

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING AN)	RESOLUTION NO. 86-635
EXEMPTION TO THE PUBLIC CONTRACT-)	
ING PROCEDURE SET OUT IN METRO)	Introduced by the
CODE SECTION 2.04.001 ET SEQ FOR)	Executive Officer
SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SERVICES FROM)	
A RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY(IES))	

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) has determined, as part of its Solid Waste Reduction Program adopted in Resolution No. 85-611, that a resource recovery facility(ies) is necessary for disposal of up to 48 percent of the municipal solid waste (MSW) in the Portland tri-county planning area; and

WHEREAS, Metro has determined that there are three acceptable alternative technologies, namely, material recovery including composting, refuse-derived fuel (RDF), and mass burn, for resource recovery as a result of the symposium it sponsored; and

WHEREAS, The successful vendor will be an experienced contractor and be required to propose an effective technology, economically and technically feasible, with substantial performance guarantees, environmental acceptability, financial viability, and public acceptability; and

WHEREAS, Solid Waste disposal services includes full service, modified full service, and turnkey proposals but not architect and engineer proposals; and

WHEREAS, Metro Code Section 2.04.011 of the Metro Contract Procedures identifies such contracts as public contracts, and requires such contracts be entered into based on competitive bids; and

WHEREAS, As part of the competitive process Metro wishes to select up to the five most qualified firms for each technological type and/or volume size based on an evaluation, not only of the price quoted for tipping MSW for disposal at the facility, but also of the technical feasibility of the disposal method and its compliance with ORS 459, as well as the procurement approach (full service, modified full service, turn-key), and the risk allocation between Metro and the private parties involved, including the type of guarantees provided Metro by the vendor; and

WHEREAS, The two-part Request for Qualifications/Information (RFQ/I) and Request for Proposals (RFP) solicitation and selection process described in the Staff Report is unlikely to encourage favoritism or substantially diminish competition because the contract will be nationally advertised, the contractual criteria and evaluation criteria will be clearly stated in the RFQ/I and the RFP, because vendor's comments and questions on the RFQ/I and RFP will be addressed, and because competition will be limited only on the basis of ability to carry out the contract, and will encourage competition for the project(s) Metro desires; and

WHEREAS, The solicitation and selection process set out in the Staff Report will result in substantial cost savings because it will allow Metro the opportunity to eliminate all unacceptable proposals prior to the RFP, and to ultimately select that vendor or vendors whose proposal, inclusive of economic, technological, procurement, financial, and political variables is most effective; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the contract(s) for the solid waste disposal services from a resource recovery facility(ies) is exempted from the competitive bid process because the Council of the Metropolitan Service District finds that the requirements of Metro Code Section 2.04.011(c) have been met.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 13th day of March, 1986.


Richard Waker, Presiding Officer

DA/srs
5263C/445-4
03/24/86

CONSIDERATION OF STRATEGY AND TIME SCHEDULE FOR THE SUCCESSFUL EXECUTION OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY PROJECT; AND

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 85-635, AUTHORIZING EXEMPTION TO THE PUBLIC CONTRACTING PROCEDURE SET OUT IN METRO CODE SECTION 2.04.001 ET SEQ FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SERVICES FROM A RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY (IES)

Date: March 5, 1986

Presented by: Debbie Allmeyer

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Solid Waste Department is undertaking to implement alternative technology, a resource recovery project, as part of Metro's Solid Waste Reduction Program, whereby up to 48 percent of Metro's municipal (residential, commercial and/or light industrial) solid waste is disposed of through an alternative technology to land-filling. This project was initiated as a result of the requirement to produce a waste reduction plan in ORS 459. The availability of alternative technologies was determined as a result of a Metro-sponsored symposium in August of 1985.

Contractors will be selected through a competitive Request for Qualification/Information (RFQ/I) and Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

The Resource Recovery Project will have three phases, as follows:

Phase I or Procurement Planning Phase, during which time the RFQ/I will be issued and evaluated;

Phase II or Procurement Phase, during which time the RFP will be issued and evaluated; and

Phase III or Negotiation Phase, when a contract(s) with vendor(s) will be negotiated for Council approval.

PHASE I

The Metro Council will have key decisions to make concerning system cost, technological approach, procurement approach and risk allocation prior to issuance of the RFP document. A time schedule has been developed to show what series of events need to occur, and is attached as Exhibit 1.

Several major questions, as originally posed in the Alternative Technologies chapter, are germane to the successful conclusion of Phase I, or the Procurement Planning Phase of the work, in anticipation of issuing the RFP document. These questions are attached as Exhibit 2.

The RFQ/I will query potential system vendors as to: 1) type of technology, 2) energy and/or material customer(s), 3) potential site, and 4) approximate system cost, in addition to requesting qualification statements. It will be from this information that Metro can glean whether or not a project may be viable, and select a "short list" of qualified firms for receipt of the RFP.

Due to the number of variables which together form a viable project, it is necessary to look beyond merely cost factors to select both a "short list" of qualified vendors who will receive the RFP, and ultimately, the vendor(s) with whom Metro will contract to provide the requisite waste disposal services. It is for this reason that it is essential to receive exemption from the public bid requirement. A resolution for this action is before you today.

The criteria upon which potential vendors will be evaluated will include:

- technologies must be one or a combination of composting, refuse derived fuel (RDF) and mass burn
- qualifications of the firm
- experience of their personnel
- corporate financial strength
- commitment to resource recovery
- impact of proposed facility(ies) on current solid waste management system
- order of magnitude of the facility(ies) capital and operating expenses, expected market revenues, mass and energy balance, and performance parameters
- ability to identify a site that can be secured and licensed
- ability to identify reliable market(s) for products that can be produced by the resource recovery facility(ies).

It will also include an assessment of the technological approach they propose, what level of risk they are willing to assume, and how strong their guarantees are. These variables will impact whatever service fee per ton of solid waste disposed is proposed by each vendor.

PHASE II

The criteria for evaluating the RFP will be developed and presented to the Council at a later date.

The RFQ/I will be advertised nationally in industry newsletters and periodicals, as well as in local newspapers. A mailing list of over 25 firms will also be used to assure vendors have an opportunity to propose to do the work.

The selection team for short listing firms following receipt of the RFQ/I responses will include at least three staff people from the Solid Waste Department, at least one Council member, and at least one professional from outside Metro, in addition to other advisors. The same will be true for evaluation of the responses to the RFP.

During final negotiations, the various risks, such as the chance that Btu content of the waste may go down, may be shared between the vendor(s) and Metro. The manner in which risks are allocated has a DEFINITE IMPACT ON THE SERVICE FEE. Similarly, one vendor may have a lower service fee requirement, but may not have strong, long-term markets for the sale of their end product(s). It would be imprudent to select the low service fee proposal without regard for the type and quality of service provided.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends Adoption of Resolution No. 86-635.

DA/gl
5263C/445-2
03/06/86

EXHIBIT 1

July Senate Bill 662 becomes law

August 2-3 Resource Recovery Symposium-Alternatives to Burying Waste

December Submission of Solid Waste Reduction Program to DEQ

January 14-28 1985
Notice of Intent to issue RFP for consultant
Notice of Intent to issue RFQ for vendors

February 27 Selection of Gershman, Brickner, and Bratton as consulting engineers for RRP

REPORT TO COUNCIL ON CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS

March 13 REPORT TO COUNCIL ON RRP STRATEGY AND TIME SCHEDULE
REPORT TO COUNCIL ON RFQ/I PROCESS
REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM PUBLIC BID PROCESS

March 14 Issue RFQ/I for resource recovery vendor
Initiation of search for legal bond counsel

March 27 REPORT TO COUNCIL ON COST OF LANDFILLING VERSUS RESOURCE RECOVERY

April 22 INITIATION OF COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON PROCUREMENT APPROACH AND METRO'S RISK POSTURE

May 30 REPORT TO COUNCIL ON VENDOR SHORT LIST
COUNCIL DECISION ON ACCEPTABLE COST AND PROCUREMENT APPROACH FOR RESOURCE RECOVERY

June Additional legal/bond counsel and advisors for Resource Recovery Project

December Issue RFP

April 1987
Proposals received

October 1988
Contract(s) awarded.

December 1990
Commercial operation begins

EXHIBIT 2

MAJOR QUESTIONS

1. Which technologies best achieve priorities in state law?

Through the Resource Recovery Symposium and the work of the Council waste reduction task force, three technologies survived the rigors of the Council adoption of the Solid Waste Reduction Program. Composting, RDF, and Mass Burn are in contention. What remains is to discern how the technologies compare when considering technical and economic questions. The responses to the RFQ/I will be used to evaluate which technologies best address the priorities in state law, within the confines of technical and economic feasibility.

A thorough discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the technologies under scrutiny is available in the Alternative Technologies chapter. There is also discussion of markets for end products of resource recovery systems in the chapter.

2. What added cost is the region willing to pay for recovery of resources?

Estimates of service fee cost for composting, RDF and mass burn will be compared with the cost of sanitary landfilling as a means of disposal. This comparison will be conducted prior to receipt of the RFQ/I responses using average, national figures for resource recovery cost ranges, and landfill cost as derived through staff analysis. Council will need to arrive at an acceptable cost range for resource recovery prior to selection of a short list of potential vendors for receipt of the RFP.

Comparative cost data on resource recovery and landfilling is discussed in the Alternative Technologies chapter.

3. For which resources do dependable markets exist?

It was determined in September 1985 that the Solid Waste Department would not undertake a market survey relative to implementation of resource recovery in Portland. Rather, it was determined that the private sector could find their own markets. The RFQ/I instrument will be used to obtain a preliminary understanding of the relative success each potential vendor might have in securing long-term material and/or energy markets. This information will be part of the criteria upon which vendors, and their approach to solving the problem, will be evaluated. This information will not be available until the responses to the RFQ/I are in, in mid-May.

4. How should financial risk be shared between Metro and private operators?

This risk analysis must be conducted prior to issuance of the RFP and should be an item for Council consideration between March and May. The consulting engineers hired to assist Metro on the Resource Recovery Project will assist in this analysis. The risk analysis is related to procurement approach, which must be decided before the RFP is issued.

5. Which approaches cause least environmental damage?

The RFQ/I will request information on the type of environmental degradation resulting from the proposed process and what equipment is used to mitigate the damage. This will be one facet of the evaluation process for the RFQ/I. Ultimately, compliance with local, state and federal air and water quality standards will be incorporated into the RFP requirements. No vendor will be selected who cannot comply with environmental safety standards at an affordable/competitive cost.

6. What technologies have broadest public support?

It is imperative that an active promotion and education effort be sustained throughout the three phases of the Resource Recovery Project. Wide public support for resource recovery exists in the three-county area and must be maintained and strengthened to safeguard ultimate public acceptance of siting resource recovery facilities.

7. What roles and responsibilities is Metro willing to take?

In what type of contract relationship will Metro engage?

5263C/445-2
03/06/86

8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-634, for the Purpose of Amending the FY 1985-86 Budget of the Metropolitan Service District, and Adding a Program Assistant 1 Position to the Zoo's Budget

Randy Boose reported Zoo staff had requested this budget adjustment in order to provide for more coverage of live animal demonstrations and traveling animal exhibits. FY 1985-86 funds previously budgeted for temporary staff could be transferred to the new position. He explained staff were requesting the change at this time in order to have a person hired by the start of the summer season. Funds for next fiscal year would be requested as part of the FY 1986-87 budget process.

Councilor Kelley asked Kay Rich whether the Zoo-To-You Program was being discontinued. Mr. Rich said the summer parks program would be replaced by the live animal demonstrations and traveling exhibits. The September to May Zoo-To-You programs for schools and nursing homes would continue.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved for adoption of Resolution No. 86-634 and Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Councilor Kirkpatrick requested the Program Assistant 1 position appear as a new position in the FY 1986-87 budget.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilor Myers

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-634 was adopted.

8.2 Consideration of Strategy and Time Schedule for the Successful Execution of the Resource Recovery Project; and

Consideration of Resolution No. 85-635, Authorizing Exemption to the Public Contracting Procedure Set Out in Metro Code Section 2.04.001 Et Seq for Solid Waste Disposal Services from a Resource Recovery Facility(ies)

Debbie Allmeyer introduced resource recovery project consultants with the firm of Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc., Harvey Gershman, president, and Bob Zier, manager for Metro's project.

She explained the consultants would be providing management and engineering consulting services.

Ms. Allmeyer then noted Councilors had received an updated project schedule and revisions of the proposed Resolution. The Resolution had been changed to recognize material recovery technology, to include public acceptability as an evaluation criteria for technologies, and to describe the various approaches Metro could take in implementing alternative technology(ies).

Ms. Allmeyer reviewed major events that had shaped Metro's resource recovery program including passage of Senate Bill 662, the Metro Resource Recovery Symposium and the Symposium Panel's recommendations, submittal of the Solid Waste Reduction Program to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and commencement of the resource recovery project. She explained staff were currently involved in Phase I of the resource recovery project, the procurement planning phase. A key step in Phase I would be the distribution of Request for Qualifications and Information (RFQ/I) documents on March 13 to technologies.

Ms. Allmeyer then explained staff was requesting an exemption from the public bidding procedures for the resource recovery project because price could not be the only factor on which proposals could be judged. Eleanore Baxendale added that if the Council wished to consider proposals according to factors other than the lowest cost, an exemption would be required. It would be especially important to have an exemption for this project, she said, because several factors would not be known until initial proposals were reviewed including the type of technology that would be chosen, the cost of the project, and where the facility(ies) would be located. She said an exemption would preserve the Council's options. Finally, she noted such an exemption would comply with Metro's Code and the state law.

Regarding the RFQ/I, Councilor Kafoury noted she would have preferred staff had distributed copies of the document to Councilors before it was distributed to the public. She also noted the project schedule did not contain information about when RFQ/I's would be returned, what would happen to the RFQ/I's once they were returned, who would review and qualify them, by what criteria would they be evaluated, and what role would the Council play in the review process. She also asked what events were planned during the six-month period of June through December after certain vendors were qualified and the Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued.

Ms. Allmeyer reviewed the RFQ/I schedule with Councilors. She said a selection committee would review all responses to the RFQ/I and would screen the responses down to a "short list" of those deemed most qualified according to predetermined criteria. The criteria, she said, was listed in the RFQ/I and in the staff report. She

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 8

explained the project consultant was currently working with staff to refine a RFQ/I evaluation process and staff could report these project developments to Councilors on a periodic basis. Doug Drennen added staff were open to input from Councilors on the role they would like to play in evaluating the proposals.

Councilor Kafoury said the process of screening prospective vendors would be the most important part of the project. She urged staff to involve the Council in decisions and to keep them informed.

Ms. Allmeyer then reviewed key dates for the project including the date responses to RFQ/I's would be due (May 19), interviewing firms (May 28), and presenting the short list to the Council (June) via audio/visual presentations.

Ms. Baxendale noted the provisions for a short list (narrowing down qualified vendors to most qualified vendors) needed to be included in the Resolution. She asked staff to note why such a process would be appropriate, explaining the rationale must also become part of the Resolution.

Ms. Allmeyer first responded to the second part of Councilor Kafoury's earlier question. She said six months might not be needed between the time specific vendors were qualified and RFP's were issued but it was necessary for certain events to take place and decisions to be made before Phase II could commence. The DEQ and the EQC had to approve Metro's Solid Waste Reduction Program. This was scheduled to occur in late June. Other major decisions to be made included the cost of the technology, which vendors would receive the RFP, the extent of risk Metro could assume and the mode of financing for the project.

Councilor Kafoury stated she wanted staff to operate on an accelerated but thoughtful schedule. She thought some preliminary work could be done in advance of the EQC's approval of the Solid Waste Reduction Program and she urged an RFP be issued no later than late fall 1986.

Councilor Oleson said it was also his understanding the schedule would be accelerated and agreed with Councilor Kafoury's concerns. He also requested Councilors receive copies of the RFQ/I as soon as possible.

In response to Presiding Officer Waker's question, Ms. Allmeyer said the RFQ/I did limit technologies to materials recovery, mass burn and refuse-derived fuel types.

Councilor Van Bergen said he was concerned about proceeding with the alternative technology project when the DEQ had not yet accepted

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 9

Metro's Solid Waste Reduction Program. He requested DEQ's position on Metro's alternative technology plans be substantiated before the project commenced further. Dan Durig and Presiding Officer Waker said the correspondence received from the DEQ clearly indicated the Department supported immediate implementation of Metro's plans for an alternative technologies program.

In response to Councilor Hansen's question, Mr. Durig discussed planned activities between April 1987 and October 1988. He said the time would be needed to complete the negotiation process with the selected vendor. Councilor Hansen expressed concern that the negotiation period was too long. He thought one of the reasons the Oregon City project had failed was because negotiations had continued longer than necessary. Mr. Durig said staff would certainly work to keep this phase of the project as short as possible.

Councilor Hansen requested staff clearly indicate to the Council the extent of Council involvement in the process of narrowing down vendors to those receiving RFP's and considered for contract negotiation. He also requested the alternative technologies project timeline be based on the closure of the St. Johns Landfill in 1989.

Councilor DeJardin said he was uncomfortable with Councilor Hansen's request because he did not want the Council to be in the position of dictating how staff should do their job. He said Councilors had shared their concerns with staff and staff should have an opportunity to respond to those concerns. To operate otherwise might lengthen the entire process, he said.

Presiding Officer Waker said he would schedule a Council work session to discuss the entire project, the proposed timeline and the extent of Council involvement in the project.

Although Councilor Gardner thought the Council had been adequately involved in the planning process, he was concerned about staff's plans to develop a "short list" before responses to the RFQ/I's were received. Narrowing down vendors to five could pose limitations to vendors or technologies and he urged keeping the process competitive as long as possible.

Councilor Frewing asked why Resolution No. 86-635 had to detail the exact process, particularly the proposed "short list" procedure. Ms. Baxendale explained state law required if an exemption from the public bidding procedure were to exist, findings must be made that applied to two sections of the statute: 1) the exemption was unlikely to encourage favoritism or substantially diminish competition; and 2) the bidding process would result in substantial cost savings. She said staff had been careful to mention in the

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 10

Resolution all the basic criteria proposed to be used in the bid process. It was, therefore, important to include the process of a "short list" in the resolution and to demonstrate it would meet the two criteria stated above.

In response to Councilor Frewing's question, Ms. Baxendale said the condition of a vendor's financial viability was addressed under the third "WHEREAS" of the Resolution.

At Ms. Baxendale's request, Mr. Gershman explained why staff recommended narrowing down vendors to a list of five before RFP's were issued. He first explained the highly competitive nature of this type of project. Prospective bidders would want to know the exact extent of the competition during each phase of the procurement process, he said. Because the bidding process was a substantial financial investment to prospective bidders (estimated at between \$250,000 to \$500,000 per bidder), the bidder would submit a high quality proposal if it were known in advance he had a one in five chance of being awarded the bid. On the other hand, if it were known in advance as many as ten vendors would be asked to submit proposals, bidders would invest substantially less in preparing proposals, or they might not submit a proposal at all. In short, the quality of proposals submitted would diminish as competition and risk increased. He also explained if the RFQ was too restrictive in determining the criteria by which vendors would be evaluated, competition would be decreased. He recommended each proposal be evaluated on its own merits, thus, the need for an exemption to the standard competitive bid process.

A discussion followed regarding the merits of restricting the competition to five vendors before RFP's were issued. At the Presiding Officer's request, staff agreed to prepare language for the Resolution that would incorporate the concerns of the Council. The Presiding Officer announced he would call the Council into Executive Session and would continue discussion of Resolution No. 86-635 later in the meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 8:00 p.m., Presiding Officer Waker called the meeting into Executive Session under the authority of ORS 192.660(1)(h). Present were Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker. The Presiding Officer called the meeting back into regular session at 8:27 p.m.

9.1 RESOLUTIONS

9.2 Consideration of a Contract with Coates Advertising for Solid Waste Reduction Program Education

Dennis Mulvihill presented the history of the project, explaining \$145,000 had been budgeted for the contract for FY 1985-86. Senate Bill 662 had preempted work on the project, however, until now. The public education program was an important component of the Solid Waste Reduction Program, he said.

Janet Schaeffer outlined the program objectives as listed in Attachment A of the staff report. She also explained the project would be performed in two phases, the first phase involving planning the program. Staff would return to the Council at the end of Phase I (April, 1986), she said, to seek approval for Phase II. Ms. Schaeffer reviewed the contractor selection process. Staff recommended awarding the contract to Coates Advertising. She then introduced Michael and Jeanie Coates to the Council.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved to approve the contract with Coates Advertising and to instruct staff return to the Council at the end of Phase I for approval of subsequent phases. Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

In answer to Councilor Frewing's question, Ms. Schaeffer said the contract could be terminated at any time upon five days notice to the Contractor.

Councilor Hansen requested the consultant and staff include Clark County, Washington, in promotional efforts and involve that county in planning and funding the project.

Councilor Van Bergen said he would not support approving the contract because it was not yet known whether the DEQ would approve Metro's proposed Solid Waste Reduction Program. He also did not think the \$186,000 proposed contract sum was sufficient to guarantee a successful public education campaign.

Councilor Kelley said she would support contract approval because a promotional campaign would be beneficial in presenting a good image of Metro. She thought \$186,000 could accomplish the desired goal if the funds were used wisely.

Presiding Officer Waker said he was supporting the contract. He had met with Coates Advertising personnel and was confident they would do a good job.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:
Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner,
Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley and Waker
Nay: Councilor Van Bergen
Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and the contract was approved. Presiding Officer Waker requested staff return to the Council on April 22, 1986, to seek approval for implementation of Phase II of the contract.

9.1 Consideration of a Contract with Duraquip Inc. for the
Fabrication and Installation of a Disc Screen and Conveying
System for Metro's Yard Debris Program

Chuck Geyer discussed the purpose of the yard debris program and the process for selecting the recommended contractor as outlined in the meeting agenda materials.

Councilor Kirkpatrick asked if staff were satisfied with Duraquip's qualifications since their bid was far lower than other bidders. Mr. Geyer explained the high bidder had not conformed to staff's specifications which explained the wide range of amounts bid. Staff were more than satisfied with Duraquip's qualifications, he said.

Councilor Hansen said he was excited about the program and encouraged staff to seek other uses for the equipment such as manufacturing composting material for sale. He suggested a separate disposal rate could be established for yard debris. Mr. Geyer reported staff were investigating these possibilities as part of the Solid Waste Reduction Program.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved the contract with Duraquip Inc. be approved and Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:
Ayes: Councilors Cooper, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen,
Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Waker
Absent: Councilors DeJardin, Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and the contract was approved.

Councilor Van Bergen requested staff return to the Council in one month and report on operations costs for the contracted project.

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 14

Councilor Hansen said he would prefer to see a broad-based group analyze the Metro organization. He questioned whether many of his constituents were represented in the City Club.

The Executive Officer said he was pleased the City Club had chosen the Metro organization for a study, but thought Metro's response to the report should point out recent activities and changes the report had not taken into consideration since the the study commenced 18 months ago. The report, however, discussed the new priorities to support a regional governance study and to examine the future role of Metro in the region.

8.2 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-635, for the Purpose of Authorizing an Exemption to the Public Contracting Procedure Set Out in Metro Code Section 2.04.001 Et Seq for Solid Waste Disposal Services from a Resource Recovery Facility(ies)
(Continued Discussion)

Staff returned to the meeting and distributed a revised Resolution No. 86-635 which incorporated new language on the competitive bidding process.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved to adopt the revised version of Resolution No. 86-635 and Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury and Waker

Nay: Councilor Van Bergen

Absent: Councilors DeJardin, Kelley, Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-635 was adopted.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Marie Nelson
Clerk of the Council

amn
5372C/313-2
04/01/86