

SOLID WASTE PLANNING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

November 20, 1987

Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Chair Jim Gardner. The following were present:

Members and Alternates

Jim Rapp, City of Sherwood
Ed Gronke, Clackamas County Citizen
Delyn Kies, City of Portland
Jim Claypool, City of Portland
Dominic Mancini, Clackamas County
Dave Phillips, Clackamas County
Mark Williams, Multnomah County Citizen
Joan Brown-English, CRRIO
Jim Benedict, Oregon Waste Systems
Bill Campbell, Yamhill County
Bob Brown, DEQ
John Drew, Far West Fibers - Citizen
Rick Daniels, Oregon Waste Systems
Ed Druback, City of West Linn
Tom Miller, Washington County Waste Haulers
Merle Irvine, Wastech, Inc.
John Trout, Teamsters Local 281

Staff and Consultants

Rich Owings, Metro
Becky Crockett, Metro
Roosevelt Carter, Metro
Bob Baldwin, Metro Consultant
Marilyn Matteson, Metro
Joe Dills, Benkendorf Associates
Kathy Thomas, R. A. Wright Engineering
Pat Vernon, Metro
Dennis Mulvihill, Metro

- I. There were no communications from committee members or citizens.
- II. The minutes of the October 23rd meeting were not available. They will be mailed in the next meeting agenda packet.

Rich Owings presented a general project update for the Committee.

Landfill Bid Document

Rich pointed out that Metro has received comments on the original bid document and that staff has prepared an addendum, which responds to some of the significant issues raised by potential vendors.

All changes to the document are meant to reduce risk and uncertainty for the vendors. Metro is extending the bid submittal deadline from December 1st to December 14th.

Resource Recovery

Rich Owings pointed out that Metro is currently negotiating with Combustion Engineering on the RDF facility in St. Helens. Metro staff hopes to make recommendations to the Executive Officer in mid-December and to the Metro Council in January. Negotiations for the mass composting facility in northeast Portland should begin in December.

The Portland/Multnomah County Transfer Center Siting Process

Rich reported that the Policy Committee had concurred with the Technical Committee's recommendation to change the work program and expedite siting of the Portland/Multnomah Transfer Station. However, he indicated that the Policy Committee had expressed concern about their ability to influence the decision process. They want to have more input, to review options, and to select between alternatives in the future.

III. Subcommittee Reports

Waste Reduction Subcommittee

Dennis Mulvihill reported that the Waste Reduction Subcommittee is currently developing costing figures for specific waste reduction programs. He pointed out that the Technical Committee will receive a white paper with program recommendations on January 14th and discussions of those recommendations will be scheduled for the January 22nd meeting.

Land Use Subcommittee

Joe Dills stated that the Subcommittee has met twice. They have been doing background work to help them prepare siting criteria for the Portland/Multnomah County Transfer Station(s) and to develop comprehensive plan policies. The Subcommittee has recommended that Goal Findings be added to their charge.

The Subcommittee has also reviewed the existing zoning in Multnomah County cities and in Portland and has determined that there are plenty of zoning provisions for transfer stations.

Facilities Subcommittee

Mark Williams reviewed the four recommendations of the Facilities Subcommittee:

1. Issue separate RFPs for the East transfer station(s) and transportation depot.
2. Accept commercial and private haul at the East transfer station(s)/depot.
3. Establish a long-term relationship with Yamhill County regarding use of the Riverbend Landfill.
4. Recommend a policy of private ownership and operation of the transfer station(s)/transportation depot with the exception of the Gatehouse.

Kathy Thomas reviewed the rationale behind the recommendation to issue separate RFPs for the transfer station and for the depot. She indicated that the Subcommittee felt separate RFPs would facilitate the RFP process for the transport facility. A lengthy discussion of the merits and drawbacks of issuing two separate RFPs followed. In particular, the questions of timing and the effect on facility costs were discussed.

The Committee asked for an explanation of time constraints on transfer station and depot RFPs. Rich Owings responded that the various planning committees need to provide recommendations on siting criteria and design standards before Metro can put together an RFP. Roosevelt Carter pointed out that the transportation element needs to be part of the out-of-region landfill process.

The Committee discussed the possibility of issuing two separate RFPs at the same time, thus giving vendors the option of bidding on one or more. The Technical Committee agreed that the planning and siting of the transfer station(s) in the Multnomah County area should be a separate process from the planning and siting of the depot. Both planning and siting of the depot should be part of the transportation Request for Proposal for the out-of-region landfill. The transportation/depot RFP and the transfer station RFP should be issued simultaneously.

MOTION AND VOTE:

It was moved and seconded to recommend to the Policy Committee that Metro issue separate RFPs for the transportation depot and

the transfer station(s), but that the RFPs go out simultaneously so that vendors would have the option of bidding on either or both. The motion passed unanimously.

Commercial and Self-Haul

Kathy reviewed the issue of whether the transfer station should serve both commercial and self-haulers or whether to have separate facilities for each. She stated that the Facilities Subcommittee recommended that the station should receive both commercial and self-haul. She pointed out that the Subcommittee generally felt that the problems associated with transfer stations, i.e., litter and traffic, are attributed to the self-hauler. If the transfer stations for the commercial haulers are separate, it may be impossible to site a self-haul facility.

The Technical Committee pointed out that it would be politically unpopular to eliminate the opportunity for self-haul and that the region needs to plan for and provide the service being demanded by citizens. It was clarified that this recommendation was only for the Portland/Multnomah County Transfer Station and not for the system as a whole. There was extensive discussion by the Committee of the land use, economic and transportation impacts of the proposal to accept both commercial and private haul.

MOTION AND VOTE:

It was moved and seconded to recommend to the Policy Committee that the Portland/Multnomah County Transfer Station(s) handle both commercial and self-haul wastes. The motion carried.

IV. Privatization

Kathy Thomas stated that the Facilities Subcommittee had recommended that new regional transfer stations be privately owned and operated with Metro in control of the Gatehouse.

Kathy also reported that the Facilities Subcommittee had reviewed three ownership options:

1. Metro Ownership and Operation
2. Metro Ownership and Private Operation
3. Private Ownership and Private Operation

She explained that the privatization option applies to all transfer stations, not just the Portland/Multnomah County station.

The rationale behind the recommendation includes the following factors:

1. Private sector can site in shorter time than public sector.
2. Private ownership results in lower costs.

3. Promotes competition between firms.
4. Produces a tax revenue for the jurisdictions.
5. Maximizes waste reduction.

The Technical Committee discussed Section 5.01.120 of Metro's Franchise Code and how this would affect privatization options. They requested additional information on the Franchise Code.

MOTION AND VOTE:

It was moved and seconded to adopt the Subcommittee's recommendation that regional transfer stations be privately owned and operated with Metro controlling the Gatehouse. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Yamhill County/Riverbend Landfill

Roosevelt Carter explained that Yamhill County and the owners of Riverbend Landfill have approached Metro and requested that we commit to a long-term agreement with them to keep waste flowing from the Metro region to the Riverbend Landfill. He pointed out that the Committee needs to recognize these various kinds of commitments when going through the functional planning process. They should be viewed favorably and should not be eliminated because of the comprehensive planning process. He pointed out that such agreements serve the need to divert waste from the region because of the impending closure of St. Johns.

He pointed out that the Riverbend Landfill owners had requested there be a ceiling rather than a floor on the total amount of waste they would receive from the Portland metropolitan region. Metro recommends the region agree to divert up to 60,000 tons for the foreseeable future. This diversion would provide a critical safety valve for waste should Metro agree to an out-of-region landfill. The Facilities Subcommittee has agreed to this recommendation.

The group raised the question as to how this commitment will affect the bidding process for the out-of-region landfill. Roosevelt Carter indicated that it will not impact this process because Metro is not committed to a minimum level of waste.

MOTION:

It was moved and seconded to recommend to the Policy Committee continuing the relationship between Metro and the Yamhill County/Riverbend Landfill.

Discussion followed. The owner of the Riverbend Landfill responded to a question from the Committee about the duration of the agreement. He indicated that he had no desire to continue the arrangement with Metro beyond two years.

The question of how Metro can make a commitment to Riverbend Landfill without a contract was also discussed. Roosevelt Carter responded that Metro does not want to preclude the possibility of diverting waste to Riverbend. Becky Crockett stated that the Committee needs to determine whether this decision should be a separate one or whether it should be made as part of the whole solid waste system planning effort.

VOTE:

The Committee voted on the question and the motion passed un-
animously.

VI. Waste Reduction Goals and Programs

Pat Vernon reported that the Waste Reduction Subcommittee has been meeting regularly since July. She also explained that Metro had conducted a Waste Characterization Study earlier this year which provided information on how much material is available in the waste stream to recycle.

The Waste Reduction Subcommittee has looked at each material and weighed it against three criteria: 1) availability, 2) markets and 3) feasibility. The Subcommittee then ranked materials to determine which would be most appropriate for targeting waste reduction programs. Pat clarified that availability refers to the amount of waste disposed of in landfills, not to the total amount of waste generated.

Pat pointed out that the Subcommittee then came up with 22 waste reduction programs. She explained that the programs are currently being analyzed to determine what they would cost to implement and operate for a 20-year period.

Waste Reduction programs will address the issues of collection, type of material, processing capabilities, costs and possible participation rates. The Committee members commented that waste reduction programs might not work without legislative mandates and/or economic incentives. It was also noted that volume, as well as tonnage, going to landfills is worth investigating. Pat stated that the final white paper will be available for Technical Committee review at their January meeting.

VII. Strategy and Timing of the Waste Reduction Forum

Pat pointed out that a public forum will be held sometime during the week of January 11 - 15. The purpose of the forum will be to educate the public on the waste reduction methodology and programs, and to get public input and support.

MOTION AND VOTE:

It was moved and seconded to recommend holding the public forum sometime during the week of January 11 - 15, as long as staff has completed their background work. Passed unanimously.

VIII. Public Education/Participation Program for Planning Project

Marilyn Matteson reviewed the proposed program for the Committee and reported on what has been done so far. She stated that all the local jurisdictions (except Banks) have passed resolutions in support of the planning process. She also reviewed the public involvement process and the specific tools that will be used to implement it.

MOTION AND VOTE:

It was moved and seconded to send a recommendation to the Policy Committee to adopt the public education/participation program for the Solid Waste Management Plan. Passed unanimously.

Becky Crockett announced that the next meeting of the Technical Committee is scheduled for Friday, December 18th, at Metro.