

# **APPENDIX C**

## **WUTC COST ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

By state law (RCW 70.95.090), solid waste management plans are required to include:

“an assessment of the plan’s impact on the costs of solid waste collection. The assessment shall be prepared in conformance with guidelines established by the Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC or Commission). The Commission shall cooperate with the Washington state association of counties and the association of Washington cities in establishing such guidelines.”

The following cost assessment has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines prepared by the WUTC (WUTC 1997). The purpose of this cost assessment is not only to allow an assessment of the impact of proposed activities on current garbage collection and disposal rates, but to allow projections of future rate impacts as well. The WUTC needs this information to review the plan’s impacts to the franchised waste haulers that it regulates. For these haulers, WUTC is responsible for setting collection rates and approving proposed rate changes. Hence, WUTC will review the following cost assessment to determine if it provides adequate information for rate-setting purposes, and will advise Whatcom County as to the probable collection rate impacts of proposed programs. Consistent with this purpose, the cost assessment focuses primarily on those programs (implemented or recommended) with potential rate impacts.

# **COST ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

**PLAN PREPARED FOR THE COUNTY OF:** Whatcom County

**PREPARED BY:** Solid Waste Staff, Whatcom County

**CONTACT TELEPHONE:** 360-676-7695

**DATE:** April, 2009

## **DEFINITIONS**

These definitions as used in the Solid Waste Management Plan and the Cost Assessment Questionnaire.

Throughout this document:

YR.1 shall refer to 2008.

YR.3 shall refer to 2010.

YR.6 shall refer to 2013

Year refers to (circle one)

**calendar (Jan 01 - Dec 31)**

**fiscal (Jul 01 - Jun 30)**

1. **DEMOGRAPHICS:** To assess the generation, recycling and disposal rates of an area, it is necessary to have population data. This information is available from many sources (e.g., the State Data Book, County Business Patterns, or the State Office of Finance and Management).

### 1.1 Population

- 1.1.1 What is the **total** population of your County/City?

YR. 1 191,000      YR.3 195,633      YR.6 202,841

- 1.1.2 For counties, what is the population of the area **under your jurisdiction?** (Exclude cities choosing to develop their own solid waste management system.)

YR.1 191,000      YR.3 195,633      YR.6 202,841

### 1.2 References and Assumptions

*Population figures taken from WA State Office of Financial Management, Medium Projection.*

*None of the jurisdictions within Whatcom County have elected to prepare their own CSWMP, therefore the full population of the county is under the County's jurisdiction.*

2. **WASTE STREAM GENERATION:** The following questions ask for total tons recycled and total tons disposed. Total tons disposed are those tons disposed of at a landfill, incinerator, transfer station or any other form of disposal you may be using. If other please identify.

### 2.1 Tonnage Recycled

- 2.1.1 Please provide the total tonnage **recycled** in the base year, and projections for years three and six.

YR.1 132,006 T      YR.3 133,326      YR.6 134,659  
*Tonnage for base year is for 2007. 2008 numbers not yet available for county total.*

### 2.2 Tonnage Disposed

- 2.2.1 Please provide the total tonnage **disposed** in the base year, and projections for years three and six.

YR.1 156,042 T      YR.3 157,602      YR.6 159,178  
*Tonnage for base year is for 2007. 2008 numbers not yet available for county total.*

### 2.3 References and Assumptions

*Year one recycling and disposal tonnages are from the Dept. of Ecology. Years three and six are projected @ 1%, reflecting economic downturn in disposal and recycling while population continues to rise. Local haulers report 9% drop in tonnage hauled from 2007 to 2008.*

Only Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) considered for tonnage **disposed and recycled** and not including other amounts diverted.

**3. SYSTEM COMPONENT COSTS:** This section asks questions specifically related to the types of programs currently in use and those recommended to be started. For each component (i.e., waste reduction, landfill, composting, etc.) please describe the anticipated costs of the program(s), the assumptions used in estimating the costs and the funding mechanisms to be used to pay for it. The heart of deriving a rate impact is to know what programs will be passed through to the collection rates, as opposed to being paid for through grants, bonds, taxes and the like.

**3.1 Waste Reduction Programs**

3.1.1 Please list the solid waste programs which have been implemented and those programs which are proposed. If these programs are defined in the SWM plan please provide the page number. (Attach additional sheets as necessary.)

IMPLEMENTED

PROPOSED

Various existing activities are already conducted for waste reduction and public education; see plan (Section 2: V & VI) for further details.

NA

Public Outreach and Promotion  
Waste Reduction and Recycling Hotline  
Classroom Education  
Added new informational website

3.1.2 What are the costs, capital costs and operating costs for waste reduction programs implemented and proposed?

IMPLEMENTED

YR.1 \$53,000      YR.3 \$55,000      YR.6 \$55,000

PROPOSED

YR.1 NA      YR.3 NA      YR.6 NA

*No new County waste reduction programs planned at this time.*

3.1.3 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will pay the cost of the programs in 3.1.2.

IMPLEMENTED

YR.1 see note      YR.3 \_\_\_\_\_      YR.6 \_\_\_\_\_

*Excise Tax on hauled MSW and grants (primarily from Ecology's CPG program) are the anticipated funding sources for all years.*

PROPOSED

YR.1 NA YR.3 NA YR.6 NA

*No new County waste reduction programs planned at this time*

**3.2 Recycling and Composting Programs**

3.2.1 Please list the proposed or implemented recycling program(s) and, their costs, and proposed funding mechanism or provide the page number in the draft plan on which it is discussed. (Attach additional sheets as necessary.)

IMPLEMENTED

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
Various existing private programs	NA	Market revenues, service charges, tipping fees
MRW Recycling & Disposal. Envirostars	\$400,000 yr \$11,000	Grant, excise taxes, fees from Small Quantity Business Generators.
Recycling Hotline	\$12,000	Excise taxes
Public Outreach & Promotion	\$15,000	Excise taxes
Classroom Education	\$25,000	Excise taxes
Solid Solutions Newsletter	\$19,000	Excise taxes
Countywide Garage Sale	\$5,000	Excise taxes
Christmas Tree Tags	\$350	Excise taxes
City of Bellingham	\$292,280	Excise tax (\$120,000 )
Clean Green Yardwaste Site		\$2.00 Per load fee Add'l City funds
Compost Education	\$20,000	Excise taxes,
Latex Paint Exchange & Reclamation @ MRW facility	\$25,000	Excise taxes, *Grant <i>*Grant funding 2008 only</i>

PROPOSED

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
Green Building Education	\$25,000	Excise Tax

### 3.3 Solid Waste Collection Programs

#### 3.3.1 Regulated Solid Waste Collection Programs

Fill in the table below for each **WUTC regulated** solid waste collection entity in your jurisdiction

<u>WUTC Regulated Hauler Name</u>	<u>Blaine Bay Refuse, Inc.</u>		
<u>G-permit # G-145</u>	<u>YR.1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	2800	2800	2800
- Tonnage Collected	6000	6000	6000
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	_____	_____	_____
- Tonnage Collected	_____	_____	_____

<u>WUTC Regulated Hauler Name</u>	<u>Nooksack Valley Disposal</u>		
<u>G-permit # G-166</u>	<u>YR.1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	2264	2284	2360
- Tonnage Collected	1850	1750	1700
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	404	408	420
- Tonnage Collected	2697	2400	2500

<u>WUTC Regulated Hauler Name</u>	<u>Point Recycling and Refuse</u>		
<u>G-Permit # G-155</u>	<u>YR.1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	339	350	350
- Tonnage Collected	609	600	600
	<i>Residential and Commercial tonnage not separated. Total tonnage includes amounts from Commercial customers below.</i>		
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	30	30	30
- Tonnage Collected	<i>see above</i>		

<u>WUTC Regulated Hauler Name</u>	<u>Sanitary Service Company</u>		
<u>G-Permit # G-14</u>	<u>YR.1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	17375	17767	18355
- Tonnage Collected	9281	9300	9300
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	4058	4274	4598
- Tonnage Collected	32095	32000	32000

3.3.2 Other (non-regulated) Solid Waste Collection Programs Fill in the table below for other solid waste collection entities in your jurisdiction. (Make additional copies of this section as necessary to record all such entities in your jurisdiction.)

<b>Hauler Name</b>	<u>Sanitary Service Company.</u>		
	<u>YR. 1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
# of Customers	20810	21410	22310
Tonnage Collected	15462	15000	15000

<b>Hauler Name</b>	<u>Nooksack Valley Disposal</u>		
	<u>YR. 1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
# of Customers	4514	4550	4650
Tonnage Collected	9830	9650	9500

### 3.4 Energy Recovery & Incineration (ER&I) Programs

NA, no such facilities.

### 3.5 Land Disposal Program

No open MSW landfills. Dollars expended for monitoring (Cedarville, Y Road I and II), leachate haul/treatment (Cedarville) and maintenance of closed landfills only.

2008 budgeted amount: \$210,000.

*Future needs being assessed at this time.*

3.5.1 Provide the following information for each **land disposal facility** in your jurisdiction which receives garbage or refuse generated in the county.

**Landfill Name:** County Construction Recyclers (CCR)  
**Owner:** Joan Muenscher  
**Operator:** Joan Muenscher  
*CCR shut down effective 6/30/08. Information not available.*

**Landfill Name:** Foothills Recycling  
**Owner:** Robert McKay  
**Operator:** Robert McKay  
*Foothills Recycling located on tribal trust land. Efforts to close it down have been largely unsuccessful although no new activity has been noted last 12 mos. No data available on costs or tonnage.*

3.5.2 Estimate the **approximate tonnage** disposed at the landfill by **WUTC regulated haulers**. If you do not have a scale and are unable to estimate tonnages, estimate using cubic yards, and indicate whether they are compacted or loose.

N/A

- 3.5.3 Using the same conversion factors applied in 3.5.2, please estimate the **approximate tonnage** disposed at the landfill by other contributors.

N/A

- 3.5.4 Provide the cost of operating (including capital acquisitions) each landfill in your jurisdiction. For any facility that is **privately owned and operated**, skip these questions.

County Construction Recyclers:	<i>Privately owned and operated facility</i>
Foothills Recycling:	<i>Privately owned and operated facility</i>
YR.1 <u>NA</u>	YR.3 <u>NA</u> YR.6 <u>NA</u>

- 3.5.5 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will defray the cost of this component.

Tipping Fees

### 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

YR.1 <u>\$237,000</u>	YR.3 <u>\$250,000</u>	YR.6 <u>\$255,000</u>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

*Administrative costs not separated out by programs.*

#### Funding Source

YR.1 <u>excise tax</u>	YR.3 <u>excise tax</u>	YR.6 <u>excise tax</u>
------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

- 3.6.2 Which cost components are included in these estimates?

Expenses that are included under administration costs include staffing, supplies, building maintenance and utilities, education and training, communications, contributions to County general and tort funds, and accounting and technical support.

- 3.6.3 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will recover the cost of each component.

Excise taxes on hauled MSW.

### 3.7 Other Programs

NA, no such programs.

### 3.8 References and Assumptions (attach additional sheets as necessary)

*Starting 2008, grant monies (and excise tax) to fund MRW program only. Balance of programs, excise taxes only.*



3.3. *All haulers are private companies not under contract to County.*

4. **FUNDING MECHANISMS:** This section relates specifically to the funding mechanisms currently in use and the ones which will be implemented to incorporate the recommended programs in the draft plan. Because the way a program is funded directly relates to the costs a resident or commercial customer will have to pay, this section is crucial to the cost assessment process. Please fill in each of the following tables as completely as possible.



**Table 4.1.1 Facility Inventory**

Facility Name	Type of Facility	Tip Fee per Ton 2008	Transfer Cost	Transfer Station Location	Final Disposal Location	Total Tons Disposed 2008	Total Revenue Generated (Tip Fee x Tons)
Disposal of Toxics (DoT)	MRW only	*NA	NA	Airport Way Bellingham	Various Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites depending on material.	32,887 Disp. 82,097 Recycled	\$46,485 SQG fees
Recycling & Disposal Svcs (RDS)	Transfer Station	\$78 - Construct. \$100 - MSW	Proprietary	4916 LaBounty Ferndale, WA	Transferred to Columbia Ridge Landfill, Oregon	56,256.5 T MSW  8,175.5 T Household Gbg.	\$5,625.650  \$817,550
Regional Disposal	Transfer Station	\$67.57	Proprietary	1254 Slater Rd. Ferndale, WA	Transferred to Roosevelt Regional Landfill, Klickitat Co.	57,920.5 T MSW	\$3,913,688
Clean Green Yardwaste	Yardwaste Drop-off, transfer	\$2 truck load	Hauling & Composting \$182,216 Yr 2008	Corner of Woburn & Lakeway, Bellingham	Transferred to Skagit County composting facility	5352 T	\$73,526 Load fees
Birch Bay Recycling	Drop off, transfer	\$.15 per lb. \$5 minimum	N/A	4297 Birch Bay Lynden Rd. Birch Bay	Transferred to RDS, then Roosevelt Regional Landfill	148.38 T	Not available
Cedarville Recycling	Drop off, transfer	\$.15 per lb. \$5 minimum	N/A	Cedarville Rd. Bellingham	Transferred to RDS, then Roosevelt Regional Landfill	137.52 T	Not available
Pt. Recycling & Refuse	Drop off, transfer	\$.125 per lb. \$5.50 minimum	N/A	Johnson Rd. Point Roberts	Transferred to RdS, then to Roosevelt Regional Landfill	421.67 T	Not available
Sanitary Service Co.	Drop off, transfer	\$5.85 minimum	N/A	1001 Roeder St. Bellingham	Transferred to RDS, then to Roosevelt Regional Landfill	140.43 T	Not available
Nooksack Valley Disposal	Drop off, transfer	\$.10 lb \$2.00 min	N/A	250 Birch Bay Lynden Rd. Lynden	Transferred to RDS, then to Roosevelt Regional Landfill	927.60	Not available
Foothills Recycling	Landfill	Mostly C&D	None		Same	N/A	N/A
County Construction Recyclers Closed 6/08	Landfill	\$Varied per Yard C&D only	None	1960 E. Hemmi Everson, WA	Same	N/A	N/A

\* Free for residential quantities. Fee for Small Quantity Generator dependent upon material and quantity.

**Table 4.1.2 Tip Fee Components**

Tip Fee by Facility	Surcharge NONE	City Tax 2008	County Tax	Transportation Cost	Operational Cost	Administration Cost	Closure Costs
Disposal of Toxics (DoT)		0	0	Contracted, combined services \$365,000 + SQG fees			0
Recycling & Disposal Svcs (RDS)		8% SW 3% Recycling	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Regional Disposal		8% SW 3% Recycling	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Clean Green Yardwaste		0	0	Yr 2008 Hauling & composting – \$182,216	\$104,422	\$5,639	0
Birch Bay Recycling		0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Cedarville Recycling		0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Pt. Recycling & Refuse		0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Sanitary Service Co.		12.99%	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Nooksack Valley Disposal		6%	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

*County Excise tax on Haulers only, not Facilities.*

**Table 4.1.3 Funding Mechanism**

Name of Program Funding Mechanism will defray costs	Bond Name	Total Bond Debt	Bond Rate	Bond Due Date	Grant Name	Grant Amount	Tip Fee	Taxes	Other	Surcharge
DoT-MRW Facility Envirostars					CP Grant	\$219,106	see above	Excise tax monies \$142,039	SQG fees \$46,000 in 2008	
Recycling & Disposal Svcs (RDS)							100%			
Regional Disposal							100%			
Clean Green Yardwaste – City of Bellingham (COB)							Per load fee Approx. 25%	Excise tax, funds approx 37.5% as County subsidy , \$120,000 max	Balance COB gen. fund	
Birch Bay Recycling							100%			
Cedarville Recycling							100%			
Pt. Recycling & Refuse							100%			
Sanitary Service Co.							100%			
Nooksack Valley Disposal							100%			

**Table 4.1.4 Tip Fee Forecast**

Tip Fee per Ton by Facility	Year One 2008	Year Two 2009	Year Three 2010	Year Four 2011	Year Five 2012	Year Six 2013
Disposal of Toxics (DoT)	** See below	**	**	**	**	**
<b>Recycling &amp; Disposal Svcs</b> - Construction - General MSW	* \$78 T \$100 T	\$78 T \$100 T	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available
<b>Regional Disposal</b> - Construction - General MSW	* \$70 T \$70 T	\$75 T \$75 T	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available
Clean Green Yardwaste	\$2 Load	\$2 Load	\$2.50 Load	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available
Birch Bay Recycling	\$.15 lb \$5 min.	\$.15 lb \$5 min.	\$.15 lb \$5 min.	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available
Cedarville Recycling	\$.15 lb \$5 min.	\$.15 lb \$5 min.	\$.15 lb \$5 min.	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available
Pt. Recycling & Refuse	\$.12 lb no min.	\$.125 lb \$5.50 minimum	\$.125 lb \$5.50 minimum	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available
Sanitary Service Co.	\$5.85 minimum	\$5.85 minimum	\$5.85 minimum	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available
Nooksack Valley Disposal	\$.10 lb \$2.00 minimum	\$.10 lb \$2.00 minimum	\$.10 lb \$2.00 minimum	No projection available	No projection available	No projection available

\*Reduced Fees may be negotiated w/individual haulers.

\*\* Free for residential quantities. Fee for Small Quantity Generator dependent upon material and quantity.

- 4.2 **Funding Mechanisms** summary by percentage: In the following tables, please summarize the way programs will be funded in the key years. For each component, provide the expected percentage of the total cost met by each funding mechanism. (e.g. Waste Reduction may rely on tip fees, grants, and collection rates for funding). You would provide the estimated responsibility in the table as follows: Tip fees=10%; Grants=50%; Collection Rates=40%. The mechanisms must total 100%. If components can be classified as “other,” please note the programs and their appropriate mechanisms. Provide attachments as necessary.

<b>Table 4.2.1 Funding Mechanism by Percentage</b>						
<b>Year One</b>						
Component	Excise Tax	Grant %	Bond %	Rates & Charges %	Other %	Total
Waste Reduction	100					100%
Recycling	75	22		3% SQG		100%
Collection	35	55		10% SQG		NA
ER&I						NA
Transfer						NA
Land Disposal						NA
Administration	100					100%
Other						NA

<b>Table 4.2.2 Funding Mechanism by Percentage</b>						
<b>Year Three</b>						
Component	Excise Tax	Grant %	Bond %	Rates & Charges %	Other %	Total
Waste Reduction	100					100%
Recycling	75	22		3% SQG		100%
Collection	35	55		10% SQG		NA
ER&I						NA
Transfer						NA
Land Disposal						NA
Administration	100					100%
Other						NA

<b>Table 4.2.3 Funding Mechanism by Percentage</b>						
<b>Year Six</b>						
Component	Excise Tax	Grant %	Bond %	Rates & Charges %	Other %	Total
Waste Reduction	100					100%
Recycling	75	22		3% SQG		100%
Collection	35	55		10% SQG		100%
ER&I						100%
Transfer						100%
Land Disposal						100%
Administration	100					100%
Other						100%

### **4.3 References and Assumptions**

Please provide any support for the information you have provided. An annual budget or similar document would be helpful.

*4.1.4 Information on future tipping fees is not available at this time.*

### **4.4 Surplus Funds**

Please provide information about any surplus or saved funds that may support your operations.

No expected surplus funds generated.