

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DESIGNATING	)	RESOLUTION NO. 87-740
SOLID WASTE AS AN AREA AND	)	
ACTIVITY APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOP-	)	Introduced by the
MENT OF A FUNCTIONAL PLAN	)	Executive Officer

WHEREAS, ORS 268.390 authorizes the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) to prepare and adopt functional plans for areas and activities which have impact on air quality, water quality, transportation, and other aspects of metropolitan area development identified by the Council; and

WHEREAS, The statute requires the Council to define a planning procedure for identifying and designating those activities and areas in need of functional planning; and

WHEREAS, The Council of the Metropolitan Service District adopted Ordinance No. 86-207 on September 11, 1986, which defines a planning procedure for designating areas and activities in need of functional planning; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 86-207 further requires that such designation of an area and activity in need of functional planning be done through a resolution presented to the Council of the Metropolitan Service District which shall have findings which support the designation and shall require the Executive Officer to return to the Council with a functional plan for consideration and adoption; and

WHEREAS, The following findings support the designation of solid waste as an area and activity appropriate for development of a functional plan and justify that solid waste has a significant

impact upon the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area:

1. Authority: ORS 268.317 authorizes the District to implement a solid waste system for the region including construction of appropriate solid waste facilities, requiring persons who generate solid waste to make use of the facilities, regulating rates and operation of the facilities and receiving, accepting, processing, recycling, reusing and transporting solid waste.
2. Statewide Goal Compliance: Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Services) of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission's Statewide Planning Goals requires each local jurisdiction to plan for solid waste disposal sites to meet both current and long-range disposal needs. All local jurisdictions have recognized Metro as the appropriate agency to carry out solid waste planning for the region, and have referenced this authority of Metro in their acknowledged comprehensive land use plans.
3. Cost-Effectiveness: Planning and coordination to ensure adequate disposal options for all citizens in the region in the most cost-efficient and environmentally safe manner possible will help provide for the orderly and responsible development of the region.
4. Transportation: A regional plan would result in a more cost-effective system of transport of solid waste to strategically located facilities than would otherwise occur if not regionally coordinated. Planning for an efficient system of transport of solid waste region-wide will reduce the burden on transportation facilities in the region, thus having a significant impact on the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area.
5. Environment: Solid waste facilities may have a direct impact on the environmental infrastructure of the region. Such environmental concerns as air quality, transportation and water quality can be significant in their impact on the region if not carefully attended to. These regional environmental issues potentially resulting from a solid waste facility have a significant impact on the orderly and responsible development of the Metro area and therefore should be addressed through a planning process in which all citizens in the region have the opportunity to comment.


6. Sociological: There is an illustrated public concern and opposition to the siting of solid waste facilities in the region which results in the inherent need to coordinate solid waste management decisions with local governments and the public. Lack of local government and citizen support for a comprehensive solid waste functional plan which will result in facility siting decisions will result in a negative impact on the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area.
7. Resource: Solid waste is a resource from which valuable materials and energy can be extracted. This resource is most efficiently and economically realized when extracted from facilities sited around the Metro region in a way that such facilities maximize efficiency from regional solid waste flow and proximity to markets.
8. Economic Development: A regional plan projects an ability to manage the region's solid waste effectively and economically; this can contribute significantly to a positive climate for economic development, and thus have a significant impact on the development of the metropolitan area.
9. Solid Waste Reduction Program: The State Legislature recognized the need for waste reduction planning and coordination in the metropolitan area by enacting SB 662 in 1985. The resultant Solid Waste Reduction Program adopted by the Metro Council and approved by the Environmental Quality Commission will provide a basis for the solid waste functional plan. The waste reduction efforts currently being implemented in the region could have a significant impact in reducing the amount of solid waste going to solid waste facilities.
10. Landfill Siting: The metropolitan region is facing the closure of its major landfill in early 1991, or sooner. Efforts to site a new regional landfill have been met with great public opposition which has resulted in a continued delay in construction (preparation) of a new facility. A well coordinated solid waste planning effort to provide the public with choices in disposing of solid waste in the region will facilitate resolution of this dilemma. These decisions will have a significant impact on the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That developing a functional plan for solid waste is related to the orderly and responsible development of the

metropolitan area and that the area and activity has a significant impact thereon.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 12th day of March, 1987.

  
Richard Waker, Presiding Officer

BC/gl  
7089C/496-2  
03/09/87

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 87-740, FOR THE  
PURPOSE OF DESIGNATING SOLID WASTE AS AN AREA AND  
ACTIVITY APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A  
FUNCTIONAL PLAN

---

Date: March 4, 1987

Presented by: Becky Crockett

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Resolution No. 87-740 designates solid waste as an area and activity appropriate for development of a functional plan. The resolution includes findings in accordance with Ordinance No. 86-207 which demonstrate that developing a functional plan for solid waste is related to the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area and that the area and activity has a significant impact thereon.

The Metro Council adopted Ordinance No. 86-207 on September 11, 1986, in order to define a planning procedure for designating areas and activities which may be the subject of a functional plan. While Ordinance No. 86-207 was written and adopted to provide a procedure for general use, its initial application was contemplated for solid waste facilities. The authority for the District to adopt and implement functional plans is set forth in ORS 298.390.

The findings in the attached Resolution demonstrate that developing a functional plan for solid waste is related to the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area and are summarized as follows:

- Authority  
Metro has the authority to manage solid waste in the region.
- Statewide Goal Compliance  
Local jurisdictions recognize Metro as being responsible for solid waste management in accordance with local land use plan compliance with LCDC's Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Services).
- Cost-Effectiveness  
Regional solid waste management is more cost-effective than local solutions.

- Transportation  
The flow and transport of solid waste can best be guided by a regional plan.
- Environment  
Environmental concerns on siting facilities affect the entire region, e.g., air quality, transportation.
- Sociological  
Public concerns for siting solid waste facilities need to be addressed regionwide.
- Resource  
Materials and energy can be most efficiently obtained from solid waste if collected and extracted in strategically located places relative to centers of waste and markets.
- Economic Development  
Projecting an ability to manage the region's solid waste effectively and economically can contribute significantly to a positive climate for economic development.
- Solid Waste Reduction Program  
This program provides a basis for the functional plan and could have a significant impact in reducing waste going to solid waste facilities.
- Landfill Siting  
There is an immediate need for comprehensive solutions for disposing of waste in the region, recognizing the dilemma in siting a regional landfill.

Application of the Functional Plan for Solid Waste  
-- Including Resource Recovery Siting

Staff has worked closely with a Land Use Transition Team brought together by the Executive Officer in developing an outline for the solid waste functional plan process. This conceptual outline is attached as Exhibit A. The plan merges the existing resource recovery siting process with the functional planning efforts in order to successfully secure a site for resource recovery. The time frame for developing the plan in accordance with the attached outline is optimistic, but it is reflective of the aggressive schedule the Council adopted for getting a resource recovery facility on-line.

The schedule allows 120 days (March-June) for staff to coordinate with local jurisdictions, write the plan, hold public hearings both at the local level where appropriate and at the Metro Council level, and have the Metro Council adopt the plan. It further assumes that local jurisdictions will be prepared to hold hearings on their comprehensive plan amendments (if necessary) in

July/August 1987. The functional plan development will require additional staff. This action is currently being pursued.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 87-740.

BC/gl  
7089C/496  
03/09/87

Attachment A

NOTE: THIS IS A DISCUSSION DRAFT

Date: February 18, 1987  
To: Metro  
From: Land Use Transition Team  
Re: Developing a Functional Plan for Solid Waste Management

PREAMBLE:

What follows is predicated upon several assumptions and values. We set them forth at the outset because they are important both to our recommendations and, we believe, to a successful adoption of a functional plan for solid waste management.

1. Believing that the "job can be accomplished" is necessary.
2. Believing that local government leaders, business/industry leaders and citizens "want the management of solid waste done" is important.
3. Believing that the public will respond favorably to a complete plan of management, especially one that minimizes or eliminates very large-scale, high-impact facilities is a must.
4. Believing that consensus-building, persuasion and negotiating cooperation will be more effective than mere use of authority is critical.
5. Believing that Metro has sufficient authority/responsibility, if it is used effectively, to reinforce the cooperative effort can be helpful.
6. The functional planning task need not be highly time-consuming or cumbersome. In fact, a simple, direct approach for the Plan format will aid clarity and serve communication. However, legal findings for the Plan must be thorough and rigorous.
7. Writing the functional plan and building the consensus can follow parallel tracks from the beginning.
8. While it is important to develop a process which takes into account the potential for appeals, this potential should not



be the dominant consideration. The process should be designed and implemented to develop a quality product and to nurture support and cooperation.

9. Projecting an ability to manage the region's solid waste effectively and economically can contribute significantly to a positive climate for economic development.
10. Metro's timeline for selecting the alternative technologies must be kept.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. **KEY-LEADER GROUP:** Form a key-leader steering group. Spokespersons from this group should be used judiciously in public communications and in developing support among other key elements of the region and state.
- B. **TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP:** Form a technical advisory group from local government and industry. Members of this group should a) work closely with Metro staff on the technical aspects of both the functional plan and the public affairs program and b) work to build support among the solid waste management professional community.
- C. **PUBLIC AFFAIRS EFFORT:** Organize immediately a thorough-going public affairs effort. Be certain to tap the leadership of community groups which have organized to oppose the landfills.
- C. **UNITED LEADERSHIP:** Metro's Executive Officer and Council Presiding Officer should develop a united stance on the Solid Waste Management function plan. Their united involvement is critical to building the kinds of key-leader and technical advisory groups needed to promote the planning and implementation efforts. Their concerted involvement will also be very useful in developing clear direction to Metro staff and, therefore, in building a positive team effort by the staff.
- E. **INDEPENDENT FACILITATOR:** Agreement should be reached (i.e., by contract, loaned staff, volunteers, etc.) on a facilitator(s), who would be responsible for overseeing the public workshops and hearings on the functional plan. The facilitator role at hearings should preserve the legitimate executive/council responsibility. Therefore, the facilitator role at hearings would focus on communicating information about the Plan and acting as "gate-keeper." The facilitator(s) would work closely with Metro's public affairs and solid waste planning staffs in preparing materials and procedures for this process.
- F. **LEAD STAFF PERSON:** The lead staff person should be identified immediately (if not already identified) and given adequate authority and resources to direct the functional planning effort. This assignment should also deal with the relationship between

the planning and public affairs staffs and integrate any other contributors (such as the facilitator(s) recommended above).

G. TARGET LOCAL PLANS: The functional plan should identify clearly which local jurisdictions are directly affected and in what regards they are directly affected (recycling facilities only; recycling and composting facilities; recycling, composting, burning and landfill facilities; etc.) Priorities should be set for working with jurisdictions according to which facilities are likely to be sited in their boundaries. For instance, first priority may be given to jurisdictions affected by composting and burning facilities. Second priority may go to those affected by landfill sites. The third priority may go to the siting of recycling facilities.

H. SPECIFIC LOCAL COMPLIANCE: In preparing the functional plan, local plans should be reviewed to determine specific changes that will be required by the functional plan. Only what is necessary by way of local plan amendments or additions should be identified in elements of the functional plan which address local plan compliance.

I. EARLY IMPLEMENTATION: Implementation of the functional plan at the local level should commence early in the planning process. This can be accomplished by identifying as much as possible at the outset what specific local expectations will be included in the plan and how they will be implemented. Understandings and agreements should be in place on these matters by the time the functional plan is adopted. This will allow the local implementation process to move quickly. The key-leader group should be included in these understandings and agreements.

J. AID TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The functional plan should include a component dealing with the economic development impact of the solid waste management plan. This component should deal with the potential for new small businesses (i.e., in reuse and recycling), expansion of large industries, jobs created and secondary financial impact. Also, the positive image for the management should be described.

#### THE PLAN:

The following is intended to sketch a potential "logic-line" for a solid waste management functional plan. We do not purport either to be inclusive of all that could or should be in the plan or to be technically correct in all respects. Completeness and technical accuracy will need to be assured by the solid waste planning professionals. The symbol "X" represents in this document an indeterminant factor.

The following descriptions recognizes component of a solid waste management plan. Several of these components already exist in the Waste Reduction Plan adopted by the Council and approved by DEQ.

The "logic-line":

A. DESCRIBE WASTE MANAGEMENT FLOW: Describe the Reduce, Reuse, Recycle, Recover: Landfill solid waste flow.

B. DEFINE THE PROBLEM: Define the problem by providing evidence of the magnitude of waste to be managed.

Current Tonnage + Future Estimated Tonnage = Year "X" Tonnage

Given existing levels of Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle, with no Recovery (Alternative Technologies), the Landfill requirement is "X" (Descriptions and estimates of size for this Landfill(s) should be presented. Description should include identification and measurement of environmentally hazardous features of the solid waste which the Landfill must accommodate.)

C. DESCRIBE AND ANALYZE ALTERNATIVES: Present a description and analyses of what can be done by Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Recover to cutback on the tonnage which must go to a Landfill.

Include in the presentation clear and specific findings supporting each activity assumed by these four methods of management, especially for the "alternative technologies" assumed in the recovery method. Regarding the latter, be sure the findings address acceptable size of facility, locational considerations, hazard control requirements, limits on environmental impact, overall solid waste system costs, etc.

Findings of compliance with Statewide Planning Goals would be a plus.

(The intent here is to legitimize the facilities which local governments will be asked to permit.)

Set-forth the major alternative ways to mix and match these four methods of management in a management system.

D. POLICY CHOICES: State Metro's policy choices or selected alternatives. Information should include, not necessarily in this fashion, the following:

	By %	How Accomplished	Timeline
Reduce	"X"	"X"	"X"
Reuse	"X"	"X"	"X"
Recycle	"X"	"X"	"X"
Recover:			
Compost	"X"	"X"	"X"
Incinerate	"X"	"X"	"X"
"X"	"X"	"X"	"X"

Include for these policies Metro's findings supporting the choices. A set of findings on economic development impacts should be included.

E. FACILITY SITING REQUIREMENTS: Address siting requirements and local comprehensive plans. Be as specific as possible about the siting requirements for each type of facility, including transfer centers. Stated another way, describe what must be present before a facility can be sited. And explain how these requirements are designed to make the facility a "good neighbor." List which local jurisdictions are eligible for which kind of facilities.

The objective in developing the facility siting requirements should be clear and easy to administer comprehensive plan and zoning code amendments. This can be achieved most effectively by coordinating closely with the elected officials and staffs of the local governments.

An example of an optimum approach for solid waste facilities would be a permitted use or a permitted use when certain standards are met. This could be done through an overlay system. Overlays could be developed for like facilities, i.e., reuse/recycling facilities; composting facilities; incineration facilities; and landfills. They could be named something like Regional Solid Waste Overlay-1: Reuse and Recycling Facilities, etc. Each overlay would have its own set of standards. The advantage of this approach is the flexibility to place the regulations over selected but general land areas. And it can be placed over selected local plan and zone designations, not all designations. This flexibility extends, for instance, to the point of applying the overlay to one area within a jurisdiction zoned light manufacturing but not all areas zoned light manufacturing.

F. LANDFILL REQUIREMENTS: Show the remaining requirements for Landfill(s). Describe the nature of the material which must go

to a Landfill. Give the quantity of fill. Can several small-scale sites satisfy the need? Describe the size(s), preferred general location(s), necessary environmental protections, etc. of the Landfill(s). Can exhausted aggregate extraction sites be used? Is it feasible to bring sites needed in the future into public ownership at this time? Etc.

ADDITIONAL WORK TO BE COMPLETED: To prepare the Plan described above, the following new tasks must be completed:

1. Identification of the types and locations of necessary solid waste facilities, i.e., recycling centers, processing centers, transfer stations and resource recovery plants, according to Item C of the Plan listed above.
2. Address siting requirements for local comprehensive plans. (See Item E of the Plan listed above.)
3. Show the remaining requirements for landfills as identified in Item F of the Plan listed above.
4. Identify a cooperative process involving local governments for siting the facilities.
5. An analysis of the impact of the facilities on economic development.

#### CALENDARS

##### I. Council Action (Complimented by Executive Officer):

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| March    | Define and Apply a Planning Procedure (with timeline, staffing, etc.) ORS 268.390(1)  |
| May-June | Conduct Council hearings on functional plan in locales directly affected by the plan and hold formal adoption hearing.  |
| June     | Adopt functional plan (with review of local plans under ORS 268-390(4) and local implementation requirements and timelines. Issue notice to local jurisdictions to amend their comprehensive plans. |
| July     | Select Resource Recovery project(s).  |

##### II. Executive Officer Actions (Complimented by Council)

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| March-July | Parallel the steps in the Council Action  |
| March      | Forge an active leadership relationship on solid waste functional plan with the Presid- |

ing Officer

March E.O. and P.O. cooperate in establishing the key-leaders group

March E.O. and P.O. direct the staff (with single direction)

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT(1) AND ACTION (A)

March-November Key-Leaders (1)

March-July Technical Advisory Group

March-June Comprehensive Plan Reviews (Metro and Local staffs) (1)

April-May Workshops (1)

May-June Metro Hearings (A/1)

July-August Prepare and Adopt Comprehensive Plan Amendments, if necessary (A)

August-Nov. Process Permit Applications for Resource Recovery facility siting if permits not obtained through the existing land use process.

By November Issue final land use permits

#### KEY-LEADERS

March Self-initiate, with E.O./P.O. cooperation.

March Develop agreement with E.O., P.O., technical advisory group and lead Metro staff on mission and goals for a Solid Waste Management functional plan.

April-November Work with business, industry, community leaders, government officials and the public (through the media) to support resolution of the planning and siting efforts. Support and guide the public workshop process.

Motion to Adopt Ordinance No. 87-215: The motion was made by Councilors DeJardin and Knowles at the meeting of December 18, 1986. It was agreed the Councilors were voting on the revised version of the Ordinance as presented in the Council meeting packet of March 12, 1987.

Vote on the Motion to Adopt the Ordinance: The vote resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Bonner, Collier, Cooper, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Knowles, Van Bergen and Waker

Nay: Councilor Ragsdale

Absent: Councilors DeJardin and Kirkpatrick

The motion carried and Ordinance No. 87-215 was adopted.

Motion to Adopt the Resolution: Councilor Gardner moved, seconded by Councilor Bonner, to adopt Resolution No. 87-717. It was agreed the Councilors were voting on the revised version of the Resolution as presented in the Council meeting packet of March 12, 1987.

Vote on the Motion to Adopt the Resolution: The vote resulted in all ten Councilors present voting aye. Councilors DeJardin and Kirkpatrick were absent.

The motion carried and Resolution No. 87-717 was adopted.

## 9. RESOLUTIONS

### 9.1 Consideration of Resolution No. 87-740, for the Purpose of Designating Solid Waste as an Area and Activity Appropriate for Development of a Functional Plan

Becky Crockett, Solid Waste Analyst, reviewed staff's written report. She concluded the findings identified in the Resolution demonstrated that developing a functional plan for solid waste was related to the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area. She also explained the Council had adopted Ordinance No. 86-206 on September 11, 1986, in order to define a planning procedure for designating areas and activities which could be subject of a functional plan. The authority for Metro to adopt and implement functional plans was set forth in ORS 298.390.

Ms. Crockett pointed out the solid waste functional plan would not be developed solely for a specific facility or site, but would be a comprehensive management plan for determining the location and need

Metro Council  
March 12, 1987  
Page 22

for all solid waste facilities in the region. Locational areas and sites for facilities would be determined cooperatively with local governments and community groups through the planning process.

Ms. Crockett reported the Executive Officer's Land Use Transition Committee, Chaired by Jim Sitzman, strongly favored the functional planning concept as a logical way of planning solid waste facilities with greater community support.

In conclusion, Ms. Crockett reviewed the relationship of the functional planning process to the current resource recovery project. She referred to an attachment to staff's report which outlined a proposed calendar of key actions involved in completing the project.

Councilor Gardner, Chair of the Council Solid Waste Committee, recommended adoption of the Resolution.

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved Resolution No. 87-740 be adopted and Councilor Kelley seconded the motion.

Councilor Bonner opposed the Resolution, saying functional planning could be used as a weapon if local governments did not cooperate with Metro in identifying sites for solid waste facilities.

Executive Officer Cusma said she preferred to view the functional planning process as a framework and opportunity to identify land for solid waste facilities with the up-front cooperation of citizens and local government officials rather than Metro picking the site and then reacting to community opposition.

Presiding Officer Waker pointed out that Washington County had initially offered to work with Metro until more specific plans unfolded. He said it would be very difficult to avoid opposition to solid waste facilities, regardless of the process used.

Jim Sitzman, 320 S.W. Stark Street, Room 530, Portland, Chair of the Executive's Land Use Transition Committee, said the Resolution had been brought before the Council at the request of the Executive Officer in a spirit of cooperation with citizens of the region. He explained the preamble of the resolution accentuated the positive approach in working with citizens to accomplish regional solid waste goals. He urged the Council to consider ways of removing the harsh edges from the siting process and for developing a total system. He was encouraged that functional planning could accomplish those goals. Mr. Sitzman then read a letter from Linda Krugen, President of the North Portland Citizen's Organization. The Organization endorsed the plan.

Councilor Ragsdale expressed concern that the functional planning process could delay the resource recovery project. Mr. Sitzman said



some delays could occur but he did not think they would be damaging to the overall project. He pointed out that if local governments and citizens group resisted a selected site, serious delays could exist. He thought it wise to spend the time to build a constituency in order to reduce the possibility of opposition.

Ardis Stevenson, 902 Abernethy Road, Oregon City, member of the Executive's Land Use Transition Committee and Clackamas County Public Affairs Manager, testified in favor of the Resolution. She was please to recommend a plan in which all players would follow the same rules. She reported Clackams County Commissioner Robert Schumacher asked her to tell the Council that without this type of cooperative effort and plan, the Council would face a much more difficult siting process.

David G. Phillips, 902 Abernethy Road, Oregon City, Clackamas County Solid Waste Administrator, explained that the siting of alternative technology and other types of facilities needed to be done cooperatively and in conjunction with local land use plans. He said functional planning was an excellent approach and that Clackamas County would be happy to participate with Metro in such a process.

Estle Harlan, 2202 Lake Road, Milwaukie, representing the Tri-County Council of six regional solid waste associations, testified she respected the recommendations of Mr. Phillips and Ms. Stevenson. Ms. Harlan pointed out the following language on page 2 of staff's report: "Materials and energy can be most efficiently obtained from solid waste if collected and extracted in strategically located places relative to centers of waste and markets (emphasis added)." She noted the Resolution did not refer to involvement in collection activities and questioned if a better word could be used. She asked for the record that staff state whether the functional plan would address solid waste collection.

Ms. Crockett responded that use of the word "collection" had not been the best word choice and that Metro would not deal with collection or flow control in the solid waste functional plan.

In response to Councilor Van Bergen's question, Eleanore Baxendale, General Counsel, said a copy of the minutes would be included in the Resolution file as a record of staff's response to Ms. Harland's question.

Marilyn Lunner, 2408 Woodhaven Court, West Linn, former Clackamas County Planning Commissioner and member of the Clackamas County Recycling Task Force, supported the functional planning process. She said she had seen the process work and testified it would give planning commissions a chance to examine all siting considerations.

Metro Council  
March 12, 1987  
Page 24

Linda Peters, Route 1, Box 192, Cornelius, Chair of Citizen's Participation Organization No. 8, endorsed the Resolution. She said functional planning would provide a means of expression for group concerns. She supported any plan would lead to a well-designed solid waste system and a safe and productive use of resources.

Councilor Bonner asked Ms. Peters if functional planning would get people to recycle. She responded that it would help people think about the scope of the entire solid waste system and alternatives to waste disposal.

Connie Hawes, testified she and the citizens she represented were very interested in transfer station siting and the Bacona Road landfill site. She supported solid waste functional planning, saying it was better late than never. She also explained the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) should have required local areas to identify four sites for solid waste facility use in comprehensive plans. She asked Metro to establish a complete solid waste policy which could include mandating recycling, if necessary, and urging the Legislature to adopt legislation to reduce the amount of plastic's generated by manufacturers. She also suggested establishing a national liaison to help businesses find alternatives to plastic packaging.

Councilor Bonner again expressed his concern that the functional planning process could be used as threat to local governments.

Councilor Hansen commended staff for the speed and quality of their work in outlining a functional planning process. He considered the plan a tremendous move forward. He said the Council had experienced setbacks in siting a landfill, the west transfer station and other solid waste projects and saw the functional planning alternative as better than any previous siting method used.

Councilor Gardner agreed with Councilor Hansen, saying the plan was a positive first step in siting facilities. He agreed it was important to put together a clear plan and to get local governments to buy into it. He cautioned that in past instances, the Council had received assurances from local governments only to have that support evaporate when citizen opposition to a planned solid waste facility eventually developed. He said the Council might need a stronger way to enforce functional planning.

Councilor Kelley supported the plan because she thought it was more workable than supersiting. The process would involve local governments and would give them a chance to discuss land they would designate for solid waste use. She also pointed out that timing would be crucial to get a resource recovery project in place.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:  
Ayes: Collier, Cooper, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Knowles,  
Ragsdale, Van Bergen and Waker  
Nay: Councilor Bonner  
Absent: Councilors DeJardin and Kirkpatrick

The motion carried and Resolution No. 87-740 was adopted.

9.3 Consideration of Resolution No. 87-739, for the Purpose of Appointing Members to the Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee (SWPAC)

Ray Barker, Council Assistant, summarized staff's written report. There was no discussion on the Resolution.

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

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all ten Councilors present voting aye. Councilors DeJardin and Kirkpatrick were absent.

The motion carried and Resolution No. 87-739 was adopted. Jeanne Roy and Tom Miller were appointed to SWPAC for two-year terms.

10. Consideration of Order No. 87-14, Authorizing the Executive Officer to Enter into a Sublease Agreement with Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission for Space at 2000 S.W. First Avenue, Portland, Oregon

Judy Munro, Support Services Supervisor, summarized staff's written report.

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved the Order be adopted and Councilor Cooper seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all nine Councilors present voting aye. Councilors DeJardin, Kirkpatrick and Knowles were absent.

The motion carried and Order No. 87-14 was adopted.