

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL BUDGET COMMITTEE
OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

March 30, 1992

Council Chamber

Committee Members Present: George Van Bergen (Chair), Judy Wyers (Vice Chair), Richard Devlin, Jim Gardner, Sandi Hansen

Councilors Also Present: Roger Buchanan

Chair Van Bergen called the regular meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

■ PHASE II BUDGET REVIEW

1. SOLID WASTE REVENUE FUND

John Houser, Council Analyst, referenced Solid Waste Director Bob Martin's memorandum dated March 27, 1992 in which questions from Mr. Houser to the Solid Waste Department contained in his document entitled 1992-93 Solid Waste Budget Introduction and Overview were answered. Mr. Martin's memorandum and the document to which Mr. Houser referred have been made a part of the permanent meeting record. Mr. Houser noted the March 27 memorandum from Mr. Martin contained handwritten notes from Mr. Houser reflecting further analysis of the responses and were in the form of additional questions.

Mr. Houser referenced his memorandum to the Budget Committee dated March 24, 1992 regarding Public Affairs Department Solid Waste Programs. This memorandum has been made a part of the permanent meeting record.

Mr. Houser referenced two additional documents provided for the Committee by Solid Waste Department staff, one entitled "Closure Fund Estimate" and the other, entitled "Materials and Services".

Chair Van Bergen indicated the Committee would focus on review in further detail the questions to which Mr. Houser gave additional attention.

Mr. Martin inquired whether the Committee wanted written responses to the additional questions posed by Mr. Houser. Chair Van Bergen said the Committee would decide at the end of the presentation.

St. Johns Landfill Closure Account

Question No. 3. James Watkins, Solid Waste Engineering & Analysis Manager, referenced page 4 of the March 27 memorandum. Mr. Watkins and Mr. Martin detailed the information contained in the Closure Fund Estimate dated March 30, 1992.

(Continued)

In response to Mr. Houser, Mr. Martin said a \$1 million contribution from rates to the Closure Fund had not yet been made in the current fiscal year. Mr. Martin noted the current fiscal year drop in tonnage would be approximately 200,000 tons leaving a \$4 million shortfall in actual solid waste revenues to cover the fixed portion solid waste expenses, one of which was the \$1 million contribution. Mr. Martin said he was unsure whether making or not making the contribution violated Oregon Budget Law. He felt it was possible should the contribution not be made the fund balance would be close to \$0.

In response to Chair Van Bergen, Mr. Houser said the Rate Review Committee had met twice and would meet again April 1, 1992 subsequent to which they would make a recommendation. Mr. Houser said the ordinance establishing the Rate Review Committee contained language indicating rates were to go into effect July 1.

Question No. 4. Mr. Martin said the numbers were not in error, and said the fact that the \$3.85 million was an estimate of expenditures and did not reflect the total dollar value of the contract due to uncertainty as to how much of the contract would be paid out in the current fiscal year and how much would be paid out in the next fiscal year. Mr. Martin said the problem was ongoing since construction season overlapped fiscal years.

In response to Chair Van Bergen, Mr. Martin said questions remained regarding the fill material used at the landfill and continued review was in process.

Question No. 6. Mr. Martin said a goal of the closure plan was to establish a regular process incorporate environmental research, which could be a benefit to solid waste systems everywhere. He said, yes, the Department anticipated formal proposals, and said Metro was not required to perform such research, but, he said, the Department felt it was beneficial to do so. Mr. Martin summarized the goals of the Closure Plan; 1) environmental compliance, 2) fit the project into the Smith and Bybee Lakes management, 3) maximize use of recycled materials, 4) incorporate meaningful research into the closure process, which he noted had all undergone review by the Solid Waste Committee and the full Council. He said research was not required by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

Construction Account

Question No. 1. Mr. Martin said the Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) facility project was on schedule, and said he anticipated a January, 1993 opening.

In response to Councilor Wyers, Mr. Martin said the Council approved the budget for the HHW facility FY 1991-92 fiscal year, and said state law requirements mandated permanent HHW receiving facilities. In response to

Councilor Hansen, Mr. Martin said the Metro South HHW facility was operating according to plan, that is receiving waste three days a week, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. He said the remaining two days of a five day work cycle were for bulking of materials and testing of unknowns, etc. He said the plan was similar for the Metro Central HHW facility. Mr. Martin felt the cost of operation, which he noted was higher than anticipated, was an issue for Committee review. In response to Councilor Hansen, Mr. Martin felt the issue was not the size of the facility but the convenience of location to the users. He said the department was reviewing alternatives to reduce the costs of operation, such as limiting the amount of waste one customer could bring in or reducing the number of days the HHW facility was open for receipt of materials. Councilor Wyers agreed with Chair Van Bergen that the issues raised were Solid Waste Committee issues. Councilor Wyers said she questioned the need for a second \$1 million HHW facility at Metro Central. Chair Van Bergen referred the issue to Mr. Houser for the Solid Waste Committee agenda.

General Account

o Budget and Finance

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 8 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 1. Mr. Houser indicated the Council Administrator had expressed concern about the process for approval of purchase of data processing equipment for Metro. He said the Council Administrator was interested in facilitation of uniformity as interdepartmental communication expanded. Mr. Houser asked if requests for such equipment were examined by another entity within Metro to insure commonality.

Mr. Martin said "shared" meant the appropriate purchasing request forms were completed and transmitted to the data processing department. He said he believed if the purchasing requests had raised issues with the data processing department, he would have been notified.

Question No. 2. Mr. Martin said the scanner would give the capability of placing documents on the network for staff to read, and saved photocopying and routing, and was likely a unique need to Solid Waste at this time, although, he felt the need could expand to other departments.

Question No. 3. Roosevelt Carter, Solid Waste Budget and Finance Manager, said the Department was concerned about ergonomics and the effect on employees of working at length with detailed spreadsheets the majority of their time. He said the larger screen monitors enabled the employee to see more data on the screen at one time or increase the size of the data residing on the screen and thus reducing eye strain. In response to Councilor Wyers, Mr. Carter said the monitors were approximately 18" in diameter. He said a standard monitor was about 14".

o Operations

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 9 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 1. Sam Chandler, Solid Waste Facilities Manager, said all items referred to in question no. 1 would be competitively bid. Mr. Martin said he believed the contracts would come in under \$15,000.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 10 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 5. Mr. Martin said Closure costs were costs incurred as described in the Closure Plan. He added ongoing operations and maintenance expenses were expected in the areas of erosion and drainage control subsequent to closure completion and would not be funded from the Closure account.

Question No. 6. Mr. Chandler said Metro staff would man the sites and operate the vehicle used in the mobile van program for HHW, and operational costs would be similar to those incurred at the facility with similar materials collected, or at about \$100 per customer. He noted that Metro was cooperating with DEQ in the matter toward an intergovernmental agreement, and said if, for instance, a collection event was specifically latex paint, costs could drop to \$25 per customer.

Councilor Wyers asked why the Solid Waste Committee had not heard the matter previously. Mr. Houser asked if the department intended to place the van on call three to five days per week to respond to any elderly person in the region with a need to dispose of HHW material, and asked what staffing would be made available. Councilor Wyers said such policy issues should be heard by the Solid Waste Committee.

Mr. Martin referenced Senate Bill 66, Section 51, which, he noted, required DEQ develop in cooperation with Metro a mobile HHW collection capability. He said the matter had been reviewed by a committee of the Council in which two fixed HHW facilities were planned supplemented in the rest of the region and state by the mobile collection capability to be developed by DEQ. He noted DEQ was authorized to raise tipping fees from \$.50 to \$.85 per ton by Senate Bill 66 to fund in part the program costs.

Chair Van Bergen suggested the Solid Waste Committee review the matter with Metro's lobbyist at the legislature. Mr. Devlin indicated recalling discussion before the Solid Waste Committee concerning two fixed facilities and that Metro would have the mobile capability to serve areas of the region including the area not served by a fixed facility. Councilor Wyers felt the matter, although discussed, should be presented before the Solid Waste Committee as a policy issue.

o Engineering and Analysis

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 11 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 1. Mr. Martin said an underground sprinkler system installed at Metro South proved inadequate, and said a dispute over responsibility was not resolved. He said the proposed budget was to provide funding to supplement the irrigation system during the dispute in order that no plantings be lost. Chair Van Bergen voiced concern whether damages could be established after the work had been undertaken. Mr. Martin said he would anticipate complaints from Oregon City and others if Metro were to let the trees and grasses die.

Question No. 4. Mr. Martin said a cost/benefit analysis would be conducted prior to development of a dewatering station at a transfer station.

In response to Councilor Gardner, Mr. Martin said a dewatering station could be anything from a place where trucks would drain off excess water to a mechanism with centrifugal force applied to separate water from solids.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 12 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 5. Mr. Martin said the property on which the staging area for the compost facility was located was not transferred to Credit Suisse as part of their arrangement with Riedel. He said Metro had a lease with Riedel for the development of property as a staging area. He said discussions with Credit Suisse were underway regarding continuation of the lease or another proposal to handle staging. In response to Councilor Wyers, Mr. Martin said \$250,000 was budgeted for construction costs of improvement of the property to develop it for the purpose intended as well as an annual lease. Mr. Martin said although a lease agreement existed, lease payments would not be made to Riedel until the property improvements were made. He said the possibility existed the lease arrangement could be dissolved if all parties agreed. Councilor Wyers requested the matter be heard at the Solid Waste Committee meeting.

Councilor Gardner commented he hoped Riedel could not, based on Metro's agreement, pave the parking lot before Metro was sure whether it was needed. Mr. Martin said Riedel was coordinating with Metro, and had offered to disregard the lease if all parties agreed. Mr. Martin noted the property could then be marketed, and said all parties concerned were involved in an effort to coordinate. He said Riedel currently did not have permits to develop the property. Chair Van Bergen affirmed with mutual consent the agreement could be nullified, but indicated he was concerned it could not be done unilaterally.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 14 of the March 27 memorandum.

Administration Division

o Materials and Services

Question No. 1. Mr. Martin said projected expenditures for FY 1992-93 were lower than FY 1991-92. He said Office Supplies overall for the Department, \$33,075 was budgeted for FY 1992-93, and said in FY 1991-92, \$43,055 had been budgeted subsequent to cuts made by the Finance Committee on the proposed FY 1991-92 budget. He said a 29% reduction in expenditures for Office Supplies was budgeted for FY 1992-93, which he noted included Planning, which he pointed out had not been included in the FY 1991-92 budget. He said the budget for postage for FY 1991-92 was \$74,170, the FY 1992-93 proposed budget, including the Planning Department, was \$49,690. He said a 23% reduction in postage was budgeted for FY 1992-93.

Question No. 3. Mr. Martin said \$3,200 for the "SOLV-IT" brochure were additional to funds appropriated "SOLV-IT." Councilor Wyers requested the matter be heard before the Solid Waste Committee.

Question No. 4. Mr. Martin said mobile phones were necessary to communicate with key staff. He said it was not a capital purchase, but the proposed budget would pay the phone bill. In response to Councilor Hansen, Mr. Martin said the Department had three mobile phones.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 15 of the March 27 memorandum.

o Contracts

Question No. 1. Mr. Martin said the \$25,000 was budgeted to assume Metro costs for data entry of information from the City of Portland and the watershed in the Portland/Metropolitan area. He said necessary watershed reports would be compiled from the model. He said the City of Portland did not have the need to enter the data into the model Metro would administer nor to compile the region watershed report Metro had the responsibility to do. He said it would be inefficient to ask them to do it as they would expect to be reimbursed. He said the City of Portland would provide the data.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 16 of the March 27 memorandum.

Budget and Finance Division

o General

Question No. 3. Mr. Martin said the Department might direct 1) selected loads of organic materials to the composter when operating again, 2) waste with high wood content from construction sites to the appropriate wood processing facility rather than a transfer station, and 3) petroleum contaminated soils (PCS) to soil processing facilities rather than

landfill. He said a level of effort was associated with locating the appropriate waste for special waste facilities as they come on line and assuring the correct inspections are given to the generators in order to direct the special waste accordingly.

Mr. Houser said he understood the amount of material processed currently at Metro Central was below the level at which a payment was obligatory, and asked was Metro making a payment for material that was not actually arriving at the facility. Mr. Martin said Metro was paying a fixed monthly cost for the operation of the facility for tonnage received. Mr. Houser noted the term used by Mr. Martin in the past, "put or pay", which he felt implied Metro cost was higher than if utilization of the facility were greater. Mr. Martin said Metro had a contract which provided for payment of \$285,250 monthly to Trans Industries to process whatever amount of waste was received at the facility up to 35 thousand tons per month. He said monthly tonnage received at the facility was consistently below 35 thousand tons per month. He said a schedule in the contract permitted lowering of the per ton cost for processing should the tonnage increase.

Question No. 5. Mr. Martin said a work plan in the Solid Waste Department would be developed with the addition of the Solid Waste Planning staff to rewrite the franchise code. In response to Councilor Wyers, Mr. Martin said the draft would include new language regarding licenses. Mr. Martin said the draft would come before the Solid Waste Committee within the fiscal year, but, he said, he could not know whether policy debate would be completed by the end of fiscal year on the matter.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 18 of the March 27 memorandum.

o Materials & Services

Question No. 1. Mr. Martin said the software the Department was using was specific to the needs of the Solid Waste Department, and said he knew of no process to review software for compatibility. He said upgrades addressed problems encountered in the Department and by other users of the same software. He said the Department was aware of the frequency of the problems as well as the amount of staff time lost due to such problems and subsequently determined department software needs. He said Data Processing agreed with the Department regarding current network problems with Windows 3.0.

Mr. Houser noted Donald Carlson, Council Administrator, had expressed concern regarding the Solid Waste Department's use of a Windows-based software at the same time other departments were using WordPerfect software, and said as a result difficulties have been encountered in the ability to transmit information between the two different software systems. Mr. Houser indicated Mr. Carlson had raised questions regarding a major entity within the agency purchasing a software package different from the software package used by the majority of the remainder of the agency. Mr.

Houser said although the question was directed at upgrades, it was meant in a broader sense.

Mr. Martin said he did not understand the question to be that broad, and said if the question was to review the decision making process the Department underwent in selecting Windows, he was not prepared to do so at this time. He said he would be prepared to do so by the next Budget Committee meeting. Chair Van Bergen requested Mr. Martin advise Mr. Houser in the matter. Councilor Wyers felt there was a need to discuss the Centralization/Decentralization of Data Processing further prior to upgrading. She noted it would be beneficial if the Accounting Manager, Don Cox, were involved.

Councilor Gardner said he wanted to clarify Mr. Martin's comments that the software used by the Department was specialized to the types of applications in the Solid Waste Department. Mr. Martin said the term "unique" would be applicable, and he noted Windows was an established software package. He said it was unique to the Solid Waste Department at Metro. In response to Councilor Gardner, Mr. Martin said the Department was not using a specialized version of Windows. Mr. Martin said the Department proposed budget would upgrade the Department to Windows 3.1, which he felt would correct system problems now experienced.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 20 of the March 27 memorandum.

Solid Waste Operations Division

Question No. 2. Mr. Martin said an error was made in the answer in which was said the positions in question were "submitted to and approved by Council during the budget process for FY 1991-92 AND at the time of the reclassification request." He said the reclassification of the positions was done pursuant to Metro Code 2.02.135 which, he noted, provided for administrative review of classification of positions. He said with an adequate budget for the reclassifications, the action can be taken administratively. He said the classification of the positions in question after hire required further review by the Personnel as to the appropriateness of the classification. He said the position classifications were submitted to Personnel and were subsequently reclassified to be called Facility Management Project Coordinators. He said the reclassification was not brought before the Council, and said it was not necessary to do so except in the event the reclassification changed the salary to the extent that further appropriation was required to fund the positions. He said that was not the case in this instance.

Mr. Houser said it appeared when the positions were reclassified to the coordinator classification, new personnel were hired to fill the Hazardous Waste (HW) Specialist positions, or other existing staff were promoted into those positions and new staff hired to replace the vacancies. He said the outcome appeared two new FTE positions were created through the

reclassification process, and said subsequently in this year's budget cycle was creating an additional fiscal impact of two new positions to be funded in this fiscal year.

Mr. Martin said that was inaccurate, and said new positions were not created through the reclassification process. He said evaluations were made of the functions of existing personnel by the Personnel Department, and said a determination was made based on that evaluation whether the positions had been classified correctly. He said the question was were staff being paid appropriately for the work expected, and if not, Personnel made a determination in order to do so. He said if an incumbent of a reclassified position can prove himself qualified for that position, then the incumbent became the staff for that position. He said no new positions were created out of the process.

Mr. Houser said if two incumbent HW Specialists were found to be qualified to become Project Coordinators, then, he said, the question was were those existing HW Specialist positions filled with additional staff.

Mr. Martin said the positions were reclassified to the new job title.

Mr. Houser said in the last fiscal year, three HW Specialists budgeted, and said if two of those positions became the new classification, and said proposed in this year's budget were four HW Specialist positions, and said if in effect we had only one HW Specialist remaining on staff after the reclassification effort, and the request was for three HW Specialists for FY 1992-93.

Mr. Chandler said the group of authorized positions under discussion would not change. He said what had changed in the group of nine positions was the classification, whereas, he said, before a combination of Technicians and Specialists made up the nine staff. He said other classifications were now necessary to accurately portray what those staff do. He said when the facility was fully staffed there would be three Project Coordinators, four HW Specialists, and two Technicians. He said there were no new positions.

Mr. Martin said there was not a net gain in staff in the process, and said he would review directly with Mr. Houser any questions should there be confusion.

Councilor Gardner commented he understood the staff required for both facilities were budgeted last year, but, he noted, not filled. Mr Chandler said one Project Coordinator vacancy existed and three HW Technician vacancies existed, of which one could be, given adequate length of service and training, promoted into the Specialist classification to reflect their skill on the job. Councilor Gardner said it appeared positions were authorized and budgeted, but not filled, was an explanation of why there was no budget adjustment needed to pay higher salaries for positions which were reclassified. Mr. Martin said yes, the funds were available.

Mr. Martin said of the three Project Coordinators for the two facilities, the third position was not new.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 21 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 3. Mr. Martin said the answer regarding the reclassification request reviewed with Council was similar to the answer to Question No. 2.

Question No. 4. Mr. Martin said the Department did believe additional staff would be necessary for Metro South.

Councilor Wyers requested a discussion take place at the Solid Waste Committee meeting concerning staffing issues overall.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 22 of the March 27 memorandum.

- o Materials & Services

Question No. 4. Mr. Martin said a system cost total for the two HHW facilities was spread equally between them, rather than distributed in another ratio, such as two-thirds to Metro South and one-third to Metro Central. He noted the amount overall would have remained the same, and said he felt Mr. Chandler split the cost equally for administrative convenience.

Councilor Wyers requested Mr. Houser verify whether the method used was adequate for the budgeting process or whether further detail would be required.

- o Contracts

Question No. 2. Mr. Martin said repairs and maintenance of the pump stations at the landfill were unpredictable, and expected any single incident would be under \$15,000 cost, although several incidents could occur amounting to the possible proposed budget of \$120,000 over a fiscal year period. He said the process would entail solicitation of bids and selecting the low bidder. Mr. Martin noted these items were a part of an ongoing system of maintenance and not new expenditures to be funded as part of the landfill closure plan.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 24 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 6. Mr. Martin said Mr. Chandler used a similar formula for allocation of facility data processing expenditures by distributing the budget equally rather than by number of months of operation or transactions for each facility.

Councilor Wyers requested Mr. Houser verify the method was in accordance with budgetary rules.

Question No. 7. Mr. Martin said costs overall for Metro Central and Metro South were not expected to increase. He noted although the composter facility had ceased operations, tonnage was down overall, thus compensating for the increase that would otherwise have been experienced due to the closure of the composter.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 27 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 9. Mr. Houser clarified the question, and said the amount of the material at the facilities was greater than anticipated, and how would that affect the allocation of disposal costs between the facilities.

Mr. Martin agreed the estimates were probably low, and proposed funding could be too low, also. He said Mr. Chandler was examining the matter.

Mr. Houser noted Question No. 14 on page 26 was similar. Mr. Martin said an error existed in the answer to the question, and said the total price would be changed via changed order, not the unit price. He said estimates were off \$334,000.

Engineering and Analysis Division

o Personal Services

Question No. 5. Mr. Watkins said no specific contracts were related to the Hazardous and Special Waste Reduction work program, and said the first two items would be emphasized and the rest would receive time if time were available.

Councilor Wyers requested the work program referenced be outlined in detail at the Solid Waste Committee meeting April 7, 1992.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 31 of the March 27 memorandum.

Waste Reduction

o General Programs

Question No. 8. Mr. Martin said the loans would be offered at favorable interest rates to encourage and stimulate development of recycling businesses. He indicated loans would be granted to businesses of a less than purely speculative nature but were financially viable, but who nevertheless would not likely be eligible for prime bank rates. Mr. Martin said Debbie Gorham, Waste Reduction Manager, was working on the revolving loan program details.

Councilor Wyers indicated further discussion was in order for the April 7 Solid Waste Committee meeting, and said she had discussed the matter with Judith Mandt, Administrative Manager. Councilor Wyers said she had asked regarding a loan program at that time in connection with the 1% program, and said she was given the impression the Executive Officer would not approve. She indicated her flexibility, but said she would have questions regarding cost administration, who would decide what projects were funded as well as defaults. Councilor Wyers expressed concern regarding governments loaning money.

Councilor Devlin said he recalled such a discussion two or three years at which it was suggested a loan program be fashioned for the 1% Program rather than a grant program, and recalled a similar response. Councilor Devlin noted Portland Development Commission (PDC) was envisioned as the organizational unit that would administer the 1% program. He said it appeared there was a question as to whether PDC wanted to assume that responsibility, and asked, if that were the case, was it the intent of the Department to pursue the 1% Program, and, if so, would budget adjustments to the proposed budget occur.

Ms. Gorham said (in answer to Question No. 7, page 38) should PDC decide not to engage in the project with Metro, Metro had other options, such as a bank or a local company that administered small business loans aimed at economic development projects.

Councilor Devlin asked whether interested parties had been made aware Metro was contemplating the outlined program shift. Mr. Martin said he believed there was a degree of awareness that the proposed policy shift was taking place, and said he believed affected parties would be able express their opinions during policy review in the budget process.

Councilor Wyers suggested the 1% for Recycling Committee review the matter, and noted the matter would be heard at the April 7 Solid Waste Committee meeting. Chair Van Bergen noted the budget process would be a matter for public hearing.

Question No. 10. Mr. Martin presented a draft report of the relationships between modeling and data gathering projects underway in the Department to the Committee. He said everything currently underway would merge into the Cambridge Systematics model in approximately six months. This document has been made a part of the permanent meeting record.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 35 of the March 27 memorandum.

o Contracts

Question No. 1a. Mr. Martin said staff regularly reviewed research work performed elsewhere, and said that was the purpose for the publications subscribed to by the Department as well as conferences attended by Department staff.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 36 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 1b. Ms. Gorham felt the companies who would benefit from research could be asked by Metro to participate in the developmental research.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 36 of the March 27 memorandum.

Question No. 2. Mr. Martin indicated he was not sure whether a temporary employee could be hired for over six months due to union restrictions. He said should Personnel approve, the Department would approve the hire of a temporary employee for the project. Ms. Gorham said circumstances of the project could sanction the use of a temporary employee. Mr. Martin responded to Councilor Gardner, and said, should the demonstration sites become permanent, a permanent employee could be hired. Councilor Wyers requested the matter be brought before the Solid Waste Committee for review. Mr. Houser asked Department staff to prepare estimates as to cost for the performance of the function by the existing temporary employee compared with the contract estimate in the proposed budget. Mr. Martin agreed to provide that report.

Chair Van Bergen referenced page 38 of the March 27 memorandum, and noted the answer to Question No. 7. had been presented earlier.

Councilor Wyers indicated she had other questions than had been covered by Mr. Houser's response to the March 27 memorandum, and said she would like to give the referenced question no. and page no. to Mr. Martin and Mr. Houser, describe her concern to the Budget Committee followed by further discussion at the Solid Waste Committee meeting April 7. Councilor Hansen said she felt Councilor Wyers' questions should not be heard at the Budget Committee meeting, and said she felt the questions should be covered at the Solid Waste Committee meeting. Councilor Wyers agreed.

Acting Chair Hansen called for a five minute recess.

Acting Chair Hansen reconvened the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

Public Affairs

Vickie Rucker, Public Affairs Director, introduced Kathy Rutkowski, Senior Management Analyst, who referenced a memorandum from Jennifer Sims, Finance and Management Information Director, dated March 30, 1992 to the Budget Committee regarding the Cost Allocation Plan.

The Committee and staff discussed relocating portions of the Public Affairs Department under the Solid Waste Department. Mr. Carlson suggested a new account be created in the Solid Waste Revenue Fund called Recycling Information Center, Education and Promotion Programs (RIC), which he felt would clarify the programs for which the Solid Waste Department was

COUNCIL BUDGET COMMITTEE

March 30, 1992

Page 14

responsible; 1) Administration, 2) Budget and Finance; 3) Operations; 4) Planning; 5) System Engineering & Analysis; 6) Waste Reduction; and RIC. Mr. Carlson suggested a budget note to indicate RIC programs should be coordinated with other Solid Waste programs and subject to measurement and evaluation.

Mr. Houser referenced a document from the Public Affairs Department entitled "Responses to Budget Questions, FY 1992-93", noting pages 4, 5, and 6 dealt with the issue of physically transferring Public Affairs programs to the Solid Waste Department. This document has been made a part of the permanent meeting record. Mr. Houser said should the Budget Committee make the policy decision not to proceed with such a transfer, the questions and responses need not be reviewed at this time. Chair Van Bergen questioned whether it was within the Budget Committee's function to require implementation of a transfer of funding of Public Affairs programs to the Solid Waste Department.

Councilor Gardner said RIC and the education program was budgeted in the Solid Waste Operating funds, but, he said, were administered on a day-to-day basis under the Public Affairs Department. He said it was within the authority of the Council to approve a budget to designate a change in that area or that it be continued in the same manner as was currently done. Mr. Carlson agreed. Councilor Hansen pointed out the Public Affairs Department had been requested through a Budget Note to design a tracking system for allocation of time and services. Mr. Carlson noted the Department had responded to the Budget Note.

Ms. Rocker indicated she discussed whether cost savings would occur by transferring Public Affairs programs to the Solid Waste Department with Mr. Martin, and said they had concluded no cost savings would result. Ms. Rocker requested Public Affairs programs be given a separate account should the Committee approve they remain in the Solid Waste Department budget.

Councilor Devlin referenced page 6 of the Public Affairs document. Ms. Rocker presented responses to questions as outlined in the remainder of the document.

Chair Van Bergen asked regarding contracting with an advertising agency that would have a conflict of interests with anyone current or former elected official with Metro. Ms. Rocker said the Department had canceled a contract with an advertising agency wherein a conflict of interests occurred, and said no contract of that nature existed between Metro and any advertising agency.

In response to Councilor Wyers, Ms. Rocker explained that media placement services were at a 15% rate, and said the service was used to locate the media to be used and to place the advertising.

COUNCIL BUDGET COMMITTEE
March 30, 1992
Page 15

Councilor Wyers noted she enjoyed having the annual Metro Recycling Awards event at the Council meetings, and felt the Council would be left out of the loop if that were changed.

Councilor Gardner raised a question, noting the question had been raised the previous year, regarding the Waste Reduction Promotion program. He asked whether 1) there was a way to measure the success of the program, and 2) was the program accomplishing a measurable success in recycling increases. Ms. Rucker said the Recycling Market Survey was able to track successes in office paper recycling, and noted the number of calls into the RIC were tracked.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marilyn Geary-Symons
Committee Clerk