

May 15, 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: May 20, 1985.

Day: Monday

Time: 12:00 Noon

Place: Metropolitan Service District: A-1, A-2

1. Minutes of April 15, 1985
2. Old Business
3. Update on Solid Waste Management Plan
 - Alternative Technologies
4. Department Update
 - Multnomah County Task Force
 - W T R C

SOLID WASTE POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE

SWPAC Regular Meeting

April 15, 1985

Committee Members Present: Shirley Coffin, Vice Chairperson
Dave Phillips, Delyn Kies, Dick
Howard, Gary Newbore, Robert Harris,
Mike Sandberg

Committee Members Absent: John Trout, James Cozzetto, Paul
Johnson, Howard Grabhorn

Staff Present: Dan Durig, Norm Wietting, Dennis
Mulvihill, Mary Jane Aman, Wayne
Rifer, Chuck Geyer, Ray Barker,
Bonnie Langford

Council Member Present: Jim Gardner, District 3

Guest: Bill Webber, Valley Landfills, Inc.

AGENDA ITEM: Minutes of the March 18, 1985 meeting
of SWPAC, were approved as written.

AGENDA ITEM: Old Business: Discussion on the
Organization and Composition of SWPAC

Jim Gardner, Councilor, endorsed the suggestion made by Dave Phillips at the March 18th meeting, that SWPAC be made up of a representative from the local governments: Multnomah County, Washington County, Clackamas County, and the City of Portland; from the solid waste industry--one commercial hauler, one residential hauler, one landfill operator and one representative from the recycling industry; and two citizens from each of the four jurisdictions. This would make a committee of 16. Councilor Gardner asked the Committee to continue their discussion on this reorganization of the committee.

Dick Howard commented when you get 16 people on a committee, it's hard to arrive at decisions.

Councilor Gardner said he had the same reservations about the size but it seemed to be as small a group as you could form and still have the representation needed. Some citizens, in the past, have felt overshadowed by the representatives from the governmental and solid waste industries and this would make it roughly a 50/50 split.

Gary Newbore questioned the purpose of the committee and how practical the citizen's knowledge would be in confronting the issues. How much impact will eight people have in spreading the word to their communities? Will they really go out and talk to anyone else? What is the goal for citizen involvement? What does the Council want them to do?

Bob Harris stated he agreed with Gary Newbore. How can two citizens provide a forum for the people of their region? They represent too large an area for true input to the Council. He added in the many years he had spent on the committee no council member had asked him, individually, for his opinion and he didn't know whether they considered even SWPAC recommendations to any extent. He

questioned whether there was much difference between the way the citizens looked at an issue from the others on the committee.

Dick Howard commented that no one was ever denied the opportunity to make presentations, and he recalled several occasions when people thought they were being put upon by Metro and they made presentations to SWPAC and the Committee helped them achieve what they wanted to accomplish. Mr. Howard added the lack of more citizens on the committee hasn't denied anyone the opportunity to be heard.

Shirley Coffin, responded to the suggestion from Bill Culham, at the March 18th meeting, that the SWPAC Committee could be large but they should look at viable subcommittees. Ms. Coffin added some of the public members may not have much expertise in rates but you might find a subcommittee of members who could deal with that while public policy issues would be of more interest to the public members for an overview. She would like to see the balance of representation that makes a 16 member committee, but it would be very important to establish what the specific relationship would be to the committee and whether all 16 members would have to be counted into the quorum when voting on a particular issue. In other words, 16 members would be fine if they didn't always have to function as a whole but as a viable subcommittee--depending on the issue. Ms. Coffin commented she would like to echo Mr. Harris's statement that SWPAC did not get much feedback from the Council on any stand they took on the issues presented to the Committee.

Councilor Gardner said he had heard from other people too that there be subcommittees of SWPAC to deal with different issues such as rate review, alternative technologies, recycling plan, etc. The Committee would need to include people with expertise in these fields. Some Council members felt there should be more participation from citizens of the region, in which case the recommendations of the Committee would probably be given more weight because of seeming to represent the citizens point of view. Councilor Gardner didn't know whether circumstances would lead to better communication between SWPAC and the Council.

Shirley Coffin responded there should be clearer guidelines as to what our relationship is to the Council. She said at present SWPAC's line of communication was through the Metro Staff--which was alright because they are the ones who deal with the Council more closely, but it would be nice to have a direct line with the Council.

Councilor Gardner reported several Councilors had mentioned to him that they used the minutes of SWPAC meetings to find out what is being discussed and what members were taking different stands on issues. He felt SWPAC wouldn't be the only committee to be dealing with issues for the Council, but would be one forum. He agreed eight people wouldn't be able to educate one-million persons in their regions about solid waste issues but if citizens could be chosen who would be likely to be active in Metro's process as well as being active in their community, the issues might be spread as well as possible, even if it's a small dent in the total population. As issues get harder and more complicated it will be more difficult to communicate the problems to the communities and let the average citizen know what is going on. Metro and the Council will have to try harder to get the word out.

In further discussion, Councilor Gardner stated he would be doing some more work on clearly defining what the purposes of the Committee will be and also on procedural details such as who would actually make the appointments, etc. He felt most of the present structure wouldn't change. Shirley Coffin questioned whether people who had the necessary background would be interested in participating in SWPAC meetings. Mike Sandberg wondered how issues, where the Committee might be at odds with the staff, might be presented to the Council in the manner the Committee would wish? Mr. Sandberg felt in the past some issues were not presented with enough emphasis to the Council through staff reports. He also felt there would be some real concern about how much citizen involvement there would be even if the Committee is reorganized to the point of eight citizens. He was concerned that you still wouldn't have citizen participation on such issues as landfill siting, solid waste and transfer stations. Mr. Sandberg added most of the general public doesn't even know SWPAC meets and their knowledge and interest of these regional issues is limited.

Councilor Gardner indicated there would probably need to be a special advisory group when a specific project was under consideration to deal with issues such as siting a transfer station or a resource recovery plant. This advisory group would be totally independent of the SWPAC Committee.

Gary Newbore said he would encourage the Council to figure out what they really want the Committee to do because there was no sense to meeting just to meet. He added two-thirds of the SWPAC meetings were briefings from staff on various items but what was the Committee supposed to do with this information? What does the Council want the group to do?

Councilor Gardner responded this went back to --who would the Committee be advising--staff or Council. He had the feeling the Council would like to have the Committee be the voice directly to the Council in a lot of situations and particularly where SWPAC might disagree with staff viewpoint. Councilor Gardner would like to have the Committee take more of a role in directly advising the Council on the basic policy decisions they make.

AGENDA ITEM

SOLID WASTE DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Dan Durig referred the Committee to the Budget Overview--an Executive summary of the budget for Solid Waste and the Budget Document for Metro, which had been mailed to the SWPAC members. He commented on the narrative overview of the seven programs contained in the operating budget and moved on to the other five funds in addition to the operating fund. He stated the Solid Waste Department had been before the budget committee twice with the presentation of our program budgets. April 22nd will be the final meeting date for all the fund considerations. In response to a question from Shirley Coffin, Mr. Durig said SWPAC had the choice of going on record either in support, modification or opposition of the budget. He indicated it was not required but an option for the committee. He said this was a follow-up on the meeting previously held with SWPAC plus interested people from the industry who were given an overview of the budget and the chance to question or voice opinions, and now it is presented for final consideration of the Committee.

Shirley Coffin asked if any of the budget items would be affected by legislation? --Metro's request to the Legislature for general operating funds? Dan answered

the solid waste portion of the budget was not directly affected. Solid waste money comes from the services we offer at the landfill and transfer centers. We are budgeting a special waste fee which will go into affect January 1, 1986, in anticipation of building it into the rate study this summer.

Discussion on various aspects of the budget followed; capital improvements, debt service, St. Johns Dike, etc. The Solid Waste budget reflects a transition from development, construction and operation, all within 12 months because of the way the budget year falls. Staff assumed, for the purpose of budget planning, that the disposal fee would stay where it is; that the regional transfer charge would increase by \$2 per ton on January 1, 1986; that the user fee might stay the same at \$1.68--although it might increase. The convenience charge was still budgeted at \$2.25. Norm added any difference would be made up by the Regional Transfer Charge.

Mr. Harris asked if there were any revenue funds in the budget which are dependent upon federal budget funds and Mr. Durig answered we aren't into federal funds and are completely self-supporting through user and disposal fees.

In answer to questions, Norm answered we do not knowingly take hazardous waste. Asbestos is only hazardous if it is not contained. The only way Metro will take it is in a double-lined bag, taped and sealed at the top. It is then buried at the landfill and is not considered hazardous under these circumstances. Norman added all hazardous waste goes to Arlington. Some concern was expressed over lack of information for people wondering how to dispose of hazardous waste. It is feared that after being given several phone numbers to call they will give up and dump the waste anywhere along the roadside. Norm said a program would be developed next year to develop a program locally to try to handle this. The problem with putting in a collection point for hazardous waste at the Transfer Station or St. Johns, is that it puts Metro in the realm of being the hazardous waste generator. If we get over 100 killograms--regardless of where it comes from originally--we become the generator and have to send it to Arlington--getting all the permits, etc. as any big generator would do. Dan stated we would like to be a public agency that could give good service in this area but on the other hand, the public liability is phenomonal. It was added, however, that if you tell the caller there is no place to take their gallon you know what will happen to it. Mr. Webber said there were several companies that will make hazardous waste pickups in the Valley and in the the Portland area then truck it to Arlington. Chem Security Systems, Inc., Spencer Environmental Services, Environmental Emergency Service, etc. (These are in the Yellow Pages under Waste Disposal). Dan commented that federal laws were changing constantly and during the St. Johns "PCB scare" it developed the cost would be \$175 per cubic yard to relocate any contamination to Arlington. To dump special waste at St. Johns there must be a permit issued, then 24 hours notice given and an appointment made to dispose of it--a whole set of procedures to go through before special waste goes into the ground.

In discussion Norm also commented that Metro Legal Counsel is researching the issue of Vancouver Waste being disposed of at the St. Johns Landfill, and how we can prohibit Washington cities from using this site.

The budget summary is scheduled for April 22. Dan added it then goes to Counsel, TSCC, and probably formally adopted as the last Council action in the latter part of June.

Vice Chairperson Shirley Coffin, asked if the SWPAC members wanted to offer any input to the Council on the budget?

Gary Newbore stated he didn't think SWPAC had much of a basis to deal with it and the numbers involved. Mike Sandberg questioned some of the other funds and Dan explained figures and reasons for items.

Dave Phillips said he had looked through the budget and it seemed in good shape. Shirley Coffin commented it seemed to cover the necessary details

MOTION: Dave Phillips made a motion that SWPAC recommend the adoption of the budget as presented; with the understanding, when presenting the recommendation to Council, that the SWPAC Committee had not analyzed it in detail but the overall feeling from the budget review, was that the budget contained the essential priority items for 1985-86 operation.

2nd: Bob Harris

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously in favor of budget adoption

During the discussion, Dan stated the budget provided for one of three things to happen. If Wildwood "shakes loose", to pursue Wildwood; if that doesn't happen, provides resources to look at other sites; and third, to continue to work at the State level as far as legislation for siting is concerned. Dan reported the Multnomah County Task force was addressing this problem and he hoped in 60 to 90 days they would produce a report that Metro can agree or not agree to follow. He added the Task Force was trying hard to come up with something reasonable. Metro has also filed with LUBA, an objection to having Wildwood exempted as a class of one in their current ordinance. The results of this should be out soon. Legislative action is being taken in this session and Metro Council has reviewed legislation including SB 662--authorizing 50¢ per ton charge for economic development. Councilor Gardner said the sponsor intended that any waste put in St. Johns Landfill after June 1, 1986, would have a 50¢ per-ton charge and the money collected from that would be turned over to the State Economic Development Commission to use for development of that North Portland area. It's a disincentive to quit putting waste in St. Johns after June 1, 1986. Mike Sandberg asked if Metro saw a possibility of a dilemma at that time? Would there be a problem with Clackamas and Washington counties having to pay 50¢ at a regional site or would they have the option of going to another site?

Dan commented the 50¢ per ton difference wouldn't be significant enough that it would have any damaging affect on the flows one way or the other. This is based upon the fact that Metro has juggled the convenience charge at CTRC and gone from \$1.50 to \$2.25 and we still get too much waste at Clackamas. Norm added that provision was meant for any landfill that would be sited in the future and they were trying to get all the counties to bear their share of the cost. Dan added we call it a regional facility but that implies everybody in the region is willing to bear their fair share of the system. Metro is having trouble with that in Washington County. Because they have opened up their landfill to the region, the City of Portland is probably the only jurisdiction that has fully cooperated. Dave Phillips reminded the group Clackamas County had the site for

A long time and now has the transfer station.

AGENDA ITEM

Washington Transfer & Recycling Center

Dan Durig stated Metro had held a series of meetings with the representatives of industry, tektronics, Nike, Sunset Corridor and others. Alternative sites were suggested by some and these have gone to the Advisory Committee. He added the Advisory Committee has a lot of power and significant impact and is doing excellent work. Metro will be meeting April 15, at Beaverton City Library at 9:00 p.m., and April 16, at Washington County Commissioners at 2:00 p.m., to present information. Mr. Durig expressed hope that the siting can move right along because people of Oregon City have a legitimate concern that they don't want to be the only regional transfer station in the area and that other parts of the region meet their obligations in developing a regional system for solid waste. This is part of the message carried to the meetings which are public. Mr. Durig asked SWPAC members to attend any of these and share their wisdom.

Mike Sandberg asked if the companies such as Tektronics and Nike had any tendency to allow a site in that area or were they fairly rigid. Dan answered their primary comments were not on our facility or its operation--about 100 people have toured CTRC--but they were more concerned with the collection vehicles that would be driving by on the highway. He added Metro isn't married to any site and will welcome assistance in obtaining a site that makes sense from a transfer station standpoint.

AGENDA ITEM

Solid Waste Update

Mr. Durig reported on the methane gas project. Metro is negotiating with BioGas, a subsidiary of Northwest Natural Gas, and the first meeting took place last Friday with the City of Portland being an active participant. The target is to come up with a final contract to present to Council within the next 60 days. Dave Phillips suggested they keep the State Public Utilities Commission involved in order to save problems later.

Chuck Geyer passed out some schedules to SWPAC on the St. Johns operation contract which will be expiring in October. Metro is preparing to rebid that contract. One column on the schedule is a request for qualifications process and the other a contract and bid process time line. Metro will advertise in May to pre-qualify the bidders; receive replies by May 29; evaluate; and notify applicants of results by the beginning of June. Time is allowed for any appeals from those who were disqualified. Contract design and bid out by June 14th; Metro Pre-Bid Conference with contractors June 28; July 12th opens bids and begins process for Council recommendation; award contract by August 8th. Norm Wfetting said we had significant interest in the contracts this time and several firms had inquired about schedules and process. Last time Metro had one bid. There are a few changes. Metro will recommend a provision against the hauling business bidding on it; there will be some changes in liability; special waste; procedures for the tipper operation; and recognition that methane recovery may have special provisions.

Next meeting is May 20th

Adjourned 1:32

Written by Bonnie Langford

SOLID WASTE POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I

NAME

This Committee shall be known as the SOLID WASTE POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE.

ARTICLE II

PURPOSE

1. To provide advice and assistance to the Executive Officer, Metro Council and Council Regional Services Committee regarding regionwide solid waste related issues.
2. To provide a forum for public, private and citizen representatives to develop and evaluate regionwide policy alternatives concerning the beneficial use and disposal of solid waste generated in the region together with its impact on collection, and with the siting, construction and operation of the necessary facilities.
3. To advise on alternative courses of action which Metro may undertake to alleviate or resolve the short- and long-term solid waste problems of the region.

ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP-VOTING-MEETINGS

Section 1. MEMBERSHIP

a. The Committee shall be representative of the general public and of persons involved in production, source separation, collection, beneficial use and disposal of solid waste, and the siting, construction and operation of necessary facilities.

b. Membership shall include:

Cities & Counties

Clackamas County	1
Multnomah County	1
Washington County	1
City of Portland	1

General Public

Clackamas County	1
Multnomah County	1
Washington County	1
<u>City of Portland</u>	<u>1</u>

Industry

Collection	2
Landfills	2
Recycling	1
Construction Industry	1

c. Ex officio -- Clark County, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Section 2. APPOINTMENT and TENURE

a. Each member appointed to represent cities and counties shall be designated by the jurisdictions they represent and shall be staff employees. All other appointments shall be made for a term of two (2) years and shall be made by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council in accordance with procedures of the Metro Council.

b. Each member shall serve until removed by the Presiding Officer, or the appointing cities or counties, or as determined under Section 2 (c) of this Article.

c. Absence unexcused by the Committee Chairperson from three (3) consecutive regularly scheduled meetings shall constitute removal of the voting member from the Committee.

d. Additional members may serve on the Committee upon nomination by the Metro Council Regional Services Committee and concurrence by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council, in accordance with procedures of the Metro Council.

e. Ex officio members, without vote, may serve on the Committee upon nomination by the Metro Council Regional Services Committee and concurrence by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council, in accordance with procedures of the Metro Council.

Section 3. VOTING PRIVILEGES

Each member of the Committee, except ex officio members, shall be entitled to one (1) vote on all issues presented at regular and special meetings at which the member is present.

Section 4. MEETINGS

a. Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held [on the Monday of the week of a regularly scheduled Metro Council meeting] once each month at a regularly scheduled date, time and place established by the Committee Chairperson.

b. Special meetings may be called by the Committee Chairperson as required.

Section 5. CONDUCT of MEETINGS

a. A majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business. The act of a majority of the voting members present at meetings, at which a quorum is present, shall be the act of the Committee.

b. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

c. The Committee may establish other Rules of Procedure as deemed necessary for the conduct of business.

ARTICLE IV

OFFICERS AND DUTIES

Section 1. OFFICERS

The officers of the Committee shall be a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson elected by the voting members of the Committee.

Section 2. TERM OF OFFICE

Each officer shall hold office during the fiscal year or until relieved of the position. Officers may hold succeeding terms of office, but may serve no longer than three (3) consecutive years.

Section 3. DUTIES

The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings he/she attends and shall be responsible for the expeditious conduct of the Committee's business. The Vice-Chairperson shall perform all duties of the Chairperson in his/her absence.

Section 4. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Metro shall supply staff, as necessary, to record actions of the Committee and to handle times and places, and citizen participation activities.

ARTICLE V

SUBCOMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

The Committee Chairperson, with the consent of the Committee, may appoint Task Forces from among its members and other interested persons. Composition and term of service shall be determined according to mission and need. Task Forces shall be given a specific Charge and time for reporting as an integral part of their establishment.

ARTICLE VI

REPORTING PROCEDURES

The Committee shall make its reports, findings and recommendations to the Council Regional Services Committee. Any such reports and recommendations shall also be sent to the Executive Officer. If there is any conflict between the position of the Committee and the Executive Officer, the Executive Officer will notify the Council Regional Services Committee and the matter will be discussed by the Regional Services Committee and other interested parties and a recommendation forwarded to the Metro Council. The Solid Waste Policy Alternatives Committee shall adopt procedures which adequately notify affected jurisdictions and interested parties on matters before the Committee.

ARTICLE VII

AMENDMENTS

These By-Laws may be amended or repealed only by the Metropolitan Service District Council.

DO/srb
4886B/285

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

same

DATE

5-20-75

NAME

AFFILIATION

Washington County

Bill Culham

Citizen Interest

- Rich McLaughly

S.W Metro Staff

Ray Barker

Metro - Council Asst.

J. K. ...

Metro

Douglas Dunne

Metro

- John Trout

Collection Industry

- Mike Sandberg

Wash City

- Dick Howard

Mutt Co

- Randi Wexler

Metro

- Wayne R. ...

- Howard ...

Landfill Work Co.

- Dave Phillips

Clackamas County DTD

- Bob ...

REG

- Robert Harris

trout

Jim Luzzetta

Robert Kane

M J

Bonne

Wally

Gene Phelps

Howard Graham

Sandberg

L Johnson

Ed Howard

Harry

Wayne

Sam N

Randy