600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Meeting minutes*

Meeting: Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)

Date: May 14, 2014

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

Members present

Dan Blue, City of Gresham
Kathy Kaatz, City of Tualatin
Scott Keller, City of Beaverton
Leslie Kochan, Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality
Theresa Koppang, Washington County
Matt Korot, Metro
Susan Millhauser, City of Lake Oswego
Amy Pepper, City of Troutdale
Keith Ristau, Far West Fibers
Amy Roth, Association of Oregon Recyclers
Alando Simpson, City of Roses Disposal & Recycling
Bruce Walker, City of Portland

Members Absent

Paul Ehinger, Metro (alternate)
Mike Leichner, Pride Disposal

Guests

Tom Chaimov, Metro
Marv Fjordbeck, Metro
Rob Smoot, Metro

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Matt Korot called the meeting to order and declared a quorum.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair Korot reviewed the meeting agenda and asked if the Committee had questions or comments regarding the agenda. They did not. Ken Ray, Metro Communications, promoted Metro's Let's Talk Trash public engagement series (see www.oregonmetro.gov/letstalktrash).

3. CONSIDERATION OF SWAC MINUTES FOR MARCH 12, 2014

The minutes of the March 12, 2014 SWAC meeting were approved as written.

4. DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY OF METRO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Marv Fjordbeck, Office of Metro Attorney, introduced a survey designed to help evaluate the level of diversity of Metro's advisory committees. Committee members will receive an invitation via email to participate in the survey. The survey is anonymous and asks for basic demographic information. In response to a question from the Committee, Mr. Fjordbeck confirmed this is a survey of individual Committee members, not the organizations they represent. Committee members can contact Mr. Fjordbeck with questions, marv.fjordbeck@oregonmetro.gov.

5. SOLID WASTE ROADMAP SEQUENCING

Tom Chaimov, Metro, provided the schedule for the Solid Waste Roadmap policy development. Through its involvement in the region's solid waste system, Metro seeks to provide the following public benefits:

1. Protect people's health
2. Protect the environment
3. Get good value for the public's money
4. Keep the commitment to the highest and best use of materials
5. Be adaptive and responsive in managing materials
6. Ensure services are available to all types of customers

Mr. Chaimov discussed the broader context of the Roadmap and presented a number of key questions for consideration by stakeholders and the Metro Council:

1. Long term, what should the region do with items that aren't reused, recycled or composted?
2. What model of public-private transfer system best serves the public interest?
3. What service alternative should Metro pursue at or near Metro South?
4. What actions should Metro take to ensure adequate and reasonably proximate food waste transfer and processing capacity?
5. How should Metro recover the cost of solid waste services and general government?

Rob Smoot and Paul Ehinger (Metro) will begin discussions on answering the long term question with the Metro Council on July 15, 2014. The Council is very interested in SWAC's comments and will consider all stakeholder input in the greater context of the Roadmap and the entire solid waste system.

Mr. Chaimov noted there have been no site-specific or company-specific conversations to this point, just concepts. He also noted that for the purposes of the long-term options study, Metro is reviewing solutions for ALL of the region's waste, not just the waste that passes through the two public transfer stations.

6. SOLID WASTE ROADMAP: LONG-TERM OPTIONS FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Rob Smoot, Metro, presented a number of potential technology options for solid waste management. Metro has contracted with HDR, a national firm with many contacts in the industry.

Questions and answers during and following the presentation:

BRUCE WALKER: Reference was made in the presentation about the failed Reidel facility, and RDF (refuse-derived fuel) was mentioned. A facility in Lane County failed along those lines. Have other advancements made the technology appropriate now?

ROB SMOOT: The technology was tested at Metro Central a number of years ago. Related technologies are now much more advanced and a more feasible proposition; costs are not as prohibitive. Metro is looking into some of the technologies that failed in the past to determine how and why they are working today, and comparing options to facilitate discussion.

BRUCE WALKER: Regarding dry anaerobic digestion, is that what San Jose is doing?

ROB SMOOT: Yes. They had to redo their waste collection process. They bid out to a single franchise for the collection of commercial dry and wet waste in the region.

BRUCE WALKER: For all of the AMR (Advanced Material Recovery), one option would be a San Jose-like mega facility, or trying to put it in public transfer stations, or more of an EDWRP (Enhanced Dry Waste Recovery Program) requirement that would rely on Metro's transfer stations, as well as private.

ROB SMOOT: Yes. But we're not looking at the how yet. We're looking at the scenarios to see how they meet our six public values.

LESLIE KOCHAN: How will the analysis be done looking at the lifecycle of some of these facilities? How does that pencil out, and the environmental benefits versus continuing to landfill? I'm hoping that's part of the broader assessment. It is critical to do that review up front.

ROB SMOOT: Yes. We'll be creating a Consumer Reports-style table to compare and contrast each of the scenarios. The consultant is currently working on a lifecycle cost analysis.

LESLIE KOCHAN: In a previous report, Metro anticipated impacts of population growth, climate change, greenhouse gas, etc. How is Metro projecting growth?

ROB SMOOT: Adaptability is one of the key criteria. We have produced some projections using many analysis tools to inform their mechanisms and have passed those along to the consultant.

MATT KOROT: The Metro Council will want to have some of those details as well, so we'll have more specifics prior to meeting with the Council.

Mr. Chaimov introduced several questions for the Committee to consider:

1. What major policy implications should be considered as the scenarios are further investigated?
2. Do you see any critical problems with the scenarios that we have described that could lead to potentially fatal flaws?
3. What other critical information do you believe is needed for decision making?

Committee members wrote their comments to the three questions, which were then discussed and attributed to one of six areas (see attached chart).

1. Landfill (+/- AMR)
2. Direct combustion (+/- AMR)
3. Gasification after AMR
4. Anaerobic digestion after AMR
5. RDF after digestion with AMR
6. Other

Mr. Smoot thanked the Committee for their comments. He noted that some are already being addressed, and some are new thoughts that will be added to the list of issues to research.

Mr. Chaimov indicated staff will summarize the comments and return them to the Committee for approval and feedback, then transmit them to the Metro Council prior to their July 15 work session. Staff will have more direction from the Council following the work session, and will report back to the Committee early next year.

7. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO SWAC AGENDA ITEMS

Rick Winterhalter, Clackamas County, noted there are issues with MRFs (Material Recovery Facilities), but if the region is looking at spending this kind of money, we need to back up and look at how to get the material out of the front end. He acknowledged there are other discussions going on, but said it is important to look at this component.

8. PREVIEW OF THE NEXT MEETING'S AGENDA AND FINAL COMMENTS

Chair Korot thanked everyone for the valuable discussion. Next month there will be the first of at least two back-to-back discussions on the Roadmap project looking at what steps Metro should take to increase capacity for the transfer and processing of food scraps.

9. ADJOURN

Chair Korot adjourned the meeting at noon.

Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee comments in response to the following questions related to potential options for solid waste management in the region:

1. What major policy implications should be considered as the scenarios are further investigated?
2. Do you see any critical problems with the scenarios that we have described that could lead to potentially fatal flaws?
3. What other critical information do you believe is needed for decision making?

LANDFILL (+/- AMR*)	DIRECT COMBUSTION (+/- AMR)	GASIFICATION AFTER AMR	ANAEROBIC DIGESTION AFTER AMR	RDF AFTER DIGESTION WITH AMR	OTHER
• Public believes that we are running out of landfill space. Must overcome this to go this direction. • What if landfills are banned in the future? • AMR – how marketable are materials? • Why looking to decrease materials to landfill? Do we need this investment? Could we gain more benefits (jobs, economic impacts) by improving material recovery and quality if we invest there instead of improved discard management? • What might the effect or impacts be to local collection structures? • How do these technologies jibe with climate change policies at State, Metro level? • There is implied consolidation. Consolidation = closing existing facilities, but consolidation improves efficiencies. • Ability to convey/ communicate process +/- to public. • Ensure thorough GHG analysis (including construction). • Evaluate environmental and public health impacts that might occur at each life-cycle stage of any materials or activities that are necessary to this solid waste management option (e.g. resource extraction, manufacture, construction, use, and end-of-life management).	• Critical flaw potentially: investing in system that requires a very specific amount/type of waste to be successful (like WTE incinerators) that they then must be "fed" in order to be efficient limiting future opportunities to reduce waste. • Perceived bias against direct combustion (historical or otherwise, not "green"). • Residual from these other technologies – would they be an issue? Toxicity of residual or other concerns? • Must be able to win public support and overcome environmental concerns about emissions. • More information regarding overall space and location needs and potential land use impacts; Needed infrastructure, e.g., water, rail, hwy access. • What might the effect or impacts be to local collection structures? • How do these technologies jibe with climate change policies at State, Metro level? • Hugely expensive, if Metro commits to this path will it lead to reduced emphasis on source separation? • There is implied consolidation. Consolidation = closing existing facilities, but consolidation improves efficiencies. • Ability to convey/ communicate process +/- to public. • Ensure thorough GHG analysis (including construction). • Public acceptability (perception of direct combustion; history of opposition in other places). Emissions. • Concerns about ash & toxicity – current controversy about use of fly ash as	• Must be able to win public support and overcome environmental concerns about emissions. • What might the effect or impacts be to local collection structures? • How do these technologies jibe with climate change policies at State, Metro level? • Hugely expensive, if Metro commits to this path will it lead to reduced emphasis on source separation? • Residual from these other technologies – would they be an issue? Toxicity of residual or other concerns? • More information regarding overall space and location needs and potential land use impacts; Needed infrastructure, e.g., water, rail, hwy access. • Location – cost of transportation. • Ongoing cost of AMR – not just labor but recapitalization. • I perceive this to be most expensive to build; if so, consolidation of tonnage may be significant barrier. • There is implied consolidation. Consolidation = closing existing facilities, but consolidation improves efficiencies. • Ability to convey/ communicate process +/- to public. • Ensure thorough GHG analysis (including construction). • Complicated sorting process – good that it is paired w/ AMR • Emissions concerns similar to direct combustion • Concern that this might direct some wastes (e.g., plastics) away from higher and better use • Creating a system that demands more	• What might the effect or impacts be to local collection structures? • How do these technologies jibe with climate change policies at State, Metro level? • Hugely expensive, if Metro commits to this path will it lead to reduced emphasis on source separation? • Residual from these other technologies – would they be an issue? Toxicity of residual or other concerns? • More information regarding overall space and location needs and potential land use impacts; Needed infrastructure, e.g., water, rail, hwy access. • I perceive this to be most expensive to build; if so, consolidation of tonnage may be significant barrier. • How scalable is dry anaerobic digestion? • There is implied consolidation. Consolidation = closing existing facilities, but consolidation improves efficiencies. • Ability to convey/ communicate process +/- to public. • Ensure thorough GHG analysis (including construction). • Siting a huge issue; cost huge issue; potential energy intensity issues. • Is digesting that last remaining residue (that we cannot get out of waste stream) really big benefit over landfilling? DEQ 2050 Materials Mgt. plan assumes some things will go to landfill b/c recovery at some point will have no benefit • More info re: local economic value; jobs generation from process; end product; which can add most value in Metro area?	• Must be able to win public support and overcome environmental concerns about emissions. • More information regarding overall space and location needs and potential land use impacts; Needed infrastructure, e.g., water, rail, hwy access. • Residual from these other technologies – would they be an issue? Toxicity of residual or other concerns? • What might the effect or impacts be to local collection structures? • How do these technologies jibe with climate change policies at State, Metro level? • Hugely expensive, if Metro commits to this path will it lead to reduced emphasis on source separation? • There is implied consolidation. Consolidation = closing existing facilities, but consolidation improves efficiencies. • Ability to convey/ communicate process +/- to public. • Ensure thorough GHG analysis (including construction). • Using waste products to burn in coal plants – could be incentive to continued burning of coal • More info re: local economic value; jobs generation from process; end product; which can add most value in Metro area? • Evaluate environmental and public health impacts that might occur at each life-cycle stage of any materials or activities that are necessary to this solid waste management option (e.g. resource extraction, manufacture, construction, use, and end-of-life management).	• Preface your presentation with what Metro region anticipates will accomplish on upstream. • Further define or refine the context for these options: permitting hurdles, public acceptance hurdles (NIMBY), incineration is bad. • Evaluate franchising commercial collection. • Criteria should explicitly include "recovery" and "energy production" (conversion) in addition to public benefits. • Besides the six public benefits should the Metro Council consider whether or not these facilities can be located within the Metro region? • What is the goal here? If landfill space is not an issue, why are we looking to invest? Is it to decrease materials to landfill for sake of decreased landfill disposal? Create jobs? Create energy? Recover more materials for higher/better use? • Policy implications: besides six public benefits, consider what policies and technologies are being investigated to first increase the amount of materials being recycled/recovered. Some of these technologies fare better with certain types of feedstock. So how does Metro plan to invest first in materials market development to then assess what is truly remaining to dispose? • Balance or compare direct costs against cost implications of inaction with regard to climate change. • Removing private transfer station tonnage caps would reduce system costs. • Need for combination of options for better flexibility – not one size fits all. • Spreadsheet - benefits, capacity, costs, environmental issues. • Education – pre-consumer materials being generated. • Use shorter term contracts for disposal.

DRAFT

LANDFILL (+/- AMR*)	DIRECT COMBUSTION (+/- AMR)	GASIFICATION AFTER AMR	ANAEROBIC DIGESTION AFTER AMR	RDF AFTER DIGESTION WITH AMR	OTHER
	substitute for cement in concrete – even though EPA "approves." • Use of ash as landfill cover – need analysis of what it would replace – envi. costs/benefits of different options (e.g., toxics concerns) • Siting a huge issue; cost huge issue; potential energy intensity issues • More info re: local economic value; jobs generation from process; end product; which can add most value in Metro area? • Evaluate environmental and public health impacts that might occur at each life-cycle stage of any materials or activities that are necessary to this solid waste management option (e.g. resource extraction, manufacture, construction, use, and end-of-life management).	waste & diverts attention from upstream recovery. • Siting a huge issue; cost huge issue; potential energy intensity issues • More info re: local economic value; jobs generation from process; end product; which can add most value in Metro area? • Evaluate environmental and public health impacts that might occur at each life-cycle stage of any materials or activities that are necessary to this solid waste management option (e.g. resource extraction, manufacture, construction, use, and end-of-life management).	• Evaluate environmental and public health impacts that might occur at each life-cycle stage of any materials or activities that are necessary to this solid waste management option (e.g. resource extraction, manufacture, construction, use, and end-of-life management).		• Any options considered where siting? • Funding – who and how will these be paid for? • How do projected volumes of waste compare to the capacity each scenario can handle? Do we need multiple options to handle our volume of waste? • Siting a huge issue; cost huge issue; potential energy intensity issues • Could use smaller facilities for transfer and sorting to reduce collection vehicle mileage. • Looking at all proposed facilities w/ a lens on the triple bottom line of sustainability; more input on overall impacts to the society, environment & economy will justify what is most beneficial to region. • Transitioning from our current system to a "new" system – will we need 13 MRFs in the future? Do we need six transfer stations? Etc. Is consolidation necessary to achieve our goals? • Perform an independent rate review for impact to the system cost. • Evaluate environmental and public health impacts that might occur at each life-cycle stage of any materials or activities that are necessary to this solid waste management option (e.g. resource extraction, manufacture, construction, use, and end-of-life management).

AMR = Advanced Materials Recovery

DRAFT

Oregon
John A. Kitzhaber, MD, Governor

Department of Environmental Quality
Northwest Region
2020 SW 4th Ave, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97201
(503) 229-5263
FAX (503) 229-6945
TTY 711

June 10, 2014

Matt Korot
Resource Conservation & Recycling Program Director
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Matt,

Please accept these corrections to the minutes for the May 14, 2014 SWAC meeting (corrections in red):

LESLIE KOCHAN: In a previous report, Metro anticipated impacts of population growth, climate change, greenhouse gas, etc. How is Metro projecting growth?

LESLIE KOCHAN: How will the analysis be done looking at the lifecycle impacts of some of these facilities? How does that pencil out, and what are the environmental benefits of the new technologies versus continuing to landfill? I'm hoping that's part of the broader assessment. It is critical to do that review up front.

LESLIE KOCHAN: In a previous report, Metro anticipated impacts of population growth, including projections for climate refugees to the region. As Metro wants to support adaptability, are potential climate change impacts, including the potential for reduced consumption due to forecasts for scarcer resources, considered? How is Metro projecting growth?

Thank you,

Leslie Kochan
Environmental Partnerships
NWR - DEQ