

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

February 6, 1997

Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Ruth McFarland (Deputy Presiding Officer), Lisa Naito, Don Morissette, Susan McLain, Patricia McCaig, Ed Washington

Councilors Absent: Jon Kvistad (Presiding Officer)

Deputy Presiding Officer Ruth McFarland called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m. She noted the Presiding Officer Kvistad was in Washington D.C. for ISTEA requests.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

4. CONSENT AGENDA

4.1 Consideration of the Minutes for the January 23, 1997 Metro Council Meeting.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved approval of the January 23, 1997 Council Meeting minutes.

Seconded: **Councilor Naito** seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: The vote was 5 aye/ 0 nay/ 1 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette abstaining as he was not present for that meeting.

5. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

5.1 **Ordinance No. 97-678**, For the Purpose of Amending the FY 1996-97 Budget and Appropriations Schedule, Transferring \$6,000 from the General Fund Contingency to Council Materials and Services; and Declaring an Emergency.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland indicated that the Presiding Officer would make the committee assignment for Ordinance No. 97-678.

5.2 **Ordinance No. 97-659**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Metro Code Title X, Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland indicated that the Presiding Officer would make the committee assignment for Ordinance No. 97-659.

6. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

6.1 **Ordinance No. 96-669**, An Ordinance Amending the FY 1996-97 Budget and Appropriations Schedule for the Purpose of Transferring \$5,000 from the Planning Fund Contingency to Materials and Services to Provide a Metro Contribution to a Regional Car-Sharing Feasibility; and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved the approval of Ordinance No. 96-669.

Seconded: **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion.

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** noted the staff report, which explained this project. Metro was giving \$5,000 for their share of the study, part of a partnership where EPA was contributing \$58,650 and DEQ was contributing the grant administration and project management. This idea was an important one, car sharing was where there was an organization, a group or a zone where people share cars similar to the government fleet car program. This allowed people who did not wish to own a car to still have opportunity to use a car when needed or when other modes of transportation were not available. This idea had worked in Europe and Canada and she believed that Metro's contribution would be worthwhile to see if this would help the region.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland asked Councilor McLain if there was anyone from staff available for questions?

Councilor Naito asked if this program studied where transit was not available?

Councilor McLain responded that it was a market based incentive program for car-sharing. It was a demonstration project of a car-sharing organization consisting of a group of individuals who would share a fleet of cars. The vehicles purchased were on a leased agreement, maintenance and repair costs would be provided. It allowed an individual to have the benefit of the use of one of these vehicles. The study was to see how it would work in this region and if this would be a pilot project possibility for this region.

Councilor Naito said that she thought it was targeted for high density for those who needed a car on occasion. If this was the intent she would support this ordinance.

Councilor McLain clarified that it was supposed to be in places where there would less parking spots, allowing more individuals to use less cars.

Councilor Washington followed up by saying that this particular program was not like the yellow bike program but rather a program for people who didn't want to own a car but there was a need for use one every so often.

Councilor Naito said one of the pros would be that in terms of zoning, where there was a goal of fewer parking spaces such as in an apartment area.

Councilor McLain believed from the presentation of staff that they were looking at the 2040 Growth Concept and high density area.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland opened an public hearing. No one came forward, the public hearing was closed.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

6.2 **Ordinance No. 96-655B**, For the Purpose of Designating Urban Areas for the Portland Metropolitan Area Urban Growth Boundary; Amending RUGGO Ordinance No. 95-625A and Metro Code Chapter 3.01; and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved to amend the map in exhibit B of Ordinance No. 96-655B to correspond to deletions in Urban Reserve Areas #18, 52, and 67, as recommended in the proposed findings from the Office of General Counsel dated 1/31/97.

Seconded: **Councilor Naito** seconded the amendment.

Discussion: **Dan Cooper, Legal Counsel**, noted that the ordinance had already been moved and seconded at a previous Council meeting.

Councilor McLain noted the map deletions and ordinance. The Council had agreed on the February 4, 1997 Work Session to bring forward to this meeting the deletions to the map.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland opened a public hearing. No one came forward, the public hearing was closed.

Councilor McLain said that this ordinance would be forwarded to the February 13, 1997 Council meeting as amended. This action was taken today to allow the public to have these deletions on the table.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion to amend passed unanimously of those present.

7. RESOLUTIONS

7.1 **Resolution No. 96-2435**, For the Purpose of Certifying that the City of Wilsonville's ADA Paratransit Plan for 1997 Meets ADA Requirements and Conforms to Metro's Regional Transportation Plan.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved for the approval of Resolution No. 96-2435.

Seconded: **Councilor Morissette** seconded the motion.

Discussion: **Councilor Washington** reviewed that SMART was required to receive certification from Metro to meet the requirements of American Disabilities Act of 1990. SMART provided four fixed routes serving Wilsonville and making commuter services connection with TriMet routes, Commerce Circle, Tualitan Park and Ride, Meridian Park Hospital, Barbur and Oregon City transit centers. This included a dollar ride service providing demand responsive curb to curb service in Wilsonville open to the general public and a link service connecting customers to transportation service within a 25 mile radius outside the Wilsonville city limits. It had a prescheduled door to door trip for senior citizen for lunch. The resolution had been before JPACT and the Transportation Committee. He urged the Council's support. There had been reports from the transit person at Wilsonville to JPACT and Transportation Committee, there had been no issue with the resolution.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

7.2 **Resolution No. 97-2448**, For the Purpose of Approving the Year 8 Waste Reduction Plan for Metro and Local Governments.

Motion: **Councilor McLain** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2448.

Seconded: **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion.

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** reviewed her amendment to Resolution No. 97-2448. Since the resolution had come from committee she had asked staff to work on some clarification, definitions and appendix being added to the resolution. There were some questions that the public had asked that were unanswered because the document was not easy to read or understand how they felt the annual Waste Reduction Work Plan for Year 8 fit in with some of the other work that was being done including changes to RSWMP and to other task force work. She pointed out that in the final outline of the Year 8 prologue there was information added about how this Year 8 Work Plan worked along with some of the other work that was discussed in the Solid Waste Committee as well as to flush out what was meant by some of the terms. There were some housekeeping amendments and definition clarification. The targeted businesses definition was added, defined as business types as well as a list of the businesses that had been chosen because of the high level of material that needed to be targeted. On page 7, 2B clarification on intent and costs via the RSWMP revision process was added. This process needed to be recognized in the resolution and to be publicized in the document to emphasize support of the RSWMP goals. The language was cleared up, definitions clarified (a copy of this amendment may be found in the permanent record of the Council). She asked Ms. Erickson to address the fact that the staff supported these clarifications and supported the definition and language clean up, supporting what SWAC and the staff had tried to do with the document.

Ms. Jennifer Erickson, REM Department, clarified the introduction section by adding some current information on page 2 under Alternative Practices and the Waste Evaluation Service Plan Framework. There was also an added section on the RSWMP amendments and how they related to the Year 8 Work Plan. Some of the amendments would remain draft until RSWMP made those decisions. On page 3, in the Regional Benchmark section, it addressed measurement adding tables from the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan to emphasize the regional benchmarks and targets with the program. She spoke of the home compost bin program. The program was not being eliminated but they had decided to discontinue directly subsidizing the individual purchase of bins. They still planned to be active in a compost bin program, a study recommended continuation of the bin program but not the current approach. She noted the commercial and business recycling programs clarified the base line. Under the building industry waste prevention she noted 1B and 1C which were originally going to be sunsetted this year but had been kept in for next year as ongoing support programs.

Councilor McLain added that staff was very careful to make sure that there were no substantial changes from the time that the committee had reviewed it. These changes were simply questions that had been brought up at the committee and these changes reflected what the goal was. The resolution was assisted by including attachments C, D, E and F reflecting the work they had done making it a more complete communication device for the public so they understood what the annual work plan was for Year 8. She supported this resolution with the language clarification and attachments that were added.

Councilor Morissette asked if Ms. Erickson had had contact with the committee members to verify that they believed that the changes were not substantive and would continue to support the original document.

Ms. Erickson said she had not had personal communication with anyone but Councilor McLain.

Councilor McLain indicated that the proposed changes had been mailed out and there had been no comments received on the changes.

Councilor Morissette asked if it would be appropriate to send the document back to committee prior to Council's vote on the resolution?

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland said that when these type of documents were mailed out the public responded if they wished input. She noted two individuals who were here to testify on this resolution.

Councilor Morissette said he assumed that the people who were here to testify were not in support of the original document.

Ms. Erickson said she did not know if the people who were testifying had seen this version, dated January 30, 1997. It was in the Council packet which had been mailed.

Councilor McLain said she had personally gone over the changes with the two individuals testifying at this meeting. She responded to Councilor Morissette's question about SWAC. There was only one committee where things were sent back if the Council didn't like the work, that was JPACT which was required legally. SWAC was an advisory committee. She indicated that SWAC was not expecting to take up another meeting on the annual work plan. They expected their advise to be used where appropriate and to make changes. The changes that were made were from the Solid Waste Committee thoughts and ideas on issues, problems and concerns. This was not undoing SWAC's work nor was there a single thing done in the amendment packet that did not support what SWAC sent forward. The language was simply tightened up.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland responded that although SWAC was an advisory committee they, on occasion when substantive changed been made, had sent letters to SWAC for response.

Councilor Naito asked a process question. She said that even though these changes were simply technical in nature, there had been no public notice. There may be others interested in input. She asked for clarification if these were in fact simply technical amendments or were there policy amendments?

Ms. Erickson said these were clarifications, there was nothing that had actually changed the intent, it was all giving more information about what was there, answering specific questions where there was not enough information in the original plan.

Councilor Morissette said he had no problem with the amendment that Councilor McLain was working on, in fact, he supported it. He thought that there had been an agreement that as this process evolved that REM would make an attempt to contact the other people that almost unanimously voted for the other document simply to verify that they agreed with the changes. This had not been done, however, he would defer to Councilor McLain assuming that the changes were not substantive and would support the changes. In the future Councilor Morissette requested that there was notification of changes.

Councilor McLain said that she thought when she left the Solid Waste Committee that she had been given direction to look at the issues that she had concerns about and work on some of the logistics. She added that there was nothing that had been done to the document that would change the support. However, if it was the pleasure of the committee to send it back to the REM Committee this was fine with her. If she had done something to the document, changing a goal or work plan, the comments made today would be appropriate, however, she had simply made the document a more readable document. Originally, it was not readable nor did it connect with the other work being done. She was comfortable voting on the resolution today.

Vote

on Amendment: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 97-2448.

Jeanne Roy, Recycling Advocates, commended the staff for improving the public process for the Work Plan this year. It had been difficult for the transition to occur between an ongoing challenge program which had been going on 8 years and the transition with the RSWMP that just came in about a year ago. She pointed out why Recycling Advocates cared about the 8 Year Work Plan. It was because of their desire to reach the 52% recovery goal by the year 2000 that was in RSWMP. She showed the Council the programs that were relied upon in RSWMP to reach that 52% goal. She reviewed the 7 practices that should be carried out in order to reach the goal. She noted that all 7 practices were more fully described in Appendix E to RSWMP. RSWMP said that if local governments did not wish to follow these practices as described in the plan then they could propose alternative practices as long as they could prove that the alternatives would reach the same results in terms of tonnage diverted and in terms of where the program was on the hierarchy. The top two programs were waste prevention, the next four were source separated recycling and the last was post collection recovery.

The purpose of the document before Council was to implement these recommended practices. The intent of Recycling Advocates was to make sure that the Work Plan was consistent with RSWMP and that the Work Plan was specific enough so that the group could be assured that the programs would be carried out. In that respect the group was supportive of Councilor McLain's amendments. They felt the amendments made it more specific and clearer. However, she pointed out that in approving the Work Plan, the Work Plan incorporated amendments to RSWMP with no analysis to show how the changes would effect the ability to meet the recycling goals. For example, the home compost distribution program was no longer listed in the work plan. This was one of the major waste prevention programs, 50% of the households having the bins by the year 2000. About 36,000 had been distributed already but that was much less than the 63,000 bins that would be required to reach that number of households. If the program was stopped, the tonnage from that program would be different, reduced. Another program was the collection of paper, bottles and cans from businesses. It was expected that the program would collect those things from all businesses. In the work plan now it said that this program could collect paper and containers or other prevalent materials. This was likely to get different tonnage than what was projected. The Recycling Advocates were requesting that the analysis take place to show how that would effect the recycling goal. Finally, another example was the on site recycling at construction sites, in the work plan, that was to be developed by July 1996 and implemented by July 1997, that had been dropped from the work plan, instead local governments were to tell their haulers to notify C and D customers about on site services. The group asked, what would be the tonnage impact of not implementing that program? The group was asking Council to direct staff to do an analysis of how these changes would impact meeting the goals and the solid waste hierarchy.

Councilor McLain agreed with the majority of what Ms. Roy said as far as internally there needed to be an awareness and have a security that REM was still trying to divert a certain amount of waste with particular types of projects. She disagreed with Ms. Roy's assessment of the last example, she did not think that the work plan said, just notification but notification and supply on site services.

Councilor Naito asked Ms. Roy if she was supporting the amendments and the document with the request that the Council monitor these activities to see how much diversion was being lost or gained with an alternative proposal.

Ms. Roy responded that they were not testifying in support or against the document. They were prepared to favor the amendments because they felt clarified the resolution. The group was pointing out to the Council the danger of accepting changes that would have some ramifications on a policy that the Council had already made, a policy where the public was involved. The group felt that there was a lot of support for the 52% recovery goal and these programs. The Recycling Advocates asked that when changes were made that the Council looked at these very carefully and made sure that the analysis was done to see what the ramification could be.

Councilor McLain said that on the 11,100 tons being diverted by bin distribution, there had been comments at the budget process to lessen the subsidy every year for the bin purchase program. If bin subsidy was going to be lowered what did Metro have to replace that 11,100 tons as far as a device to divert tonnage. She believed staff had answers to this. These answers needed to be verified to the public and publicized so that people could see that Metro was still dedicated to the 50% reduction by the year 2000.

Loretta Pickereil, 26370 SW 45th Drive, Wilsonville, OR , testifying on behalf of Recycling Advocates. The group had two other concerns that should be brought forward. The first concern was in approving the Year 8 Work Plan the Metro Council could be sending too strong a signal to local governments to count on the amendments to the RSWMP that were incorporated in the Work Plan. A subcommittee of SWAC would be reviewing proposed amendments and would be looking at the purpose of the amendments and analyzing their impacts on achieving the regional goals and their consistency with the RSWMP. They would also explore alternatives. If this process was respected and supported there could not be an assumption that the amendments to the RSWMP incorporated in the work plan now would move forward unchanged. As a result the Year 8 Work Plan that the Council would be approving at this meeting, there may have to be revisions in June to be consistent with the RSWMP. To avoid misunderstanding, unfounded expectation and wear and tear on the regional corporation, the group was asking the Council to send the following messages to all interested parties. First, in approving the Year 8 Work Plan the Council was not approving the amendments to the RSWMP that were incorporated in the work plan. Secondly, all parties needed to acknowledge now that the Year 8 Work Plan may have to be revised in June after the Council had acted upon proposed amendments to the RSWMP so that the work plan was consistent with the RSWMP. It was critical that Metro staff and local governments keep this in mind in developing the work plans and budgets for next fiscal year. Recycling Advocates recommended that these messages be communicated in writing to the SWAC and elected officials and staff of local governments. Her group would be working with the SWAC subcommittee on the RSWMP. The subcommittee should not labor under the cloud of forgone conclusions and false expectations. Her group urged that this message be sent so that they can develop the best possible RSWMP changes for the region and maintain the cooperative environment that would be required if the goals of the RSWMP were to be met. The last concern was that there were still significant gaps in the Year 8 Work Plan that would need the Council's attention. There were four significant pieces missing from the work plan and the staff had set up work groups to develop recommendation on these four components; first, measure methods for tracking and reporting progress in meeting the targets of the various recommended practices, for example, collection of paper and containers from 100% of businesses by January 1999. Secondly, developing methods to be used for evaluating programs such as the commercial waste evaluation program. Thirdly, developing program standards, goals, roles and responsibilities for the waste evaluation program. Finally, developing the process and the criteria for approving alternative practices. They understood that the Metro staff's intent was to put these pieces of the work plan into the Work Plan sometime this spring after they had been developed. They supported the process being used and would participate on some of those work groups. Recycling Advocate's concern was that these were some very significant pieces of the RSWMP and they urged that the Council require the Year 8 Work Plan be brought back to the Council for their approval on these missing pieces when they were developed.

Councilor Naito asked if Ms. Pickereil was in favor of this resolution being moved forward at this meeting?

Ms. Pickereil responded that they were not here to favor or oppose, they were favoring the amendments that Councilor McLain brought forward. They asked that the Council send the messages mentioned previously, loud and clear, that the Council was not approving the RSWMP amendments and that people needed to keep in mind that they had to come back in June to revise the Year 8 Work Plan that the Council was approving today. This needed to be laid out very clearly to respect the process to review the proposed amendments in the RSWMP and to eliminate false expectations come June.

Councilor Naito asked Councilor Morissette if it was his intention to revisit this in June.

Councilor Morissette said that he had no problem with revisiting this in June.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland also responded that she believed that the staff had heard very clearly that they needed to come back to this, the subcommittee of SWAC was just appointed at their last meeting to review some of these concerns. She added that this was an evolving document always subject to the Council's change.

Councilor McLain responded to this issue, she reminded the Council that they were here because of the budget season. As the local governments and Metro were going forward with their work plans, they needed to have at least what was already completed and knew what they were going to do in the work plan laid out so that they could look at what that budget meant. They would be scoping over two years of budget. She believed the sequencing was doable.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland closed the public hearing.

Vote on the Main Motion	The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed	as
Amended:	unanimously as amended.	

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland moved item 7.5 forward for consideration.

7.5 **Resolution No. 97-2450**, For the Purpose of Appointing Ben Middleman to the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission.

Motion: **Councilor Naito** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2450.

Seconded: **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion.

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** said it was her pleasure to recommend the reappointment of Ben Middleton to the MERC Commission. He had been serving on the MERC Commission for several years. She believed there was an advantage to having someone continue service in light of the transition occurring with MERC. She noted that Mr. Middleton was a CPA, the only one on the MERC Commission, an important criteria for serving. MERC was moving into a new accounting and reporting system.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland added that Mr. Middleton was known at MERC as their 'sharp pencil'.

Councilor Washington said that he had the opportunity to work with Mr. Middleton over the past four years. It was a pleasure to have him back to serve. He was a very approachable person on the Commission.

Mr. Mark Williams, Interim MERC General Manager, urged that the Council approve the resolution. Mr. Middleton had been an asset to the Commission. He had served on the MERC budget committee and it was very useful to have a CPA on the team.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

Councilor McCaig requested that as the Council looked at appointments to the MERC Board that they consider the following. She believed Mr. Middleton had already served 9 years and the Council had just appointed him for another 4 years. In some local governments and jurisdictions there was actually a limit on the number of terms that someone could serve, the reason being primarily that there was a huge opportunity to bring different people through to become familiar with public service and the workings of Metro. As the Council looked at the appointment process, it was her recommendation that these considerations may be a valuable addition to the public policy.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland said she felt this was a very good idea. Within the next six month, the committee would be looking at how they dealt with the appointments to the MERC Commission. All MERC Commission appointment were four years.

7.3 Resolution No. 96-2443, For the Purpose of Approving Change Order No. 21 to the Waste Transport Services Contract.

Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 96-2443.

Seconded: **Councilor Morissette** seconded the motion.

Discussion: **Councilor Washington** said that this was the proposed Change Order No. 21 with the Jack Gray system. Over the past, there had been some things that needed to be rectified providing a benefit for both the Contractor and Metro. He reviewed the nine items; modify the criteria under which the contract can change ownership of its company, reduce the number of parking spaces Metro was obligated to provide from 105 to 51, adjust the amount of compensation that the Contractor would receive for shuttling services for moving trailers to and from the compactor for the on-site parking and it provided some minimum performance level to receive such compensation and adjust such compensation if the number of parking spaces available fall below 65, eliminate the Contract ability to terminate Metro's purchase of fuel used by the contractor as a result by Metro purchasing the fuel it saved the amount of federal excise which was approximately \$350,000 per year which would have been paid had the Contractor bought the fuel, terminate a previous change order which obligated Metro to reimburse the Contractor for the provision of equipment at the composting facility, release the funds from the retainage account for the Contract in excess of \$2,500,000.00, expand the condition under which a contractor default could be declared, extend Metro's rights under the default provisions of the Contract to include the Contractor's default on lending agreements and a standard provision limiting the change order to the specific items and stating that all other contractual provisions remain in effect.

The budget impact saved Metro approximately \$135,000 annually due to the shuttle savings and terminating the equipment purchases related to the compost facility. Additionally Metro secured about \$350,000 in annual federal excise tax savings.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland noted that Councilor Morissette said that this would save Metro and the Contractor money.

Councilor Washington asked Mr. Warner to cover the savings portion in more detail.

Mr. Bruce Warner Director, Metro REM Director, reviewed item 3 on parking spaces. He said that this was just part of the give and take of the negotiations whereby Metro wanted something which was a reduced fixed price for shuttling of trucks and the contractor wanted to ensure that Metro would make sure there was space for their trucks. This change saved about \$120,000 for Metro annually. The second issue was the purchase of fuel by Metro directly which allowed waiver of the federal excise tax on fuel. This equated to about \$350,000 per year savings for Metro. As the prices went up on fuel, Metro would have to bear increased costs for fuel. If the price went up through the contractor, Metro would pay this through increased prices in the CPI adjustments. This was a much better business deal for Metro to continue to enjoy the saving that Metro had had over the last several years.

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland added that in doing this it did not cost the contractor anything it simply saved Metro excise taxes.

Councilor Washington urged the Council's support.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

7.4 **Resolution No. 97-2447**, For the Purpose of Extending the Current Operations Contracts for Metro Central and Metro South Transfer Stations Until September 30, 1997.

Motion: **Councilor Morissette** moved the adoption of Resolution No. 97-2447.

Seconded: **Councilor Washington** seconded the motion.

Discussion: **Councilor Morissette** said that the main reason for delaying this contract proposal was Contract Amendment No. 7. What this resolution was trying to do was to avoid some of the peak times for potentially transitioning an operator for the facility. The resolution proposed that the request for proposal be extended five months to September 30, 1997 for the operational bids for the Metro's transfer stations.

Councilor McCaig asked if this was the second postponement?

Deputy Presiding Officer McFarland responded yes.

Mr. Bruce Warner said that as a result of the discussion by the Council on Change Order No. 7 they did issue a delay on the opening date of the RFPs. As a result of the continuation of that discussion, they issued a second extension for the RFP submission which was now March 5, 1997. This extension had nothing to do with the RFP but rather with the operational contracts which originally envisioned new operators taking charge about May 1, 1997. The problem was with the dates now they would not be able to get a new contractor on by May 1. As such if they tried to do this as quickly as possible they would be transitioning about June or July, the busiest time of the transfer stations. They wished to avoid this busy time.

Vote: The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor Morissette reviewed the solid waste actions that the REM Committee had been working with. Last night they completed their rate review with A.C. Trucking. The rate review committee approved a base rate of

\$23.00 which led to a tipping fee rate of about \$66.00. There was a proposal coming from the Executive in the budget to reduce the solid waste tipping fee which was currently \$75.00 to \$71.00. There were several things that he would be interested in the Council commenting on, the capital projects which was about \$6 million as well as the amount of money that they were slating even with the reduction in the tipping fee for contingencies.

Councilor McLain mentioned that at this next Council meeting of February 13, 1997, reviewing the agenda, it had come to her attention that the public hearing would start at 2:15 p.m. Both Councilor Naito and she had said that they had gotten calls that the public wished to testify after their work hours. She was lobbying with the Presiding Officer to try and make sure that more time was allowed in the evening for testimony. She felt that for a decision of this magnitude there may be a need for a hearing of four to five hours. She said there were some items on the agenda that may be able to be taken off so the rest of the work would be lightened for that evening.

Mr. Jeff Stone responded that he had not gotten a hold of the Presiding Officer yet, he would express the concerns of Councilor McLain.

Councilor Washington said he would be joining the Presiding Officer in Washington D.C. tomorrow. He would take this message to him. They would be attending the NARC Conference as well as presenting this Council's and JPACT's broad regional consensus on the ISTEA reauthorization bill.

Councilor Naito said that the Government Affairs Committee met, the bills were piling up in Salem. They had a set presented to the GA Committee by Brad Higbee this week. She had instructed staff to give the bills to the appropriate committee so the committee could review the bills prior to any action.

9. ADJOURN

With no further business to come before the Metro Council this afternoon, the meeting was adjourned by Deputy Presiding Officer Ruth McFarland at 3:30 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

I:\MINUTES\1997\02FEB\020697C.DOC

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT TITLE	TO/FROM
020697c-01		Res. 97-2448	mike burton