

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING LONG-) RESOLUTION NO. 84-507
TERM LANDFILL STRATEGIES AND)
RELATED POLICIES AS A COMPONENT) Introduced by the
OF THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN) Executive Officer
UPDATE 1984)

WHEREAS, The ORS chapters 268 and 459 provide for the development of a solid waste management plan; and

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) is the primary provider of the solid waste disposal system in the Portland metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Solid Waste Management Plan was adopted in 1974-75 and as a result of changing practices and policies in the solid waste management field, is due for a comprehensive evaluation and update; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the following long-term landfill strategies and related policies are adopted for the purpose of clearly indicating the direction the Metro Council intends to proceed as they relate to solid waste management in the Portland metropolitan area:

1. The site known as "Wildwood" has been identified and designated by the Metro Council as the long-term regional landfill for the Portland metropolitan area. Metro will continue to pursue siting approval and the required permits which will enable this site to function as an operating landfill.

2. Metro recognizes that numerous limited-use landfills have reached capacity and will continue to be less available as current sites are closed. Metro has identified and

supports the development of the site known as "Waybo/Roselawn" as a replacement, limited use landfill for the Killingsworth Fast Disposal site upon its closure which is expected in 1989.

3. Metro will continue to rely on the private sector to provide limited use landfills in the region as per conditions stated in Chapter 5.01 of the Metro Code. Each application will be judged on the following criteria in conjunction with the applicant's obtaining appropriate local and state permits:

- a. A potential site will be evaluated according to its proximity to existing and future landfill sites to ensure the efficiency of the solid waste system;
- b. Adequate quantities of acceptable waste material should be available to ensure the economic viability of a given site; and
- c. A proposed site should be consistent with other elements of the solid waste disposal system, including general purpose landfills, transfer stations, recycling efforts, or resource recovery facilities.

4. Metro will consider a contractual commitment of solid waste to non-Metro disposal sites or facilities based upon:

- a. The site(s) or facility(ies) being properly permitted and approved by required governmental bodies;
- b. The disposal cost available from a site or facility including the financial impact on

Metro operations and subsequent effect on
customer costs; and

- c. The length of contract term and its concomitant
impact on the Metro solid waste disposal system.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this 25th day of October, 1984.



Presiding Officer

DD/gl
2149C/392-5
11/02/84

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 84-507 FOR THE
PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING LONG-TERM LANDFILL
STRATEGIES AND RELATED POLICIES

Date: October 12, 1984

Presented by: Dan Durig

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The purpose of this report is to present Resolution No. 84-507 to the Council for consideration. Resolution No. 84-507 proposes long-term landfill strategies and related policies which will become integral parts of the updated Solid Waste Management Plan.

In March 1984 the first chapter of the Solid Waste Management Plan - Update 1984 was completed by the Metro Solid Waste Department. The "Landfill Chapter" discussed the current status of the Metro solid waste system, the recent history of that system and reviewed the alternatives and related policies that need to be considered for the future. In August 1984 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 84-491 which established an interim landfill management strategy to assure that the region's only general purpose landfill will be adequate until a replacement site is ready for use. This report will summarize the remaining issues and policies that should be adopted to deal with the long-term landfill system.

The report deals with two types of landfills, general purpose which can accept all types of solid waste excluding hazardous materials and limited use landfills which are limited to inert materials, metal, building materials, paper, yard and demolition waste. The most notable difference is that limited use sites are not allowed to accept "food waste." The following outline summarizes the alternatives discussed in the report.

- I. Alternatives for Establishing a Long-Term General Purpose Landfill
 - A. Implementation of the Wildwood site.
 1. Continue efforts to obtain a land use permit from Multnomah County.
 2. Request that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) begin the state siting process authorized in ORS 459.047 or ORS 459.049.

- B. Seek land use permits for an alternate site.
 - 1. Select a site identified in the Landfill Site Search in 1980.
 - 2. Attempt a long-term expansion of St. Johns Landfill.
 - 3. Initiate an entirely new landfill siting processing.
- II. Alternatives for Establishing a Long-Range Plan for Limited Use Landfills
 - A. Continue current practice of franchising a limited number of private operations.
 - B. Initiate a Metro siting process.

In order to clearly and concisely review the various alternatives presented in the "Landfill Chapter" the attached chart (Table A) provides an analysis of the long-term disposal alternatives and with the report serves as the basis for the following summary. In reviewing the alternatives presented it should be noted that some of the alternatives are existing policy and would require no change.

Summary of Recommendations:

- I. The need for a general purpose landfill in the Metro solid waste system has been recognized since the early 1970s. In December 1979 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 79-118 which established a "Procedure for Siting a Sanitary Landfill." In June 1981 Metro Council authorized application to Multnomah County for the Wildwood site which completed step number seven in the siting process. A permit was issued by the County and subsequently overturned on appeal. Multnomah County is currently considering modifications to its ordinance to make it possible to site a landfill in light of the court decision.

In 1979 Metro recognized that the siting process would be long and reviewing the alternatives to continuing with Wildwood there are none that would either assure that any other site could be permitted or that would result in an earlier completion schedule. On the contrary, any alternative would probably go through the same steps that Wildwood has and would delay the implementation schedule. Wildwood should continue to be the designated regional landfill and efforts should be continued to gain approval from the required agencies.

Efforts should also be made to clarify the "super siting" authority given to DEQ in ORS 459.047 or ORS 459.049 to assure that if it is needed in the future that DEQ could approve a site and issue a valid permit.

II. Currently the Metro region is served by two limited-use landfills, Killingsworth Fast Disposal (KFD) and Hillsboro Landfill, and a demolition landfill, Lakeside Reclamation (Grabhorn). Another site, Waybo/Roselawn, has received land use approval and is in an area that DEQ has classified as having possibly acceptable environmental conditions. In 1981 prior to the adoption of its franchise system Metro indicated to the owners of Waybo/Roselawn that their facility would not be needed until the KFD site was completed. The Waybo/Roselawn should be considered as a replacement for the KFD site upon closure which is expected by 1989.

Metro should continue to franchise private operators for limited use sites and review each application to assure that an adequate number of sites are available at any point in time, that adequate quantities are available to assure economic viability and that the sites would be consistent with other elements of the solid waste disposal system.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 84-507.

NW/gl
2118C/392-3
10/12/84

LONG-TERM DISPOSAL ALTERNATIVES
TABLE A

Alternatives	Description	Pros	Cons
I. A. Implementation of Wildwood			
1. Multnomah County	Continue legal effort and resubmit application when siting criteria is adopted.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Best site identified in selection process. 2. Represents shortest time frame. 3. Feasibility work has been completed. 4. DEQ preliminary approval obtained. 5. Adopted as regional landfill. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. May require capital investment prior to obtaining land use. 2. New criteria is untested.
2. State Siting	Request DEQ to site Wildwood.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State authority may supersede local land use process. 2. If I. A1 and A2 done simultaneously it may speed up process. 3. May force legislative changes to clarify the law. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potentially lengthy process. 2. Process is untested. 3. May be subject to same local land use problems as I. A1. 4. Request for state siting must be made by local jurisdictions and Metro.
B. Seek Alternative Site			
1. Select a different site from within the four areas identified in the original process.	Use the 1980 site search process information to select an alternative site.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Original information can be used to determine alternate location. 2. Other counties land use criteria may be easier to meet. 3. Though ranked lower than Wildwood other sites were identified that were suitable. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased cost to determine technical feasibility. 2. Time required for studies and permit process. 3. Potentially the same point will be reached three years hence.
2. Expand St. Johns	Apply for long-term expansion of St. Johns Landfill.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could be potentially implemented in stages. 2. Delays the need for east transfer station. 3. Long-term liability would be limited to one location. 4. Maintains use of existing ancillary facilities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requires change in state law. 2. Past promises to North Portland residents. 3. Destroys wetlands. 4. No cover material available. 5. Technical feasibility uncertain.
3. Initiate a new siting process.	Start a new siting process with new criteria and process.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potentially wider search area. 2. Process could involve other local officials. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potentially lengthy process 2. Process is untested. 3. Increased cost to review new sites. 4. Could reach the same point years later.
II. Long-Term Alternatives for Limited Use Landfills			
	Should limited use sites be used in the future?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide additional capacity. 2. Potentially reclaims mined out land. 3. Convenient locations may reduce the need to transfer waste. 4. Potentially easier to site. 5. May be more advantageous with some processing alternatives. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental concerns may be equal to general purpose sites. 2. May decrease the efficiency of one large regional site.
A. Continue to franchise private operations.	Continue current practice of franchising private operations while limiting their number and regulating their rates.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Private development and operation. 2. Limit public liability. 3. Restricts number to make operating sites financially more feasible. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No guarantees that sites will be available or private sector will pursue.
B. Metro Development	Metro would begin a siting process to develop new limited use sites as needed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide resources to seek new facilities. 2. Individual segment of the system does not have to stand alone financially. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eliminate private development.