

REGIONAL WASTE SUBCOMMITTEE: MEETING #2

Meeting Date/Time: Monday, March 5, 2025, 8:00am-10:00am

Meeting Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85423985285?pwd=El2ZlITdp7QOFPlaPbkO1BHvQVZnn.1&from=addon>

Attendees

Subcommittee Members

Commissioner Kevin Cameron, Benton County
Tim Dooley, Association of Oregon Counties
Tom Egleston, Oregon Metro
Courtney Flathers, Regional Solutions, Governor's Office
Jessi Just, Heart of CARTM
Commissioner Pat Malone, Benton County
Brian May, Marion County
Sean McGuire, Benton County
Jeff Orlandini, Lane County
Bailey Payne, Benton County
Amy Roth, Association of Oregon Recyclers

Staff

Facilitator: Elizabeth Start, Start Consulting Group
Subject Matter Expert: Bryce Hesterman, RRS

Notes

Key Takeaways

- Three main focus areas confirmed: transfer station design for recovery, transfer network logistics/export, and integrated mixed waste facilities
- New state-level SMMP task force bill introduced, highlighting need for regional representation and coordination
- Strategies discussed for each focus area, including public-private partnerships, intermodal operations, and new technologies
- Importance of considering policy/legislation, economic incentives, and ownership models in developing strategies

Topics

Legislative Update

- Representative Fagan McDonnell introduced bill for state-level SMMP task force
- Concerns raised about representation, especially for Metro region and Lane County
- Opportunity to provide input on task force structure and appointments

Transfer Station Design for Recovery

- Develop new infrastructure vs retrofit existing
- Public-private partnerships and eco-parks for market development
- Separate strategies for commercial waste vs residential self-haul
- Policy/regulations to require waste segregation
- Operator training programs
- Examples to research:
 - Tualatin Valley Waste Recovery (TVWR) facility
 - Greenway facility achieving high recovery rates
 - RCI certification for dry waste facilities
 - Vancouver BC integrated facilities with EPR programs

Transfer Network Logistics and Export

- Hub and spoke model
- Intermodal operations (rail, barge)

- Intergovernmental partnerships
- Multi-scale strategies
- Incentives/disincentives for recovery
- Examples to research:
 - Cost-benefit analysis of different transportation modes
 - Optimal travel distances for various material types
 - Existing infrastructure capacity and potential efficiencies
 - Public financing options for multi-jurisdictional projects

Integrated Mixed Waste Facilities

- RFP for design/build/operate contracts
- Best available technologies for recycling, organics, and other waste streams
- Large centralized vs modular facilities
- Examples to research:
 - Wet vs dry waste processing
 - Reload facilities for spoke-to-hub aggregation
 - Economic and environmental trade-offs of various technologies

Cross-Cutting Considerations

- Ownership models (public vs private) and implications for flow control
- Policy and legislation needs for each strategy
- Economic incentives and disincentives for increased recovery
- Balancing immediate needs with long-term planning (5-50 year outlook)
- Importance of public education and simplified messaging

Ideas

Transfer Station Design for Recovery:

- Public-private partnerships
- Supply processing contracts
- Eco-parks and market development integration
- Policies/regulations requiring segregation of waste streams (e.g. C&D, commercial routes)
- Operator training

Transfer Network Logistics and Export:

- Intermodal operations (e.g. rail, barge)
- Intergovernmental partnerships/regional approaches
- Multi-scale strategies (hub-and-spoke model)
- Backhaul opportunities to improve efficiency

Integrated Mixed Waste Facility:

- Segregating wet vs dry waste streams
- Exploring advanced waste processing technologies (e.g. refuse-derived fuel, pyrolysis)
- Considering scale (centralized vs modular facilities)
- Incentives/disincentives for recovery performance

Considerations

Balancing immediate needs vs long-term vision:

- Ensuring solutions address current challenges, while also planning for future needs and technological advancements.

Public vs private ownership and control:

- Exploring the pros and cons of public, private, and public-private partnership models in terms of control, efficiency, and accountability.
- Considering the role of "flow control" or directing the supply of materials to achieve desired outcomes.

Integrating policy and legislation:

- Recognizing the need to align strategies with relevant policies, rules, and regulations at the local, regional, and state levels.
- Identifying opportunities to update or create new policies to enable preferred approaches.

Prioritizing high-impact materials:

- Focusing efforts on waste streams with the greatest potential for diversion and environmental/health benefits (e.g. food waste, C&D).
- Balancing the cost-benefit of recovering lower-volume, harder-to-process materials.

Leveraging existing infrastructure and partnerships:

- Exploring ways to optimize the use of current transfer stations, processing facilities, and transportation networks.
- Identifying opportunities for inter-county/regional collaboration and resource sharing.

Ensuring financial viability and sustainability:

- Considering the long-term costs and revenue implications of different strategies.
- Exploring innovative financing mechanisms, such as public bonding or special districts.

Questions

Ownership and control models:

- What is the optimal balance of public, private, and public-private partnership ownership and control models?
- How can contractual strategies and mechanisms like "flow control" be used to manage the flow of materials?

Policy and legislation:

- What policy and legislative changes are needed at the local, regional, and state levels to enable preferred strategies?
- How can policy and legislation be integrated into the different focus areas (transfer station design, transfer network, integrated facilities)?

Waste stream segregation and processing:

- How can transfer stations be designed or retrofitted to better segregate wet vs. dry waste streams?
- What are the most effective technologies and processes for recovering materials from integrated/mixed waste facilities?

Regional coordination and collaboration:

- How can counties and municipalities in the region work together more effectively on infrastructure, operations, and markets?
- What are the opportunities and challenges around creating multi-jurisdictional entities (e.g. special districts) to manage waste systems?

Financing and economic viability:

- What are the long-term costs and revenue implications of different strategies?
- What innovative financing mechanisms (e.g. public bonding, special districts) could be leveraged?

Prioritizing high-impact materials:

- How should the focus areas prioritize recovering high-volume, high-impact materials (e.g. food waste, C&D) versus lower-volume, harder-to-process materials?

Action: Research and analysis

- Incorporate the "policy/legislation" focus area as a column across the different strategies.
- Add any new strategies or ideas that participants want to capture.
- Encourage participants to continue adding notes, examples, and resources to the whiteboard.
- Explore local examples of transfer stations designed for recovery, such as the Tualatin Valley Waste Recovery facility and Greenway facility.
- Investigate ownership models, including public, private, and public-private partnership approaches.
- Research innovative financing mechanisms like public revenue bonding and special districts.
- Analyze pricing, revenues, and market conditions to understand the viability of segregating and transporting different waste streams.