



COST ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

FOR LOCAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING

Third Edition, Revised October 2019

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

Version 4



Table of Contents

1. Process Overview	3
1.1. Purpose of the cost assessment guidelines	3
1.2. The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission	3
1.3. Relationship with the Washington Department of Ecology	4
2. UTC Rate Setting Process	4
2.1. Rate Setting Process.....	4
2.2. How the UTC Sets Rates.....	5
3. Cost Assessment Information	5
3.1. Information Needed.....	5
3.2. Planning Numbers and Rate Data	6
3.3. Direct and Indirect System Costs	6
4. UTC Cost Assessment Review	7
4.1. The Internal Process.....	7
5. Solid Waste Cost Assessment Questionnaire	7
COST ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE	8
General Information	8
Years.....	8
1. Demographics	9
1.1. Population.....	9
1.2. References and Assumptions.....	9
2. Waste Stream Generation	9
2.1. Tonnage of Solid Waste Disposed.....	9
2.2. Tonnage of Recyclable Materials with a Market	10
2.3. Tonnage of Recyclable Materials without a Market.....	10
2.4. References and Assumptions.....	11
3. Collection Programs	11
3.1. Regulated Solid Waste Collection Programs.....	11
3.2. Cost & Funding for Solid Waste Programs	12
3.3. References and Assumptions.....	13
4. Waste Reduction (Recycling and Organics)	13
4.1. Recycling	13
4.2. Other Waste Reduction Programs (Organics, such as Yard Waste and Food Waste)	16

4.3.	References and Assumptions.....	18
5.	Disposal.....	18
5.1.	Energy Recovery & Incineration (ER&I) Disposal Programs.....	18
5.2.	Land Disposal Program	20
5.3.	References and Assumptions.....	23
6.	Administration Program.....	23
6.1.	Costs & Funding for Administration Programs	23
6.2.	References and Assumptions.....	24
7.	Other Programs.....	24
7.1.	Programs.....	24
7.2.	Costs & Assumptions of Other Programs.....	24
7.3.	References and Assumptions.....	25
8.	Funding Mechanisms	25
8.1.	Facility Inventory.....	26
8.2.	Tip Fee Component.....	27
8.3.	Tip Fee Forecast	28
8.4.	References and Assumptions.....	29
8.5.	Surplus Funds	29

1. Process Overview

1.1. Purpose of the cost assessment guidelines

The purpose of the cost assessment guidelines is to help local governments prepare cost assessments for their solid waste management plans (SWMP). Counties or cities should prepare their cost assessments so that impacts on solid waste haulers and their ratepayers are easy to determine. If a local government does not have Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC)-regulated collection companies in its jurisdiction, the commission will not review the plan. Instead, the Washington Department of Ecology will consider in its review whether or not the plan adequately meets the cost assessment requirements.

Every local government with a UTC-regulated collection company within its jurisdiction must complete a cost assessment pursuant to these guidelines and state law.¹

The cost assessment:

- is a comprehensive, system-wide review of a solid waste plan's costs,
- considers the dollar impact on ratepayers of the plan's recommendations, and
- provides sufficient information to estimate future rate levels over the plan period.

The cost assessment is beneficial to:

- local elected officials and staff who may use the cost assessment process as an evaluation tool for selecting preferred solid waste management system alternatives,
- UTC commissioners and staff who use cost assessments to obtain information about probable future rate increases and policy directions set by local governments,
- solid waste advisory committee members who can use cost assessments to evaluate solid waste systems and estimate costs of implementing proposed plans,
- UTC-regulated solid waste collection companies that can use assessments to plan for future capital and operating expenditures, and
- citizens who pay for solid waste management systems through solid waste collection bills and tipping fees and can use cost assessments to estimate future expense levels. This information can help the public provide input to local officials about their solid waste program preferences. The information can also further citizen understanding of the rate setting process.

1.2. The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

The UTC is composed of three commissioners who are appointed by the governor and confirmed by the Senate to six-year terms. The commissioners are supported by a staff of accountants, economists, engineers, consumer program specialists, and special investigators.

The commission regulates privately owned utility companies, including energy, telecommunications, natural gas, water, and transportation companies, including low-level nuclear waste, solid waste, and medical waste companies. The commission is primarily an economic regulator, but it also regulates the airpotter, solid waste hauling, railroad, and oil and gas pipeline industries for safety.

Chapter 81.77 RCW sets forth the UTC's role in solid waste management. The commission grants authority to operate, approves rates, prescribes accounting formats, and requires regulated companies

¹ RCW 70.95.090(8) and RCW 70.95.096

to file annual reports. However, RCW 81.77.22 provides exemptions from regulation for a municipality, or any solid waste or recycling company providing solid waste collection service under contract for a municipality. In addition, any recycling company providing service solely to commercial customers are federally exempt.

The commission's responsibility to approve rates makes the UTC directly accountable to ratepayers. The commission's goals are to ensure that rates charged by regulated companies are fair, just, reasonable, and sufficient. Cost assessments prepared according to these guidelines provide the commission with information it needs to understand how proposed changes to a local SWMP will affect future rates.

1.3. Relationship with the Washington Department of Ecology

The Washington Department of Ecology's *Guidelines for the Development of Local Solid Waste Management Plans*² and the UTC's *Cost Assessment Guidelines* are mutually supportive. Ecology's guidelines help a local government prepare its SWMP, while the UTC's guidelines help assess the costs of various alternatives considered in the plan.

The UTC reviews the draft local SWMPs autonomous of reviews performed by other parties. Once the UTC review is complete, staff prepares a letter with its recommendations for the commission to consider at an open meeting. Once the letter's recommendations are acknowledged at the open meeting, it is sent to the county or city and Ecology.

2. UTC Rate Setting Process

2.1. Rate Setting Process

UTC-regulated collection companies must file with the commission in order to change rates. The company must file its rate changes in a proposed tariff that the commission must receive at least 45 days before the proposed effective date. Commission staff reviews the company's justification to support the proposed rates as well as the company's books and records. After staff completes the audit and analysis, staff prepares a memorandum to the commissioners explaining findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

The commissioners consider the proposed rates at an open meeting, after reviewing staff's memorandum. The company, customers, and other interested parties may address their concerns to the commissioners in writing or during the open meeting.

Commissioners may approve proposed rates to become effective as scheduled or issue an order suspending the proposed rates in order to look further into whether the request is reasonable. Suspended rates do not become effective as requested, instead, the rates in effect at the time of filing, remain in effect until the commission approves a change.

If rates are suspended, the matter may require a formal hearing before an administrative law judge. This is a quasi-judicial proceeding with attorneys and witnesses providing sworn testimony. The administrative law judge issues a decision, based on the record. Parties can appeal to the commissioners for review, at the end of which the three commissioners issue their own decision. Additional appeals of the commission's decision would go through the court system.

² <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1007005.html>

2.2. How the UTC Sets Rates

When requesting revised or new rates, a company must file a revised tariff along with detailed financial and operational data to demonstrate its proposed rates are fair, just, reasonable, and sufficient. Rates are set to recover the costs of providing service to customers. Although companies are entitled to recover appropriate expenses and earn reasonable returns, they are not entitled to recover imprudent or nonservice related costs.

The rate setting process allocates total company expenses to regulated activities (i.e., garbage service in an unincorporated county), by different service categories (e.g., garbage, recycling, organics), by different service levels (e.g., residential customers with mini cans or commercial customers with 32-gallon cans). The allocations may take place in several different levels.

In determining the company's gross revenues, an adjusted historical test period is used to forecast the period rates will be in effect. Staff adjusts the company's income statement for the test year in two ways: 1) Restating adjustments correct errors and departures from regulatory accounting practice; and 2) Pro forma adjustments revise historical amounts for known and measurable changes in revenue and expenses.

3. Cost Assessment Information

For the reasons outlined above, the UTC reviews the local SWMP's cost assessment and advises the local government of the probable effect the alternatives may have on rates charged by companies regulated by the UTC. This section identifies the information the UTC requires to accurately analyze the cost and rate impacts. UTC staff looks for evidence that the planning jurisdiction:

- considers solid waste management from a comprehensive, system-wide perspective,
- considers the cost impact of its decisions on ratepayers, and
- provides information sufficient to estimate future rate levels.

3.1. Information Needed

To determine the probable effect a SWMP will have on rates, the UTC requires the following information:

- current population and solid waste disposal quantities,
- detailed description of the existing comprehensive solid waste management system(s), including selected alternatives,
- proposed changes in the present solid waste management system(s),
- estimated cost requirements for each component of the solid waste management system(s) for years one through six, including the component costs of recycling programs,
- all sources of funding to be utilized to operate and pay for the system(s),
- the role of the UTC-regulated solid waste collection company(s), and
- information on all the solid waste collection companies in its area.

Factors impacting solid waste rates include population and the number of businesses, the weight of material collected, and collection time required for routes. In addition, the cost of local government programs and supporting infrastructure, and facilities also impact rates.

Expected cost variances over the plan period are important elements needed for assessing rate impacts. RCW 70.95.090(3) requires the local SWMP to contain:

- a six-year construction and capital acquisition program for solid waste handling facilities³, and
- a plan for financing both capital costs and operating costs of the proposed solid waste management system.⁴

The cost data should address capital costs and associated financing options for years one through six. For proper assessment of rate impacts, costs should include both direct and indirect cost information for each component of the solid waste facilities and system(s). All assumptions used to develop the cost data should also be included.

The questionnaire in Section Five outlines the information the UTC needs to assess changes in rates. Completing this questionnaire is not mandatory. We provide it as a tool to help ensure that each plan provides UTC staff the necessary information to complete their analysis. Local governments may use the questionnaire provided or submit comparable information in another form.

3.2. Planning Numbers and Rate Data

The SWMP guides decisions about future activities. Any plan that involves forecasting is subject to uncertainty. Population changes, economic growth or decline, housing construction, fluctuating interest rates, enforcement actions by state or local authorities, changes in state and federal law, and participation levels in recycling programs are just some of the variables in the solid waste equation that will vary between planning and implementation of solid waste programs.

These guidelines are intended to be flexible while assisting local governments in calculating rates based on assumptions outlined in their plan. To provide a clear rationale for its decisions, a local comprehensive SWMP should contain a statement of the county's goals, objectives, and policies. The plan should also contain explicit information on local conditions, various assumptions, and information on existing operations used to support the plan's cost conclusions. During its review, the UTC staff will use these same assumptions, along with current solid waste collection company statistics and data, to estimate changes in rates to customers the plan may cause.

3.3. Direct and Indirect System Costs

During its review, the UTC looks at both direct costs and indirect costs.

An example of a direct cost is a recycling program provided by a UTC-certificated hauler. In this case, the company recovers its program operation costs directly from ratepayers through collection rates. An example of an indirect cost is a surcharge or city tax. The SWMP should provide sufficient information for UTC staff to determine the probable rate impact such as the number of participating households, type and volume of materials collected, frequency of collection, the processing facility to which materials will be taken, and expected markets for recycled materials or costs of disposing nonmarketable recyclable materials.

³ RCW 70.95.090(3)(c)

⁴ RCW 70.95.090(3)(d)

4. UTC Cost Assessment Review

4.1. The Internal Process

State law requires local governments to submit preliminary draft SWMPs to Ecology for review.⁵ The commission reviews plan assessments of the impact solid waste collection costs will have on rates charged by solid waste collection companies regulated under 81.77 RCW. Commission staff must complete the review within 45 days of receiving the plan from Ecology.⁶

When the UTC receives a draft plan for review, staff assigns a docket number and schedules it for an open meeting. Once review is complete and the commission has acknowledged the staff recommendations, the review letter is sent to the local government and Ecology.

If UTC cannot make a cost assessment because of missing, imprecise, or unclear information, UTC staff will first contact the local government planner or, if necessary, the Ecology reviewer for clarification. If the local government planner or Ecology reviewer clarifies the information, the commission reviewer will make an assessment. If the commission reviewer still cannot make a cost assessment, the commission will state so in its review letter.

5. Solid Waste Cost Assessment Questionnaire

While the UTC prefers the local government submit information in the provided format, RCW 70.95.090 does not mandate the use of this questionnaire. The local government may provide the requested information in any format it chooses, but it is mandatory that a cost assessment is prepared. Complete and accurate responses will facilitate a quality cost assessment. If the local government does not have the information or does not know the answer, explaining that this information is unavailable is an acceptable response and allows the reviewer to understand areas that call for closer analysis and study.

Each major section of the questionnaire concludes with a subsection titled “References and Assumptions” that allows the local government a place to note sources and references the UTC should know about in preparing the cost assessment. In these sections, the county or city should also report any assumptions made while compiling questionnaire responses.

Once the cost assessment is complete, it may be included with the SWMP as a separate section or an appendix.

⁵ RCW 70.95.094

⁶ RCW 70.95.096

COST ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

General Information

Plan prepared for the County of Lincoln County

Plan prepared for the City of _____

Prepared by Greg Holmes

Contact telephone 509-725-0122

Contact email gholmes@co.lincoln.wa.us

Date June 6, 2024

Years

Throughout this document:

Year 1 (Base Year) shall refer to 2023

Year 2 shall refer to 2025

Year 3 shall refer to 2026

Year 4 shall refer to 2027

Year 5 shall refer to 2028

Year 6 shall refer to 2029

Each year shall refer to (check one):

- Calendar year January 1 – December 31
- Fiscal year Such as July 1 – June 30

1. Demographics

1.1. Population

1.1.1. Provide the total population of your County (excluding cities choosing to develop their own SWMP) for the base year and each of the following five years.

Table 1.1.1.a.

Year 1	11070
Year 2	11104
Year 3	11119
Year 4	11124
Year 5	11135
Year 6	11141

1.2. References and Assumptions

Washington Office of Financial Management, US Bureau of Economic Analysis

2. Waste Stream Generation

Provide the information below related to solid waste and recycling. Disposal refers to 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 of Solid Waste Disposed

2.1.1. Provide the total tonnage of solid waste disposed of in the base year and each of the following five years.

Table 2.1.1.a.

Year 1	8361
Year 2	8361

Year 3	8396
Year 4	8431
Year 5	8466
Year 6	8500

2.2. Tonnage of Recyclable Materials with a Market⁷

2.2.1. Provide the tonnage of recyclable materials recycled in the base year and each of the following five years.

Table 2.2.1.a.

Year 1	850
Year 2	900
Year 3	925
Year 4	900
Year 5	975
Year 6	1000

2.3. Tonnage of Recyclable Materials without a Market

2.3.1. Provide the tonnage of recyclable materials disposed of in the base year and each of the following five years.

Table 2.2.1.a.

Year 1	54.1
Year 2	54.1
Year 3	54.1
Year 4	54.1

⁷ RCW 90.95.090(7)(c)

Year 5	54.1
Year 6	54.1

2.4. References and Assumptions

Garbage tonnage will likely increase due to modest population increases, business activity increases, and increased per capita waste, a pattern that has been established and is expected to continue.

Recyclable materials collected may increase for these same reasons

The garbage and recycling system will functionally remain unchanged for the 5 year period

The short term increase in tonnage of garbage will flatten due to the out-of-County flow of a single previous user

3. Collection Programs

3.1. Regulated Solid Waste Collection Programs

Provide information for each UTC-regulated solid waste collection company operating in your jurisdiction for the base year and each of the following five years.

Table 3.1.a.

UTC-Regulated Hauler Name	Ada-Lin Waste Systems, Inc. dba Sunshine Disposal and Recycling					
G-Certificate #	G000104					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Residential						
# of customers	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
Tonnage collected	800	800	800	800	800	800
Commercial						
# of customers						
Tonnage collected						

Table 3.1.b.

UTC-Regulated Hauler Name	Sunrise Disposal, Inc.
G-Certificate #	G000201

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Residential						
# of customers	<u>unknown</u>	<u>unknown</u>	<u>unknown</u>	<u>unknown</u>	<u>unknown</u>	<u>unknown</u>
Tonnage collected	<u>105</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>110</u>
Commercial						
# of customers	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Tonnage collected	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Table 3.1.c.

UTC-Regulated Hauler Name _____

G-Certificate # _____

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Residential						
# of customers	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Tonnage collected	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Commercial						
# of customers	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Tonnage collected	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

3.2. Cost & Funding for Solid Waste Programs

Provide information for solid waste programs that have been implemented and/or proposed. Include costs and proposed funding mechanism. If these programs are discussed in the SWMP, provide the page number in the draft plan on which it is discussed.

Table 3.2.a.

Implemented			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #

Transfer Station	\$460,000	tipping fees, program fees recycling income	9.1, 5.1
Litter Crew	\$35,000	grant	6.9
MRW program	\$16,000	grants,program fees, local match	9.1,7.1

Table 3.2.b.

Proposed			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #
no new proposed programs			

3.3. References and Assumptions

Data derived from County and grant budgets, costs assume a static regulatory environment, stable LSWFA grant, tipping fees rising to match inflationary pressures

4. Waste Reduction (Recycling and Organics)

4.1. Recycling

4.1.1. Regulated Recycling Collection Programs⁸

Provide information for each UTC-regulated recycling company operating in your jurisdiction for the base year and each of the following five years.

⁸ RCW 70.95.090(7)(c)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Residential						
# of customers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tonnage collected	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commercial						
# of customers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tonnage collected	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4.1.2. Recyclable Materials

Provide a list of recyclable materials to be collected in accordance with the SWMP. For each item, indicate if there is an active market and if the revenues exceed the cost of processing.

<i>Table 4.1.2.a.</i>		
Recyclable Material	Active Market	Revenues > Processing Costs
paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
plastic bottles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
steel and aluminum cans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
ferrous and non ferrous metal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
used motor oil	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
antifreeze	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
batteries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
electronics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
tires	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
organic and yard waste	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.1.3. Costs & Funding for Recycling

Provide information for recycling programs that have been implemented and/or proposed. Include costs and proposed funding mechanism. If these programs are discussed in the SWMP, provide the page number in the draft plan on which it is discussed.

<i>Table 4.1.3.a.</i>			
Implemented			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #
Recycling program	110,000	grant, program fees, local match	9.1,3.3
Electronics program	unknown costs, <1k annual local	local match, manufacturer program	6.8

<i>Table 4.1.3.b.</i>			
Proposed			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #
recycled material storage building	\$200,000	1/2 grant, 1/2 local match	9.1

4.2. Other Waste Reduction Programs (Organics, such as Yard Waste and Food Waste)

4.2.1. Regulated Organics Collection Programs

Provide information for each UTC-regulated company collecting organics operating in your jurisdiction for the base year and each of the following five years.

Table 4.2.1.a.

UTC-Regulated Hauler Name _____ none _____

G-Certificate # _____

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Residential						
# of customers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tonnage collected	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commercial						
# of customers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tonnage collected	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Table 4.2.1.b.

UTC-Regulated Hauler Name _____

G-Certificate # _____

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Residential						
# of customers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tonnage collected	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commercial						
# of customers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tonnage collected	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4.2.2. Costs & Funding for Organics Collection Programs

Provide information for programs for collecting organics that have been implemented and/or proposed. Include costs and proposed funding mechanism. If these programs are discussed in the SWMP, provide the page number in the draft plan on which it is discussed.

<i>Table 4.2.2.a.</i>			
Implemented			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #
organics program	\$18,000	grant, program fees, local match	9.1,3.4

<i>Table 4.2.2.b.</i>			
Proposed			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #
upgrade organics collection	\$70,000	1/2 grant, 1/2 local match	9.1

4.3. References and Assumptions

Public Works Board loan/grant \$270,000 for organics upgrade+recyclable materials storage building

Costs and funding assume a stable regulatory environment, continued steady LSWFA grant funding

5. Disposal

5.1. Energy Recovery & Incineration (ER&I) Disposal Programs

5.1.1. ER&I Facilities:

Table 5.1.1.a.

	Facility	Facility
Name	not applicable	
Location		
Owner		
Operator		

5.1.2. Amount Landfilled

For each facility, provide the estimated amount of ash or materials that cannot be processed for the base year and each of the following five years.

Table 5.1.2.a.

Facility		
Year 1		
Year 2		
Year 3		
Year 4		
Year 5		
Year 6		

5.1.3. Costs & Funding for ER&I Programs

Provide information for ER&I programs that have been implemented and/or proposed. Include costs and proposed funding mechanism. If these programs are discussed in the SWMP, provide the page number in the draft plan on which it is discussed.

Table 5.1.3.a.

Implemented			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #

<i>Table 5.1.3.b.</i>			
Proposed			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #

5.1.4. Ash Disposal Expense

Provide the expected costs ash disposal.

<i>Table 5.1.4.a.</i>	
Amount of Ash	Cost
Year 1	
Year 2	
Year 3	
Year 4	
Year 5	
Year 6	

5.2. Land Disposal Program

5.2.1. Land Disposal Facilities

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

<i>Table 5.2.1.a.</i>	
Facility	Facility
Name	not applicable
Location	
Owner	
Operator	

5.2.2. Regulated Disposal

Provide the tonnage disposed of at each facility by UTC-regulated haulers.

<i>Table 5.2.2.a.</i>	
Facility	
Year 1	
Year 2	
Year 3	
Year 4	
Year 5	
Year 6	

5.2.3. Non-Regulated Disposal

Provide the tonnage disposed of at each facility by other (non-regulated) haulers and other contributors.

<i>Table 5.2.3.a.</i>	
Facility	

Year 1		
Year 2		
Year 3		
Year 4		
Year 5		
Year 6		

5.2.4. Costs & Funding for ER&I Programs

Provide information for land disposal programs that have been implemented and/or proposed. Include costs and proposed funding mechanism. If these programs are discussed in the SWMP, provide the page number in the draft plan on which it is discussed.

<i>Table 5.2.4.a.</i>			
Implemented			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #

<i>Table 5.2.4.b.</i>			
Proposed			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #

5.3. References and Assumptions

6. Administration Program

6.1. Costs & Funding for Administration Programs

Provide information for administration programs that have been implemented and/or proposed. Include costs and proposed funding mechanism. If these programs are discussed in the SWMP, provide the page number in the draft plan on which it is discussed.

<i>Table 6.1.a.</i>			
Implemented			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #
Lincoln County Health Dept	\$12,320	grant, local match	8.1

<i>Table 6.1.b.</i>			
Proposed			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #
no new programs proposed			

6.2. References and Assumptions

Costs and funding assume a static regulatory environment, stable LWSFA grant funding

7. Other Programs

7.1. Programs

For each program in effect or planned that does not readily fall into one of the previously described categories please fill in the following table.

<i>Table 7.1.a.</i>					
Program	none				
Page #					
Owner/Operator					
UTC Regulations	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Anticipated Yearly Costs					

7.1.1. UTC Regulation Involvement

If UTC regulation is involved, please explain the extent of involvement.

7.2. Costs & Assumptions of Other Programs

Provide information for other programs that have been implemented and/or proposed. Include costs and proposed funding mechanism. If these programs are discussed in the SWMP, provide the page number in the draft plan on which it is discussed.

<i>Table 7.2.a.</i>			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #

<i>Table 7.2.b.</i>			
Proposed			
Program	Cost	Funding	Page #

7.3. References and Assumptions

8. Funding Mechanisms

This section relates specifically to the funding mechanisms currently in use and the ones that 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.

8.2. Tip Fee Component

Table 8.2.a.

Tip Fee Components							
Tip Fee by Facility	Surcharge	City Tax	County Tax	Transportation Cost	Operational Cost	Administration Cost	Closure Costs
124.32	credit card fees 3.6% refuse tax			77.76 per ton Disposal Cost	\$46.50 per ton	\$0.06	

8.3. Tip Fee Forecast

Table 8.3.a.

Tip Fee Forecast

Tip Fee per Ton by Facility	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Lincoln County Transfer Station	119.04	124.32	129.91	135.75	141.85	148.23

8.4. References and Assumptions

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

tip fee increases assume maximum inflation, projections assume a similar priced contract for garbage hauling service in 2026

8.5. Surplus Funds

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

Operational levels of surplus gain and diminish depending on recycled material income, grant funding, and County support.