

201 ORDINANCE No. 113163

JR1 COUNCIL BILL No. 105870

AN ORDINANCE amending Section 21.40.080 of the Seattle Municipal Code as of December 1, 1986, to establish certain new rates for use of the Solid Waste Utility Transfer Stations and disposal sites.

*Budget 11/11/86 Fees*

COMPTROLLER FILE No. \_\_\_\_\_

Introduced: <i>Nov. 10, 1986</i>	By: <i>Elec.</i>
Referred: <i>Nov. 10, 1986</i>	To: <i>Budget Committee</i>
Referred:	To:
Referred:	To:
Reported: <i>NOV 26 1986</i>	Second Reading: <i>NOV 26 1986</i>
Third Reading: <i>NOV 26 1986</i>	Signed: <i>NOV 26 1986</i>
Presented to Mayor: <i>NOV 26 1986</i>	Approved: <i>NOV 26 1986</i>
Returned to City Clerk: <i>DEC 1 1986</i>	Published:
Vetoed by Mayor:	Veto Published:
Passed over Veto:	Veto Sustained:

The City of

Honorable President:

Your Committee on \_\_\_\_\_

to which was referred the within Co report that we have considered the

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

# The City of Seattle--Legislative Department

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Date Reported  
and Adopted

President:

Committee on \_\_\_\_\_

was referred the within Council Bill No. \_\_\_\_\_

that we have considered the same and respectfully recommend that the same:

Vote 7-0

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Chair

ORDINANCE 113163

1  
2  
3 AN ORDINANCE amending Section 21.40.080 of the Seattle Municipal  
4 Code as of December 1, 1986, to establish certain new rates  
5 for use of the Solid Waste Utility Transfer Stations and  
6 disposal sites.

7 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

8 Section 1. As of December 1, 1986, Section 21.40.080 of  
9 the Seattle Municipal Code (Ordinance 90379, Section 5, as last  
10 amended by Ordinance 112942, Section 5) is further amended as  
11 follows:

12 21.40.080 Transfer Station and disposal site rates.

13 A. The following rates are established for the use of  
14 the City's disposal sites and transfer stations (~~(---The~~  
15 ~~1986 rates are)~~) effective August 1, 1986 (~~(---)~~), except  
16 the rate revised by Seattle Municipal Code 21.40.080A.4  
17 hereof, which shall be effective December 1, 1986, and  
18 except as otherwise provided in Seattle Municipal Code

19 21.40.080D:

20 Passenger Vehicle and 1986  
21 Commercial Rate Schedules Rate

22 1. Passenger vehicle

23 a. Operated by City residents \$ 4.00

24 b. Operated by non-City residents \$ 8.00

25 2. Minimum charge for passenger  
26 vehicles with trailers and all  
27 other vehicles (trucks, vans,  
28 motor homes, travelalls, etc.) \$ 9.00

3. Refuse deposited at disposal  
sites (~~(---by---)~~) from commercial  
vehicles \$25.60  
per ton

4. Refuse deposited at transfer  
stations (~~(---by---)~~) from passenger  
vehicles with trailers and all  
other vehicles (trucks, vans, motor  
homes, travelalls, etc.), and (~~(---\$35.50)~~) \$56.00  
commercial vehicles (~~(---per ton)~~) per ton

1 B. It shall be the duty of the Director of Engineering,  
2 or his authorized agent, to issue and sell tickets at  
3 disposal sites for the privilege of such disposal; provided  
4 that such disposal charges shall not apply to the disposal  
5 of earth or other material suitable for road construction  
6 when disposal of same has been approved by the Director of  
7 Engineering or his authorized agent.

8 C. State Tax Collection and Refund. The Director of  
9 Engineering, or his authorized agent, has the authority to  
10 collect State taxes due as required by State Law and to  
11 make refunds to any person entitled thereto under State Law  
12 and RCW 43.155.050.

13 D. Effective December 1, 1986, a charitable organiza-  
14 tion qualified by the Director of Engineering or his  
15 authorized agent, in accordance with Seattle Municipal Code  
16 21.40.080E, shall be charged at the rate of \$35.50 per ton  
17 for the disposal on an ongoing rather than on an occasional  
18 or incidental basis, of refuse generated within The City of  
19 Seattle only, that is deposited at transfer stations from a  
20 passenger vehicle with trailer or any other vehicle (truck,  
21 van, motor home, travelall, etc.) or commercial vehicle.

22 E. A charitable organization shall be qualified for the  
23 rate established in Seattle Municipal Code 21.40.080D if  
24 found by the Director of Engineering, after application by  
25 such organization to the Director, to:

- 26 1. Be a credit customer of the Solid Waste Utility;
  - 27 2. Be a non-profit charitable organization recog-
  - 28 nized as such by the Internal Revenue Service;
- and

(To be used for all Ordinances except Emergency.)

3. Be engaged, as a primary form of its doing business, in processing abandoned goods for resale or reuse.

Section 2. Announcement of the rate increase and providing other actions preliminary to and to implement the increased rates as of December 1, 1986, and prior to the effective date of this ordinance is hereby ratified and confirmed.

Section <sup>3</sup> This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage and approval, if approved by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect at the time it shall become a law under the provisions of the city charter.

Passed by the City Council the 26th day of November, 1986  
and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 26th day of November, 1986.

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
President of the City Council.

Approved by me this 26th day of November, 1986  
*[Handwritten Signature]*  
Mayor.

Filed by me this 1st day of December, 1986

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
Attest: City Comptroller and City Clerk.

(SEAL)

Published.....

By *[Handwritten Signature]*  
Deputy Clerk.

# City of Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Gary Zarker, Director  
Charles Royer, Mayor



## MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 3, 1986

TO: Virginia Galle, Chair  
Environmental Management Committee

FROM: Gary Zarker, Interim Director, SED  
Jim Ritch, Acting Budget Director 

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Council Actions Related to the City's Use of the Cedar Hills Landfill

**RECEIVED**

NOV 3 1986

VIRGINIA GALLE  
Seattle City Council Member

In an October 21, 1986 memorandum, you requested information and recommendations on three issues:

1. interim transfer station rates for commercial customers;
2. interim transfer station rates for charitable organizations who are engaged in the processing of abandoned goods for resale and reuse; and
3. lump-sum versus six annual payments to the County for the shortened life of Cedar Hills.

An issue paper detailing the information you requested on items (1) and (2) is attached. In summary, we are recommending a \$56.00/ton interim transfer station rate for commercial customers while retaining the current \$35.50/ton rate for charitable organizations engaged in processing abandoned goods for resale or reuse. A draft ordinance reflecting our recommendations is attached.

With regard to item (3), we recommend a lump-sum payment, rather than six equal annual payments at 9% interest. The Solid Waste Fund has sufficient cash balances to make the lump-sum payment and we can avoid \$145,000 in interest payments to the County. Since the 9% rate we would pay the County exceeds the projected 7% in interest earnings on Solid Waste cash balances, the net effect of the lump-sum payment is to save about \$32,200 over the six year period.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. If we can help expedite Council consideration, please let us know. For additional information, contact Jean Domergue at x-2551.

GZ/JR/jd/1a

Attachment

# City of Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Gary Zarker, Director  
Charles Royer, Mayor  
November 7, 1986

RECEIVED NOV 10 1986

C

34130



CB 105870

The Honorable Douglas Jewett  
City Attorney  
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Jewett:

The Mayor is proposing to the City Council that the enclosed legislation be adopted.

REQUESTING  
DEPARTMENT: Seattle Engineering Department

SUBJECT: An ordinance amending Section 21.40.080 of the Seattle Municipal Code as of December 1, 1986, to establish certain new rates for use of the Solid Waste Utility Transfer Stations and disposal sites.

Pursuant to the City Council's S.O.P. 100-014, the Executive Department is forwarding this request for legislation directly to your office for review and drafting.

After reviewing this request and drafting appropriate legislation:

- ( ) File the legislation with the City Clerk for formal introduction to the City Council as an Executive Request.
- ( ) Do not file with City Council, but return the proposed legislation to OMB for our review. Return to \_\_\_\_\_.
- (X) Send to Councilmember Virginia Galle's Office.

Sincerely,

Charles Royer  
Mayor

by

JIM RITCH  
Acting Budget Director

JR/jd/cb

Enclosure

cc: Director, SED

the problem only for one month. We also considered administrative or legal action to prevent the licensed haulers from using the City's transfer stations. The problems with this alternative are two. Commercial haulers currently use the City's transfer station and are therefore existing customers. It is doubtful that we can legally ban their use. Furthermore, this action would be a direct contradiction of the City's position that the County cannot ban our use of Cedar Hills. Finally, neither of these actions would prevent a large increase in the subsidy. Therefore, we recommend an interim rate increase.

Interim Rate Alternatives: We have looked at four interim rate alternatives:

	<u>City Rate</u>	<u>Differential With King Co.</u>
1. Maintaining a positive contribution to fixed costs.	\$53.00	\$ 6.00
2. Maintaining the \$9.00/ton differential between City and County transfer station rates.	\$56.00	\$ 9.00
3. Maintaining a \$5.00+/ton contribution to fixed transfer station cost.	\$59.00	\$ 12.00
4. Maintaining a City rate which is 34% higher than King County transfer station rates.	\$63.00	\$ 16.00

We developed and evaluated these options with one criteria in mind: minimizing the subsidy of commercial customers. We defined this criteria as maximizing the contribution of commercial customers to the fixed costs of 1) landfill closure, and 2) transfer station operation. A rate of \$53.00 is required to provide a positive contribution in both of these categories.

The key factor in an evaluation of the four alternatives is the estimated tonnage for each rate. This, in turn, is predicated on price response. Because our information on response to the recent rate increase is limited at present, we used historic data as well as a comparison of 1985 and 1986 data. Unfortunately, the results are not entirely consistent. Depending on the approach used to forecast tonnage, the rate which minimizes the subsidy could be either \$56.00 or \$63.00/ton. As displayed in Table 1, the \$56.00/ton rate minimizes the subsidy of commercial customers if the historic price response is accurate. Using January-August data, the \$63.00/ton is preferable.

Based on historic information, we can expect a dramatic decline in tonnage as we increase the differential with King County. As displayed in Table 2, we lost 38.4 percent of our tonnage between 1978 when our transfer rates were approximately the same as King County's and 1983 when our rate was \$11.00 higher. Considering that total commercial tonnage doubled during this period\*, the effective rate of loss was closer to 77 percent. However, the price response to a decreasing differential is considerably less dramatic. From 1984 through July 1986, the City's rate was held constant at \$3.00 more than King County. During this period, tonnage grew 29 percent over the low point in 1983 but did not reach the 1981 level when our rate was \$7.00 higher than the County rate. Based on this information, it would appear that some commercial customers faced with a

## TRANSFER STATION RATES

### Current Rate Vs. Interim Rate Increase

Currently, the City's commercial transfer station rate of \$35.50/ton is designed to cover an \$11.00 tipping fee at Cedar Hills, all long-haul costs and taxes, plus contribute about \$5.00/ton (\$74,180 annually) to the fixed transfer station costs. Once the new Cedar Hills rates are in effect, the City's current transfer station rate would cover the \$31.50 tipping fee, about half of the long-haul cost, and none of the taxes. Thus, if we do not raise transfer station rates, the increase in the residential subsidy would be \$20.50/ton -- \$15.50 in out-of-pocket in variable costs and \$5.00 in the lost contribution to transfer station cost. Assuming no tonnage increase, the current subsidy would increase \$137,000 for every month we do not raise rates, or \$1,644,000 annually.

We expect increased commercial use of the City's transfer station if we delay a rate increase. As of December 1, the Seattle transfer station fee would be \$11.50/ton lower than the King County transfer station rate and provide only \$4.00 to cover operating costs over and above the Cedar Hills tipping fee. At least one commercial hauler has stated that he cannot process and deliver garbage to Cedar Hills for \$4.00/ton and therefore it would be in his economic interest to deliver garbage to our transfer station at the current rate. If all the City's commercial haulers decided to use the City's transfer stations exclusively, we would receive an additional 1,000 tons per day and the monthly subsidy would grow to about \$450,000 or \$5,400,000 per year. In addition, it would be almost impossible for the Solid Waste Utility to handle this kind of increase in the short term -- they would need to double the number of truck drivers and long haul trucks immediately.

Whether or not the commercial haulers would actually shut down operations depends on a number of issues:

1. How much they could save in operating costs and taxes -- at this point more than 1/4 of transfer station costs are taxes.
2. How difficult it would be to shut down and then start up again.
3. Loss of revenues from recycling and resale.

Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient information to assess these items. About all we can say is that the longer we keep the current transfer station rates, the greater the economic incentive to shut down private operations. At a minimum, commercial haulers as well as other commercial customers would increase their use of the City's transfer station. If we simply recaptured the tonnage lost in August due to the August 1 rate increase, we would see a 24 percent growth. With a rate that is \$11.50 below King County's transfer station rate, double or triple this growth would not be unreasonable. The subsidy of commercial customers would then increase to \$200,000-300,000+ per month.

We have considered and rejected two administrative options to limit major growth in commercial tonnage at the City's transfer stations. One option is to permit licensed commercial haulers to use the Kent-Highlands Landfill until it closes. While this would provide an equal or better economic deal for the commercial haulers, it could damage our relations with the City of Kent. It also solves

large differential will make alternative arrangements which are then maintained even when the differential is reduced.

A comparison of 1985 and 1986 for the months of January through August would suggest a considerably smaller decline in tonnage due to the August 1 rate increase and the \$9.00 differential with King County. If we use this to indicate price response, a differential of \$16.00/ton would still provide sufficient tonnage to justify the higher rate. The main problem with relying on this data is that one month of information does not provide an accurate assessment. In addition, the response may reflect public reaction to the future King County rate increase rather than our own.

Recommendation: Based on this limited analysis of price response, we would recommend the \$56.00/ton as an interim rate.

If historic data proves to be the best indicator of price response, this rate will generate the greatest contribution to landfill closure and fixed transfer station costs. Even if more recent information is a better indicator, this interim rate provides the greatest contribution to landfill closure costs and some contribution to fixed costs. If rates should be raised again, this can be accomplished when residential rates are considered in 1987.

We would further recommend a more extensive price response analysis prior to the 1987 rate adjustments. To complete such an analysis, we need to compile tonnage data for 1983, 1985, and 1986 for selected commercial customer groups. There has been insufficient time to do this at this point.

#### **Exemption of Charitable Organizations With Recycling Activities from the Recommended Interim Increase**

We have tonnage information for four organizations in this category -- St. Vincent De Paul, Seattle Goodwill Industries, the Salvation Army, and the Union Gospel Mission. Assuming tonnage from these organizations is not increased more than five percent due to illegal dumping, the increased subsidy associated with retaining a \$35.50/ton rate would be about \$7,800/month -- \$5,850 in out-of-pocket costs and \$1,950 in the planned contribution to transfer station fixed expenses. If additional organizations inside the City used our transfer stations, the subsidy would be larger. Given the \$11.50/ton savings over use of King County's transfer station, we could expect this kind of response.

Recommendation: On an interim basis, we recommend retaining the \$35.50 rate for such organizations. This should offset the (hopefully) short term increase in dumping garbage at recycling and resale sites.

#### **Timing of Council Consideration**

After discussion with Council staff, we have developed some alternative courses of action for your review. We propose that an ordinance establishing interim rates be adopted and effective by December, 1986.

There are several alternative schedules the Council may wish to consider for acting on the ordinance:

1. During the Engineering Department's budget hearing, November 6.
2. When the Council acts on the Cedar Hills agreement (by the end of November?).
3. At the next scheduled Environmental Management Committee meeting, December 9.

Obviously, the third alternative would necessitate a delay of effective date to January 1, 1987, or possibly mid-to-late December.

We are available to discuss these options with you or your staff. Please contact Jean Domergue at extension 2551.

- \* King County "Cedar Hills Regional Landfill Phase 2 -- Site Development Plan: Conceptual Alternatives Report -- Technical Supplement."

JD/len  
11/03/86

Table 1. COMMERCIAL RATES AT CITY TRANSFER STATIONS

	Adopted	August 1 Rate Options with Cedar Hills Rate @ \$31.50/ton	
Rate/ton	\$35.50	\$53.00	\$59.00
Rate/ton differential with King County	\$9.00	\$6.00	\$12.00
Est. tonnage/month; historic price response	6,693	10,217	4,151
Est. tonnage/month; August, 1986 price response		7,477	6,231
Contribution/month to landfill closure			
o tonnage @ historic price response	\$39,390	\$55,760	\$23,019
o tonnage @ August, 1986 price response	167,392)	42,234	34,867
Contribution/month to fixed T.S. costs			
o tonnage @ historic price response	\$35,271	\$ 1,950-	\$22,746
o tonnage @ August, 1986 price response	209,271)	1,802	34,234
Total contribution/month			
o tonnage @ historic price response	\$74,180	\$57,710	\$45,765
o tonnage @ August, 1986 price response	376,663)	44,036	69,101
Increase (decrease) in subsidy of commercial customers			
o tonnage @ historic price response	\$137,199-	\$16,470	\$28,415
o tonnage @ August, 1986 price response	450,843	30,144	5,079

JD/jwa  
11/03/86

Table 2. PRICE RESPONSE DATA

	Rate-per-Ton Differential with King County	Tonnage	C H A N G E F R O M	
			1978	
			Previous Period Tons	Tons
1978	(\$ .62)	143,356		
1981	+ 7.00	122,815	(20,541)	(14.3%)
1983	+ 11.00	88,334	(34,481)	(28.1%)
1985	+ 3.00			
o January - July		61,431	N/A	N/A
o August		10,055	N/A	N/A
o Total Year		103,426	15,092	17.1%
			(39,930)	(27.9%)
1986				
o January - July	+ 3.00	67,690	6,259	10.2%
o August	+ 9.00	8,827	(1,228)	(12.2%)
o Estimated 1986 total @ +3.00 differential		113,975	10,549	10.2%
o Estimated total with revised rates		104,460	1,034	1.0%
			(29,382)	(20.5%)
			(38,296)	(27.1%)

JD/jwd  
11/03/86



# Seattle City Council

## Memorandum

Date: October 21, 1986

To: Gary Zarker, Interim Director, Engineering Department

From: Virginia Galle, Chair, *VG* Environmental Management Committee

Subject: Executive Recommendations for Council Actions Related to the City's Proposed Use of the Cedar Hills Landfill

There are a number of solid waste revenue requirements/rates issues related to the City's proposed use of the Cedar Hills landfill later this year. In order to facilitate informed actions on the part of the Council when it acts on a Cedar Hills Use Agreement in November, please provide written responses to each of the requests detailed below no later than Friday, October 31.

1. Please clarify how the increase in the County's transfer station rate from \$26.50/ton to \$47.00/ton effective December 1, 1986, will impact the City's Solid Waste Utility if there is no December 1st increase in the City's transfer station rate from its current level of \$35.50/ton. Include in your response: a) an estimate of the increased amount existing transfer station users would be subsidized without an interim increase; and b) the reasons private haulers might choose to use the City's transfer stations and the economics of such a choice.

Given this impact, do you recommend an interim increase in the City's transfer station rates effective 12/1/86? To what level? Why?

2. What would be the monthly cost of maintaining the transfer station rates charged to charitable organizations who are engaged in the processing of abandoned goods for resale or reuse and other such activities that serve to significantly reduce the wastestream at their current level until a variety of mitigating alternatives can be reviewed as part of the next rate review process? What are the pros/cons of excluding such charitable organizations from an interim increase in transfer station rates? Would you recommend this action?
3. Please itemize the pros/cons of paying the \$1.611 million payment to the County for the shortened life of Cedar Hills in one lump-sum payment this November as opposed to six equal annual installments at 9% interest. What is your recommendation?

VG:jn

cc: Jean Domergue, OMB  
Rich Owings, Solid Waste Utility  
Nancy Glaser, Council Staff

# Affidavit of Publication

## STATE OF WASHINGTON KING COUNTY—SS.

The undersigned, on oath states that he is an authorized representative of The Daily Journal of Commerce, a daily newspaper, which newspaper is a legal newspaper of general circulation and it is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continuously as a daily newspaper in Seattle, King County, Washington, and it is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of this newspaper. The Daily Journal of Commerce was on the 12th day of June, 1941, approved as a legal newspaper by the Superior Court of King County.

The notice in the exact form annexed, was published in regular issues of The Daily Journal of Commerce, which was regularly distributed to its subscribers during the below stated period. The annexed notice, a .....

Ordinance No. 113163

was published on December 4, 1986

*V. Rain*

Subscribed and sworn to before me on

December 4, 1986

*Yvonne Summers*  
Notary Public for the State of Washington,  
residing in Seattle.

## City of Seattle

### ORDINANCE 113163

AN ORDINANCE amending Section 21.40.080 of the Seattle Municipal Code as of December 1, 1986, to establish certain new rates for use of the Solid Waste Utility Transfer Stations and disposal sites.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. As of December 1, 1986, Section 21.40.080 of the Seattle Municipal Code (Ordinance 90379, Section 5, as last amended by Ordinance 112942, Section 5) is further amended as follows:

21.40.080 Transfer Station and disposal site rates.

A. The following rates are established for the use of the City's disposal sites and transfer stations (~~(---The 1986 rates are---~~) effective August 1, 1986 (~~(---)~~), except the rate revised by Seattle Municipal Code 21.40.080A.4 hereof, which shall be effective December 1, 1986, and except as otherwise provided in Seattle Municipal Code

#### 21.40.080D:

Passenger Vehicle and Commercial Rate Schedules	1986 Rate
1. Passenger vehicle	
a. Operated by City residents	\$ 4.00
b. Operated by non-City residents	\$ 8.00
2. Minimum charge for passenger vehicles with trailers and all other vehicles (trucks, vans, motor homes, travelalls, etc.)	\$ 9.00
3. Refuse deposited at disposal sites ( <del>(---by---</del> ) <u>from commercial vehicles</u>	\$25.60 per ton
4. Refuse deposited at transfer stations ( <del>(---by---</del> ) <u>from passenger vehicles with trailers and all other vehicles (trucks, vans, motor homes, travelalls, etc.), and commercial vehicles</u>	<del>((\$25.60))</del> \$56.00 <del>(per ton)</del> per ton

B. It shall be the duty of the Director of Engineering, or his authorized agent, to issue and sell tickets at disposal sites for the privilege of such disposal; provided that such disposal charges shall not apply to the disposal of earth or other material suitable for road construction when disposal of same has been approved by the Director of Engineering or his authorized agent.

C. State Tax Collection and Refund. The Director of Engineering, or his authorized agent, has the authority to collect State taxes due as required by State Law and to make refunds to any person entitled thereto under State Law and RCW 43.153.050.

3. Effective December 1, 1986, a charitable organization qualified by the Director of Engineering or his authorized agent, in accordance with Seattle Municipal Code 21.40.080E, shall be charged at the rate of \$35.50 per ton for the disposal on an ongoing rather than on an occasional or incidental basis, of refuse generated within The City of Seattle only, that is deposited at transfer stations from a passenger vehicle with trailer or any other vehicle (truck, van, motor home, travelall, etc.) or commercial vehicle.

E. A charitable organization shall be qualified for the rate established in Seattle Municipal Code 21.40.080D if found by the Director of Engineering, after application by such organization to the Director, to:

1. Be a credit customer of the Solid Waste Utility;
2. Be a non-profit charitable organization recognized as such by the Internal Revenue Service;  
and
3. Be engaged, as a primary form of its doing business, in processing abandoned goods for resale or reuse.

Section 2. Announcement of the rate increase and providing other actions preliminary to and to implement the increased rates as of December 1, 1986, and prior to the effective date of this ordinance is hereby ratified and confirmed.

Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage and approval, if approved by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect at the time it shall become a law under the provisions of the city charter.

Passed by the City Council the 26th day of November, 1986, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 26th day of November, 1986.

SAM SMITH,  
President of the City Council.

Approved by me this 26th day of November, 1986.

CHARLES ROYER,  
Mayor.

Filed by me this 1st day of December, 1986.

Attest: NORWARD J. BROOKS,  
City Comptroller and City Clerk.

(Seal) By MARGARET CARTER,  
Deputy Clerk.

Publication ordered by NORWARD J. BROOKS, Comptroller and City Clerk.

Date of official publication in Daily Journal of Commerce, Seattle, December 4, 1986. (C-577-X)