

 Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Transfer System Task Force – Meeting 9

Date: Tuesday, December 3, 2015

Time: 9 to 11:30 a.m.

Place: Room 370 A&B, Metro Regional Center

Outcomes: Review of Alternatives Scoring and Weighting

- 9:00 1. Welcome Steve Faust
- > • Introductions
 - > • Summary of Meeting 8
 - Agenda review
 - Announcements Tim Collier
- 9:15 2. Task Force Interview Results Faust
- 9:30 > 3. Multi-Objective Decision Analysis Results Dan Pitzler
Task Force Question & Answer
- 11:15 4. Comments from the public Faust
- 11:25 5. Wrap up, schedule and adjourn Faust
Recap outcomes; confirm information requests, and next meeting date and agenda

Key to symbols

- > Material included with this agenda
Copies of all background materials will be available at the meeting

Transfer System Configuration Project

This project focuses on the region's system of solid waste facilities. The Metro Council has charged the project staff with determining *what management model for the system best serves the public interest*. The project scope includes delivery of services, implementation of public policies, public and private roles, and the economics and governance of the system. The policies and actions that emerge from this project will help shape the future of the regional transfer and recovery system. Options are scheduled to go before the Metro Council in Winter 2015.

Transfer System Task Force

The Transfer System Task Force is comprised of stakeholders that Metro has asked to advise on this project. The Task Force meets on an as-needed basis, and occasionally will host presentations by outside specialists or interested parties. Task Force meetings are open to the public.*

Organization	Representative	Alternate
City of Roses Disposal and Recycling	Alando Simpson	—
Environmentally Conscious Recycling	Vince Gilbert	Vern Brown
Greenway Recycling	Terrell Garrett	Eric Wentland
Gresham Sanitary	Matt Miller	Larry Head
Kahut Waste Services	Andy Kahut	—
Metro Solid Waste Operations	Paul Ehinger	Bruce Philbrick
Pride Recycling	Mike Leichner	—
Recology	Greg Moore	Carl Peters
Republic Services	Brian May	Ray Phelps
Waste Connections	Jason Hudson	Dean Large
Waste Management	Dean Kampfer	Bill Carr

* To be added to the mailing list contact Steve Faust of the project team (steve.faust@coganowens.com) and include "Transfer system project" in the subject line.

Metro | *Meeting minutes*

Meeting: Transfer Station Task Force – Meeting 8
Date/time: Tuesday, October 27, 2015
Place: Council Chambers
Purpose: Review Updated Strategy Table
Confirm Preliminary Task Force Recommendation

Attendees

Members: Vern Brown, Environmentally Conscious Recycling; Paul Ehinger, Metro; Jason Hudson, Waste Connections; Andy Kahut, Kahut Waste Services; Dean Kampf, Waste Management; Mike Leichner, Pride Recycling; Brian May, Republic Services; Greg Moore, Recology; Alando Simpson, City of Roses Recycling and Disposal.

Alternates: Dean Large, Waste Connections; Ray Phelps, Republic Services.

Staff: Steve Faust, Cogan Owens Greene; Lyndsay Lopez and Dan Pitzer, CH2M Hill; Roy Brower, Tom Chaimov, Andy Cotugno, Chuck Geyer, Warren Johnson, Katie Reeves, Joel Sherman, Metro.

Guests: Dave White, Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association.

Desired Outcomes

- Review updated strategy table
- Confirm preliminary Task Force recommendation

Welcome

Following introductions, Roy Brower made an announcement about the Title V process. Task Force members and Metro staff also discussed the current situation regarding wood. Metro is working on a resolution that would suspend EDWRP requirements on wood loads to be disposed of directly. Clean wood should still be recovered, but the rest could be disposed of if the resolution is approved. Task force members had a few minor edits to the summary notes from the September 22 Task Force meeting.

Process Update

Steve Faust gave an update on the process schedule. Today, the Task Force will review their preliminary recommendation and the options Metro is considering. The same information will be presented to SWAAC on November 19th and Metro Council on November 24th. At the next Task Force meeting on December 3rd, members will review and comment on Metro's recommendation and scoring of the various options. Following the December 3rd meeting, Metro staff will present the recommendation to stakeholders, including haulers and local jurisdictions. Should Metro staff decide to change the recommendation based on stakeholder comments, the Task Force will convene in January 2016 to review the revised recommendation. The final recommendation likely will go to Metro Council in February 2016.

In November, Steve will be contacting members to discuss the Task Force process and recommendation. This will provide individual members with an opportunity to share their thoughts about the recommendation in greater detail.

Review Drive Time Maps

Dan Pitzler presented a series of maps that display travel times to transfer facilities in the region. Task Force members agreed that the map showing travel time to self-haul facilities makes a strong case that there is equity across the region. Metro Council will use the maps as one source of data when evaluating the system. Other considerations are service standards at the facilities, such as hours of operation. One Task Force member stated that only 10%-20% of residents in the region use these facilities while the rest use curbside collection service. Another stated that most that use these facilities have collection services, but supplement that service due to one-time events.

Review/Discuss Updated Strategy Table and MODA Evaluation

Dan described the strategy table and explained how it was created. He led the Task Force in an exercise to review the various alternatives and confirm that the Task Force recommendation is represented accurately. Task Force members commented as follows:

Self-haul: No comments.

Household Hazardous Waste: Under the light regulation option, prefer to host additional round-ups rather than accept and store materials on-site.

Commercial Food: No comments.

Residential Food: Choices in this column should refer to residential food, not commercial food.

Mixed Dry Waste: In light of recent events, Status Quo should be revised to add flexibility to recognize market conditions.

Recycling: No comments.

Operating Hours: Add another Light Regulation option that states operating hours are established to meet local community needs relative to cost. Also need to designate class of service.

Sustainability: Actually referring to environmental standards, not the broader concept of sustainability.

Number and Location: Change “public interest” to “public benefits” and ensure all seven benefits, including the one added by the Task Force, are included.

Flow: For the Light Regulation option, the relationship between VMTs tip fees is very complicated. The market already regulates this.

Economics and Pricing (for wet waste only): The term “costs” should be used instead of “tip fee” or “price.” The heavy regulation option would require Metro to audit, collect and public information. Recommend changing the Light Regulation option to Heavy Regulation. Regulation options are complicated. Tonnage flows would have to be guaranteed in order to set rates. Along with local limits, facilities would be subject to double regulation. What is a fair profit in return?

In the coming weeks, Metro staff will work through the Multi-Objective Decision Analysis (MODA). Detail on the scoring will be provided to the Task Force at the next meeting.

Comments from the Public

Has Metro staff worked with attorneys to ensure the agency has the legal authority to implement all the options we have discussed? Metro staff responded that the Office of Metro Attorney is involved in this process, but there will not be an official opinion until more specific details are known.

Wrap Up and Adjourn

Reminder that Steve will be contacting Task Force members in November. The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 3rd at 9am in Rooms 370 A&B at Metro.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 am.

METRO TRANSFER STATION CONFIGURATION PROJECT
DRAFT SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE INTERVIEWS
November 2015

In October and November 2015, Steve Faust (Task Force Facilitator) interviewed eight of the nine voting members of Metro's Transfer Station Configuration Task Force to gather comments on the Task Force process and recommendation.

Themes

- Task Force members acknowledge a difficult transition from a Metro staff member with whom they had a long and trusting relationship. For some, trust in the process and the project management is diminished as a consequence.
- Several members believe there is a pre-determined outcome and that their suggestions are not taken seriously. Task Force members feel they have been operating in isolation and that an exchange between operators and regulators is needed. More transparency in Metro's internal process would be welcomed.
- A lack of diverse voices on the Task Force has resulted in a) a singular and biased perspective and b) an environment where members do not feel comfortable voicing disagreement from the majority. Outreach to haulers and local government representatives is needed to provide a comprehensive review of the recommendations.
- Most Task Force members support the Task Force recommendation. However, some members support tonnage caps while others want them eliminated. The role of tonnage caps and, by extension, Metro is the main point of disagreement among Task Force members.
- Task Force members are most concerned about some of the "heavy regulation" requirements. They oppose Metro requiring facilities to a) accept certain materials, b) provide access to their operating costs for local governments to set rates, or c) operate at rates set by Metro. Members will likely take their concerns directly to Metro Council if any of these measures are part of the recommendation from Metro staff.

What are your thoughts on the Task Force process thus far? What has worked well? What could be improved?

- Were told that the Task Force recommendation would go directly to Metro Council and now it is going to Metro staff.
- Interest in participating declined when trying to define a problem statement, but members agreed that there is no problem with the current system.
- Ranked the seven criteria at one meeting then it was presented to us in a different order at the next meeting. How did we go from seven criteria to eight?
- Doug Anderson knows the numbers and impacts better than anybody. He has always been transparent and neutral.
- Feel like our suggestions are not always reflected in the materials.
- Feel like Task Force is being guided in a certain direction. Concerned that we are driving toward a pre-determined outcome.
- Metro staff listens to our conversations, but we are not privy to theirs.
- Would like to have a Metro representative (regulator) in the room so we can find common ground between the Task Force recommendation and Metro staff recommendation.
- Process seems geared towards three or four people in the room.
- The lack of diverse stakeholders creates a hostile environment.

- Preferred when Metro brought all stakeholders into the same room to have these conversations and create solutions.
- How will these recommendations be reported? Want to see Task Force report before it goes to Council.
- Will go directly to Council if the report does not reflect what the Task force has said.

Are there any aspects (columns) of the Task Force recommendation you would change? If so, what changes would you make?

- There is not a level playing field between Metro and private facilities. Metro does not have the same costs.
- If Metro wants to compete with private facilities, it should not subsidize competitive services with revenues from the regional system fee.
- Public facilities should meet the same standards and requirements as private facilities.
- Metro falsely presents itself as the facility of last resort.
- Metro needs to step back and clarify its mission / decide what role the agency should play in the system.
- Metro needs to be part of the system.
- Metro should not be a regulator, competitor and tax collector.
- Equity presentation showed good coverage across the region. It's too expensive to serve the "last" household as well as the majority.
- Willing to do more on self haul if there is a good rate of return and it is done safely.
- Each transfer system facility is unique and therefore you cannot require facilities to offer the same services. There is an expense to modifying facilities that would have to be covered by Metro/the public.
- Opposed to the option where transfer stations hold hazardous waste. Metro has the facilities, staff and fee to handle hazardous materials. We should build on that.
- There is capacity in the system to process trash, but not to increase recovery. More facilities are needed.
- Need to keep small, local operators in the system because they work and innovate to recover more material. Vertically integrated firms do not always serve the public interest.
- Need more information on the specific sustainability measures/standards Metro is referring to (e.g. power generation, CNG vehicles).
- If Metro facilities are achieving certain standards through the regional system fee, then private facilities should have access to those funds if required to meet the same standards.
- Do not support the "nearest-cheapest" option unless tonnage is divided equally among facilities.
- Tonnage caps force haulers to make trips across the region, resulting in more windshield time which results in higher costs and greenhouse gas emissions.
- Tonnage caps should be flexible.
- Tonnage caps are the best tool for achieving public benefits.
- Tonnage caps are good because they keep Metro funded.
- Metro should look for new and innovative ways to divert tonnage to diverse operations.
- Why is Waste Connections not shown on the geographic distribution maps?
- Opposed to Metro setting rates at private transfer systems. You cannot set rates without guaranteeing tonnage. Need flexibility.
- Concern about sharing information with an entity (Metro) that is both a regulator and a competitor. Don't want to give away trade secrets.