

Chapter 7 Contents

Solid Waste System Finance

Policies	2
Summary of Recommendations.....	4
FUNDING OF SOLID WASTE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS.....	5
Solid Waste Division Revenues	5
Basic Fee	
Regional Direct Fee	
Yard Waste and Clean Wood Fee	
Special Waste Fee	
Solid Waste Division Expenditures	7
Operating Costs	
Administrative Costs	
Debt Service	
Transfers to Reserve Funds	
Influences on Future Costs and Revenue.....	10
Interest Earnings	
Waste Prevention and Recycling	
Amended and Restated ILAs and “Latecomer” Provisions	
Operational Efficiencies	
Landfill Tippers	
Solid Waste and Cardboard Compactors	
Potential Changes in the Fee Structure	
Closure of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill	
New Revenue Sources	
Resource Recovery	

Solid Waste System Finance

Policies

FIN-1 Utilize the assets of the Solid Waste Division exclusively for the benefit of the solid waste system. If the division's assets are used by others, require full reimbursement for the value associated with the use, transfer, or sale.

FIN-2 The County General Fund will not charge use fees or receive other consideration from the Solid Waste Division for use of any transfer facility property in use as of November 6, 2013. The division's use of assets acquired by other separate County funds is subject to use fees. If the division ceases to use a property, all proceeds from the sale or other use of such property are due to the owner of record.

Comment [HB1]: TRANSFER FACILITY RENT/USE FEES

FIN-3 Use solid waste fees to fund mitigation payments to cities for impacts directly attributable to solid waste facilities per Revised Code of Washington 36.58.080 and the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement.

Comment [HB2]: CITY MITIGATION

FIN-4 Use solid waste fees to fund required mitigation for solid waste facilities, including mitigation mandated by federal, state, and local regulations and permits.

Comment [HB3]: OTHER MITIGATION

FIN-5 Maintain a Solid Waste Division financial forecast and cash-flow projection of four years or more.

Comment [HB4]: FIN-2

FIN-6 Keep tipping fees as low as reasonable, while covering the costs of effectively managing the system, protecting the environment, [encouraging recycling](#) and providing service to customers.

Comment [HB5]: FIN-3

FIN-7 Assess fees for use of the solid waste transfer and disposal system at the point of service.

Comment [HB6]: FIN-4

FIN-8 Subject to approval from the Metropolitan King County Council, define customer classes and establish equitable fees for each customer class based on services provided, benefits received, use of the system, and the costs, incurred or avoided, of providing those services.

Comment [HB7]: DIFFERENTIAL RATES – was FIN 9, switched order

FIN-89 The fee charged to customer classes will be the same at all facilities, unless the Metropolitan King County Council determines a change in the rate structure is appropriate.

Comment [HB8]: FIN-6

FIN-10 Include a "rainy day" reserve in the Solid Waste Division financial plan equal to approximately thirty (30) days of operating expenses.

Comment [HB9]: RAINY DAY RESERVE

FIN-11 Incorporate a rate stabilization reserve into multi-year rates.

Comment [HB10]: RATE STABILIZATION RESERVE

FIN-12 Maintain the following reserve funds:

Comment [HB11]: FIN-7

- a. Landfill Reserve
- b. Landfill Post-Closure Maintenance
- c. Capital Equipment Recovery Program
- d. Construction

FIN-13 Maintain the Landfill Post-Closure Maintenance Fund at a level to ensure that environmental monitoring and maintenance of the closed landfills for which the county has responsibility will be fully funded through the end of their post-closure maintenance periods, as defined by applicable law.

Comment [HB12]: FIN-8

FIN-14 The Executive may establish an Environmental Reserve Fund funded by disposal rates for the benefit of ~~and~~ funded by the signatories to the Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement.

Comment [HB13]: ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND

FIN-15 Routinely evaluate all reserve funds for long-term adequacy and set contributions to maintain reasonable rate stability

Comment [HB14]: FIN-9

FIN-16 Fund transfer facility capital projects with a combination of contributions to the Construction Fund and debt financing. The term for repayment of debt will not extend beyond, and may be less than, the useful life of the capital asset.

Comment [HB15]: DEBT FINANCING

Comment [SWD16]: Moved back to policy from text.

FIN-17 Consider various financing options for capital projects and in consultation with stakeholders evaluate projected costs, benefits, schedules, project features, and overall rate payer value for the design and construction of the project.

Comment [HB17]: POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE FINANCING

DRAFT

Solid Waste System Finance

Summary of Recommendations

Responsibility		Action	Detailed Discussion
1.	County	Continue to evaluate and implement fiscally responsible operational changes to support a sustainable business model.	Pages 7-
2.	County	Study the advantages and disadvantages of alternatives to the current rate methodology.	Pages 7-
3.	County	Study the cost of providing services to self-haul customers and <u>to</u> signatories to the two different interlocal agreements.	Pages 7-
4.	County, cities	Continue to explore new revenue sources to help finance the solid waste system.	Pages 7-
5.	County	Consider discounts for low-income customers consistent with RCW 81.77.195.	Pages 7-
6.	County, cities	By December 31, 2017, agree to a process to determine the conditions to which "latecomers" to the Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement will be subject. By June 30, 2016, establish the a process and financial conditions to analyze the costs, benefits and terms for "latecomer" cities that wish to enter into the Amended and Restated ILA after January 1, 2017	Pages 7-

Comment [tvs18]: Page numbers will be updated later.

Formatted: Not Highlight

SOLID WASTE SYSTEM FINANCE

Even as the division embarks on its most extensive capital program in 50 years, keeping fees low and stable remains a fundamental objective.

Starting in late 2007, the system experienced reductions in garbage tonnage and corresponding revenues due to the global economic downturn. The division responded to this economic trend by reducing both staff and programs, and, as necessary, by increasing fees to cover rising operating costs, to pay for renovating the transfer system, and to ensure continued solvency of the landfill reserve fund. In 2012, following a rate study, the Metropolitan King County Council approved new fees for the years 2013 and 2014 (KCSWD 2012). However, through a mix of savings the division has been able to extend the existing rate through the end of 2016. Financial policies help guide the solid waste system's operations and investments; policies should be considered as a whole rather than individually. The division works with its advisory committees, the executive, the County Council, and the Regional Policy Committee to develop and/or revise policies that address debt issuance, rate stabilization, cost containment, reserves, asset ownership and use, and other financial issues. The policies will be codified at the same time as comprehensive solid waste management plan updates, but may be adopted from time to time as appropriate outside of the plan process.

This chapter provides a brief summary of the division's financial structure, including descriptions of funding sources, revenues, and expenditures. The remainder of the chapter describes a range of influences expected to have a financial impact on the division in the future.

FUNDING OF SOLID WASTE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

King County's solid waste transfer and disposal system is a public-sector operation that is funded almost entirely by fees collected from its customers. The division is an enterprise fund, managing nearly all of its expenses with revenues earned through these fees.

The fees charged at county facilities, called tipping fees, pay for the operation and maintenance of transfer and disposal facilities and equipment, education and promotion related to waste prevention and recycling (WPR), grants to cities to support WPR efforts, and administrative operating expenses and overhead.

Tipping fees also pay for the construction of transfer facilities. Bonds or loans may be used for large projects, but repayment of this debt is funded by tipping fees.

As discussed later in this chapter, through transfers into reserve funds, the fee paid for each ton of waste entering the system today covers the expenses involved in disposal of that waste, even if the costs are incurred decades in the future. Using this financial structure ensures that the full cost of solid waste handling is paid by the users of the system.

A summary of the fund structure is illustrated in Figure 7-1 and discussed in the following sections.

Insert Figure 7-1. **Solid Waste Division fund structure**

Comment [SWD19]: Verify information

Box: Funding for the Cities

Cities fund their solid waste and WPR programs in a variety of ways, and the resources available to the 37 cities in the King County system vary widely. Some cities receive revenue from fees paid for solid waste collection services. These fees may be paid directly to the city or to the collection company depending on who provides the collection service – the city itself or a commercial collection company – and what contractual arrangements have been made. In some cases, the collection companies charge a fee that is passed on to the city to fund their programs. Some cities also charge a utility tax. Another funding source for cities is state and county grants (see Chapter 3, *Waste Prevention and Recycling*, for more information about grants). For cities that do not receive any revenue from collection, grants and the city's general fund may be the only revenue sources.

Solid Waste Division Revenues

As mentioned earlier, the solid waste system is funded primarily by the tipping fees charged at division facilities. The tipping fee is charged to the commercial collection companies that collect materials curbside and to residential and business self-haulers who bring wastes to the transfer facilities themselves. In accordance with KCC 10.08.040, the County Council establishes the fees charged at county solid waste facilities.

There are four main types of tipping fees:

Basic Fee – The per-ton fee charged to customers disposing of municipal solid waste at transfer facilities and to curbside collection vehicles at the Cedar Hills landfill; the basic fee accounts for more than 95 percent of tipping fee revenues.

Regional Direct Fee – A discounted fee charged to commercial collection companies that haul solid waste to Cedar Hills in transfer trailers from their own transfer stations and processing facilities, thus bypassing county transfer stations.

Yard Waste and Clean Wood Fee – A fee for separated, clean yard waste and clean wood delivered to facilities that have separate collection areas for these materials.

Special Waste Fee – The fee charged for certain materials, such as asbestos-containing materials and contaminated soil, which require special handling, record keeping, or both. Two fees reflect the various handling and tracking requirements of different materials.

Other fees are charged for recyclables, such as appliances. KCC 10.12.021.G authorizes the division director to set fees for recyclable materials for which no fee has yet been established by ordinance; these fees may be set to encourage recycling and need not recover the full cost of handling and processing. In accordance with state law (RCW 70.93.097), the division also charges a fee to vehicles with unsecured loads arriving at any staffed transfer facility or landfill in the jurisdiction of King County.

Figure 7-2 shows the breakdown of revenues as projected for 2017 and 2018 in the 2016 Rate Study. As shown, more than 90 percent of the division's revenue comes from tipping fees. The remainder of the division's revenue comes from a few additional sources. The most significant of those is the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP). Other sources of revenue include revenue from the sale of landfill gas from the Cedar Hills landfill; interest earned on fund balances; recyclables revenue, including revenue from both the sale of scrap metals received at division transfer facilities and from a fee on recyclables collected in unincorporated areas; fees collected on residuals of construction and demolition (C&D) recycling; and Washington State Department of Ecology grants to help clean up litter and illegal dumping throughout the county, as well as to support WPR. Based on economic and market conditions, revenues from the sale of scrap metals and other recyclable materials and interest earned can vary considerably.

Comment [HB20]: Update with 2016 rate study (for 2017/18) when completed

Insert Figure 7-2

Comment [tvs21]: draft will use 2015/16; final can be updated with 2017/18

Box: Construction and Demolition Debris Surcharge

Starting in September 2015, management of the county's construction and demolition (C&D) waste will change. In the past, the division had contracts with two private companies – Republic Services and Waste Management – to manage the majority of the county's C&D. Under the new system, the division will designate qualified facilities to accept and process C&D materials.

By 2016, the division will ban disposal of C&D materials that have stable recycling markets. As future markets develop, more materials may also be banned. Materials that are brought to a designated facility for processing, but cannot be recycled, will incur a ~~\$4.25~~ per ton disposal surcharge that will be payable to the division. The surcharge is currently set at \$4.25 per ton, but may be changed if necessary. This system is designed to encourage recycling of C&D materials.

Solid Waste Division Expenditures

Division expenditures, paid through the Solid Waste Operating Fund, can be divided into four broad categories: operating costs, administrative costs, debt service, and transfers to other funds. The division maintains a rainy day reserve – an average balance in the Operating Fund sufficient to cover 30 days of direct operating expenses; operating expenses are defined to exclude reserve funds. A rate stabilization reserve allows the accrual of funds in the early years of a multi-year rate that may be used to cover higher expenditures in subsequent years. The amount of the reserve may vary with rate actions and may be depleted by the last year of the rate period.

Figure 7-3 uses 2015 and 2016 projections to illustrate the various division expenditures, which are described in the following sections.

Comment [tvs22]: the draft will use 2015/16, can be updated for the final with 2017/18

Operating Costs

Operating costs include the day-to-day expenses for transfer, transport, and landfill operations, including maintenance of equipment and facilities, and management of landfill gas and wastewater. It also includes

business and occupation (B&O) tax, rent for use of the Cedar Hills landfill property, and an emergency contingency to cover some costs related to weather-related events or other small emergencies.

The Solid Waste Division pays rent to the County's General Fund for use of the landfill property. Rent is based on a fair market property appraisal. An appraisal by [Murray & Associates in 2012](#) determined a rent payment schedule for 2015 through 2025. Mitigation paid to cities for impacts directly attributable to solid waste facilities (RCW 36.58.080) and other mitigation related to construction or other activities as required by federal, state, and local regulations and permits are also operating expenses (See Chapter 5, page___ for an in-depth discussion).

Comment [tvs23]: will be a link

Administrative Costs

This cost category includes administrative functions that support operations, such as engineering, overhead, and finance, administration, and planning. It also includes grants to the cities and other waste prevention and recycling programs and services provided by the division.

Insert Figure 7-3

Comment [tvs24]: to be updated

Debt Service

Debt service is the payment of interest and principal on bonds and loans. Major transfer facility capital projects are generally financed by a combination of general obligation (GO) bonds backed by the full faith and credit of the county's General Fund and contributions to the Construction Fund. It is anticipated that with approval of the County Council, GO bonds will be issued for future transfer facility capital projects. ~~Repayment of the debt will not extend beyond, and may be less than, the useful life of the facility. Additional factors that may be considered include but are not limited to: changes in disposal method, length of the ILA, bond market/bond rates, and waste generation. Additional factors that may be considered include but are not limited to: changes in disposal method; length of the ILA; bond market/bond rates, and waste generation.~~

Comment [SWD25]: statement from policy FIN 16 – moved back to policy.

As required by ordinance 17437, prior to the design of any new recycling and transfer station, an analysis of available financing options will be conducted. The options will be evaluated looking at projected costs, benefits, schedules, project features, and overall rate payer value for the design and construction of the project.

Cedar Hills landfill capital projects are not funded through debt financing, but through the Landfill Reserve Fund discussed later in this section.

Transfers to Reserve Funds

Transfers from the Operating Fund to reserve funds make up a portion of the division's costs. These reserve funds were established to ensure that the division can meet future obligations, or expenses, some of which are mandated by law. Contributions to reserve funds are routinely evaluated to ensure they are adequate to meet short- and long-term needs. Paying into reserve funds stabilizes the impact on rates for certain expenses by

spreading the costs over a longer time period, and ensures that customers who use the system pay the entire cost of disposal. The four reserve funds – the Construction Fund, the Capital Equipment Recovery Program Fund, the Landfill Reserve Fund, and the Post-Closure Maintenance Fund – are discussed below.

Bond proceeds and contributions from the Operating Fund to the **Construction Fund** are used to finance new construction and major maintenance of division transfer facilities and some closed landfill mitigation projects. Contributions from the Operating Fund to the Construction Fund result in less borrowing, and consequently, a lower level of debt service.

The **Capital Equipment Recovery Program Fund** (CERP) is codified in KCC 4.08.280. The purpose of the CERP is to provide adequate resources for replacement and major maintenance of solid waste rolling stock (primarily long-haul trucks and trailers) and compactors. New equipment is purchased from the Operating Fund, but after the initial purchase, replacements are funded from the CERP.

By accumulating funds in the CERP, the division ensures that it is able to cover the variable expenditures that come with replacing needed equipment even while revenue fluctuates, without impacting rates. Annual contributions to the CERP are calculated by projecting future replacement costs, salvage values, and equipment life. Contributions are adjusted to reflect changes in facilities and operations that affect equipment needs. The contributions are held in an account, earning interest, until needed.

The **Landfill Reserve Fund** (LRF), codified in KCC 4.08.045, covers the costs of four major accounts maintained for the Cedar Hills landfill, shown below. The new area development and facility improvement accounts ensure sufficient funds for capital projects. The cell closure and post-closure maintenance accounts are mandated by federal and state law.

- **New area development account** – Covers the costs for planning, designing, permitting, and building new disposal areas.
- **Facility improvements account** – Covers a wide range of capital investments required to sustain the infrastructure and operations at the landfill, such as enhancements to the landfill gas and wastewater systems.
- **Closure account** – Covers the cost of closing operating areas within the landfill that have reached capacity. These contributions help the division prepare incrementally for the cost of final closure of the entire landfill.
- **Post-closure maintenance account** – Accumulates funds to pay for post-closure maintenance of the Cedar Hills landfill for 30 years.

The sum of all four accounts, based on projected cost obligations, makes up the LRF contribution from the operating fund. Projected cost obligations are based on the current plan for the landfill. When Cedar Hills closes, the division will discontinue its contributions to the LRF. After final closure, the balance of the LRF will be transferred to the Post-Closure Maintenance Fund to pay for Cedar Hills' post-closure maintenance and monitoring.

The **Post-Closure Maintenance Fund** is a separate fund that pays for the maintenance and environmental monitoring of nine closed and custodial landfills in the county (see Chapter 6). Federal and state laws require this fund for closed landfills. The county has also included funding for custodial landfills – landfills which were not operated by the county, but for which the county assumed responsibility. Although many of these landfills have met the obligatory number of years of post-closure care, there are on-going needs for monitoring and

maintenance. The division will work with regulators to assess these needs and will periodically review the fund to ensure that it remains sufficient.

Potential new Environmental Reserve Fund

In addition to the funds mentioned above, the division is investigating funding an Environmental Reserve, as discussed in the Amended and Restated ILA. The purpose of such a fund would be to help to pay for any environmental liabilities not already covered by system rates or insurance. The fund would be retained for a minimum of thirty years following the closure of the Cedar Hills Landfill.

INFLUENCES ON FUTURE COSTS AND REVENUE

In addition to the unanticipated reductions in tonnage due to the economy, there are other factors that can be expected to influence costs and revenues. These can be projected and budgeted for with varying degrees of certainty. Those influences are summarized briefly in this section.

Interest Earnings

The division's reserve funds are invested to earn interest during the years, or even decades, before the funds are needed. This is particularly significant for the long-term Landfill Reserve Fund, which will finance landfill closure and 30 years of post-closure care, a period expected to run from about 2032 through 2062; making interest earnings a considerable factor in the amount that needs to be put aside. In 2013, the value of interest earned was less than inflation. As of August 2014, the King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis was forecasting that this pattern would continue through 2018. The county is looking at how the funds might be invested differently to earn a higher rate of return.

Waste Prevention and Recycling

As discussed earlier, revenues from garbage tipping fees cover the costs of WPR services and programs. This financing structure requires the division to estimate the effects of WPR on garbage disposal to reasonably project future revenues.

While the revenue stream relies primarily on garbage tipping fees, the current priorities in solid waste management are waste prevention and recycling – which lead to reductions in the amount of solid waste disposed, and hence in revenues received. The reduction in the amount of waste received due to WPR has been gradual, and the system has adjusted to lower revenues. Further reductions through increasingly rigorous WPR efforts will continue to affect the revenues of King County and other jurisdictions across the state. The state's *Beyond Waste Plan 2009 Update* recognizes that it "is important to ensure reliable and adequate funding for all elements of the solid waste system, including reduction and recycling" (Ecology 2009a). The county completed a Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study in 2014 that looked at multiple strategies, technologies and services that the division could employ to increase recycling and manage solid waste. One of the strategies suggested by the study is to develop a sustainable financing model that is aligned with WPR.

Increased WPR efforts have had positive influences on the financial aspects of the system as well. As discussed in Chapters 3 and 6, WPR has contributed to extending the life of the Cedar Hills landfill, which will save money for ratepayers (see "Closure of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill" on page 7-11). Another aspect of WPR that has had

Comment [HB26]: Update reference – Ecology now updating Beyond Waste Plan

a positive financial effect is product stewardship. Product stewardship shifts the management of materials at the end of their life to the product manufacturer. This shift reduces the costs to cities and counties of managing products such as televisions, computers, and fluorescent bulbs and tubes, to name a few. The savings are most substantial for products that contain hazardous materials and are more difficult and expensive to manage within the public collection, transfer, and disposal system.

Amended and Restated ILAs and “Latecomer” Provisions

As of the adoption of this Plan, thirty two of the original thirty seven cities have signed the Amended and Restated ILA. When the ~~existing original~~ ILAs expire in 2028, the five cities that have not signed will be responsible for planning and managing solid waste generated within their city limits. ~~If a city does decide to sign the new ILAs, they will pay net costs (such as costs for planning or capital costs) attributable to their entry into the Agreement and will receive all benefits of the Agreement. However, these cities may decide to sign the new ILA at some point in time.~~ There could be multiple types of “latecomers” to the system:

- Cities that are currently members of the system that have not signed the amended and restated ILA but sign before their current ILA expires.
- Cities that are currently part of the system but have not signed the amended and restated ILA – and then wish to rejoin after ~~time has passed~~ their current ILA expires.
- Cities that ~~have never been~~ are not currently part of the system and wish to sign an ILA in the future. ~~(latecomers to the system.)~~

Many questions remain about what provisions should be in place ~~if a city decides to sign the Amended and Restated ILA prior to 2028 and/or after 2028 for any of the “latecomer” categories. If a city is interested in signing the Amended and restated ILA, a~~ The division will work with stakeholders to establish a stakeholder process shall be implemented to analyze the costs, benefits and terms of a “latecomer” city’s potential entry into the ILA. Because of the diverse opinions on this subject, a committee shall be formed to discuss and make recommendations on a process to put in place should any of these cities want to sign the Amended and Restated ILAs.

Operational Efficiencies

The division continually seeks to eliminate waste and variability in its operations. This commitment ensures the division’s ability to provide value to its customers, while improving the quality of service, controlling costs, and upholding the county’s environmental goals. Examples of operational efficiencies that are producing significant and long-term results are discussed briefly below.

Landfill Tippers

The division uses tippers to empty garbage from transfer trailers at the landfill. The tippers replaced the use of older walking floor trailers (see Chapter 6, *Landfill Management and Solid Waste Disposal*, for more details). Tippers save staff time and other resources, as well as reduce equipment and tire damage.

Solid Waste and Cardboard Compactors

As discussed in Chapter 5, the transfer system in King County is undergoing major renovations to update station technology, improve efficiencies, and enhance environmental sustainability. The installation of solid waste compactors is one important component of that plan. The Bow Lake, Enumclaw, Shoreline, and Vashon stations

currently have waste compactors. All newly constructed recycling and transfer stations, including the Factoria and the South County Recycling and Transfer Stations, will incorporate compactors as well.

Compacting solid waste at the stations reduces the number of trips necessary to transport the waste by up to 30 percent. Fewer trips translate directly into lower costs for fuel, equipment, and staff. In July 2012, the Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station began operating with a compactor, saving almost 900 trips and over 8,400 gallons of diesel during the last six months of the year.

In addition to solid waste compactors, the division is installing cardboard compactors at many of the stations. These compactors will allow the division to reduce the number of trips needed with all of the associated savings.

Potential Changes in the Fee Structure

The division may propose modifications to the current fee structure in future rate studies. Possible changes include establishing different customer classes, discounts for low income customers, and moving some costs from the fee charged at transfer facilities and the landfill to a fee on the curbside collection bill. In the 2014 Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study, one of the recommendations was to look at the fee structure. The division plans to complete such a study prior to the next rate study in 2016.

To equitably allocate the benefits and costs of transfer system improvements, the division may consider different customer classes. This would ensure that system users do not pay a disproportionate share of the cost of these improvements as a result of a decision by a city not to extend the term of the Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement. The customer classes would take into consideration the services provided, benefits received, use of the system, and the costs, incurred or avoided, of providing those services.

In 2010, legislation was passed authorizing the WUTC to approve discounts for low-income customers under certain circumstances. The division will consider what would be involved in establishing such a policy, and whether it should be implemented in King County.

Before changes to the fee structure could be proposed, a number of factors would need to be studied, including the impact on revenue and cost, equity issues, and system-wide financing implications. These factors will be considered in a future rate studies.

Closure of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill

When Cedar Hills reaches capacity and closes, the division's solid waste tipping fee is expected to increase to cover the cost of using an alternate means of disposal. Whether it is export to an out-of-county landfill, disposal at a waste-to-energy facility, or other conversion technology, a preliminary study indicates that the cost for disposal after Cedar Hills closes will be higher (R.W. Beck 2007). As discussed in Chapter 6, *Landfill Management and Solid Waste Disposal*, the county is monitoring and tracking a wide range of options for disposal after the closure of Cedar Hills, including export to an out-of-county landfill, waste conversion technologies, and incineration with energy recovery.

Implementation of the approved development alternative in the Cedar Hills Project Program Plan (discussed in Chapter 6) is being financed through the landfill reserve fund. New area development, associated facility improvements, and area closure will cost approximately \$70 million (in current dollars). The cost to operate

Comment [HB27]: Update as necessary

Cedar Hills is expected to rise by inflation, but remain consistent with current costs. Assuming costs for waste export, which is estimated to have lower costs than other disposal options (R.W. Beck 2007), the additional landfill capacity could save ratepayers about \$100 million.

Comment [HB28]: Update as necessary

New Revenue Sources

The division is continually exploring new sources of revenue to help offset reductions in tonnage. Cities may also want to consider additional funding sources to support their solid waste and WPR programs.

Comment [SWD29]: Add information on other possible new revenue sources such as carbon credits, etc.

Sales from the Landfill Gas-to-Energy Facility

An example of the successful development of a new revenue source is the sale of landfill gas. In 2009, a landfill gas-to-energy facility began operations at Cedar Hills, and the division began to receive revenues from the sale of landfill gas. The facility, which is privately owned and operated by Bio Energy (Washington) LLC (BEW), converts methane collected from the landfill into pipeline quality natural gas, which BEW sells to Puget Sound Energy (PSE). The division will receive revenue in the range of \$1 to \$1.4 million depending on production rates and the market price.

Comment [HB30]: Update – make consistent with budget

Carbon Emissions Credits

Carbon emissions credits, also called greenhouse gas offsets, from the landfill gas-to-energy facility at Cedar Hills offer another promising source of revenue. The conversion of landfill gas to a renewable source of green energy will generate greenhouse gas offsets, which have value in the market. The division, rather than the owner of the landfill gas facility, BEW, has contractually retained the offset rights associated with the project. In January of 2011, the County Council unanimously approved an ordinance authorizing the division to enter into a contract to sell carbon emissions credits associated with the landfill gas to energy project to PSE. The contract with PSE is structured so that the county shares in profits that PSE gets when selling the emissions credits associated with the gas. Because of the nature of the credit sales, the amount received each year may vary. The division will also be investigating the possibility of attaining greenhouse gas offsets from other sources related to solid waste operations or programs.

New section Resource Recovery

Significant amounts of recyclable materials – notably wood, metal and cardboard - are disposed at the transfer stations. The division is implementing new approaches, such as sorting the recyclable materials on the tipping floor, to recover more of these materials at the transfer stations. Revenues from the sale of these materials will help to offset the costs of sorting. A pilot is underway to better assess the costs and benefits of recovering these resources (see Chapter 3 for more discussion).

The division will continue to explore innovative opportunities, such as partnering with the private sector or other public agencies, to earn additional revenues and achieve savings through operational efficiencies. Although in many cases, these efforts may involve relatively small amounts of money, they can have a cumulative effect over time and contribute to stabilizing rates for solid waste customers.