

# ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION

## Meeting Agenda

October 23, 2014

Community Development Building, Siskiyou Room  
51 Winburn Way

---

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Consent Agenda / Reports** (5 min)
  - 2.1. Minutes September 24, 2014 Commission meeting
3. **Announcements** (5 min)
  - 3.1. Next Regular Meeting: November 19, 2014
  - 3.2. Upcoming Sub-committee meetings
    - Sustainability – October 5th, 19th
  - 3.3. Other Announcements from Commissioners
4. **Public Forum** (10 min to be evenly divided by public wishing to speak)
5. **Reports / Presentations/Updates** (35 min)
  - 5.1. Council - Councilor Rosenthal (5 min)
  - 5.2. City Conservation & Operations – Hanks (5 min)
  - 5.3. Quarterly Report – Recology - Buck (5 min)
  - 5.4. Recycling Center Ad-Hoc Re-cap – Hanks (5 min)
  - 5.5. Climate/Energy Sub-committee(15 min)
6. **Old Business**
  - 6.1 Commission Goals – Discussion and Assignments (20 min)
  - 6.2 Commission Monthly Column in Sneak Preview (5 min)
7. **New Business**
  - 7.1 Carbon Fee/Dividend (30 min)
  - 7.2 Bee City USA – Presentation follow up (10 min)
8. **Wrap Up**
  - 8.1 Items to be added to next agenda
  - 8.2 Adjournment (8 PM)

**MINUTES FOR THE ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Wednesday, September 24, 2014**  
**Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Marni Koopman called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. in the Siskiyou Room.

Commissioners Mark Weir, Thomas Beam, Risa Buck, Jim McGinnis, Jim Hartman, Roxane Beigel-Coryell, and Brian Sohl were present. Councilor Rich Rosenthal was present. Commissioner Shel Silverberg was absent. City Staff Adam Hanks and Diana Shiplet were also present.

**2. Announcements**

Salmon Fest will occur on October 4. Buck encourages youth participant in “Slam for Salmon” event.

**3. Public Forum**

Christina LeFever from the Rogue Valley Pollinator Project came to the group to request support for their upcoming request to Council to make Ashland a Bee City, USA. Talent recently became the 2<sup>nd</sup> Bee City and they have also been working on getting Rogue River and Jacksonville to join. Explained that Bee City, USA projects and support are not just for bees, but are for all pollinators.

Laura Ferguson teaches bee-keeping and would also like the Commission to offer their support for the Bee City, USA request. She spoke about the various pollinators and how they work within, particularly, our food production system. She would like the Commission to provide up to \$1,000 in financial support for their projects.

Cat Gould gave an update on recent projects at Helman School. She has started the process for idle-free zones but would encourage the commissioners to attend School Board meetings to see if they can make additional progress in their own schools. Is working with the Chamber of Commerce to create one single notice regarding after-school programs, rather than have each group individually send out notices to all students. Reminded the group to continue to encourage the Council to proceed with fossil-fuel divestment.

Camilla Thorndike and Natalie Mitchell spoke about an upcoming state-wide campaign for carbon pricing. They are working to change the policy of under-priced fossil-fuels. They believe that this effort will succeed where others have failed because it is revenue-neutral. They estimate \$900 will go back to each citizen to off-set the rise in prices on all fossil fuels.

The Group had a discussion for clarification with each of the presenters and asked that discussions about Bee City USA and the Carbon Tax be placed on the next agenda. McGinnis recommended that info, particularly for the carbon tax, go to the sustainability sub-committee so they can make a recommendation to the group for the next meeting.

**4. Reports/ Presentations/ Updates**

*Council Update* – Rosenthal thanked Beigel-Coryell and McGinnis for their presentation at the last Council Study Session. Thought it was well-done, even though Council had questions about the use of the STAR framework. Thought it was positive that Council recognized the need for more Conservation staff.

Rosenthal will be out of town for the next Commission meeting. The group agreed that he should extend an invitation to Councilor Morris to sit in on the commission in his place.

*City Conservation & Operations* – Hanks stated water levels in the reservoir are in good shape after the rain and continued citizen conservation. Conservation staff found an opportunity to partner with Public Works on the upcoming N. Mountain street project. They will be removing the grass in the median and replacing with low-water plantings. Additionally, the Mountain Meadows area is working with the City to remove some of their grass areas to reduce water usage. North Mountain Nature Center will be installing an artificial turf demo project in an area not typically successful at growing grass. Will be good place for educational signage. Hanks is working with the new Park's Director on including Parks in the upcoming city facilities water audit. Lastly, Julie Smitherman is working with a group who is doing some information sessions regarding lower water use grass seeds. They may be working with the School District next year to test some of the new seeds.

*BYOB project* – Hanks and Buck would like the sub-committee to meet to discuss the next steps in getting the word out, as the deadline fast approaches. The sub-committee decided to meet on September 29<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 p.m. in the Siskiyou Room.

*Ashland School District* – Hartman gave update on progress of the roof project. Stated there has been interest from other groups due to low-watering. He is working with Brent Thompson to improve things at the football field, including needing more recycling containers and adding announcements as part of the game. The group thanked him for writing the composting article which will be in an upcoming Sneak Preview.

*Ad-hoc Recycle Center Committee* – Beam and Beigel-Coryell gave update on the recommendation which will be presented to Council. Group discussed financing, and that charges will require further discussion. The committee feels good about the end result of their work.

**Weir/Beam m/s to endorse the memo, with the noted changes, going to Council.** Discussion: group discussed the minor differences between the memo in the packet and the version going to Council. **Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion passes.**

*Sustainability Sub-Committee* (Council study session re-cap) – The group discussed the parts of the meeting which left them confused and how they will use the opportunities in the Climate & Energy section of the STARR Framework to take away the fear or lack of understanding. The group was very pleased that Council clearly acknowledged the need for additional staff.

Group discussed whether the Sustainability Sub-Committee should be re-named the Climate and Energy Sub-Committee to align more with what Council asked of them.

**Beam/Weir m/s to rename the Sustainability Sub-Committee to the Climate and Energy Sub-Committee. No discussion. Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion Passes.**

Group discussed whether the subcommittee needed a change in membership now that the focus had changed. Agreed it was unnecessary. The group discussed the next steps, which includes a response from the commission to Council to get as much clarification as they can. The sub-committee will work on that at their next meeting.

*Leaf Bag Program & Compost Classes* – Buck thanked the group for leading the compost classes. She requested that on the January commission agenda there be time for the group to determine the schedule for next year. She also thanked the group for helping with their work in the Leaf-Bag Program.

**5. Old Business**

*Commission Goals* – Group discussed some of the minor work changes needed. They will discuss further assignments and timelines for the goals at the next commission meeting.

*Sneak Preview Column* – Hartman informed the group it will likely be called, “Conservation Corner.” Due to deadlines and the need for both the commission and the city to give approval to articles before they are submitted, the committee needs to be working at least two months out from publication. They determined the following topics:

- November edition (due Oct 23) - BYOB, author to be determined at the sub-committee meeting.
- December edition (due Nov 23) - Holiday Wrapping, written by Beam
- January edition (due late Dec) – Waste Prevention Resolutions, written by Buck

The article authors will bring their articles to the meeting one month before the due date for the group and the City to give a thumbs up or make required changes. The group is to send topic ideas and possible months for publication to Hanks, who will start a “master calendar” to be further discussed at the October meeting.

**Weir/Beam m/s to accept Hartman’s article as-written. No discussion. Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion Passes.**

**6. New Business**

*Cigarette Butt Collection* – The city has a plan to purchase and install (attach to light poles) collectors with “sponsored by” or “cleaned up by” which ever business takes on that particular collector (typically the bar or restaurant nearest).

**Weir/ Beigel-Coryell m/s to move forward with this project. No discussion. Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion Passes.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Shiplet  
Executive Secretary

# Council Communication

## October 21, 2014, Business Meeting

---

### **Ad-Hoc Recycle Center Committee Recommendations for the Recycle Center, Waste Reduction and Recycling**

---

**FROM:**

Adam Hanks, Management Analyst, adam.hanks@ashland.or.us

**SUMMARY**

The Ad Hoc Recycle Center Committee has developed a final set of recommendations for the Council's consideration and request Council direct staff to begin implementation. These recommendations include:

- Creation of a sticker program for curbside recycling
- Analysis of potential additional materials to be accepted at the Recycle Center
- Development of an expanded education and outreach program for the community
- Exploration and review of potential post consumer food waste diversion programs for implementation in the community
- Updating/Expansion of the existing Opportunity to Recycle Code (AMC 9.22)

Additionally, the Committee had substantial discussion and deliberation on two other significant issues; the removal of comingle recycling options from the Recycle Center and changing the methodology of the current monthly Recycle Center surcharge on Recology customer billings. In both cases, the Committee chose not to recommend changes to the current status.

**BACKGROUND AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

The Ad-Hoc Recycle Center Committee was created and appointed at the request of the Mayor and Council following the October 2013 approval of an updated solid waste and recycling franchise agreement and corresponding rate increase that included a new Recycle Center surcharge that created a separate fee to offset the costs associated with the annual operation of the Recycle Center.

The scope of work of this committee is as follows:

*The ad hoc Recycling and Waste Reduction Committee is charged with making recommendations to the City Council regarding the future of the recycling center; its effectiveness, what form it should take, how it should be funded and whether it should continue to operate at all. The Committee will also examine City-wide waste reduction and recycling efforts; examine best practices and how they might be applied in Ashland to improve waste diversion and recycling; and examine how the recycling center fits or should fit into those efforts.*

*The Committee shall, in the course of its work:*

- *Provide ample opportunity for public input;*



- *Consult with Recology and City staff to determine what impact, if any, its recommendations would have on garbage rates; and*
- *Present its recommendations in writing so they can be easily shared with the public*

In its assessment and response to its charge noted above, the committee broke down the recommendation into two primary categories, each with several sub-components:

Assess the future of the recycle center

- Assessment of its effectiveness
- What form it should take (services offered, materials accepted, etc)
- How it should be funded
- Whether it should continue to operate/exist

Examine community-wide waste reduction and recycling efforts

- Examine current best practices for application in Ashland
- Examine and recommend actions to be implemented to improve waste diversion and recycling
- Examine and recommend role of Recycle Center in waste diversion and recycling for the future

#### Committee Results

The final recommendations document provides a brief description, actions required to implement/take action, proposed timeline and specific recommendations for each of the seven items considered.

#### **FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The final five recommendations put forward by the Committee primarily involve an expense of existing staff time to develop in coordination with Recology staff. Each recommended implementation process will result in more detailed and complete information collected, analyzed and presented to the City Council for their final consideration, which will include financial impact analysis for the City, Recology and residents.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND REQUESTED ACTION:**

Staff recommends Council approval of each of the five recommendations as presented and requests Council direction for staff to begin work on each of the items.

#### **SUGGESTED MOTION:**

I move to accept and approve the recommendations of the Ad-Hoc Recycle Center Committee and direct staff to begin work as described in the Committee recommendations memo.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Ad-Hoc Recycle Center Committee Final Recommendations Memo  
Ashland Municipal Code, Chapter 9.22 – Opportunity to Recycle



# Memo

---

DATE: October 15, 2014  
TO: City Council  
FROM: Ad-Hoc Recycle Center Committee  
RE: Recommendation Regarding the Recycle Center, waste reduction and recycling

---

## 1) Create curbside recycling sticker program

### Description

The implementation of a sticker program for Recycling would provide another opportunity for residents and businesses to participate in curbside recycling and create a financial incentive/reward for minimizing the volume of recycled materials by using the pre-paid stickers only when the bin is completely full which could significantly reduce costs for those that are able to reduce recycle materials volumes.

This provides higher participation in Recology curbside services with only an incremental additional cost as the sticker customers already reside within an existing collection route. Sticker program revenue would offset the incremental additional costs incurred.

### Actions Required

Modification of Solid Waste Rate Resolution to include a Recycle Only Sticker rate. A suggested rate structure would be four stickers for \$20 or 10 stickers for \$40 (to be calculated and formalized with Recology staff).

### Timeline

Resolution including the new fee in the rate structure could be developed and presented to Council within 60 days of Council approval of recommendation.

## Committee Recommendation – Approve and Implement

## 2) Remove comingle recycle collections from the Recycle Center

### Description

Discontinuance of the collection of comingle recycling at the Recycle Center has three primary objectives:

- Maximize participation in the existing curbside comingle services already in place and available to all Recology subscription customers





- Transition the Center to be a recycling resource primarily for materials that are not a part of the comingle curbside collection service.
- Reduce the operating costs of the Recycle Center. As noted in previous committee and Council meetings, the Recycle Center costs are primarily driven by hauling costs from the Center to the Valley View Transfer station. Cardboard has the highest hauling volume, with comingle second. While cardboard has a resale value in the market and provides revenues of between \$20,000 and \$30,000 annually, comingle recycling has no associated revenue. It is estimated that the removal of comingle recycling would save \$25,000 to \$30,000 in annual hauling costs.

The removal of comingle recycling would also provide additional physical space at the Center to offer recycling services for additional materials that are not a part of the curbside collection program and do not currently have a collection point available to the public (see Recommendation #3).

#### Actions Required

Onsite advance notice of removal (30-45 days)  
Physical removal of two 25 yard dumpsters

#### Timeline

Noticing and removal could be accomplished within 60 days of Council approval.

**Committee Recommendation – Do not approve or implement. Cost savings gained do not outweigh overall goal/objective of maintaining waste diversion options for the community (residents and those outside city limits)**

### **3) Change Fee Methodology for Recycle Center Surcharge**

#### Description

The Committee reviewed a series of potential methodologies for billing and collection of fees to cover the operational costs associated with the Recycle Center. Concepts discussed included:

- Maintain existing monthly flat fee surcharge, currently \$1.60/mo per account (7,000 +/-)
- Use City Utility bill and charge each water meter account (roughly equivalent to every property/parcel in Ashland).
  - Approximately 8,200 water meter accounts would equate to a fee of approximately \$1.40/mo per account
- Use City utility bill and charge each electric meter account (roughly equivalent to every residence/business in Ashland)
  - Approximately 11,350 electric meter accounts would equate to a fee of approximately \$1.00/mo per account
- Create a “pay to play” fee collection system at the Recycle Center. Fee would need to be calculated based on estimated use of the Recycle Center
  - Average of 100 customers per day would require a fee of approximately \$4.50
  - Average of 200 customers per day would require a fee of approximately \$2.25



- Create a donation system with signage to describe how the Recycle Center is funded and by whom and provide an unmanned collection option for users (targeting non Recology customers) to contribute to the continued operation and availability of the Recycle Center. Recommended donation could be \$1.00 into a highly secured collection container that is emptied by either Recology or City staff on a regular basis.

**Committee Recommendation – Maintain existing monthly flat fee on Recology customer bills**

**4) Expand (non-curbside collections) materials available to reuse/recycle at the Recycle Center**

Description

Over time, the Recycle Center has expanded its menu of materials accepted for recycle or re-use, the most recent being the soft plastic collections. The Committee would like City staff to work with Recology to develop a list of items currently in the waste stream that could potentially be collected at the Recycle Center that are not part of the curbside collection program. The list would provide information and analysis on the following:

- Current and potential volume expected
- Costs associated with their collection and distribution
- Regulatory issues associated with the materials
- Other pertinent information needed to determine likely new materials to be accepted.

Actions Required

Two to three meetings with City and Recology staff to generate draft document, research issues, develop final report.

Timeline

City and Recology staff could initiate the work immediately and have report available for review within 120 days of Council approval.

**Committee Recommendation – Approve and bring back results to the Council for final implementation approval (with review by Conservation Commission)**

**5) Develop and implement a waste reduction and recycling education and outreach program for the community**

Description

The Committee felt that a critical component to the future success in reaching higher levels of waste reduction and recycling is expanded and targeted education and outreach. While the ongoing efforts by Recology have paid dividends and have played a large role in achieving our current levels of waste prevention and recycling, a more formal and expanded education and outreach program in addition to and in coordination with that of Recology is critical in future success and achievement in the community. Program elements could include:



- Coordinated City/Recology promotional campaign focusing on waste reduction initiatives, best practices and education highlighting existing services available to the community in these areas including and beyond Recology services.
- Curriculum development for use in Elementary and Middle School classrooms
- Targeted action/results activities for Elementary, Middle and High Schools (collections contests, videos, public awareness, etc)
- Hardcopy and web based packets targeted and tailored specifically for each customer group (single family, multi-family and commercial) providing existing services available, best practices, on site assessment self-checklists, details for on-site technical assistance, etc

#### Actions Required

City and Recology staff research, meetings and development of program objectives, tools available to achieve objectives and task allocation and scheduling to implement programs

The Committee recommends that options and recommendations for dedicated funding beyond the existing franchise agreement for the implementation and ongoing activities of the program be included in the development of the plan. Options include expanded participation in the Jackson County Recycling Partnership of which both the City of Ashland and Recology are members.

#### Timeline

Initial development of program could be done within 120 days of Council approval with implementation schedules guiding each program element launch.

### **Committee Recommendation – Approve and bring back results to the Council for final implementation approval (with review by Conservation Commission)**

#### **6) Explore a pilot program or system to offer pre and/or post consumer food waste diversion options**

##### Description

The committee recommends that City staff work with Recology to research and report back to Council potential options for the implementation of one or more pilot programs for pre and/or post consumer food waste handling, which makes up between 15 to 30 percent of the waste stream.

This could include the following:

- Free or reduced cost compost bins to customers for their own separation and compost use
- Centralized location for drop off of approved food waste materials
- Food waste collections service for commercial and/or residential customers
- Other pilot programs that would assist Recology, the City and the community in a long term sustainable solution to remove food waste from the local waste stream.



Reporting shall include potential regulatory issues, estimated customer uptake, program costs, sources of funding, operational impacts and other relevant issues for each of the potential programs researched.

#### Actions Required

City and Recology staff research, meetings and analysis of different pre/post consumer food waste program opportunities.

#### Timeline

Development of a final report could be completed within 180 days of Council approval with implementation dependent on the type and scope of pilot project selected.

### **Committee Recommendation – Approve and bring back results to the Council for final implementation approval (with review by Conservation Commission)**

## **7) Update Ashland Municipal Code 9.22 – Opportunity to Recycle**

#### Description

AMC 9.22 was adopted in 1992 and requires all owners or managers of multi-family sites within Ashland to provide an “opportunity to recycle site” to ensure that all occupants of multi-family dwellings that do not typically have individual trash service have the ability to recycle if they so choose. These sites “shall meet the reasonable requirements of the local solid waste franchisee”.

Additionally, AMC 9.22 requires the owner or manager of a multi-family site to annually inform all tenants of the location of the site and provide information on how to use the site for recycling purposes.

Rather than taking the step of instituting mandatory trash service throughout the community, the committee recommends that City and Recology staff develop formal minimum standards for recycling facilities required to be located on multi-family properties. Standards could be tiered based on the number of units on the property, with more minimum features required for larger complexes with more potential for waste diversion.

The noticing requirement could also be reviewed and updated to require the owner or manager to contact the City or Recology each year to verify their compliance with the noticing requirement and to ensure that they have provided tenants with the most current information available. AMC 9.22 could also include a requirement for an annual or bi-annual on site assessment of the facilities for the larger facilities that have higher minimum standards to ensure that they continue to meet the standards and to offer suggestions or educational opportunities for the owners/managers or the tenants.

#### Actions Required

City and Recology staff research, meetings with coordination of City Legal Staff when appropriate. Contact and coordination with multi-family property owners and managers would



also be required to ensure a code that is functional and can be practically applied in the community.

Timeline

Development of draft ordinance changes and additions could be completed within 180 days of Council approval with implementation beginning after ordinance adoption, which could add an additional 60-90 days.

**Committee Recommendation – Approve and bring back results to the Council for final implementation approval (with review by Conservation Commission)**

Summary of Timeline for Items Recommended for Approval

1)	Create curbside recycling sticker program	60 Days
4)	Expand materials available to reuse/recycle at the Recycle Center	120 Days
5)	Develop and implement a waste reduction and recycling education and outreach program for the community	120 Days
6)	Explore a pilot program or system to offer pre and/or post consumer food waste diversion options	180 Days
7)	Update Ashland Municipal Code 9.22 – Opportunity to Recycle	180 Days

\*Items #2 and #3 were not recommended for approval by the Committee

Additional Considerations

The Committee had several discussions regarding the concept of mandated trash/recycling services as a method of addressing cost equity of the Recycle Center operations, as well as potentially increasing overall recycling/diversion rates within the City. The committee’s preliminary conclusion was that the move to mandated services could potentially contribute to cost equity improvements for the Recycle Center, but that administrative, operational and political challenges would need to be studied further before a formal recommendation could be made.

The Committee suggests that City and Recology staff continue discussions on the merits and challenges of imposing mandated services, including researching other similar communities that have implemented mandated service but does not recommend moving forward until the formal recommendations have been implemented and reviewed for their effectiveness.

Summary

The committee recommends that the Council approve the recommendations of the committee and direct staff to begin work on the five recommendations and work with the City Administrator to develop a schedule for their development and implementation that includes appropriate review and approval by Council as needed.



## **9.22 Opportunity to Recycle**

### **9.22.010 Definitions**

The following words and phrases whenever used in this chapter shall be construed as defined in this section unless from the context a different meaning is intended.

- A. "Common solid waste receptacle" means a receptacle where solid waste is deposited from more than one dwelling unit for collection by a solid waste franchisee.
- B. "Dwelling" or "dwelling unit" has the same meaning as defined in the land use ordinance at AMC 18.08.230 and includes a mobile home park space.
- C. "Multi-family complex" means a multi-family dwelling or any other dwelling, apartment, condominium, facility, mobile home park or location where two or more residential units share a common solid waste receptacle. Transient accommodation facilities such as hotels or motels are not included in this definition.
- D. "Multi-family dwelling" has the same meaning as defined in the land use ordinance at AMC 18.08.220 and includes mobile home park spaces.
- E. "Opportunity to recycle site" means a place for the deposit of tenant separated recyclable material.
- F. "Recyclable material" means all material collected by the local solid waste franchisee under its residential on-route collection program for purposes of recycling.
- G. "Responsible person" means the owner of a multi-family complex in those complexes where the tenants individually contract directly with the local solid waste franchisee for solid waste collection. Otherwise responsible person means the person or persons who contract with the local solid waste franchisee for solid waste collection of solid waste from the common solid waste receptacle in a multi-family complex.
- H. "Tenant" includes owner in the case of a condominium or other multi-family complex where the dwelling unit is individually owned and the owner resides in the unit.

### **9.22.020 Generally**

- A. Every multi-family complex shall include on the premises an opportunity to recycle site provided by the responsible person or owner of the multi-family complex or both.
- B. All multi-family complex leases or rental agreements or any other type of agreement providing for the lease of property or space for residential purposes may, at the discretion of the landlord or owner, state that tenants or occupants shall deposit recyclable materials in the opportunity to recycle site provided on the premises.
- C. Within thirty days of the effective date of this chapter and at least once a year thereafter, the responsible person, or the owner of a multi-family complex, or both,

shall inform tenants of the multi-family complex of the location of the opportunity to recycle site and of information about how to recycle. New tenants shall be informed by the responsible person, or by the owner of a multi-family complex, or both, about the opportunity to recycle at the time of entering into a lease or rental agreement or any other type of agreement providing for the lease of property or space for residential purposes.

#### **9.22.030 Opportunity to recycle site standards**

The opportunity to recycle site:

- A. Shall meet the reasonable requirements of the local solid waste franchisee.
- B. Shall, whenever reasonably feasible, be centrally located in a single repository in the multi-family complex. Small multi-family complexes may use individual curbside containers for recyclable material if permitted by the local solid waste franchisee.

#### **9.22.040 Exemptions**

The City Administrator, or designee, may exempt a multifamily complex from the requirements of this chapter upon a showing by the applicant that the conditions of this chapter would cause undue hardship. The phrase "undue hardship" shall be construed to include, but not be limited to:

- 1. Situations where the physical environment of an existing complex cannot be reasonably adapted to provide the opportunity to recycle;
- 2. Situations where the opportunity to recycle is being met in some other manner; or
- 3. Situations where compliance with the requirements of this Ordinance would deprive a person of a legally-protected right.

#### **9.22.050 Enforcement**

A. A warning notice of a violation of this ordinance shall be given prior to the issuance of a citation. Warning notices shall give a brief description of the violation and a statement that failure to correct the alleged violation may result in issuance of a citation to the City of Ashland Municipal Court. The warning notice shall be served upon the person accused of the violation.

B. A responsible person, or an owner of a multi-family complex, who violates this chapter shall be deemed guilty of an infraction, and shall be punishable as set forth in Section 1.08.020 of the Municipal Code.

(Ord. 2686, 1992)

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST CARBON PRICING BY THE STATE OF OREGON**

The City Council of \_\_\_\_\_:

- A. Is compelled by the scientific consensus that carbon dioxide emissions are the primary cause of global climate change.
- B. Finds that climate change is a threat to public health, national security, food security, and business supply chains. These costs to our society are not reflected in the price of fossil fuels and therefore the City Council of \_\_\_\_\_ regards them as hidden costs—or *market externalities*—of fossil fuels.
- C. Believes that a simple price signal to consumers is the most efficient way to discourage consumption of fossil fuels and encourage innovation of alternatives.
- D. Finds that the preponderance of research—including the 2013 Tax and Shift report published by the Portland State University Northwest Economic Research Center and the 2014 Carbon Tax Study published by Regional Economic Models, Inc.—indicates a revenue neutral carbon fee would stimulate economic growth and rapidly reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- E. Believes that an upstream fee on fossil fuels would make low-carbon sectors of Oregon’s economy more competitive, and that renewable energy development is a growth opportunity for our state.
- F. Appreciates that a carbon tax by itself would be regressive and supports a provision to alleviate the burden on low-income households.
- H. Finds that global climate change is uniquely urgent and therefore supports a policy free from traditional wedge issues such as revenue, spending and the size of government.

**THEREFORE, EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY, THE CITY COUNCIL OF \_\_\_\_\_,  
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF OREGON, CALLS ON THE OREGON STATE  
LEGISLATURE TO:**

- §1. Levy a fee on fossil fuels at the most upstream possible point of sale in the State of Oregon,
- §2. Schedule an annual increase in this fee without a cap to establish predictability in Oregon’s energy market,
- §3. Establish levels in Sections (1) and (2) that adequately address the climate crisis, according to the most credible climatological and economic research,
- §4. Return all net revenues generated by said fee evenly among Oregon voters on an annual basis..

This resolution shall be sent to Governor Kitzhaber, Senators Wyden and Merkley, Congressman DeFazio, our local state legislative delegation; and the City shall lobby on its behalf where appropriate.

The foregoing Resolution adopted on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy City Recorder



**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**  
**RESOLUTION DESIGNATING [city/town], [state] A *BEE CITY USA***

WHEREAS, the goal of *BEE CITY USA* is to promote healthy, sustainable habitats and communities for bees and other pollinators; and

WHEREAS, thanks to the tremendous diversity of wild native bees, along with the honey bees that were brought here from Europe in the 1600s, we have very diverse dietary choices rich in fruits, nuts and vegetables: *“One in every three bites of food we eat is courtesy of insect pollination. Even our meat and milk trace back to insects that pollinate the alfalfa and other feed for beef cattle and cows”* (Mace Vaughan, Pollinator Program Director for the Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation); and

WHEREAS, bees and other pollinators around the globe have experienced dramatic declines due to a combination of habitat loss, use of pesticides, and the spread of pests and diseases, with grave implications for the future health of flora and fauna; and

WHEREAS, cities and their residents have the opportunity to support bees and other pollinators on both public and private land; and

WHEREAS, supporting pollinators fosters environmental awareness and sustainability, and increases interactions among community stewards such as commercial and backyard beekeepers, farmers, children, educators, Master Naturalists, Master Gardeners, plant nurseries, municipalities, neighborhoods, and garden suppliers and clubs; and

WHEREAS, the economic benefits of (native and honey) bee-friendliness are:

- Healthy ecosystems--insect pollinators are required for pollination and reproduction of about 85% of flowering plants globally, plants that: 1) are vital for clean air and water; 2) provide food, fiber and shelter for people and wildlife; and 3) support the very insects that pollinate our crops and form the basis of food webs.
- Increased vegetable and fruit crop yields due to bee pollination.
- Increased habitat for natural enemies of crop pests and therefore reduced need for and costs associated with pesticides.
- Increased demand for pollinator-friendly plant materials from local nurseries and growers.
- Income earned by beekeepers and others through the sale of bee products, beekeeping equipment and supplies, and hive rentals for pollination; and, heightened prestige and premium asking prices for place-based honey, which enhances the visibility and reputation of its community of origin; and

WHEREAS, [city/town] should be a *BEE CITY USA* affiliate because:

- XXXX
- XXXX
- XXXX

WHEREAS, ideal pollinator-friendly habitat:

- Provides diverse and abundant nectar and pollen from plants blooming in succession.
- Provides clean water for drinking, nest-building, cooling, diluting stored honey, and butterfly puddling.
- Is pesticide-free or has pesticide use carried out with least ill effects on pollinators.
- Is comprised of mostly, if not all, native species of annual and perennial wildflowers, shrubs, trees, and grasses because many native pollinators prefer or depend on the native plants with which they co-evolved.
- Includes, where possible, designated pollinator zones in public spaces with signage to educate the public and build awareness.

- Provides for safe and humane removal of bees when required.
- Provides undisturbed spaces (leaf and brush piles, un-mowed fields or field margins, fallen trees and other dead wood) for nesting and overwintering for native pollinators; and

WHEREAS, in order to enhance understanding among municipal staff and the public about the vital role that pollinators play and what each of us can do to sustain them, the [City/Town] of [name of city/town] agrees to meet the following standards required of all *BEE CITY USA* affiliates:

- 1) Establish/maintain a **subcommittee** of an appropriate municipal body or department, comprised of citizens and staffed by employees, charged with assembling and disseminating information on topics of pollinator-friendly habitat and policies to municipal departments, residents, businesses, and developers. For example, it might be a subcommittee of the Sustainability, Natural Resources, or Tree Commission.
- 2) Pass this *BEE CITY USA* **resolution** (which articulates these standards).
- 3) **Publicly acknowledge** the community’s commitment by agreeing to a) install/maintain at least one authorized *BEE CITY USA* street sign in a prominent location, and b) create/maintain links on appropriate pages of the municipal website which includes the municipality’s *BEE CITY USA* liaison(s), links to a PDF of this signed Resolution and the *BEE CITY USA* website, and summaries of the pollinator-friendly activities the municipality has undertaken or accomplished the previous year(s).
- 4) Commit to **annually celebrate** National Pollinator Week (third full week of June) or some other appropriate occasion through events, proclamations, and promotions that showcase the municipality’s commitment to being a *BEE CITY USA* affiliate.
- 5) Commit to annually **apply for renewal** of the community’s designation and submit a report of *BEE CITY USA* activities following the format provided.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE [City/Town Council or appropriate body] THAT:

The [City/Town Council or appropriate body] accepts the designation and commits to the standards of *BEE CITY USA*.

Read, approved, and adopted this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_.

---

City/Town Clerk

---

Mayor (or appropriate official)

*Approved as to form:*

---

City/Town Attorney