

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT**

**Special Meeting
June 6, 1985**

Councilors Present: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner,
Kirkpatrick, Kelley, Myers, Oleson, Van Bergen,
Waker and Bonner

Councilors Absent: Councilors Rafoury (excused) and Hansen

Also Present: Rick Gustafson, Executive Officer

Staff Present: Don Carlson, Eleanore Baxendale, Sonnie Russill,
Ray Barker, Gene Leo, Kay Rich, Bob Porter,
Carol Nelson, Dan Durig, Doug Drennen, Norm
Wietting, Dennis Mulvihill, Wayne Rifer, Buff
Winn, Dennis O'Neil, Chuck Gever, Rich
McConaghy, Mary Jane Aman, Debbie Gorham, Vickie
Rocker, Jan Schaeffer, Phillip Fell, Jeff Booth

Vice Presiding Officer Waker called the special meeting to order at
5:30 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Waker read a proclamation by the Mayor of the City of
Portland declaring June Zoo Month.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Legislative Update. Executive Officer Gustafson invited Phillip
Fell to review the status of Metro-supported legislation. Mr. Fell
reported HB 2036 (Zoo uncoupling) and HB 2037 (local government
dues) were passed by the House and Senate and would be received by
the Governor within the next few days.

A hearing on HB 2053 (extension of tax credits for energy recovery
facilities and recycling) was rescheduled for June 7. Mr. Fell
thought support for energy tax credits would continue for recycling
but the sentiment was less strong to continue them for energy recovery
facilities.

HB 2275 (Metro excise tax authority) passed the House with signifi-
cant changes regarding the number of signatures required for peti-
tions effecting Metro. Glenn Otto, Chairman of the Senate Govern-
ment Operations Committee, was negotiating with Representative Fred
Parkinson who introduced the amendment to lower the percentage of

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 2

signatures required. Mr. Fell reported this situation was further confused when another bill passed the House earlier today establishing the same 4 percent for referendums and 6 percent for initiatives for tri-county area special districts.

Mr. Fell explained HB 2276 (18¢ cigarette tax) was dead. However, HB 2183 (Governor's cigarette tax bill) was amended by the Senate Revenue Committee to give cities and counties 1-1/2¢. Cities and counties within the Metropolitan Service District would pay a total of \$200,000 to Metro.

HB 2308 (State Intergovernmental Relations Commission) was still in Committee and would probably not be scheduled for a hearing.

The bill that would allow Metro to create commissions was scheduled for a hearing before the Senate Governmental Operations Committee next Friday, Mr. Fell reported.

HB 3024 (appropriates matching funds on committees for regional conventions) was most likely dead.

SB 509 (exotic animal licensing) passed the House 43 to 0. The definition of animals covered under this bill was amended and the bill must go back to the Senate for final approval.

Mr. Fell explained Speaker of the House Katz had been working with several parties, Metro representatives not included, to redraft SB 662 (state landfill siting authority). Metro would have an opportunity to review the new draft on June 7 and the bill was tentatively scheduled for a hearing before the House Environment and Energy Committee on June 10.

SB 808 (requires the State Corrections Division to pay costs of jailing convicted A and B felons) died in the Ways and Means Committee.

Councilor Myers asked about the status of legislation that would change Metro's structure. Mr. Fell reported that legislation was dead.

Councilor Oleson commended Mr. Fell and Roger Martin for their work on cigarette tax legislation.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 3

5. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

5.1 Request to Amend Resolution No. 85-564 (A Resolution Requiring Mandatory Prequalification for the Contract for Operating the St. Johns Landfill) by Extending the Deadline for Filing a Prequalification Application by Roadway Constructors Corporation

Councilor Myers excused himself from considering this matter because his law firm was general counsel to Riedel International. Councilor Cooper also excused himself from considering this matter because his company did business with Riedel International.

Councilor Waker announced the Council had received written communications from Riedel Resources, Inc., Mr. Westerman, Kedon Services Ltd., and the Herzog Contracting Corporation regarding this matter and asked they be considered part of the official record.

Chuck Geyer reviewed information contained in the staff report. He explained on May 9, 1985, the Council adopted Resolution No. 85-564, the prequalification application process, which contained provisions for a deadline by which applicants must submit prequalification applications. After the Resolution was adopted, staff advertised the application process and mailed instructions for the process to firms deemed qualified to perform the work. Staff began mailing applications to interested parties on May 10 and a prequalification meeting was held on May 23, Mr. Geyer reported. He said the details of Roadway Constructors Corporation's request for extension of the application deadline were contained in the staff report.

Mr. Geyer then reviewed the options before the Council: 1) the Council could not extend the application submission deadline; 2) the deadline could be extended for firms which received prequalification packets but did not submit applications; and 3) the deadline could be extended and the entire advertising process could be repeated.

Mr. Geyer explained positive effects of extending the application deadline: 1) if Roadway's application or other applications were approved, at least one additional local firm would be bidding for the contract; 2) no bid amounts had been disclosed so the bid process would not be damaged.

Negative effects of extending the deadline, Mr. Geyer reported, would include: 1) a minimum of two weeks would be added to the application submission process - four weeks could be added if any additional firm's application was denied and a firm decided to appeal before the Council; 2) the project schedule would be delayed 45 to 60 days if the Council decided the entire advertising for applications process should be repeated; 3) Roadway Constructors

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 4

Corporation had received names of firms submitting applications and other firms did not have this benefit; and 4) if the application deadline were extended, other deadlines and procedures could be questioned.

Councilor Oleson asked which of the nine companies submitting applications were Oregon companies. Norm Wietting said Browning & Ferris International of Oregon was an Oregon company.

Councilor Waker invited parties to speak who were in favor of the Council extending the deadline for prequalification applications.

Art Riedel, Chairman of Roadway Constructors Corporation and Chairman of Riedel Resources, Inc. who owned Roadway and Riedel International, thanked the Council for considering this matter. Mr. Riedel then introduced the following gentlemen: Roger Huntsinger, Chief Estimator for Roadway (present at the meeting by permission of his physician); Gary Newbore with KFD; John Spencer, President of Riedel Environmental Services; and Dennis Lindsay, Attorney.

Mr. Riedel asked the Council to consider waiving the deadline for Roadway's prequalification application which had been submitted two days after the deadline date. Roadway had been looking forward to bidding on the St. Johns operations contract for the last several years, he said. However, an unfortunate series of accidents resulted when the Chief Estimator Roger Huntsinger became ill. Mr. Huntsinger requested his assistant start the application process in his absence and the "baton was dropped" when the assistant delayed starting the work until the afternoon applications were due to Metro. The prequalification application was submitted two days late, Mr. Riedel reported.

Mr. Riedel asked the Council to consider the fact that Roadway Constructors would be the only local bidder for the landfill contract if the deadline extension were granted. Riedel International had worked hard in Oregon and could be considered a homegrown company, he said. Browning & Ferris, he explained, was a large, international firm which had set up a corporation in Oregon. He also advocated the addition of more competitors to the bidding process explaining the public would benefit from the competition.

Councilor Waker asked Mr. Riedel if it were a somewhat common occurrence to miss a proposal deadline. Mr. Riedel explained his company responded to perhaps one request for prequalification applications a year. Because of the rarity of this procedure, Roadway staff had never prepared a prequalification before and it fell through the cracks, Mr. Riedel said. He said it was very rare that his company had missed a bid submission deadline.

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 5

No other proponents of the deadline extension addressed the Council.

Councilor Waker asked if any individuals wished to speak against the deadline extension.

Alex Cross of Genstar Corporation explained he was not speaking as an opponent of the deadline extension but wished to make a statement regarding the decision. Mr. Cross said in the five years he had been working with Metro he found the agency played by the rules. Genstar had spent considerable time and effort playing by Metro's rules, he said, and his company would accept any decision made by the Council on this matter. If the Council decided to add more bidders to the prequalified list, Mr. Cross hoped the other nine bidders who had already submitted applications would receive similar, favorable consideration during the bidding process when other items of precedent needed to be addressed.

Councilor Gardner asked if staff had any indication that firms other than Roadway Constructors would submit prequalification applications if the deadline were extended. Mr. Wietting said he did not know of other firms that would be interested in participating.

Councilor Oleson noted the staff report for this item did not include a staff recommendation and asked if Mr. Durig or Executive Officer Gustafson could explain whether extending the application period would discredit or compromise the criteria and procedures for Metro's bidding processes, specifically or generally.

Mr. Durig responded he thought the staff report was self-explanatory and he indicated there would be negative factors involved if the deadline were extended. He said the Council would have to take these factors into consideration along with Mr. Cross' testimony and the letters received by Councilors from other applicants.

Executive Officer Gustafson added that if this were a request for extending a bid process, there would be no consideration of the issue because of the proprietary nature of the submitted material. However, in this case, the material submitted was not proprietary and no harm to a public process would exist, he said. He explained Roadway Constructors had asked for the opportunity to bring the matter before the Council. The Council was being asked to decide whether the deadline should be extended and the Council would have to weigh the factors of Roadway being a local firm, the extenuating circumstances and the importance of the Council's rigorous process. He then reviewed the decision options before the Council as explained earlier by Mr. Geyer.

Presiding Officer Bonner entered the Council Chamber.

Councilor Waker explained that in his experience in the engineering field, it was not uncommon to submit prequalification statements to a contracting agency as a first step of the bidding process. He said those processes had deadlines and he would find it difficult to support a change of this deadline. There were always excuses for not meeting deadlines, but one had to play by the rules of the game and try again when the next opportunity presented itself, he said.

Presiding Officer Bonner asked if Councilors wished to make a motion regarding the request. Hearing no motion, the Presiding Officer announced the Council had taken no action and Roadway Constructors Corporation request for extending the deadline for submitting pre-qualification applications had been denied.

6. CONSIDERATION OF A CONTRACT WITH BISHOP CONTRACTORS, INC. FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE WEST BEAR GROTTO REMODEL AND RELATED AREAS

Kay Rich reviewed the bid process, particularly the process for consideration of cost savings ideas, as reported in the agenda materials. There were no questions from the Council.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved the Bear Grotto contract be approved. Councilor Kelley seconded the motion.

In response to Councilor Waker's question, Mr. Rich said the total contract sum would be under the amount previously bid based on deductibles submitted for gunnite work. Councilor Waker said he was concerned that the aesthetic quality of the project would be compromised if decorative items and outdoor furniture were deducted from the contract. Mr. Rich explained many of these items would be purchased directly by the Zoo at a considerable cost savings and the aesthetics of the overall exhibit would therefore not be damaged.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Gardner, Kirkpatrick, Kelley, Myers, Oleson, Van Bergen, Waker and Bonner

Absent: Hansen and Kafoury

The motion carried and the contract was approved.

7. CONSIDERATION OF SOLID WASTE RATE POLICIES

Doug Drennen introduced new staff member Rich McConaghy to the Council. Mr. Drennen explained this item was before the Council because as part of adopting last year's rate policy, the Council requested the policies he reviewed prior to beginning a new rate

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 7

study. He also explained staff would present rate issues and were soliciting Council agreement regarding the scope of the new rate study and which policies should be evaluated.

In response to Councilor Bonner's question, Mr. Drennen said if the Council wished to make changes to the rate ordinance, staff would prepare an ordinance for Council consideration in late July. He advised, however, the Council might want to review results of staff analysis on various rate options before an ordinance was prepared.

Policy 1. Mr. McConaghy reviewed policy 1 of the staff report which indicated the base disposal rate charged at the St. Johns Landfill could be increased above the cost of service to reflect the limited nature of the landfill's capacity, to provide incentives for recycling, to encourage the development of alternative technologies and to divert material to other landfills. He explained the current base disposal rates and the regional transfer fee reflected the actual cost of service. If directed by the Council, staff could conduct a rate study that would calculate the effects of proposed changes.

Councilor Waker thought such studies would be a waste of time. He did not think imposing rate penalties on waste generated outside the region would be effective.

Councilor Kelley asked about the current policy regarding disposal of waste generated from outside the region. Mr. Drennen responded a special fee was charged those disposing of wastes generated out of state. Councilor Kelley requested staff prepare more information on the legal ramifications of prohibiting out-of-state haulers from disposing waste at St. Johns Landfill.

Councilor Gardner thought increasing disposal rates was not the most effective diversion tactic and that the rate structure should not be used to generate revenue for planning a new landfill. He thought the rates could be used for planning the expansion of St. Johns and requested this information be provided in the rate study.

Presiding Officer Bonner asked Councilors whether they wanted staff to consider the factor of diverting waste from St. Johns Landfill in their base disposal rate recommendations. Executive Officer Gustafson added that more control of who used the facility was needed and of the two options for controlling use of the landfill - controlling who entered the facility and controlling through a pricing mechanism - he preferred the latter option.

Councilor Cooper was supportive of a study and said some way of controlling the material entering the landfill must be found.

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 8

Councilor Waker said he didn't disagree with the Executive Officer and thought Metro's duty was to dispose of waste at the most reasonable cost. He thought a solution to the landfill space problem would only come around when it reached the crisis stage and the public had not yet accepted the problem as a crisis.

Councilor Kelley asked staff to compare Metro's disposal rates with other areas to make ensure rates were competitive.

Policy 2. Mr. McConaghy explained policy 2 would effect policy 3 and could divert some non-putrescible wastes from St. Johns.

Councilor Waker supported considering this option because it was not punitive in nature and would not effect the overall cost of the system.

Presiding Officer Bonner thought policies 1 and 2 were related in that rates would be altered to change the flow of solid waste. He requested more analysis of the different options available.

Councilor Gardner said the question he wanted answered was whether eliminating the transfer charge at limited purpose landfills would divert a portion of non-putrescible wastes.

Councilor Waker asked if the volumes at CTRC were reduced when the rate structure was adjusted last year. Mr. Drennen said initially the volumes were reduced but when Marion County haulers started bringing loads in to CTRC, the factors were skewed.

Policy 3. Mr. McConaghy asked for Council concurrence on whether startup rates should be imposed as a two-step or one-step process.

Councilor Waker said he would prefer the one-step process.

Councilors Kirkpatrick, Cooper and Gardner did not think WTRC would be operational in time to be effected by these rate policies and it would be counterproductive for staff to examine this issue.

Policy 4. Regarding convenience charges for transfer stations, Mr. McConaghy asked if the Council wanted the charges continued or whether the charges be adjusted to encourage direct hauling to St. Johns Landfill.

Councilor Waker wanted the current policy to continue.

Policy 5. Mr. McConaghy explained staff wished to consider whether the current user fees generated sufficient revenue and whether pre-financing should be provided for future system improvements.

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 9

Presiding Officer Bonner suggested staff examine the effect of these costs being included in the base disposal rate. After discussion, the Council decided staff should not examine this issue.

Policy 6. Mr. McConaghy requested staff examine whether an additional fee be imposed for handling special wastes and how the fee would be applied.

The Council agreed this policy should be studied by staff.

Summary. Councilor Van Bergen questioned whether staff had received sufficient direction for carrying out a study of solid waste rates and policies. The Presiding Officer said staff had received instruction not to consider rates as a means of diverting waste and not to use either user fees or the base rate to finance capital projects. Staff had also been instructed to produce a good analysis of rates charged by other disposal facilities around the region.

Councilor Van Bergen asked why these management issues were being raised before the Council. Mr. Carlson explained the process was mandated by the Council when they adopted Resolution No. 84-483. The Resolution required an annual review of rate issues by the Council before these policies were considered for adoption. He suggested the Council consider whether the process they had adopted was useful.

A discussion followed regarding the best way to review the rate policies. Presiding Officer Bonner said the current process was too loose to be useful and was confusing to staff. Councilor Gardner suggested staff prepare an annual report analyzing the current year's policies and recommended changes. The Council would then decide whether the changes should be adopted.

Councilor Waker and Kelley were supportive of the current process because staff could hear Council concerns before conducting in-depth analyses of the issues important to the Council.

Mr. Carlson said staff would continue to follow the rate review process outlined in Resolution No. 85-483 until the Council adopted other policies.

8. DISCUSSION OF THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES CHAPTER OF THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Mr. Drennen introduced Wayne Rifer and new employee Debbie Gorham to the Council, explaining these employees would be responsible for updating the Solid Waste Master Plan. Mr. Drennen then reviewed the status of the chapters of the Plan.

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 10

Mr. Drennen explained the purpose of this discussion was to review the draft Alternative Technologies chapter, to receive comments, and to determine the process for public review and adoption of the document.

Mr. Rifer reported that as part of the technical review process, 300 copies of the Alternative Technologies chapter had been mailed to people with technical knowledge for their comments. Another 300 letters were sent to additional parties explaining the document was available for review upon request. Mr. Rifer said comments of a non-technical nature would be solicited later in the review process. The staff report explained the review process in detail.

Mr. Rifer then reviewed Table 4-1 of the document (page 9) which estimated the composition, quantities and disposition of recyclable waste generated within the region. Mr. Rifer also discussed Table 4-2 (page 24) which reviewed post-collection process techniques, the types of materials that could be recovered for each process, material available for processing and the estimated cost per ton of material recovered or processed. Information about alcohol recovery technology was not presented on the chart but was an emerging option, Mr. Rifer said. He noted the information presented many options and if the Council chose to pursue a mode of alternative technology, many smaller decisions would need to be made, the cost of recovering specific materials being a large factor.

Mr. Rifer briefly reviewed energy recovery technology and explained fewer materials would be recovered if this mode of technology were selected. This process, however, would significantly reduce the volume of waste landfilled. Two types of technology - mass burn facilities or small, modular facilities - were available for consideration.

Mr. Rifer then stressed the importance of economic factors in selecting alternative technology options. Mr. Drennen added that the revenue and cost estimates provided in the report represented desirable and typical examples. Staff would perform an extensive market analysis, once the Council provided more specific direction, regarding which options to pursue. In response to Councilor Myers' question, Mr. Rifer explained that because energy recovery facilities were more prevalently used than other modes of alternative technology, staff could compile reliable cost and revenue statistics. In response to Councilor Cooper's question, he said that other types of fully operational, alternative technology facilities existed from which to gather valid economic information. He referred the Council to the last several pages of the draft document which provided summary information about various plants which were (or soon would be) in operation around the country.

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 11

Councilor Waker asked how staff had justified assumptions listed in Appendix "A," specifically projected inflation and interest rate percentages. Mr. Drennen responded that because most facility contracts were long-term in nature, many assumptions had to be made that might not bear out exactly as projected. However, one could safely assume that initial tip fees would be higher and that eventually, landfill costs would be greatly reduced. Councilor Waker noted that capital replacement costs could also be higher as the facility became older. Mr. Drennen said staff had projected 8 percent as an inflationary factor for landfill rates. Councilor Waker asked what percentage of that figure included transportation costs. Executive Officer Gustafson said the cost of transportation would vary greatly depending on the type of facility, its location, and volumes of waste transferred. Mr. Drennen assured the Council that transportation issues were very important and would be a major part of staff's final analysis.

Presiding Officer Bonner asked why staff had shown revenues of an energy recovery facility would experience a marked increase after seven years of operation. Mr. Drennen explained staff had made this assumption after examining PGE's projections and their rate increases corresponding with that same time period.

Councilor Kelley expressed concern about the effects of an energy recovery facility on recycling. Mr. Rifer said a facility's effects on recycling would depend on the size of the facility. If it were designed to process 100 percent of the waste stream, competition would clearly be created for materials that could be further recycled. He said Metro's philosophy was such that this type of competition would be avoided. A facility could be designed to separate most recyclables, market them, and burn the remaining waste. Councilor Kelley explained she was very interested in the cost effectiveness of any facility in order to keep regional disposal costs down. Both Councilor Kelley and Presiding Officer Bonner said that as part of the public process for developing the Alternative Technologies chapter, staff should ask the public how much they would be willing to pay for solid waste disposal.

Mr. Rifer summarized Section I of the document and the process for considering which technologies should be selected. Page 2 listed key considerations that must be taken into consideration including priorities mandated by state law, cost, markets for recyclables, dependability of technologies, risk factors of experimental and hopeful technologies, shared financial risk between owner and operator, environmental impacts and public support. Mr. Rifer said staff could provide detailed information on each consideration once the Council had determined which factors were most important.

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 12

The two-stage process for review of the Alternatives chapter of the Solid Waste Management Plan was presented by Mr. Rifer. Stage one would involve extensive evaluation of technology options by persons with specific knowledge. Staff were soliciting major ideas that would add to or delete from the draft document. A technology symposium would be organized for this purpose and the Council would be involved in this forum. Based on this input, the Council will be asked to determine which technologies should receive further consideration. At the end of stage one, the Council would make three decisions: 1) whether Metro should pursue consideration of alternative technologies; 2) which technologies should receive further consideration; and 3) at what stage in the Solid Waste Management Plan process should alternative technologies be implemented.

The second stage would provide for direct citizen involvement in addressing major policy issues, Mr. Rifer explained. Alternative Technologies could be addressed as part of the total Plan or separately. The purpose of this stage would be to provide information to the Council concerning public viewpoints on policy issues and to develop a sense of ownership by the community for the resulting decisions. After the Council had evaluated information gained from the technical and public involvement processes, the Council would then determine whether more information was needed, at what cost over landfilling would the Council be willing to entail, to which technologies should the Council commit waste, and what would be Metro's role in the project.

Councilor Cooper asked about the time frame for the process outlined by Mr. Rifer assuming everything went smoothly. Mr. Rifer said stage one could begin immediately and be completed by mid-September.

Councilor Kirkpatrick asked about the status of the Finance chapter of the Solid Waste Management Plan. Mr. Rifer reported the completion of that chapter would follow all others because the decisions made about other components would alter information presented in that chapter. In response to Councilor Kirkpatrick's question about the Source Separation chapter, Mr. Rifer said draft documents were planned to be distributed in mid-August.

Councilor Kirkpatrick recommended staff complete the Source Reduction and Recycling chapter before implementing the public involvement portion of the Alternative Technologies chapter adoption process. She suggested the public involvement process for both chapters could be coordinated. Councilor Kelley agreed with this recommendation saying both chapters were closely related and it was important the public buy into a consolidated plan they could understand and support. Presiding Officer Bonner concurred saying it made sense to present all the available options to the public and

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 13

their related costs. The three Councilors agreed staff should not stop work on the Alternative Technologies chapter but they should proceed with uncompleted chapters of the plan as soon as possible in order for the total picture to be discussed. Councilor Gardner urged that stage one of the Alternative Technologies chapter be completed as soon as possible in order for Metro to be prepared for the implementation of Senate Bill 662, if it were adopted in its current form.

Executive Officer Gustafson urged the Council to commence with stage one saying there were many complicated elements of alternative technology that were not related to source reduction and recycling. He thought the Council should review the chapter to determine what decisions could be made before the entire Plan was completed.

Councilor Oleson said he was most interested in getting feedback from technical people at this stage in the process, especially regarding experimental technology.

Councilor Waker concurred with the Executive Officer's advice. A key decision to be made would be at what added cost over landfilling was the region willing to pay for recovery of usable resources. If the Council could set a policy or at least get a feeling for the answer to this question, it would be much easier to answer other questions about what technologies would be acceptable, he said. He explained he would be suspect of any alternate technology that cost more than landfilling because if the costs were higher, it would be doubtful energy had been saved. However, it would be well within the public's right to spend money pursuing any method it preferred, he said, and the key would be giving the public complete information on which to make an informed decision. He was also concerned that the public understand the state currently defined a material as recyclable if a suitable market existed for that material.

Councilor Cooper asked staff if the base line of the financial plan would be the current cost of landfilling. Mr. Rifer said staff had been assuming landfilling would be the base line cost although they were discussing this issue with other technologies and jurisdictions. Councilor Cooper said he was concerned that the draft report included information about 14 alternative technology plants that had stopped operations. The consumer would assume the costs, he said, and the Council must consider this risk.

Councilor Waker said another factor to consider was when the costs of disposal increased substantially, people could resort to other, unacceptable methods of disposal and cleaning up illegally disposed waste could result in another kind of net cost. He said it was important not to discourage people from using the formal system of

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 14

waste disposal. Mr. Durig said staff would be presenting a report to the Council on June 13 dealing with solid waste disposal authority which would address the problem Councilor Waker raised.

Councilor Van Bergen said he was doubtful the public could offer input on a preferred, workable solid waste system at a feasible cost.

The Presiding Officer summarized the Council's general directions to staff saying staff should continue to explore the input of knowledgeable people on this chapter of the Plan for inclusion in the process. Before the commencement of stage two, staff should have completed a draft of the Source Reduction and Recycling chapter. The public review process for this chapter and the Alternative Technologies chapter should be conducted as one unit in order to make a decision about which solid waste system should be implemented by Metro.

Judy Dehen, 2965 N.W. Verde Vista, Portland, Oregon, representing the Columbia Group Sierra Club, reported the Sierra Club would be recommending changes to the Alternative Technologies chapter and asked the Council to be receptive to additional ideas. Regarding the Council's previous discussion about how much the public would be willing to pay for a solid waste system, she referred to page 1 of the draft chapter which stated that Oregon state law required jurisdictions to apply a particular set of priorities to the plan. As long as these measures were technologically and economically feasible, they must be used, she said, and would not be subject to popular opinion. She urged the Council to examine the whole picture in order to develop a workable system. The effects of mandatory curbside recycling would certainly have to be taken into consideration, she said, and the safe disposal of household toxic materials should also be considered.

Mr. Rifer completed his presentation by reviewing a schedule for the Council's consideration of the process for the Solid Waste Management Plan. There were no suggestions for changes.

Alex Cross of Genstar Waste Management, Inc. invited staff, Councilors and the community to the annual Genstar picnic which would take place Saturday, June 8, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the St. Johns Landfill. He said the picnic had traditionally been a very good opportunity for the community to visit and landfill and learn more about its operation.

At 8:50 p.m., the Presiding Officer called the Council into Executive Session under the authority of ORS 192.660(1)(h). Councilors present at the regular session were all present at the Executive Session. The regular session of the Council reconvened at 9:00 p.m.

Council Meeting
June 6, 1985
Page 15

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at
9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A. Marie Nelson

A. Marie Nelson
Clerk of the Council

amn
3732C/313-2
06/17/85