

Phone: 360-897-9533

Fax: 360-897-2348

May 20, 2016

Ann LaRue Utilities and Transportation Commission PO Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250

RE: Cost Assessment Questionnaire for Jefferson County SWMP

Dear Ms. LaRue:

Attached is a revised cost assessment questionnaire for the 2016 Jefferson County Solid Waste Management Plan.

After the cost assessment questionnaire was initially submitted, a mistake was discovered in the way that future tipping fee increases were shown. This copy corrects that mistake. The primary revisions for the attached questionnaire were made in Table 4.1.4 (all figures shown in that table have been revised), with a minor revision also made in Table 4.1.1 (to clarify that the tipping fee shown in that table is for 2015).

It is my understanding that this submittal does not need to be re-docketed but should be considered to be part of TG-160343.

Please accept my apologies for this error and do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions about this submittal or other aspects of the solid waste plan.

Sincerely,

Richard of Hlavka

Rick Hlavka Green Solutions

Enc.: Cost Assessment Questionnaire

UTC COST ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PLAN PREPARED FOR THE	COUNTY OF:	Jefferson
PLAN PREPARED FOR THE	CITY OF:	NA
PREPARED BY:	Rick Hlavka, G	Freen Solutions
CONTACT TELEPHONE:	(360) 897-9533	
DATE: December	er 7, 2015, Revised N	lay 13, 2016

DEFINITIONS

Definitions used in the Solid Waste Management Plan and the Cost Assessment Questionnaire.

Throughout this document: YR. l shall refer to <u>2016</u> YR. 3 shall refer to <u>2018</u> YR. 6 shall refer to <u>2021</u>

Year refers to Calendar Year (Jan 01 - Dec 31)

1.0 DEMOGRAPHICS

1.1 **Population**

1.1.1 Total population of the County:

Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
30,779	31,398	32,349

1.1.2 Population of the area included in the solid waste management plan:

Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
30,779	31,398	32,349

1.2 References and Assumptions

See Table 2-2.

2.0 WASTE STREAM GENERATION

2.1 Tonnage Recycled

2.1.1 Total tonnage recycled in the base year, and projections for years three and six.

Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
19,313	16,641	17,145

2.2 Tonnage Disposed

2.2.1 Total tonnage disposed in the base year (2016), and projections for years three and six.

Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
17,544	17,897	18,439

Note: 2015 Actual tonnage disposed = 18,977

2.3 References and Assumptions

See Table 2-8.

3.0 SYSTEM COMPONENT COSTS

3.1 Waste Reduction Programs

3.1.1 Implemented and proposed waste reduction programs

IMPLEMENTED

Existing waste reduction activities are anticipated to be continued.

PROPOSED (see pages 3-11 to 3-13)

Consider product stewardship programs if proposed Education on wasted food More promotion for clothing reuse and recycling Consider ban on yard waste disposal Promote smart shopping Promote fix-it workshops Publicize volume-based rates more Expand business recognition program City and County to adopt waste reduction policies Consider other bans Monitor with performance-based measures

3.1.2 Costs for waste reduction programs implemented and proposed?

Implemented *			
Year 1	Year 3	Year 6	
266,000	271,350	279,600	
Proposed **			
Year 1	Year 3	Year 6	
55,000	56,100	57,800	

 \ast includes current public education and recycling costs. Current costs assumed to increase at 1% per year.

** proposed activities and expenses are contingent on the availability of funding.

Implemented				
Year 1	Year 3 Year 6			
Tipping Fees and	Tipping Fees and CPG Tipping Fees and C			
CPG Funds	Funds Funds			
Proposed				
Year 1	Year 3	Year 6		
Tipping Fees, CPG	Tipping Fees, CPG Tipping Fees, CI			
Funds, and Other	Funds, and Other	Funds, and Other		
Funds as Available	Funds as Available	Funds as Available		

3.1.3 Funding mechanism(s) that will pay the cost of the programs in 3.1.2.

3.2 Recycling and Composting Programs

3.2.1 Proposed or implemented recycling and organics programs:

IMPLEMENTED

Existing recycling activities are anticipated to be continued. Continue to promote on-site composting.

PROPOSED (see pages 4-14 to 4-15 and 5-10 to 5-11)

More promotion of curbside recycling in unincorporated areas. Consider increasing curbside recycling to weekly in Port Townsend. Consider switching to dual-stream or single-stream without glass. Consider additional steps to encourage curbside recycling. Conduct a recycling potential assessment.

Consider charging fees for hard-to-recycle materials.

Seek local applications for glass.

Support proposals for commercial food waste diversion as appropriate. Support programs for residential food waste diversion as appropriate. Support methods for diversion of pet waste as appropriate.

3.2.2 Costs for recycling programs implemented and proposed?

Implemented			
Year 1	Year 3	Year 6	
Costs for current programs are included in above table			
Proposed			
Year 1	Year 3	Year 6	
25,000	51,000	52,500	

Implemented			
Year 1	Year 3 Year 6		
Garbage Rates, Other	Garbage Rates, Other	Garbage Rates, Other	
User Fees, and	User Fees, and	User Fees, and	
Tipping Fees	Tipping Fees Tipping Fees		
Proposed			
Year 1	Year 3	Year 6	
Garbage Rates, Other	Garbage Rates, Other	Garbage Rates, Other	
User Fees, and	User Fees, and	User Fees, and	
Tipping Fees	Tipping Fees	Tipping Fees	

3.2.3 Funding mechanism(s) that will pay the cost of the programs in 3.2.2.

3.3 Solid Waste Collection Programs

3.3.1 Regulated Solid Waste Collection Programs

UTC Regulated Hauler Name	Oly	Olympic Disposal		
G-Permit #9				
Residential and Commercial	Year 1	Year 3	Year 6	
# of Customers	3,452	3,522	3,628	
Tonnage Collected	5,000	5,100	5,260	

UTC Regulated Hauler Name	West Waste & Recycling		
G-Permit #251			
Residential and Commercial	Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
# of Customers	1,014	1,034	1,066
Tonnage Collected	1,200	1,224	1,261

* Data shown for West Waste is for entire regulated area, including Clallam County customers.

3.3.2 Other (non-regulated) Solid Waste Collection Programs.

Hauler Name	DM Disposal (contract with Port Townsend)		
Residential and Commercial	Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
# of Customers	3,626	3,700	3,811
Tonnage Collected	4,400	4,490	4,620

3.4 Energy Recovery & Incineration (ER&I Programs)

NA, no such facilities

3.5 Land Disposal Program

NA, no such facilities

3.6 Administration Program

3.6.1 What is the budgeted cost for administering the solid waste and recycling programs and what are the major funding sources.

Budgeted Cost		
Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
461,000	470,300	484,500
Funding Source		
Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
Tipping Fee	Tipping Fee	Tipping Fee

3.6.2 Which cost components are included in these estimates?

Management and planning services provided by County departments.

3.6.3 Funding mechanism(s) that will recover the cost of each component.

Tipping Fees

3.7 Other Programs

3.7.1 Describe the program, or provide page numbers.

Moderate-Risk Waste Facility, see pages 8-7 through 8-10.

3.7.2 Owner/Operator: Jefferson County

3.7.3 Is UTC Regulation Involved?

No

3.7.4 Anticipated costs for this program.

Year 1	Year 3	Year 6
87,000	88,750	91,400

3.7.5 Funding mechanism(s) that will recover the cost of this component.

Tipping Fees Coordinated Prevention Grant Fees charged to Small Quantity Generators

3.8 References and Assumptions

Costs shown in Section 3.1.2 include public education costs and recycling program costs. Costs for current and proposed programs are escalated at 1.0%, based approximate current inflation rate.

For Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, the tonnages collected by Waste Connections are based on county records for 2014 and are escalated at 1.0% per year (which is the anticipated population increase for this period). The customer count is based on mid-2015 figures for the regulated area and 2014 figures for the City of Port Townsend, and both are escalated at 1% (the population increase). For West Waste & Recycling, figures shown are based on 2014 data (escalated by 1% per year) and includes both Jefferson County and Clallam County customers.

For Section 3.6 and 3.7, costs for administration and MRW operations are assumed to increase 1% annually, beginning with 2016 budgeted figures (see Table 9-1, page 9-4).

4.0 FUNDING MECHANISMS

4.1 Funding Mechanisms (Summary by Facility)

The following tables provide information on funding sources for programs and activities.

Table 4.1.1 Facility Inventory									
Facility Name	Type of Facility	Tip Fee	Transfer Cost	Transfer Station Location	Final Disposal Location	Total Tons Disposed (2014)	Total Revenue Generated (Tip Fee x Tons)		
Jefferson County Solid Waste Disposal Facility (JCSWDF)	Transfer Station	\$147.61 per ton (2015)	NA	Near Port Townsend	Roosevelt Regional Landfill	17,662	\$2,558,253		
Quilcene Drop-Box	Drop Box	\$32.80 per c.y.	NA	Quilcene area	Roosevelt Regional Landfill (through JCWMF)	176	\$44,538		

See page 7-3 for further details.

Table 4.1.2 Tip Fee Components										
Tip Fee by Facility	Surcharge	City Tax	State and County Tax	Trans. and Disposal Cost	Operational Cost	Admn. Cost	Closure Costs			
Jefferson County Solid Waste Disposal Facility (JCSWDF)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Quilcene Drop-Box	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
All Facilities	0	0	1.8%	41.9%	19.8%	15.7%	1.8%			

See Table 9-1, figures here are based on projected 2015 costs.

Table 4.1.3					Funding Mechanism					
Name of Program	Bond Name	Total Bond Debt	Bond Rate	Bond Due Date	Grant Name	Grant Amount	Tip Fee	Taxes	Other	Surcharge
Recycling and Education					CPG	\$28,000	\$238,000			
Moderate-Risk Waste							\$76,000		\$11,000	

See Table 9-1, figures here are based on budgeted 2016 costs.

Table 4.1.4 Tip Fee Forecast									
Tip Fee per Ton	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five	Year Six			
Jefferson County Solid Waste Disposal Facility (JCSWDF)	\$151.30	\$155.08	\$158.96	\$162.93	\$162.93	\$162.93			
Quilcene Drop-Box	\$265.87	\$272.52	\$279.33	\$286.31	\$286.31	\$286.31			

Note: The tipping fee shown in the above table for JCSWDF is for larger loads of mixed solid waste (i.e., amounts above the minimum charge). The tipping fee shown for the Quilcene Drop-Box is based on the per-ton actual costs for 2014, but the rates there are actually volume-based. Fees have been adopted by county ordinance (see page 9-3) for Years One through Four and are set to increase 2.5% per year, but years Five through Six have not been determined yet and so are assumed to remain the same as Year Four.

.

4.2 Funding Mechanism Summary:

4.2.1 Year One

	Funding Mechanism (in percent)									
Component	Tip Fee	Grant	Bond	Collection Tax	Rates, Service Fees	Other	Total			
Waste Reduction	89	11					100			
Recycling	89	11					100			
Collection					100		100			
ER&I	100									
Transfer	100						100			
Land Disposal	100						100			
Administration	100						100			
Other										
Moderate-Risk Waste	87				13		100			

4.2.2 Year Three

Funding Mechanism (in percent)									
Component	Tip Fee	Grant	Bond	Collection Tax	Rates, Service Fees	Other	Total		
Waste Reduction	89	11					100		
Recycling	89	11					100		
Collection					100		100		
ER&I	100								
Transfer	100						100		
Land Disposal	100						100		
Administration	100						100		
Other									
Moderate-Risk Waste	87				13		100		

4.2.3 Year Six

Funding Mechanism (in percent)									
Component	Tip Fee	Grant	Bond	Collection Tax	Rates, Service Fees	Other	Total		
Waste Reduction	89	11					100		
Recycling	89	11					100		
Collection					100		100		
ER&I	100								
Transfer	100						100		
Land Disposal	100						100		
Administration	100						100		
Other									
Moderate-Risk Waste	87				13		100		

4.3 References and Assumptions

See Section 14.

For Table 4.1.2, operational cost includes MRW operations.

4.4 Surplus Funds

NA