

A G E N D A



METRO

MEETING: REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: Monday, January 26, 2004

TIME: 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

PLACE: Room 370A & B, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland

5 mins. I. Call to Order and Announcements Susan McLain

Announcements

Responses to Issues from the December 16th Meeting

**Approval of Minutes*

10 mins. II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update Mike Hoglund

70 mins. III. *Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update Matthews/Blauer

After some preliminary internal work, the RSWMP Update process is beginning. SWAC agendas will be heavily weighted with RSWMP-related topics over the next 12 months. This agenda item will launch SWAC's involvement in the RSWMP Update by covering: (1) the key tenets of the current RSWMP; (2) the draft scope for the RSWMP Update project; and (3) the draft public involvement plan for the project

5 mins. V. Other Business and Adjourn Susan McLain

** Materials for these items are included with this agenda.*

All times listed on this agenda are approximate. Items may not be considered in the exact order listed.

Chair: Councilor Susan McLain (797-1553)
Staff: Janet Matthews (797-1826)

Alternate Chair: Councilor Rod Park (797-1547)
Committee Clerk: Michele Adams (797-1649)

Solid Waste Advisory Committee Meeting Summary December 16, 2003

Attendees:

Susan McLain	Steve Schwab	Bruce Walker
Rick Winterhalter	Sarah Jo Chaplen	Jeff Murray
Mike Leichner	Mike Misovetz	John Lucini
Mary Sue Gilliland	Anita Largent	Barb Disser
Eric Merrill	Kevin Rauch	Steven Yett
Doug DeVries	Tanya Schaefer	Doug Anderson
Dave White	Ray Phelps	Janet Matthews
Mark Altenhofen	Terry Waddell	Lee Barrett
Dean Kampfer	Scott Keller	Michele Adams
Michael Hoglund	Karen Feher	

I. Call to Order and Announcements

Susan McLain

- Councilor McLain explained that this meeting was rescheduled due to a Council Retreat. Councilors are discussing organization and chair and committee assignments for 2004.
- Approval of Minutes: Mr. Kampfer motioned to approve the summary; Mr. Misovetz seconded the motion; none opposed; the Executive Summary passed as read.
- Councilor McLain handed out a list of agenda items covered by SWAC during a total of nine meetings in 2003. She requested that members provide feedback on topics for 2004.

II. Solid Waste & Recycling Director's Update

Michael Hoglund

- Mr. Hoglund mentioned that staff are working on a request for proposals (RFP) for transfer station operations. The Council was briefed last week on environmental sustainability elements that could be included. The first option is to structure the RFP with incentives and disincentives for increased material recovery. Council is also inclined to support purchasing wind power and clean air proposals. The RFP will likely be released at the end of January and close at the end of March. During this time, staff will make information related to transfer station operations available and conduct site tours. After staff evaluation of proposals, Council will consider staff recommendations and award a contract at the end of April.
- Council approved six non-system licenses and three local transfer station franchise renewals for Pride, WRI and Recycle America (now known as the Troutdale Transfer Station). The Franchises were approved for a five-year term and have a 65,000-ton limit on in-district wet waste.

III. Next Steps for Recovery: Incentives & Requirements

Doug Anderson/Lee Barrett

Mr. Anderson explained that a Recycling Credits Evaluation Task Force (RCETF) has been convened by Council President Bragdon to look at the Regional System Fee Credit Program – a credit program established in 1998 to encourage material recovery despite the lowered disposal fee. This Task Force is comprised of individuals that have no stake in the industry and they are charged with evaluating the program for cost effectiveness. The Task Force has met several times and has one meeting remaining.

Mr. Anderson said that the Task Force has been looking at many issues to develop an understanding of the solid waste system. For example, they have studied the 62% recovery goal and concluded that approximately 30,000 additional tons are being recovered due to the credit program. They are reluctant to recommend eliminating the program if it will cause backsliding on the recovery rate. However, as there are some undesirable side effects of the program as implemented, they will be recommending some adjustments to the program.

The credits currently kick-in when a facility reaches 30% recovery, and there is concern that facilities that control their waste stream can do load rejection or acceptance to help manipulate their recovery rate. The problem is that they may choose not to recover loads that only have 10% or 20% recoverable materials.

Another area in question is what materials count toward credits. The way the program is structured now, credits are due for all materials that DEQ counts towards the region's recovery rate. An undesirable side effect is that some materials, e.g., brick, are hard to accurately measure for purposes of the recovery rate and eligibility for credits. The Committee is interested in finding a way to tie this program to real, measurable performance. At this point, they are looking at an assay of the residual to determine performance, e.g., if there is no recoverable material left at the back-door, then there has been real effort. This may be determined by random inspections, but the implementation details have not been worked out yet.

The final observation by the Task Force is that Metro instituted this program at a time when the tip fee was lowered and material recovery became less economically viable. The group noted that when tax credits are used as an incentive they typically provide an incentive to do a certain thing. The group's opinion is that these credits do not operate that way; instead they prop up the current system rather than give an incentive for new behavior. They also noted that the credits might be irrelevant in the long run due to other initiatives. The group also believes that if a market will not support the level of recovery that is contemplated by this program, then in the long-run perhaps that market should prevail.

Councilor McLain said that the Task Force's work has also been discussed in draft form with the Council. Mr. Anderson added that the Task Force meetings are noticed and open to the public so SWAC members may attend the final meeting in January if they are interested.

Mr. Barrett began by acknowledging the excellent work of Marta McGuire in coordinating the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP) Contingency Plan Work Group (CPWG). Last spring, Council made some revisions in the RSWMP and at that time, they directed SW&R to convene a committee to recommend a contingency plan that could be implemented if we do not meet the 62% recovery goal. Most people agree that under the current opportunity model, we will not meet the goal. Council directed this committee to focus on increasing recovery in the C&D, commercial and organics sectors and return with a report on recommendations. The CPWG met eight times, listened to experts in the three areas and came up with twelve ideas, then refined the ideas into four recommended strategies. The report outlining these strategies has been completed and is available upon request.

The first required recycling strategy recommended by the group is that all C&D loads be MRF'd prior to landfilling. The only person who voted against this recommendation actually preferred a stricter requirement – disposal bans. This requirement would primarily affect a couple of facilities just outside the Metro boundary that landfill dry waste. It will also require Metro transfer stations to perform more material recovery on dry loads.

The second strategy is to expand the Commercial Technical Assistance Program (CTAP) and to expand commercial outreach efforts. However, the Committee doesn't necessarily support an increase in CTAP funding if it will cause an increase in the tip fee. With that caveat, the group voted unanimously in favor of this recommendation. The CPWG voted six to four, with one abstention, on whether to require businesses to recycle. A number of committee members wanted to link some of these requirements, namely the increased funding of CTAP to local jurisdictions enacting programs to require their businesses to recycle. If jurisdictions hadn't put such programs in place, they would not receive any CTAP funding. This requirement passed by a vote of nine to three.

Strategy three is to MRF (i.e., perform material recovery at a material recovery facility) all dry waste. This requirement would be implemented after the first and second strategies, and is aimed at capturing any remaining recyclables in dry waste loads.

Strategy four encourages Metro to monitor efforts by the City of Portland and City of Gresham to secure an organics processor and implement organics programs. If those efforts result in the recovery of an additional 5,000 tons of organics, then no contingency plan is needed. If they do not, then Metro should consider requiring the 700 largest businesses generating organics in the region to recycle organics

material. Residential collection of organics would also be considered by Metro at that time. The committee expects that if these strategies are employed, the 62% recovery goal will be met. Overall, the CPWG voted eleven to one in favor of recommending these strategies.

Mr. Barrett noted that this information had been presented to the Metro Council and they reacted positively to the recommendations, with some hesitation over mandatory programs. Mr. Hoglund added that some of the Councilors and others have questioned the price elasticity of recyclables – how high does disposal cost have to be before recovery improves. SW&R is going to prepare some information on that. Another question was regarding the impact of these recommendations on prices at landfills and MRFs. Councilor Monroe asked about MRFing operations at landfills. Councilor McLain asked how mandatory MRFing might affect Metro transfer station operations. The Council also identified values such as doing things in a sustainable manner, protecting public health and welfare, protecting the public investment in our transfer stations, and others, to see how the contingency plans align with these values. The next steps are to draft legislation to incorporate these contingency plans into the RSWMP, as an amendment, pending further Council direction. Implementation details will have to be worked out, as well.

Ms. Chaplen remarked that she was not able to attend the meetings of the CPWG, however, she has discussed these issues with Mr. Altenhofen and solicited input from the jurisdictions that she represents. There are a number of concerns. Many cities in Washington County are concerned about economic development and fear that implementing mandatory business recycling could act as a disincentive for businesses considering relocating to Washington County. They are also concerned about linking the amount of educational money to be received with implementing mandatory recycling for local businesses, as this threatens some very successful educational programs. Ms. Chaplen observed that it appears that these contingency plans would be adopted in the RSWMP and then local jurisdictions would be consulted. Mr. Hoglund clarified that draft RSWMP amendment language would be subject to a comment period prior to adoption. Councilor McLain thanked Ms. Chaplen for her comments and stressed that Metro would partner with all jurisdictions to achieve these goals. However, we do want to strive to achieve goals, and develop effective new tools, and the reality is that we may need to go one step further to achieve the 62% recovery goal. Ms. Chaplen replied that she will appreciate the opportunity for further comments and that she's dedicated to accomplishing goals, but it takes time to develop and implement programs.

Mr. Walker said that other cities have had the concerns that Washington County has. However, the City of Portland already has a mandatory program and it works, if only as a way to get businesses to listen to educators and haulers and accept advice on how to implement recycling at their business. The City of Portland has had to issue a few penalties, but the businesses are not leaving Portland due to it. He suggested that everyone work together to send a message that we are not doing enough, and to use places like City of Portland and Seattle as examples. Mr. Walker stressed that we've used the opportunity model; it is now time to consider mandatory requirements to leverage greater recovery.

Mr. White remarked that the haulers participated in this exercise as a worthwhile enterprise and in the spirit of the charge, which was to talk about ideas that could be implemented on a contingency basis to reach the 62% recovery goal. Councilor Newman, in the Council meeting just now, asked what the penalty would be if the 62% goal is not met. There is no penalty; it is a goal. Mr. White does not remember Metro consulting the local governments before arriving at that number. The benefit of these contingency plans will be to show that we made a good faith effort, which will be relevant when presenting our accomplishment to the legislature in 2005. The haulers feel that these contingency plans are being driven by the 62% recovery goal, and the feasibility of that goal is questionable because it is difficult and expensive.

As far as the four recommendations go, Mr. White said he believes industry could agree with the following. The first strategy is realistic, but it has implications and will be difficult. The second strategy will be extremely difficult and expensive due to the mandatory requirement. Even the City of Portland with its mandatory program has hired a consultant to look at how to encourage recycling in North and Northeast Portland. In fact, the mandatory requirement simply enhances the outreach opportunity model. In smaller jurisdictions that have limited staff, mandatory recycling could be particularly difficult. Strategy three can be done. Strategy four, the organics plan, is probably irrelevant due to timing. There is only one year left until 2005 and implementing a program would take that long. The strategy is

convoluted in that if two jurisdictions are making progress then this will not be implemented, but if no jurisdictions have been successful then organics recovery will be mandated. If the cities haven't done it, then there must be a good reason. Strategy four cannot be relied upon to meet our goals.

Mr. White concluded by saying that the haulers will work with Metro and local governments to accomplish these, but the 62% recovery goal is difficult to achieve and he will be happy to support to Metro in 2005 in asking for an extension. Councilor McLain asked for clarification on Mr. White's skepticism about the fourth strategy. Mr. White explained that Metro will evaluate the progress in organics problems after one year – at the end of 2004 – and that makes it impossible to implement a program by 2005. Then, the strategy includes *specific measurables* that if not met, would trigger action to implement programs. If programs were not already in place, then it would be important to look at the realistic reasons why programs don't exist.

Mr. Barrett noted that the City of Portland, with mandatory recycling, had a 2002 recovery rate of 55%. Including the six percent credits, it is nearly 62% and that includes negligible organics recovery. This demonstrates that the 62% recovery goal is not unattainable. As for organics, the problem is that a processor that accepts meat does not exist. There are no negative economics for the 700 largest commercial generators that may be required to recycle organics once a processor is in place, at a tip fee of \$41 per ton. Residential organics recovery has different implications.

Mr. Merrill suggested that if a cost benefit analysis was done, organics recycling might appear to be an economic no-brainer and this type of information could frame the discussion.

Mr. Altenhofen said that he was the person on the CPWG that voted against these contingency plans. However, he clarified that he is not against the substance of these recommendations; he just feels that the details need to be worked out.

Councilor McLain concluded the discussion by acknowledging that these goals are difficult and there is lots of work ahead to determine if they can be implemented.

IV. Other Business and Adjourn

Susan McLain

Councilor McLain reminded the group to share suggestions for topics for the SWAC in 2004. She explained that there will be further discussion on Metro's budget and program resources; a service area report in March; discussions on system capacity; several topics relating to the RSWMP update; contingency plan implementation feedback; and more information on the evolution of waste reduction initiatives. In addition, Councilor McLain suggested that the SWAC could discuss the various roles and responsibilities in the solid waste system. Her experience suggests that the system does not look aligned and efficient from an outsider's perspective.

As there was no further business, Councilor McLain wished everyone a happy holiday season and adjourned the meeting.

Documents to be kept with the record of the meeting (copies available upon request):

Agenda Item I:

- Handout: "2003 SWAC Agenda Items"
- Executive Summary of the November 17, 2003, SWAC meeting

Agenda Item III:

- "Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee: Recycling Credit Evaluation Task Force Status Report"
- "Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Contingency Plan Work Group Summary and Recommendations"
- "Recommended Contingency Strategies"
- PowerPoint presentation, "Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Contingency Plan Work Group"

**Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Update
Public Involvement Plan**

Projected Schedule and Tasks

January to February 2004 – Phase One

- Conduct interviews with focus groups
- Produce summary report based on interviews
- Finalize Metro's public involvement plan
- Develop stakeholder questions and approach

March to April 2004 – Phase Two

- Write stakeholder-specific discussion guides and questionnaires
- Conduct stakeholder interviews and meetings
- Produce summary report

September 2004 to January 2005 – Phase Three

- Facilitate public involvement activities for first draft of RWSMP
- Produce summary report
- Integrate public involvement research into Plan development

February through ^{Sept} August 2005 – Phase Four

- Metro staff review of final draft RSWMP update
- DEQ review of RSWMP update
- Prepare staff report; file ordinance with Metro Council
- Public hearings at Metro Council
- Consideration by Metro Council
- Review by EQC

Regional Solid Waste Management Plan Goals and Objectives

Any plan of this scope must have a guiding vision. The preceding history clearly illustrates an evolving solid waste policy that recognizes the values inherent in protecting the region's environment, providing adequate levels of waste collection and disposal services and efficiently allocating finite fiscal resources.

The vision of this plan can be summarized as follows:

Solid waste is viewed by citizens of the region as a resource to be managed. We understand that the conservation of natural systems – soil, water, air and biological diversity – sustain both economic prosperity and life itself and that the protection of our natural systems requires changes in consumption of resources. In order to build a sustainable future together, we recognize the link between integrated waste management and the conservation of resources as an integral part of the regional decision-making process.

The overall goal of the RSWMP is:

Continue to develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Plan that achieves a solid waste system that is regionally balanced, environmentally sound, cost-effective, technologically feasible and acceptable to the public.

As used in this plan, goals are value-based statements about what is desirable to achieve in the long run. They are broadly worded and express ideals. The objectives are more specific milestones that lead to goal attainment. Performance benchmarks, presented in Chapter 9, are measurable characteristics of the solid waste system that will be used to monitor the success or failure of objectives as they are acted upon.

System-Wide Goals and Objectives

Goal 1 - The Environment. Solid waste management practices that are environmentally sound, conserve natural resources and achieve the maximum feasible reduction of solid waste being landfilled are implemented by the region.

Objective 1.1. The guiding policy for waste management in the region is based on the following priorities:

- Reduce the amount of solid waste generated
- Reuse material for the purpose for which it was originally intended
- Recycle material that cannot be reused
- Compost material that cannot be reused or recycled
- Recover energy from solid waste that cannot be reused, recycled or composted so long as the energy recovery facility preserves the quality of air, water and land resources
- Dispose of, by landfilling, any solid waste that cannot be reused, recycled, composted or from which energy cannot be recovered.

Goal 2 - Education. Residents and businesses of the region are knowledgeable of the full range of waste management options, including waste prevention and reduction, that are available to them.

Objective 2.1. Provide for public education regarding the costs and benefits of alternative waste management practices in a coordinated fashion such that duplication is avoided and consistent information is provided to the public.

Objective 2.2. Involve the public in five-year updates of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. More frequent Plan revisions may be made as conditions warrant.

Objective 2.3. Standardize waste reduction services within the region to the extent possible to minimize confusion on the part of residents and businesses and construct cooperative promotion campaigns that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

Goal 3 - Economics. The costs and benefits to the solid waste system as a whole are the basis for assessing and implementing alternative management practices.

Objective 3.1. System cost (the sum of collection, hauling, processing, transfer and disposal) is the primary criterion used when evaluating the direct costs of alternative solid waste practices rather than only considering the effects on individual parts of the system.

Objective 3.2. The economic and environmental impacts of waste reduction and disposal alternatives are compared on a level playing field in order that waste reduction alternatives have an equal opportunity of being implemented.

Objective 3.3. After consideration of technical and economic feasibility, Metro will support a higher system cost for waste reduction practices to accomplish the regional waste reduction and recycling goals.

Objective 3.4. Government and private industry will work cooperatively to identify, explore and confirm the cost and reliability of emerging solid waste technologies.

Objective 3.5. Implement a system measurement program to provide data on waste generation, recycling and disposal sufficient for informed decision-making and planning.

Goal 4 - Adaptability. A flexible solid waste system exists that can respond to rapidly changing technologies, fluctuating market conditions, major natural disasters and local conditions and needs.

Objective 4.1. Implement an integrated mix of waste management practices to provide for stability in the event that particular alternatives become viable.

Objective 4.2. Government regulation is the minimum necessary to ensure protection of the environment and the public interest without unnecessarily restricting the operation of private solid waste businesses.

Objective 4.3. Facilities that handle, process, buy and sell source-separated recyclables remain in private ownership in order to maintain greater flexibility to rapidly respond to changing market conditions.

Objective 4.4. Integrate local solid waste solutions into the solid waste management system.

Objective 4.5. Solid waste facilities may be publicly or privately owned, depending upon which best serves the public interest. A decision on ownership of transfer and disposal facilities shall be made by Metro on a case-by-case basis.

Objective 4.6. Metro shall encourage competition when making decisions about transfer station ownership or regulation of solid waste facilities in order to promote efficient and effective solid waste services. Metro shall consider whether the decision would increase the degree of vertical integration in the regional solid waste system and whether that increase would adversely affect the public. Vertical integration is the control by a private firm or firms of two or more of the primary functions of a solid waste system - collection, processing, transfer and hauling and disposal.

Goal 5 - Performance. The performance of the solid waste system will be compared to measurable benchmarks on an annual basis.

Goal 6 - Plan Consistency. The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan shall be integrated with other Metro, state, local government, community and planning efforts and shall be consistent with existing Metro policies for managing solid waste.

Objective 6.1. The RSWMP shall be consistent with the adopted Region 2040 Plan and the Regional Framework Plan, when it is adopted.

Objective 6.2. The RSWMP shall be consistent with the State of Oregon Integrated Resource and Solid Waste Management Plan.

Objective 6.3. Each city and county shall provide appropriate zoning to allow planned solid waste facilities or enter into intergovernmental agreements with others to assure such zoning. Whether by outright permitted use, conditional use or otherwise, appropriate zoning shall utilize only clear and use objective standards that do not effectively prohibit solid waste facilities.

Objective 6.4. Metro and local governments shall work together to ensure that solid waste facilities and services are positive contributions to the region.

- a. For any community providing a solid waste "disposal site," as defined by ORS 459.280, Metro shall collect a fee to be used for the purpose of community enhancement.
- b. Solutions to the problems of illegal dumping and to other adverse impacts caused by changes in the waste management system shall be cooperatively developed.
- c. To the extent that tonnage limits and other locally imposed restrictions would prevent Metro from fully using its facilities to carry out this Plan, Metro reserves its authority to override such restrictions, after receiving public comment, by action of its council.

Objective 6.5. The RSWMP shall be recognized through city and county comprehensive plan policies and ordinances governing the siting, permit review and development standards for solid waste facilities.

Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives

Waste Reduction Goals and Objectives

Goal 7 - Regional Waste Reduction Goal. The regional waste reduction goal is to achieve a recovery rate of 62% as defined by state statute by the year 2005. Per capita disposal rates and reductions in waste generated attributable to waste prevention programs are also acknowledged to be key waste reduction indicators.

Goal 8 - Opportunity to Reduce Waste. Participation in waste prevention and recycling is convenient for all households and businesses in the urban portions of the region.

Goal 9 - Sustainability. Secondary resource management is a self-sustaining operation.

Objective 9.1. Include both direct and indirect costs in the price of goods and services such that true least-cost options are chosen by businesses, governments and citizens when making purchasing decisions.

Objective 9.2. Develop markets for secondary material that are stable and provide sufficient incentive for separation of recoverable material from other waste and/or the post-collection recovery of material.

Objective 9.3. Support an environment that fosters development and growth of reuse, recycling and recovery enterprises.

Goal 10 - Integration. Develop an integrated system of waste reduction techniques with emphasis on source separation, not to preclude the need for other forms of recovery such as post-collection material recovery.

Facilities and Services Goals and Objectives

Goal 11 - Accessibility. There is reasonable access to solid waste transfer and disposal services for all residents and businesses of the region.

Objective 11.1. Extend and enhance the accessibility of the infrastructure already in place for the management of the waste stream for which the RSWMP is responsible. These responsibilities include all wastes accepted by general- and limited-purpose landfills, construction and demolition wastes, household hazardous waste and hazardous waste from conditionally exempt generators.

Objective 11.2. Provide reasonable access through new transfer or reload facilities if it becomes evident that waste reduction practices and existing transfer and disposal infrastructure will be unable to keep pace with the future demand for disposal services.

Goal 12 - Recovery Capacity. A regionally balanced system of cost-effective solid waste recovery facilities provides adequate service to all waste generators in the region.

Goal 13 - Toxics Reduction. Protect the environment, residents of the region and workers who collect, transport, process and dispose of waste by educating residents of the region on methods eliminating or reducing the risks arising from hazardous materials.

Objective 13.1. Manage hazardous waste based on the Environmental Protection Agency's hierarchy of "reduce, reuse, recycle, treat, incinerate and landfill."

Objective 13.2. Educate residents of the region about alternatives to the use of hazardous products, proper use of hazardous products, how to generate less hazardous wastes and proper disposal methods for hazardous waste.

Objective 13.3. Provide convenient, safe, efficient and environmentally sound disposal services for hazardous waste that remains after implementing prevention and reuse practices.

Goal 14 - Disaster Management. In the event of a major natural disaster such as an earthquake, windstorm or flood, the regional solid waste system is prepared to quickly restore delivery of normal refuse services and have the capability of removing, recycling and disposing of potentially enormous amounts of debris.

Objective 14.1. Provide both accurate and reliable information for use in predicting the consequences of a major disaster and an inventory of resources available for responding to and recovering from disasters.

Objective 14.2. Develop a phased response plan that coordinates emergency debris management services and maximizes public health and safety.

Objective 14.3. Develop a recovery plan that maximizes the amounts of materials recovered and recycled and minimizes potential environmental impacts.

Objective 14.4. Provide for innovative and flexible fiscal and financial arrangements that promote efficient and effective implementation of response and recovery plans.

Objective 14.5. Ensure the coordination and commitment of local, state and federal governments and the private sector.

Goal 15 - Facility Regulation. Metro's methods for regulatory control of solid waste facilities will include a system of franchising, contracting, owning and/or licensing to ensure that disposal and processing facilities are provided and operated in an acceptable manner.

Metro Revenue System Goals and Objectives

Goal 16 - Revenue Equity and Stability. To ensure that the Metro solid waste revenue system is adequate, stable, equitable and helps achieve the goals of the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

Objective 16.1. Charges to users of Metro-owned disposal facilities will be reasonably related to disposal services received. Charges to residents of the Metro service district who may not be direct users of the disposal system should be related to other benefits received.

Objective 16.2. There will be sufficient revenues to fund the costs of the solid waste system.

Objective 16.3. The revenue system will help the region accomplish management goals such as waste reduction and environmental protection.