

MARION COUNTY
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE SWMAC MEETING

May 21, 2019
5:30-7:30 PM

Marion Resource Recovery Facility
3680 Brooklake Rd NE
Salem, OR 97303

PRESENT: **Members:** Judy Skinner, Bonnie Sullivan, Tim Rice, Julie Jackson, April Murazzo, Joe Fowler, Kevin Hines, Keith Bondaug-Winn, Will Posegate, Scott Anderson
 Staff: Brian May, Stephanie Rosentrater, Commissioner Brentano, Barb Young, Thomas Kissinger
 Public: Ralph Lewis, Bryce Jacobson, Will Ennis

ABSENT: Brian Sund, Chris Ream

CONSENT

MOTION: Bonnie moved to approve the April 23, 2019 the amended February 26, 2019 minutes.

DISCUSSION: None.

RESULTS: Kevin seconded the motion. A voice vote was unanimous. Minutes approved pending corrections listed above.

ADMINISTRATIVE (Information/Action):

PUBLIC INPUT: None.

AGENDA REVIEW: None.

EDWRP/Mandatory MRFing Discussion

Brian May introduced Will Ennis and Bryce Jacobson from Metro. They will be giving us an overview of the Enhanced Dry Waste Recovery Program (EDWRP) that Metro has had in place for about 10 years. Bryce is a Senior Waste Reduction Planner at Metro. Most of his projects deal with construction and demolition materials. He works a lot with wood markets and deconstruction. Will is a Solid Waste Planner at Metro. Will works for the Solid Waste Compliance division as compliance inspector. As a compliance inspector, Will was responsible for implementing EDWRP sampling requirements on the ground.

EDWRP Background: In 2003, working off of a 1995 Solid Waste Management Plan, Metro started to look at options for dry waste recovery. The goal was to increase the recovery rate and draft legislation that would cease direct disposal of certain materials. Waste composition data showed that loads going to two specific low-cost landfills just outside of the Metro area were richer in recoverable material than many loads that were going to the Materials Recovery Facilities (MRFs). Fixing this issue could boost their recovery 1.5% (then, total tons in the system was around 1 million tons) just from recovering wood, cardboard, and metal. The objective was to implement a program that *required* recovery before disposal. This went along with a City of Portland ordinance that required the sorting of construction waste and recycling. Now rather than having to have multiple drop boxes, construction companies could take their waste to a MRF who would sort for them. In 2009, when the legislation went into effect, there were ten dry waste recover facilities in the Metro area that were not operating at capacity. There was also a System Fee Credit Program that went into place in 1998 that gave a rebate to recovery facilities that recovered more than 25% of front door material. This was to help them from going out of business when tipping fees at landfills were low. When designing the EDWRP legislation, solid waste

system stakeholders wanted to do away with the System Fee Credit Program. They also wanted Metro facilities to conform to the same standards that they would have to. They also wanted to replace the front door 25% (by weight) recovery standard with 15% backdoor residual standard.

Designing EDWRP Legislation: With the adoption of EDWRP, the standard became that residual material could not contain more than 15% (by weight) wood, metal, or cardboard of certain dimensions. This was accompanied by a code ban on size reduction of residual waste (facilities could not grind up residual material). Recoverable material was defined as followed:

Wood – lumber, pressure treated, painted, stained, engineered wood (MDF, plywood, etc.) counted as recoverable wood. Creosote, rail ties, and yard debris did not count as recoverable material.

Cardboard – All cardboard, including cardboard attached to a non-cardboard component, as long as it didn't require the use of hand tools to separate it from what it was attached to.

Metal – Pretty much the same standard as cardboard, but for metal.

The next step in implementing the legislation was to decide how to determine if facilities were meeting the standard. Metro worked with contractors to develop a sampling method. Facilities were required to perform nine sampling events per quarter, taken over three non-consecutive days (three per day on non-consecutive days). 300 pound samples were to be taken from different sections of the residual stockpile and sorted into EDWRP pile (wood, metal, cardboard) and non-EDWRP pile. Each pile is weighed and that's how the facility comes up with the percentage of recoverable materials in the residual. After the procedure was finalized, Metro staff went to the facilities to demonstrate how sampling would be done and how they would report their sampling results. Metro also would visit facilities and conduct samples (that the facility could use the results of for their quarterly sampling). Metro's sampling could be done randomly or based on complaints/what inspectors see during visits for other reasons, etc. EDWRP went into effect in July of 2009

EDWRP after ten years: As an inspector, Will believes that the front door number should have been used, rather than a residual number. 15% was decided on without much analysis and is easy to meet (Will has only seen one instance of non-compliance). EDWRP did not incentive companies to increase recovery or to recover materials other than wood, metal, and cardboard. The launch of the program in 2009 coincided with the economic recession, which caused Oregon to see a 21% decrease in construction activities. This is also around the time that the SP Mill in Newberg closed, which caused a 50% reduction in regional wood recycling. EDWRP was temporarily changed to remove wood as a recoverable material. A progress report was done in 2012 to evaluate the program's success. They saw a boost in recovery of 20,000 tons, regardless of the reduction in dry waste flow (22%). One of the two low-cost landfills closed and the other built a state-of-the-art recovery facility.

List of things that could be done beyond EDWRP to incentivize recovery:

- Incentivize material reuse for building materials.
- Return to a front door standard
- Third party recovery standard – a third party evaluates the facility for different criteria (quality of operations, facility's markets, safety, etc.) and gives it a grade or seal of approval.
- Innovation and investment grants to incentivize recovery at private recovery facilities.

History & Tour of Marion Resource Recovery Facility (MRRF)

Kevin presented the history of the MRRF before starting the tour. Seven local haulers own the MRRF. In 2000, they decided to build a dry mixed waste recover facility to help keep recoverable material out of the landfill/Covanta. In 2001, the MRRF processed 28,000 tons of total material. In 2018, they brought in 170,000 tons. Due to increased tonnage, in 2014 the MRRF added a second shift. Kevin showed the Council a comparison of operations, equipment, and personnel in the years 2001 and 2018. The Haulers Association is currently looking for a way to expand their facility.

Kevin showed the Council the whole process by way of the cameras that are set up throughout the facility. He explained that the material is hand-sorted. He also explained that the MRRF is not open to the public, so only the haulers deliver material there, which gives them more control over what comes into the facility. There is also a transfer station for yard debris on site. Yard debris is delivered by the haulers and then transferred to PRC.

Brian explained that the County has switched the way that they calculate recovery at the MRRF. In the past, they measured front door numbers, but the loads had to be “highly recoverable” to be able to come there in the first place, which meant they were losing recoverable material. They’ve switched to back door sampling of the residual material with the change in route for the transfer stations (they now go to MRRF first).

Kevin led the Council on a tour of the MRRF.

Mandatory MRFing and the 2025 Goal

Keith wanted to tie the idea of mandatory MRFing back to the discussion on how we meeting the 64% recovery goal by 2025. He asked Will and Bryce how Marion County could go about beginning mandatory MRFing, if that was a route they decided to take. Metro started by discussing with advisory groups and stakeholder groups and speaking with the industry. It was not exactly a smooth process— Metro got sued by a small, family-owned landfill – however, most of the solid waste industry people seemed to be in favor of it. There were some director changes during the process.

April wanted to know if dry waste recovery is a problem in Marion County. Brian explained that leakage is definitely a problem, meaning that loads generated in Marion County sometimes get taken to facilities outside of Marion County. The MRRF not being open to the public adds to this a bit, though they’ve recently changed it so that the County can direct specific loads to the MRRF from the public.

Because we have identified that demolition waste is an issue, April wanted to know how SWMAC could assist in writing mandatory MRFing legislation. SWMAC can’t write legislation, but can provide guidance, recommendations, and feedback to the Board of Commissioners. Other ideas for requiring sorting/recovery of materials including making it a part of the building permit process (or providing education upon application for a permit) or requiring a separate solid waste permit to be obtained. Recovering construction and demolition materials would be helpful in meeting the 2025 goal of 64% because there’s so much of it and because the material is so heavy.

FUTURE TOPICS/EMERGING ISSUES/OTHER BUSINESS (Information/Discussion):

Announcements and Upcoming Events: None.

Other Business: None.

Staff Updates: None.

Membership/Attendance: A new applicant, Ralph, attended the meeting and submitted an application. Chris Ream and Brian Sund were absent, but excused.

Meeting Review: Keith thanked Kevin and his staff for hosting the meeting and providing dinner. Bonnie noted that she very much enjoyed the presentation from Will and Bryce.

Motion to close the meeting: Bonnie motioned to adjourn the meeting. Joe Seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 7:18 pm