

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE
OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

April 2, 1991

Council Chamber

Committee Members Present: Ruth McFarland (Vice Chair), Tom DeJardin,
Jim Gardner, Susan McLain

Committee Members Absent: Judy Wyers (Chair)

Committee Member Also Present: Roger Buchanan

Acting Chair McFarland called the regular meeting to order at 5:39 p.m.

1. Resolution No. 91-1421, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointments of Kent Frutiger, Linda Mullen, and Emilie Kroen to Fill Vacancies on the 1% for Recycling Committee

Judith Mandt, Solid Waste Director Assistant, introduced 1) Kent Frutiger, a resident of the city of Milwaukie in Clackamas County, 2) Linda Mullen, a resident of the city of Portland in Multnomah County, and 3) Emilie Kroen, a resident of the city of Tualatin in Washington County, and she requested the committee recommend confirmation of their appointments as committee members of the 1% for Recycling committee.

Ms. Mandt said after application review with Lee Zimmerman for committee membership, Mr. Frutiger, Ms. Mullen, and Ms. Kroen were recommended. She said the committee's work program would begin with orientation meetings in the spring, and said a schedule for the committee would be developed with the help of Councilor McLain to begin the program for the next funding cycle. She said she and Lee Zimmerman were preparing a report to be presented in May to the Solid Waste Committee on previous years' projects.

In response to Acting Chair McFarland, Mr. Frutiger, former board member of the Inskeep Learning Center, said should the need arise he would be prepared to abstain due to conflict of interests with regard to the Learning Center.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved to recommend Resolution No. 91-1421 to the full Council for adoption.

Councilor DeJardin commented he felt Mr. Frutiger would not need to abstain due to conflict of interests as had been requested. Acting Chair McFarland reiterated Mr. Frutiger had agreed to do so.

Vote: Councilors DeJardin, Gardner, McFarland, and McLain voted aye.

The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

(Continued)

2. Resolution No. 91-1415, For the Purpose of Recognizing the Model Solid Waste Facility Siting Ordinance as Meeting the Requirements of Chapter 16 of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan

Acting Chair McFarland said the committee required information which indicated the proposed ordinance would accomplish what was necessary. Rich Carson, Planning and Development Director, and Mark Turpel, Senior Regional Planner, presented the staff report. Mr. Carson said Metro had agreed to provide a model facility siting ordinance at the time the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) was adopted. He said the model ordinance had been under extensive review by the region's city managers, planning directors, as well as solid waste industry representatives, and said approval was recommended by the Solid Waste Policy Committee, the Solid Waste Technical Committee, the Land Use Sub-Committee and Metro's Executive Officer.

Councilor McLain inquired whether the model included a timeline for various aspects of the plan such as the household hazardous waste collection facility. Mr. Carson explained a periodic review of each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan would be conducted. He said plans would be reviewed for 24 cities in three counties according to an established schedule. He added Washington County had agreed to work with Metro to initiate the model ordinance immediately in conjunction with the Washington County transfer system.

Councilor Gardner noted the definitions included reference to mixed solid waste, and said it appeared the definitions did not include materials recovery facilities which would receive and separate co-mingled recyclables, or an organic composting facility. Mr. Turpel said facilities were defined so a facility could either stand alone, be expanded, and/or combined at one site. Mr. Carson noted a co-mingled facility could be interpreted as a recycling center over which Metro did not retain authority. He said organic compost was considered mixed solid waste and as such was under the purview of Metro.

Councilor Gardner asked if the proposed model ordinance provided clear and objective standards similar in detail and complexity to codes for other institutional and industrial uses. He noted hospital land use issues in locating would be distinct from and less detailed than state standards for permits. Councilor Gardner said he was concerned about blending the land use process with the permitting process. Mr. Carson said DEQ did not want local governments making DEQ decisions. Mr. Turpel noted also citizens in several local jurisdictions had raised health and safety issues, and noted several communities had found the scope of options available helped local governments track DEQ decisions.

Acting Chair McFarland asked if a community could defer siting a facility because of the number of options available. Mr. Turpel responded there

were communities that had no available land on which to site a facility while others did.

In response to Acting Chair McFarland, Mr. Turpel said the definitions section could be rewritten to address concerns regarding mixed solid waste, co-mingled waste, and composting.

Councilor McLain noted Section 7.F. Conditions of Approval and Enforcement, which allowed a city or county to conduct a periodic performance review of a facility to determine whether it continued to comply with applicable standards, was drafted in permissive rather than mandatory language. Mr. Turpel said if a community approved conditional use of a facility, it could subsequently review the conditions and revise them. Councilor McLain noted implementation and review were part of effective model language. Staff agreed mandatory language could be included.

Karla Forsythe, Council Analyst, referred to her memorandum of March 29, 1991 which addressed Metro's involvement in facility siting under the proposed ordinance. Mr. Martin said the standards were clear and objective.

Acting Chair McFarland opened a public hearing.

Jeanne Roy, Recycling Advocates, requested an amendment to definition G on page 3, which she noted referred to the compost facility. She indicated several benefits were derived from source-separated composting such as the final product was deemed of increased value and marketable. She said over 1000 yard debris composting sites were in operation nation wide and a few municipal composting facilities. She said householders became responsible regarding waste and began to reduce personal waste.

Acting Chair McFarland said amended language was proposed as follows: Section 1., Facility Definitions would read:

"G. [~~Mixed~~] Solid waste composting facility: A facility that receives, stores, and processes solid waste to [~~separate out the recyclable and organic components of the waste and to~~] biologically decompose the organic waste under aerobic and anaerobic conditions into a final product such as compost, mulch, etc. that can be stored, sold or used as a soil amendment or for other useful purposes."

Ms. Roy spoke in favor of the proposed amended language. Ms. Roy said materials reach their highest use with source-separation of waste, thus conserving natural resources.

Councilor Gardner noted also the proposed amended language would include, not exclude, mixed solid waste facilities.

Councilor Gardner referred to Section 3, Solid Waste Facilities Allowed by Zone, and expressed concern that the language suggested appropriate zoning for solid waste facilities but did not require inclusion within a particular zone. He asked if a community with industrial land could exclude a facility. Mr. Turpel said Metro would review Findings and Conclusions from cities and counties that did not apply the model to industrial or other zones. He indicated the ordinance set out alternatives to consider.

Councilor Gardner noted the process by which such decisions were made would be discussed under the next agenda item.

Motion as Amended: Councilor DeJardin moved to recommend Resolution No. 91-1415 as amended to the full Council for adoption.

Acting Chair McFarland noted the amended language for Section 7.F. which would delete all use of the word, "may," and insert the word, "shall," instead.

Councilor Gardner indicated he was not in favor of the proposed language changes in Section 7.F.

Larry Shaw, Metro Legal Counsel, stated the proposed language changes to Section 7.F. would require periodic review by the city, and noted the ordinance would lose objectivity in this area if a review was not considered necessary or desired. He said the word "may" would allow a periodic review to be done, but said it would limit such review to the standards contained in the ordinance. Mr. Turpel added that a locality could permit a facility outright, and said that the conditional use process would be used if there were additional community concerns.

Councilor Gardner expressed concern that the complexity of the ordinance made the process so cumbersome that a facility without political support could not be sited, and that the ordinance could be used to reject permitting a facility.

Acting Chair McFarland requested staff draft the amendments and bring the model ordinance back to the committee for further review, and Mr. Carson agreed to this process.

In response to Councilor Gardner, Mr. Carson said under Oregon Law decisions must be made in 120 days.

Mr. Shaw noted concerns based on DEQ prerequisites of land use compatibility statements prior to permitting, and said the model ordinance was objective as written by providing local government options.

Councilor DeJardin said the ordinance should be moved from committee without a clear majority vote, and he noted support for staff's efforts.

Motion Withdrawn: Councilor DeJardin withdrew his motion to recommend Resolution No. 91-1415 as amended to the full Council for adoption pending further review by the Committee.

Councilors Gardner and McLain requested staff review and comment regarding zoning ordinances elsewhere in the region and country to determine the approach taken by other jurisdictions to incorporate permitting regulations.

Ms. Forsythe noted the main item on the agenda for the next Solid Waste Committee meeting was committee consideration of the Washington County Technical Analysis, and asked whether Planning and Development staff would wish to schedule consideration of Resolution No. 91-1415 at the May 7 Solid Waste Committee meeting.

Mr. Carson was concerned the committee have time to consider the Washington County Technical Analysis at the next committee meeting, and agreed Resolution No. 91-1415 should be set over.

Councilor DeJardin expressed regret that Resolution No. 91-1415 could not be moved out of committee at this time.

Ms. Forsythe suggested the committee consider scheduling a special meeting in the fifth week in April.

3. Ordinance No. 91-393, For the Purpose of Amending Ordinance No. 88-266B Adopting the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan to Identify Options for Implementing Local Government Facility Siting Standards

Mr. Carson and Becky Crockett, Regional Planning Supervisor, presented the staff report and said the ordinance amended Chapter 16 of RSWMP and addressed the methods to be used by local governments to implement RSWMP Policy 16.2 requirements for providing appropriate zoning for solid waste facilities. He referred to the methods outlined in the staff report which could be exercised by the local government such as using Metro's model ordinance as a basis for local standards, adopting clear and objective standards, entering into a mitigation agreement with Metro or signing an intergovernmental agreement with Metro when there were no viable sites.

Ms. Crockett discussed the difference between the resolution before the committee and the proposed ordinance. She said local governments would be required to implement the policies in the ordinance. She noted the model ordinance for consideration by the committee in resolution form was not mandatory. She said it was drawn to assist local governments in the development of their own clear and objective standards or in specifying zones for siting solid waste facilities. She added the committee's concerns regarding permissive versus mandatory language should be addressed in the proposed ordinance rather than in the resolution.

Acting Chair McFarland referred to Ms. Forsythe's memorandum of March 29 regarding Ordinance 91-393. In response to Acting Chair McFarland, Ms. Crockett said Metro in the person of the Planning Director (Mr. Carson) determined whether local jurisdictions' findings and conclusions have satisfied the requirements of providing clear and objective standards for siting solid waste facilities or whether an appropriate intergovernmental agreement could be put into place.

Councilor Gardner indicated the ordinance was not explicit that Metro would make determination regarding the findings and conclusions of a locality. He felt the language gave the impression the local jurisdiction would draft and adopt findings and conclusions to say no sites were appropriate for solid waste facilities.

Ms. Crockett noted page 5 of 6 in the chapter language said "the Director of Metro Planning and Development department will provide written notification to each local government it is in compliance with Policy 16.2."

Staff and the committee agreed the language needed clarification. Mr. Carson suggested the word "Metro" be added at the top of page 4 of 6 so that the line would read: "The basis for Metro determining that no sites are available for such facilities would be findings and conclusions based on this Plans, state or federal regulations."

In response to question number 2 of Ms. Forsythe's memorandum, Ms. Crockett said as part of implementation technical materials would be provided which described each item in detail, and said forms would be provided to the local governments regarding compliance with the provisions identified in the chapter. She added a jurisdiction would have to justify they did not have appropriate zones. She said Metro review of the comprehensive plan for the locality could determine no commercial industrial zones for solid waste facilities were found.

In response to Acting Chair McFarland, Mr. Carson indicated legal counsel review of Metro code in this area was advisable as it was administrative in nature.

Staff responded to questions number 3, 4 and 5. Ms. Crockett said at the top of page 5 of 6 it was noted "local implementation of a policy may occur before or during comprehensive plan periodic review," and said the exercise must have been completed prior to periodic review. She said also LCDC had agreed not to sign off on local government periodic review until Metro has agreed that a jurisdiction has satisfied provision of clear and objective standards. Mr. Carson added the same form of review was used by the state to implement state wide planning goals.

Councilor Gardner noted the use of the word "may" was permissive rather than mandatory. He proposed the language read, "...may occur before or shall occur during..."

In response to Councilor Gardner, Mr. Carson said 27 jurisdictions were in varied phases of periodic review at this time, which he said were aligned to maintain order.

Councilor McLain noted a four or five year time frame for the reviews to be completed and the ordinance would be in effect for the 27 jurisdictions. Mr. Carson indicated this time frame would be beneficial to the process.

In response to question number 6, the committee and staff felt the purpose of the process was to guarantee each jurisdiction in the region would be enabled to provide appropriate zoning for solid waste facilities, unless there was no space for such a facility.

Councilor Gardner noted concern about the length of time the process was going to take, and said he felt with Metro's help in providing a model, technical materials and assistance implementation should occur in a shorter time frame. He was concerned that the option to wait until periodic review was in the ordinance.

Mr. Carson noted regarding land use planning in the state that LCDC required amendments which were through the periodic review process, and said if a local jurisdiction adopted zoning that were in violation of the ordinance, Metro would appeal. Mr. Carson noted also this was an amendment to a chapter of a 20 year plan, and said the primary facilities that were to be brought on line would be in Washington County, which he noted had agreed to work with Metro to implement the process.

Councilor Gardner indicated agreement that once the facilities in Washington County were sited and built the system for the foreseeable future would be close to completion, and said at the workshop in 1988 an agreement was made that the local option policy would be part of the RSWMP in exchange for local governments agreements adoption of clear and objective standards for siting facilities in a timely way. He noted he was encouraged by jurisdictions in the region which have agreed to implement the process in this way.

Ms. Forsythe commented the resolution and the ordinance were so interrelated as to suggest they might be set before the Council as companion pieces, and asked did the committee wish to consider them as such.

Motion as Amended: Councilor Gardner moved to recommend Ordinance No. 91-393 as amended to the full Council for adoption and further asked the Presiding Officer to not place that

ordinance on the Council agenda until the Resolution No. 91-1415 is ready for the Council agenda.

Acting Chair McFarland requested a roll call vote.

Vote on Motion as Amended: Councilors DeJardin, Gardner, McLain and McFarland voted aye.

The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

4. Request for Bids for Grinding of Yard Debris at St. Johns Landfill

Ray Barker, Assistant Facilities Manager, presented the staff report and said the committee was being asked to review and comment regarding a Request for Bids for grinding of a mound of source-separated yard debris estimated to be 11,000 cubic yards and weighing about 2,000 tons at St. Johns Landfill. He said the department was recommending the product of grinding the material be stockpiled at the landfill for use as a component in final cover contours for the landfill. He said the department had sent out a request for bids previously, and noted bids had been higher than the funding authorization. He said the process was considered cost effective compared to the alternative of hauling the material off site to be processed.

Acting Chair McFarland asked regarding a \$30,000 cost if it might be more beneficial or cost effective to use the material processed or unprocessed for another purpose. Mr. Barker indicated cost would be greater to grind the material and haul it off site.

Councilor Gardner referred to a letter dated April 1 from Rod Grimm, Grimm's Fuel Co., which has been made a part of the permanent meeting record, and he asked the Solid Waste Department provide a written response to the issues raised by Mr. Grimm.

Acting Chair McFarland opened a public hearing.

Mr. Grimm said Grimm's Fuel Co. was a yard debris processor in the Tualatin area, and said he felt market development of processed yard debris had suffered in the last two years. He commented he felt Metro had given the previous bid to an unqualified party. He disagreed with the concept of processing the yard debris at the landfill and retaining it for use as a landfill cover, and said such material had a higher and better use in the arena of recyclable materials, which he said was to take the place of, and was superior to, peat moss. He agreed with committee comments earlier in the meeting regarding mixed solid waste. He read from a paper which he said expressed his feelings that man had the responsibility to return organic materials to nature in an orderly fashion so plant life can benefit, for what is good for nature is good for man. He said composting is recycling nature's way. He reflected that on a trip into Canada a maple

tree had spoken to him, and said the maple tree asked him to take a plea and spread it, which he said he had done for the last four years. He said the tree's plea was "Garbage we are not. We are meant to be more than the stench of your landfills for we are the soil of the earth, the blanket of the world, the spring of life. Garbage we are not. It is the stench of time, the odor of death. We are the spirit of life and the freshness of air. Garbage we are not. Let me lie down with the brothers before me so that I may be the strength to the seeds that I have sown." He said he felt this was the spirit of the yard debris program.

In response to Acting Chair McFarland, Mr. Barker said it would cost Metro to turn the yard debris mound at St. Johns Landfill over for other purposes and have the material removed. He noted Grimm's Fuel Co. had retained the contract prior to Farmers Plant Aid and said Mr. Grimm's company had performed well.

Mr. Barker noted the material would help against erosion by helping grass get established at the landfill when final contours were installed. He added the yard debris market was due to increase through future plans for curb side recycling of yard debris.

Councilor McLain commented regarding the issues before the committee, which she noted were that Metro felt the mound of yard debris would be best used as processed for landfill cover while Mr. Grimm felt it should be used for peat moss. She asked was the mound of yard debris at the landfill going to cause an imbalance in the market or could Metro absorb the cost of using replacement cover. She noted information regarding specific cost would be helpful. Acting Chair McFarland noted the committee was hearing this matter for review and comment and was not making a decision.

Mr. Barker said the staff report cost estimate was \$64,000 to have the material hauled off site. He noted an estimated cost of less than \$32,000 to have it ground and stockpiled, and said in addition replacement material would have to be procured should the material be removed.

Mr. Grimm stated landfills should be shock absorbers and if markets were not available for a material for a period of time, he suggested, store the material at the landfill until the markets could catch up.

Councilor Gardner said he had concerns regarding the contract with Farmers Plant Aid and restated his request for a written response to Mr. Grimm's letter from the Solid Waste Department.

Acting Chair McFarland called for a five minute recess at 7:40 p.m.

The committee reconvened at 7:45 p.m.

5. Legislation

Ms. Forsythe stated that Councilor Devlin, Chair of the Governmental Affairs Committee, had asked that the Solid Waste Committee review the legislation before the Committee and send comments to the Governmental Affairs Committee regarding the Solid Waste Committee's position on each bill. She said Councilor Devlin noted also that some of the new bills contained concepts already endorsed by the committee and would not go before the full Council.

Mr. Martin said he had reviewed the bills and categorized them as should be 1) monitored, 2) further studied, 3) supported, or 4) not directly related to Solid Waste Department. He added he found no bills to oppose. Mr. Martin categorized the bills as follows: SB 685, monitor; SB 706, not related to Solid Waste; SB 717, monitor; SB 872, needed further study; SB 895, monitor; SB 1092, support; SB 1093, monitor; HB 3089, not related to Solid Waste; HB 3183, needed further study; HB 3339, monitor, support in concept; HB 3342, support; HB 3350, monitor; HB 3256 and HB 3257, monitor; HB 3361, monitor and support; HB 3376, monitor.

In response to Councilors McLain and Gardner, Mr. Martin said the Solid Waste Department would further study the bills so notated and would obtain reports from Burton Weast, lobbyist, as hearings occur.

Acting Chair McFarland opened a public hearing.

Jean Roy, representing Recycling Advocates, agreed the Committee should support HB 3342, and requested the Committee oppose or take no position on SB 872 and SB 717.

Acting Chair McFarland closed the hearing.

Councilors Gardner, McLain and McFarland voiced support SB 895, a bill regarding aseptic packaging. Mr. Martin said after listening to the discussion he concurred with their findings.

Motion: Councilor McLain moved to forward the Committee's legislation recommendations to the Governmental Affairs Committee as discussed by the Committee and staff.

Vote: Councilors DeJardin, Gardner, McLain and McFarland voted aye.

The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

6. Resolution No. 91-1418, For the Purpose of Authorizing an Exemption to Metro Code Chapter 2.04.060, Personal Services Contracts Selection Process, and Authorizing a Sole-Source Contract with Stop Oregon

Litter and Vandalism (SOLV) for the Coordination of the 1991 "SOLV-It"
Clean-Up Event

Acting Chair McFarland indicated she was displeased regarding publicity released for the proposed event prior to the hearing process before the Solid Waste Committee and the Metro Council.

Judith Mandt, Solid Waste Director Assistant, said such an instance would not occur next year and presented the staff report. She said the proposed resolution was for a sole-source contract for a second tier event produced by SOLV, introduced Jack McGowan, Executive Director of SOLV, and noted Pamela Kambur, Assistant Solid Waste Planner, had worked with the neighborhood associations and was available to answer questions.

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved to recommend Resolution No. 91-1418 to the full Council for adoption.

Vote: Councilors DeJardin, Gardner, McLain and McFarland voted aye.

The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Mr. Martin indicated no department updates were necessary, and Acting Chair McFarland removed Agenda Item No. 8, Solid Waste Updates from the agenda, and moved Agenda Item No. 9 to No. 7.

7. Solid Waste Committee Information Requests

Acting Chair McFarland requested prior Committee information requests from the Solid Waste Department which were pending be made available in writing to the Committee.

Acting Chair McFarland opened a public hearing.

George Ward, Consulting Engineer representing Soil Tech, Inc., said in December, 1990 he had issued a request to Rena Cusma, Executive Officer, for consideration to use methane at the landfill that could result in potential cost savings for landfill cover. He said in February he responded to a request for information regarding nine special wastes for consideration for use to utilize methane at the landfill, and said he subsequently met with Metro staff. He referenced his letter to Mr. Dennis O'Neil, Senior Solid Waste Planner, which has been made a part of the permanent meeting record. He said he submitted an application to Metro for a franchise to construct a petroleum-contaminated soil facility on St. Johns Landfill or the corridor entrance, and said Sonas Co. of Pennsylvania had retained his firm with a view toward a \$2.5 to \$3 million dollar facility which he noted would resemble the Riedel composter facility in appearance. He described a rotating drum with a 100 million BTU per hour burner fed by methane which he said would dry the volatiles from the soil

and treat the soil thermally producing clean fill at the landfill entrance for potential use as landfill cover. He added the soil could be blended with yard debris for a cover material. He said staff had prepared a methane production chart with a projected methane flow noting methane production would peak in 1992, and said the amount of methane produced currently would fill the Council Chamber every two minutes. Also noted was the potential reduction in traffic to the Arlington landfill of trucks currently transporting petroleum-contaminated soils. He asked the Committee give serious consideration to his proposal.

Acting Chair McFarland asked Mr. Martin give a report to the Committee at the next regular meeting and to the St. Johns Landfill Sub-committee regarding the outcome of Mr. Ward's meeting with staff planned for the morning of April 3, 1991, and closed the public hearing.

8. Budget Issues

Acting Chair McFarland referenced a letter dated March 1, 1991 from Judy Wyers, Chair, containing budget issues questions, which has been made a part of the permanent meeting record.

In response to Planning & Development (P & D) question #1, Mr. Carson said the department was planning the study of collection options and systems for FY 1991-92 in an effort to assist local and county jurisdictions.

In response to P & D question #2, Mr. Carson said RSWMP was scheduled to be completed FY 1991-92, and staff time would be reduced. Mr. Martin explained the changing nature of solid waste management would mean future planning needs and new development on an ongoing basis.

In response to P & D question #3, regarding the Solid Waste Planning Committee, Mr. Carson said it was effective in bringing regional participation to the table for consideration of solid waste issues, and said the measure of effectiveness was the quality of the work. He noted the yard debris plan, special waste plan, waste reduction effort, and solid waste management plan were worked on by Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee.

In response to General Issues question #1, Mr. Carson said P & D did the planning and the Solid Waste Department implemented.

Councilor Gardner asked staff to respond to questions regarding budget issues only.

In response to Solid Waste question #1, Mr. Martin said the department attempted to identify the amount of material recovered against the dollars expended, and compare the rate with the rate of disposal. In response to Acting Chair McFarland, Mr. Martin said the first year of the 1% for Recycling Program was budgeted at approximately \$350,000, second year at

COUNCIL SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE

April 2, 1991

Page 13

\$500,000 (some of which, he said, remained unexpended), and FY 1991-92 at approximately \$300,000. He added he felt the program was beneficial and generated enthusiasm in areas not normally addressed in solid waste. Councilor McLain voiced support for the 1% for Recycling Program.

In response to Solid Waste question #2, Mr. Martin said the Metro franchise administrator would be devoting time to the Metro franchise code in the coming year, and said legal counsel as well as Planning and Waste Reduction staff would need to apply resources to review technical and policy related issues for redrafting the franchise code. He said rate setting policies and procedures and flow management issues were non-emergency projects which should be addressed in the current year as well as in future years.

In response to Solid Waste question #3, Mr. Martin said he would come to the Committee with input on how the recycling credits program should be funded in the budget.

In response to Solid Waste question #4, Mr. Martin said financial management functions included development and processing of approximately 100 contracts administering the present solid waste management system, process contract payments of approximately \$4 million per month, track waste flow, implement gate house procedures to assure correct revenue collection, track encumbrances and analyze cost alternatives. He added new reporting systems under development as management tools which he noted would require additional resources proposed in the FY 1991-92 budget, and said the reports would be made available to the Committee for review and comment.

In response to Solid Waste question #5, Mr. Martin said a need existed to define the role of the Rate Review Committee, and said review of the franchise code interrelated in that area.

In response to Solid Waste question #6, Mr. Martin said he identified a new position in the Operations Division for flow control management in the proposed budget FY 1991-92.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marilyn Geary-Symons
Committee Clerk