

A G E N D A



METRO

MEETING: **REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

DATE: Monday, December 13, 2004

TIME: 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

PLACE: Council Chambers and Annex, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

- 5 mins. **I. Call to Order and Announcements** .....**Susan McLain**  
*Announcements*  
*Responses to Issues from the November 15th Meeting*  
*Approval of Minutes*
- 10 mins. **II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update**..... **Janet Matthews**
- 60 mins. **III. Let's Talk Trash: Public Input for the RSMWP Update** ..... **Jan O'Dell**  
*This Fall, Metro staff developed the "Let's Talk Trash" discussion guide as the basis for a series of public meetings about three key planning issues: (1) How well garbage and recycling services meet the public's needs; (2) whether more effort and investment should be put toward reaching our regional waste reduction goal; and (3) to what degree sustainability principles should guide solid waste practices in the regional system. The purpose of this agenda item is to (a) summarize the viewpoints and preferences expressed during the Let's Talk Trash public meetings and through the on-line questionnaire; (b) relay Council comments received to date, and then (c) engage SWAC members in a discussion about the most significant public input and how it should guide elements of the draft plan.*
- 10 mins. **IV. 2005 SWAC Workplan** ..... **Janet Matthews**  
*This agenda item is intended to preview topics anticipated for the first six months of SWAC meetings in 2005, and get feedback from SWAC members about other regional topics that should be explored.*
- 5 mins. **V. Other Business and Adjourn**.....**Susan McLain**

**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: Susan Moore (797-1643)



**METRO**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Solid Waste Advisory Committee**  
Metro Regional Center, Council Annex  
November 15, 2004

**Members / Alternates Present:**

Councilor Susan McLain, Chair  
Mike Hogle  
Wade Lange  
John Lucini  
Matt Korot  
Heather Hansen

Mike Miller  
Steve Schwab  
David White  
Dean Kampfer  
Mark Altenhofen  
Babe O’Sullivan

David Allaway  
Ray Phelps  
Tom Badrick  
Rick Winterhalter  
Eric Merrill  
Paul Edwards

**Guests and other Metro staff:**

Janet Matthews  
Roy Brower  
Steve Kraten  
Jerry Powell

Lee Barrett  
Scott Klag  
Karen Feher  
Kevin Six

Jim Watkins  
Barry Peine  
Gina Cubbon

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

- Councilor Susan McLain convened the meeting, and asked everyone to introduce themselves.
- David Allaway of the Oregon DEQ announced the preliminary recycling figures for 2003. While disposal was up approximately 20,000 tons (a 0.4% increase per capita over 2002), recovery was up by 58,000 tons, bringing it to 50.9%. “All the major materials are up,” he said, including asphalt roofing, corrugated cardboard, high grade and mixed paper, newspaper, scrap metal, wood waste, and yard debris. Waste generation per capita, however, is up (6.5%). The region’s recovery rate increased by 3%, bringing it to 50.9%. Final numbers will be released in a few weeks.
- Councilor McLain introduced Heather Hansen, who will be representing Clackamas County rate-payers.
- With no changes or additions to the minutes from the October 25 meeting forthcoming, Tom Badrick moved they be accepted as written; Matt Korot seconded the motion, which was then passed unanimously.

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

- Mr. Hogle announced that on Tuesday, December 7 at 2 pm, an informal Council Work Session will focus on the new recycling policies being spear-headed by Lee Barrett.
- Additionally at the session, Jan O’Dell and Janet Matthews will give an update on RSWMP public involvement activities. Since the original round of Let’s Talk Trash meetings, several community groups in targeted neighborhoods have participated in the process. Combined results from all the meetings will be discussed.

- At the December 14 work session, Janet Matthews will speak about a dredge sediment policy report. Metro is considering revising the fees and taxes collected on dredge material that goes to landfills. URS was hired to compile pertinent information about dredge issues such as how the sediment is collected, and disposal options.
- Doug Anderson and Mr. Hoglund will do a presentation to Council at the January 11 work session regarding disposal system planning for the next several years. Issues include Metro's ownership of its transfer stations, the role of private transfer stations, disposal caps (existing and possible future caps), host fees, disposal fees, etc. Much of this will work into the RSWMP. Janet Matthews added that in February and March, various RSWMP issues will be brought to SWAC for discussion.
- Councilor McLain mentioned that the Council is working on improving the Tuesday work sessions. The process is being refined to better accommodate testimony so that industry or other stakeholders can be more involved in session agenda items.
- Mr. Hoglund announced that the five-year contract with Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI) for Metro transfer station operations has been approved by Council.
- Columbia Environmental has applied to build a new transfer station. The first reading before Council will be November 18, followed by a hearing and presentations by the applicant and staff in early December. The current staff recommendation is denial.
- Roy Brower announced that two public notices were sent to the SWAC via e-mail. The first is regarding Thermo Fluids, who is proposing to re-load waste from clean-ups, sort out the hazardous waste, consolidate the rest into drop boxes and take them to a landfill. They will also be involved in collecting and de-watering non-hazardous sludge. The other public notice regards USA Junk, who propose to become a dry mixed-waste MRF. No staff recommendation has been made yet for either license application; comments will be taken through December 13.

### III. Hospital Waste Management ..... Tom Badrick

Mr. Badrick, who works for Legacy Health Systems, explained ways that area hospitals are improving their management of waste. "Portland has a whole bunch of hospital systems that are doing a remarkable job [in waste recovery, but] are not getting enough national attention."

There are currently over 20 collection points for regular solid waste generated by hospitals, collecting approximately 200 tons of waste per month. Medical waste generates roughly 38 tons of material per month. Last year, 1,915 tons of hospital waste was recycled (mostly paper and cardboard). Many improvements are being made to this waste system. For instance, "sterile blue wrap" is used to sterilize implements; this material is recycled thanks to a partnership between some local hospitals, Kimberlee Clark, and Waste Management. The program began 15 years ago; the Northwest is the only part of the US doing this successfully.

Mr. Badrick went on to define medical waste (versus solid waste), which includes pathogen waste, chemotherapy, hypodermics ("sharps"), etc. Most is disposed in red bags to indicate that it is medical waste; however, regular, recoverable material such as paper sometimes gets mixed in, so this is one issue being addressed. Common-sense changes in waste management have cut Legacy's \$1 million annual garbage bill by almost half. For instance, autoclaving (steam sterilization) has reduced waste costs considerably. Additionally, the plastic portions of sharps are going to start being recycled. They're also looking for savings in water, electricity, and by source-reduction, as well as food composting. A round-table of hospital representatives convenes quarterly to discuss issues and exchange ideas.

Unfortunately, not much headway has been made regarding pharmaceutical waste, Mr. Badrick said. Mr. Allaway added that the DEQ is looking into the problem of residential pharmaceutical waste. People have been taught for decades to flush old medicine down the drain, and that is not a

good idea in terms of water quality. A group of DEQ staff is working on identifying best management practices for pharmaceuticals.

**IV. Illegal Dumping Update.....Roy Brower with Steve Kraten**

Metro has had an illegal dumping program in place for the past ten years. The main goal is to quickly and efficiently clean-up illegal dumpsites and prosecute as much as possible. Work includes cleanups on public property, investigating incidents, and assisting local jurisdictions with large-scale cleanups such as homeless camps. "One small dump breeds a larger dump," Mr. Brower commented. Quick clean-up helps prevent a larger problem. The goal is to not simply clean up, but to solve the bigger problem. Population density, he has noticed, forces more illegal dumpers to go further out, into farm and forest lands. Clackamas County has created a full-time position just to keep an eye on forest lands.

Mr. Brower described how the program works, and how it benefits the Region's goals. Future plans include further collaboration with local governments and businesses to help prevent illegal dumping, and expanding education / outreach. Most of the program's work thus far has been within the City of Portland, and Multnomah and Clackamas counties. Councilor McLain stressed that she hopes Washington County will take more advantage of the services offered.

Wade Lange asked how high illegal dumping fines are. Mr. Brower responded that the most Metro can fine is \$1,000 + the cost of the clean-up. The money is not, he said, easy to collect.

(See attached for complete highlights of Mr. Brower's presentation.)

**V. E-waste Policy Developments in the US .....Jerry Powell**

Councilor McLain introduced Resource Recycling Magazine's Jerry Powell. Resource Recycling recently held the only national conference dealing with the issue of "e-waste" (electronic waste, primarily computers and related items). Over 500 attendees discussed the growing problem; his magazine's readers currently name e-waste the number 1 topic of interest in the recycling field. 1,000 communities in the US have some form of stable e-scrap recovery. A recent survey of 179 such programs showed that many are charging fees, and seeing stable processing fees. There is also a trend towards permanent facilities rather than collection events. While 3/4ths of e-waste collection programs surveyed note rising participation, "...still, participation on any one event is only one to two percent of the community," Mr. Powell noted.

The top issues surrounding collection of e-waste are lack of value, logistics (cost of diesel, shipping, etc.), cost of processing, and plastics. On a national or regional level, Mr. Powell continued, there are roughly five options. "You can do the Oregon option: Little or nothing," he remarked. That is the most common option at this time. Another option is for government to institute landfill bans, but that requires having a recovery system to handle the materials. Up-front retail charges (point of purchase) could capture funding for recycling systems. In January 2005, California will begin a program in which a \$6-10 fee will be charged at the time of purchase on all display devices – CRTs, flat bale, plasma, laptop, and television. "They had to hire 36 tax collectors to find the 225,000 places in California that sell those items," Mr. Powell said. The state will pay reclaimers \$0.48/lb for the material, keeping \$0.28, and giving the other \$0.20 to local government to administer the program. "The cost of the good pays for the recycling," is the logic, he stated. Another system would require producers to run the system; Japan and nearly 25 countries in Europe are having success with this option. Finally, there is an option to use a combination of these.

Continuing, Mr. Powell described a program Maine is about to begin, and of various legislation being considered throughout the country. In addition to the up-front fees program, California has passed legislation requiring all cell phones be taken back rather than disposed.

**VI. Other Business and Adjourn..... Susan McLain**

- Dave White asked that more RSWMP pieces be discussed with the SWAC. In the absence of very much public interest, he feels discussing issues with SWAC would add other perspectives. After some discussion of what the members would like, Ms. Matthews stated that plans currently are to have SWAC delving deeply into some of the RSWMP sections at the February and March meetings. Councilor McLain said she will discuss what to bring to the SWAC with Ms. Matthews and Mr. Hoglund and send the group an e-mail with the results.
- Councilor McLain thanked everyone for attending, and adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

---

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

Update: Metro's Illegal Dumping Program

gbc  
M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\MINUTES\2004\SWAC111504min.DOC  
Queue

# **Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update**

## **Summary Report of Public Outreach for “Let’s Talk Trash”**

**December, 2004**

**Prepared by Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC**

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Public Outreach Efforts</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of Public Meetings Hosted by Metro</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Summary of SWAC Meeting</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Summary of Meetings Hosted by Neighborhood Associations, Civic Organizations and Area Schools</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Summary of Questionnaires</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix A: Discussion Guide</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix B: Discussion Leaders' Guide</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix C: Agenda</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Appendix D: Informational Materials</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Appendix E: Additional Comments</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Appendix F: Questionnaire Data</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Appendix G: Summary of Franklin High School Questionnaires</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Appendix H: Meeting notes</b>	<b>94</b>

# Executive Summary

## Overview

Metro's Phase Two public involvement activities in support of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan update (RSWMP) took place between August and December 2004. During this phase, Metro hosted and facilitated "Let's Talk Trash" discussions with the public, made several presentations at an area high school, and gathered input from its Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC). The purpose of the outreach was to collect opinions, preferences and ideas related to three key issue areas:

1. Do garbage and recycling services meet your needs?
2. How much can we recycle?
3. How can sustainability principles guide solid waste practices?

Outreach materials included a discussion guide providing background information on the issues; approaches and tradeoffs with a question posed for discussion; and a questionnaire. Both tools were available on Metro's web site.

Overall, 88 people attended Metro's hosted or facilitated discussions and 151 people submitted comments using the on-line or printed questionnaire. During this period, Metro also recorded more than 1,300 "visits" to Metro's "Let's Talk Trash" web pages.

## Conclusions

Metro's Phase Two outreach efforts attracted a wide array of participants. The discussion with SWAC tapped into a group with expertise in the field of solid waste, and recycling and sustainability; neighborhood and civic organizations drew individuals active in their neighborhoods and communities who may or may not have any particular interest in solid waste management; respondents to the online questionnaire were anonymous, but were tracked by postal zip code to assess geographic representation. Despite their interest in or knowledge of the issues, there was a high level of agreement reflected in participants' responses.

### **The current garbage and recycling system is adequate, but recycling rates and services should be improved.**

Participants generally express a high degree of satisfaction with solid waste and recycling systems. However, each group also expresses the point of view that recycling services could be improved. Specifically, participants would like to see recycling services expanded to make more items -- such as all plastics, food and organic waste, electronics and households hazardous wastes -- eligible for curbside pickup. There also is a desire to see recycling made easier by using consistent standards (e.g., acceptable materials and preparation instructions) across the region and providing households with larger recycling bins that are covered to protect



recyclables from the elements. While all groups state a willingness to pay for these services, it is uncertain how much people are willing to pay.

**Residents and businesses can do more to recycle; more education and incentives should be emphasized over regulation.**

Questionnaire respondents express only moderate satisfaction with current levels of household and business recycling. Participants prefer incentives to regulations. Some would encourage covering the costs of additional recycling services by charging households and businesses that don't recycle, while other groups are in favor of broadening the scope of the "bottle bill" to include more types of beverage containers. Despite a preference for financial incentives, participants recognize that there is sometimes a need to use regulations to encourage recycling. Parties are generally in favor of requiring businesses to recycle. Other suggested strategies to increase recycling include increasing education in schools and making a larger investment in publicity and informational materials. In particular, resource conservation should be an emphasis of future efforts.

**Home and business sustainability practices should be improved, and government agencies should lead by example.**

Many participants are unfamiliar with the meaning of terms such as "green," "sustainable," and "zero waste." Those who are aware of these concepts are not satisfied with current household and business sustainability practices, and support "greening" the solid waste system and adopting zero waste strategies as long-term goals. The majority of questionnaire respondents feel the region should adopt zero-waste strategies, but it is unclear how much people would be willing to pay for sustainability-related services. Participants generally feel that manufacturers should be encouraged to reduce product packaging and be held responsible for the end-of-life of their products. They also believe that governmental agencies and schools should lead by example when it comes to sustainable practices.

**Bottom line: The current system is generally good, but improvements in services and recycling are desired, with resource conservation as the guiding principal.**

Overall, participants are generally satisfied with solid waste and recycling services, but see room for improvement. Investing in education, expanding recycling services and encouraging corporate responsibility will move the region toward the desired goal of conserving resources through increasing recycling rates, "greening" the solid waste system and zero waste.

## ***Introduction***

Phase Two of public involvement activities for the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) update took place between August and December of 2004. Stakeholder and public input play a large role in shaping the issues and content included in updating Metro's Regional Solid Waste Management Plan for 2005 – 2015. Specific public involvement activities to-date include:

- Phase One – Focus group-style meetings were used to identify and narrow a list of regional issues. The results were reported to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) and Metro Council.
- Phase Two – Metro hosted public and SWAC meetings to collect input on identified issues, approaches and trade-offs identified in Phase One. Outreach materials included a discussion guide and questionnaire. The questionnaire was also available on Metro's web site. Additional public meetings were hosted by neighborhood and civic organizations, and a discussion with high school students also took place.

Subsequent phases of the public involvement process will include stakeholder comments on the draft plan and public hearings with Metro Council on the final draft plan.

Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC (COC) was hired by Metro to advise on incorporating public interests into all phases of the process, facilitate meetings, and provide summaries. The purpose of Phase Two of the RSWMP update is to educate members of the public about some of the key planning issues being considered in the update; evaluate discrete choices that could be made to address these issues; and express preferences for certain approaches.

It should be noted that this report makes no attempt to correct or edit any comments for accuracy. The comments recorded here reflect the participants' opinions and knowledge about the solid waste issues presented in the outreach program.

## ***Public Outreach Efforts***

Public outreach efforts began in Phase Two with Metro hosting three two-hour “Let’s Talk Trash” discussions intended for the general public: Sept. 23 in Portland, Sept. 28 in Oregon City and Oct. 2 in Hillsboro. The meetings were held at various times and locations in order to reach a wide audience. A fourth meeting was held with the Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

In preparation for the public meetings, a discussion guide was developed to help participants understand key solid waste planning issues, examine various approaches and discuss the implications and tradeoffs. It was intended for use at the facilitated public meetings, but could be used as a stand-alone information piece if necessary. A complete discussion guide is included in Appendix A.

Volunteers from Metro staff were recruited to serve as table discussion leaders and note-takers. A “Discussion Leaders’ Guide” was developed to aid them in facilitating their table discussions. A complete copy of the discussion leaders’ guide can be found in Appendix B. A one-hour training was held to familiarize discussion leaders and note-takers with the discussion leaders’ guide. Tips for both discussion leaders and note-takers were distributed at the training. Additional 15 minute trainings were held before each public meeting.

Public participation opportunities were announced and sent by e-mail to approximately 7,000 individuals representing neighborhood associations, environmental advocacy groups, interested parties lists and local government list serves. Notices were distributed at Metro transfer stations and hazardous waste facilities. News releases were sent to reporters and calendar editors at *The Oregonian* and community newspapers; print advertisements were purchased with these same media outlets.

Thirty-eight people attended the three public meetings. At the meetings, group facilitators led participants through an agenda organized by four key questions:

1. Do garbage and recycling services meet your needs?
2. How much can we recycle?
3. How can sustainability principles guide solid waste practices?
4. What is the bottom line?

A similar format was used to obtain feedback at the September 27, 2004 SWAC meeting.

Following each of the public meetings, participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire. The questionnaire asked questions similar to those posed in group discussions, but provided an opportunity for individuals to express their opinions in greater detail. The questionnaire was also offered to the general public online at Metro’s web site ([www.metro-region.org](http://www.metro-region.org)), and nearly 100 questionnaires were submitted on-line

Metro staff and elected officials continued public outreach efforts by making presentations and facilitating discussions with neighborhood associations, community planning organizations, and civic organizations around the region. Fifty people attended four meetings: Nov. 3 at the Gresham Environmental Services Council Advisory Committee, Nov. 3 at the Raleigh West

Neighborhood Association Committee meeting, Nov. 9 at the Five Oaks/Triple Creek Neighborhood Association meeting, and Nov. 11 at the Park Place Neighborhood Association meeting. Different organizations had varying amounts of time available for discussion. When time allowed, a format similar to that of the public meetings hosted by Metro was followed.

Finally, in order to gain a youth perspective, “Let’s Talk Trash” was presented to two freshman political science classes at Franklin High School over three class periods on October 28, 29 and November 3. Approximately 65 students explored several topics to gain a deeper understanding of waste management issues and 37 students completed questionnaires.

While not part of the official “Let’s Talk Trash” public outreach program, Metro also conducted a number of meetings to gather input that will help shape the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan for 2005-2015. Metro conducted meetings with chambers of commerce and other business groups around the region in order to learn what strategies they would prefer to increase recycling in the business sector. In addition, local governments hosted discussions with businesses in their jurisdictions, and provided summaries of that input to Metro. A report to summarize businesses’ input is being compiled outside the scope of this report. Lastly, Metro hosted two meetings seeking input on the hazardous waste portion of the RSWMP – one with a group of technical advisors, and one with citizens.

## ***Summary of Public Meetings Hosted by Metro***

A summary of comments made at the three public meetings is organized by topic. After each summary, specific comments are grouped by similarity. If a comment appeared more than once, numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of times each comment was made. In addition to comments made at the public meetings, nineteen questionnaires were returned by discussion participants.

### **Topic 1 – Do garbage and recycling services meet your needs?**

This question was designed to elicit feedback from residents about whether solid waste management practices and the regional system meet their needs in a convenient and cost-effective way while conserving natural resources and protecting the environment. Specific questions asked include:

1. Does the current system meet your needs?
2. What changes would you recommend to the system?
3. What aspect of the system should be emphasized for the future?

#### Discussion Summary

In general, public participants feel that the current system is adequate, but should be improved in the future.

- More materials should be recycled and more recyclables should be collected curbside. People are generally willing to pay more for increased services.
- Curbside pickup should include plastics, food and organic material, hazardous waste, Styrofoam and electronics.
- Recycling should be more convenient and less costly than garbage disposal.
- Recycling should be made easier by standardizing the program region-wide and providing the public with large, inexpensive recycling bins with covers.
- Education and publicity should be emphasized to get more people recycling.
- In the future, Metro should emphasize resource conservation as a system priority.

#### Specific Comments

- Not enough materials are recycled at curbside. (6)  
Additional materials should include:
  - o Plastics (3)
  - o Food/organics (3)
  - o Yard debris (2)
  - o Hazardous waste (2)
  - o Electronics (2)
- Residents and businesses should receive larger incentives for recycling. Garbage disposal should be more expensive. Recycling should be subsidized with higher landfill disposal rates. There should be special rates for those on fixed incomes. Haulers should not accept recyclable materials from businesses or residents and should charge more for larger garbage cans. Curbside garbage service is too expensive. Self-hauling of garbage

and recyclables is currently easier and cheaper. Reducing waste is not cost-effective. We pay the same rate for a garbage bin no matter how much we put in it. (6)

- Local governments, haulers, and/or consultants need to educate residents, businesses and youth about recycling. Especially about paper and plastics recycling. (5)
- The current system is adequate, but needs to be improved for the future. It is good that metals and aerosols are accepted. (5)
- Recycling bins should be standardized to save money. Bins should be uniform and inexpensive. They should have lids to keep recyclables dry. Roll carts are preferred. (4)
- The collection system should be standardized for the region to ensure consistent separation of recyclables at work and home. There should be increased education efforts because recycling practices are inconsistent across municipalities. (4)
- Styrofoam packaging is an expensive problem. There should be more research & development done for new uses of recycled plastics and Styrofoam. Food-related Styrofoam should not be created because it causes a health risk. Styrofoam manufacturers should be responsible for the recycling/disposal of their products. (3)
- The cost of recycling is secondary to convenience and conservation values. (3)
- Garbage and recycling facilities are convenient in terms of locations and hours of operation. (3)
- The current recycling system does not meet our needs. (3)
- There should be more hazardous waste depots and events. Pickup for special, bulky materials should be publicized. (3)
- There should be more plastics recycling, including materials without necks and plastic bags. (3)
- Citizens and businesses should be recognized for good recycling practices. (2)
- Junk mail creates a confidentiality concern when recycling. Metro should subsidize home paper shredders like they do for home compost bins.
- More products should be made with recycled goods and packaged with less waste.
- The region should use locally-owned haulers.
- Metro should let public know where waste disposal rates are headed in the long term.
- Commingling is costly to society in tax dollars and in the labor to separate materials. It sends the wrong message to the public.
- Rural areas would like to be able to co-mingle.

### Participant Questionnaires

In addition to comments made at the public meetings, the following comments were collected from participant questionnaires:

1. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not satisfied and 5 = very satisfied, indicate your satisfaction with the current garbage and recycling services you use. For example, are services convenient, are facilities easy for you to access and are costs reasonable?

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	5	29.4
2	0	0.0
3	4	23.5
4	6	35.3
5	2	11.8
Average score = 3.0		

While approximately 30% of respondents are not satisfied with the current garbage and recycling services, the remaining 70% of respondents showed an average or above average satisfaction with those same services.

Comments:

- Service is good but needs to be expanded (plastics, Styrofoam, hazardous waste, etc.). (4)
- Rural Washington County services are lacking and commingling is not available. Rate structures cause rural areas to put waste into landfills rather than recycle. (3)
- Recyclable materials are being mixed. The result is poor quality and land-filled residuals.
- Recently discontinued service.
- Costs are too high.
- More publicity of recycling availability to businesses; especially in Washington County.
- Hardship rates for poor families.
- Need more education and information from Metro and haulers.
- Good variety.

2. Are there services you want added, expanded or changed in the future? What are they?

- Recycle more plastics. (5)
- Focus on prevention and education in all sectors. Introductory brochure for new residents. (3)
- Yard debris pickup. (2)
- Larger, covered recycling bins. Roll carts. (2)
- Food collection. (2)
- Incentives for reducing solid waste such as reduced fees for reduced waste and recycling more.
- Increase services for multi-family developments.
- Would like to recycle plastic bags and tubs curbside.
- Clear and consistent recycling rules.
- Expand hazardous waste recovery.
- Remove rural disincentive to recycle.
- Eliminate curbside yard debris collection. People should compost on-site.
- Collect electronics, clothing.
- Convenient collection sites.

3. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = nothing more and 5 = a lot more, indicate how much more you would be willing to pay for any new service, if it were to cost more to provide.

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	3	18.8
2	2	12.5
3	4	25.0
4	4	25.0
5	3	18.8
Average score = 3.13		

Approximately 20% of respondents are not willing to pay more for new services. The remaining 80% are willing to pay more, but the amount they are willing to pay varies.

Comments:

- Willing to pay more. (5)
  - o Five to seven dollars more.
  - o Twenty to twenty five dollars more.
- Paying too much right now. Added expense should not fall upon recyclers. (2)
- Need to demonstrate the benefits.
- Balance costs with an incentive to recycle.
- Solid waste should not fund programs like parks and healthcare.

4. What is most important to you about services in the future? Cost, convenience, resource conservation or other? If other, explain:

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
Cost	2	12.5
Convenience	3	18.8
Resource Conservation	10	62.5
Other (All of the Above)	1	6.3

Approximately two-thirds of respondents said that resource conservation is most important for future services.

Comments:

- Apply sustainability concept to solid waste program.
- Convenience is most important, but cost follows closely.
- Find a way to integrate concepts into a mission statement.
- Convenience. If it is not easy, people won't do it.
- Currently recycling is not convenient (plastic bottles).
- There should be more variety in curbside pickups.
- Need consistent, region-wide and enforced regulations.
- Do not like adding to landfills.
- Conservation and sustainability.
- Resource reclamation and repurposing.



- Encourage waste reduction and re-use rather than recycling.

The following comments were made by participants who submitted written comments in addition to the questionnaire.

- There is a need for standardization of collection. There is great confusion in the region about what is collected and how it should be sorted. Householders don't sort correctly and put out non-recyclable items. Local governments give them separation directions, but householders see the haulers mixing items on the truck. Workplace employees say their hauler won't pick up certain items. In order to impart clear messages to the public, local governments should require haulers to collect recyclables in at least three streams (paper, plastic & metal, and glass) and to keep these items separate in the truck. Then Metro can publicize the system.
- There is a need for food collection from commercial and residential customers. Without this it will be impossible to reach recycling goals.

## **Topic 2 – How much can we recycle?**

This question focused on how much the region can recycle and the level of effort and investment that residents are willing to make to reach or increase the current goal of 62 percent. Questions asked include:

1. Are you satisfied with the current level of effort?
2. Do you want to make a larger investment in educational programs and recycling options?
3. What level of regulation would you support in order to increase recycling?

### Discussion Summary

Public participants are generally satisfied with the current level of recycling, but see room for improvement.

- Incentives are the best way to entice people to recycle, but reasonable regulations should be used where incentives fail.
- Education efforts should focus on school-age children and increasing the participation in paper and plastics recycling. A larger investment should be made in public information and recycling programs.
- Recycling needs to be cheaper and more convenient than trash disposal. This can be accomplished by maintaining high tipping fees, imposing disposal bans on some recyclable materials, improving recycling services in rural areas and increasing the number of items that are collected curbside.
- Metro should model recycling practices for the region.
- People are generally willing to pay more and support further government regulation in order to increase recycling

### Specific Comments

- Regulatory efforts should be a last resort. Recycling programs with incentives such as tax cuts, a levy system on products in landfills and procurement taxes are important. Education and incentives are better than regulation. People are generally unreceptive to governmental intervention or regulation. (6)

- Increase education and funding for education in schools (K-12 and beyond) - they are doing a good job of training children to recycle. (6)
- Recycling should be cheaper and more convenient than disposal. Tipping fees should be high as an incentive to recycle. We need to make recycling more affordable and charge more for garbage disposal. Demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of recycling in the long-term. Correlate recycling rate and disposal costs. Roll carts should be used instead of the current bins. (5)
- Local government should be held accountable for implementing local programs. Metro and local governments should model progressive recycling practices and standards (e.g. rainwater toilets). (4)
- Education: People need to know these services are available and free. Recycling should be better promoted. Send out periodic brochures. Educate citizens about plastics and paper recycling. Recycling education should be coordinated with water, air, wastewater, storm water and solid waste education efforts to avoid confusing and conflicting messages. Recycling information should be included on the back of garbage bills. (4)
- The recycling goal should be 75%. The 62% level can be exceeded via sustainability measures. Generally satisfied with level of effort, but could improve. (4)
- There should be curbside collection of hazardous waste such as anti-freeze, batteries and paint. (3)
- Disposal bans are one solution to limit the disposal of items that can be recycled. (3)
- Financial incentives may be a way to involve more businesses. Recycling saves businesses money. (3)
- Strategies such as building recycling depots should make it easier to recycle in multi-family dwellings. There should be model design programs and an ordinance/permit process. Rental and commercial property management companies should share in the cost of recycling. Recycling bins should be part of kitchen design. (3)
- Need to educate private sector businesses. Businesses need more recycling information and instruction. (2)
- There should be a full lifecycle analysis of recyclables. (2)
- We need to increase the number of items that can be recycled (e.g. construction and demolition, organics, etc.). (2)
- Recycling services need to be improved in unincorporated areas. (2)
- An auditing system should be used to track resident and business recycling. They should get feedback based on the audit. (2)
- Master Recyclers should be used as an educational resource. (2)
- Current regulations are not adequate. More regulations should be placed on businesses to recycle. Hauling practices need to be monitored and regulations enforced. (2)
- The inability to reach current recycling goals shows system insufficiencies.
- Evaluate success of recycling rates by weight rather than material types. Metro should increase analysis of environmental impacts by material content.
- A high recovery rate of energy resources and environmental benefits are not mutually exclusive.

- All environmental impacts should be considered when making decisions about recycling and sustainability (e.g. water pollution, deforestation, etc.).
- Food waste should be separated from its packaging for recycling purposes.
- Source separation would save the economy money.
- The “bottle bill” should be expanded to cover all containers.
- Waste prevention and reuse is preferable to waste diversion and recycling.
- There is a need to develop markets for recycled and recyclable products.

Participant Questionnaires

In addition to comments made at the public meetings, the following comments were collected from participant questionnaires:

5. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not satisfied and 5 = very satisfied, rate your satisfaction with the current level of effort by residents and businesses on recycling.

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	3	17.6
2	5	29.4
3	5	29.4
4	3	17.6
5	1	5.9
Average Score = 2.65		

Nearly 50% of respondents stated that they were unsatisfied with the current efforts by residents and businesses to recycle. Only 23% were more than satisfied with the current level of effort.

Comments:

- So much more to be accomplished. Let’s get to 62% first. (2)
- More effort is needed for construction waste.
- Multi-family development recycling is poor.
- Need more incentives.
- Businesses are not recycling enough especially in Tualatin and Wilsonville.
- Need to increase education for businesses.
- Need more publicity/promotion of current programs.
- We could go to 75% if not for plastic packaging and fabric scraps.
- Need to make it clear and easy for people to recycle.
- Recycling services are available but not well-advertised.
- People recycle too much instead of preventing waste.
- Not nearly enough is being done to educate about reducing and recycling.

6. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not important and 5 = very important, rate the importance to you of making a larger investment in public information and recycling programs.

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	1	5.9
2	1	5.9
3	1	5.9
4	1	5.9
5	13	76.5
Average score = 4.41		

Over 75% of respondents stated that making a larger investment in public information and recycling programs is very important.

Comments:

- Not more investment, but better leadership is consistency of basic information. (2)
- Education should be reducing, reusing, recycling and restoring. (2)
- Need enforcement to support education efforts. (2)
- Coordination is needed between solid waste and water pollution agency education efforts.
- Information – yes. Education – no.
- An educational component is necessary to assist meeting the goal.
- Invest in waste prevention, not recycling.

7. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = no further government regulation and 5 = high level of government regulation, what level of government regulation would you support in order to increase recycling?

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	4	25.0
2	0	0.0
3	3	18.8
4	4	25.0
5	5	31.3
Average score = 3.38		

Over 70% of respondents felt that there should be a moderate to high level of government regulation, while 25% felt that there should be no further government regulation.

Comments:

- Regulation is the only way to standardize the system so that the average person knows what to do. Reasonable regulation to achieve attainable results. (3)
- Balance regulation with incentive and education/prevention. (2)
- Provide financial incentives and disincentives before regulations.
- Promote and enforce existing state laws. Most people will recycle if they know it's available.
- Try public information first.

- Uncertain how this should be done. Ban non-recyclable packaging? Tax on plastic bags?
- Need incentives for businesses to recycle.
- There should be no containers or packaging or products that cannot be recycled.
- Do not regulate.
- Need better leadership to educate and motivate the public.

8. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = nothing more and 5 = a lot more, indicate how much more you would be willing to pay for any new service that would increase recycling if it were to cost more to provide.

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	2	13.3
2	2	13.3
3	3	20.0
4	5	33.3
5	3	20.0
Average Score = 3.33		

Responses to this question were fairly evenly distributed. Only 13% are not willing to pay any more for new recycling services.

Comments:

- Will pay more. Will pay more for consistently mandated and funded K-12 school education and information. Would pay 25% more if guaranteed to reach the 62% goal. (3)
- Rely on the private sector and capitalism. Nothing. (2)
- Define recycle and how it brings us to zero waste.
- Increase costs at the point-of-purchase.
- Direct funding from recycling and solid waste to these programs.
- If it costs to recycle, the public will not buy into it.
- It should be more expensive for trash and less expensive to recycle.
- Costs should be shared.

The following comments were made by participants who submitted written comments in addition to the questionnaire.

- Increase recovery goal to 75% by 2015.
- Make each local government responsible. Calculate tonnage reduction needed to meet goals. Pro-rate tonnage reduction that each local government must achieve by a certain date.
- Metro should have an intergovernmental agreement with each local government stating the local jurisdiction's commitment to meet goals.
- Give incentives. Metro could give money to each local jurisdiction based on its success in keeping recyclables out of the landfill. Metro can estimate the proportion of recyclables in the road at the transfer station.

- Have disposal bans for office paper, cardboard, glass, aluminum, plastic bottles, yard debris, and wood.
- Include in RSWMP, an automatic trigger for disposal bans on mandatory separation if goals aren't met by a certain date.
- RSWMP should include a policy of keeping the tip fee high enough to encourage recycling.
- RSWMP should be a functional plan that can be enforced

### **Topic 3 – How can sustainability principles guide solid waste practices?**

This question looks at what the region can do beyond recycling to reduce the amount of resources that are consumed and thrown away.

Questions asked include:

1. Are you satisfied with current sustainability practices?
2. Should government set sustainability standards for the solid waste system?
3. Should we go further and adopt zero-waste strategies?

#### Discussion Summary

In general, discussion participants feel that zero waste is a good long-term goal, but is not realistic in the short-term. They are generally unsatisfied with current sustainability efforts.

- Financial incentives, rather than regulations, should be put in place to encourage sustainable practices.
- Government should lead by example when it comes to sustainability.
- Metro should educate the public on the meaning of terms such as “sustainability” and “zero waste.”
- The solid waste system should be made more “green” in terms of emphasizing broader environmental protection and resource conservation practices.
- There should be positive publicity about residents and businesses employing sustainable practices and negative publicity for companies that use wasteful packaging.
- Participants saw two ways to deal with the cost of sustainable practices.
  1. Similar to the current “bottle bill,” consumers should pay for the end-of-life disposal of products at the point-of-purchase.
  2. State and national standards should be created to reduce product packaging and/or make manufacturers responsible for the end life of their products.

#### Specific Comments

- Government needs to be the model for new and progressive recycling practices. Schools should set an example by using recyclable lunch packaging. Community and institutional based change is necessary. Government should eliminate “least cost” purchasing practices. Metro needs to be a model for the region. Agencies should require double-sided documents and recycled content paper for contracts. Create a market for sustainable materials. Metro should develop a mission statement with roles for government, businesses, manufacturers and residents. (6)

- A deposit system, like the “bottle bill” and reusable containers should be encouraged. Charge for disposal at point-of-purchase. (4)
- There should be state or national standards to decrease packaging (computers, cell phones, electronics, appliances, cans). There should be environmental performance standards. Zero waste practices make manufacturers responsible for their products. Target companies (Whirlpool and GE) that ship their packaging and products. (4)
- Government recommendations and incentives are preferred to regulations. Consumer advocacy, media coverage or boycotts would increase corporate accountability. Consumer complaints are most effective. There should be incentives for zero waste such as tax credits for businesses that provide recycled products. There should be incentives for packaging alternatives. There should be credits and incentives for haulers with greener operations over regulations (i.e. constructing a sorting facility with natural lighting). (3)
- Companies that use wasteful packaging should be called out on a web site. It would be like the Business for an Environmentally Sustainable Tomorrow (BEST) and the Business Recycling Awards Group (BRAG) for bad practices. (2)
- Zero waste should be the primary focus of Metro’s efforts. There should be zero waste pilot programs. Zero waste products should receive more publicity. Zero waste is a good long-term goal. There should be intermediate steps including education and “greening.” (3)
- Single-use products should be biodegradable. Manufacturers should be responsible for single-use products such as disposable diapers. (3)
- There should be disincentives for purchasing products that create hazardous waste. (3)
- Educate residents to keep waste out of the system. Communication strategies are important. Publicize and give awards for business and residents employing sustainable practices. Publicize those with bad practices in a negative light. Promote and define sustainability. (2)
- Zero waste policies would be too difficult for the government to implement. Zero waste is a utopian and unrealistic ideal. (2)
- Change habits and behavior by making recycling programs mandatory (e.g. make people pay for grocery bags). Use fees and enforcement. (2)
- More money should be put into the research and development of recycled and recyclable products. (2)
- Encourage “freecycling” and other electronics reuse and recycling programs.
- Hauling trucks should pollute less. Fuel emissions should be reduced within the waste management system. Any strategy needs to involve haulers in the effort.
- All plant-based products should be composted.
- Enforcement measures should be sensitive to small business and of cultural practices.
- The real estate market should educate new residents about sustainability and recycling.
- Metro should develop a sustainability management system and brand Portland as a sustainable city.
- Include manufacturers in the process without driving up their costs and driving them out of Portland.

- Sustainability needs to be measured versus cost. Demonstrate economic savings of greening the system (bio vs. regular diesel).
- Funds should come from garbage bills and tipping fees, not the government.
- Do not expand transfer stations.
- Do not sacrifice public safety and sanitation by reducing packaging.
- Sustainability great, but not at the cost of losing recycling.

Participant Questionnaires

In addition to comments made at the public meetings, the following comments were collected from participant questionnaires:

9. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not satisfied and 5 = very satisfied, how satisfied are you with the current level and type of home and business sustainability practices?

Rank	# Responses	% Responses
1	4	26.7
2	6	40.0
3	4	26.7
4	1	6.7
5	0	0.0
Average score = 2.13		

Over 65% of respondents are less than satisfied with the current level and type of home and business sustainability practices.

Comments:

- This is a new area and more can be done with time. People do not yet operate in this way. (4)
- Not very happy. Many homes have poor practices. Businesses consider revenue over waste requirements. (4)
- What does “sustainability” mean? Need a mission and goals statement that defines roles for all participants. Must be defined and educated by Metro. (4)
- Metro needs to be a leader.

10. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not “green” and 5 = very “green,” how “green” should we make the solid waste system in terms of emphasizing broader environmental protection and resource conservation practices?

Rank	# Responses	% Responses
1	1	6.7
2	0	0.0
3	4	26.7
4	3	20.0
5	7	46.7
Average score = 4.0		

Only 7% of respondents feel that we should not make the solid waste system “green.” More than 45% of responses stated that we should make the solid waste system very “green.”



Comments:

- Metro should look at the system holistically. Consider a broad view of waste or pollutants and their interaction in the environment. (2)
- I worry that “green” practice would be what the haulers want.
- Need to do better.
- Educate the public on what “green” means.
- I think we have a good system in place.
- Convenience for masses is vital, with greening next.
- Reward and recognize successful sustainable companies.
- Trash should cost more than recycling.
- Start talking about life cycle implications of the products we use daily.
- Need to eliminate waste at the source.

11. The region should go beyond the “greening” approach to adopt zero waste strategies. Indicate your agreement on a scale of 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree.

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	3	18.8
2	1	6.3
3	1	6.3
4	4	25.0
5	7	43.8
Average score = 3.68		

Approximately 69% of respondents mostly or strongly agree with adopting zero waste strategies. Nearly 20% strongly disagree with zero waste strategies.

Comments:

- Need to know more about zero waste strategies. What does it mean? (2)
- We are not there yet as a culture. (2)
- Zero waste strategy is too costly. It will never happen. (2)
- We need to focus on current programs. (2)
- Educate to make this another to implement in the future. Zero waste cannot be achieved but it should be the goal. (2)
- Multiple strategies / tiered approach to reach an ultimate goal.

12. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = nothing more and 5 = a lot more, indicate how much more you would be willing to pay for any new practice that would increase the sustainability of our solid waste system.

Rank	# Responses	% Responses
1	3	20.0
2	2	13.3
3	3	20.0
4	6	40.0
5	1	6.7
Average score = 3.0		

Twenty percent of respondents said that they are not willing to pay more for new practices that would increase the sustainability of our solid waste system. The average response shows that participants are willing to pay more for new sustainability practices.

Comments:

- Will pay for increased sustainability. (2)
- Portland is becoming a very expensive place to live. This is a way to improve livability.
- Cost should be applied in some equitable manner with equitable criteria in home and business.
- You need to make a case to the public for higher rates.
- Metro should invest by helping to protect valuable resources.
- Need to see the cost-benefit ratio.
- Shift the money from recycling education to the goal of zero waste.

The following comments were made by participants who submitted written comments in addition to the questionnaire.

- RSWMP's long-term goal should be zero waste. This is the only goal that will save enough resources and avoid enough pollution to keep our planet healthy in the long-term. The time seems right to be heading in this direction.

#### **Topic 4 – What is the bottom line?**

The intent of this question was to have participants reflect on all they had talked about and come up with a list of the issues, strategies and objectives that are most important to them.

Questions asked include:

1. What are the most important strategies or directions the region should focus on?
2. Is there any information missing or incomplete?

#### Discussion Summary

Participants generally are in favor of making improvements to the current system, but would support several new programs as well.

- Improvements can be made by increasing recycling education and publicity, increasing the number of materials that can be recycled and by making recycling more convenient and less expensive than garbage disposal.

- Sustainability and zero waste should be long term goals. Metro should put funding into the research and development of sustainable products and markets.

### Specific Comments

The following comments were made at the three public meetings:

- Educate to increase recycling rate. (4)
- Continue and improve the existing system. (2)
- Make recycling more convenient and less expensive. Make garbage disposal more expensive and less convenient. (2)
- Increase publicity efforts to promote recycling, sustainable practices and residents and businesses that employ recycling and sustainable practices. (2)
- Increase funding for the research and development of recyclable products, uses for recycled materials, non-toxic materials and zero waste products and practices. (2)
- Do not sacrifice safety and sanitation for less packaging.
- Focus efforts on reducing waste, then reusing products and finally on recycling.
- Increase the number of products that can be recycled.
- Correct the way we measure success.
- Use incentives to encourage recycling and green practices.
- Pay the cost of product disposal up front.
- Increase the recycling goal.
- Make zero waste the long term goal.
- Conduct audits for residents and businesses. Give feedback on how recycling practices can improve. Fine repeat offenders.

### **Other comments**

#### Participant Questionnaires

In addition to comments made at the public meetings, the following comments were collected from participant questionnaires:

13. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? Use additional sheets if needed.
- Increase “bottle bill” deposits and expand the program to include all containers. (3)
  - The government should provide markets for recycled products. (2)
  - Small businesses need education and enforcement of regulations.
  - The entire system needs a basic, consistent message.
  - Metro should fund education to change people’s habits.
  - Tap land fills for methane.
  - Use hybrid garbage trucks.
  - Conduct waste hauler evaluations and publicize results.
  - Use master recyclers for education.
  - Require manufacturers to be responsible for their products.

- Base disposal rates on audits of residential and business waste.
- Provide more publicity for green companies.
- Help people get off junk mail lists.
- Decrease environmental impacts (noise and air) of collection trucks.
- Improve household hazardous waste recycling.

## ***Summary of SWAC Meeting***

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee is a group of recycling and disposal facility owners, recycling advocates, haulers, local government solid waste staff, business owners and citizen ratepayers formed to advise Metro. SWAC has a role in reviewing the development of RSWMP and to ensure that the interests of all affected parties are considered. The Sept. 2004 SWAC meeting followed a format similar to that of the public meetings. SWAC members were not asked to answer questions about Topic 1 – “Do garbage and recycling services meet your needs?” This question was intended for feedback from system users and was omitted due to time constraints.

### **Topic 2 – How much can we recycle?**

While respondents were somewhat mixed over their satisfaction with current recycling levels, many expressed interest in additional analysis and information about perceived obstacles. A variety of ideas were offered about ways to increase recycling participation in the future.

#### Discussion Summary

- The current level of recycling can be improved. This can be accomplished using financial incentives and continuing educational efforts.
- Metro needs to collect more diverse and accurate data about waste and recycling. New measures, such as the toxicity of what is put into landfills, should be used to supplement current measures when gauging regional success.
- Recycling is susceptible to changing markets for recyclable materials. Metro should investigate ways to ensure that there is a consistent market for these products.

#### Specific Comments

- Not satisfied with the current level; too much can still be recycled. (3)
- Educate businesses about how recycling can lower waste disposal costs. The current amount of recycling is low due to a lack of education. Give the public better access to recycling information. (3)
- Satisfied with the current level, but would like to improve. (2)
- The market is an obstacle to increasing recycling. Need to ensure that there are markets. Where will recyclables be shipped if overseas markets go away? Need financial assistance to ensure a consistent and sustainable market for recyclables. (2)
- Recycling goals are currently weight-based. Should it be toxicity-based? (2)
- Continue school-age education. (2)
- Incentives work better than regulations. (2)
- Conduct more research in outlying areas of the region. Collect new, better and more accurate data. (2)
- Require businesses to recycle. Need to enforce current recycling regulations. (2)
- Conduct a cost-benefit analysis to demonstrate that the cost of recycling is an issue. (2)
- Increase recycling education for non-English speaking residents.
- Simplify the system and make it consistent throughout the region.
- Research who is not recycling and why.

- Focus on multi-family dwellings.
- Recycling is a public good.
- There should be more places to take non-curb-side items such as TVs and computers.
- Landfills cannot absorb or control government regulations/disposal bans. Impose regulations on waste generators, not disposal sites.
- Costs for product disposal should be put in the base cost.
- Need to make it easy for businesses to recycle. Let waste generators put waste in one container and ensure that waste goes into a non-vertically integrated facility.
- Treat business and residential education differently.

### **Topic 3 – How can sustainability principles guide solid waste practices?**

In general, respondents expressed support for and interest in sustainability principles. Participants offered a mix of comments, concerns and ideas about how such principles might be used to guide solid waste practices.

#### Discussion Summary

- All sectors of society need to be involved in developing a sustainable approach to solid waste.
- Manufacturers need to work to develop products with less packaging.
- Government needs to lead by example as well as put policies in place that address the costs of disposal.
- Money should be put into researching how the solid waste system can be “greened.”

#### Specific Comments

- Encourage manufacturers to use recyclable packaging with less toxic products. Work with local businesses and large companies with headquarters in the metro area to use less packaging. (3)
- All sectors must be involved in the sustainability approach (government, manufacturers, retail, haulers, etc.). (2)
- Need a federal approach. Products that come back into the state do not meet local standards. (2)
- Examine “up-stream” impacts more thoroughly. Obtain better data on the state of sustainability. (2)
- More businesses should be responsible for the packaging of their products. (2)
- Metro should take a larger role in promoting sustainability. Government should lead by example. (2)
- Metro and local governments need to lead a drive for particulate traps on garbage trucks. The collection/disposal system should look into putting cleaner fuel in vehicles. There should be emission controls on hauling trucks. Metro could centralize fueling stations. (2)
- Sustainability hedges against a flux in the recycling market.
- The home composting program was discontinued too soon.
- Determine what measurements for success are best (e.g. weight vs. toxicity).

- Level the playing field region-wide so businesses can go “green” but stay competitive.
- Make sure that recycling programs don’t cause more environmental harm than good (e.g. more recycling trucks lead to more air pollution).
- Do not sacrifice other environmental issues in the name of “zero waste.” Some recyclable packaging is less environmentally favorable because it uses more fossil fuels to produce.
- Governmental incentives should be put in place to support market development.
- Zero waste is a good goal.
- Educate residents about the importance of a zero waste mind frame.
- There should be tax relief for zero waste houses and facilities.
- There should be standards for recycled content paper.
- There should be local standards but not regional standards.

#### **Topic 4 – What is the bottom line?**

As a group, SWAC members tend to believe more education should be used as a strategy to improve current participation before starting new programs.

##### Specific Comments

- Build on the success of residential recycling with more education. (3)
- Continue improving current programs before starting new ones. (2)
- Conduct better outreach and obtain better data about who is not recycling and why?
- Make better environmental decisions (quality results over quantity).
- Make greener products. Clean up manufacturing processes.
- Have incentives for research and development of zero waste achievers.
- There should be an economic development framework.

No questionnaires from SWAC members were received at the SWAC meeting, although they could have been submitted online or anonymously.

## ***Summary of Meetings Hosted by Neighborhood Associations, Civic Organizations and Area Schools***

A summary of comments made at four meetings with neighborhood associations, community planning organizations and civic organizations is organized by topic. After each summary, specific comments are grouped by similarity. If a comment appeared more than once, numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of times each comment was made. Questionnaire results from meeting participants are included with online questionnaire results in the following section.

### **Topic 1 – Do garbage and recycling services meet your needs?**

#### Discussion Summary

In general, participants feel that the current system curbside system did not meet all of their needs and that recycling should be made easier and made more consistent across the region.

- People need more recycling bins that are bigger and covered.
- More materials should be recycled and more recyclables should be collected curbside.
- Transfer stations services should provide better customer service and improve opportunities for recovery and recycling.

#### Specific Comments

- The current services do not meet my needs. Some cities have large recycling bins for everything commingled and someone else separates wastes. Products are not used in a segregated manner so separation of recyclables is inconvenient. Need for more bins because only has one recycling bin and end up putting stuff in boxes and bags. Want more, larger and covered bins. (8)
- Curbside pickup should include yard debris, batteries and all kinds of plastics. (3)
- I've used the facility many times, but transfer station staff doesn't know what to do with some recyclables. It also can be inconvenient to wait in line 25 minutes just to drop off recyclables. Want to get in a quick line. (2)
- The transfer station should have a scavenger place for items such as paint. Someone could pull out usable items at transfer station. (2)
- Recycling services should emphasize plastic recycling, polystyrene, packaging, computers and electronics.
- Far West Fibers – hours are a problem. Not open on weekends. Like to use them, but can't on weekends.
- Metro Paint facility. Why moving? Homes are being built here. We need access to paint.
- Home garbage service and transfer station service is good, although the recycling sorts keep changing. It's confusing.
- Cynical about Waste Management trash services because they are charging premium rates for garbage disposal and recycling in order to optimize profit and not because of a sense of civic duty. Recycles because of legal and moral values and says that the companies are making money off of "what we have to do."
- Levels in Beaverton seem average or lower than in close-in Portland. Bins are never full.



- The general population is committed to recycling, but this breaks down when it becomes inconvenient, particularly for larger families with more kids that create large volumes of garbage.
- Want more accurate time pick up for trash. Not consistent. One time one week, another time another week.
- Choice and cost are important issues.
- Transfer station used to really smell bad. Okay now.
- Would like to get a certificate to recognize efforts and motivate recyclers.

## **Topic 2 – How much can we recycle?**

### Discussion Summary

Participants believe that a number of steps must be taken in order to increase recycling rates.

- Recycling should be made easier by providing necessary information and educational materials and by broadening programs.
- Benefits and incentives are preferred to regulations. However, sometimes regulations are needed.
- In order to increase business recycling, there is a need for commitment from businesses' leadership, a change in workplace culture, and to putting recycling systems in place.
- Corporations should be held responsible for the end-life of their products and should be encouraged to reduce packaging.
- Education is an important component and should focus on school-aged children.

### Specific Comments

- Make recycling easier. Dissatisfied with how slow the aluminum can recycling machines are; the 5-cent refund is not worth the time. It's easier to skip the deposit and dump recyclables into the recycling bin. Machines don't accept every size/variety of can and bottle or different bar codes. Oregonian's idealism exemplified by the bottle bill is frayed. They want to "do the right thing", but recycling should be made simpler and more convenient. Large retailers and distributors put up consumer roadblocks including slow machines and only recycling store specific brands. (8)
- People need to understand the rules of recycling and all of the materials that can be recycled (paper, plastics, food, cardboard, paint, etc). This should include information about the costs and benefits of recycling and how recycling processes work. (6)
- Recyclers need to benefit. A voluntary incentive is a great idea. State should give tax credit to residents and businesses reusing recycled materials to encourage recyclables to remain in the region instead of sending them to out-of-state markets. The bottle return refund is no longer an incentive. (5)
- There's opportunity to do more at businesses, especially with paper and plastic and in cafeterias. Businesses are a challenge and require more work. What is needed includes:
  - internal culture for change (regulations and thought processes) (2)
  - commitment to change (top management, leadership) (3)
  - ability to put systems in place (5)
  - dedicated people to make it work

- help to see opportunities, technical assistance
- Work with corporations to ensure that materials are recyclable and less packaging is used. McDonalds only has trash cans. Why not recycling containers too? (4)
- Business and residential developments often have only a tiny area for recycling. Would like to see some legislation for new development that space has to be designed for businesses to recycle. (3)
- Easy kinds of recycling are happening, especially residential. (3)
- Education should take place at schools (middle school) because it is most effective at changing the behavior of children's who then influence their parents. (2)
- Monitoring is not effective for commercial facilities or residences.
- Businesses may have materials that expire (paint or other chemicals) that might be able to be used for a non-manufacturing use. Do assessment. Need to check internal rules.
- There should be a 24 hour source of recycling information (e.g. Metro web site).
- Outreach efforts should target apartments.
- Would pay more for recycling services if knew money would help businesses recycle more.
- There should be no cost for recycling certain items.
- One citizen is forced to dispose of bulky Styrofoam in his trash can and is charged the same rate as household garbage.
- Commingled residential recycling is preferred. It's simpler.
- It is difficult to regulate when Waste Management is often out-sourced to other companies, although neighborhood cleanups could be mandated.
- Would be willing to separate and donate refundable bottles to people in need.
- Resident would be willing to pay more to separate recyclables, but would not pay more for additional recycling service.
- Concern about contaminating the system with plastics that cannot be recycled (e.g., cottage cheese cartons).
- How will new technology for tracking products (i.e., radio frequency identification) affect recycling efforts (e.g., product containers will have transmitters affixed to them)?
- Why don't we have more recycling options, end-use markets locally, instead of shipping stuff far away?
- Emphasize composting.
- Why do we still allow things made with plastics that aren't recyclable?
- Less waste makes for a nicer place to live, especially on trails.

### **Topic 3 – How can sustainability principles guide solid waste practices?**

#### Discussion Summary

In general, participants feel that sustainability principles are an important guide to solid waste practices and that a combination of strategies is needed.

- Manufacturers must be involved for sustainability principles to be successful. If necessary, regulations should be used to impose higher standards (e.g. less packaging) on manufacturers.
- Government agencies should hold themselves to higher standards and lead by example when it comes to sustainability.
- Education is a key component to promoting sustainable practices.

### Specific Comments

- Education about chemicals in the garden. How to get to new homeowners? You don't need to have a green, green lawn. We should not be spraying instead of mowing along Hwy 213. (4)
- Might require regulations to equalize market impacts – no manufacturer will do the right thing first because of initial start-up costs. (4)
- Product packaging should be recyclable or reusable. Would be willing to pay more for products if packaging was more environmentally friendly. Use less packaging! (3)
- Government standards are not as high as they could be; Norm Thompson, Nike and Intel may have higher standards. Government should purchase energy efficient fleet cars and paper with recycled content. (2)
- Have manufacturer tell you what you can recycle (like a note with your tennis shoes that you can recycle them). Manufacturer involvement critical to make it work. (2)
- Easier to start a sustainable business, but harder with existing facility, culture. (2)
- Look at lifecycle of a product. Focus on long term, look at big picture. (2)
- Barriers to sustainability: Cost and culture. If you can save money and you might be able to change culture. (2)
- Consensus on improving the bottle bill to include all types of bottles, wine, juice, milk, Sobe. (2)
- Recycled products should cost less, not more. Recycled-content paper costs more.
- Education.
- Takes a whole combination of strategies.
- Would like to see less garbage, but don't want government regulations.
- Washington is recycling more than Oregon.
- In California, returnable items are priced by weight and not per piece.
- Power companies don't offer options that consumers want. They don't have sufficient knowledge to set appropriate standards, and are motivated by corporate interests.
- It costs more on the front end to think sustainably.
- Waste prevention should be a priority.
- Purchasing items with higher organic cotton content is one example of how collective purchasing power can drive higher standards.
- Higher standards usually cost more. A cost benefit ratio applied to gasoline means that as the price of gas goes down, more driving yields additional environmental residues and health care costs.

- A public trash summit that converts Metro’s complex analysis into layman’s terms and real choices would add a sense of urgency to citizens in the community. Avoid academic terms.
- Increasing grant opportunities and available funds would increase participation.
- Concern about the potential increase in taxes for implementing sustainable practices to the solid waste system.
- What will costs look like immediately and how much will it cost on a long-term basis?
- Concerned about air emissions from school buses and trucks. Need to take care of what comes out of our cars. A Federal mandate will soon require trucks to be fitted with new filters.
- Hosted Japanese visitors here, they recycle everything! How do they do it? We can learn from them.
- Too many plastics get thrown away.
- Why is there a charge when you bring wood in a truck, but not when you have some of it separate out from your garbage, and they take it for free?
- More should be done to improve water quality.
- Everything that’s manufactured could have a stamp on it “Oregon Recyclable” to make it easy to know what’s recyclable. All of it could go in another recycling bin at the curb.

## **Topic 4 – What is the bottom line?**

### Discussion Summary

- Education and incentives should be used to encourage recycling and sustainable practices.
- Corporations should be responsible for the end life of their products and their packaging.
- Recycling should be made as easy as possible.

### Specific Comments

- Education! For residents and for Metro to listen to our comments!
- Product stewardship – make manufacturers responsible for their own products.
- Go into corporations and help them see how they can reduce packaging.
- Monetary incentives. The more you recycle the cheaper your trash bill.
- Will-call trash service is cheap! Do people know you can get trash picked up for just \$6.30? I only call every six weeks.
- Make it simple and easy.
- Advertise paint more.

## **Franklin High School Meetings**

Listed below are common themes from questionnaires filled out by 37 students from Franklin High School. A more complete account of questionnaire data can be found in Appendix F.

### Questionnaire Summary

1. Recycling services are good but could be improved. Recycling should be easier and cheaper. More products should be recyclable.

2. More items should be recyclable and there should be containers that have separate sections for paper, plastic, yard debris, clothes, etc.
3. Students would pay a little more for better garbage and recycling services.
4. Resource conservation is the most important aspect of the system for the future.
5. People are doing a good job to recycle, but a lot more could be done. In particular, businesses could do more to recycle.
6. There should be some increased spending on recycling education, because some people do not know about recycling.
7. There should be some regulations to increase recycling, but they shouldn't be too strict. Regulations are needed to encourage businesses to recycle.
8. Students would pay more for recycling services if it would increase recycling rates.
9. Sustainability practices are not bad, but not great. Businesses should do more to reduce packaging.
10. The solid waste system should be made as green as possible.
11. Zero waste strategies should be adopted if the cost is reasonable.
12. Students are willing to pay more for increased sustainability practices, but it is uncertain how much more.

## ***Summary of Questionnaires***

The following comments were collected from the 114 questionnaires filled out online or mailed to Metro. The questionnaires filled out by participants in the three Metro-hosted meetings are recorded in the “Summary of Public Meetings Hosted by Metro” section of this report. Each question is followed by a summary of responses. Quantitative questions are followed by a summary table.

Topic 1 – Do garbage and recycling services meet your needs?

1. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not satisfied and 5 = very satisfied, indicate your satisfaction with the current garbage and recycling services you use. For example, are services convenient, are facilities easy for you to access and are costs reasonable?

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	4	3.6
2	7	6.4
3	24	21.8
4	56	50.9
5	19	17.3
Average score = 3.72		

Only 3.6% of respondents are not satisfied with current garbage and recycling services.

### Summary of Comments

Despite their satisfaction with current services, people generally feel that the system should be improved.

- The pricing system is inefficient and does not reward people for recycling.
- More items should be recyclable and picked up curbside, such as plastics, yard debris, household hazardous waste, furniture, building materials, Styrofoam, batteries, and fluorescent bulbs.
- Households should be able to place all recyclables into one roll cart.

2. Are there services you want added, expanded or changed in the future? What are they?

### Summary of Comments

- There should be pricing incentives for those who waste less and recycle as well as for those who separate their recycling.
- More items should be recyclable and picked up curbside, such as plastics, yard debris, household hazardous waste, furniture, building materials, Styrofoam, batteries, and fluorescent bulbs.
- A greater effort should be made to recycle more items in schools, especially Styrofoam and organic waste.

3. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = nothing more and 5 = a lot more, indicate how much more you would be willing to pay for any new service, if it were to cost more to provide.

Rank	# Responses	% Responses
1	17	15.7
2	28	25.9
3	39	36.1
4	17	15.7
5	7	6.5
Average score = 2.71		

On average, respondents are willing to pay only a little more for new services. However, few respondents are willing to pay significantly more.

#### Summary of Comments

- The costs of recycling programs should be paid for by those who don't recycle.
- Will pay more for increased services that benefit them.
- Recycling should be cheaper than garbage disposal.

4. What is most important to you about services in the future? Cost, convenience, resource conservation or other? If other, explain:

Rank	# Responses	% Responses
Cost	13	12.0
Convenience	16	14.8
Resource Conservation	58	53.7
Other (All of the Above)	21	19.4

A majority of respondents identify resource conservation as the most important aspect of future services.

## **Topic 2 – How much can we recycle?**

5. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not satisfied and 5 = very satisfied, rate your satisfaction with the current level of effort by residents and businesses on recycling.

Rank	# Responses	% Responses
1	9	8.7
2	29	27.9
3	45	43.3
4	15	14.4
5	6	5.8
Average Score = 2.81		

Approximately 80% of respondents are dissatisfied or only somewhat satisfied with the current level of effort by residents and businesses on recycling.

#### Summary of Comments

- For the most part, households do a good job of recycling, although they could do better. Businesses and schools need to do a better job.

- There is no incentive for businesses to recycle.
- There is a need for more outreach/education/informational materials.

6. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not important and 5 = very important, rate the importance to you of making a larger investment in public information and recycling programs.

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	1	1.0
2	11	10.5
3	17	16.2
4	28	26.7
5	48	45.7
Average score = 4.06		

Over 72 % of respondents feel it is important to make a larger investment in public information and recycling programs.

#### Summary of Comments

- Education is the most important aspect of increasing recycling rates.
- Reusing and reducing should be emphasized.
- Improving services is more important than making a larger investment in education.

7. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = no further government regulation and 5 = high level of government regulation, what level of government regulation would you support in order to increase recycling?

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	10	9.6
2	4	3.8
3	27	26.0
4	30	28.8
5	33	31.7
Average score = 3.61		

Over 80% of respondents would support more government regulation in order to increase recycling.

#### Summary of Comments

- Regulations should be placed on businesses to recycle, manufacturers to be held responsible for the end-life of their products and on what can be accepted at land fills, not on residential households.
- Regulations on households and businesses will have to be used to improve current recycling rates.

8. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = nothing more and 5 = a lot more, indicate how much more you would be willing to pay for any new service that would increase recycling if it were to cost more to provide.



Rank	# Responses	% Responses
1	8	7.8
2	22	21.4
3	42	40.8
4	17	16.5
5	14	13.6
Average Score = 3.07		

Thirty percent of respondents would pay quite a bit or a lot more, with an equal percentage saying they'd pay nothing or only a little more for increased recycling services. It is unclear how much more people would be willing to pay for any new service.

#### Summary of Comments

- People are willing to pay a small amount for services that they will use.
- Those who waste should pay the cost for those who recycle. There should be penalties for those who do not recycle.

### **Topic 3 – How can sustainability principles guide solid waste practices?**

9. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not satisfied and 5 = very satisfied, how satisfied are you with the current level and type of home and business sustainability practices?

Rank	# Responses	% Responses
1	17	17.3
2	32	32.7
3	34	34.7
4	12	12.2
5	3	3.1
Average score = 2.51		

Approximately 50% of respondents are dissatisfied with the current level and type of home and business sustainability practices. An additional 35% are only somewhat satisfied.

#### Summary of Comments

- Not enough is being done. There should be more systems and programs in place.
- Businesses could do better.
- People need to be educated on sustainability concepts.

10. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = not “green” and 5 = very “green,” how “green” should we make the solid waste system in terms of emphasizing broader environmental protection and resource conservation practices?

Rank	# Responses	% Responses
1	5	4.9
2	1	1.0
3	16	15.7
4	19	18.6
5	61	59.8

Average score = 4.27

Approximately 60% of respondents support making the solid waste system very green, with another 18% expressing strong support for the idea.

#### Summary of Comments

- Many people are not familiar with these concepts.
- The system should be made more green, but not at too high a cost.
- Garbage and recycling trucks should be greener.
- Greening the system is a good long-term goal.

11. The region should go beyond the “greening” approach to adopt zero waste strategies. Indicate your agreement on a scale of 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree.

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	13	12.7
2	3	2.9
3	17	16.7
4	20	19.6
5	49	48.0
Average score = 3.87		

Over 65% of respondents mostly or strongly agree with going beyond the “greening” approach to adopt zero waste strategies. Only 15% disagree with this approach.

#### Summary of Comments

- Many people are not familiar with zero waste principles or feel that the term should be changed to something people can understand.
- Zero waste is unachievable.
- Zero waste strategies should be adopted and are a great long-term goal.
- Most of the effort should be placed on working with corporations to prevent waste.

12. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = nothing more and 5 = a lot more, indicate how much more you would be willing to pay for any new practice that would increase the sustainability of our solid waste system.

<b>Rank</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b>% Responses</b>
1	13	12.5
2	17	16.3
3	28	26.9
4	27	26.0
5	19	18.3
Average score = 3.21		

Twenty-nine percent of respondents are not willing to pay any more or only a little more for new practices that would increase the sustainability of our solid waste system. There is no consensus on how much more people are willing to pay.

### Summary of Comments

- Willingness to pay for these services varies greatly.
- People need proof of the effectiveness of new practices
- These practices are needed, but who should pay?

### **Other comments**

13. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

- Metro is doing a great job.
- More effort should be put into education.
- Recycling should be cheaper than garbage.
- Focus on working with businesses to recycle more and produce less waste.

## ***Conclusions***

These conclusions are based on comments made at public meetings hosted by Metro, the SWAC meeting, public meetings hosted by neighborhood and civic organizations, and comments collected from questionnaires. Additional detail for each key topic and associated public comment follows in the report.

### ***The current garbage and recycling system is adequate, but recycling rates and services should be improved.***

- The current garbage and recycling system is inconsistent across the region. Standards for what can be recycled and how items can be recycled vary among jurisdictions. Rural and unincorporated areas do not receive the same service that urbanized areas do. The entire system needs to be standardized across the region and made simple and easy to understand
- More materials need to be recyclable and more recyclables need to be collected curbside. Styrofoam and all types of plastic should be recyclable. Products such as electronics, food/organics, hazardous materials and plastics should be home-sorted and eligible for curbside pickup. Large items should also be picked up periodically.
- Transfer stations should have more knowledgeable staff, shorter lines and more convenient hours.
- Efforts should be made to make the solid waste system more “green” in terms of emphasizing broader environmental protection and resource conservation practices. However, this should not be done at much cost to the public.
- Resource conservation is the most important factor for future services.
- People generally are willing to pay something more for increased services, but few are willing to pay a lot more.

### ***Increase efforts to inform and educate the public and businesses about recycling.***

- Businesses need more information and instruction about what they can recycle and how recycling benefits them economically.
- Recycling education programs in K-12 schools have been successful. Funding should continue to be directed towards programs for school-age children.
- Information should be easy to understand and distributed periodically in the form of brochures, packets for new residents and on the backs of garbage bills.
- Recycling and sustainability issues are not publicized enough. Advertising campaigns should be used to provide basic education about recycling, but should also emphasize “reduce” and “reuse.” In addition, businesses and residents that employ exemplary recycling and sustainable practices should be recognized for their efforts.

### ***Make recycling less expensive and more convenient relative to garbage disposal.***

- People are generally willing to support a higher level of government regulation in order to increase recycling rates. However, fees and regulations should be a last resort and must go toward services that will benefit those who pay for them.
- Households and businesses that do not recycle should pay for those who do. Regulations should first be placed on manufacturers to reduce and use recyclable packaging.

- Incentives and disincentives may include subsidizing the costs of recycling, providing residents and businesses that recycle with tax breaks, charging a higher cost for garbage bins, setting jurisdictional garbage rates by the amount they recycle, maintaining high tipping fees for garbage collection, providing larger, covered recycling bins and placing disposal bans on certain recyclable materials.

***Government and Metro in particular should model sustainable practices and standards for the region.***

- Sustainability is still a fairly new concept to many people and some do not understand it or equate it with recycling. However, those who do understand the concept are supportive of incorporating more sustainability into government business practices, especially the solid waste system.
- Government agencies and Metro in particular should lead the region by modeling sustainable practices and standards. These practices could include using recyclable lunch packaging in school and hospital cafeterias, requiring the use of recycled content paper and double-sided printing for all government documents and by purchasing recyclable materials and materials with reduced packaging.

***Zero waste is not a priority in the current system, but should be a long-term goal.***

While society is not ready to adopt zero waste policies today, it should be a long-term goal for Metro’s solid waste system. Metro should begin by educating the public about terms such as “sustainability” and “zero waste” or finding alternative terms that resonate with the public. Incentives should be used to encourage waste reduction by residents and businesses. Efforts should be placed in one or more of the following areas:

- Work with national and state agencies, as well as large companies with headquarters in the metro area, to develop voluntary standards for reducing product packaging.
- Hold manufacturers accountable for the end life of their products.
- Incorporate end-of-life disposal costs at the point-of-purchase.

## *Next Steps*

More than one hundred residents from cities throughout the metropolitan area took part in "Let's Talk Trash" discussions to express their opinions on solid waste services and how we should conserve natural resources in the future. The comments and ideas collected, as well as technical data, legal requirements and staff recommendations will help staff update the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan for the next ten-year period (2005-2015). Additional phases of public involvement are planned to take place in early 2005 when a draft of the plan will be made available for review and comment.

The revised RSWMP and details about staying informed and involved in Metro's public involvement process will be posted on Metro's web site ([www.metro-region.org/letstalktrash](http://www.metro-region.org/letstalktrash)).