

April 9, 1985



Agenda

SOLID WASTE POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE
(SWPAC)

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT 527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OREGON 97201 503 221-1646
Providing Zoo, Transportation, Solid Waste and other Regional Services

Date: April 15, 1985

Day: Monday

Time: 12:00 Noon

Place: A-1 A-2 Conference Rooms at Metro

- I. Minutes of March 18, 1985
- II. Old Business: Discussion on the Organization and Composition of SWPAC
- III. Solid Waste Department Budget
- IV. Department Update

SOLID WASTE POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE
SWPAC REGULAR MEETING
March 18, 1985

Committee Members Present: John Trout, Chairman; Delyn Kies, Dave Phillips, Mike Sandberg, Gary Newbore, Howard Grabhorn, James Cozzetto

Committee Members Absent: Shirley Coffin, Robert Harris, Dick Howard, Paul Johnson
Bob Brown, Ex Officio

Staff Present: Daniel Durig, Dennis Mulvihill, Mary Jane Aman, Doug Drennen, Randi Wexler, Dennis O'Neil, Bonnie Langford, Ray Barker

Council Members Present: Jim Gardner, Gary Hansen

Guest: Bill Culham

Agenda Item Minutes of January 21, 1985

The minutes of the January 21, 1985 SWPAC meeting were approved as written.

Introductions: Mr. Trout introduced Jim Gardner, a new member of the Council, and acknowledged Councilor Gary Hansen who also was attending the SWPAC meeting. Mr. Bill Culham was also introduced as a former representative of the Portland Citizen's Committee for many years. Mr. Culham still retains his interest in SWPAC issues.

Agenda Item Status of SWPAC

Mr. Trout asked Councilman Jim Gardner, to discuss the status of SWPAC which has been under consideration of the Council since January. Mr. Gardner stated the Management Committee had discussed SWPAC as now representing the more direct users of solid waste--the collection industry and operators--and they would like to see it become more of a citizen's advisory committee. The Management Committee felt with Metro having trouble finding a new landfill site, siting a new transfer station, plus broader issues such as burners and composting, it was a good time to see what the present members of SWPAC thought about bringing in more citizen representatives.

Councilman Gary Hansen stated it was very important to get the issue resolved as to how many should serve on the SWPAC committee and what the function should be. He said when the Council reorganized last summer and dropped the Regional Services Committee there was a void that SWPAC needed to fill for the Council. Mr. Hansen felt it was important to get SWPAC's high-quality input during the next few years because of the number of major decisions required of the Council. Advice from both industry and the public on these issues would be both appreciated and needed.

Dave Phillips inquired of the Council members if it was their intention to reduce some of the areas now involved or would they be adding people to SWPAC?

Councilman Gardner said what he was visualizing was a way to get some citizen support for the solid waste plan Metro has --a reduction of people in some other areas so more representative citizens could be added but still make it a workable committee. He felt SWPAC could also take over other duties such as landfill siting, transfer stations and issues formerly using a number of committees. These people could become informed on the issues and work as a counter to other testimony Metro will get which is often basically critical. He added Metro needs informed citizens who can give us some support.

Mr. Trout stated he would have concerns about that because it would appear Metro wanted a committee to "rubber stamp" staff and Council's ideas. He added a true citizen's committee wouldn't necessarily do that because they have diverse ideas on how the solid waste program should move forward--they would be looking for the reverse side of issues as well as the positive side and therefore couldn't be an advocate group on some issues, and they would continue to operate in that manner no matter how many people you had on the committee.

Councilman Gardner replied he surely wouldn't want a "rubber-stamp" committee but they might feel they had more of a stake in the problems if they had an opportunity for input into a decision before it was made.

Dave Phillips said he often had trouble keeping two citizens on a seven-member committee since it wasn't a glory issue. Citizen involvement is good, he said, and wished it were possible to get more of it, but with issues being controversial it's hard to hang too-heavy a hat on citizen involvement.

Delyn Kies commented that she worked for the Bureau of Environmental Services which is both garbage and sewers--two of the worst issues--and they had a citizen's advisory committee primarily set up to deal with the budget but when that season was over the committee served on other projects. From a committee of nine, five to seven would show up every month. Delyn added they went on a tour of the landfill and it did change their opinion of this issue --which may help when they go back to their neighborhood to talk about it. She said the City's experience has been worthwhile with an all-citizen committee and the City had sometimes changed their recommendations on an issue based on the committee's comments.

Mr. Trout commented to Councilors Gardner and Hansen that the basic question of SWPAC members--including citizens at large--was how much "clout" they had or what influence their opinions had on the Council? The fact that some of the citizen members felt their feedback had little affect on the Council was apparent in their lack of attendance or active involvement at SWPAC meetings.

Councilman Gardner felt part of their lack of participation might have been from feeling--as he did-- that SWPAC seemed more of a "user" group, haulers and government representatives taking part in the issues, rather than a group for citizen involvement. SWPAC seemed to represent more industry than citizens though that didn't mean they necessarily had interests in conflict because what was best for industry was often best for the citizens too.

Councilor Hansen said he believed a greater citizen involvement would enhance the relationship between the Committee and the Council and that the Council would be more apt to follow the advisory position put forth by SWPAC if there was a greater input from citizens. He added, as an advisory committee SWPAC's recommendations would probably never be followed right to the letter but it would help to read the

minutes to see what people are in accordance with the recommendation and take that into consideration. Councilor Hansen said if we were able to recruit really interested, active citizens, the over-all effect would enhance the input to Council from both industry and citizens. He added the public input is very important and to know there was free-flowing discussion from all parties, the Council would feel they were getting good, well-rounded advice.

Dave Phillips suggested the Committee might function well with representatives from the following: three or four from local government of the four jurisdictions, two collectors, one land-fill operator, one recycler, and eight citizens. This would make a balance the Council seems to want between user-oriented people and citizens.

Discussion followed on these issues. Shirley Coffin and Robert Harris were commended as two active and interested citizens presently on the SWPAC committee.

Mr. Cozzetto commented that many on the Committee, being citizens, were also representing citizens--already wearing "two hats" whether they were from government, haulers, recyclers or other, and that a large committee wouldn't be too practical--SWPAC already crowded A-1--A-2, and if enough members didn't attend it affected the voting or quorum. He felt the Council was discounting the fact that all present members of SWPAC were in effect representative citizens.

Mr. Trout stated that it takes new people a long time to assimilate the issues and put any knowledge to work and that some new people will spin wheels for some months and lose interest because their background hasn't taken in these issues. The present SWPAC committee has been involved, in one way or another, in solid waste problems for some years and knows the subject well. It has a tendency to overwhelm new people.

Dennis Mulvihill stated it was his observation that when you design a committee you first decide on what the purpose of the committee will be, what your needs are as Council members, and that will design who the people will be who serve on the committee.

Councilman Gardner said there had been some discussion that SWPAC would still fill its present function as well as that of the rate review committee but change the composition for broader citizen input--different voices on basically the same issues.

Mike Sandberg and Dave Phillips both explained the construction and workings of their committees and stated in case of conflict of interest on an issue, such as rates affecting haulers, they abstained from voting but did give input on the issues.

Mr. Culham commented that in remembering what had happened when he was Chairman of the Committee, Council should look basically at the effectiveness of this SWPAC Committee and how it can help the Metropolitan Service District and the Council as well as the citizens. Mr. Culham didn't believe this could be accomplished by redoing the SWPAC committee. He felt it could be useful to the Council with minor changes and when certain issues came up to call in, if necessary, a sub-committee to study and develop the issue with other committees already organized. Then you would set up a public hearing, let the MSD Council actually name people to attend the meeting --possibly with recommendations from SWPAC. Over the years, the effectiveness of what has been done in the Committee has often stayed in the Committee. Some advice gets back to the Council but it isn't always representative of the total committee. Mr. Culham felt committees serving the Zoo or transportation or other, could also be used to consider Solid Waste issues and that an interaction between the various committees could be beneficial to both Council and MSD.

SWPAC Meeting
3/18/85

AGENDA ITEM

UPDATE ON WASHINGTON TRANSFER AND RECYCLING
CENTER (WTRC)

Randi Wexler reported the Siting Committee had gone from nine potential sites to three. These she depicted on a map and explained both the Jenkins Road and Merlo Road Sites were chosen by the group to have further technical studies, including general-site layout showing the benefits and disadvantages of an efficient WTRC on those sites. A contract was recently awarded to Swan-Wooster Engineering, a local consulting firm, to assist Metro with the technical work. They have expertise in architecture, transportation, soil analyzing, etc., and are highly qualified for the job. On March 5th, Metro held a public meeting to discuss the siting process and the three potential sites the advisory group had chosen. There were approximately 60 people attending who seemed well-educated on the subject and a good discussion was held on these sites. Metro discussed how CTRC operates, the siting process, and focused on the concerns people had on the proposed sites. Major concerns were on traffic impact, visual appearance of sanitation trucks during the peak periods they would be arriving at WTRC, concerns of potential impact to Reser's Fine Foods--located just north of the Merlo Road site on Jenkins Road, and general questions on odor and litter problems. Swan-Wooster will next start lay-out work for Jenkins and Merlo road sites. Metro will be putting together a packet for the advisory group that details all the public comment taken at the meeting. More tours are planned for CTRC to give people a better understanding of transfer stations and a more realistic view of their impact.

Mr. Trout brought up the Valley Times comment on Reser's being concerned with a transfer station being adjacent to their company, and asked Randi how they were addressing the issue. Randi stated she had done some research and found there are several transfer stations in the country that are located immediately adjacent to bakeries and other food-processing plants and couldn't find, at this point, where they have any impact on their long-term operation.

Mr. Durig said the basic concern was not for the need for transfer stations or their appearance in the area, but it's the image of a sanitation truck driving down the street that builds up in the citizen's minds. He emphasized Metro was trying to explain it was part of life like brushing your teeth in the morning. He added that people need to be reassured there are ordinances that require closed trucks and also that the trucks are spread out over the day and don't appear all at once. CTRC has done a lot to take the "fear" factor out of speculation.

Mr. Trout brought out that it is mainly the "self-haul" public that contributes the roadside litter rather than the enclosed hauler trucks. Mr. Durig added there is a tremendous amount of litter along streets that have no transfer stations in the vicinity. At Metro's facilities we probably have a higher level of cleanliness because of using the litter clean-up programs and the double charge for uncovered loads.

AGENDA ITEM

CTRC ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Durig distributed the CTRC Annual Report for 1984. Metro goes to the Oregon City Planning Commission once a year and provides the report and answers questions about CTRC. He said it was an excellent meeting and a positive experience with

SWPAC Meeting
3/18/85

the Planning Commission. There were three areas the Commission continues to be concerned about and Metro is attempting to address all three: 1) keeping the landscaping in good shape and being a participant in the Park Place Beautification Committee, 2) Keeping tonnage at CTRC at the 800 ton limit or less for a 30-day average and 3) Pushing the WTRC for an early opening to keep trucks from other areas out of the CTRC Transfer Station. Dan stated when WTRC opens tonnage at CTRC should drop by 10 to 15 percent.

AGENDA ITEM

COMPOSTING WORKSHOPS

Dennis Mulvihill affirmed that former program assistant Patrick Miner, in the Recycling Information Center, was now Program Coordinator in the Waste Reduction Department. Last year Metro Council adopted a budget so the Waste Reduction Dept. could provide technical assistance to the region on organizing workshops on composting, and in-service training for teachers on recycling. Because of staff turnover, Metro wasn't able to go ahead with this but Clackamas County was organized to do this and in a role-reversal, Clackamas County will present six workshops on composting--three in their County and three in the City of Portland. Metro is coordinating the program and supplying materials so there can be a sharing of resources. Metro is also purchasing curriculum materials for distribution to the 60 different schools in the Clackamas County area and in return will get in-service training to show the teachers how to use the materials. Consequently, for about \$3,000 we are getting six composting workshops; 60 curriculum plans; and several in-service training workshops. It is significant that Metro has Clackamas County, Clackamas County Recycling Task Force, City of Portland, Neighborhood Associations and Extension Service, plus some other groups, all involved in putting this together. A flyer listing the workshops and a booklet on composting was distributed to the SWPAC members. Mr. Mulvihill stated this was the type of role Metro could do best--bringing the resources of the region together and Metro providing the money and staffing to make it all work.

AGENDA ITEM

UPDATE ON LANDFILL SITING

Dan Durig pointed out that Councilor Jim Gardner, was serving as one of two Metro Councilors on the Multnomah County Task Force on Solid Waste, along with Councilor Larry Cooper. Some of the Metro staff and SWPAC Committee are also in attendance at the meetings each Wednesday morning at 8:00 at the Courthouse. The Committee is taking the landfill siting process from 1979 to 1981 and Dennis O'Neil presented a slide show with accompanying reports and charts giving this landfill history. The slide presentation has also been shown to the League of Women Voters, Citizen Groups and other clubs. Mr. O'Neil reviewed the steps used during that siting period. The first three months they screened sites, scored and ranked them, revealed the sites, studied five best suited to the criteria, then presented them to the Council. There were 46 sites at the beginning some contributed by consultants and others carried over from previous studies. The Task Force was comprised of experts from Metro, DEQ, Water Resources Department hydrogeologist, geologists, engineers and other technical experts. Diking and flood plains were studied and maps made. Dennis dropped various overlay maps for the overhead projector and showed how various issues affected the final choice for sites. Four general areas were then chosen from three counties. Screening criteria was developed for all sites under various headings such as land use, environmental and operational issues, zoning, current and future use, adjacent use, geology, ground water, soil depth, type of surface water, gas, leachate, cover material (is any on site?), and capacity, is the site historical or near an airport? All these issues were considered and are part of the history of the landfill siting.

Sites with highest possibilities were recommended to the Regional Committee. They held ten meetings, all open to the public, plus three public hearings. The Regional Committee all had some type of background making them knowledgeable in various aspects of the operation. They visited the sites and reviewed the feasibility studies, toured the jeep trail now called the Wildwood site, considered public comments, and in 1981 recommended the Wildwood site. Four public meetings were held in conjunction with citizens near Wildwood and a consultant was commissioned to study the site. A high-level study of four other sites was also made during this time. The Metro Council made the final decision after two more public meetings. Dennis also reviewed the present problems of landfill siting as have been reported in previous meetings with SWPAC members. The Task Force is to critique our Metro 1980-81 procedures and criteria and to look at the whole issue of solid waste--landfills, composting, burning, recycling. Metro is prepared to meet with the Task Force and prepare the whole issue as a unit.

Handouts on various alternatives and procedures in landfill-siting history, plus Senate Bill 662 which would have three counties site a landfill or have a state-siting council, were given the SWPAC members.

Mr. Trout asked why they didn't just refine SB 925 (Super-siting) and Dan Durig answered that many people are seeing SB 662 as an enhancement of 925. Discussion followed on the merits of the bills.

AGENDA ITEM

UPDATE FROM SOLID WASTE

Dan Durig stated this Thursday, March 21, all the Metro departments will be doing an overview of what we've been involved in and how we operate our funds, for the Council meeting. The Solid Waste Department will present a detailed budget discussion to the Metro Budget Committee on March 25th. These are all public meetings.

SWPAC meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Written by Bonnie Langford

CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSAL TO REORGANIZE THE
SOLID WASTE POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE (SWPAC)

Date: May 6, 1985

Presented by: Ray Barker

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Council Management Committee on February 21, 1985, requested that one or two Metro Councilors attend the March 18 meeting of SWPAC and discuss the possible reorganization of SWPAC. Councilors Gardner and Hansen attended and participated in the March meeting.

Following the March SWPAC meeting, Councilor Gardner prepared a draft of some proposed changes to the organization and composition of SWPAC. (A copy of the draft is attached.) The proposed changes are an effort to move toward the Council's goal of increasing the level of citizen participation in solid waste policy decisions.

Councilor Gardner presented the proposed changes to SWPAC at their April 15 meeting. The proposal was generally well received by SWPAC. The following comments were made by individual SWPAC members:

1. The size of the committee is too large;
2. The purpose of the committee needs to be better defined; and
3. Who does SWPAC advise and report to?

In regards to the size of SWPAC, the By-Laws currently provide for 14 voting members and two ex officio members. While the total membership proposed is the same as that which presently exists, there is a balance between citizens (8) and local government and solid waste industry representatives (8). To reduce the total number of committee members and retain this balance is difficult.

The purpose of SWPAC is to provide advice and assistance to the Metro Council regarding regionwide solid waste-related issues. Increasing citizens involvement, providing a forum for communication, and building a base of support are good reasons for having SWPAC, but do not need to be stated in the purpose section of the By-Laws.

SWPAC asked who they will advise and report to. It is recommended that they advise and report to the Metro Council directly.

Councilor Gardner would like additional feedback from the Council Management Committee regarding the draft proposal, and then the SWPAC By-Laws can be revised and a resolution prepared for consideration at the June Council Management Committee meeting.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer has no recommendation on this proposal.

RB/gl
3420C/D2-2
05/07/85

DRAFT

SWPAC REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL

Name change: "Solid Waste Advisory Committee"

Purpose of reorganization/ objectives of new committee:

- Increase citizen involvement in policy decisions related to the region's Solid Waste Management Plan
- Retain involvement and advice of the solid waste collection and disposal industries, and local government staff
- Provide a forum for communication between Metro and citizens of the region on solid waste disposal issues
- Build a base of involved citizens with knowledge of regional solid waste disposal issues

Membership of new committee:

- Local governments: Multnomah County..... 1
Washington County..... 1
Clackamas County..... 1
City of Portland..... 1
- Solid waste industry: Commercial haulers..... 1
Residential haulers..... 1
Landfill operators..... 1
Recycling industry..... 1
- Citizens: Multnomah County..... 2
Washington County..... 2
Clackamas County..... 2
City of Portland..... 2



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
Providing Zoo, Solid Waste and Local Government Services

527 SW Hall St., Portland, OR 97201-5287 • 503/221-1646

Jim Gardner
Councillor, District 3

2930 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, OR 97201
221-2444 (work)
227-2096 (home)

SWPAC members —

Please look over the attached draft of some proposed changes to the organization and composition of SWPAC. I think these changes move toward the Council's goal of increasing the level of citizen participation in the policy decisions made by Metro. At the same time, we continue the involvement and advice of the solid waste industry.

I plan to be at the next SWPAC meeting and hope to hear your ideas on the "workability" of such a committee.

Jim Gardner.

SWPAC REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL

Name change: "Solid Waste Advisory Committee"

Purpose of reorganization/ objectives of new committee:

- Increase citizen involvement in policy decisions related to the region's Solid Waste Management Plan
- Retain involvement and advice of the solid waste collection and disposal industries, and local government staff
- Provide a forum for communication between Metro and citizens of the region on solid waste disposal issues
- Build a base of involved citizens with knowledge of regional solid waste disposal issues

Membership of new committee:

- Local governments: Multnomah County..... 1
Washington County..... 1
Clackamas County..... 1
City of Portland..... 1
- Solid waste industry: Commercial haulers..... 1
Residential haulers..... 1
Landfill operators..... 1
Recycling industry..... 1
- Citizens: Multnomah County..... 2
Washington County..... 2
Clackamas County..... 2
City of Portland..... 2



Budget Overview

SOLID WASTE OPERATING FUND

Metro's Solid Waste Department is responsible for regional solid waste management and disposal. The department goals are:

1. To operate its facilities in an environmentally sound and financially prudent manner.
2. To reduce the amount of solid waste generated and increase recycling participation.
3. To identify, plan, provide, and explain the need for the development of a solid waste disposal system that is efficient, economical and environmentally responsible.

DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>TOTAL</u>
1. <u>Management and Administration</u> (2.77 FTE) - This program provides overall administration and support services to all Solid Waste programs, provides assistance to local governments, administers Metro's Solid Waste Disposal Franchise Ordinance, and responds to the public and solid waste industry on solid waste issues.	\$ 254,791
2. <u>St. Johns Landfill</u> (9.67 FTE) - This program provides for the environmentally sound and efficient operation of the only general-purpose landfill in the Metro region. Reducing flow to the St. Johns Landfill in order to allow ample time to obtain permits for a new landfill will continue to be a priority.	5,377,377
3. <u>Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center (CTRC)</u> (5.26 FTE) - This program provides for the operation of the region's first full-line transfer and recycling center. This coming year the Regional Transfer Charge (RTC) will be applied to both CTRC and the upcoming Washington Transfer and Recycling Center (WTRC).	2,276,377
4. <u>Washington Transfer & Recycling Center (WTRC)</u> (3.54 FTE) - This program provides for the construction and operation of the region's second transfer station. The facility is expected to be completed and operational during the FY 1985-86 budget year. Anticipated start up date is May 1, 1986.	851,350
5. <u>Landfill Siting</u> (1.33 FTE) - The objective of this program is to provide a replacement site for the St. Johns Landfill. This year's program will emphasize public education and citizen involvement. The program is designed to make sufficient resources available to carry out of several possible options.	164,317
6. <u>Waste Reduction</u> (5.18 FTE) - The task of this program is to increase recycling and reduce waste throughout the region by providing technical assistance to public and private bodies, maintaining a Recycling Information Center, producing a multi-media promotion campaign, and conducting research projects that provide information and models for use by public and private interests in waste reduction activities (curbside recycling, multiple family recycling, yard debris).	373,296



Budget Overview

SOLID WASTE OPERATING FUND (continued)

7. System Planning (3.55 FTE) - The task of this program is to produce an updated Solid Waste Management Plan comprised of chapters on Financial Management; Alternative Technologies; Landfills; Transfer Stations, and Source Reduction and Recycling. Policy and program option documents will be prepared; public review will be sought and incorporated; and implementation of priority programs will begin upon adoption of the plan. 160,056

TOTAL (Seven Operating Programs) \$9,457,564

TRANSFERS

Management & Administration

General Fund Transfer	322,475	
Building Fund Transfer	96,031	
Debt Service Transfer	363,004	
IRC Transfer	5,000	
		\$ 786,510

St. Johns

General Fund Transfer	161,000	
Building Fund Transfer	50,000	
Debt Service Transfer	207,873	
Reserve Fund Transfer	333,000	
Final Improvements Transfer	645,000	
		1,396,873

CTRC

General Fund Transfer	97,000	
Building Fund Transfer	30,000	
Debt Service Transfer	281,073	
Capital Improvements Transfer	100,000	
		508,073

WTRC

General Fund Transfer	64,000	
Building Fund Transfer	20,000	
Debt Service Transfer	450,000	
		534,000

Landfill Siting

Debt Service Transfer	20,000	
		20,000

Total Transfers 3,245,456

Operations (seven programs total) 9,457,564

Total Operating Budget \$12,703,020



Budget Overview

SOLID WASTE OPERATING FUND (continued)

<u>RESOURCES</u>	<u>Proposed Budget</u>	<u>REQUIREMENTS</u>	<u>Proposed Budget</u>
Fund Balance	\$2,001,000	Personal Services 31.3 FTE	\$ 894,813
Documents	570	Materials & Services	7,146,480
Concessions (tarps)	4,200	Capital Outlay	172,890
Special Waste Fee	30,000	Transfers	3,245,456
Disposal Fees	5,919,550	Contingency	1,243,381
User Fees	1,347,000	Total	\$12,703,020
Regional Transfer Charge	2,681,300		
Convenience Charge	595,600		
Franchise Fees	800		
Salvage	24,000		
Interest and Finance Charges	99,000		
Total	\$12,703,020		

KEY ACTIONS

1. Create a new St. Johns Methane Gas Fund separate from the Solid Waste Operating Fund.
2. Continue to develop a flow management program at St. Johns which emphasizes the monitoring and managing of the landfill as a resource.
3. Expand litter control around Metro disposal sites.
4. Complete the Solid Waste Management Plan update.
5. Assist in implementation of Oregon's Recycling Opportunity Act.
6. Expand the special waste program at St. Johns Landfill.
7. Construct and operate the region's second transfer station - Washington Transfer & Recycling Center.
8. Develop a promotion program emphasizing recycling and including promotion on the understanding of the total solid waste system.
9. Develop a collection and processing program for yard debris at Metro solid waste facilities.



Budget Overview

SOLID WASTE DEBT SERVICE FUND

This fund provides for the repayment for three loans received from the State Pollution Control Fund through DEQ and for anticipated loans for WTRC and landfill siting programs.

Planning and Implementation (SW 115)	Principal Interest	\$150,000 <u>54,900</u>	\$ 204,900
St. Johns Improvements (SW 117)	Principal Interest	\$184,870 <u>23,003</u>	207,873
CTRC (SW 118)	Principal Interest	\$133,000 <u>306,177</u>	439,177
WTRC (new)	Principal and Interest		450,000
Landfill Siting (new)	Principal and Interest		<u>20,000</u>
	Total Debt Service Budget		\$1,321,950

Revenues are \$938,946 from disposal fees and \$383,004 from user fees.

SOLID WASTE CAPITAL FUND

The Solid Waste Capital Fund provides money for projects anticipated to be undertaken in FY 1985-86. These are:

CTRC	Construction/Modifications	\$ 67,000	
	Engineering Services	10,000	
	Equipment & Vehicles	40,000	
	Improvements	<u>45,000</u>	\$ 162,000
WTRC	Land Acquisition	\$ 800,000	
	Construction	4,100,000	
	Engineering Services	<u>400,000</u>	5,300,000
Landfill Siting	Engineering Services	<u>\$430,000</u>	430,000
Transfer to St. Johns Final Improvements Fund			<u>103,000</u>
	Total Capital Budget		\$5,995,000



Budget Overview

ST. JOHNS RESERVE FUND

This fund is used to accumulate reserves during the remaining life of the landfill to finance post-closure expenses. \$333,000 will be transferred from the Solid Waste Operating Fund in FY 1985-86.

Total St. Johns Reserve Budget	\$957,700
--------------------------------	-----------

ST. JOHNS FINAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND

This fund provides for placing final cover material, maintaining roads and drainage ways, and seeding and erosion control to complete the landfill based on an approved closure plan. \$645,000 will be transferred to this fund from the Solid Waste Operating Fund in FY 1985-86.

Total St. Johns Final Improvements Budget	\$1,444,000
--	-------------

ST. JOHNS METHANE RECOVERY FUND

This is a new fund created for financial management of the methane gas project at St. Johns Landfill. This is a long-term project, and a separate fund is proposed to appropriately identify and manage the revenues and expenses. A total of .7 FTE in personal cost is budgeted in this fund.

Total St. Johns Methane Budget	\$136,000
-----------------------------------	-----------

ST. JOHNS CONTRACT SCHEDULE

<u>TIME</u>	REQUEST For QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)	CONTRACT AND BID PROCESS	<u>TASKS</u>
April - -	4/05 .	Draft Report to Council	4/04 . Staff Meeting to Discuss Process & Assignments
	4/12 .	Final Report to Council	4/26 . Assignment Drafts Due
	4/25 .	Council Approves Bid and RFQ Process	
MAY - -		Advertise	5/01 . Staff Meeting to Discuss Revisions
	5/10 .	Mail RFQ	5/17 . Assignments (Final Drafts)
			5/24 . Staff Meeting to Discuss Final Changes
	5/29 .	Receive Statements of Qualification	5/31 . Final Contract Submitted to WP
JUNE - -	6/05 .	Notification of Applicants	
	6/10 .	Receive Appeals of Disqualification	
	6/13 .	Appeals Hearing and Selection of final Bidding List	
JULY - -			6/14 . Contract & Invitation to Bid Mailed
			6/28 . Pre-Bid Conference
			7/12 . Bids Due & Opened
AUG. - -			7/19 . Draft Council Report
			7/26 . Final Council Report
			8/08 . Council Awards Contract
SEPT. - -			
OCT. - -			10/10 . New Contract Starts

ST. JOHNS CONTRACT SCHEDULE

<u>TIME</u>	REQUEST For QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)	CONTRACT AND BID PROCESS	<u>TASKS</u>
April - -	4/05 .		Draft Report to Council
	4/12 .	4/04 .	Staff Meeting to Discuss Process & Assignments
	4/25 .	4/26 .	Assignment Drafts Due
MAY - -			Council Approves Bid and RFQ Process
		5/01 .	Advertise
	5/10 .	5/17 .	Staff Meeting to Discuss Revisions
		5/24 .	Assignments (Final Drafts)
	5/29 .	5/31 .	Staff Meeting to Discuss Final Changes
			Receive Statements of Qualification
JUNE - -			Final Contract Submitted to WP
	6/05 .		Notification of Applicants
	6/10 .		Contract & Invitation to Bid Mailed
	6/13 .	6/28 .	Pre-Bid Conference
		7/12 .	Bids Due & Opened
JULY - -		7/19 .	Draft Council Report
		7/26 .	Final Council Report
		8/08 .	Council Awards Contract
AUG. - -			
SEPT. - -			
OCT. - -		10/10 .	New Contract Starts

April 1982

SOLID WASTE POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE

NAME	REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	PHONE	TERM OF OFFICE
1 James Cozzetto	Collection Industry	P.O. Box 11457 Portland, OR 97211	285-0576	Feb. 1982-84
2 Shirley Coffin Vice Chairman	Public, Washington County	65 SW 93rd Portland, OR 97225	292-9338	Feb. 1982-84
3 Howard Grabhorn	Landfill Operators	Route 1, Box 849 Beaverton, OR 97402	628-1866	Feb. 1982-84
John Gray	Public, Multnomah County	3918 SE 116th Portland, OR 97266	288-7086	Feb. 1982-84
4 Robert Harris	Public, Clackamas County	32660 Lake Point Ct. Wilsonville, OR 97070	794-2370	Feb. 1982-84
5 Dick Howard	Multnomah County	Dept. of Public Works 2115 SE Morrison Portland, OR 97214	248-3623	Feb. 1982-84
6 Paul Johnson	Construction Industry	Copenhagen Utilities and Construction P.O. Box 429 Clackamas, OR 97015	654-3104	Feb. 1982-84
7 Gary Newbore	Landfill Operators	c/o Reidel Internat'l P.O. Box 3320 Portland, OR 97208	222-4210	Feb. 1982-84
8 Dave Phillips	Clackamas County	Dept. of Env. Services 902 Abernethy Rd. Oregon City, OR 97045	655-8521	No Limit
9 Mike Sandberg	Washington County	Dept. of Public Health 150 N. First St. Hillsboro, OR 97123	648-8609	No Limit
Delwyn Kreis Mike Sievers	City of Portland	Office of Public Works 621 SW Alder St. Portland, OR 97205	248-4390	No Limit
Edward Sparks	Recycling Industry	Publishers Paper Co. 4000 Kruse Way Pl. Lake Oswego, OR 97034	635-9741	Feb. 1982-84
11 John Trout Chairman	Collection Industry	Teamsters Local 281 1020 NE Third Ave. Portland, OR 97232	236-8171	Feb. 1982-84
Kelly Wellington	Public, City of Portland	1513 SE Ash, #2 Portland, OR 97214	239-5083	Feb. 1982-84
Bob Brown Ex Officio	DEQ	P.O. Box 1760 Portland, OR 97207	229-5157	No Limit
Norman Harker Ex Officio	Clark County	Clark Co. Public Works P.O. Box 5000 Vancouver, WA 98668	(206) 699-2451	No Limit

11 members

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE (SWPAC)

DATE April 15, 1985

NAME

AFFILIATION

Bill Webber

Guest

Valley Landfills, Inc.

Norm Wietting

Metro

Dave Phillips

Clackamas County

Shirley Coffey

Washington County Public

Dennis Mulvihill

Metro

Delyn Kies

City of Portland

Mary Jane Amad

Metro

DANIEL F. DURIG

METRO

Jim Gardner

Metro Council

Wayne Rifer

Metro

Dick Howard

Mult Co

GARY NEWBORN

KFD

Bob Harris

Clackamas Co. - Public

Mike Sandberg

Washington City

CHUCK Geyer

METRO

Ray Barber

"(Municipal)"

Tommy Simpson

Metro Secretary