

Appendix F  
WUTC Cost Assessment



# **COST ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please provide the information requested below:

**PLAN PREPARED FOR THE COUNTY OF: Spokane**

**PLAN PREPARED FOR THE CITY OF: N/A**

**PREPARED BY: SCS Engineers; Michelle Leonard, Project Manager**

**CONTACT TELEPHONE: 626.792-9593 DATE: 1/1/2015**

## **DEFINITIONS**

Please provide these definitions as used in the Solid Waste Management Plan and the Cost Assessment Questionnaire.

Throughout this document:

YR.1 shall refer to **2015.**

YR.3 shall refer to **2017.**

YR.6 shall refer to **2020.**

Year refers to: **calendar** (Jan 01 - Dec 31)

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.1 489,491 YR.3 499,348 YR.6 513,910

- 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.1 376,236 YR.3 383,453 YR.6 394,081

### 1.2 References and Assumptions

Population projections using OFM data, which anticipates growth of approximately 1.0% per year, applied to the percentage of the total county population that is participating in the County solid waste system.

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.1 247,330 YR.3 258,287 YR.6 274,915

### 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.1 237,424 YR.3 236,894 YR.6 235,621

### 2.3 References and Assumptions

Disposal and diversion data from Spokane Regional Solid Waste System, Spokane County, and Ecology, applied to the percentage of the total county population that is participating in the County solid waste system.

**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 (pgs. 4-1—4-7)

PROPOSED (page 4-12)

Education and outreach  
 Website  
 Newsletters  
 Brochures  
 Classroom presentations  
 EnviroStars  
 Green Zone  
 US Green Building Council  
 Rate incentives  
  
 Backyard Composting/  
 Master Composter/Recycler Program

Collaboration with other entities  
 Community based social marketing  
 Residential toxic waste reduction  
 Potential single-use plastic bag ban  
 Business on-site technical assistance  
 Business recognition program  
 Self-haul source separation  
 Promotion of durable items donations  
 Backyard Composting/  
 Master Composter/Recycler Program

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

IMPLEMENTED

**YR.1    \$825,000      YR.3    \$825,000      YR.6      \$825,000**

PROPOSED

**YR.1    \$634,000      YR.3    \$634,000      YR.6      \$634,000**

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

IMPLEMENTED

YR.1 Grant, tip fee for local match  
 YR.6 Grant, tip fee for local match

YR.3 Grant, tip fee for local match

PROPOSED

YR.1 Grant, tip fee for local match  
 YR.6 Grant, tip fee for local match

YR.3 Grant, tip fee for local match

**3.2 Recycling 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 (pages 5-3 - - 5-7)

PROGRAM	COST	FUNDING
<b>Drop-off facilities at transfer stations; other recycling programs</b>	<b><u>\$824,000</u></b>	<b><u>Tip fees, grant</u></b>

PROPOSED (page 5-24)

PROGRAM	COST	FUNDING
<b>Drop-off facilities at transfer stations; other recycling programs</b>	<b><u>\$839,000</u></b>	<b><u>Tip Fees, Grant</u></b>

**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. (Make additional copies of this section as necessary to record all such entities in your jurisdiction.)

**WUTC Regulated Hauler Name: Waste Management of Washington, Inc.**  
**G-Permit # 237**

<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>	<u>YR.1</u>	<u>YR.3</u>	<u>YR.6</u>
- # of Customers	22,800	22,987	23,175
- Tonnage Collected	19,700	19,833	19,968
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	1,200	1,210	1,220
- Tonnage Collected	10,800	10,873	10,947

**WUTC Regulated Hauler Name: Empire Disposal, Inc.**  
**G-Permit # G-75**

<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>	<u>YR.1</u>	<u>YR.3</u>	<u>YR.6</u>
- # of Customers	1,395	1,406	1,418
- Tonnage Collected	1,562	1,573	1,583
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	133	134	135
- Tonnage Collected	213	214	216

**WUTC Regulated Hauler Name: Sunshine Disposal**  
**G-Permit #**

<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>	<u>YR.1</u>	<u>YR.3</u>	<u>YR.6</u>
- # of Customers			
- Tonnage Collected	<b>NON-RESPONSIVE</b>		
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers			
- Tonnage Collected			

*Waste collection projections based on annual population estimates and waste generation trends for the county.*

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.)

**Hauler Name: City of Spokane**

	<u>YR. 1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
# of Customers	67,000	67,549	68,103
Tonnage Collected	162,464	163,564	164,672

City of Spokane services 63,000 residential and 4,000 commercial customers.

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

(If you have more than one facility of this type, please copy this section to report them.)

3.4.1 Complete the following for each facility:

**Name:** City of Spokane Waste to Energy Facility  
**Location:** 2900 S. Geiger Blvd., Spokane  
**Owner:** City of Spokane  
**Operator:** City of Spokane

3.4.2 What is the permitted capacity (tons/day) for the facility?

The available capacity for acceptable MSW is 248,200 tons per year. There is no permitted maximum. In 2012, the facility processed 272,799 tons.

3.4.3 If the facility is not operating at capacity, what is the average daily throughput?

YR.1 **800**                      YR.3 **800**                      YR.6 **800**

3.4.4 What quantity is estimated to be land filled which is either ash or cannot be processed.

YR.1 **95,300**                      YR.3 **95,300**                      YR.6 **95,300**

3.4.5 What are the expected capital costs and operating costs, for ER&I programs (not including ash disposal expense)?

YR.1 **N/A**                      YR.3 **N/A**                      YR.6 **N/A**

3.4.6 What are the expected costs of ash disposal?

YR.1 **N/A**                      YR.3 **N/A**                      YR.6 **N/A**

3.4.7 Is ash disposal to be:                             on-site?  
          in county?  
     X   long-haul?

3.4.8 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will fund the costs of this component.  
**N/A – The facility is owned and operated by the City of Spokane.**

**3.5 Land Disposal Program**

(If you have more than one facility of this type, please copy this section to report them.)

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

N/A



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.<sup>1</sup>

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.

N/A

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

N/A

### 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 **\$250,000**      YR.3 **\$250,000**      YR.6 **\$250,000**

Funding Source

YR.1 **Grants, tip fees**      YR.3 **Same**      YR.6 **Same**

3.6.2 Which cost components are included in these estimates?

**Expenses included in the estimate are as follows: salaries and wages, personnel benefits, supplies, permits, and other services and charges.**

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Compacted cubic yards will be converted at a standard 600 pounds per yard. Loose cubic yards will be converted at a standard 300 pounds per cubic yard. Please specify an alternative conversion ratio if one is presently in use in your jurisdiction.

**Funding mechanisms include grants and tip fees.**

**3.7 Other Programs**

For each program in effect or planned which does not readily fall into one of the previously described categories please answer the following questions. (Make additional copies of this section as necessary.)

3.7.1 Describe the program, or provide a page number reference to the plan.

**Transfer Stations Operations and Maintenance**

3.7.2 Owner/Operator

Owner: Spokane County

Operator: Waste Connections

3.7.3 Is WUTC Regulation Involved? If so, please explain the extent of involvement in section 3.8.

N/A

3.7.4 Please estimate the anticipated costs for this program, including capital and operating expenses.

Operations & Maintenance:

North County Transfer Station: \$1,730,000 per year

Valley Transfer Station; \$1,400,000 per year

3.7.5 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will recover the cost of this component.

Tip fees

3.7 **References and Assumptions** (attach additional sheets as necessary)

**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	Transfer Cost**	Transfer Station Location	Final Disposal Location	Total Tons Disposed	Total Revenue Generated (Tip Fee x Tons)
North County Transfer Station	Transfer Station	\$104.59		N. 22123 Elk-Chattaroy Road	City of Spokane Waste To Energy Facility	42,725	\$4,393,447.82
Valley Transfer Station	Transfer Station	\$104.59		3941 N. Sullivan Road	City of Spokane Waste To Energy Facility	88,971	\$9,201,768.31

Table 4.1.2 Tip Fee Components

Tip Fee by Facility	Surcharge	City Tax	County Tax	Transportation Cost	Operational Cost	Administration Cost	Closure Costs
North County Transfer Station	0%	0%	0%	6.5%	88%	5.5%	%
Valley Transfer Station	%	%	%	6.5%	89%	4.5%	%

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
Outreach and Education					CPG		X			
Waste reduction					CPG		X			
Recycling					CPG		X			
HHW/MRW					CPG		X			
Organics					CPG		X			
Planning					CPG		X			

Table 4.1.4 Tip Fee\* Forecast

Tip Fee per Ton by Facility	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five	Year Six
North County Transfer Station	\$101.00	\$101.00	\$101.00	\$101.00	\$101.00	\$101.00
Valley Transfer Station	\$101.00	\$101.00	\$101.00	\$101.00	\$101.00	\$101.00

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.

Table 4.2.1 Funding Mechanism by Percentage						
Year One						
Component	Tip Fee %	Grant %	Bond %	Collection Tax Rates %	Other %	Total
Education and Outreach	25%	75%				100
Waste Reduction	25%	75%				100
Recycling	25%	75%				100
HHW/MRW	25%	75%				100
Planning	25%	75%				100
Organics	25%	75%				100

Table 4.2.2 Funding Mechanism by Percentage						
Year Three						
Component	Tip Fee %	Grant %	Bond %	Collection Tax Rates %	Other %	Total
Education and Outreach	25%	75%				100
Waste Reduction	25%	75%				100
Recycling	25%	75%				100
HHW/MRW	25%	75%				100
Planning	25%	75%				100
Organics	25%	75%				100

**Table 4.2.3 Funding Mechanism by Percentage**

**Year Six**

Component	Tip Fee %	Grant %	Bond %	Collection Tax Rates %	Other %	Total
Education and Outreach	25%	75%				100
Waste Reduction	25%	75%				100
Recycling	25%	75%				100
HHW/MRW	25%	75%				100
Planning	25%	75%				100
Organics	25%	75%				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.

**4.4 Surplus Funds**

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