

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Tuesday, May 27, 2003
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Susan McLain, Carl Hosticka, Rod Park, Rod Monroe, Rex Burkholder

Councilors Absent: Brian Newman (excused)

Council President Bragdon convened the Metro Council Work Session Meeting at 2:02 p.m.

1. SALEM LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said the transportation-funding package bill had not been released yet. There would be two hearings on the transportation-funding package tomorrow. He explained the process. Mr. Cotugno provided details on the package (a copy of which is included in the meeting record). Councilor McLain asked about bond ratings. Councilors discussed the transportation package. They were continuing to work on the periodic review bill. He thought it would pass in some form. Councilor Hosticka asked about when they would recess. Council President Bragdon asked about the sub-regional bill. Mr. Cooper said it wasn't going anywhere now. He spoke to amendments, which didn't go anywhere also. Councilor McLain raised an issue about an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Hillsboro, Cornelius and Forest Grove concerning the sub-regional issue. Mr. Cooper explained what the IGA was. Mr. Cooper talked about coordination. Mr. Jordan made some suggestions as to how they could come to some agreements. Council President Bragdon asked about PacWest coordination and how had they been performing? Mr. Cooper said it was a good time to rethink and re-look at our representation.

2. DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, MAY 29, 2003.

Council President Bragdon spoke to the consent agenda items. He noted Councilor Monroe would carry Ordinance No. 03-1009 and Resolution No. 03-3320 would come off the agenda. Council President Bragdon said he would not at the Council meeting so Councilor Park would chair the meeting.

3. SOLID WASTE POLICY DISCUSSION

Mike Hogle, Solid Waste & Recycling (SW & R) Department Director, said they would be discussing the Solid Waste system. What were the key pieces of the system and what makes them work from both regulatory and incentive perspective. He presented a power point presentation on the Solid Waste and Recycling system (a copy of which is found in the meeting record). He spoke to purpose, mission, historical milestones, Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) and Strategic Plan, Metro's role, roles in the system, key issues and next steps.

Councilor Hosticka asked about recovery rate and how it related to reducing waste. Lee Barrett, SW & R Department, explained recovery rate, the material that was recovered versus that which was disposed. Mr. Barrett said there was not standard way to measure what you did not buy or what was not consumed. The best indicator was population and income. It was not a good enough calculation to state a waste reduction percentage. Mr. Hogle said Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) tracks the material. Councilor Hosticka said what his concern was that we were

not working at cross-purposes. Councilor McLain said the idea on the validity itself was a good question and what was it they were trying to count. She explained further that every one counts it a bit differently. She suggested including a discussion about disposal issues, crossing jurisdictional lines, and the need for the regional system. The history was still valid. How we used and refined the system was important to discuss. Why a regional system? RWSMP and Strategic Plan needed to ensure why Metro was in the business. As a regional government we were looked at being more removed than local jurisdictions. There were regulation issues they needed to discuss.

Councilor Park gave an example to clarify Councilor Hosticka's question. Council President Bragdon summarized Councilor Hosticka's concern. Councilor Park said there were different types of combinations to get to the recovery rate. Mr. Hogle said in this integration schedule of recycling we needed to keep an eye on this. Councilor Burkholder said it seemed what we measure may be different than what DEQ measures. The per capita disposal rate would tell him more. What was your actual impact of reducing garbage? He spoke to waste prevention. Was there direction that we might want to look at? He suggested other measures of success. Mr. Hogle said there were other measures just as in the transportation system. Councilor Monroe expressed concerned about markets and margins. How can we develop new markets? If there was not a market for recycling glass, we ought to be finding a market for this. Another example was tires. He suggested that it mean that we had to raise the tip fee to encourage the market and generate revenue to subsidize recycle markets. We must look for every opportunity to find markets for recyclables.

Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer, said he would like to see this Council focus on the values which would then drive the system. What they wanted to accomplish was in qualitative terms rather than quantitative terms. He spoke about behavior. Council President Bragdon said the metrics were confusing. Having results oriented measurements of the system. Less stuff was a high priority. Another broad value was accessibility and competition in the public interest. It was an industry that was becoming increasingly limited. Council President Bragdon asked about the schedule of upcoming discussions. Councilor McLain said she would provide values to SW & R Department. Councilor Park said increasing the tip fee had different effects on different parts of the system. Councilor Burkholder said the analysis had to be focused differently. You had to segment your market out quite a bit. Councilor Monroe said if it cost more to bury garbage there would be an increased incentive to not bury garbage. He talked about efficiency of transport, which was difficult with vertical integration. He felt the trucking 20-year contract was costly. It would be more efficient to rail the garbage. Councilor Burkholder said what was critical was helping Council have a better understanding of the system and the upcoming changes in the system. Council President Bragdon noted Steve Apotheker's paper. He asked who was doing the good thinking about this around the country? Impartial, quasi-academic information would be helpful. Mr. Hogle said Metro was one of the leaders in SW & R. Councilor Park suggested talking about basing the value of the transfer stations. He felt we should figure how to value a transfer station just like we did with the convention center. Mr. Hogle said it was hard to appraise. Councilor Hosticka said it seemed that they were having an underlying discussion on sustainability. Council President Bragdon said he was also thinking about solid waste consolidation. Councilor Burkholder suggested looking at local economic development. Were there ways we could act to encourage recycling of the dollars into our local economy.

4. REGULATON OF DREDGE MATERIALS AND OTHER SPECIAL WASTE

Janet Matthews, Program and Policy Manager for Solid Waste and Recycling, noted how dynamic the solid waste system was. She noted the briefing paper (a copy of which is included in

the meeting record). She said Terry Petersen, former director of Solid Waste and Recycling Department, had presented information to the Solid Waste Committee last year. This material had not been managed in the solid waste system. Previously there had been disposal areas available for the dredging. In the future, Metro could anticipate some dredging materials. The sediments were tested for contamination. They were focused on contaminated dredge sediments. They anticipated more of this material. She spoke to Metro's regulatory practices for this material. There were no facilities in the region that processed contaminated dredge. She spoke to what they were currently assessing on dredge sediment. Ms. Matthews explained what was currently happening with dredge material. Council President Bragdon asked what the moisture content was of a wet versus a dry ton. Councilor Hosticka asked what the capacity of Arlington was in cubic yards. He said the scale of this was immense. Councilor Park talked about putting dredge in the landfill and how much of the landfill would be used for just that material. Ms. Matthews said every one of the landfills in the Gorge was competing for this material. There were a lot of people watching what this agency decided to do. She said there was a lot of concern from the Port of Portland about the cost. She noted that this was solid waste going into the landfill. She noted staff concerns. They didn't see a regulatory role for Metro. The staff report suggested a facilitation role. She spoke to issues that needed to be discussed by Metro Council. Councilor McLain said she thought the Council needed to protect the agency if we choose not to put a fee on this currently. She said DEQ could decide to make Metro responsible. She felt she did not know enough. She wanted to know what DEQ and other regulatory bodies were thinking about Metro's role. Did we have any possibility that it would cost us something down the road? Councilor Burkholder said the real question was what was our role here. If there were new facilities for temporary storage what was the impact on the local communities? He spoke to trucking issues. Councilor McLain talked about the contaminated petroleum soil. Councilor Hosticka asked if they were going to have future discussion, what was the public interest? What value did we add by getting involved? Ms. Matthew suggested a breakdown of the various agencies that were currently involved. Councilor Park asked about the bidding process. Depending upon the role Metro played, did this preclude Gillam County's participation?

5. FOOD WASTE INFRASTRUCTURE

Lee Barrett, Solid Waste and Recycling, updated the Council on the organics program. He spoke to the applications they had received thus far (a copy of a map indicating the facilities in the area). He spoke to the specific facilities and the problems that could arise. He said there were two remaining facilities. He explained where they were in the process. They would be meeting with local jurisdictions about their comfort with having a food waste facility in their jurisdiction. They would also be meeting with the Oregon Department of Agriculture and DEQ. He said the map pointed out how things could happen in the future. Metro Central may have to be considered as a reload facility. Forest Grove was an applicant who was proposing a reload facility as well. He noted Recycle America might also be a reload facility in the future. He spoke to the reason why they were looking at food waste recycling. It was to reach the 62% recycling. He gave a run down on their schedule. By end of July, they would be able to come back to Council. Mr. Hoglund said the processing and composting was one component of the process. Transportation was an issue as well. Then markets were also an issue in dealing with this material. Councilor Burkholder asked about fees for the reload facilities. Mr. Barrett suggested that they could propose that there would be a tip fee to process the material at the reload facility and explained further the possible additional costs. He said composting varied dependent whether it was used in east or west of the Cascades. Councilor Park asked if this issue was ready for prime time? Mr. Barrett said yes. It had been demonstrated in the City of San Francisco that it was a viable program. They were not sure they would be using plastic bags. It wasn't difficult to compost this material. There were a lot of successful operations that collect and compost the material. Councilor Park suggested a

presentation on the successful versus non-successful programs. Councilor McLain said the committee was very thorough. They have looked at every regulatory issue. They wanted this to succeed. She talked about ag bags. Councilor Park asked about tip fee? Mr. Barrett said they were talking about \$40. Mr. Hoglund said they were seriously monitoring all of these steps. They would bring this back for further discussion.

6. MTIP 100% LIST POLICY DISCUSSION

Andy Cotugno and Ted Leybold, Planning Department, noted a summary of the overall public comments. Mr. Cotugno walked through the cover memo and the edit changes. Mr. Leybold spoke to what the full packet included (a copy of which is included in the meeting record) which included the process, technical scoring for land use, full technical summary, the executive summary of public comments, the draft final cut list, and the draft of program approvals for applicants. Councilor Hosticka asked about the Boeckman Road project. Why was it listed twice, once as a previous commitment and as a road modernization project? Mr. Leybold talked about the regional policy direction as well as funding projects throughout the entire region. He spoke to the top four bike and trails projects. Mr. Leybold talked about the Boulevard and Bridge categories. He then talked about the Green Streets category, including Yamhill, Cully and Beaver Creek projects. The freight category included Columbia to Lombard connector project, I-5/99W corridor study, St. Johns pedestrian improvement project. In the Planning section they had include Metro MPO required planning, Powell/Foster, Corridor Plan, and RTP Corridor Plan. The Pedestrian category included Forest Grove Town Center Improvement and the Central Eastside Improvement. Under the Road Modernization category they included Boeckman Road, 10th Avenue in Hillsboro, and SW Macadam projects.

Councilor Hosticka spoke to the rankings of some of the projects. Mr. Cotugno responded to his ranking issue. Mr. Leybold spoke to the Road Reconstruction and Regional Transportation Options project proposals. He then detailed the recommended TOD and Transit projects. Councilor McLain asked about the Frequent Bus Corridors. Mr. Cotugno said this money was for capital improvement. TriMet was responsible for the other operational costs. He noted a memo he distributed (a copy of which is included in the meeting record) which talked about partial funding. Mr. Leybold spoke to the next steps. Councilor Hosticka asked what was the Council's role now? Councilor Park said they released the list and explained the future process. He suggested guidance on the core mission. Councilor McLain suggested keeping the emphasis on land use projects and regional balance. Timing was everything. Councilor Monroe said it was important that the Council has appropriate input before JPACT gets the final say. Councilor Hosticka said at this point, we were just listening to the staff recommendations. Council President Bragdon asked for direction from Council. Councilor Hosticka said the only glaring issue was modernization and the limits of money going to that category. Councilor Monroe spoke to the limited discretionary funds and what those funds should pay for. Councilor Burkholder said over the last two years, they have redirected some of these funds. Just because there was a high demand, was that good policy choice? Councilor Park said there was one policy question under the category of Modernization, which was Reconstruction project. Mr. Cotugno spoke to the history of reconstruction versus modernization. Both types of projects were being advocated. Councilor McLain said there would be several projects that she would be getting calls on. She asked staff to be able to give her foundation for those projects. Councilor Park asked Council if they were comfortable with the list of projects. No one objected to the list.

7. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

There were none.

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Michael Jordan asked for comments on the Work Session format.

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 27, 2003

Item	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
2	Council Agenda	5/29/03	Metro Council Agenda for May 29, 2003 meeting	052703c-01
3	Power Point Presentation	No date	To: Metro Council From: Mike Hogle, Director of Solid Waste & Recycling Re: Power point presentation on Solid Waste and Recycling system	052703c-02
8	Work Session Request Process	No date	To: Metro Council From: Mike Jordan, COO, Re: Work Session Request Process Draft	052703c-03
4	Briefing Paper	5/27/03	To: Metro Council From: Janet Matthews, SW & R Re: Metro Regulation of Dredge Sediments Briefing Paper	052703c-04
5	Map	5/12/03	To: Metro Council From: Lee Barrett, SW & R Re: Potential Organics Facilities Map	052703c-05
6	Memo and attachments	5/27/03	To: Metro Council From: Ted Leybold, Planning Department Re: Memo concerning Transportation Priorities 2004-07 – Draft Staff Recommended Final Cut List, May 23, 2003 Land Use Evaluation of Projects, April 23, 2003 Technical Evaluation and Qualitative Factors Summary, Draft Public Comment Summary on Transportation Priorities 2004-07, Transportation Priorities 2004-07 Draft Staff Recommended Final Cut List	052703c-06
6	Memo	5/21/03	To: Councilor Hosticka From: Andy Cotugno Re: MTIP	052703c-07
1	Investment Act	5/23/03	To: Metro Council From: Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, Re: 2003 Oregon Transportation Investment Act (III)	052703c-08