

A G E N D A



METRO

MEETING: REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
DATE: Thursday, February 24, 2005
TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
PLACE: Rooms 370A/B, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

5 mins. I. Call to Order and Announcements Rod Park

*Introductions and Announcements
Approval of Minutes**

15 mins. II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director’s Update..... Mike Hoglund

40 mins. III. Sustainability and the Solid Waste System Rene Eyerly

As part of the RSWMP update public involvement process, the “Let’s Talk Trash” discussion guide asked this question of participants: “How can sustainability principles guide solid waste practices?” The possible approaches included: 1) maintain current practices; 2) “green” the solid waste system; and 3) adopt “zero waste” strategies. The majority of comments received indicate a desire to see the system become more “green” in terms of emphasizing broader environmental protection and resource conservation practices. If the updated RSWMP is to incorporate a greater emphasis on sustainability, what does “a more sustainable solid waste system” mean? What would a sustainability goal or goals for the solid waste system encompass? What sustainability measures might be implemented over the next ten years, by whom, and in what components of the solid waste system? This agenda item is intended to discuss these issues and the potential formation of a small group to examine them in some detail.

50 mins. IV. RSWMP Vision, Values, and Policies* Janet Matthews

Last month SWAC members reviewed the proposed direction-setting framework for the updated RSWMP: 1) Plan Vision; 2) Regional Values; 3) Regional Policies; and 4) Goals and Objectives for Waste Reduction and Facilities and Services. A lively but inconclusive discussion ensued on the Plan Vision and Regional Values. This agenda item will return to summarize input from Metro Council on these items and to capture any further comments by SWAC on concepts for the vision statement and regional values. As time allows, the discussion will then turn to proposed regional policies for the updated RSWMP.

5 mins. V. Other Business and Adjourn..... Rod Park

**Materials for these agenda items are attached.*

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

Chair: Councilor Rod Park (797-1547) Staff: Janet Matthews (797-1826) 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
January 27, 2005

Members / Alternates Present:

Councilor Rod Park, Chair
Mike Hogleund
Bruce Walker
John Lucini
Rick Winterhalter
Heather Hansen
Dave White

Dean Kampfer
Mark Altenhofen
Mike Leichner
JoAnn Herrigel
Anita Largent
Mike Miller

Mike Huycke
Ray Phelps
Eric Merrill
Paul Edwards
Susan Ziolk
Vince Gilbert

Guests and other Metro staff:

Janet Matthews
Easton Cross
Roy Brower
Todd Hubbard
Jim Watkins
Ken Adams

Marta McGuire
Lee Barrett
Scott Klag
Marv Fjordbeck
Kathryn Schutte
Jan O'Dell

Karen Blauer
Karen Feher
René Eyerly
Lori Stole
Gina Cubbon

I. Call to Order and Announcements.....Rod Park

- Councilor Rod Park convened the meeting, introducing himself as the new committee Chair. He welcomed everyone present, and referenced a memo to members from outgoing Chair, Councilor McLain.
- Members were asked to consider the list of potential SWAC work plan items that was included in the agenda packet. The Councilor encouraged members to get in touch with Solid Waste & Recycling Director Mike Hogleund or SW&R's Program and Policy Manager Janet Matthews with comments, additions, etc.
- Minutes from the December meeting were approved unanimously.

II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update..... Mike Hogleund

- Mr. Hogleund updated the group that the contract for transfer station operations has been signed by BFI and will take effect after March, when the current contract extension expires.
- A proposal for the Dry Waste Recovery / Mandatory MRFing program is being drafted by Lee Barrett and Doug Anderson of SW&R. A lot of good comments have come in over the last few months, Mr. Hogleund said, regarding effects the program could have to the system. The proposal will try to account for those as best as possible.
- The report from "Let's Talk Trash" for business recycling has been sent out to interested parties via e-mail. Copies are available; contact Mr. Hogleund or SW&R Administrative Secretary Gina Cubbon. Meetings were held with area businesses to get their perspective on different

recycling options, such as mandatory versus incentive-based systems. Overall, respondents were mostly interested in education and rate incentives. The next step will be to present a report to Council before instituting a program.

- Continuing, Mr. Hoglund presented some regulatory updates. The deadline for Columbia Environmental's transfer station application has been extended while SW&R staff works with Columbia to address specific questions from Council. A work session is tentatively scheduled for late February.
- The application from USA Junk to operate a reload facility has been denied because they failed to obtain a conditional use approval from the City of Portland. They plan to apply for that approval and try again at a later date.

III. 2005-06 Budget: Themes and Process Mike Hoglund

Mr. Hoglund briefly highlighted Metro's 11-month budget process. At this time, SW&R has submitted a proposed budget to Council President Bragdon for his consideration. Revisions are due from departments on February 25. A draft budget calendar containing key dates was handed out to attendees. Work session budget discussions with Council will take place in March; Council President Bragdon will release a full budget proposal to the public in April. A final budget hearing will take place on May 5; Council will then approve the budget. The Oregon TSCC audits the approved budget prior to formal adoption by the Metro Council on June 16. Rate changes take effect 90 days after budget adoption.

Councilor Park noted that the Council "has been going through a very intensive strategic planning process, not just about the Solid Waste [and Recycling] Department, but about all of Metro." He said the Council has been looking at many issues that the Council President can take into consideration before moving the proposed budget forward to the full Council. Councilor Park feels this process is much more efficient than previous methods.

As for the proposed budget from SW&R, Mr. Hoglund said the Department is "holding the line." \$1.3 million in cuts were made in 2003-04, and \$1.2 million last year, with five less FTEs budgeted, and four FTEs restructured. He handed out and briefly explained a draft entitled "Review Framework for Programs, Projects, Activities and Initiatives for the FY 2005-06 Budget." This piece shows the themes of the next budget, such as completing the Regional Solid Waste Management (RSWMP) update.

Another theme is continued waste reduction. The Contingency subgroup of SWAC asked for a larger Commercial Technical Assistance Program (CTAP) budget; accordingly, some funding has been moved to add \$250,000 to that program, which will be targeting increased business recycling.

Metro's latex paint recycling operations are moving to a larger facility, on Swan Island in Portland. Retail sales will begin from the new building on February 1; processing will be up and running by April. There is a new program in SW Washington with Rodda and Miller paints that will deliver their paint to Metro, as well.

Regarding Metro's Hazardous Waste Program, Mr. Hoglund noted that it's been a very popular program, but staff will be evaluating the current system. For example, whether it's too easy to use, and therefore doesn't actually help reduce use of toxic products. Councilor Park commented that the program is not currently a user-pay proposition. He'd like to look at how to make it more fair, perhaps by point-of-purchase fees.

Councilor Park introduced his new assistant, Kathryn Schutte. Ms. Schutte handed out a working draft entitled, "Metro Council Goals and Objectives" from the Council's strategic planning process. Councilor Park reviewed the piece briefly, saying that some goals are met by multiple departments, showing that there's a lot of interaction and perhaps duplication. This may lead to some reorganization, such as what SW&R did not too long ago.

IV. RSWMP Update: Shaping the Plan Vision and Values..... Janet Matthews

Ms. Matthews gave a quick background of the RSWMP project for those who have not attended previous meetings. The draft update will be ready in Spring 2005, she said; SWAC has been deeply involved in the update progress. Asking the group to open their agenda packets to the RSWMP draft outline, Ms. Matthews said this piece illustrates that much of the current plan will remain in place. Some of the organization has changed, "Primarily just to improve the flow of the direction-setting chapters," she explained. An Executive Summary will be included, which is a change from the original document. SWAC and the Council will spend the most time helping staff shape Chapters 3, 4, and 5, which set the direction for the entire Plan.

Ms. Matthews directed attention to the agenda piece about the "Vision Statement" that will be included in the RSWMP update. "We are defining 'vision' as a long-term ideal and ultimate aspiration," she noted. "That's what we think a vision statement is intended to be. The plan vision is probably the one thing in this plan that is not intended to be accomplished in the ten-year duration of the Plan. It is something that we aspire to in the future."

Three vision statements were presented as part of the agenda packet; the current statement (1995-2005 RSWMP), and two proposed statements, Ms. Matthews continued. The commonality of the three pieces, she said, "...is an attempt to articulate the region's arrival at a more sustainable future." She briefly reviewed each proposed vision statement. The first (and current statement), Ms. Matthews said, is somewhat impenetrable in its phrasing. It does touch on the fact that in the future, waste should be viewed as a resource to be managed, and the need to change consumption and build upon sustainability. It links integrated waste management and the conservation of resources.

The two proposed vision statements share an opening thought, "The protection of our environment requires changes in consumption of resources." Both aim for sustainability in the future; and mention that consumer choices will help achieve that goal.

Proposed vision #1 is a more general picture, Ms. Matthews continued. "If you go to [proposed vision #2], you'll see that it is a specific description of a system in the future." Consumers make choices, producers take responsibility for impacts of their products and packaging, businesses reuse discarded materials, and government will curtail its role in disposal as solid waste is virtually eliminated, she explained. "It tries to get at a more specific vision of the future...as opposed to the previous one, which articulates a sustainable future in a more general fashion."

Turning the floor over to the members, Ms. Matthews solicited opinions. "Do you like one? Why is that? Do all three of them stink?" she asked frankly. "We need to get a plan vision statement that is readily understandable by just about every reader. It really should be accessible; people should be able to understand where it is we really want to go in the future."

Councilor Park commented that although Council was supposed to have looked at these options, "...our ranks were disseminated by the flu, so we haven't looked at them. You guys get first shot." His first thought, however, was that the term "changes in consumption" in both new proposals

doesn't necessarily mean less consumption, though that's staff's assumption. "That isn't necessarily the general society's choice, yet."

Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association's Dave White commented that he would like to see a modified version of the current statement rather than either of the proposals. It acknowledges, he said, "...that we generate waste, and this says that that waste needs to be managed." Mr. White said that while Statement Proposal #2 envisions zero waste, "...I can't imagine we'll ever get to the point where you'll buy just the right amount of food to put on the table for your family, and there are no scraps left over ...". The current statement, he said, takes into account that the region is looking towards sustainability, and he feels that the link between management of waste and conservation still needs to be stressed.

Regarding the last portion of Statement Proposal #2, Mr. White articulated, "It really bothers me to think that government is going to curtail its role in disposal. I think somebody doesn't understand that if we ever get to a point of zero waste, we still will have recycling, we still will have composting, we still will have stuff that goes somewhere, and I think we'll still need to manage it.... Government will still have a role, whether we're trying to get to 62% [recovery], or whether we're trying to develop markets, or trying to convince producers to work in a more sustainable way. There will be a role for government." In summation, Mr. White reiterated that he likes the current statement, with modifications for readability.

Clackamas County's Rick Winterhalter agreed with the sentiment of Mr. White's comments, that there will still be waste of some sort for government to manage. East County Recycling's Vince Gilbert said that alternative funding for Metro would need to be considered if it stepped out of its role in solid waste.

From the audience, WRI's Ray Phelps said that he, too, likes the current statement better than the proposals. In particular, the sentence "The protection of our environment requires changes in consumption of resources.." doesn't settle well with him. "I'm not so sure change is *required* so much as change will evolve," he asserted. He felt that the phrasing referred to restrictions rather than motivations to change behaviors. Mr. Phelps continued, "I'd like to remove the words 'protect' and 'require changes' – not to dilute or make this statement meaningless, but to make it more positive and proactive." Councilor Park suggested "...requires a more efficient utilization of our natural resources."

"I find it interesting," Mr. Winterhalter countered, "...that Mr. Phelps connotes changes with being negative, when changes can, indeed, be positive. I would say that yes, in order to protect the environment, it is going to require changes.." He felt that the sentence works fine as-written.

Next, Waste Management's Dean Kampfner spoke up, saying that he, too, prefers the current vision statement to either of the suggested alternatives. He sees the phrase about "protection" as a move towards the hierarchy of reduce, reuse, etc. "I think the change they're talking about there is trying to shift that from disposal up to reduce."

In answer to a question from Councilor Park regarding if the original vision statement was meant to address the entire system, Eric Merrill of Waste Connections said that the intent had been to have a vision statement that "...had long-term implications, but encapsulated what we were trying to accomplish in the short to mid-range." He said they chose words that incorporated the essence of what the group was trying to do at that time, including "...manage, conservation, natural systems, sustainability, conservation of resources, the link between integrated waste management and conservation resources.... and that is the way we created the vision statement." The intent was to address how RSWMP would affect the system, but also the world at-large. Councilor Park

commented that he wants to be sure the final vision statement is broad enough to encompass unknowns, such as drastic changes in the price of fuel.

The City of Portland's Bruce Walker remarked that all three statements hold key points he feels are interconnected and can be positive in a long-term vision. The current one, he said, seems very direct from a system that evolved from dumping into landfills to one moving into recycling programs and solid waste management. "The current statement is too limiting, Mr. Walker said. "We need to get beyond that, but I think Janet is absolutely right: Putting out suggestions will generate lots of discussions." He'd like to see a push for more emphasis on sustainability in the update.

Councilor Park attempted to steer discussion away from wordsmithing and more towards overall concept.

Mike Huycke, of Allied / Waste Control Systems, offered that while he did like the current statement, a change could be made to the last sentence. He liked the first portion, "In order to build a sustainable future together..." but felt that the next section wasn't pro-active and could be better crafted.

Susan Ziolk of Clackamas County spoke in favor of Proposal #2, saying that it's much clearer for a member of the public. It's important to consider who the ultimate audience is. "As the general public, [Proposal #2] tells each person what their part is. It specifically pulls out the parts of the different players." Mr. Winterhalter agreed, and also likes the fact that the words "solid waste" do not appear in that statement.

John Lucini of SP Newsprint agreed with Mr. Huycke, noting that when the original statement was written over ten years ago, it applied well. However, he said, when it comes to recognizing the link between solid waste management and resource conservation, "I think we've moved beyond that; we have a system in place now that more than recognizes that link. Maybe some language that would say we continue to manage, or optimize the relationship between those two items." There will always be something to dispose of, he said. Additionally, don't lose sight of economic impacts while approaching "zero waste." Keep "economic prosperity" as a part of the updated statement.

Giving a citizens' perspective, committee member Heather Hansen sided with the new statements. "The two new ones somewhat define what sustainable development is – that's a term that's often thrown around but people have different understandings of it," noting the phrase "preserving options for future generations." Ms. Hansen also liked that the new versions address citizens understanding the impact they have on the solid waste system – she felt that was very important and missing from the current statement.

Washington County's Mark Altenhofen didn't have a clear choice, but noted that vision statements often become "...too cumbersome and complex; you get a lot of vernacular in there that the general public doesn't really understand." Much of that, he continued, is spelled out in the Plan itself. He strongly encouraged staff to, "...boil this down to one or two sentences, something very simple, very easy to understand. All the details and everything else can be brought out in the Plan – the goals, the economics, sustainability, environmental impacts..." Looking at Statement Proposal #1, Mr. Altenhofen suggested the second sentence might be enough, "The Plan envisions a future in which knowledgeable and engaged residents have, and make, choices that preserve options that future generations will need to secure the quality of life we enjoy."

"How important is it to maintain options for future generations, or is it not important?" Councilor Park asked.

Mr. Merrill agreed with the concept of simplifying, but felt that is more important to a mission statement than a vision statement. He felt a vision statement should state "...the goal and some idea of how you get there." What is missing from the two new proposals, in Mr. Merrill's mind, "...is the idea that it's a managed process or that we manage the waste stream until we get to the point of zero waste, although I hate that term," he added parenthetically.

Mr. Gilbert commented that he did not like the very sentence that Mr. Altenhofen mentioned earlier. "It leaves out a whole bunch of people who aren't knowledgeable and engaged in the system. I want to be careful with that type of language not to have a vision statement that doesn't include the people who couldn't care less. They're a big part of the region."

The City of Milwaukee's JoAnn Herrigel acknowledged what Mr. White had said about the current vision statement, and wondered, "If you took the current vision statement and you changed the language so it has the same concepts in it but the language is more open...." She said that the current wording is all present tense rather than looking toward the future. Applying the type of language used in Statement Proposal #1 to the current statement may result in a compromise everyone could live with, Ms. Herrigel suggested. "You want the concepts of economic viability, and management and system and cost – all those things, but how you want it to be in the future, not what we know now."

Councilor Park spoke about Statement Proposal #1, noting wryly that it calls for "the elimination of toxicity," a term that the Councilor pointed out is technically impossible. Toxicity, he pointed out, is a matter of quantity – almost everything is toxic in large amounts. That aside, he asked the group if they felt there should be something about reducing the use of toxic / hazardous products in the statement. Mr. Kampfer responded that while such a concept is not spelled out, it is implied by "...conserving natural resources, consumption of resources, etc." Mr. Huycke agreed that it needn't be spelled out but kept broad. "This [vision statement] is more of a 30,000 ft. level thing. The toxicity of waste is an issue we want to encompass, but I don't know that we necessarily want to specifically address it [in the statement]." Mr. Lucini agreed, and Mr. White felt the issue is implicitly a part of "protection of our natural systems" in the current statement.

Continuing, Mr. White said he felt that Statement Proposal #1 (and to some degree, both proposals), "...focuses on one element of management; that is environmental protection, which is important. What it doesn't speak to me about is what John [Lucini] mentioned, the economic aspects of the system, and it doesn't talk about how you manage the system as a whole." He still preferred the current statement, finding it a more balanced statement.

Councilor Park mentioned the EESE test (environmental, economic, social, and energy) used by some Metro staff that is used to find such a balance. The Councilor said that EESE is a good yardstick for balancing concepts.

Mr. Walker suggested the group step back, list concepts and where they'd like to see the system headed. "Maybe there are things we need to have in here that aren't listed, such as economic prosperity. I tend to agree that's very important."

Councilor Park asked members to e-mail ideas for issues they would like to look at incorporating; staff will take them into consideration, rework the statement and present it to Council. He spoke, too, about the difficulty in getting citizens engaged in the process. "Governing people who aren't engaged is the hardest thing to do; they know they don't like it, but they can't explain why they don't like it. We do spend a lot of money on education programs; we need to make them more effective. Like they say: You educate with facts and motivate with emotion." The Councilor told

the Committee that a redraft of the vision Statement would be sent out prior to the next SWAC meeting.

Ms. Matthews suggested sending out revised options (plural), because of so many conflicting opinions voiced. “Those of you engaged in the day-to-day business of solid waste, I’m hearing that you prefer the current vision statement, because it does say ‘solid waste.’ Those on the more policy side of things – local government and some rate-payer reps – want to push the envelope a little bit.” Mr. White reiterated that blending the two factions might be the best solution.

“The current vision statement,” Ms. Matthews said, “...talks about waste as a resource to be managed. I want to point out that in the last vision statement, #2, that’s what that whole process was getting at. [The statement envisions that] Before material becomes waste – that is the producer-responsibility end of things. But after materials are discarded, they go into a system where they are actually a resource to be managed, and there’s very little left to dispose compared to what we know today. I just wanted to point out that the ‘waste as a resource to be managed’ theme does carry into the last proposal. It’s not like it expects nothing will ever be disposed again – it envisions much, much less disposed.”

Mr. Hoglund added that he hadn’t heard anyone say any of the proposals were bad, just that they wanted to consider emphasizing other aspects, such as managing, and refining the economic aspect. He agreed with Ms. Matthews assertion that Statement Proposal #2 does encompass those things; he said he and staff will take another look at it and work on saying things more proactively and incorporate the opinions expressed at this meeting. Personally, Mr. Hoglund said he liked the way Statement Proposal #2 laid out roles and responsibilities. Perhaps the portion about phasing out government was overstated, but over all he liked the concepts stated. He also said he liked Mr. Altenhofen’s idea of shortening the statement as much as possible, so a long and short version may be presented to the Committee.

From the audience, SW&R’s Scott Klag pointed out the agenda packet piece entitled, “Potential Regional Values.” He suggested people look over the list, keeping in mind that the vision statement should reflect what the highest values are in the document.

Ms. Matthews then presented a new piece for the RSWMP update – the list of values mentioned by Mr. Klag, which Ms. Matthews explained are referred to as “regional” because they are meant to be values that are largely shared throughout the Metro region.

“Values to us seemed a bridge between a more lofty vision and the more down-to-earth policies, goals and objectives that would follow [in the update],” Ms. Matthews continued. The piece is still in a rough draft format, she explained, with the bulleted items illustrating what will describe each specific value in the RSWMP narrative. She asked the group’s opinion of using a set of regional values to articulate the Plan, as well as any specifics.

In the general discussion that followed, Ms. Hansen noted that economic vitality is not addressed in the list. “Economics / business practices and the environment - those goals are not necessarily mutually-exclusive,” she stated. A value about improving the environment and the economy would be a good addition, Ms. Hansen concluded.

Mr. White would like a statement about “environmentally appropriate collection and disposal” within the Public Health and Safety value. “That’s the key to the franchise system, that we collect the [waste] that’s putrescible, we take it to an appropriate place and it’s handled through transfer stations and disposal sites, etc., in an environmentally and healthy manner.”

Customer service isn't included in the list, Mr. Merrill noted.

Following-up on Ms. Hansen's comments, Mr. Huycke suggested that Value #6 could be modified to "Performance and Economic Stewardship," and add "cost effectiveness" to the last bullet under that value.

Mr. Lucini would like a competitive aspect to be included, to show the region as "...a place for people to want to live and also for a place for businesses to locate... to be competitive in a more global marketplace." Councilor Park referred back to the Council goals, with the thought that the #1 goal listed there, "Great Places: Goal – Residents of the region enjoy vibrant, accessible, and physically distinct places to live, work, and play" encompasses the ideas Mr. Lucini voiced.

Concluding the item, Ms. Matthews said she would take the members' ideas and return next month with a narrative version for their consideration. She noted that there seemed to be no opposition to the concept of including regional values in the RSWMP update.

V. Other Business and Adjourn.....Rod Park

Ms. Matthews handed out a revised list of SWAC members and alternates. She asked for help recruiting interested parties to fill the vacancies noted.

Councilor Park concluded the meeting with some interesting figures / comparisons about the Metro region's waste reduction efforts that Steve Apotheker related to him in response to a request from a writer recently:

- The Metro region recycled 405,000 tons of paper in 2002, which is the equivalent of stacking paper on a football field to a height of 2/3 mile.
- Recycling 405,000 tons of paper reduced air emissions equivalent to taking 194,000 cars off the road for one year. The air emissions tracked were carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons.

Councilor Park thanked the group for their attendance, and adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

**Next meeting:
Thursday, February 24, 2005
Room 370 A/B**

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

- DRAFT: Review Framework for Programs, Projects, Activities and Initiatives for the FY 2005-06 Budget
- Metro Council Goals and Objectives (working draft)
- VISION – A long-term ideal and ultimate aspiration
- Solid Waste Advisory Committee membership as of January 25, 2005

gbc
M:\rem\od\projects\SWAC\Agenda_Minutes\Minutes\2005\SWAC012705min.DOC
Queue

CONCEPTS FOR VISION STATEMENT:
Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update

SUGGESTED CONCEPT FOR INCLUSION	SUPPORTED BY:		
	SWAC	Council	SW&R Staff
1. Build a sustainable future	X	X	X
2. A more sustainable waste system	X		X
3. Inter-dependence of economic, environmental, and social systems.			X
4. Conserve resources	X	X	X
5. Reduce consumption	X	X	X
6. Conservation of natural systems	X		X
7. Preserve options for future generations	X	X	X
8. Recognize link between waste management and resource conservation	X		
9. Shared responsibility among producers, users, and government	X	X	X
10. Producer responsibility		X	
11. Economic prosperity	X	X	X
12. Waste as a resource to be managed	X		X
13. Waste as an inefficient use of resources		X	X
14. Waste as a liability to be safely managed, a resource to be productively used			X
15. Comprehensive waste management practices enhancing community quality of life	X		
16. Knowledgeable and engaged residents	X	X	X

Regional Solid Waste Management Plan 2005-2015

DRAFT CHAPTER 3: FUTURE DIRECTION AND REGIONAL POLICIES

Current RSWMP Structure

- I. Vision
- II. Goals
- III. Objectives
- IV. Recommended Strategies

Recommended New Structure

- I. Vision
- II. Values
- III. Policies
- IV. Goals
- V. Objectives

DEFINITIONS

Vision: A long-term ideal and ultimate aspiration.

Values: A set of principles held by the region that guide and shape policies and programs.

Policies: A high-level statement to guide and determine present and future decisions and courses of action.

Goals: A broad statement of what you want to achieve. A goal is future-oriented and somewhat general.

Objectives: A specific statement of how you will reach the goal. Objectives are specific accomplishments that must be accomplished in total, or in some combination, to achieve the goals in the plan.

RSWMP Chapter 3 DRAFT Regional Policies

System-wide Policies

Policy 1.0 Preferred Practices (*Modified Goal 1 and Objective 1.1*)

Solid waste management practices will be guided by the following hierarchy:

- First, reduce the amount of solid waste generated;
- Second, reuse material for the purpose for which it was originally intended;
- Third, recycle or compost material that cannot be reduced or reused;
- Fourth, recover energy from material that cannot be reduced, reused, recycled or composted so long as the energy recovery facility preserves the quality of air, water and land resources.
- Fifth, landfill solid waste that cannot be reduced, reused, recycled, composted or from which energy cannot be recovered.

Policy 2.0 System Performance (*Modified RSWMP Plan Goal and Goal 4*)

The regional solid waste system will perform in a manner that is:

- Environmentally sound
- Regionally balanced
- Cost-effective
- Adaptable to change
- Technologically feasible and
- Acceptable to the public.

Policy 3.0 Solid Waste Facilities (*Modified Objective 4.2*)

Regulation of solid waste facilities will ensure protection of the environment and the public interest while not unnecessarily restricting the operations of private solid waste businesses.

Policy 3.1 Solid Waste Facilities (*Goal 15*)

Regulatory control of solid waste facilities will include a system of franchising, licensing, contracting and/or owning.

Policy 3.2 Solid Waste Facilities (*Significantly modified Objective 4.5 and 4.6*)

Transfer facilities in the solid waste system will be both publicly and privately-owned. Publicly-owned facilities will ensure public access to services, reasonable rates, and a hedge against increased vertical integration in the region. Privately-owned facilities will promote competition and improve access for haulers throughout the region.

Policy 3.3 Solid Waste Facilities (*Modified Goal 12*)

Recovery and disposal capacity will be adequate to service all generators in the region.

Policy 3.4 Solid Waste Facilities (*Objective 6.3*)

Appropriate zoning in each city or county will utilize clear and objective standards that do not effectively prohibit solid waste facilities.

Policy 3.5 Solid Waste Facilities (*Objective 6.4*)

Metro will exercise its authority to override any locally imposed restrictions that would prevent utilization of the public facilities to carry out this Plan.

Regional Sustainability Policies

Policy 4.0 Sustainability Alternatives (*Significantly modified Goal 3 and Objective 3.2*)

Waste reduction or other sustainability alternatives identified for business practices or programs will be evaluated based on (a) technological feasibility; (b) economic comparison to current practice; and (c) net environmental benefits.

Policy 4.1 Sustainability Alternatives (*New*)

Sustainability practices for the solid waste system may be implemented voluntarily or required by regulation.

Policy 5.0 Service Provision (*New*)

Integrated public drop-off services, including source-separated recycling, disposal, and household hazardous wastes will be provided by regional transfer facilities.

Policy 5.1 Service Provision (*Modified Goal 8*)

Recycling services will be offered as a component with residential and commercial collection in the region.

Policy 6.0 Recycling Markets (*Goal 10*)

Source separation is the preferred approach in the region for ensuring quality secondary materials for recycling markets, but other forms of material recovery such as post-collection separation will not be precluded.

Policy 6.1 Recycling Markets (*Modified Objective 9.3*)

Enterprises that can significantly expand end-use opportunities for reuse or recycling will be fostered by the region.

Regional Rate and Revenue Policies

Policy 7.1 Rates and Revenues (*Modified Objective 16.2*)

All generators in the region will pay a user charge sufficient to fund the costs of the solid waste system.

Policy 7.2 Rates and Revenues (*Objective 16.1*)

Charges to users of disposal or other facilities will be reasonably related to services received.

Policy 7.3 Rates and Revenues (*New*)

Regional fees and taxes will be applied to solid waste in a manner that will encourage material recovery.

Policy 7.4 Rates and Revenues (*New*)

Potential impacts on ratepayers will be evaluated when new programs or policies are being considered.

Policy 7.5 Rates and Revenues (*Modified Objective 6.4*)

Any community hosting a solid waste “disposal site” as defined by ORS 459.280 is entitled to a Metro-collected fee for the purpose of community enhancement.

RSWMP Goals and Objectives

Recommended Revisions Table

Current RSWMP	Recommended Revisions
System-Wide Goals and Objectives	
<p>Goal 1 - The Environment Solid waste management practices that are environmentally sound, conserve natural resources and achieve the maximum feasible reduction of solid waste being landfilled are implemented by the region.</p>	<p>Policy 1.0 Preferred Practices</p>
<p>Objective 1.1. The guiding policy for waste management in the region is based on the following priorities:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the amount of solid waste generated; 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuse material for the purpose for which it was originally intended; 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recycle material that cannot be reused; 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compost material that cannot be reused or recycled; 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recover energy from solid waste that cannot be reused, recycled or composted so long as the energy recovery facility preserves the quality of air, water and land resources; and 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispose of, by landfilling, any solid waste that cannot be reused, recycled, composted or from which energy cannot be recovered. 	
<p>Goal 2 – Education Residents and businesses of the region are knowledgeable of the full range of waste management options, including waste prevention and reduction, that are available to them.</p>	<p>Moved to Chapter 4 Toxics and Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives</p>
<p>Objective 2.1. Provide for public education regarding the costs and benefits of alternative waste management practices in a coordinated fashion such that duplication is avoided and consistent information is provided to the public.</p>	<p>Moved to Chapter 4 Toxics and Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives</p>
<p>Objective 2.2. Involve the public in five-year updates of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. More frequent Plan revisions may be made as conditions warrant.</p>	<p>Moved to Plan Overview</p>
<p>Objective 2.3. Standardize waste reduction services within the region to the extent possible to minimize confusion on the part of residents and businesses and construct cooperative promotion campaigns that cross jurisdictional boundaries.</p>	<p>Moved to Chapter 5 Solid Waste Facilities and Services</p>
<p>Goal 3 – Economics The costs and benefits to the solid waste system as a whole are the basis for assessing and implementing alternative management practices.</p>	<p>Policy 4.0 Sustainability Alternatives</p>
<p>Objective 3.1. System cost (the sum of collection, hauling, processing, transfer and disposal) is the primary criterion used when evaluating the direct costs of alternative solid waste practices rather than only considering the effects on individual parts.</p>	<p>Deleted</p>
<p>Objective 3.2. The economic and environmental impacts of waste reduction and disposal alternatives are compared on a level playing field in order that waste reduction alternatives have an equal opportunity of being implemented.</p>	<p>Policy 4.0 Sustainability Alternatives</p>
<p>Objective 3.3. After consideration of technical and economic feasibility, Metro will support a higher system cost for waste reduction practices to accomplish the regional waste reduction and recycling goals.</p>	<p>Deleted</p>

Objective 3.4. Government and private industry will work cooperatively to identify, explore and confirm the cost and reliability of emerging solid waste technologies.	Deleted
Objective 3.5. Implement a system measurement program to provide data on waste generation, recycling and disposal sufficient for informed decision-making and planning.	Deleted
Goal 4 – Adaptability A flexible solid waste system exists that can respond to rapidly changing technologies, fluctuating market conditions, major natural disasters and local conditions and needs.	Policy 2.0 System Performance
Objective 4.1. Implement an integrated mix of waste management practices to provide for stability in the event that particular alternatives become viable.	?
Objective 4.2. Government regulation is the minimum necessary to ensure protection of the environment and the public interest without unnecessarily restricting the operation of private solid waste businesses.	Policy 3.0 Solid Waste Facilities
Objective 4.3. Facilities that handle, process, buy and sell source-separated recyclables remain in private ownership in order to maintain greater flexibility to rapidly respond to changing market conditions.	Considered for Chapter 5 Solid Waste Facilities and Services Goals and Objectives
Objective 4.4. Integrate local solid waste solutions into the solid waste management system.	Deleted
Objective 4.5. Solid waste facilities may be publicly or privately owned, depending upon which best serves the public interest. A decision on ownership of transfer and disposal facilities shall be made by Metro on a case-by-case basis.	Policy 3.2 Solid Waste Facilities
Objective 4.6. Metro shall encourage competition when making decisions about transfer station ownership or regulation of solid waste facilities in order to promote efficient and effective solid waste services. Metro shall consider whether the decision would adversely affect the public. Vertical integration is the control by a private firm or firms of the primary functions of a solid waste system- collection, processing, transfer and hauling and disposal.	Policy 3.2 Solid Waste Facilities
Goal 5 – Performance The performance of the solid waste system will be compared to measurable benchmarks on an annual basis.	Deleted
Goal 6 - Plan Consistency The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan shall be integrated with other Metro, state, local government, community and planning efforts and shall be consistent with existing Metro policies for managing solid waste.	Moved to Plan Overview
Objective 6.1. The RSWMP shall be consistent with the adopted Region 2040 Plan and the Regional Framework Plan, when it is adopted.	Moved to Plan Overview
Objective 6.2. The RSWMP shall be consistent with the State of Oregon Integrated Resource and Solid Waste Management Plan.	Moved to Plan Overview
Objective 6.3. Each city and county shall provide appropriate zoning to allow planned solid waste facilities or enter into intergovernmental agreements with others to assure such zoning. Whether by outright permitted use, conditional use or otherwise, app	Policy 3.4 Solid Waste Facilities

Objective 6.4. Metro and local governments shall work together to ensure that solid waste facilities and services are positive contributions to the region.	Policy 7.5 and Policy 3.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For any community providing a solid waste “disposal site,” as defined by ORS 459.280, Metro shall collect a fee to be used for the purpose of community enhancement. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solutions to the problems of illegal dumping and to other adverse impacts caused by changes in the waste management system shall be cooperatively developed. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the extent that tonnage limits and other locally imposed restrictions would prevent Metro from fully using its facilities to carry out this Plan, Metro reserves its authority to override such restrictions, after receiving public comment, by action of its Council. 	
Objective 6.5. The RSWMP shall be recognized through city and county comprehensive plan policies and ordinances governing the siting, permit review and development standards for solid waste facilities.	Moved to Plan Overview
Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives	
Goal 7 - Regional Waste Reduction Goal The regional waste reduction goal is to achieve a recovery rate of 62% as defined by state statute by the year 2005. Per capita disposal rates and reductions in waste generated attributable to waste prevention programs are also acknowledged to be key waste indicators. The region's interim goal for the year 2000 is 52% recovery rate as defined by state statute.	Moved to Chapter 4 Toxics and Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives
Goal 8 - Opportunity to Reduce Waste Participation in waste prevention and recycling is convenient for all households and businesses in the urban portions of the region.	Policy 5.1 Service Provision
Goal 9 – Sustainability Secondary resource management is a self-sustaining operation.	Deleted
Objective 9.1. Include both direct and indirect costs in the price of goods and services such that true least-cost options are chosen by businesses, governments and citizens when making purchasing decisions.	Deleted
Objective 9.2. Develop markets for secondary material that are stable and provide sufficient incentive for separation of recoverable material from other waste and/or the post-collection recovery of material.	Deleted
Objective 9.3. Support an environment that fosters development and growth of reuse, recycling and recovery enterprises.	Policy 6.1 Recycling Markets
Goal 10 – Integration Develop an integrated system of waste reduction techniques with emphasis on source separation, not to preclude the need for other forms of recovery such as post-collection material recovery.	Policy 6.0 Recycling Markets
Facilities and Services Goals and Objectives	
Goal 11 – Accessibility There is reasonable access to solid waste transfer and disposal services for all residents and businesses of the region.	Considered for Chapter 5 Solid Waste Facilities and Services Goals and Objectives
Objective 11.1. Extend and enhance the accessibility of the infrastructure already in place for the management of the waste stream for which the RSWMP is responsible. These responsibilities include all wastes accepted by general- and limited-purpose landfills.	Considered for Chapter 5 Solid Waste Facilities and Services Goals and Objectives

Objective 11.2. Provide reasonable access through new transfer or reload facilities if it becomes evident that waste reduction practices and existing transfer and disposal infrastructure will be unable to keep pace with the future demand for disposal services.	Considered for Chapter 5 Solid Waste Facilities and Services Goals and Objectives
Goal 12 - Recovery Capacity A regionally balanced system of cost-effective solid waste recovery facilities provides adequate service to all waste generators in the region.	Policy 3.3 Solid Waste Facilities
Goal 13 - Toxics Reduction Protect the environment, residents of the region and workers who collect, transport, process and dispose of waste by educating residents of the region on methods eliminating or reducing the risks arising from hazardous materials.	Moved to Chapter 4 Toxics and Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives
Objective 13.1. Manage hazardous waste based on the Environmental Protection Agency’s hierarchy of “reduce, reuse, recycle, treat, incinerate and landfill.”	Moved to Chapter 4 Toxics and Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives
Objective 13.2. Educate residents of the region about alternatives to the use of hazardous products, proper use of hazardous products, how to generate less hazardous wastes and proper disposal methods for hazardous waste.	Moved to Chapter 4 Toxics and Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives
Objective 13.3. Provide convenient, safe, efficient and environmentally sound disposal services for hazardous waste that remains after implementing prevention and reuse practices.	Moved to Chapter 4 Toxics and Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives
Goal 14 - Disaster Management. In the event of a major natural disaster such as an earthquake, windstorm or flood, the regional solid waste system is prepared to quickly restore delivery of normal refuse services and have the capability of removing, recycling	Moved to DDM Goals and Objectives section
Objective 14.1. Provide both accurate and reliable information for use in predicting the consequences of a major disaster and an inventory of resources available for responding to and recovering from disasters.	Moved to DDM Goals and Objectives section
Objective 14.2. Develop a phased response plan that coordinates emergency debris management services and maximizes public health and safety.	Moved to DDM Goals and Objectives section
Objective 14.3. Develop a recovery plan that maximizes the amounts of materials recovered and recycled and minimizes potential environmental impacts.	Moved to DDM Goals and Objectives section
Objective 14.4. Provide for innovative and flexible fiscal and financial arrangements that promote efficient and effective implementation of response and recovery plans.	Moved to DDM Goals and Objectives section
Objective 14.5. Ensure the coordination and commitment of local, state and federal governments and the private sector.	Moved to DDM Goals and Objectives section
Goal 15 - Facility Regulation. Metro’s methods for regulatory control of solid waste facilities will include a system of franchising, contracting, owning and/or licensing to ensure that disposal and processing facilities are provided and operated in an acceptable manner.	Policy 3.1 Solid Waste Facilities
Metro Revenue System Goals and Objectives	
Goal 16 - Revenue Equity and Stability. To ensure that the Metro solid waste revenue system is adequate, stable, equitable and helps achieve the goals of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.	Deleted

Objective 16.1. Charges to users of Metro-owned disposal facilities will be reasonably related to disposal services received. Charges to residents of the Metro service district who may not be direct users of the disposal system should be related to other	Policy 7.2 Rates and Revenues
Objective 16.2. There will be sufficient revenues to fund the costs of the solid waste system.	Policy 7.1 Rates and Revenues
Objective 16.3. The revenue system will help the region accomplish management goals such as waste reduction and environmental protection.	Deleted