

COUNCIL SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 24, 1987
5:00 p.m. - Room 330

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Jim Gardner, Gary Hansen,
Sharron Kelley

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Jon
Allred, Bob Applegate, Becky
Crockett, Rena Cusma, Dennis
Mulvihill, Tor Lyshaug, Judith
Mandt

TRANSITION TEAM MEMBERS: Jim
Sitzman, Ardis Stevens

OTHERS: 37 interested members
of the public; see file for
detailed list.

Jim Gardner opened the meeting at 5:25 and announced the first agenda item, Resource Recovery Citizen Involvement Process, and introduced Bob Applegate, who is the staff member responsible for community relations on the Alternative Technology Resource Recovery Project. Bob gave a brief recap of staff's status of the resource recovery project and described the planned staff schedule regarding the project and public meetings designed to inform the public of the process, the status, and general information on an incineration plant. "Informational fairs" would then be arranged with the five vendors for them to explain their proposals. Public meetings with the Resource Recovery Review Committee, after compiling their preliminary report, would be held. Art Lawes of Timberline Dodge (234-0771) was named as the representative of the concerned citizens of the Interlachen area, through which Bob Applegate would keep the public informed as to the exact time and location of the aforementioned meetings.

Discussion followed regarding the availability of the proposals submitted being available to the public. The process being followed to choose an alternate technology and the choices beside incineration were briefly described.

The public voiced their concern regarding the environmental impact of an incinerator.

Tom Hyland, of the Oregon State Aeronautics Division of the FAA was present to voice the FAA's opposition to the height of the chimney tower. Rena Cusma suggested that Mr. Hyland finalize the documentation of the FAA's standing and forward it to Metro and Fluor, the vendor proposing the conflicting site.

The public questioned conflict of interest with choosing a vendor to give information on environmental impact. Jim Gardner responded that the vendors would give their proposals and justifications and the committee would look at a plant similar to the proposed facility and find out the environmental impact of that specific plant, and also consult third parties such as state regulatory agencies for their analyses, stating the final report of environmental impact would lay in the Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ) who would have to issue permits for the operation of the facility.

It was pointed out that in addition to mass incineration, two composting facilities and a refuse derived fuel (RDF) system are being considered.

Recycling was discussed and it was pointed out the homeowners would not recycle if another alternate such as burning or landfilling were available.

Jim Gardner responded that after the facts have been reviewed by Metro and the State DEQ, more facts and information would be available.

Discussion of Functional Planning regarding process and time frame was then introduced. Jim Sitzman and Ardis Stevens briefed the committee on the assumptions and values they believe necessary to promote the adoption of a functional plan for solid waste management. This was followed by the Land Use Transition Team's recommendations, which are attached.

Discussion continued describing a potential plan. The key elements are:

1. Description of the waste management flow with emphasis on Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Recover.
2. Definition of the problem by providing evidence of the magnitude of waste to be managed.
3. Describe and analyze alternatives and the influence Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Recover would have on cutting back the tonnage.
4. Stating Metro's policy choices and alternatives.
5. Addressing the siting requirements.
6. Describing the landfill requirements.

Additional work to be completed are:

1. Identification of the types and locations of necessary solid waste facilities such as recycling centers, processing centers, transfer stations and resource recovery plants.
2. Addressing siting requirements with regard to local comprehensive plans.
3. Show remaining requirements for landfill siting.
4. Identify a cooperative processing involving local governments for siting the facilities.
5. Complete an analysis of the impact of the facilities on economic development.

A general calendar citing the time frame of involvement by council, local jurisdictions and key leaders was introduced. Discussion followed.

Kim Duncan then introduced a list of Solid Waste related bills now under consideration in Salem.

Metro will need to clarify their positions on the following bills: HB2026, LC1031, HB2654, HB2493, HB2619, and SB11.

The process for legislative program needs to be clarified and possibly changed. Jim Gardner and Kim Duncan will meet to discuss.

Discussion of legislation concerning solid waste continued.

HB2654 was discussed at length. Metro has been opposed to any extension of the landfill siting deadline. The Committee requested Solid Waste staff to report on the impact of this bill to help in the decision to solidify the Council's position or possibly change their position. The Committee also requested that Kim Duncan provide the Council with DEQ's position on this bill. Sharron Kelley opined that the Council Solid Waste Committee's opinion should coordinate with the DEQ position.

The Committee also requested a staff report regarding the space left at St. Johns Landfill and the effect that the bill regarding moving the DEQ deadline back to 1989 will have.

Tor Lyshaug responded that he would like to hold off the report until the staff has prepared a complete report specifying solutions for diverting garbage from St. Johns.

Gary Hansen questioned the proposed 1992 on-line construction time frame of a new landfill and its effect on St. Johns proposed 1991 closing.

Staff is now considering alternatives in dealing with the waste stream in case of delays.

Jon Allred was then introduced to present the Yard Debris Marketing Plan. Solid Waste Reduction Program calls for stimulating markets for recyclable materials. A marketing survey has been completed and found that compost is the most viable potential market for yard debris. 75% of yard debris being landfilled can be diverted by this marketing plan which reduce the waste stream by 10%. Three elements of the market plans are:

1. Economic trends
2. A month-by-month schedule of marketing tasks for Metro to accomplish.
3. Recommended business practices for private processes.

Jim Gardner responded questioning the interaction that may exist should we choose mixed waste composting as an Alternative Technology.

Jon responded that this is a concern that has been conveyed to vendors and the staff's position is that they would like to protect the integrity of the compost markets made from yard debris. The memorandum of understanding to be reached with the composting vendors must include an address and resolution of this issue.

Gary Hansen questioned how the marketing plan has been accepted by the processors.

Jon explained that both processors support presentation to the Council of this plan.

Jim questioned the supply and demand. There is a staff report forthcoming regarding this.

Certification was discussed regarding yard debris haulers.

Dennis Mulvihill responded that next year is slated as the time frame for developing guidelines for the haulers for yard debris and presenting the need for certification to the council then.

Discussion on certification continued.

Agenda items for future meetings to include:

- DEQ on pollution risk factors (air and ground) in understandable language
- Legislative review of solid waste-related bills
- Executive Officer's concerns of policy makers being on a technical review committee

- Clarification of councilors role in citizen involvement process
- Update on Waste Reduction Plan

Next meeting is scheduled for March 10, 1987 at 5:00 p.m.