cautioned that the viability of such recovery is contingent on the market.

Mr. Dean Large asked if the committee would look at the recovery percentage requirement. Mr. Barrett explained that the committee would recommend whether Metro should require recovery at a certain percent or by commodities. Mr. Large asked why it would only be required at these two facilities, and Mr. Barrett explained that recovery facilities in the region are already required to recover 25% of dry waste, so nothing will change for them.

Mr. Murray explained that currently, poor loads can be diverted to these two landfills so they will not impact a facility's recovery rate. Also, businesses will now be required to recycle. He said that current approaches seem to be different than the work group's original recommendations. Councilor McLain replied that she believes the philosophy is to do things better in the future than they are done today, and to create equity for those that are currently trying to recover more. Mr. Murray suggested that mandatory requirements on dry waste recovery could influence people to take different actions in source separation.

In response to a question, Mr. Barrett said the composition of the committee will be two government representatives from Washington County, both affected landfills, Washington County haulers, and two generator representatives – one from a construction company and one a dry waste generator, such as from a big box retailer.

Mr. White stated that holding the two landfills in Washington County to a percentage recovery requirement makes sense because it is the same at regional facilities. However, if they are held to commodity recovery requirements, it is not equitable.

Mr. Steve Schwab observed that vertically integrated companies may have an easier time insuring that their facilities meet the 25% recovery level required to receive regional system fee credits. Non-integrated companies now have the option to divert loads to these two landfills, but that option is being taken away and it will be more difficult to meet recovery requirements.

Councilor McLain said Metro is striving for equity within the system while increasing recovery. The committee's recommendations will be reported back to SWAC. Mr. Hogle said that Metro is aware that there are potential ripple effects; that new requirements on the two landfills may impact other facilities. He said that system economics and cost recovery are important elements of any new program. For example, the Rate Review Committee recommended that the system fee credit program be phased out over time, and these new recovery requirements could create enough consistency and equity within the system that facilities could recover costs through rates and credits would not be as necessary.

Mr. Barrett explained that Council directed staff to develop a program to increase business recycling after consulting with local jurisdictions and business groups, such as Chambers of Commerce. Staff will need to resolve whether local jurisdictions should implement standards, or if they can customize programs to meet goals. Mr. Hogle added that Council was concerned with the work group's recommendation for a mandatory, regulatory approach and asked staff to identify alternative approaches. Mr. Barrett said staff identified, and are analyzing and soliciting feedback on the following four options: required business recycling; disposal bans on certain materials; a rate mechanism

providing an incentive to recycle in franchised areas; and, performance based goals in local jurisdictions for their businesses to meet. Interestingly, the Washington County Managers group said perhaps uniform program requirements across jurisdictions are a good idea, because it would create equity between businesses across jurisdictions.

Mr. Gilbert speculated that if businesses were required to source separate certain commodities, it could make it difficult for facilities to meet the 25% recovery requirement.

Councilor McLain emphasized that policies are still in the development stage and SWAC will be briefed on the substance of conversations with the various jurisdictions and businesses prior to further Council action.

## **V. Other Business and Adjourn**

**Susan McLain**

Councilor McLain announced the July meeting date and as there was no further business, adjourned the meeting.

---

### **Documents to be kept with the record of the meeting (copies available upon request):**

#### Agenda Item I:

- Meeting Summary of the April 19, 2004, SWAC meeting (included in agenda packet)

#### Other:

- SWAC Survey (included in agenda packet)

#### Agenda Item III:

- RSWMP Planning Issues Matrix – By Topic (included in agenda packet)
- Identifying Key Planning Issues for the RSWMP Update (handout)
- Guidelines for Narrowing the RSWMP Update Issues List (handout)
- Key Planning Issues (handout)
- RSWMP Update Project Discussion Routes to Draft (handout)

#### Agenda Item IV:

- Resolution No. 04-3455, for the purpose of acknowledging the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Contingency Plan and directing staff to conduct additional outreach and analysis on select contingency strategies (included in agenda packet)
- Staff Report to Resolution No. 04-3455 (included in agenda packet)
- Dry Waste Recovery Work Group, June 2004 (handout)
- Let's Talk Recycling – Business Recycling Approaches Overview (handout)



# Solid Waste Advisory Committee Survey Results

Conducted June 2004

Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) members and alternates were invited to provide feedback via a survey that was distributed along with the agenda packet for the June 28, 2004, meeting. The stated purpose of the survey was to determine: 1) how well SWAC members (or their alternates) feel this advisory body serves the purposes identified [in Metro Code]; 2) whether those purposes are still reasonable or are too narrowly defined; and 3) how well SWAC members or their alternates feel the meetings are planned and executed. There were eleven respondents out of the current membership of forty members and alternate members.

0	not sure
1	strongly disagree
2	disagree
3	agree
4	strongly agree

Average Score	Questions
3.1	Meeting content: SWAC meeting agendas always contain policy and program development or review items for members to discuss and sometimes vote on.
3.4	Meeting frequency: meeting 10 times each year (as has been the case for the past two years) is about the right frequency.
2.9*	Meeting discussions: free-flowing and frank discussion by all members is encouraged at SWAC meetings.
3.2*	Meeting presentations: information is well-presented at SWAC meetings.
2.6	Meeting length: there is adequate time allotted to fully air each item at SWAC meetings.
3	Meeting packet: the SWAC meeting agenda and related materials usually reach me in time to allow review prior to the meeting.
2.3*	SWAC and Metro Policymakers: Metro's Council and Chief Operating Officer value SWAC's input on solid waste plans, policies and practices.
3.5*	SWAC's purpose: Metro should broaden SWAC's purpose, for example, "Advise the Chief Operating Officer and Council on solid waste impacts of proposed Metro budgets."

\* Average not including score(s) of "0 – not sure"

## Further Comments<sup>1</sup>:

1. Meeting content: SWAC meeting agendas always contain policy and program development or review items for members to discuss and sometimes vote on.

*An example is that budget cuts to certain recycling programs were not discussed as policy in SWAC.*

2. Meeting frequency: meeting 10 times each year (as has been the case for the past two years) is about the right frequency.

*It depends upon the need for [input?] Depending upon the item, SWAC should meet more often.*

<sup>1</sup> Further comments were encouraged when a "disagree" or "strongly disagree" score was chosen.

*Content is more important than frequency. However, I sometimes am puzzled by the last-minute cancellations. It seems to me that there are many significant matters at issue that would warrant a full year's schedule.*

3. Meeting discussions: free-flowing and frank discussion by all members is encouraged at SWAC meetings.  
*Discussions are usually frank, however, Councilor McLain often cuts off individuals and group debate. She seems eager to end discussions and does not solicit the input of constituencies which are less vocal than others. She not infrequently expresses irritation with members of the committee and staff.*  
*The dialog of these meetings has been directed from Metro staff to the interested parties. For whatever reason there seems to be very little dialog coming from the industry to Metro. More often than not it is a very one sided conversation.*
4. Meeting presentations: information is well-presented at SWAC meetings.  
*Staff does a good job on presentations but sometimes the breadth is limited (not all options discussed).*  
*Except sometimes an item needs more explanation time, but it is on a fast track to go to Metro's Council and it feels very rushed.*
5. Meeting length: there is adequate time allotted to fully air each item at SWAC meetings.  
*Generally this is the case. Would like to take a greater role in RSWMP development than has been done so far.*  
*I think the agenda planning is good, however, my comments about actual discussions apply (see #3).*
6. Meeting packet: the SWAC meeting agenda and related materials usually reach me in time to allow review prior to the meeting.  
*[unclear] on a Thursday means if it is large I am reading it over my weekend. I'd really [rather] we would get it a working week ahead of time.*  
*Receiving small agenda packets two business days before the meeting is not ideal but is okay. However, we frequently receive large, complicated packets with the same short notice. This is particularly frustrating when the issues are of major importance and the meeting is the SWAC's only opportunity to comment as a group. I would imagine that only lobbyists paid to attend the meetings can keep up.*
7. SWAC and Metro Policymakers: Metro's Council and Chief Operating Officer value SWAC's input on solid waste plans, policies and practices.  
*It appears that solid waste & recycling is a low priority.*  
*Sometimes it seems hard to tell if SWAC's advice is really sought and makes a difference, or if it is merely a stop on the input board.*  
*I perceive them to put a much higher value on the opinions of stakeholders with paid lobbyists than on the SWAC's input as a multistakeholder advisory group.*  
*It's not immediately obvious of this. Because I don't have direct issues such as rate increases as a top priority, I'm not attending a lot of council sessions to know first hand if our input is valued.*
8. SWAC's purpose: Metro should broaden SWAC's purpose, for example, "Advise the Chief Operating Officer and Council on solid waste impacts of proposed Metro budgets."  
*I don't think SWAC's purpose needs to be broadened in order for the SWAC to advise Council on solid waste impacts of proposed Metro budgets. Section 2.19.130(1) seems to give us this authority already. We can't evaluate policy options in a vacuum. We need to know if we should be ranking policy/program options due to limited funds.*  
*An example of this would be how does a proposed policy change, fee increase, recycling credit to MRF's etc. effect the hauling community. Metro policies have created an uneven playing field in the Portland commercial market. Metro collects fees from all commercial haulers, and then provides a credit (kick back)*



*to MRF's. These MRF's in turn charge the same disposal rate as at Metro facilities and provide "volume discounts" to their own hauling company or to "preferred" hauling companies. These companies then take the savings, provided by Metro, and offer service at rates that are subsidized by Metro.*

*Currently the Metro SWAC is a very purposeless committee. It needs a sense of direction and purpose to be effective.*

*Not having a long historical background, it seems to me the SWAC is underused – its an official body but the operational style seems to be unofficial capacity, seldom is there a direct vote of the SWAC for or against anything.*

9. Please list any topics that you think SWAC should be informed of and/or discuss.

*a) How do you plan to lower cost to citizen rate payers.*

*b) Input from citizen should be more valued for the service provider.*

*Solid waste impacts of proposed Metro budgets, policy regarding rate-setting.*

*Maybe a more direct connection between State level and local? Maybe it exists already and I'm just unaware of it but a flowchart of who does what, where materials go, who handles what (franchise areas for example or facilities). I'm a big picture person and having some charts to follow allow me to better understand the whole picture so when an issue is brought before the SWAC I understand most of the implications.*



## What is Fork It Over?

### It's a campaign to

- inspire **increased donation of excess prepared foods** by restaurants, catering companies, institutional kitchens and grocery stores.
- educate decision makers** in these businesses about the safety and legality of donating
- help **establish connections** between food businesses and charitable agencies to make donating easier.

## Why does Fork It Over exist?

**Hunger** is a major concern.

- Oregon ranks worst in the nation for hunger.
- According to Oregon Food Bank, last year 50,000 people in the metro area needed food assistance. Over 40% were children.

**Food waste** accounts for more than 190,000 tons of waste each year—much of it could be helping fight hunger.

### **Restaurant/food professionals want to help.**

Decision-makers and staff don't have the best information about how to donate in a way that is **safe, legal and convenient**.

## Breaking the myths

### It's safe

- Fresh and prepared foods are in demand by food rescue agencies.
- Many foods that have been prepared for the public but not served can be donated, including unserved menu and buffet items, deli foods, produce, dairy etc.
- Food service staff is already trained to handle food safely; food rescue agencies follow the same guidelines.
- This is not risky business. Both Oregon and Federal Good Samaritan laws (The Bill Emerson Food Donation Act of 1996) protect the donor from liability as long as you donate food you believe to be safe and edible.

### It's Simple

- There is a food rescue agency to fit specific needs-regular or sporadic donation.
- Food agencies will do pick-ups.
- Some agencies even provide containers.
- Metro will help donors set up a program.

## **It's the right thing to do**

Food donations:

- Benefit people in need.
- Show customers that businesses care about our community.
- Increase employee satisfaction.

## **How does Fork It Over work?**

### **A Commitment to Fighting Hunger**

- Businesses make a **public commitment to donate** excess prepared food to a charitable agency either on a regularly scheduled basis, or as needed.
- No specific donation date or size of donation.
- Commitments recognized in advertising, on the web site and with PR.

### **Metro will provide free assistance**

- Support** from Metro staff in setting up a donation program.
- Informative brochures** with detailed information about what can be donated.
- Instructional posters** with simple steps on how to prepare food for donation.
- Stickers** for front window of business to let customers know who's participating.
- Specific information** about the food rescue agencies picking up in each part of the region.

## **Who else is Forking It Over?**

A select group of industry representatives have made the first commitments to join this campaign. These **Fork It Over! Pioneer Donors** are inspiring other businesses to help end hunger in our communities.

### **Assaggio Restaurant**

Bon Appetit Management Company-all sites

### **Culinary Artistry**

### **DeAngelo's Catering**

Food Front Coop. Grocery

### **Hot Lips Pizza**

Nike cafeterias

### **Noodlin'**

Portland Marriott Downtown on the Waterfront

### **Reedville Catering**

### **Salvador Molly's Restaurant & Catering**

Veritable Quandary

Western Culinary Inst./Le Cordon Bleu Program

Whole Foods Market Portland

Willamette Falls Hospital

**For more information visit [www.forkitover.org](http://www.forkitover.org)**



**Solid Waste Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Monday, July 26, 2004**  
**3 p.m. to 5 p.m.**  
**Metro**  
**Room 370**

**RSWMP Issue Discussion:** Examining the Regional Waste Reduction Goal

**Format:**

- Speakers: 10-15 minutes each
- Q&A: 20 minutes

**Speaker #1:** Mary Sue Gilliland, DEQ

10 minutes

Mary Sue will talk about the objectives of the waste reduction goals—e.g., what the goals were intended to accomplish; how we are doing reaching those goals; and implications for future if goals are not met. Also, how do waste reduction goals factor into the state's solid waste management plan update.

**Speaker #2:** Doug Anderson, SW&R Department

15 minutes

Doug will give an overview of how the 62 percent waste reduction goal was established and what has changed.

**Speaker #3:** John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute

15 minutes

Perspective: A market-based approach to recycling and recovery. Does a 62 percent goal make environmental and economic sense?

**Speaker #4:** Jerry Powell, Resource Recycling Magazine

15 minutes

Perspective: Why it matters that we spend time and energy and dollars (public and private) on waste reduction.