

Goals & Key Questions

- **Accountability & Transparency:** How transparent and accountable to the public are the processes managing rate setting?
- **Quality of Service:** Is service cost-effective and does it meet established environmental and performance standards?
- **Rates:** Are customers paying appropriate and fair rates for residential refuse services?

Rate-setting **timeframe may be too long** to truly estimate costs

- Ad hoc nature does not allow for City staff to build expertise
- Rate calculations are complicated, not transparent, and need improved methodology to ensure accuracy

Lack of sufficient **ongoing monitoring**

- Lack of independent audits has led to low public confidence
- Little monitoring of performance standards occurs, including environmental and customer service goals
- Rate Board is not involved in ongoing monitoring outside of rate setting process

The structure of the 1932 Refuse Ordinance has **limited the City's ability to make changes** to the system when issues are identified

Proposed Refuse Measure

3

- Controller established as the **Refuse Rate Administrator**
 - Administer the rate setting process and propose rates to the Rate Board
 - Ongoing financial and performance monitoring of residential refuse provider
- **Rate Board** membership & responsibility changes
 - Remove Controller, add ratepayer representative
 - Approves rate applications and oversees ongoing financial and performance reporting
- Allows **flexibility** for the future
 - Authorizes regulation of commercial rates
 - Allows changes with BOS supermajority, MYR approval