

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO SOLID)	ORDINANCE NO. 86-214
WASTE DISPOSAL CHARGES, REGIONAL)	
TRANSFER CHARGES AND USER FEES:)	
AMENDING METRO CODE SECTIONS)	
5.01.150, 5.02.020, 5.02.025,)	
5.02.045, 5.02.050, 5.02.065 AND)	
5.02.070; AND ESTABLISHING METRO)	
CODE SECTION 5.02.075 FOR)	
COLLECTION OF A CERTIFICATION)	
NON-COMPLIANCE FEE)	

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT HEREBY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Metro Code Section 5.01.150, User Fees, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding Section 5.01.040(a)(2) of this chapter, the Council will set User Fees annually, and more frequently if necessary, which fees shall apply to processing facilities, transfer stations, resource recovery facilities or disposal sites which are owned, operated, or franchised by the District or which are liable for payment of User Fees pursuant to a special agreement with the District. User Fees shall not apply to wastes received at franchised processing centers that accomplish materials recovery and recycling as a primary operation.

"(b) User Fees shall be in addition to any other fee, tax or charge imposed upon a processing facility, transfer station, resource recovery facility or disposal site.

"(c) User Fees shall be separately stated upon records of the processing facility, transfer station, resource recovery facility or disposal site.

"(d) User Fees shall be paid to the District on or before the 20th day of each month following each preceding month of operation.

"(e) There is no liability for User Fees on charge accounts that are worthless and charged off as uncollectable provided that an affidavit is filed with the District stating the name and amount of each uncollectable charge account. If the fees have previously been paid a deduction may be taken from the next payment due to the District for the amount found worthless and charged off. If any such account thereafter, in whole or in part, is collected, the amount so collected shall be included in the first return filed after such collection, and the fees shall be paid with the return.

"(f) All User Fees shall be paid in the form of a remittance payable to the District. All User Fees received by the District shall be deposited in the Solid Waste Operating Fund and used only for the administration, implementation, operation and enforcement of the Solid Waste Management Plan."

Section 2. Metro Code Section 5.02.020, Disposal Charges at St. Johns Landfill, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A commercial base disposal rate of \$9.25 per ton of solid waste delivered is established for disposal at the St. Johns Landfill. A private base disposal rate of \$2.17 per cubic yard is established for disposal at the St. Johns Landfill. Said rate shall be in addition to other fees, charges and surcharges established pursuant to this chapter.

"(b) The minimum charge for commercial vehicles shall be for one ton of solid waste. The minimum charge for private vehicles shall be for two and one-half cubic yards of solid waste. The minimum charge for private trips shall be waived for any person delivering one-half cubic yard or more of acceptable recyclable materials. Such persons shall be charged for the actual amount of waste delivered at the extra yardage rate.

"(c) The following disposal charges shall be collected by the Metropolitan Service District from all persons disposing of solid waste at the St. Johns Landfill:"

ST. JOHNS LANDFILL

Vehicle Category	Fee Component	Tonnage Rate \$/ton	Compacted Rate \$/cy	Uncompacted Rate \$/cy
<u>Commercial</u>				
	Base Rate	\$ 9.25	\$2.73	\$1.16
	Metro User Fee	3.20	.95	.40
	Regional Transfer Charge	2.75	.80	.35
	Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fee	.50	.15	.06
	State Landfill Siting Fee	<u>1.00</u>	<u>.30</u>	<u>.12</u>
	Total Rate	\$16.70	\$4.93	\$2.09

Vehicle Category	Fee Component	Trip Rate \$/2.5 cy	Extra Yards \$/cy
<u>Private</u>			
	Base Rate	\$5.43	\$2.17
	Metro User Fee	1.00	.40
	Regional Transfer Charge	1.87	.75
	Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fee	.15	.06
	State Landfill Siting Fee	<u>.30</u>	<u>.12</u>
	Total Rate	\$8.75	\$3.50

<u>Type of Tire</u>	<u>Disposal Rate Per Unit</u>
<u>Tires</u>	
Passenger (up to 10 ply)	\$.50
Passenger (on rim)	2.00
Truck (20"-48")	2.00
Truck (on rim)	8.00
Small Solids	2.75
Dual (off rim)	9.00
Tractor (off rim)	9.00
Grader (off rim)	9.00
Duplex (off rim)	9.00
Large Solids (off rim)	9.00

Section 3. Metro Code Section 5.02.025, Disposal Charges

at Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A commercial base disposal rate of \$9.25 per ton of solid waste delivered is established for solid waste disposal at the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center. A private base disposal rate of \$2.17 per cubic yard is established at the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center.

"(b) A convenience charge of \$3.00 per commercial ton and \$.40 per private cubic yard of solid waste delivered is established to be added to the base disposal rate at the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center.

"(c) The base disposal rate and convenience charge established by this section shall be in addition to other fees, charges and surcharges established pursuant to this chapter.

"(d) The minimum charge for commercial vehicles shall be for one ton of solid waste. The minimum charge for private vehicles shall be for two and one-half cubic yards of solid waste. The minimum charge for private trips shall be waived for any person delivering one-half cubic yard or more of acceptable recyclable materials. Such persons shall be charged for the actual amount of waste delivered at the extra yardage rate.

"(e) The following disposal charges shall be collected by the Metropolitan Service District from all persons disposing of solid waste at the Clackamas Transfer & Recycling Center:"

CLACKAMAS TRANSFER & RECYCLING CENTER

Vehicle Category	Fee Component	Tonnage Rate \$/ton	Compacted Rate \$/cy	Uncompacted Rate \$/cy
<u>Commercial</u>				
	Base Rate	\$ 9.25	\$2.73	\$1.16
	Metro User Fee	3.20	.95	.40
	Regional Transfer Charge	2.75	.80	.35
	Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fee	.50	.15	.06
	State Landfill Siting Fee	1.00	.30	.12
	Convenience Charge	<u>3.00</u>	<u>.88</u>	<u>.37</u>
	Total Rate	\$19.70	\$5.81	\$2.46

Vehicle Category	Fee Component	Trip Rate \$/2.5 cy	Extra Yards \$/cy
<u>Private</u>			
	Base Rate	\$5.43	\$2.17
	Metro User Fee	1.00	.40
	Regional Transfer Charge	1.87	.75
	Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fee	.15	.06
	State Landfill Siting Fee	.30	.12
	Convenience Charge	<u>1.00</u>	<u>.40</u>
	Total Rate	\$9.75	\$3.90

<u>Type of Tire</u>	<u>Disposal Rate Per Unit</u>
<u>Tires</u>	
Passenger (up to 10 ply)	\$.50
Passenger (on rim)	2.00
Truck (20"-48")	2.00
Truck (on rim)	8.00
Small Solids	2.75
Dual (off rim)	9.00
Tractor (off rim)	9.00
Grader (off rim)	9.00
Duplex (off rim)	9.00
Large Solids (off rim)	9.00

REPLACEMENT CTRC RATE SCHEDULE

CTRC

Vehicle Category	Fee Component	Tonnage Rate \$/ton	Compacted Rate \$/cy	Uncompacted Rate \$/cy
<u>Commercial</u>				
	Base Rate	\$ 9.45	\$2.79	\$1.18
	Metro User Fee	3.20	.95	.40
	Regional Transfer Charge	2.75	.80	.35
	Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fee	.50	.15	.06
	State Landfill Siting Fee	1.00	.30	.12
	Convenience Charge	<u>3.00</u>	<u>.88</u>	<u>.37</u>
	Total Rate	\$19.90	\$5.87	\$2.48

Vehicle Category	Fee Component	Trip Rate \$/2.5 cy	Extra Yards \$/cy
<u>Private</u>			
	Base Rate	\$5.43	\$2.17
	Metro User Fee	1.00	.40
	Regional Transfer Charge	1.87	.75
	Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fee	.15	.06
	State Landfill Siting Fee	.30	.12
	Convenience Charge	<u>1.00</u>	<u>.40</u>
	Total Rate	\$9.75	\$3.90

<u>Type of Tire</u>	<u>Disposal Rate Per Unit</u>
---------------------	-----------------------------------

Tires

Passenger (up to 10 ply)	\$.50
Passenger (on rim)	2.00
Truck (20"-48")	2.00
Truck (on rim)	8.00
Small Solids	2.75
Dual (off rim)	9.00
Tractor (off rim)	9.00
Grader (off rim)	9.00
Duplex (off rim)	9.00
Large Solids (off rim)	9.00

RM/srs
6623C/485-2
12/01/86

Section 4. Metro Code Section 5.02.045, User Fees, is amended to read as follows:

"The following user fees are established and shall be collected and paid to Metro by the operators of solid waste disposal facilities, whether within or without the boundaries of Metro, for the disposal of solid waste generated, originating, collected or disposed within Metro boundaries in accordance with Metro Code Section 5.01.150:

"(a) For noncompacted commercial solid waste, \$.40 per cubic yard delivered, or \$3.20 per ton delivered.

"(b) For compacted commercial solid waste, \$.95 per cubic yard delivered; or \$3.20 per ton delivered.

"(c) For all material delivered in private cars, station wagons, vans, single and two-wheel trailers, trucks with rated capacities of less than one (1) ton, \$.40 per cubic yard with a minimum charge of \$.80 per load when disposal rates are based on a two cubic yard minimum or \$1.00 per load when rates are based on a two and one-half cubic yard minimum.

"(d) User fees for solid waste delivered in units of less than a whole cubic yard shall be determined and collected on a basis proportional to the fractional yardage delivered.

"(e) Inert material, including but not limited to earth, sand, stone, crushed stone, crushed concrete, broken asphaltic concrete and wood chips used at a landfill for cover, diking, road base or other internal use and for which disposal charges have been waived pursuant to Section 5.02.030 of this chapter shall be exempt from the above user fees.

"(f) User fees shall not apply to wastes received at franchised processing centers that accomplish materials recovery and recycling as a primary operation."

Section 5. Metro Code Section 5.02.050, Regional Transfer Charge, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is hereby established a regional transfer charge which shall be a charge to the operators of solid waste disposal facilities for services rendered by Metro in administering and operating solid waste transfer facilities owned, operated or franchised by Metro. Such charge shall be collected and paid in the form of an add-on to user fees established by Section 5.02.045 of this chapter.

"(b) The following regional transfer charges shall be collected and paid to Metro by the operators of solid waste disposal facilities, whether within or without the boundaries of Metro, for

the disposal of solid waste generated, originating, collected or disposed within Metro boundaries:

"(1) For noncompacted commercial solid waste, \$.35 per cubic yard delivered; \$2.75 per ton delivered.

"(2) For compacted commercial solid waste, \$.80 per cubic yard delivered; \$2.75 per ton delivered.

"(3) For all material delivered in private cars, station wagons, vans, single and two wheel trailers, trucks with rated capacities of less than one (1) ton, \$.75 per cubic yard with a minimum charge of \$1.50 per load when disposal rates are based on a two cubic yard minimum or \$1.87 per load when rates are based on a two and one-half cubic yard minimum."

"(c) Regional transfer charges shall not be collected on wastes disposed at limited use landfills by commercial disposers. The purpose of this exemption is to encourage the disposal of non-food wastes at limited use sites and thus prolong the capacity of general purpose landfills."

"(d) The Solid Waste Director is hereby authorized to exempt those wastes which are disposed at transfer stations or other solid waste facilities not operated by Metro from the collection of Regional Transfer Charges if the following conditions are met:

- i The RTC exemption benefits the entire waste management system and is needed to provide economic incentives for diverting wastes away from a Metro facility; and
- ii The RTC exemption is for a reasonable time not to exceed the completion of construction of the West Transfer & Recycling Center; and
- iii The RTC exemption will apply only to the quantity of waste which does not adversely affect the finances of the entire waste management system; and
- iv The facility agrees to accept the entire quantity of waste from the region that it can legally and operationally accept; and
- v The facility continues to collect other Metro fees as required; and
- vi The RTC exemption is granted to a facility through a written agreement.

"(e) Regional Transfer Charges shall not apply to wastes received at franchised processing centers that accomplish materials recovery and recycling as a primary operation."

Section 6. Metro Code Section 5.02.065, Special Waste Surcharge and Special Waste Permit Application Fees, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There are hereby established a Special Waste Surcharge and a Special Waste Permit Application Fee which shall be collected on all special wastes disposed at the St. Johns Landfill and on all Special Waste Permit Applications. Said Surcharge and fee shall be in addition to any other charge or fee established by this chapter. The purpose of the surcharge and permit application fee is to require disposers of special waste to pay the cost of those services which are provided at the St. Johns Landfill and by the Metro Solid Waste Department to manage special wastes. The said surcharge and fee shall be applied to all special wastes as defined in Metro Code Section 5.02.015.

"(b) The amount of the Special Waste Surcharge collected at the St. Johns Landfill shall be \$4.00 per ton of special waste delivered.

"(c) The minimum charge collected through all fees for each special waste disposal trip shall be \$50.00.

"(d) The amount of the Special Waste Permit Application Fee shall be \$25.00. This fee shall be collected at the time Special Waste Permit Applications are received for processing."

"(e) Lab or testing costs which are incurred by Metro for evaluation of a particular waste may be charged to the disposer of that waste."

"(f) The fees listed in this section shall not be collected from any person who obtains a special waste permit to dispose of waste containing asbestos or other special waste which is removed from a dwelling or apartment building of three or fewer units owned or rented by that person and not disposed of by a commercial hauler or asbestos remover. The purpose of this exemption is to encourage such persons to separate Special Waste from the residential waste stream so that it is disposed of properly."

Section 7. Metro Code, Section 5.02.070, Source Separated Yard Debris Disposal Charge is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is hereby established a reduced disposal fee for Source Separated Yard Debris which shall be collected on all source separated yard debris disposed at the St. Johns Landfill by either commercial or private disposers. Said disposal charge is in lieu of other Base Disposal charges, User Fees, Regional Transfer Charges, Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fees, State Landfill Siting Fees and Certification Non-Compliance Fees which may be required by

Sections 5.02.020, 5.02.025, 5.02.041, 5.02.045, 5.02.046, 5.02.050 and 5.02.075 of this chapter. These other fees shall not be collected on waste which is accepted as source separated yard debris, under the definition of 5.02.015(d). The purpose of the Source Separated Yard Debris Charge is to encourage greater source separation of yard debris so that material is diverted from land disposal at St. Johns and is made available for reuse.

"(b) The amount of the Source Separated Yard Debris charge to be collected at the St. Johns Landfill shall be \$9.25 per ton for source separated yard debris delivered by commercial disposers and \$2.00 per cubic yard for source separated yard debris delivered by private disposers.

"(c) The minimum charge for commercial vehicles delivering source separated yard debris shall be for one ton. The minimum charge for private vehicles delivering source separated yard debris shall be for two and one-half cubic yards. The minimum charge for the delivery of a single Christmas tree as source separated yard debris shall be \$.50.

Section 8. Metro Code, Section 5.02.075, is established to read as follows:

"5.02.075 Certification Non-Compliance Fee

"There is hereby established a Certification Non-Compliance Fee. The purpose of this fee is to pay for the cost of implementing remedial programs to bring non-certified areas or jurisdictions in compliance with current certification standards, and to support other programs which are directed at accomplishing the recycling goals of the certification program. This fee shall be collected on all waste generated in non-certified areas and delivered to Metro facilities by specifically identified commercial disposers and shall be in addition to other fees collected. The Certification Non-Compliance Fee shall be set by the Metropolitan Service District Council when the following conditions have been met:

- "(a) The Metro Council has adopted a Waste Reduction Certification Program which provides criteria and a process for designating local areas or jurisdictions and/or commercial waste disposers as either certified or non-certified for the purpose of collecting this fee; and
- "(b) The Metro Council has made the determination that a local jurisdiction is not in compliance and that implementation of the fee is needed to achieve the purposes stated above.

Section 9. The Council finds that, in order to assure sufficient revenue to operate disposal facilities and programs for 1987, it is necessary that the rates and amendments established herein be effective on April 1, 1987.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 18th day of December, 1986.


Richard Waker, Presiding Officer

Attest:


Clerk of the Council

RM/gl
6623C/485-4
12/29/86

CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 86-214 FOR THE
PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL
RATES TO BE EFFECTIVE ON APRIL 1, 1987

Date: November 28, 1986

Presented by: Steve Rapp
Rich McConagy

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The purpose of this Staff Report is to present the 1987 Rate Study and to introduce Ordinance No. 86-214 which would establish rates to be charged at Metro facilities on and after April 1, 1987. The Rate Study Executive Summary is appended to this Staff Report. The complete Rate Study document has been provided to Councilors separate from the agenda and is available to others on request. A public hearing on the recommended rates will be held at the December 11 Council meeting, and final action on the 1987 rate ordinance is scheduled for December 18. The Solid Waste Rate Review Committee is scheduled to meet on December 4 and is expected to provide its recommendation on the proposed rates at the December 11 Council meeting.

Chapters 1 through 4 of the 1987 Rate Study provide an analysis of costs and a projection of waste flows which allow for a relatively straightforward calculation of disposal rates. In addition to this, however, there are a number of policy options identified in Chapter 5 of the study which could impact these disposal rates if the policies are adopted. Rate Study Chapter 6 presents the policies and rates that staff is recommending for adoption and that have been incorporated in the drafting of Ordinance No. 86-214. The following are the key policies on which the rate recommendation is based:

Recycling Incentives

- Adoption of a differential tip fee (\$4.50 per ton) to support the certification program is recommended, however, the fee should not be implemented at this time, to allow for the success of an alternative approach to certification. Section 8 of the Ordinance indicates the conditions under which the rate would be implemented.
- Modifications to the Metro Code which exempt processing centers that recover materials from having to collect Metro fees are included in Sections 1, 4 and 5 of the Ordinance.

- Continuation of the source separated yard debris rates at St. Johns (\$2.00 per public yard and \$9.45 per commercial ton) is recommended (Section 7 of the Ordinance).

Waste Diversion

The cost of disposing of wastes in Marion County and the cost of paying the \$1.00 per ton State Landfill Siting Fee paid to DEQ for wastes disposed at non-Metro sites are both included in the Base Rate. If either of these costs for diversion had been included in the User Fee, there would be a smaller total rate increase and greater waste flows could be expected at St. Johns.

Fund Balance

Incorporated in the recommended rates of Ordinance Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5, is a policy to limit total rate increases to less than 18 percent over the current year and to about 50 percent of the increase anticipated over the next two years through application of the fund balance to reduce rates. Therefore, \$810,000 of the fund balance is applied to offset 1987 rates. This allows for: one, the initial implementation of a long-term financial management strategy which will help to lower future rates (through allocation of the remaining fund balance to specific financial needs) and two, the moderation of rate increases which are projected for 1988 and future years.

Other Issues

Effective Date

New rates would be effective on April 1, 1987. As a consequence of not being implemented on January 1 the recommended rates are somewhat higher than would be necessary if they were applied all year. If an emergency were declared, rates could be imposed sooner (Ordinance Section 9).

Special Waste Fees

The special waste surcharge is increased from \$3.65 to \$4.00 per ton. Other special waste fees adopted last year remain the same so that the total disposal rate for special waste disposers will be \$20.90 per ton with a \$50.00 per trip minimum charge.

Tire Rates

Increases in tire disposal rates reflect increased handling costs since these rates were last set in 1984. Adjustments range from \$.25 to \$1.25 per tire depending on the type of the tire and the disposal site (Ordinance Sections 2 and 3).

Public Minimum Charge

The two cubic yard minimum charge which has been applied to private cars is eliminated so that cars must pay the same 2.5 cubic yard minimum charge which pickups, vans and trailers are charged. This change will eliminate difficulties which gatehouse attendants have had with administering two separate minimum rates. Fewer than 5 percent of public trips have been charged the two cubic yard minimum. The opportunity for a waiver of the minimum charge remains available for all public customers who deliver at least one-half of a cubic yard of recyclables with their mixed wastes (Ordinance Sections 2 and 3).

As indicated in the Ordinance and the Rate Study document, the net effect of these policies on the recommended rates results in roughly a 17 percent increase in the St. Johns disposal rates. This will result in roughly a 15 percent increase in the CTRC disposal rates since the convenience charge is added to make for a higher total rate at that facility.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Ordinance No. 86-214.

RM/srs
6623C/485-3
12/03/86

1987 RATE STUDY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Rate Study is an annual projection of solid waste operating costs and waste flows which is needed to derive recommended disposal fees and review rate policies. The 1987 Rate Study recommends rates be adjusted, effective April 1, 1987. In addition to detailing revenues and expenses, the 1987 Rate Study is the first rate study to:

- incorporate the implementation of the Waste Reduction Program, which is a comprehensive mixture of recycling and other waste reduction measures;
- include a significant amount of diversion as well as reduction of waste to save landfill space; and
- project future rates to provide guidance for long-range financial decision-making.

The 1987 Rate Study considers two important policies. One is the consideration of financial management policies. The other is the stabilization of rate increases to avoid rate volatility in future years.

Background

The Waste Reduction Program, which along with waste diversion efforts, will substantially reduce the volume of waste that gets buried at landfills, especially St. Johns, and was developed in response to SB 662 of the 1985 Oregon state legislature. Waste reduction efforts under this program, and tonnage limitations of the recently signed lease agreement with the City of Portland for the operation of the landfill are intended to extend the life of the landfill. Timing of its closure is important since the successor general purpose landfill must be ready for operation by St. Johns' closure.

Waste Reduction

Under the Waste Reduction Program, Metro has committed to increasing recycled volumes of waste through the structuring of its rates. After identifying potential rate incentive strategies based on cost of service, staff met with members of various interest groups to review the options, and to solicit ideas on other approaches. Contacted were local government representatives, processing center operators, individuals from the hauling industry, and personnel from not-for-profit reuse centers such as Goodwill or Salvation Army. (For a list, see Table 5-1 in the Rate Study.)

Further input was obtained from Metro's Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee and Rate Review Committee. Recommended rate incentives, all based on cost of service, are 1) differential rates to drive the certification program, explained briefly below; 2) a processing center rate strategy; and 3) special rates for source-separated yard debris at the St. Johns Landfill.

A certification program is being developed, the first year standard of which is compliance with SB 405. SB 405 requires curbside collection of recyclables be available at least once per month to residences. Serious consideration was given to various means of encouraging compliance. Establishing tip fees which are higher for haulers operating in non-certified areas than for haulers in certified areas is considered to be a primary option. A Certification Non-Compliance Fee of \$4.50 per ton would be charged to haulers operating in non-complying areas. Adoption of the fee would promote compliance with the certification program. Though the fee is proposed to be adopted, implementation is not recommended at this time, since alternative strategies are currently being developed to produce voluntary compliance with certification standards. If voluntary compliance is adequate, implementation of the differential will be unnecessary. By adopting this differential rate in the ordinance, implementation if the need exists, would be more immediate than if the rate were not adopted.

Several rate options to increase utilization of waste processing centers were evaluated, also modifying the rate ordinances to waive Metro fees at processing centers would encourage the development and operation of these facilities. A key strategy to increase waste flows to existing processing centers will be to assure the difference between the disposal rate at St. Johns and the rates at processing centers (see the Five-Year Rate Forecast in Chapter 6). The agency will continue to monitor processing center rates, which are currently free of active regulation. If the tipping fee increases at these facilities are unreasonably high, Metro may actively regulate their rates. Staff will review their operations and financial information to assess whether there are forms of assistance which may enable them to operate more efficiently and lower their rates. Reasonable performance expectations for high-grading of waste will be established with the above-mentioned information and results of the current waste composition study.

Yard debris is a major component of the waste stream which could be encouraged to be separated with reduced disposal fees for uncontaminated material. It is recommended tipping fees for source-separated yard debris be set at \$2.00 per cubic yard or \$9.45 per ton at St. Johns to encourage its removal from the waste stream. The \$2.00 rate is the same fee charged at private yard debris processing centers. The rates compare with recommendations of \$3.50 per cubic yard and \$16.90 per ton for other types of waste.

Adjustments in the Special Waste Surcharge and tire disposal rates are recommended to reflect current costs. Special waste costs are projected at \$3.65 per ton, while the costs for tires depend on the

size and if it is on the rim. There are 10 categories. Passenger tire costs are up 100 percent. Some truck tire costs are down over 25 percent. Details are in Chapters 2 and 6. Direct rate incentives to aid reuse centers are not thought to be effective. Staff is reviewing other options to expand and encourage reuse operations or make them more efficient and increase their waste reduction efforts.

Waste Diversion

Numerous options to further reduce the waste flow at St. Johns by diverting waste to other facilities were considered. The Council has already approved a ban on out of planning area waste and a waste transfer and disposal agreement with Marion County. Transfer trucks will haul up to 40,000 tons of waste per year from CTRC to the Brooks Waste-to-Energy Facility. Additionally, staff considered banning dry drop box loads from Metro facilities. (Rate impacts of this alternative are considered in Chapter 5.)

The End Use, Landfill Siting, and Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fees are charges to generate monies for specific purposes. The End Use Fee is a new expense which adds \$.40 per ton to the base rate, and the proceeds will finance implementation of the City of Portland end use plan for the St. Johns Landfill. The Landfill Siting Fee, which is \$1.00 per ton at Metro sites, reimburses DEQ for their costs in siting a new landfill to service the region, and will expire when that agency covers all its costs of siting the successor to St. Johns. The Rehabilitation and Enhancement Fee is \$.50 per ton. The proceeds are to be used to make improvements in the St. Johns area. This \$.50 per ton will also be applied at the new regional landfill.

Metro has already implemented some rate incentives to discourage disposal at Metro facilities (and, therefore, at landfill sites per SB 662). The RTC is currently charged mainly at Metro sites for commercial haulers (all regional public waste pays the RTC), although the whole region benefits from the regional transfer system. If all regional sites were to collect the charge from all disposers, commercial rates could be \$.82 per ton lower at Metro sites, but \$2.27 per ton more elsewhere (assuming rates are adjusted January 1). The Landfill Siting Fee is collected only at Metro facilities, resulting in Metro site users subsidizing non-Metro commercial users about \$.50 per ton, and public haulers \$.06 per cubic yard for their obligation to DEQ. Although the whole region benefits from the User Fee Program, disposers at processing centers do not have to contribute to its costs. This saves disposers at processing centers \$3.20 per ton, and, therefore, encourages use of those facilities.

Fund Balance and Rate Projection

In the next few years, several capital investments are going to be necessary in developing the solid waste disposal system. Metro's financial advisors are recommending the agency begin to establish operating, debt, capital development, capital repair/replacement,

and environmental insurance reserve accounts. Adequately funded accounts will substantially reduce the cost of borrowing and are consistent with standard capital financing practices for utility operations. With major projects such as the West Transfer and Recycling Center (WTRC) and a new landfill soon to be developed, Metro can lower its debt service payments and bolster its financial position by allocating the fund balance to reserve accounts. The current fund balance is \$3.4 million. The challenge this year is to be able to moderate rate increases while implementing a long-term financial strategy.

WTRC will be in operation in 1988 and cause a rate increase of two to three dollars per ton. The commercial rate is expected to be about \$21. Fees are expected to nearly double over the next five years, with average annual increases to be roughly \$3 per ton. A new landfill will be the biggest factor in the rate increases.

With a sufficiently funded operating reserve account, new contingency funds will not need to be generated through rates. This strategy means the fund balance pays a projected \$672,000 (\$610,000 commercial, and \$62,000 public) of costs, containing the 1987 rate increase to 18 percent. Public rates would require an additional \$138,000 from the fund balance to keep the increase to that group down to a percentage increase commensurate the commercial increase.

Waste Flow

The 1987 waste flow at St. Johns is assumed to be 560,750 tons. This volume is consistent with limits specified in the lease agreement with the City of Portland for operation of the landfill. The volume at St. Johns is assumed to be the same as that of the July 1, 1985, to June 30, 1986, period with certain adjustments: wastes from out of the planning area are deducted; the Marion County Waste-to-Energy Plant will receive some diverted waste; some yard debris will be removed from the waste stream; processing centers will receive more recyclables; more diversion to Killingsworth Fast Disposal will further reduce volumes; and further reduction at St. Johns will be as a result of Metro rate increases.

Revenue Requirements

Financial obligations in 1987 include \$6,336,000 in projected disposal costs, \$3,119,000 in transfer costs, \$2,831,000 in User Fee program costs, and \$841,000 in additional legislative requirements. The commercial cost will go up \$2.52 per ton.

1986 Commercial Fee: 14.38 per ton

Major Influences for 1987:

Marion County Diversion	1.10
Rate Adjustment Delay to April 1	1.00
Implementation of Waste Reduction Programs	1.00
Increased Waste Flow Projection Over Projection in 1986 Rate Study	(.70)
1986 Fund Balance Subsidy of Rates	.55
Subsidization of Landfill Siting Fee	.50
End Use Fee	.40
Cover Removal and Later Reseeding of Area of Landfill which has Settled More than Expected	.35
Net Effect of Other Items Such as Reduced Landfill Siting Costs and Lease Payment Savings	<u>(.33)</u>
 Total Revenue Required	 18.25
 Fund Balance Contribution of \$610,000 to Lower Rates	 <u>(1.35)</u>
 Recommended 1987 Commercial Fee	 16.90

One component of the total rate is the User Fee. Consistent with the projection in the fiscal year 1986-87 Budget, it is expected to increase from \$2.04 to \$3.20 per ton. No new programs which the Metro Council has not previously approved are funded by this user fee increase.

Staff recommends the fees be adjusted on April 1, 1987, and the following total rates apply:

METRO FACILITIES

<u>Commercial (\$/ton)</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	
Base Rate	7.86	9.45	
incl. Landfill Siting Fee Subsidy			.50
End Use Fee			.40
Regional Transfer Charge	2.98	2.75	
User Fee	2.04	3.20	
SB 662 Fees	<u>1.50</u>	<u>1.50</u>	
Total St. Johns Landfill	<u>14.38</u>	<u>16.90</u>	
Convenience Charge	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>	
Total CTRC	17.38	19.90	

METRO FACILITIES
(continued)

<u>Public</u> (\$/cu. yd.)	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	
Base Rate	1.92	2.17	
incl. Landfill Siting Fee Subsidy			.06
End Use Fee			.05
Regional Transfer Charge	.68	.75	
User Fee	.22	.40	
SB 662	<u>.18</u>	<u>.18</u>	
Total St. Johns Landfill	3.00	3.50	
Convenience Charge	<u>.40</u>	<u>.40</u>	
Total CTRC	3.40	3.90	

NON-METRO FACILITY FEES

<u>Commercial</u> (\$/cu. yd.)	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
User Fee	.25	.40
RTC*	.37	.35
 <u>Public</u> (\$/cu. yd.)		
User Fee	.22	.40
RTC	.68	.75

*Collected at general purpose sites only.

The RTC is collected from all public users at Hillsboro and Killingsworth.

The rate increase is reasonable considering rates are projected to go up 40 percent over the next two years. Without using fund balance subsidies, revenue requirements indicate commercial rates should go up 27 percent, and public rates 41 percent in 1987.

Conclusions

Over the next five years the solid waste disposal rates are expected to increase substantially. The transition to a new sanitary landfill, operation of additional transfer and recycling centers, and maintaining a comprehensive waste reduction effort will require this level of increases. In the next two years, it is reasonably

certain the rate will need to be raised about 40 percent. By using a portion of the fund balance to maintain an 18 percent increase this year, while allocating the remaining amount to a capital investment strategy, long-term rate increases will be less volatile in the future.

SR/gl
6622C/481-3
11/28/86

Ayes: Councilors Collier, DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Kirkpatrick, Knowles, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilors Cooper and Ragsdale

The motion carried and the minutes were approved.

7. ORDINANCES

7.1 Consideration of Ordinance No. 86-213, for the Purpose of Amending Metro Code Section 2.04.030 to Require Council Approval of Contracts with Another Government Agency (First Reading and Public Hearing)

The Clerk read the Ordinance a first time by title only. Ray Barker, Council Assistant, briefly presented staff's report.

Presiding Officer Waker asked why the agreement with Marion County for the transfer of solid waste had not been listed in staff's report as an intergovernmental agreement entered into during 1986. The Deputy Executive Officer responded that agreement had not been executed at the time the staff report had been prepared.

Motion: Councilor Ragsdale moved the Ordinance be adopted and Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

Presiding Officer Waker opened the public hearing on the Ordinance. There being no testimony, he closed the hearing and announced the second reading of the Ordinance was scheduled for December 18, 1986.

7.2 Consideration of Ordinance No. 86-214, for the Purpose of Establishing Solid Waste Disposal Charges, Regional Transfer Charges and User Fees; Amending Metro Code Sections 5.01.150, 5.02.020, 5.02.025, 5.02.045, 5.02.050, 5.02.060 and 5.02.070; and Establishing Metro Code Section 5.02.075 for Collection of a Certification Non-Compliance Fee (First Reading and Public Hearing)

The Clerk read the Ordinance by title only a first time.

Steve Rapp, Solid Waste Analyst, reviewed the "1987 Rate Study Executive Summary" which was included in the printed agenda materials. He explained the 1987 Rate Study was the first study to incorporate the implementation of the Waste Reduction Program, included a significant amount of diversion as well as reduction of waste to save landfill space, and projected future rates to provide guidance for long-range financial decision-making. He further

explained the rate study considered financial management policies as well as stabilization of rate increases to avoid rate volatility in future years. Mr. Rapp then reviewed more specific provisions of the study.

Rich McConaghy, Solid Waste Analyst, discussed policy options available to the Council including recycling incentives, waste diversion and the solid waste fund balance. Other issues reported included the April 1, 1987, proposed effective date of new rates, special waste fees, tire rates and a public minimum charge for waste disposal.

In response to Councilor Kelley's question, Mr. McConaghy estimated a cost of about \$4.50 per ton if a geographic area did not comply with waste reduction program certification standards.

George Hubel, member of the Solid Waste Rate Review Committee (RRC) explained the \$4.50 per ton figure had been presented to the Committee but the RRC did not think there was enough support to impose the fee. Because the RRC considered the matter a political rather than fiscal issue, it had made no recommendation, he explained.

Mr. McConaghy said he hoped Metro would not have to impose the non-compliance fee but thought the existence of the fee would send a signal to any jurisdiction not in compliance with waste reduction policies.

Councilor Kelley questioned whether Metro had the authority to penalize a jurisdiction for non-compliance with waste reduction policies. She recommended deleting reference to the fee from the Ordinance until authority issues were settled.

Responding to Councilor Kelley's question regarding the commercial rate of \$16.90 per ton for disposal at St. Johns Landfill, Mr. McConaghy said a lower rate could effect Metro's bonding capability. Mr. Hubbel added the RRC debated the rate and most members thought the \$16.90 figure too high given Metro's problem of explaining a high solid waste operating fund balance. Mr. Hubel said he could not personally recommend a rate higher than \$16.70 per ton.

Motion: Councilor DeJardin moved the Ordinance be adopted and Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Presiding Officer Waker opened the public hearing on the Ordinance.

Dale Harlan, appearing before the Council for Estle Harlan, a representative of the Tri-County Council of the solid waste industry, read a statement prepared by Ms. Harlan. He also referred

the Council to a letter from Ms. Harland to Metro's Solid Waste Rate Review Committee. Ms. Harlan expressed the following concerns with the Ordinance: 1) the time frame was too short for adequate review of the proposed rates; 2) it was not the cost effective to establish programs costing millions of dollars to extend the life of St. Johns Landfill only a few days; 3) Metro had no statutory authority to manage or regular collection programs such as imposing a \$4.50 per ton differential tip fee; and 4) the Council needed to identify and justify long-term needs when allocating the fund balance.

Referring to Ms. Harlan's letter to the RRC, Councilor Hansen asked staff to respond to Ms. Harlan's statement that \$1.3 million would be spent to add two days to the life span of St. Johns Landfill.

Mr. Rapp responded that the \$1.3 million was "seed" money which would derive future dividends: \$310,000 was allocated for resource recovery; \$300,000 for promotion and education; \$175,000 for market assistance; and \$35,000 for a waste composition study. He explained the impact of the curbside recycling collection program would add two days to the life of St. Johns Landfill. When other measures were considered, the landfill's life would be extended longer.

Ron Honstein testified the Washington County Refuse Haulers Association was opposed to increasing disposal fees. Metro's solid waste operating fund balance was ridiculously high, he said, and should be reduced. Mr. Honstein said his hauling firm paid about \$6,500 a year to Metro for dumping fees and he resented being Metro's tax collector. He said Metro could have saved money by siting a new landfill in Newberg in 1982 when Angus McFee offered his landfill site for that purpose. He criticized the performance of Metro's Solid Waste Department staff and in response to Councilor Frewing's question about ways Metro could save money, he suggested the staff person who worked to site the west transfer and recycling center be fired now that the facility was sited.

Merle Irvine, Manager of Oregon Processing & Recycling Center, supported removal of user fees and transfer charges from source separated material. This practice, he said, was consistent with the State mandated waste reduction program. Mr. Irvine encouraged Metro to adopt policies other than rate differentials for a viable waste reduction program.

Presiding Officer Waker read a letter from Michael M. Miller, President of Goodwill Industries of Oregon. Mr. Miller strongly encouraged Metro to keep tipping fees low for his industry. "Without Goodwill's reprocessing and recycling efforts, more than 15 million additional pounds of materials would in all likelihood be shipped to local landfills rather than being recycled."

The Presiding Officer also read a letter from Elizabeth Haglund, President of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Ms. Haglund also urged low tipping fees for source separated waste. She explained disposal fees paid by St. Vincent had increased to an average rate of about \$3,000 a month. She believed the proposed rate increased for April 1, 1987 would further jeopardize the Society's Community Service Program. "Based upon our experience, a rate increased will result in an increased flow of unusable materials through illegal dumping."

Councilor Van Bergen, referring to Mr. Irvine's earlier statement that Metro should employ methods other than rate differentials to reduce waste, requested he relate ideas for staff consideration.

Jack Flemming, 6233 N.E. Alameda, Portland, a Metro area recycler, testified the current \$3.5 million solid waste operating fund balance was too high, his disposal charges were too high and as such, he should receive a rebate. He explained it was becoming very difficult to run a profitable recycling business in light of high disposal fees and the fact that the City of Portland planned to subsidize a recycling program. He agreed with Mr. Honstein's earlier testimony that it was unfair to use waste collectors as tax collectors. He did not think true costs had increased enough to warrant another rate increase.

The Presiding Officer explained Metro's high fund balance was a direct result of the fact that the disposal rates at St. Johns Landfill had been the lowest in the region. Far more waste was disposed at that facility than projected because of low disposal rates and thus, a high fund balance had resulted. Metro now needed to find another place to dispose of the region's waste, he said.

Councilor Gardner further explained to those testifying earlier that Metro's rate policies were in direct response to Senate Bill 662 and the State's mandate to reduce the amount of waste landfilled.

Mr. Flemming noted the State had mandated that be done in a cost effective manner. Councilor Gardner said "cost effective" must be defined as "reasonable" rather than "cheapest."

The Presiding Officer asked if Councilors had concerns or specific amendments for staff to consider before the second reading of the Ordinance on December 18.

Councilor DeJardin said he was concerned about the use of the word "manage" when defining Metro's solid waste authority. Per Dale Harlan's testimony, he did not want "manage" to be construed as authority to collect solid waste.

Councilor Ragsdale said he was concerned rates be reasonable but still comply with the State's mandate to reduce waste. Mr. McConaghy referred to a chart in staff's report which projected disposal rates if no alternative technology project were in place and another landfill were needed.

There being no further testimony, Presiding Officer Waker closed the public hearing and announced the second reading of the Ordinance would take place on December 18, 1986.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 Discussion and Public Hearing Regarding the Zoo Tax Levy Ballot Measure

The Presiding Officer announced the Council would conduct the public hearing on this matter at this time out of respect to the public expecting the hearing to start promptly at 7:00 p.m.

Donald Carlson, Deputy Executive Officer, and Councilor Kirkpatrick, liaison between the Metro Council and Friends of the Washington Park Zoo, introduced Resolution No. 86-714 which would establish a ballot title for the proposed \$5.5 million, three year Zoo tax levy.

Presiding Officer Waker opened the public hearing.

Carol Bailey, Director of the Friends of the Zoo (FOZ), said she was speaking on behalf of the FOZ Board of Directors in support of the proposed levy. The Board had reviewed the ballot title and explanation and supported its language, she said, and the FOZ Board would allocate \$5,000 to the Zoo tax levy campaign effort.

Councilor Kirkpatrick said the Council's Zoo Planning Committee recommended the language contained in the proposed ballot title and explanation. The levy would allow Metro to complete the Africa Bush Exhibit and other important projects, she said.

Councilor Hansen asked if the \$500,000 increase over the previous levy would result in a change in the Zoo's operations budget. Kay Rich, Assistant Zoo Director, replied the Zoo's operations costs would increase but the operations budget would continue to be comprised of 50 percent non-tax revenue.

Councilor Frewing said that during discussions of the levy at the Council's Zoo Planning Committee meetings, he had expressed his conviction that the new levy should be devoted exclusively to operations. He said there were other needs for tax dollars in the community and a capital levy would compete with other priorities.

- 6.4 Contract Extension with Skyline Building Maintenance for Janitorial and Maintenance services (at the 2000 S.W. First Avenue Building)

7. ORDINANCES

- 7.1 Consideration of Ordinance No. 86-214, for the Purpose of Establishing Solid Waste Disposal Charges, Regional Transfer Charges and User Fees; Amending Metro Code Section 5.01.150, 5.02.020, 5.02.025, 5.02.045, 5.02.050, 5.02.060 and 5.02.070; and Establishing Metro Code Section 5.02.075 for Collection of a Certification Non-Compliance Fee (Second Reading)

The Clerk read the Ordinance a second time by title only.

Motion: A motion to adopt the Ordinance was made by Councilors DeJardin and Kirkpatrick on December 11, 1986, at the first reading of the Ordinance.

Presiding Officer Waker explained because Estle Harlan, a representative of the Tri-County Council of the solid waste hauling industry, could not attend the meeting, he would read a statement to the Council expressing her concerns about the proposed Ordinance. Ms. Harlan was concerned about the impact of the proposed rate increase on the cost of operations for the solid waste industry. The Tri-County Council recommended the additional solid waste operating fund balance be used to off-set the increase in disposal fees for 1987 as her previous testimony had more fully detailed. Ms. Harlan also recommended not including a specific fee for non-compliance with the waste reduction program in the Ordinance until actual costs were known.

Councilor Gardner reported the Solid Waste Committee recommended the Council not adopt a specific fee for non-compliance with the waste reduction certification program at this time. He said a fee could be adopted after the certification program was developed and language could be left in the Ordinance which would provide for the fee concept.

First Motion to Amend: Councilor Gardner moved, seconded by Councilor Kelley, Section 5.02.075 of the Ordinance be amended to read:

"[(a)] There is hereby established a Certification Non-Compliance Fee. The purpose of this fee is to pay for the cost of implementing remedial programs to bring non-certified areas or jurisdictions in compliance with current certification standards, and to support other programs which are directed at accomplishing the recycling

goals of the waste reduction program. This fee shall be collected on all Metro facilities by specifically identified commercial disposers and shall be in addition to other fees collected. The amount of the Certification Non-Compliance Fee shall [not be implemented and applied until after] be set by the Metro Council when the following conditions have been met:

"[i.] (a) The Metro Council has adopted a Waste Reduction Certification Program which provides criteria and a process for designating local areas or jurisdictions and/or commercial waste disposers as either certified or non-certified for the purpose of collecting this fee; and

"[ii.] (b) The Metro Council has made the determination that [a local jurisdiction is not in compliance and that] implementation of the fee is needed to achieve the purposes stated above[; and].

"[iii. Thirty (30) days have elapsed since the preceding two conditions have been made.]

"[(b) The amount of the Certification Non-Compliance Fee shall be \$4.50 per ton of waste received from a non-certified area.]"

Councilor DeJardin requested staff's response to the proposed amendment. Mr. McConaghy said he supported the Solid Waste Committee's recommendation because it introduced the concept of the non-compliance fee.

George Hubel, Chair of the Solid Waste Rate Review Committee (RRC), supported the amendment because the RRC had been reluctant to make a specific recommendation on the non-compliance fee.

Vote on First Motion to Amend: A vote resulted in all twelve Councilors voting aye.

The motion carried and the Ordinance was amended.

Presiding Officer Waker read a letter from the City of Tigard Mayor in which he expressed concern about the proposed rate increases and the effect of those increases on citizen's disposal rates.

Second Motion to Amend: Councilor Gardner moved the Ordinance be amended to decrease the St. Johns base disposal rate to \$16.70 per ton rather than the \$16.90 recommended rate. Councilor Kelley seconded the motion.

Councilor Gardner explained the Solid Waste Committee recommended the amendment because the \$16.70 figure was more in line with leveling future rate increases and it recognized the historical pattern of revenue projection linked with projected tonnages.

After discussion, it was acknowledged if the amendment were adopted, staff would revise all related figures and totals throughout the ordinance to reflect the lower rate.

Councilor Knowles asked if the recommended amended rate were based on actual calculations and whether the lower rate would endanger the present solid waste operating fund balance for its intended contingencies. Mr. McConaghy said a lower rate would not endanger the solid waste programs and staff would provide new rate and revenue projections as part of the FY 1987-88 budget process.

Vote on Second Motion to Amend: A vote resulted in all twelve Councilors voting aye.

The motion carried and Ordinance No. 86-214 was amended.

Vote on the Main Motion as Amended: A vote resulted in all twelve Councilors voting aye.

The motion carried and Ordinance No. 86-214 was adopted as amended.

7.2 Consideration of Ordinance No. 86-213, for the Purpose of Amending Metro Code Section 2.04.030 to Require Council Approval of Contracts with Another Government Agency (Second Reading)

The Clerk read the Ordinance a second time by title only. There was no discussion on the Ordinance.

Motion: The motion to adopt the Ordinance was made by Councilors Ragsdale and DeJardin at the meeting of December 11, 1986.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all twelve Councilors voting aye.

The motion carried and Ordinance No. 86-213 was adopted.

7.3 Consideration of Ordinance No. 87-216, for the Purpose of Adopting Contract Procedures and Repealing Chapter 2.04.001 to 2.04.270 (First Reading and Public Hearing)

The Clerk read the Ordinance a first time by title only.



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

February 4, 1987

Mr. Charles D. Cameron
County Administrator
Washington County Courthouse
150 North First Avenue
Hillsboro, Oregon 97123

Dear Mr. Cameron:

Enclosed are true copies of the following ordinances adopted by the Metro Council. Please file these ordinances in the Metro files maintained by your county.

Ordinance No. 86-213, Amending Metro Code Section 2.04.030 to Require Council Approval of Contracts with Another Government Agency

Ordinance No. 86-214, Relating to Solid Waste Disposal Charges, Regional Transfer Charges and User Fees; Amending Metro Code Sections 5.01.150, 5.02.020, 5.02.025, 5.02.045, 5.02.050, 5.02.065 and 5.02.070; and Establishing Metro Code Section 5.02.075 for Collection of a Certification Non-Compliance Fee

Ordinance No. 87-216, Adopting Contract Procedures and Repealing Code Chapter 2.04.001 to 2.04.270

Ordinance No. 87-217, Amending Code Section 5.01.030 (Regarding the Transfer of Solid Waste)

Ordinance No. 87-218, Amending Code Section 2.02.040 Regarding Personnel Rules for Appointments

Sincerely,

A. Marie Nelson
Clerk of the Council

Metro Council

Richard Waker
Presiding Officer
District 2

Jim Gardner
Deputy Presiding
Officer
District 3

Mike Ragsdale
District 1

Corky Kirkpatrick
District 4

Tom DeJardin
District 5

George Van Bergen
District 6

Sharron Kelley
District 7

Mike Bonner
District 8

Tanya Collier
District 9

Larry Cooper
District 10

David Knowles
District 11

Gary Hansen
District 12

Executive Officer
Rena Cusma



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

February 4, 1987

Ms. Juanita Orr
County Clerk
Clackamas County Courthouse
8th and Main
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Ms. Orr:

Enclosed are true copies of the following ordinances adopted by the Metro Council. Please file these ordinances in the Metro files maintained by your county.

Ordinance No. 86-213, Amending Metro Code Section 2.04.030 to Require Council Approval of Contracts with Another Government Agency

Ordinance No. 86-214, Relating to Solid Waste Disposal Charges, Regional Transfer Charges and User Fees; Amending Metro Code Sections 5.01.150, 5.02.020, 5.02.025, 5.02.045, 5.02.050, 5.02.065 and 5.02.070; and Establishing Metro Code Section 5.02.075 for Collection of a Certification Non-Compliance Fee

Ordinance No. 87-216, Adopting Contract Procedures and Repealing Code Chapter 2.04.001 to 2.04.270

Ordinance No. 87-217, Amending Code Section 5.01.030 (Regarding the Transfer of Solid Waste)

Ordinance No. 87-218, Amending Code Section 2.02.040 Regarding Personnel Rules for Appointments

Sincerely,

A. Marie Nelson
Clerk of the Council

Metro Council

Richard Waker
Presiding Officer
District 2

Jim Gardner
Deputy Presiding
Officer
District 3

Mike Ragsdale
District 1

Corky Kirkpatrick
District 4

Tom DeJardin
District 5

George Van Bergen
District 6

Sharron Kelley
District 7

Mike Bonner
District 8

Tanya Collier
District 9

Larry Cooper
District 10

David Knowles
District 11

Gary Hansen
District 12

Executive Officer
Rena Cusma



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

February 4, 1987

Ms. Jane McGarvin
Clerk of the Board
Multnomah County Courthouse
1021 S.W. Fourth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Jane:

Enclosed are true copies of the following ordinances adopted by the Metro Council. Please file these ordinances in the Metro files maintained by your county.

Ordinance No. 86-213, Amending Metro Code Section 2.04.030 to Require Council Approval of Contracts with Another Government Agency

Ordinance No. 86-214, Relating to Solid Waste Disposal Charges, Regional Transfer Charges and User Fees; Amending Metro Code Sections 5.01.150, 5.02.020, 5.02.025, 5.02.045, 5.02.050, 5.02.065 and 5.02.070; and Establishing Metro Code Section 5.02.075 for Collection of a Certification Non-Compliance Fee

Ordinance No. 87-216, Adopting Contract Procedures and Repealing Code Chapter 2.04.001 to 2.04.270

Ordinance No. 87-217, Amending Code Section 5.01.030 (Regarding the Transfer of Solid Waste)

Ordinance No. 87-218, Amending Code Section 2.02.040 Regarding Personnel Rules for Appointments

Sincerely,

A. Marie Nelson
Clerk of the Council

Metro Council

Richard Waker
Presiding Officer
District 2

Jim Gardner
Deputy Presiding
Officer
District 3

Mike Ragsdale
District 1

Corky Kirkpatrick
District 4

Tom DeJardin
District 5

George Van Bergen
District 6

Sharron Kelley
District 7

Mike Bonner
District 8

Tanya Collier
District 9

Larry Cooper
District 10

David Knowles
District 11

Gary Hansen
District 12

Executive Officer
Rena Cusma