

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING	)	RESOLUTION NO. 86-720
RESOLUTION NO. 86-696, REGARDING	)	
RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR	)	Introduced by the
PROPOSALS FOR COMPOST FACILITY	)	Executive Officer
SERVICES	)	

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District's Solid Waste Reduction Program recognizes that up to 48 percent of the waste stream (estimated 450,000 tons per year) is available for alternative technology/resource recovery projects to develop useful by-products and/or energy from solid waste; and

WHEREAS, Metro's Solid Waste Reduction Program recognizes that 52 percent of the waste stream is first allocated to source reduction through implementation of reduce, re-use, and recycle programs; and

WHEREAS, There are 1,270,000 cubic yards of yard debris in the waste stream, of which 1,000,000 cubic yards, or 100,000 tons per year, (which represent approximately one-fifth of the 52 percent of the waste stream allocated to source reduction), have been targeted for production of yard debris compost; and

WHEREAS, On March 13, 1986, the Council of the Metropolitan Service District adopted Resolution No. 86-635 "For the Purpose of Authorizing Exemption from 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)"; and

WHEREAS, That Resolution described a process for contractor selection which included using a Request for Qualifications and Information to select "up to the five most

will authorize staff to complete negotiations with the vendor(s) who best appears to meet Metro's needs; if a top ranked vendor fails to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding or if the Council rejects a Memorandum of Understanding, a Memorandum of Understanding may be negotiated with the next most appropriate vendor; and d) the Request for Proposals and the Memorandum of Understanding will be the basis for the final agreement between the parties.

2. That the primary risks Metro will accept are the delivery of waste and certain uncontrollable circumstances as outlined in Exhibit A.

3. That Metro expects to share product sales revenues and will structure the Tip Fee to be the Service Fee less Recovered Materials Revenues and the Service Fee to be the Debt Service and Operations and Maintenance Costs.

4. That the Contractor will be responsible for marketing the compost and by-products, and for costs associated with providing sufficient guarantees such that compost and recovered materials will not be landfilled.

5. That the contractor will pay landfill disposal charges for compost and recovered materials which must be landfilled due to lack of a market.

6. That Metro will evaluate the marketing plans proposed by compost vendors relative to the economic efficiency of yard debris compost markets and sewage sludge compost markets, should the plan include markets already targeted by yard debris or sewage sludge composters.

7. That Exhibit B reflects the issues described in Ordinance No. 86-201 and the Solid Waste Reduction Program.

8. That Metro will develop and implement a public involvement program.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 18th day of December, 1986.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Waker, Presiding Officer

DA/gl  
6431C/485-2  
12/10/86

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No. 8.5

Meeting Date Dec. 18, 1986

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 86-720 FOR THE  
PURPOSE OF AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 86-696  
REGARDING RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS FOR  
COMPOST FACILITY SERVICES

---

Date: December 10, 1986

Presented by: Debbie G. Allmeyer

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Resolution No. 86-696 unintentionally omitted reference to sewage sludge compost markets and markets targeted for sewage sludges in resolve #6. Yard debris compost and sewage sludge compost are currently being marketed, and both should be considered when evaluating marketing plans proposed by mixed waste compost Proposers. As Metro has disposal responsibility for sewage sludge, it is proposed that it be included in the resolution in resolve #6.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 86-720.

DGA/gl  
6679C/485-1  
12/10/86

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-714 was adopted.

8.4 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-715, for the Purpose of Entering Into an Intergovernmental Agreement and Expending Funds to Preserve the Southern Pacific Right-of-Way (Jefferson Street Branch) Between Portland and Lake Oswego

Councilor Gardner presented staff's report and reviewed the history of events leading up to the recommendation of the Resolution. He reported land owners in the Johns Landing area did not support this action because of the potential for noise.

Councilor Cooper asked if Metro's charter allowed for purchase of railroad right-of-ways. Eleanore Baxendale, General Counsel, replied such an action would be allowed.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved the Resolution be adopted and Councilor Hansen seconded the motion.

Councilor Gardner explained the Resolution would not obligate Metro to purchase the right-of-way but would create a situation where the property could not be sold to another party for one year. This would allow time to explore all options further, he said.

Councilor Frewing asked if adoption of the Resolution would prevent future use of the land as a bike path. Councilor Gardner replied it would not.

Councilor Ragsdale said he would support the Resolution given its interim nature. He cautioned linear land parcels traditionally had low market value and that land prices should be examined very closely before any purchase was made.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all twelve Councilors voting aye.

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-715 was adopted.

8.5 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-720, for the Purpose of Amending Resolution No. 86-696, Regarding Responses to Requests for Proposals for Compost Facility Services

Debbie Allmeyer, Solid Waste Analyst, reported Resolution No. 86-696 unintentionally omitted reference to sewage sludge compost markets and markets targeted for sewage sludges in the sixth resolve paragraph. Because both yard debris compost and sewage sludge compost were being marketed, both should be considered when evaluating marketing plans proposed by mixed waste compost properers, she explained.

Motion: Councilor Kelley moved the Resolution be adopted and Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all twelve Councilors present voting aye.

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-720 was adopted.

8.6 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-721, for the Purpose of Stating the Availability of Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center Property

Debbie Allmeyer, Solid Waste Analyst, distributed a revised version of the Resolution which contained additional language from the version printed in the agenda packet. Councilor Frewing requested the Resolution, if adopted, be made available to all proposers for solid waste alternative technology projects.

Councilor Van Bergen said he was violently opposed to the Resolution. Eleanore Baxendale, General Counsel, explained she had talked to the Oregon City Manager Noel Klein and had added language consistent with Oregon City's charter which excluded garbage burning plant from the site. Mr. Klein had agreed with the revision, she said. The Councilor said the City Manager may have agreed but he did not think the Oregon City community would support the Resolution.

A discussion followed about the meaning of the Resolution. Presiding Officer Waker and Councilor Kelley said the Resolution identified the transfer center location as a potential site for a compost project and therefore, they supported adoption of the Resolution. Councilor Knowles agreed with Councilor Van Bergen that the Resolution would send a signal to Oregon City residents that Metro could build a plant at the transfer center location.

Councilor Van Bergen agreed the use proposed in the Resolution was legal but he thought the location was a unique piece of property which the public had clearly rejected for solid waste use.

In response to the Presiding Officer's question, Ms. Allmeyer said if the Council delayed action on the Resolution until January 8, some proposers would be forced to submit incomplete proposals. Councilor Frewing pointed out that if the Council adopted Resolution No. 86-725 at this meeting, the deadline for submitting proposals for resource recovery projects would be extended to January 30, 1987, and there would be no negative impact of delaying consideration of Resolution No. 86-721.

Councilor Gardner questioned what new information could be learned by delaying consideration of the Resolution. He explained the 1982