

COUNCIL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting  
of November 15, 1982

Committee Members Present: Councilors Banzer, Bonner, Burton, Deines,  
and Schedeen.

Committee Members Absent: Councilor Oleson

Other Councilors Present: Councilors Etlinger, Kirkpatrick, and  
Williamson.

Staff Present: Don Carlson, Dan Durig, Warren Iliff, Ray  
Barker, Kay Rich, Dennis Mulvihill, Doug  
Drennen, Norm Wietting, Tim Cauller, Dennis  
O'Neil, Phil Fell, Jennifer Sims, Dan  
LaGrande, and Tom O'Connor.

Visitors: Pat Stryker, PRT  
Isaac Regenstreif  
Mike Fitts  
Sandra Brantley  
John Hayes, The Oregonian

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Deines at 5:32 p.m.

1. Consideration and Recommendation for Award of Remodeling Contract for  
Penguinarium.

Warren Iliff, Zoo Director, presented the staff report, as contained in  
the agenda of the meeting.

Motion to recommend Council approval of award of contract to RP&I  
General Contractors for Penguinarium remodeling (Schedeen/Bonner)  
The motion carried unanimously.

2. Solid Waste Budget (Informational)

Dan Durig, Director of Solid Waste, stated that while the Solid Waste  
budget was an informational item for the committee, he would like to  
get direction from the Committee members on what they would like to  
see in the six month budget for the last half of FY 82-83. He said  
a firm proposal would be going to the Services Committee on December  
7th and the Coordinating Committee on December 13th, and that Council's  
first reading of the ordinance was expected December 21st, with 2nd  
reading on January 6, 1983. He said staff would run through the sub-  
programs to bring the committee up-to-date on what had occurred during  
the last six months.

Operation of St. Johns--Norm Wietting, Operations Manager, stated that the major emphasis of the St. Johns budget was the monitoring of the Genstar contract and the monitoring and staffing of the house. He said they had been working over the summer to prepare St. Johns for the increased volume expected once Rossman's landfill was closed, both in waste and traffic, as well as the transfer trucks from CTRC.

Councilor Bonner inquired if the rate of filling was down at St. Johns. Mr. Wietting responded that the rate of filling was down from the original projections that CH2M/Hill had done in 1980. He said that all over the region the waste flow was down approximately 20%.

Mr. Wietting stated that during the last six months of FY 82-83 they anticipated the work program to include: administering the contract for an independent engineering review required under an agreement with the City of Portland; finalization of the St. Johns Yard Debris program; continuance of the St. Johns recycling center; developing a closure plan schedule for St. Johns to be submitted to the City of Portland by July 1983; and developing the FY 83-84 budget. Mr. Durig said there were two options aside from the base budget: 1) the methane gas recovery study, and 2) the end use plan, which wasn't really an option any longer since it was required by the City of Portland by July 1983. Mr. Wietting pointed out that the end use plan schedule deadline of July 1983 was based on a closure of St. Johns in 1984-85, and since they were now looking at a 1987 closure, the July date may be able to slide.

Operation of CTRC--Mr. Wietting stated that when CTRC was budgeted for the year, it was anticipated that the opening would be January 1st. He said that date will now slide to February 1st, but even after that there will be construction going on because the February 1st date was the date for only substantial completion of the contract. Mr. Wietting said the prime responsibility for the next six months was to coordinate the transition between the construction contractor and the operations contractor.

Waste Reduction--Mr. Durig stated it was his understanding from the public workshops, as well as from Councilors, that a shift should occur toward recycling and a need to step back and look at total system design. He said that there may be an increase in the recycling budget to reflect the added emphasis.

Dennis Mulvihill, Waste Reduction Manager, reviewed what had been occurring during the last six months, which included: the Recycling Support Fund, which had funded 17 drop-off centers; funding for PRT; the yard debris demonstration program; the curbside demonstration program which was slated to begin after the first of the year; general education and promotion (recycling switchboard, visiting schools and general education). He said for the next six months it was anticipated that the work program would include: a yard debris program (even though federal funding runs out, there may be a desire to continue it); updating the data base; staffing for the Recycling Subcommittee;

developing a budget for FY 82-84; and monitoring legislation which may be introduced at the legislative session.

Councilor Bonner stated that he felt more funds should go into waste reduction in general and there should be an effort to get feedback from the region on what it wanted. He said he would like to see for the next six months and the first six months of FY 83-84 the establishment of a recycling and waste reduction program that everyone was fully acquainted with, believed in and supported, with a clear budget and a clear source of funding.

Councilor Etlinger stated that he had a resolution he wanted introduced later in the meeting regarding recycling emphasis by Metro.

Energy Recovery--Mr. Durig stated that the six month budget for Energy Recovery had incorporated different elements and that it had been expected that Council would complete its analysis and make a decision by the first of the year. He said approximately \$348,500 had been budgeted for the first six months only: \$250,000 for consulting services and approximately \$75,000 in staff time. He said given the outcome of the November 2nd election, there were four options: 1) stop everything immediately; 2) stop on a selective basis certain elements between now and the end of the year; 3) close out at the end of the year; or 4) look beyond the end of the year and carry the subprogram forward for the last six months of FY 82-83 and budget some amounts of money on the possibility that the program may become possible in some other form or fashion or something might happen in Oregon City to make the site available. He said they had received calls from other parts of the region indicating interest in an energy recovery facility.

Chairman Deines stated that given the vote in Oregon City to continue to direct any activities in Oregon City would appear to be a waste of money. However, he said, he would like to see a final contract in order to build a matrix to show possible prices for energy, interest rates, front end costs and other costs. The purpose of the matrix, he said, would be the ability to then analyze other sites which might become available in the future.

Councilor Bonner said he agreed with Chairman Deines that the option for an energy recovery facility should be kept open in order to compare the burning option with other options but did not think Metro should run for another location. He said there should be regional support for a burning facility before another process was begun. He also commented that it seemed to him that the Oregon City office, as well as the consulting contracts, should be closed down as soon as possible.

Councilor Etlinger asked how much more had to be done in order to do a comparison between burn and bury. He said he wasn't sure that any more money should be spent on the burn option and that the emphasis should be on building a consensus for the elements of a solid waste plan for the next six months.

Transfer Station Planning--Mr. Durig stated that transfer station planning had largely focused on the West Side and that the budget would either stay constant or be slightly reduced. He said he was thinking about looking at the total system and dropping some of the subprograms to create a new subprogram called systems planning. Chairman Deines commented that he thought the systems planning idea was good.

Landfill Siting--Mr. Durig stated the Wildwood Landfill appeal would be before the Multnomah County Commission on November 16th and staff would know more about how to proceed with the budget once a determination was made.

In summary, Mr. Durig stated that it appeared there was a shift toward recycling and going back into total system design, and a shift away from ERF and transfer stations.

Councilor Kirkpatrick stated she was very supportive of recycling but questioned whether it could deal with the total problem. She said she was also concerned about the costs of stepping back and redoing work, and hoped that whatever was done during the next six months would determine a long range solid waste program.

Councilor Burton inquired what legal, binding expenditures were outstanding for the Oregon City Energy Recovery Facility. Mr. Durig responded that staff was currently going through the contracts to see where they stood. Chairman Deines requested that before the December Council meeting that the information should be made available.

Councilor Bonner stated that he had a resolution he wanted to introduce which would focus the discussion. He said the resolution was sponsored by Councilors Burton, Deines, Etlinger, Rhodes and himself.

Resolution No. 82-370, For the purpose of terminating work on the proposed energy recovery facility at Oregon City, and redirecting the Metro Solid Waste Program.

Councilor Bonner stated that the resolution made it clear that the Council, in light of the vote in Oregon City, did not consider the Oregon City site an option; and that the Council wanted a plan and revisions to the solid waste budget.

Motion to recommend Council approval of Resolution No. 82-370 (Bonner/Schedeen).

Councilor Williamson commented that five years and 3.5 million dollars had been spent on the project and felt it was irresponsible for the Council to terminate the work without completing the analysis. He said that Metro had an obligation to the people in the entire region, and not just those in Oregon City.

Councilor Burton stated that the opportunity to conclude the work and present the option as a solution had been lost because the vote had occurred first. He said he understood there was a possibility that the vote in Oregon City might be challenged, and though there was a slim glimmer of hope that ERF was an option, in all likelihood it would not be in Oregon City.

Motion to amend the main motion to delete the language in the second Whereas and insert the following: "Whereas, The Metro Council understands that an energy recovery facility in Oregon City is not currently a legal options". (Burton/Schedeen)

Councilor Bonner stated he had no problem with the amendment but wanted to insert in the Resolve section a statement to the effect that Metro would not challenge the vote in court or participate in any way with efforts to have another vote. He said his reason for the amendment was that he thought it was very important for Metro to respect the results of the vote.

Councilor Williamson commented that if Metro decided it wouldn't challenge the vote, then no one else would.

Councilor Banzer stated that whether it was seventy-four votes or one vote that made the decision in Oregon City, she personally felt that Metro was in a terrible situation if it went in as a regional government and used regionalism to overthrow a local vote. She said the resolution did not preclude looking at an energy recovery facility at another location.

The vote on the motion to amend the main motion carried 4-1. (Bonner dissenting).

Motion to amend the main motion to add a new number two under the Resolve section to read: "Avoid the expenditure of staff resources or monies on any legal challenge to the November 2, 1982 vote in Oregon City", and renumber the remaining Resolves 3 and 4. (Bonner/Schedeen)

Councilor Burton said he had a dilemma with the amendment. He said the Council had not made a decision whether ERF was a good idea or not and was not sure the people in Oregon City had really had an honest opportunity to vote on the issue; but at the same time he did not like the idea of overturning a vote.

Councilor Bonner stated that it was absolutely clear to him that it was a locality's right to vote and just as clear that Metro should abide by that vote.

Councilor Etlinger commented that if a consensus could be reached on what the options were, and if it included ERF, they should go to Salem to get legislative authority to site major public facilities, just as DEQ could do with landfills.

The vote on the motion to amend the main motion carried 4-1 (Burton dissenting).

The vote on the main motion to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 82-370 carried unanimously.

Councilor Bonner then introduced a resolution to close the office in Oregon City.

Resolution No. 82-371, For the purpose of closing Metro's Energy Recovery Office in Oregon City.

Motion to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 82-371 (Bonner/Banzer).

The vote on the motion carried 4-1 (Deines dissenting).

Councilor Banzer stated she had several resolutions she wanted to introduce: 1) a resolution relating to the contracts for the energy recovery facility to assure that Metro had a complete set of papers pertaining to the facility. She said she didn't expect a vote on it that evening but asked that it be taken under advisement. She suggested that it might even be taken care of internally without having to adopt a resolution. Mr. Durig commented that it could and would be done internally. 2) a resolution for the purpose of requesting a change to Department of Environmental Quality rule prohibiting use of gravel pits as landfills. She said that out of the workshops several options were being suggested and that this was one that should be considered. Again, she said it was not for a vote that evening but should be taken under advisement. 3) a resolution for the purpose of authorizing the Metropolitan Service District to gather information regarding the proposed Big Fir landfill site located in Yamhill County near the City of Dundee. Councilor Banzer said this suggestion had also come out of the workshops. She said questions were going to come up regarding the site and wanted the appropriate information gathered should it need to be considered. Again, she asked for no vote.

Chairman Deines stated that he would work with Mr. Durig and Mr. Barker and come back to the Committee at the December meeting to discuss what needed to be done.

Councilor Scheeden then introduced and moved to recommend for Council adoption Resolution No. 82-372, For the purpose of emphasizing recycling as Metro's highest priority while developing solid waste management plan.

Councilor Scheeden stated the resolution was sponsored by Councilor Etlinger. She also said the emphasis of recycling did not preempt other options for disposal of waste but provided a priority for Metro while developing a plan.

Councilor Etlinger stated that the intent of the resolution was that before plans were completed for any new disposal facility, a long range recycling program be implemented.

Chairman Deines commented that the whole solid waste issue needed to be dealt with and that the resolution only addressed one aspect of it and made it the highest priority. He suggested that the title of the Resolution be amended to read, "For the purpose of emphasizing implementation of the Solid Waste Plan while developing the Solid Waste Management Plan".

By unanimous consent, the resolution, as amended, was forwarded to the Council with a recommendation to adopt.

### 3. Presentation of PRT Management Reports.

Dennis Mulvihill introduced Ms. Pat Stryker of PRT and stated that she was present at the request of Council to present PRT's management reports.

Ms. Stryker reviewed with the Committee the management reports, as contained in the agenda of the meeting.

There was then general discussion of PRT activities.

Councilor Burton asked what the Board's plans were after Metro's funding ran out at the end of December, 1982. Ms. Stryker stated they had been able to negotiate a reduction in their warehouse rent, they were looking at their operations to see if they could be cut any more, and they were continuing discussions with other recycling organizations for the merger or sale of their operations. She said they were not planning on going out of business January 1 even though they wouldn't get a check from Metro.

Councilor Etlinger asked if they were planning to come back to the Council and ask for continued funding. Ms. Stryker responded that that Metro's funding was for six months, that the resolution specified no more funding after that period, and that several members of the Council had expressed the feeling that they should not come back. She said they had no plans to request additional funding.

### 4. 1982-83 Budget Changes (Informational)

Jennifer Sims, Budget and Administrative Services Manager, stated there were a significant number of budget actions to bring to the Coordinating Committee at their next meeting, with Council action expected at the last meeting of December and the first meeting of January. She then outlined generally the changes in each fund.

5. First Quarter Financial Report

Don Carlson, Deputy Executive Officer, stated that the First Quarter Financial Report had been distributed at the last Council meeting and that if there were any questions regarding it, staff was available to respond.

6. Consideration of Work Plan for Council Assistant.

Motion to accept Work Plan for Council Assistant (Burton/Banzer).  
Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Written by Everlee Flanigan