

**Metro Solid Waste Advisory Committee, July 9, 2014**

**Committee member comments in response to questions related to potential alternatives for food scraps processing in the region**

QUESTION FOR COMMITTEE	ALL ALTERNATIVES	ALTERNATIVE 1 <i>Status quo</i>	ALTERNATIVE 2 <i>Food scraps disposal ban</i>	ALTERNATIVE 3 <i>Flow control and contracting</i>	ALTERNATIVE 4 <i>Metro builds facility</i>	ALTERNATIVE 5 <i>Wastewater treatment</i>
<b>1. Thoughts on each alternative and the identified roles?</b>	<p>Has the Metro Council determined that energy production is the highest and best use for food waste?</p> <p>To really evaluate potential for any option, need an understanding of the potential capacity opportunities, GHC emissions/impacts, and any other environmental impacts, as well as community acceptance.</p>	<p>Relies on voluntary participation. Almost impossible to create incentives for participation.</p> <p>Unstable, limited available capacity.</p> <p>Not an acceptable alternative to meet existing or future recovery rate. Food is critical material to address and programs are unlikely to be robust enough under this alternative.</p> <p>No economies of scale, limited efficiencies, low participation as a result.</p>	<p>Provides necessary material flows to build incentives.</p> <p>Add organics to required recycling (add as a principle recycling rather than banning disposal).</p> <p>Allows (but does not guarantee) for private sector development of processing capacity.</p> <p>Disposal ban (phased in over time to allow for infrastructure development and local government programs) is critical to driving development and insuring predictable tonnage.</p> <p>Supportive of a disposal ban on commercial food scraps to increase tonnage and increase participation.</p> <p>Who is responsible for enforcement of disposal ban?</p>	<p>Why the use of Metro Central and Metro South only for transfer? Current private transfer has capacity.</p> <p>Either Alternative 3 or 5, not both. Both would disperse tonnage too much and need tonnage to remain consolidated for economy of scale.</p> <p>If requiring all commercial food scraps to go to Metro Central and Metro South, how will that impact the facilities that are already accepting food?</p> <p>Would Metro need to require flow control to its transfer station?</p> <p>Private or public or both for processing capacity.</p> <p>Not sure why all commercial food scraps would need to go to Metro Central or Metro South. Can't other facilities be part of the mix?</p> <p>Metro South has limited footprint, what kind of throughput could that facility really manage?</p>	<p>If Metro finances and builds a facility, the public is on the hook for the cost. A private facility does not risk ratepayer money.</p> <p>Metro was not created to go into business.</p> <p>If requiring all commercial food scraps to go to Metro Central and Metro South, how will that impact the facilities that are already accepting food?</p> <p>Metro South has a limited footprint. What kind of throughput could that facility really manage?</p> <p>Disposal ban (phased in over time to allow for infrastructure development and local government programs) is critical to driving development and insuring predictable tonnage.</p> <p>Why the use of Metro Central and Metro South only for transfer? Current private transfer has capacity.</p>	<p>Only a small number of wastewater treatment plants could likely accept materials.</p> <p>If requiring all commercial food scraps go to Metro Central or Metro South, how will that impact the facilities that are already accepting food?</p> <p>Metro South has limited footprint, what kind of throughput could that facility really manage?</p> <p>Disposal ban (phased in over time to allow for infrastructure development and local government programs) is critical to driving development and insuring predictable tonnage.</p> <p>Why the use of Metro Central and Metro South only for transfer? Current private transfer has capacity.</p>
<b>2. Additional alternatives or refinements to those presented?</b>	<p>Any thoughts on possible transition to a wet/dry collection system? What implications would that have on infrastructure needs?</p> <p>Consider longer-distance haul options along with more local option (make sure to compare emissions impacts).</p> <p>Hybrid of Alternatives 2, 3 and 5.</p>					<p>Need to ensure that food scraps add to actual energy recovery and is not just off-gassed at WWTP.</p>
<b>3. Red flags?</b>	<p>How would you manage the contamination by non-food items?</p> <p>Would the disposal ban be a central landfill ban or a required recycling style rule similar to BRR? BRR style would be much more difficult to implement as it would require getting all the region's cities to pass ordinances.</p>		<p>60% of alternatives require processing through Metro's transfer stations – there's limited capacity and a lot of tons if recovery is high. Not sure if the region could rely on Metro's facilities – would require private sector transfer too.</p> <p>No guarantee of new capacity with ban.</p> <p>Chicken-egg scenario? No guarantee of flow will come from a ban.</p>		<p>Private industry opposition would be strong.</p> <p>Funding?</p> <p>Siting? Enormous opposition from neighbors of facility.</p> <p>Siting within the region is a significant barrier.</p>	<p>Mixing food scraps with sewage is a big problem for final disposition of solids. Strong reservations about WWTP unless it is a separate digester.</p> <p>WWTP operations, while capable of processing food through their AD technology, are currently outside the solid waste collection-transfer-processing system. It would require a significant culture shift.</p>

QUESTION FOR COMMITTEE	ALL ALTERNATIVES	ALTERNATIVE 1 <i>Status quo</i>	ALTERNATIVE 2 <i>Food scraps disposal ban</i>	ALTERNATIVE 3 <i>Flow control and contracting</i>	ALTERNATIVE 4 <i>Metro builds facility</i>	ALTERNATIVE 5 <i>Wastewater treatment</i>
<p><b>4. What would need to change if residential is included?</b></p>	<p>Don't overlook residential food scraps recovery. It will engage participation and ultimately support broader programs.</p> <p>Jurisdictions are looking to expand to residential food scraps. Metro needs to work with DEQ to permit yard debris processors to be able to accept residential food scraps and yard debris.</p>		<p>Is there capacity/facilities to take both?</p>	<p>Portland and Metro have worked very successfully to recover residential food scraps. Limiting residentially-generated food scraps at Metro transfer stations would be a huge problem.</p> <p>Where would residents take their yard waste/food scraps for drop off?</p> <p>I like the idea of a separate residential transfer facility and consolidation of residential food scraps/yard waste to keep costs down.</p> <p>We've been discussing capacity implications at Metro South and how to accommodate that material. How would that change plans for that facility if all commercial goes there?</p>	<p>Portland and Metro have worked very successfully to recover residential food scraps. Limiting residentially-generated food scraps at Metro transfer stations would be a huge problem.</p>	