

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 11, 1972

ATTENDANCE

Eldon Hout, Chairman
Lloyd Anderson, Vice Chairman
Mel Gordon
Robert Schumacher
Harold Ruecker
Homer C. Chandler, Executive Director
Herbert Hardy, Attorney

There being a quorum present, the Board considered the following items:

I. OFFICERS FOR 1972

Mr. Hout stated that, in accordance with the Rules and Regulations, now was the time to select officers for the year 1972. He stated that there were two positions to fill--that of the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Mr. Hout stated that he would entertain nominations for the office of Chairman. Mr. Anderson nominated Mr. Hout; Mr. Ruecker seconded the nomination. Inasmuch as there were no other nominations, Mr. Ruecker requested that the nominations be closed and that a unanimous ballot be cast, thus naming Mr. Eldon Hout as the Chairman for the year 1972.

For the office of Vice Chairman, Mr. Ruecker nominated Mr. Anderson; Mr. Schumacher seconded the nomination. There being no further nominations, Mr. Ruecker moved that nominations be closed and that a unanimous ballot be cast. The Board approved the motion, thus electing Mr. Anderson as the Vice Chairman for the year 1972.

Mr. Anderson stated that it is his hope that by continuing the present officers for another term, this would not establish a precedent that would be automatically followed in following years. Mr. Hout concurred in this thought and indicated that in the following year different men should fill these positions.

II. RULES OF ORDER

Mr. Hout requested that this matter be set over to the next meeting. The Board concurred. Mr. Chandler was instructed to place it on the next meeting agenda.

III. SOLID WASTES

(1) Mr. Hout called on Mr. Hardy to report on the progress of the MSD Solid Waste loan application. Mr. Hardy reviewed the procedures of the Emergency Board in which that Board tabled for one month the MSD application and made the recommendation that it would be advisable for the MSD Board to resubmit an application for a grant rather than a loan.

Mr. Hardy stated that in light of that meeting, he had been instructed the Department of Environmental Quality to submit the following: a grant application; the loan application; or a combination of a grant and loan. He requested that the Executive Board ratify his action in this matter.

Mr. Anderson moved that the Metropolitan Service District officially submit to the Emergency Board of the State of Oregon the documents specified by Mr. Hardy. Mr. Schumacher seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

ORDER 2

Mr. Hardy stated that it was his opinion that as a companion to the applications that the Board should adopt a resolution ordering the reimbursement of cities, counties, CRAG, and firms who have rendered services to the Metropolitan Service District, but have not yet been paid.

Mr. Anderson moved that this matter be placed on this agenda and that the second reading of Order #2 be taken up in the next regular meeting of the Metropolitan Service District Board. Mr. Schumacher seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

(3) Engineering Services

Mr. Anderson submitted a memorandum to the Board in which he recommended the following:

- (1) select a consulting firm to develop a solid waste program;
- (2) have the consultant make an immediate evaluation of the most² proper disposal methods within economic and environmental constraints. Have this work done within 4-6 weeks;
- (3) adopt a course of action which looks most beneficial on a short- and long-term basis.

Mr. Anderson stated that, under this proposal, various methods of solid waste disposal such as the pyrolysis process that he had previously announced to the Board would be analyzed and a professional report made to the Board concerning each and every process analyzed.

Mr. Schumacher stated that, inasmuch as the Board has had serious legal problems brought to its attention which affect the engineering firm selected for this study, he is of the opinion that Mr. Anderson's recommendations would allow the Board to move forward in the development of the Solid Waste Program. Therefore, Mr. Schumacher moved that the Board adopt the recom-

mendations of Mr. Anderson and that the Board also select the firm of Metcalf, Eddy-CH₂M Hill to develop the solid waste plan for the Metropolitan District. In recommending this firm, Mr. Schumacher stated that they were the second choice in the previous analysis of engineering firms that had submitted engineering proposals to MSD. Mr. Ruecker seconded the motion.

Mr. Gordon stated that he had a paper that he wished to read into the record which would speak to the subject of the pyrolysis disposal method that has been introduced by Commissioner Anderson (see attachment).

Following discussion of the recommendation and Mr. Gordon's statement, Mr. Hardy stated that, if the Board wishes to proceed with the selection of a new firm, they should amend Mr. Schumacher's motion by adding that, because of legal entanglements involving Engineering Science, Inc., it is the intent of the Board to notify Engineering Science, Inc., that the Board is withdrawing the letter of intent to employ said firm.

Mr. Ruecker moved to amend the motion to cover the withdrawal of the letter of intent. Mr. Schumacher seconded the amendment. The Board voting on the amendment approved it unanimously. The Board also voted unanimously to adopt the original motion as amended.

Mr. Ruecker moved that the Board meet with the consulting firm of Metcalf, Eddy-CH₂M-Hill for the purpose of redefining the duties and the scope of work and that this meeting should be arranged before February 24, 1972. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Mrs. Barbara Lucas asked for a clarification of MSD's grant-loan solid waste application. She specifically wanted to know the exact amount of the grant and whether or not it would have to be repaid. The Board stated that the amount of the grant is for \$467,000 and that the matter of repayment of the grant would be at the discretion of the Emergency Board. Mrs. Lucas also asked concerning the status of the citizens advisory committee. Mr. Hout informed her that the

committee will be complete upon notice of acceptance of an appointment from approximately 7 people.

Mr. David Charlton asked for a clarification of the terms of the study. He was particularly concerned that the amount of money appears to be excessive for the type of work that is to be done and he wondered if the Executive Board would have continued authority over the way the planning effort would be conducted. Mr. Hout assured Mr. Charlton that in entering into a contract with a consulting firm provisions would be made that the Board will have the discretion of revising the scope of work as the study goes on and eliminating, if necessary and desirable, any portions of the work deemed not necessary. He also pointed out that the contract can be terminated at any time during the course of the study if the Board feels it is desirable. Because of this flexibility, it is the Board's opinion that they can expect to get a professional job that will provide the kind of assistance that the Board seeks.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.