

SOLID WASTE PLANNING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

March 25, 1988

Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rich Owings. The following were present:

Members and Alternates

Michael Borg, Clackamas County Waste Haulers
Carolyn Browne, Citizen
Pam Christian, City of Troutdale
Jim Claypool, City of Portland
Sebastian Degens, Port of Portland
Dick Howard, Multnomah County
Merle Irvine, Wastech, Inc.
Lynda Kotta, City of Gresham
Gary LaHaie, Citizen
Dominic Mancini, Clackamas County
Kevin Martin, Washington County
Tom Miller, Washington County Waste Haulers
Dave Phillips, Clackamas County
Jim Rapp, City of Sherwood

Staff and Consultants

Rich Owings, Metro
Bob Martin, Metro
Dennis Mulvihill, Metro
Becky Crockett, Metro
Leigh Zimmerman, Metro
Robert Newman, Metro
Marilyn Smalls, Metro
Neil Saling, Metro
Marilyn Matteson, Metro
Bob Baldwin, Consultant

Guests

Dave Luneke, Waste Management
Judith Henley, Waste Management

Committee Members' and Citizens' Communications

There were no communications from citizens or Technical Committee members.

Approval of December 18th and January 29th Minutes

MOTION AND VOTE:

Dave Phillips moved and Merle Irvine seconded the motion that the minutes from the December 18th and January 29th meetings be approved. The motion was passed unanimously.

Subcommittee Updates

Land Use Subcommittee

Kevin Martin reported that the Land Use Subcommittee last met on February 9. At that meeting they discussed the Fatal Flaw date which had been changed at the last Technical Committee meeting. Previously, the siting criteria indicated that permits were to be in hand by June 1, 1988. Kevin explained that the issue was heavily discussed and it was determined that there is still a need for a date certain, but the Committee had not determined specifically what that date should be.

Kevin reported that the Metro Council Solid Waste Committee (CSWC) had asked for identification and evaluation of various siting options for a publicly owned ETRC. The five options (summarized on green sheet of agenda packet) were identified.

He explained that the Land Use Subcommittee was not asked to make recommendations on the siting options, but the final consensus was that Option 2 would probably be the most effective process to use. This option recommends issuing an RFP/RFB for property owners who wish to sell their land to Metro for use as a transfer station. This could also be accomplished by using a real estate brokerage firm. The final conclusion was that none of these options would allow Metro to pick a site in the time frame considered necessary for the Metro East Transfer Center.

Rich Owings stated that Metro staff is following the guidelines of Option 2, preparing to send out an RFP or RFB and/or get a broker on board to help find a public site.

Facilities Subcommittee

Dave Phillips presented the Facilities Subcommittee update. He stated that at the last meeting the Subcommittee reviewed a set of

design criteria and a set of operational criteria for the Metro East Transfer and Recycling Center. Examples of design criteria include architecture/landscaping and graphics; gatehouse entrance, workspace, and exterior. Dave pointed out that the Subcommittee did not consider recycling activities. These will come from the Waste Reduction Subcommittee. Dave reported that the operation standards deal with hours of operation, traffic control, vector control, dust, customer assistance, odor, weighing, billing, maintenance, etc.

Waste Reduction Subcommittee

Dennis Mulvihill gave an update on the Waste Reduction Subcommittee's activities. He explained that the 22 program options are being reworked, although the pattern of costs and impacts will stay the same. He indicated that one of the fundamental decisions is whether the region's waste reduction system will primarily be a source separation or post-collection type system.

Dennis explained that there are seven major source separation programs with 16 variations, and two major post-collection programs with six variations. Three key variables impact cost and efficiencies of the nine major types. These include 1) the waste stream which is being considered (commercial or residential); 2) what materials are being sought; and 3) frequency of collection.

Dennis reviewed the draft program matrix. There was a discussion of program costs. The consensus was that the numbers were not accurate. The group also agreed that true costs may never be determined. Dick Howard suggested that while the numbers are important, practicality will dictate the end result, and he suggested that the region look at a system that people will use, and that is also practical for collectors.

Rich Owings recommended that the Committee suggest alternatives on how to rank or rate the 22 programs. He also suggested that dollar amounts only be used as indicators (\pm \$5.00).

Rich indicated that hopefully the CSWC and the Policy Committee will give direction to the Technical Committee on how the programs should be ranked, provide a list of issues and concerns, and determine preferred implementation strategies.

Project Updates

East Transfer Station White Paper

Rich Owings stated that at their last meeting the Policy Committee recommended that source separation be given priority over post-collection in the preparation of the Metro East Transfer Station RFP.

Rich continued that the Policy Committee's recommendation on the East Transfer Station was that the facility may be privately owned and also that there should be a municipal option. The Policy Committee reconfirmed its desire to see an Evaluation Committee formed. There was discussion of the "leveraging" concept. Rich stated that Bob Koch is interested in seeing the Metro East Station foster and support other community programs.

Bob Martin stated that the function of the Evaluation Committee is not only to evaluate proposals, but also to be involved in the process of developing the RFPs that Metro puts out. Members selected for the Evaluation Committee are John Lang, Bureau of Environmental Services, City of Portland; Carter MacNichol, Planning and Development, Port of Portland; Lorna Stickel, Multnomah County Planning; Rich Owings, Metro Solid Waste Director; and Neil Saling, Construction Manager at Metro.

Bob reviewed Metro staff's current activities related to transfer station and transport issues. He indicated that there are three interrelated timelines: 1) development of public transfer station; 2) development of private transfer station and 3) development of an RFP for the depot/transportation element. Depending on the outcome of the privatization issue, Metro may or may not be involved in developing an RFP for a private transfer station. Staff effort is being organized around those items that need to be done regardless of the outcome of the privatization issue. These include the transport and depot RFP and the public site selection.

Merle Irvine asked if it is still Metro's intent to issue RFPs for the depot and private transfer station at the same time. Bob Martin responded that the possibility of accelerating the schedule for the transport RFP has been considered, but a final decision has not been made. The group discussed how to proceed with simultaneous RFPs for the transfer station and depot, given the fact that the Metro Council has not made a decision on the transfer station.

Dave Phillips suggested that one alternative would be to proceed simultaneously, but realize that the actual awarding or final comparison of the transfer element would occur at a later date. Then the proposals could be reviewed on the transport end, but the transfer element would not be compared until the public option is completed.

Bob Martin replied that putting the transfer station RFP and the transport RFP out together and allowing for the full range of various combinations is a much more complex situation than proceeding sequen-

tially. He expressed some concern about possible confusion and the potential for a difficult process if a simultaneous process is used. He continued that proceeding sequentially does not necessarily rule out the possibility of co-location of facilities. A transportation RFP could still allow a vendor to reserve a future option for co-locating a transfer station when that RFP is released.

Policy Committee Interviews

Rich explained to the Committee that he and Vickie Rocker have interviewed all the Policy Committee members to get their opinions on the Solid Waste Planning Project to date. He pointed out that the Policy Committee members were very impressed with the work the Technical Committee and Subcommittees are producing. They were very supportive of the fact that the regional forum has been created and that there is an opportunity to talk about common concerns and issues such as privatization, waste reduction and special waste. Rich stated that the Policy Committee wanted technical materials to be summarized and policy options to be presented to them.

Becky Crockett indicated that one of the comments from the Policy Committee, CSWC and the full Council was that they want to direct the course of policy development prior to Technical Committee, subcommittee and staff formulating the work. Staff is trying to come up with work program options so that we can get these groups on board. She stated that staff is preparing the following for consideration by the CSWC and Policy Committee in early April: 1) four work program options; and 2) a reorganized decision-making structure, where the policy makers initiate a white paper by agreeing to a white paper outline of major policy issues.

Sebastian Degens asked if the Council wants to formulate conclusions on the white papers. Becky replied that they want to identify policy issues that should be considered. The CSWC was very receptive to the technical analysis for the Metro East Transfer Station. Their concern was that staff did not address the full range of their questions.

Project Evaluation Discussion

The group discussed their opinions on the planning project so far. Dave Phillips expressed frustration on the slowness of the process. He indicated that this has always been a problem when dealing with the Metro Council. He explained that the East Transfer Station is a good example. He believes there is a long history on this issue to guide the agency. He explained that it is becoming more and more critical that the region move forward on solid waste issues.

Gary LaHaie commented that he is concerned about the Policy Committee's top-down approach and with the tendency to pre-decide what should be investigated. He stated that this approach runs the risk of not

identifying some options that may be identified at the technical levels. He indicated that he was also frustrated by the project, and suggested more two-way communication between the Technical and Policy Committees.

Tom Miller added that the top-down approach is fine if you have direction from the top. He indicated that there has not been enough communication. The amount of effort being expended should be recognized and also the region's frustration level over solid waste issues for the past 12 years. He recommended joint meetings or discussions with the Policy Committee. The group agreed that more two-way communication between the Policy and Technical Committees and between the Policy Committee and CSWC was essential. Tom Miller felt that an occasional joint meeting where everybody is updated would shorten the overall planning process.

Rich Owings stated that the Technical Committee could complete the questionnaires in their agenda packets or call Bob Martin for a personal interview, if they had additional comments on the planning project.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 22, 1988. The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.