



2005-06 REVISED/NEW FEE REQUESTS  
PROGRAM SUMMARY

GROUP NAME: Economic Development/Public Services  
 DEPARTMENT NAME: Public Works  
 FUND NAME : Solid Waste Management - Operations  
 BUDGET UNIT: EAA SWM  
 PROGRAM: Sanitation Services

<b>PROGRAM APPROPRIATION AS CURRENTLY BUDGETED</b>	
Budgeted Appropriation	<u>\$ 58,585,356</u>

<b>PROGRAM APPROPRIATION IF FEE REVISIONS ARE ACCEPTED</b>	
Revised Appropriation	<u>\$ 60,419,561</u>

<b>DIFFERENCES</b> (See Following Page for Details)
<u>\$ 1,834,205</u>

<b>PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES AS CURRENTLY BUDGETED</b>	
Current Fee Revenue for listed fees	18,462,231
Fee Revenue for fees not listed	35,963,484
Non Fee Revenue	4,473,542
Retained Earnings	<u>3,402,590</u>
Budgeted Sources	<u>\$ 62,301,847</u>

<b>PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES IF FEE REVISIONS ARE ACCEPTED</b>	
Fee Revenue for listed fees	20,296,436
Fee Revenue for fees not listed	35,963,484
Non Fee Revenue	4,473,542
Retained Earnings	<u>3,402,590</u>
Revised Sources	<u>\$ 64,136,052</u>

1,834,205
-
-
-
<u>\$ 1,834,205</u>

<b>SUMMARY OF JUSTIFICATION FOR FEE REQUEST(S)</b>	
Change in Employee Related Costs	-
Inflationary Costs	537,542
Other	1,296,663
Total	<u>\$ 1,834,205</u>

**Summary of Justification for Fee Request(s) and the Budgetary Impact to Program if Fee(s) are approved:**  
 See Attached



2005-06 REVISED/NEW FEE REQUESTS  
SUMMARY OF JUSTIFICATION AND BUDGETARY IMPACT

GROUP NAME: Economic Development/Public Service  
DEPARTMENT NAME: Public Works  
FUND NAME : Solid Waste Management - Operations  
BUDGET UNIT: EAA SWM  
PROGRAM: Sanitation Services

Summary of Justification for Fee Requests(s) and the Budgetary Impact to Program if Fee(s) are approved:

**Inflationary Increases**

1. The ordinary per ton tipping fee increase requested is \$1.08/ton. This will increase revenues by **\$536,354**. This is necessary to maintain parity between this fee and the WDA tipping fee, as required by the WDA agreements. Increase of the bark beetle fees is also requested to maintain the parity between the bark beetle fee and the ordinary tipping fee, as required by the Board approved three-tiered fee waivers.
2. The hard/special handle minimum load fee increase requested is \$0.27/load. This will increase revenues by **\$108**. This increase is necessary to maintain the link between these fees and the ordinary tipping fee.
3. The compacted and non-compacted volume fee increases requested are \$0.10/cyd and \$0.36/cyd. This will not increase revenues, because there are no projected units for these rates [they are only used when the scales are inoperative or unavailable]. This is necessary to maintain the link between these fees and the ordinary tipping fee.
4. The uncovered/unsecured loads per ton fee increase requested is \$1.08/ton. This will increase revenues by **\$1,080**. This is necessary to maintain the link between this fee and the ordinary tipping fee.

The revenue generated from the above fee increases would be set aside in contingencies to finance unanticipated costs that may occur in the upcoming fiscal year.

**Other**

1. There is a new proposed fee to be applied to the receipt of processed green waste at \$1.75/ton. There will also be an equivalent \$0.96/cyd rate available for use when scales are inoperative or unavailable. This will increase revenues by **\$437,500**. This new fee will help cover the future revenue loss to be incurred from capacity loss due to the use of this material for daily cover. This daily cover material must be used in thicker layers than when dirt is used.
2. There is a new proposed surcharge fee to be applied to various waste types to fund perchlorate mitigation at \$0.69/ton. There will also be an equivalent \$0.17/load rate to be applied to various minimum load types. And there will be equivalent \$0.07/cyd [non-compacted waste] and \$0.23/cyd [compacted waste] rates to be applied when scales are inoperative or unavailable. This will increase revenues by **\$948,494**. This new fee will help offset costs of the ongoing perchlorate mitigation issues facing the county landfill system.
3. There is a proposed conversion of mountain commercial parcels from a land use fee billing system to a landfill gate fee billing system. This program change will mean a decrease in assessment fee revenue of **\$370,018**. This revenue loss would then be partially offset by an increase in tipping fee revenue of **\$280,687**.

Revenue generated from the new green waste fee and the perchlorate mitigation surcharge would be transferred to the Site Expansion/Acquisition Fund and Groundwater Remediation Fund, respectively, to finance future capital projects.



2005-06 REVISED/NEW FEE REQUESTS  
FEE SUMMARY

GROUP NAME: Economic Development/Public Services  
DEPARTMENT NAME: Public Works  
FUND NAME : Solid Waste Management - Operations  
PROGRAM: Sanitation Services

CURRENT FEE ORDINANCE/ CODE SECTION	FEE TITLE/ DESCRIPTION	CURRENT FEE	CURRENT UNITS IN BUDGET	CURRENT FEE REVENUE	PROPOSED FEE	PROPOSED UNITS	PROPOSED/ NEW FEE REVENUE	CHANGE IN FEE	CHANGE IN UNITS	CHANGE IN REVENUE	INCREASE IN APPROP	JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST INCLUDE BUDGETARY IMPACT IF FEE IS APPROVED
16.0222(a)(1)	Ordinary Refuse & Bark Beetle [per ton]	\$ 36.34	496,624	\$ 18,047,316	\$ 37.42	496,624	\$ 18,583,670	\$ 1.08	-	\$ 536,354	\$ 536,354	This adjustment is an inflationary increase to correspond with COLA adjustments for WDA cities.
16.0222(h)(3)(B)	Hard to Handle Refuse [per ton]	\$ 21.39	200	\$ 4,278	\$ 21.66	200	\$ 4,332	\$ 0.27	-	\$ 54	\$ 54	This fee increase is "inflationary" in nature and is linked to the Ordinary refuse fee increase.
16.0222(h)(3)(C)	Special Handling Refuse [per ton]	\$ 21.39	200	\$ 4,278	\$ 21.66	200	\$ 4,332	\$ 0.27	-	\$ 54	\$ 54	This fee increase is "inflationary" in nature and is linked to the Ordinary refuse fee increase.
16.0222(i)(1)(A)	Non-Compacted Refuse [per cubic yard]	\$ 3.56	-	\$ -	\$ 3.66	-	\$ -	\$ 0.10	-	\$ -	\$ -	This fee increase is "inflationary" in nature and is linked to the Ordinary refuse fee increase.
16.0222(i)(1)(B)	Compacted Refuse [per cubic yard]	\$ 11.86	-	\$ -	\$ 12.22	-	\$ -	\$ 0.36	-	\$ -	\$ -	This fee increase is "inflationary" in nature and is linked to the Ordinary refuse fee increase.
16.0222(a)(3)	Uncovered/Unsecured Loads [per ton]	\$ 36.34	1,000	\$ 36,340	\$ 37.42	1,000	\$ 37,420	\$ 1.08	-	\$ 1,080	\$ 1,080	This fee increase is "inflationary" in nature and is linked to the Ordinary refuse fee increase.
16.0222(a)(4)	Processed Green Waste [per ton]	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ 1.75	250,000	\$ 437,500	\$ 1.75	250,000	\$ 437,500	\$ 437,500	This material is being used as alternative daily cover at landfills. It must be placed in thicker layers than soil, using greater airspace. This new fee is proposed to offset the cost of this capacity loss.
16.0222(i)(1)(D)	Processed Green Waste [volume per cubic yard]	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ 0.96	-	\$ -	\$ 0.96	-	\$ -	\$ -	This is a volume-based fee equivalent for the per ton fee for this waste type. It is for use whenever the scales are inoperable or missing.



2005-06 REVISED/NEW FEE REQUESTS  
FEE SUMMARY

GROUP NAME: Economic Development/Public Services  
DEPARTMENT NAME: Public Works  
FUND NAME : Solid Waste Management - Operations  
PROGRAM: Sanitation Services

CURRENT FEE ORDINANCE/ CODE SECTION	FEE TITLE/ DESCRIPTION	CURRENT FEE	CURRENT UNITS IN BUDGET	CURRENT FEE REVENUE	PROPOSED FEE	PROPOSED UNITS	PROPOSED/ NEW FEE REVENUE	CHANGE IN FEE	CHANGE IN UNITS	CHANGE IN REVENUE	INCREASE IN APPROP	JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST INCLUDE BUDGETARY IMPACT IF FEE IS APPROVED
16.0222(h)(2)(E)	Perchlorate Mitigation Surcharge [per ton]	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ 0.69	1,374,629	\$ 948,494	\$ 0.69	1,374,629	\$ 948,494	\$ 948,494	The ongoing substantial financial nature of the Perchlorate issue dictates that a fee be charged to mitigate its impacts on revenue sources. This fee was calculated as a flat fee over the current remaining Disposal System capacity. This surcharge is not applicable to processed green waste, septic waste or ESFR charged waste.
16.0222(h)(3)(D)	Perchlorate Mitigation Surcharge [minimum loads]	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ 0.17	-	\$ -	\$ 0.17	-	\$ -	\$ -	At this time, no real estimate can be made of how many minimum loads will be impacted by this new fee surcharge. This minimum fee is only applicable to Hard and Special Handle minimum loads.
16.0222(i)(1)(E)	Perchlorate Mitigation Surcharge - noncompacted [volume per cubic yard]	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ 0.07	-	\$ -	\$ 0.07	-	\$ -	\$ -	At this time, no real estimate can be made of how many loads will be impacted by this new fee surcharge when the scales are down. This volume fee is not applicable to processed green waste, septic waste or ESFR charged waste.
16.0222(i)(1)(F)	Perchlorate Mitigation Surcharge - compacted [volume per cubic yard]	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ 0.23	-	\$ -	\$ 0.23	-	\$ -	\$ -	At this time, no real estimate can be made of how many loads will be impacted by this new fee surcharge when the scales are down. This volume fee is not applicable to processed green waste, septic waste or ESFR charged waste.
16.0222(c)(1)(A)(I) and (II)	Mountains Commercial Parcels Conversion [per ESFRs]	\$ 85.14	4,346	\$ 370,018	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ (85.14)	(4,346)	\$ (370,018)	\$ (370,018)	Part of the necessary actions to satisfy the Pawlick lawsuit was the generation of a more equitable basis for charging commercial property in the Mountains for waste disposal. It was determined converting the parcels to a gate fee system would accomplish this goal. This represents the esfr revenue loss, and the need to issue residential land use passes.
16.0222(c)(1)(A)(I) and (II)	Mountains Commercial Parcels Conversion [per ton]	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ 37.42	7,501	\$ 280,687	\$ 37.42	7,501	\$ 280,687	\$ 280,687	Part of the necessary actions to satisfy the Pawlick lawsuit was the generation of a more equitable basis for charging commercial property in the Mountains for waste disposal. It was determined that converting these parcels to a pay-at-the-gate system would accomplish this goal. This represents the revenue recapture through gate fees.