

SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

BUDGET ANALYSIS – FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

DATE: May 4, 2010
SUBJECT: REFUSE COLLECTION FUND CLASS -
Operations & Recycling Fund, Environmental & Energy Fund
STAFF REPORT BY: Lehua Weaver
CC: David Everitt, , Rick Graham, Kevin Bergstrom, Parviz Rokhva, Greg Davis, Nancy Sanders, Gina Chamness, Randy Hillier, Vicki Bennett, Debbie Lyons, Emy Storheim

Salt Lake City provides a refuse program of weekly curbside trash collection, recycling (including curbside residential recycling and centralized glass recycling), curbside yard waste collection, and annual neighborhood cleanup. These services are funded through the Operations & Recycling Fund (O&R Fund).

In addition to trash collection services, the City's concentrated environmental and sustainability efforts are staffed and funded through the Environmental & Energy Fund (E&E Fund). This includes open space, outreach, management, Blue Sky participation, and tree purchasing funds.

The proposed budget for fiscal year 2010-11, includes expanding the yard waste service as a piece of the Administration's multi-year proposal for "accelerated diversion". The goal is to divert garbage from the landfill by enabling residents to more thoroughly sort out recyclable, compostable, or mulch-able items from their waste.

The majority of changes to the Refuse Fund Class budget are related to the plan for accelerated diversion. Following is a brief introduction to the components of the plan. Since pursuing accelerated diversion targets affects both the O&R Fund and the E&E Fund, the more detailed discussion of these components are included in the "Overall Key Issues" section beginning on Page 2.

1. A goal for diverting 50% waste from the Landfill
2. Program Expansions included in Fiscal Year 2010-11
3. Single Combined Rate Structure
4. Conducting a Waste Stream Audit
5. Staffing Changes to support program changes and expansion
6. Future Plans for 2011 and beyond, including in-house recycling service and data collections
7. An overall budget impact

The various other changes that may be specific to the individual funds and are not affected by accelerated diversion will be addressed beginning on Page 6.

| REFUSE FUND CLASS | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Operations & Environmental | | | | |
| PROPOSED BUDGET | | | | |
| | Adopted | Proposed | | |
| | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | Difference | % Chg |
| Revenue & other sources | | | | |
| Service Fee Revenues | \$7,606,256 | \$8,724,019 | \$1,117,763 | 14.7% |
| Landfill annual revenue dividends | 700,000 | 850,000 | 150,000 | 21.4% |
| Interest Income | 172,500 | 15,500 | (157,000) | -91.0% |
| Bond Proceeds & Other Sources | 1,877,658 | 5,396,453 | 3,518,795 | 187.4% |
| Landfill One-Time Dividend* | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | - | 0.0% |
| Total revenue & other sources | \$17,356,414 | \$21,985,972 | \$4,629,558 | 26.7% |
| Operating Expenses | | | | |
| Collection Services | 7,078,437 | 8,080,387 | 1,001,950 | 14.2% |
| Environmental | 698,304 | 822,696 | 124,392 | 17.8% |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$7,776,741 | \$8,903,083 | \$1,126,342 | 14.5% |
| Capital Outlay | 3,685,400 | 9,709,896 | 6,024,496 | 163.5% |
| Total expenses & capital outlay | \$11,462,141 | \$18,612,979 | \$7,150,838 | 62.4% |
| | | | | |
| Appropriation of reserves | \$5,894,273 | \$3,372,993 | (\$2,521,280) | -42.8% |

*Note: the one-time landfill payment was originally expected in this current fiscal year. The budget was not amended to reflect the new timeframe of next fiscal year, so the \$7 million shows up in both years. However, it will only be received once.

OVERALL KEY ISSUES:

- **Accelerated Diversion Components** - The accelerated diversion strategy is something the Council has expressed interest in over the years. In fact, the Council may recall that during last year's budget discussions, the Administration stated that they would be working on a more comprehensive plan and would come back to the Council with those details. There are seven major items:
 1. **Goal:** Divert 50% of the residential waste stream from the landfill by fiscal year 2015-16. The Administration estimates that expanded yard waste participation, mandatory 100% recycling, expanded glass recycling, the waste stream audit, and additional education efforts would set the City on the course to meet 42% diversion. Each of these components are included in the proposed budget. Without a plan for increasing diversion, the Administration estimates that within the same time, the diversion rate may be only 21%.
 2. **Program Expansions:** There are several program expansions proposed this year to support accelerated diversion, including:
 - a. **Expanded Yard Waste** - last year the Council and Administration discussed expanding the yard waste program for 100% residential enrollment. This year's budget from the Administration includes that 100% roll out. Currently, there is approximately 19% participation rate in the yard waste program. The Administration has scheduled an October 2010 start date for citywide yard waste collections - cans would be purchased and then distributed in September.
 - **Changes:** This service expansion would discontinue separate collection of the leaf-bags and Christmas trees, and combine them into the yard waste program. The Neighborhood

Clean-up Program will continue with one minor change in 2011 - yard waste that is small enough to fit into a yard waste container will not be allowed in the Clean-up pile.

- **Costs:** \$2,372,904 Total Increase - made up of:

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 1,631,297 | Purchase 31,000 yard waste cans. (The existing replacement budget will cover 59 of the cans, and this \$1.6 million will cover the remaining 30,832.) |
| 88,707 | Ongoing O&M costs |
| 272,600 | Additional capital needs and equipment |
| (119,700) | Elimination of Leaf Bag & Tree Pick-up |

- b. Expanded Glass Recycling locations - proposed increase of the centralized glass recycling collection locations from three to 25.

- **Costs:** \$221,540 Total Increase, which includes an interfund transfer of \$110,000 for clean-up of the collection sites, additional receptacles, and hauling costs.

- c. Expansion of recycling program - since the single-family residential recycling program has been considered voluntary, not every household has a recycling bin (just over 11% of accounts do not have one). The proposed budget includes the cost to purchase and distribute a recycling can to each household.

- **Costs:** \$ 82,655 Purchase 2,733 cans. (The existing budget for replacement will cover 1,035 cans, and this \$83k will cover the remaining 1,698.)

- d. Education efforts - significant resources budgeted for education efforts with sorting and contamination.

- **Costs:** \$ 269,498 Total Increase - made up of:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 154,658 | Staffing |
| 44,840 | 3-Wheel Vehicles for patrolling around the City |
| 70,000 | Materials, Website updates, pamphlets, mailers |

3. Single Combined Rate: As was suggested by the Council last year, the Administration is proposing a single combined rate for the four components of the refuse program: trash, recycling, yard waste, neighborhood clean-up. The basis for a combined rate is that regardless of which service a resident uses, the ability to divert waste from the landfill benefits all users by delaying costs associated with closing the existing landfill and relocating to a new site.

4. Waste Stream audit, \$150,000: The Administration has planned to conduct an audit of the City's waste stream. The information will provide helpful data for targeting diversion opportunities and education strategies.

5. Staff Levels: The Administration proposes hiring nine full-time and 9.13 seasonal employees to support program changes. Based on the Council's approval of the proposed budget, the employee changes would be:

- **Yard Waste Expansion:** 3 full-time and 6.13 seasonal employees. Hired in September for training, and to be ready to begin citywide collections in October.
- **Recycling In-House:** 6 full-time and 3 seasonal employees. Hired June of 2011 so that they are trained and ready to provide the collection services on July 1, 2011.

- **Cost:** The cost in 2010-11 for the partial year of the additional staff would be \$341,000 and the full year cost in 2011-12 for the staff would be \$824,000.

6. Future Plans:

a. In-house recycling service – the Administration is proposing that when the recycling contract expires in June 2011, that the City take on the service of curbside recycling collections. Some of the start-up costs associated with that shift are included in this budget.

- **Costs:** A cost comparison is provided in the chart below. In general, the current costs associated with the recycling collection include the contract cost, container purchases, sorting, plus some City staff time for support, outreach, and customer service. If the City were to bring the collection service in-house, the costs for collection would include the operating and capital costs. (City support would likely increase as educational efforts are ramped up as part of the whole accelerated diversion package.) The benefit, as proposed by the Administration, to bringing the service in-house is that there are significant efficiencies gained by sharing a common staff for the four trash services, equipment and fleet redundancy. Over time, these benefits would result in significant financial savings.

| Recycling Comparison | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 | FY 2016 | |
|---|----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Contract | 1,143,720 | 1,458,803 | 1,597,498 | 1,715,603 | 1,811,258 | 1,939,233 | |
| In-House Service (Capital & Operating) | 614,043 | 1,778,446 | 1,806,630 | 1,831,088 | 1,389,166 | 1,137,309 | |
| In-House Efficiencies | | (228,251) | (277,502) | (302,812) | (304,255) | (334,693) | |
| Cost / (Savings) to Refuse Fund: | 614,043 | 91,392 | (68,370) | (187,327) | (726,347) | (1,136,617) | (1,413,226) |

- **Staffing & Equipment Efficiencies:** By staffing and delivering all four trash services in-house, there are efficiencies that will be realized between staff assignments and vehicle use.
 - Staffing – allows for sharing between weekly pick-ups and the annual Neighborhood Clean-up. (The drivers’ schedules will change from four-ten hour days per week to five-eight hour days.)
 - Equipment redundancy – historically, the Refuse Fund has maintained 50% redundancy on packers – so that for every 10 packers in a schedule, there were 15 in rotation. This reduces the wear and tear on vehicles, and allows for the maintenance routines. With expanding the services to include recycling collection too, the Administration will reduce the redundancy level to 25%.
 - **Sorting of Recyclables:** The Administration proposes contracting with the same facility to sort and sell the recyclables. It is anticipated that the City will receive some revenue from the sale of the recyclables. The Administration anticipates that there will be less contamination because of the concerted education efforts.
- b. Waste Stream Monitoring – The Administration plans to look into implementing a tagging system to further monitor waste stream and service usage. The system includes placing a Low Frequency-Radio Frequency Identification tag on every waste can, packer arm, and using software to read and analyze the data. Primarily, the benefit would be to track usage levels by household and type of can and use the data to evolve rate structures and education efforts.

7. **Overall Budget Impact:** The plan for accelerated diversion will draw on the O&R Fund cash balances, namely for the purchase of yard waste cans and start-up capital costs for bringing recycling collection in-house. However, according to the Administration, the efficiencies to be gained from the different changes will reduce the overall cost for providing the services. The efficiency savings in 2010-11 is estimated to be \$887,488 to the cost for weekly pick-ups and Neighborhood Clean-Up programs.

OTHER OVERALL ISSUES:

Landfill One-Time Payment - As the Council may recall, last year it was anticipated that the City would receive \$7 million from the Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Management Facility ("Landfill") as a one-time distribution payment from the "Post-Closure Fund" (designated cash account). However, it is now scheduled for the first half of FY2010-11. The Administration proposes holding \$1.5 million in the O&R Fund cash balances to replenish several years of reserves use. With the other \$5.5 million, it would be held in the E&E Fund cash balance pending decision on a project.

The Council may recall discussing this possibility during the Landfill's annual budget discussions in November last year. As part owner with the County of the Landfill, any withdrawal from this account is split between the two entities.

QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

With regard to the plans for accelerated diversion, here are some policy questions the Council may wish to consider:

- A. *What are the possibilities that the Administration is considering for including businesses in the accelerated diversion plans?* Over the past year, some improvements have been made, including the downtown business glass recycling initiative. Other ideas that Council Members have raised are business licensing requirements for recycling participation, providing larger recycling can options for businesses.
- B. *Is the Administration considering use of the \$7 million one-time landfill payment (or part of it) toward any of the accelerated diversion pieces?* Some of the current costs and 'next steps' have a steep financial cost, including costs for rolling out the yard waste, the start-up costs for bringing the recycling in-house, and, potentially, the micro chips & software for the waste cans & trucks. Each Fund's reserve balance is not sufficient enough to cover all of these costs.
- C. *If the Administration is not considering using money from the one-time landfill payment, what are the other potential uses for that money?*
- D. *The Council may wish to ask about the educational efforts that the Administration plans for combating contamination of recycling and yard waste.* The Administration has reported that the City experiences their highest contamination rates in the curbside recycling program - between 30 and 40% - in November / December and May, mostly with yard waste.
- E. *What concerns have residents raised about an expanded yard waste program, and what are some options that the Administration might suggest to accommodate those concerns?* The Council Office has been contacted by some residents who are concerned about the space requirements for a third can (both on their property and on the street on pick-up days); the additional cost; and lack of interest because of minimal need or other composting / yard waste practices. The Administration has indicated that residents may opt out of the yard waste program, with a plan to otherwise dispose of their yard waste items. The current City Ordinance specifies that recyclable material is not allowed in the general waste cans. The Administration will be forwarding an ordinance amendment to also prohibit yard waste from being placed in general waste cans. The Administration intends to begin "enforcement" activities through detailed and involved education efforts.

OPERATIONS & RECYCLING FUND

| REFUSE FUND CLASS | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| OPERATIONS & RECYCLING FUND | | | | |
| PROPOSED BUDGET | | | | |
| | Adopted | Proposed | Difference | % Chg |
| | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | | |
| Revenue & other sources | | | | |
| Refuse fees | \$7,272,776 | \$8,614,973 | \$1,342,197 | 18.5% |
| Yard Waste fees | 333,480 | 109,046 | (224,434) | -67.3% |
| Landfill annual revenue dividends | - | - | | |
| Interfund Reimbursements | 269,258 | 273,653 | 4,395 | 1.6% |
| Sale of vehicles & Misc. | 46,000 | 56,000 | 10,000 | 21.7% |
| Interest income | 70,000 | 10,000 | (60,000) | -85.7% |
| Landfill One-Time Dividend (operations) | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | - | 0.0% |
| Bond Proceeds | 1,562,400 | 5,066,800 | 3,504,400 | 224.3% |
| Total revenue & other sources | \$11,053,914 | \$15,630,472 | \$4,576,558 | 41.4% |
| Operating Expenses | | | | |
| Weekly trash collection & Administration | \$3,842,372 | 4,039,242 | \$196,870 | 5.1% |
| Curbside recycling | 1,231,922 | 1,441,772 | 209,850 | 17.0% |
| Glass and Cardboard Recycling | 88,239 | 365,751 | 277,512 | 314.5% |
| Annual neighborhood cleanup | 1,511,643 | 1,314,958 | (196,685) | -13.0% |
| Yard Waste Collection | 404,261 | 918,665 | 514,404 | 127.2% |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$7,078,437 | 8,080,387 | \$1,001,950 | 14.2% |
| Capital Outlay | | | | |
| Debt service | 1,829,110 | 2,300,269 | 471,159 | 25.8% |
| Equipment purchases | 1,856,290 | 7,409,627 | 5,553,337 | 299.2% |
| Total expenses & capital outlay | \$10,763,837 | \$17,790,283 | \$7,026,446 | 65.3% |
| Change in Net Assets | \$290,077 | (\$2,159,811) | (\$2,449,888) | -844.6% |

In addition to those items listed in the Overall Key Issues, the other noteworthy changes in the proposed budget for the Recycling & Operations Fund include:

Revenues

- **Rate Increase** - as was discussed last year, the Administration is proposing a rate increase for trash collection services. Under the proposal, all residents will see a fee increase of \$1.25 for the coming year. For those who were not previously enrolled in the yard waste program, they will see an additional monthly increase of \$3.50. It should be noted that this still does not cover the full cost of the program.
 - **Market Comparison** - The Administration conducted a rate comparison study to gauge where Salt Lake City's rates sit compared to other western communities in and out of state. (Please see Attachment A for a summary of all the findings.)
 - Outside Utah:
 - Salt Lake City's \$12.75 fee for garbage & recycling (not yard waste) is the second lowest of the 27 western cities surveyed.

- Only 9 of the cities provide yard waste service. Salt Lake City's \$17.25 combined rate for garbage, recycling, and yard waste is lower than all cities that provide curbside yard waste service.
- Within Utah:
 - Salt Lake City's \$12.75 fee for garbage & recycling (not yard waste) is lower than two-thirds of the Utah communities surveyed. (The lowest is Murray at \$6.50 and the highest is Ogden at \$17.14.) The average rate is \$13.05.
 - Salt Lake City, Provo, and West Jordan are the only three that provide curbside yard waste service. For the combined services, West Jordan charges \$13.00 and Provo charges \$21.00; Salt Lake City's proposed combined rate is \$17.25.
- **Interest Revenue Decrease** - (Decrease of \$60,000) As with all other funds and departments, the revenue expected from interest has dropped dramatically.

Operating Expenses & Capital

- **CNG vehicles** - especially with the opportunity to purchase new packer trucks for the proposed in-house recycling collection, the Administration plans to significantly increase the number of their packers that are CNG vehicles. In addition to the recycling fleet, the Refuse Fund has budgeted to replace 3-5 vehicles with CNG vehicles each year, until the entire 35-vehicle packer fleet is made up of CNG vehicles.
To support this, part of this year's budget includes \$456,000 for a CNG slow fill station that will be constructed at the new Fleet facility. This will allow the packers to be plugged in overnight and last a whole day without refueling.
Vehicles are purchased on a 4-year lease cycle.
- **Personal Services** - In addition to hiring new employees to support the expanded yard waste program and potentially converting to in-house recycling collections (discussed in the next item), the personal services budget is also increasing due to the Mayor's recommendation to restore the 1.5% pay suspension and merit pay, and the increase to health insurance costs. The Refuse Fund, although a separate Enterprise Fund, follows the salary & benefits decisions of the Administration.
- **Other C&S Costs** - (not related to expansion of programs)

| | |
|------------|--|
| \$ 143,000 | Increase to Fleet Fuel & Maintenance to more closely reflect actual levels |
| 132,000 | Increase to tipping fee costs (includes a new \$85,000 contingency) |
| 14,000 | Increase to street sweeping costs |
- **Use of Reserve Funds** - If the Council adopts the budget as proposed, the balance remaining in reserved funds will be \$7.3 million. If the \$7 million one-time payment from the Landfill is deducted, however, the balance would only be \$315,000. This is one reason that the Administration proposes using \$1.5 million of the payment toward replenishing cash reserves in the O&R Fund.

ENVIRONMENTAL & ENERGY FUND

| REFUSE FUND CLASS | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| ENVIRONMENTAL & ENERGY FUND | | | | |
| PROPOSED BUDGET | | | | |
| | Adopted | Proposed | Difference | % Chg |
| | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | | |
| Revenue & other sources | | | | |
| Landfill annual revenue dividends | \$700,000 | \$850,000 | \$150,000 | 21.4% |
| Interest income | 102,500 | 5,500 | (97,000) | -94.6% |
| Landfill One-Time Dividend (environmental) | 5,500,000 | 5,500,000 | - | 0.0% |
| Total revenue & other sources | \$6,302,500 | \$6,355,500 | \$53,000 | 0.8% |
| Operating Expenses | | | | |
| Environmental - management | 286,787 | 390,450 | 103,663 | 36.1% |
| Environmental - outreach | 200,057 | 274,875 | 74,818 | 37.4% |
| Environmental - open space | 97,760 | 100,671 | 2,911 | 3.0% |
| Environmental - Blue Sky & Tree Planting | 113,700 | 56,700 | (57,000) | -50.1% |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$698,304 | \$822,696 | \$124,392 | 17.8% |
| | | | | |
| Change in Net Assets | \$5,604,196 | \$5,532,804 | (\$71,392) | -1.3% |

In addition to those items listed in the Overall Key Issues, the other noteworthy changes in the proposed budget for the Environmental & Energy Fund include:

Revenues

- **Annual Landfill Dividend Increase** - Increase of \$150,000. The E&E Fund's primary source of revenue is the annual dividend that the City receives from the Landfill as part-owner. This is expected to increase from \$700,000 to \$850,000.
- **Interest Revenue Decrease** - Decrease by \$97,000.

Expenses

- **Personal Services & Staffing** -
 - Open Space Seasonal employee - Increase of \$10,000; based on workload to assist the Open Space Lands Manager.
 - Salaries & Benefits - restoration of the 1.5% salary suspension and increased health insurance costs.
- **Administrative Fees** - \$90,000 of the \$111,892 increase in the E&E Fund Operating Expenses are due to higher Administrative Fees - this will cover purchasing and legal assistance provided by the General Fund.
- **Tree Purchasing** - Decrease by \$57,000. The Council may recall that the budget for purchasing trees and shrubs was moved into the E&E Fund last year. Last year's budget for the purchases and tipping fees was \$101,000.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. *The Council may wish to consider requesting that the Administration conduct a rate study.* Especially as the program continues to evolve, the Council may consider requesting a study of the full cost to provide collection services to residents. If accelerated diversion steps are implemented, and the City adopts a combined rate, the City could ensure that the full cost is covered by the rates and not being subsidized by the Fund's cash reserves. Furthermore, as changes are considered, a study could indicate options for rate restructuring as well. This could provide support for the rates for all customers, even those who opt out of certain services, and could evolve with program changes. If the tagging system leads to a 'pay per tip' system, the City may want to consider a structure that includes a base service fee.
2. *Further, the Council may wish to discuss some financial policy items, and perhaps identify some policy decisions.* For example:
 - a. As briefly mentioned in question #1, the Council may wish to discuss the policy basis for subsidizing refuse services.
 - b. The Council may also wish to discuss a policy on the minimum level of reserves in each Fund. Although there is no statutory requirement, the Council may wish to have a policy on a minimum acceptable amount.
3. *The Council may wish to consider whether projects & expenses in other Funds could be paid for out of E&E funds, or possibly the one-time landfill payment.* There are more projects paid for by other funds that are related to environment / sustainability goals, and there might be a consistent policy basis for charging some or all of the costs to the E&E Fund. For example, bike lane striping (CIP Fund), trail development (General Fund & CIP), environmentally friendly vehicle purchases (Fleet Fund), Bus Pass Program (General Fund, other funds), etc. Another recent issue arose for providing water service for urban gardens on property currently owned by the City.
4. In supporting this budget, the Council is confirming its previous decision to dedicate the one-time \$7 million landfill payment to environmental projects. It should be noted, however, that the Council could identify other uses for that money.
5. *The Council may wish to ask about a study by university students regarding emissions and yard waste collections.* The Landfill Council reportedly received a study from students at Utah State University relating to emissions generated in the course of yard waste pick-up. The findings are not necessarily supportive of expanding the program, but some of the assumptions included in the study parameters could be argued.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The operations of the Landfill are not part of the Refuse Fund budget, but the two functions are closely related. The Solid Waste Facility administers the Landfill, coordinates the transfer station and the long range planning for future landfill sites. The Salt Lake City Council reviews and adopts the budget for the Solid Waste Facility on a calendar year basis, which affects the revenue and expenditures of the Refuse Fund. For instance, an increase in material collection through the curbside recycling program will result in less garbage collection and lower tipping fee expenditures in the Refuse Fund. It also reduces the over-all revenue to the landfill, impacting the dividend that the City receives as a result of landfill revenue.

The Refuse Fund Class operates as an enterprise fund, so the General Fund does not subsidize these services.

Comparing Salt Lake City Garbage Rates to NON-UTAH Western Communities

Which Communities Did We Survey?

We looked at 27 other western cities outside of Utah:

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Cheyenne, WY | Dallas, TX | Missoula, MT | San Francisco, CA |
| Tacoma, WA | Portland, OR | Bozeman, MT | Oakland, CA |
| Seattle, WA | Las Vegas, NV | Boise, ID | Tucson, AZ |
| Spokane, WA | Henderson, NV | Boulder, CO | Flagstaff, AZ |
| Plano, TX | Reno, NV | Denver, CO | Phoenix, AZ |
| Austin, TX | Albuquerque, NM | Colorado Springs | Anchorage, AK |
| San Antonio, TX | Santa Fe, NM | Chico, CA | |

What We Found

Fees for Waste & Recycling

SLC, current fee (excluding yard waste): \$12.75

| | |
|----------|---------------------------|
| Average: | \$31.15 |
| Median: | \$21.86 |
| High: | \$91.51 (Oakland, CA) |
| Low: | \$10.75 (Albuquerque, NM) |

- SLC's current fee of \$12.75 is the 2nd lowest fee of all cities surveyed
- SLC's proposed fee of \$17.25, which includes mandatory weekly yard waste, is lower than 65% of cities surveyed who do not provide weekly yard waste service

Fees including Waste, Recycling and Yard Waste

- 9 (33%) provide yard waste cart service
- 3 of the 9 charge extra fees for yard waste (ranging from \$4 to \$13 per month)

| | |
|----------|-----------------------|
| Average: | \$56.44 |
| Median: | \$48.50 |
| High: | \$91.51 (Oakland, CA) |
| Low: | \$18.50 (Austin, TX) |

- SLC's proposed fee of \$17.25 is lower than all cities that provide curbside yard waste

Garbage

- 14 (52%) provide multiple sizes of garbage containers

Curbside Recycling

- All cities provide curbside recycling for at least single family homes
- Most (89%) include recycling in trash fee
- 3 charge extra for recycling (Colorado Springs, Bozeman, Cheyenne)

Comparing Salt Lake City Garbage Rates to UTAH COMMUNITIES

Which Communities Did We Survey?

We looked at 15 other Utah Communities:

| | | |
|------------|----------|------------------|
| Bountiful | Murray | Salt Lake County |
| Draper | Ogden | Sandy |
| Farmington | Orem | South Jordan |
| Layton | Provo | West Jordan |
| Midvale | Riverton | West Valley |

What We Found

Fees for Waste & Recycling

SLC, current fee (excluding yard waste): **\$12.75**

SLC, proposed fee (including yard waste): **\$17.25**

| | |
|----------|-----------------|
| Average: | \$13.05 |
| Median: | \$13.30 |
| High: | \$17.14 (Ogden) |
| Low: | \$6.50 (Murray) |

- SLC's current fee of \$12.75 is lower than two-thirds of Utah communities surveyed

Garbage

- **Salt Lake City** and Ogden City are the only communities that provide at least 2 size options for garbage collection

Curbside Recycling

- All communities but one (Layton) have curbside recycling available
- About half of the communities surveyed charge an extra fee for recycling (ranging from \$3.07 to \$5.00 per month)
- Only one-third of the communities (including **Salt Lake City**) provide WEEKLY recycling service

Curbside Yard Waste

- **Salt Lake City**, West Jordan, and Provo are the only communities providing curbside yard waste service
- Fee comparison, including garbage, recycling, yard waste
 - SLC Proposed fee \$17.25
 - Provo \$21.00
 - West Jordan \$13.00

Salt Lake City
Recycling Trivia
April 2010

What we're collecting

| Item | Percent of total | Shipped to | Made into |
|--|------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Paper (news, magazines, office, cardboard) | 66% | Oregon, California | New paper and cardboard products |
| Metal (Tin, aluminum) | 2% | Missouri, Utah | New metal products |
| Plastic | 6% | California, Utah, China | New plastic products |
| Residual | 3% | Utah | Reprocessed, used as an alternative fuel by local cement company, or landfilled |
| Contamination (Trash and Green waste) | 23% | Utah | Landfilled |

Residual

Residual items are those that cannot be easily identified as one type of recyclable commodity and need further disassembly or separation in order to recycle it. Market prices largely determine how it is handled by the contractor. If prices are high, material will be reprocessed and disassembled. Material may be sold to a local cement company and used as an alternative fuel, or, if markets are low, it will be landfilled.

Contamination

We experience highest contamination, 30-40% in November/December and May, and it is mostly yard waste.

Curbside Recycling Program in Business and Multifamily

- We are servicing 1,175 recycling containers for businesses and multi-family housing.
- About ten new recycling containers are placed into service each month.
- 90% of business/multi-family customers have fewer than 3 recycling containers in service.

Drop Off Recycling

- An average of 90 tons of glass are collected from our drop off sites each month.
- About 1 ton of recyclable material is collected from downtown recycling containers each month.