



**METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT**

6400 S.W. CANYON COURT PORTLAND, OREGON 97221 (503) 297-3726

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT BOARD

MSD Office  
6400 SW Canyon Ct.

October 12, 1973  
1:30 P.M.

A G E N D A

- I. MINUTES
- II. SELECTION OF FINAL REGIONAL SOLID WASTE SYSTEM  
Board Action
- III. NON-PROCESSIBLE WASTE DISPOSAL SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS  
Board Action
- IV. DISCUSSION OF SEPARATION OF WASTES FOR RECYCLING
- V. PRESENTATION OF FIRST PHASE FINAL REPORT  
CHAPTERS FOR SOLID WASTE STUDY
- VI. TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM JOHNSON CREEK WATER CONTROL DISTRICT  
Board Action
- VII. NEW BUSINESS



# METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

6400 S.W. CANYON COURT PORTLAND, OREGON 97221 (503) 297-3726

October 9, 1973

TO: Metropolitan Service District Board  
FROM: MSD Staff  
SUBJECT: STAFF REPORT OCTOBER 12, 1973 MSD BOARD MEETING

Presented to the Board herein for transmittal, information and recommended action are the following items:

Page

- 1 I. MINUTES  
Action - Approval
- 7 II. SELECTION OF FINAL REGIONAL SOLID WASTE SYSTEM  
Action - Approval of Regional Milling with Transfer Stations (Plan B) approach for further development by the MSD consultants.
- 12 III. NON-PROCESSIBLE WASTE DISPOSAL SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS  
Action - Approval of staff report
- 15 IV. DISCUSSION OF SEPARATION OF WASTES FOR RECYCLING  
Action - None at this time
- 16 V. PRESENTATION OF FIRST PHASE ROUGH DRAFT FINAL REPORT CHAPTERS FOR SOLID WASTE STUDY  
Action - Accept the COR-MET report and authorize disbursement for review and comment.

Page

19 VI. TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM JOHNSON CREEK WATER CONTROL  
DISTRICT

Action - Authorize MSD staff to request transfer  
of funds.

I. MINUTES

The following pages contain Minutes of the last MSD Board meeting and Public Hearing. The Minutes contain public testimony and all action of the Board for September 14, 1973. The MSD staff recommends approval of the Minutes.

STATEMENT TO THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT  
OCTOBER 12, 1973

My name is Nancy Hoover. This afternoon I am speaking as vice-chairman of the League of Women Voters Inter-League Metro Committee. This committee consists of delegates from all eight Leagues in the Portland metropolitan area-East Multnomah County, East Washington County, Forest Grove, Hillsboro, Milwaukie-East Clackamas County, Portland, West Clackamas County in Oregon and the Vancouver League in Washington.

In 1956, Leagues in our area began to study problems which ignore local boundary lines. Members subsequently reached a position supporting the formation of an areawide governmental entity with power to enforce its decisions. We supported the formation of MSD in 1970.

In 1971 the Inter-League Metro Committee undertook a study of solid waste management. As a result of this study member leagues agreed that:

"A good solid waste management plan should be environmentally sound. To conserve our resources as much as possible, it should provide for maximum re-use and recycling. In support of this, local units of government should use recycled products whenever economically feasible. Industry should produce less unnecessary packaging, and more standardized and bio-degradable containers. It is industry's obligation to discard the 'built-in obsolescence' theory and to manufacture better quality products."

"Local government should foster the use of neighborhood shredders, encourage research for alternatives to burning, and enforce existing laws."

"Education of the public about solid waste problems is a primary need. Public responsibility for environmental control must be accepted. The consumer should be educated to exercise care in purchasing, to demand quality products to recycle, and to change the throw-away philosophy."

"Financing of the solid waste management program must be adequate--economical, efficient, manageable and flexible--covering present and future needs. Financing should be supported by private and commercial interests together with local and regional governments. Financing should be provided by users' fees and charges, licensing fees, disposal fees on car bodies and appliances, by bonds, and by federal and state grants and monies."

"Transfer stations, recycling and disposal, and the disposal sites should be under regional jurisdiction."

After looking over your proposed systems, it seems to us that plan B comes closest to the type of regional solid waste management that the League would endorse. We support its relatively low-cost, its provision for separation of material which could ultimately lead to recycling when markets become available, and its flexibility.

Nancy Hoover  
3725 N. W. 183rd Avenue  
Portland, Oregon  
East Washington County



PORTLAND RECYCLING TEAM, INC.  
1207 SW Montgomery Street  
Portland, Oregon 97201  
228-6760

October 6, 1973

Mr. Charles Kemper  
Program Coordinator  
Metropolitan Service District  
6400 SW Canyon Court  
Portland, Oregon 97221

RECEIVED  
OCT 08 1973

Dear Mr. Kemper,

COLUMBIA REGION ASSN.  
OF GOVERNMENTS

We appreciated the opportunity to review and question the COR-MET Solid Waste Disposal Study at the public information meetings. Unfortunately, this was our first exposure to the proposals, and we are quite disturbed. Public participation and input seemed to have been lacking in your planning process, therefore we do not believe a sound decision can be reached at the Metropolitan Service District board of directors meeting, October 12.

As a non-profit corporation with an interest in the expansion of residential recycling for environmental reasons (i.e. conservation of energy and natural resources) we feel recycling provides a viable alternative and/or addition to the proposed solid waste disposal plan. The COR-MET study, in our opinion, was not open to all possible alternatives and the processes used to reach many important decisions are very confusing. Given the apparent lack of knowledge about recycling (most evident in "Separation of Wastes for Recycling", Melissa Brown) we feel COR-MET has failed to give full consideration to the possibilities of large scale recycling.

We are anxious to discuss our questions and concerns with you and the COR-MET staff. We also hope that you will share this letter with all the board members of the Metropolitan Service District.

Sincerely,

*Scott Burgwin*  
for Portland Recycling Team, INC.

October 12, 1973

Mr. Bell's Statement:

When the Johnson Creek Water Control District was dissolved, it was dissolved by the popular vote of the people in the District. It was dissolved in November 1964 for the reason that the way it was set up, the District was so small that according to our Tax Assessor in Multnomah County, the taxes would have been confiscatory if it was left up to boundaries set up at that time. A water control district could not go above the high plain of the flood. They put me on the Board for the last three meetings to close out and at the last meeting, when it was decided what to do with the money, I made the motion on the floor, it was seconded, unanimously passed by the Board, that the money would be turned over to Alex Parks, our attorney, to be deposited in Multnomah and Clackamas County Treasury with a mandate that it be used for the improvement of Johnson Creek only. This was the entire Board. About a year ago, I came in front of this Board and requested that those funds be taken out and put into an interest bearing account. I don't know what was ever done about that but that money was collected on a tax base for the Johnson Creek Water Control District, and we feel that it is dedicated money, and should be for the improvement of Johnson Creek only. It predominately comes from people in the lower incomes. I think it would be a high injustice to those people to take it and use it for anything else. I am speaking in favor of the motion of transferring it to the Metropolitan Service District.

## II. SELECTION OF FINAL SOLID WASTE SYSTEM

Public Meetings were held in Columbia, Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties between October 1 and October 4, to review the alternatives for a Regional Solid Waste System. The audience was asked to indicate their preference of solid waste regional systems by completing a Questionnaire. Since the alternatives differed between Columbia County and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties, two different sets of questions were provided, copies of which are attached. The results of this survey are shown on the following Table.

Of those people present at the Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington County Public Meetings, 78% indicated a preference to Regional Milling Plan B. At the Columbia County Meeting 69% indicated preference for Alternative Plan #1. In addition, at least four service club showings of the second slide show provided a general consensus towards "Plan B" but not to the extent indicated in the Public Meetings. The Heat Recovery System, Plan D, received some positive reaction due to the present energy problems facing the region.

Pending final recommendations from the MSD Technical and Citizens Advisory Committees, the MSD consultants should be given go-ahead from the MSD Board to further develop the Regional Milling with Transfer Stations Alternative. The MSD staff has received no adverse comments concerning "Plan B". In fact, most comments indicate support for this system because it is most logical and best common sense approach.



RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETINGS QUESTIONNAIRE  
REGIONAL SOLID WASTE SYSTEM SELECTION

GROUP		CLACKAMAS COUNTY	MULTNOMAH COUNTY	WASHINGTON COUNTY	COLUMBIA COUNTY
Collection or Disposal		3	4	2	4
Recycle or Special Interest		2	5	1	2
Neither		5	7	2	8
PLAN	SYSTEM	PRIORITY			COLUMBIA COUNTY
		1	2	3	
A	Trans.Station w/Landfill	2	3	2	9
B	Trans.Station w/Shredding	8	1	1	
C	Trans.Station w/Baling	-	3	3	
D	Trans.Station w/Heat Recovery	-	-	-	
1	Trans.Station w/one Landfill				
2	Trans.Station w/two Landfills				

S U M M A R Y

PLAN	PRIORITY			GROUPS
	#1	#2	#3	
A	16%	35%	29%	Collection or Disposal = 29% Recycle or Special Interest = 22% Neither = 49%
B	78%	13%	12%	
C	3%	30%	47%	
D	3%	22%	12%	
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	

Columbia County Alternative #1 = 69%

Columbia County Alternative #2 = 31%



## PUBLIC MEETING

### REGIONAL SOLID WASTE SYSTEM SELECTION

The MSD Board of Directors will select one of the two systems presented to you tonight for further study and development by the consultants. They will use the information supplied by you to help them select the best system.

1. Check which of the following groups you belong to:

\_\_\_\_\_ Garbage collection or disposal business.  
\_\_\_\_\_ Recycling or other public groups interested in the solid waste problem.  
\_\_\_\_\_ Neither

2. Which solid waste system do you prefer?

\_\_\_\_\_ Columbia County Alternative System No. 1  
\_\_\_\_\_ Columbia County Alternative System No. 2

Why?

---

---

---

(Refer to following table)

PLAN	SYSTEM	COST* \$/TON	SYSTEM ADVANTAGES	SYSTEM DISADVANTAGES
Columbia County Alternative 1	Rural Transfer stations with landfills	6.35	. Least cost . Flexible for eventual addition of shredding . Most convenient	
Columbia County Alternative 2	Rural Transfer stations with landfills	6.50	. Responds to public interest in disposal site in northern county	. Most expensive . Less flexible

\* Costs represent capital and operation and maintenance costs for transport, transfer, processing, and disposal. They do not include collection. Land acquisition costs are not included, for it is assumed that land will retain its value and therefore, is not a chargeable system cost.



# METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

6400 S.W. CANYON COURT PORTLAND, OREGON 97221 (503) 297-3726

## PUBLIC MEETING

### REGIONAL SOLID WASTE SYSTEM SELECTION

The MSD Board of Directors will select one of the four systems presented to you tonight for further study and development by the consultants. They will use the information supplied by you to help them select the best system.

1. Check which of the following groups you belong to:

- ☐ Garbage collection or disposal business.
- ☐ Recycling or other public groups interested in the solid waste problem.
- ☐ Neither

2. Which solid waste system do you prefer?

- ☐ Plan A
- ☐ Plan B
- ☐ Plan C
- ☐ Plan D

Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Which do you rate second and third in priority?

2nd \_\_\_\_\_ 3rd \_\_\_\_\_

(Refer to following table)

100% Recycled Paper



PLAN	SYSTEM	COST* \$/TON	SYSTEM ADVANTAGES	SYSTEM DISADVANTAGES
A	Transfer Stations with landfills	5.60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Cheapest alternative</li> <li>. Contributes to best available use of wastes</li> <li>. Land reclamation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Does not respond to public interest in recycling</li> </ul>
B	Transfer Stations with shredding and magnetic separation	7.50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Flexible</li> <li>. Enables recovery of ferrous materials; leads to recycling of other materials</li> <li>. Offers better transport and disposal characteristics for remaining materials</li> <li>. Clean appearance of disposal site - free from litter, odor and vectors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. More expensive than A or C</li> </ul>
C	Transfer Stations with baling	6.60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Clean appearance of disposal site - free from litter, odor and vectors</li> <li>. Improves disposal in wet weather</li> <li>. Somewhat reduces need for landfill</li> <li>. Less expensive than B</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. More expensive than A</li> <li>. Does not readily lead to recycling</li> </ul>
D	Transfer Stations with heat recovery	11.50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Enables recovery of ferrous materials</li> <li>. Potential for sale of steam</li> <li>. Greatly reduces need for landfill</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Most expensive alternative</li> <li>. Capital costs leave little flexibility for future development in other solid waste processing and recycling</li> <li>. Increases downtown traffic</li> <li>. Potential for air discharge problem</li> </ul>

\* Costs represent capital and operation and maintenance costs for transport, transfer, processing, and disposal. They do not include collection. Land acquisition costs are not included, for it is assumed that land will retain its value and, therefore, is not a chargeable system cost.

### III. NON-PROCESSIBLE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SITES

#### GENERAL

At the last MSD Board meeting, the MSD engineering consultants presented a report discussing the existing non-processible waste disposal system. This report entitled "System for Non-Processible Wastes" also included a discussion of recommended technical and administrative criteria for selecting non-processible disposal sites. The Non-Processible Solid Waste System Report contains:

- . General discussion and definitions
- . Criteria for site selection
- . Procedure for site selection
- . Site operators and users
- . Landfill operation regulations

In addition, the Oregon State Department of Environmental Quality has indicated that they want MSD to review and comment on proposed applications for non-processible solid waste sites.

Therefore, it appears the MSD Board should take a position on MSD involvement in authorizing non-processible waste disposal sites. The staff recommends that the MSD Board authorize continued planning that will lead to management development for non-processible waste disposal sites in the MSD area.

#### ADMINISTRATION

Since MSD Administration plans are not complete, it is further recommended the MSD Board approve the following:



1. MSD should not proceed with regulatory or administrative tasks concerning non-processible waste sites until completion of the solid waste technical and financial plan.
2. MSD should provide current data or information, including written reviews, regarding proposed non-processible waste disposal sites, to applicants and DEQ.
3. MSD should caution local jurisdictions and DEQ that until the plan is completed they should insure the need for a proposed disposal site. It should be noted that other sites are available for filling of non-processible wastes.

#### REVIEW OF TWO PROPOSED SITES

Two applications for non-processible waste disposal permits have been received from DEQ in the past several months. The following is a review of, a) Columbia Land Reclamation, Inc., - NE Union and Columbia Blvd., (NPDS-001); and b) Portland Park Department - West Delta Park Landfill (NPDS-002).

a. Columbia Land Reclamation, Inc. - NE Union and Columbia Blvd. (NPDS-001)

This site is located north of NE Columbia Blvd., approximately one block east of Union Avenue. The intended use of this non-processible waste site will be to receive demolition debris, household trimmings, and commercial or construction wastes. No wet garbage, oils, chemicals, sludges or etc., will be placed in the site. The estimated site capacity is 800,000 yds and has an estimated life of two years.

The proposed non-processible waste site has a planned completed land use for light industry. In addition, the engineering consultant for this project has stated the Portland Planning Commission recommends the site be filled to surrounding elevation. The Department of Environmental Quality as the regulatory agency has requested that MSD review the site and comment on implications to the existing and planned regional solid waste system.

After review of this site in light of MSD's engineering consultants' guidelines, we find no apparent adverse conditions that would make this site technically unsound. Further, it is our recommendation that the site be approved for permit assuming the applicant complies with all DEQ technical requirements and that a need is shown. It should be noted that final engineering information for this site has not been received by DEQ.

b. Portland Park Department - West Delta Park Landfill (NPDS-002)

This proposed non-processible waste site is located at the west end of Portland International Raceway Track in West Delta Park, Multnomah County. The City of Portland Park Bureau is requesting a permit for construction of several large mounds made of earth covered debris. After completion of this report safety fences will be installed and the completed hills will be used for spectator seating.

The proposed site will be filled with dry demolition waste only and earth covered per DEQ regulations. Filling will take place during the winter from September to May and should be completed in two years.

Our review indicates that no apparent effects will be noted by permitting this site for a demolition waste site. Therefore, it is recommended the site be approved for permit by DEQ assuming all DEQ regulations are met and that a need for the site is shown.

#### IV. DISCUSSION OF SEPARATION OF WASTES FOR RECYCLING

The MSD engineering consultants, COR-MET, have provided the MSD Board with the attached report entitled "Separation of Wastes for Recycling". The MSD Board accepted the report and requested that both committees be provided with copies for review and comment. The Board requested that comments from the Committees be given as to the direction that MSD should take in light of COR-MET's recommendation.

No MSD staff recommendation is offered at this time. Staff review will be performed after committee comments are received.

V. PRESENTATION OF FIRST PHASE ROUGH DRAFT FINAL REPORT  
CHAPTERS FOR SOLID WASTE STUDY

At this MSD Board meeting you will receive the first submittal of the final report from COR-MET, our engineering consultants. Chapters 1 and 3 through 11, and Appendices A through G of Volume I will be presented. At a previous meeting, the MSD Board approved use of the following procedure.

1. MSD will receive from COR-MET and Bartle-Wells, the appropriate copies of the draft report.
2. The Board will receive a special notebook for the review copy of the final report.
3. Review of draft documents will be performed by following groups within 30 days.
  - . MSD Board (7 copies)
  - . DEQ (1 copy)
  - . Multnomah County Public Works Department (1 copy)
  - . Clackamas County Public Works Department (1 copy)
  - . Washington County Planning Department (1 copy)
  - . Washington County Public Health Department (1 copy)
  - . CRAG (1 copy)

- . City of Portland - City Engineer (1 copy)
- . Columbia County Organization of Governments (1 copy)
- . Columbia County Division of Environmental Health  
(1 copy)
- . MSD-CAC (10 copies)
- . MSD-TAC (15 copies)
- . Two selected cities in each county (8 copies)

Gresham  
 Milwaukie  
 Oregon City  
 Lake Oswego  
 Beaverton  
 Forest Grove  
 St. Helens  
 Vernonia

4. Comments will be submitted to MSD staff for compilation and review.
5. The first COR-MET submittal must be returned to MSD staff by mid-November for final recommendations by MSD-TAC and CAC, and subsequent Board action on December 12, 1973.
6. The second COR-MET submittal and Bartle-Wells submittal comments must be returned to MSD by January 2, 1974, MSD-TAC to review MSD staff compilation and subsequent Board action on January 11, 1974.



VI. TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM THE JOHNSON CREEK WATER CONTROL DISTRICT

At their August 10, 1973 meeting, the MSD Board authorized the development of cost estimates for staff and consultants to prepare an assessment role for Johnson Creek Flood Control Improvements and other administrative functions including:

1. Define benefited property
2. Determine method of assessing
3. Determine legal ownership
4. Estimate assessment
5. Perform legal work

Because MSD does not have money to accomplish these tasks the Board must look elsewhere for funding.

The Johnson Creek Water Control District was dissolved by an order of the Board of County Commissioners of Multnomah County on September 28, 1972. At the time of dissolution, the District had \$8,911.37 which had been collected from previous tax levies. These funds were dispersed as indicated below:

\$ 890.17	Judgement - Multnomah County
393.06	Judgement - Clackamas County
7,628.14	General Fund - Multnomah County
<hr/>	
\$8,911.37	TOTAL

In discussing this with Mr. Paul Mackey from the Office of the Board of County Commissioners, Multnomah County, he stated that there might be a possibility that the county could remit their share of the District's money to MSD for the purpose of flood control on Johnson Creek. He further stated that the county would have to first obtain a legal opinion regarding the transfer of funds.

Mr. Winston Kurth, Assistant Public Works Director for Clackamas County indicated that the Board of County Commissioners would release their portion of the District funds to MSD provided that they are used for Johnson Creek Flood Control.

Therefore, it is recommended that the MSD Board formally request Multnomah and Clackamas Counties to transfer their portion of the funds from the dissolved Johnson Creek Water Control District to the Metropolitan Service District to perform the work previously authorized for the Johnson Creek Drainage Basin.