SAVI' LAKE; GHIY CORPORATION

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES

ROSS C. "ROCKY" ANDERSON

COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL

TO:

Rocky Fluhart,

Chief Administration Officer

DATE:

November 2, 2006

THRU:

Sam Guevara

Chief of Staff

FROM:

Rick Graham, Director

Public Services Department

SUBJECT:

Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Management Facility

Waste Hauling Program

STAFF CONTACT:

Rick Graham

535-7774

Linda Hamilton, Director

468-3780

Salt Lake County Public Works Department

DOCUMENT TYPE:

Briefing Report

RECOMMENDATION:

No Council action requested.

BUDGET IMPACT:

None

DISCUSSION: Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County jointly own the Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Management Facility (Landfill). A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is set up between the City and County that spells out the role and responsibility of each government agency. Under the MOU the County is responsible for management of the Landfill. Management is an executive function, and in the case of the Landfill management decisions are held by the County Mayor and his administrators.

The City and County jointly own the Transfer Station located at 3300 South and 500 West. Municipal waste from both the City and County is hauled to the Transfer Station, and then is reloaded and transferred to a permanent landfill site for final disposal. Since 1999 the City's and County's municipal waste has been hauled from the Transfer Station to private landfill sites under a contractual agreement with Allied Waste. Allied Waste owns the private landfill sites. Currently the Transfer Station waste is hauled to Tooele County. As a private customer, Allied Waste also hauls waste it collects from its

commercial customers to the Landfill. The contract between the Landfill and Allied Waste allows the Landfill to cancel the contract on 30 days notice.

Two recent events have dramatically affected the operation and financial viability of the Landfill. First, the arrangement with Allied Waste to haul waste by rail to its Landfill site in East Carbon County was ended. Allied now hauls the Transfer Station waste by truck to its Tooele County landfill at the same rate it charged to haul by rail to Carbon County. Second, the amount of waste hauled to the Landfill has declined significantly.

The Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Management Council (Landfill Council) is established under the MOU to represent the interests of the City and County by overseeing the operation of the Landfill. In action to reverse the financial hemorrhaging caused by the recent events the Landfill Council issued a waste hauling RFP for the purpose of considering an alternative waste hauling program. Based on the results of the RFP, and other management considerations the Landfill Council recommended to the City and County Mayors that the contract with Allied Waste be terminated and a new contract be awarded to a private waste hauler that would truck waste from the Transfer Station to the Landfill. This recommendation received unanimous support by the Landfill Council. It is also supported by both Mayors.

Attached, is an analysis of this issue prepared by Salt Lake County. It describes the current situation and recommends three (3) actions the Landfill could take to restore financial stability to the Landfill operation. The analysis also reports that the Landfill has a current estimated life of 49 years.

In conclusion, changes to the Solid Waste Management environment in Salt Lake County forced a change to the current Landfill operation. The attached analysis will show that the decision to hire a private hauling contractor to truck waste from the Transfer Station to the Landfill, coupled with the restructuring of disposal prices will increase operating income at the Landfill by \$2,375,000.

<u>PUBLIC PROCESS:</u> This issue was fully discussed in open public meetings held by the Landfill Council.

Analysis of Current Financial Problems at Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Operations

Purpose Statement

Assess the current financial situation of the Salt Lake Valley Landfill and Transfer Station

Explore existing capacity in Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste

Propose a course of action to address the financial loss associated with lower tonnage being received at the landfill

Current Situation

Two recent events have dramatically affected the operation and financial outlook of the Solid Waste Management Division. First, the previous arrangement of hauling waste via rail to the ECDC facility in Carbon County ended. Second, the amount of waste going to the Salt Lake Valley (SLV) Landfill has declined significantly.

Until April of 2006, Allied Waste (a private solid waste management corporation) annually hauled roughly 165,000 tons of waste collected from commercial customers to the SLV Landfill. Allied also hauled roughly 165,000 tons annually from the SLV Transfer Station to its landfill in Tooele. In April, Allied opened its own transfer station to maximize its profit. The result is that Allied now diverts 40% of the waste it previously took to the SLV Landfill to its transfer station. This action, with all other things being equal, represents an estimated annual loss of income at the SLV Landfill of \$1,130,000 (\$4,300 per day). It is very likely that this situation will worsen as Allied's transfer station becomes fully operational and is able to divert more tonnage to its landfill. In the meantime, the SLV Landfill continues its contract with Allied to haul waste from the SLV Transfer Station to Allied's landfill. We are paying \$23.85 per ton for hauling and disposal.

Continuing the current agreement with Allied will reduce the annual owners' dividend which currently is supporting a program in the Salt Lake Valley Health Department and Salt Lake City's recycling program.

Allied recently submitted a proposal for a new agreement. Its proposal stated the County would **guarantee** Allied 165,000 tons of waste annually and Allied would **seek to supply** 160,000 tons. Allied stated it could not guarantee 160,000 tons because of uncertainty regarding its contracts. Unless there is a ton for ton swap, the proposed agreement does not work financially for the SLV Landfill. There were other issues in Allied's proposal that were less advantageous than the current agreement as well. It did not make good business sense to do anything other than reject Allied's proposal, simply because the contract price to haul and dispose of waste at \$23.85/ton exceeds managements projected cost at \$18.50/ton to do the same.

Plan to Restore the Financial Stability of Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Operations

The SLV Landfill can stop the financial hemorrhaging by taking three actions.

First, the Landfill Council recommended hiring a private hauling company to haul City and County waste from our transfer station to our own landfill for \$5.50 per ton plus a fuel surcharge. This will replace the waste Allied has diverted to its landfill. Additional revenue from Allied will be lost; however, the high cost to haul and dispose at \$23.85/ton will also be eliminated. An alternative to hiring a private hauling company to haul City and County waste from our transfer station to our own landfill was to purchase trucks and trailers and self haul the waste.

Second, increase the use of the SLV Transfer Station by other commercial haulers by making its pricing structure more competitive. Current policy restricts other commercial haulers from taking waste to our transfer station.

Third, phase out our existing contract with Allied Waste over the next six months. The current Allied contract has a 30-day cancellation provision.

Financial Analysis

The spreadsheets below identify four scenarios and the financial implications of each. The first scenario represents actual revenues and expenditures for 2005. A one-time transfer to designated fund balance was eliminated for comparability. This scenario reflects operations prior to the opening of Allied's transfer station. Operating income in 2005 was \$4,035,496. These funds go toward owners' dividend, which are currently supporting Health Department programs for the County and recycling for the City, presubtitle D closure, module construction, restoration and end use, facility replacement, equipment replacement, capital improvement, environmental liability, and post-subtitle D closure/post closure costs.

Scenario 1: 2005 Baseline

<u>Description</u>	Landfill (L/F) T	-Station (T/S)	<u>L/F + T/S</u>
•		•	
Actual 2005			
Total Tons	<u>626,705</u>	140,197	
Total Revenues	\$13,805,617	\$3,939,444	\$17,745,061
Total Costs	\$8,866,208	\$4,843,357	\$13,709,565
Operating Income	\$4,939,409	<u>(\$903,913)</u>	<u>\$4,035,496</u>

The second scenario represents the projected budget for the balance of 2006. Reflected is the loss of 130,000 tons from the waste stream compared to 2005 tonnage levels. The tons lost by customer is as follows: Allied Waste – 45,100 tons, Waste Management – 40,900 tons, Ace Disposal – 32,200 tons, A-1 Disposal – 6,400 tons, all others – 5,400 tons. It illustrates the impact of Allied diverting 40% of its waste stream away from the SLV Landfill and continuing the contract with Allied wherein it trucks the majority of City and County waste to its landfill. The SLV Landfill and Transfer Station lack hauling capacity and therefore have limited ability to manage income. In essence, income at these facilities become more dependent on Allied's operation than in-house operations. Thus, scenario three is presented expanding hauling capacity.

Scenario 2: 2006 Projected Budget - Status Quo-Continue Allied Contract/Lose 40% of Allied Waste Stream and loss of additional tons

<u>Description</u>	Landfill (L/F)	T-Station (T/S)	<u>L/F + T/S</u>
Projected Budget 2006			
Total Tons	<u>497,459</u>	<u>130,059</u>	·
Total Revenues	\$11,918,631	\$3,719,444	\$15,638,075
Total Costs	\$8,019,685	\$4,731,959	<u>\$12,751,644</u>
Operating Income	\$3,898,946	<u>(\$1,012,515)</u>	<u>\$2,886,431</u>

The third scenario represents the same operating assumptions as scenario two but on a pro forma basis eliminating the profit made by the division during the transition period. The operating income would have been reduced to \$866,991.

Scenario 3: If the Contract change was not made:

<u>Description</u>	Landfill (L/F)	T-Station (T/S)	<u>L/F + T/S</u>
Total Tons	408,518	165,000	
Total Revenues	\$10,649,956	\$3,719,444	\$14,369,400
Total Costs	\$8,683,113	\$4,819,296	\$13,502,40 <u>9</u>
Operating Income	\$1,966,843	(\$1,099,852)	<u>\$866,991</u>

The fourth scenario represents the recommendation of the Landfill Council, Public Works Department and CFO Office; to contract a private hauling company to haul City and County municipal waste to the SLV Landfill. The assumptions in this scenario are that Allied will divert 80% of its waste to its transfer station rather than the current rate of 40% and assumes the SLV Transfer Station adopts more competitive rates so that other haulers are encouraged by price to use the transfer station. The pro forma projects the addition of 200 tons per day, which is believed to be a realistic estimate. Attached are letters from Waste Management and Utah Independent Waste Handlers and Recyclers, which represent most of the smaller hauling companies, indicating their willingness to bring waste to the SLV Transfer Station if prices are competitive and their waste does not go to their competitor, Allied Waste. Reflected in the budget is the elimination of the hauling/disposal costs to Allied at \$23.85 per ton and the inclusion of the hauling costs to a private hauling company at \$5.50 per ton plus a fuel surcharge. On a forward looking basis, operating income increases by \$2,375,000. This increase will inure to the benefit of Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City via increased dividends and funds for the purposes identified above.

Scenario 4: Contract Haul; 200 TPD from commercial @ \$24/ton; lose 80% Allied waste

Description	Landfill (L/F)	T-Station (T/S)	<u>L/F + T/S</u>				
Budget Request 2007							
Total Tons	<u>592,518</u>	<u>217,000</u>					
Total Revenues	\$10,023,956	\$4,867,444	\$14,891,400				
Total Costs	\$8,662,113	\$2,986,766	<u>\$11,648,879</u>				
Operating Income	\$1,361,843	<u>\$1,880,678</u>	<u>\$3,242,521</u>				

Life of the landfill

The current estimated life of the SLV Landfill is 49 years with a capacity of disposing 35 million tons. This calculation does not include an additional 170 acres already owned by Solid Waste Management that yields an additional capacity of 16,400,000 tons, or 23 years.

If we entered into an agreement with Allied where it seeks to supply 160,000 tons annually and is successful in doing that, the life of our landfill would not be extended. We would be close to a ton for ton swap of waste with Allied.

There are a couple of events that might affect the capacity at the SLV Landfill including the pending development of the west bench. Each of these events is briefly addressed below.

Removing waste from old landfills

It is possible the County may have to move waste from its old landfill (that Salt Lake County leased from the LDS Church) to its current landfill. There is roughly 610,000 tons at the old landfill. If we had to accept all the waste from the landfill, it would utilize 2% of the 35,000,000 ton capacity at the current site. That would reduce the life of our landfill by only one year.

There is also an old City landfill that is estimated to contain roughly the same amount of debris as the old County landfill. If we removed all the debris from the old City landfill it would reduce the capacity of our landfill by another 2%.

Removing the debris from both the old landfills would reduce the capacity at our existing landfill by roughly 4%, or two years.

It is likely, however, that Allied and others would compete for that waste. It is entirely possible that the SLV Landfill would not need to take the waste.

Earthquake

To provide some perspective, the California Northridge earthquake generated 5,250,000 tons of debris. An earthquake of that magnitude would use 15%, or 7.35 years, of the capacity of the current landfill operations.

West Bench

The west bench is likely to develop over the next 45 to 70 years. It is incomprehensible that during that timeframe no new technology would be developed to make better use of waste. In fact, we have had a meeting with a company that stated that current technology is in use in Europe to recycle 100% of our waste stream.

If, however, we assume an increase in population from the West Bench of $\frac{1}{2}$ million over 50 years starting in 2010, the life of the current operating landfill would be reduced by five years.

In summary, if there was a convergence of events including level growth on the west bench, a Northridge size earthquake, and removal of debris from both the City's and County's old landfills, capacity at the SLV Landfill would be reduced by 14.4 years. If, however, we add existing owned and permitted capacity of 16,400,000 tons (or 23 years), the net affect would be to reduce the life of the owned and permitted SLV Landfill to 58 years.

Privatization

The division of Solid Waste is an enterprise fund. As such, it is operated like a business. Private alternatives are available in the Salt Lake County market. However, Public Works management has been advised by Management Partners, a national consulting firm, that privatizing public landfills often leads to price increases due to the oligopolistic nature of the industry. It is management's belief the landfill is currently operating at an efficient level. Indeed, the tipping fee of the SLV Landfill is among the lowest in the state. A much more detailed analysis should be conducted before considering privatization as an option.

Conclusion

There have been changes in the solid waste environment in Salt Lake County that create the need for changes to our current operations. The County Mayor has adopted the unanimous recommendation of the Landfill Council to hire a private hauling company to haul waste from the SLV Transfer Station to the SLV Landfill. This decision, coupled with a new pricing structure at the SLV Transfer Station, is projected to increase operating income at the SLV Landfill by \$2,375,000 (or \$9,000/day).

Capacity at the SLV Landfill, including the permitted 170 acres, can absorb:

- Waste from Salt Lake County's and City's old landfills
- Debris from an earthquake the size of the California's Northridge earthquake
- Expansion on the west bench

Even after absorbing solid waste material from these events, the landfill has an estimated remaining life of 58 years.

Additional properties are also available for acquisition to expand capacity for another 29 years.

Solid Waste Council is comprised of:

- Rick Graham, Salt Lake City's Public Services Director
- Ryan Dupont, Head of the Division of Environmental Engineering Division at Utah State
- Russ Willardson, Public Works Director for West Valley and representative for the Council of Governments
- Kent Miner, Salt Lake Valley Health Department
- Linda Hamilton, Salt Lake County's Public Works Director

Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Management Facility

Financial Analysis-Summary

Scenario 1: 2005 Baseline

<u>Description</u>	Landfill (L/F)	T-Station (T/S)	<u>L/F + T/S</u>
Actual 2005			
Total Tons	<u>626,705</u>	<u>140,197</u>	•
Total Revenues	\$13,805,617	\$3,939,444	\$17,745,061
Total Costs	\$8,866,208	\$4,843,357	<u>\$13,709,565</u>
Operating Income	<u>\$4,939,409</u>	(\$903,913)	<u>\$4,035,496</u>

Scenario 2: 2006 Projected Budget - Status Quo-Continue Allied Contract/Lose 40% of Allied Waste Stream and loss of additional tons

<u>Description</u>	Landfill (L/F)	T-Station (T/S)	<u>L/F + T/S</u>
Projected Budget 2006			
Total Tons	<u>497,459</u>	<u>130,059</u>	
Total Revenues	\$11,918,631	\$3,719,444	\$15,638,075
Total Costs	\$8,019,685	\$4,731,959	\$12,751,644
Operating Income	\$3,898,946	<u>(\$1,012,515)</u>	<u>\$2,886,431</u>

Scenario 3: If the Contract change was not made with existing tonnages

<u>Description</u>	Landfill (L/F)	T-Station (T/S)	L/F + T/S
Total Tons	408,518	<u>165,000</u>	
Total Revenues	\$10,649,956	\$3,719,444	\$14,369,400
Total Costs	\$7,984,283	\$5,518,137	\$13,502,420
Operating Income	\$2,665,673	(\$1,798,693)	<u>\$866,980</u>
12.50		(10) 并第三种 (10) 第三种	

Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Management Facility <u>Financial Analysis-Summary</u>

Scenario 4: 2007 Budget Request - Contract Haul; 200 TPD from commercial @ \$24/ton; lose 80% Allied waste

<u>Description</u>	<u>Landfill (L/F)</u> <u>T</u>	-Station (T/S)	L/F + T/S
Budget Request 2007			
Total Tons	592,518	<u>217,000</u>	•
Total Revenues	\$10,023,956	\$4,867,444	\$14,891,400
Total Costs	\$8,511,549	\$3,137,330	\$11,648,879
Operating Income	<u>\$1,512,407</u>	<u>\$1,730,114</u>	<u>\$3,242,521</u>

\$2.94

\$10.24

\$24.30

\$34.55

\$9.11

\$25.44

\$10.83

\$7.05

140,197

140,197

. 140,197

140,197

140,197

140,197

3,732,603

3,732,603

78,089 128,752

128,752

78,089

3,939,444

3,939,444

17,745,061

\$18.28 \$23.14 \$5.26

1,027,300 376,065 1,686,795

14,654,901

\$28.10 \$28.10

\$28.10 \$28.10

\$0.00 \$0.00 0

-\$6.45

\$4,035,496

Landfill <u>Variable</u> 44,252 1,470,939

T-Station 374,950 311,876

T-S Hauling 61,038 50,771

T-Station 435,988 362,647

119,694 51,625

Total <u>L/F + T/S</u> 3,386,146 3,264,715 1,200,000 400,819 1,816,145 448,124 3,193,616

1,550,823 1,200,000 400,819

00 0

1,816,145

T-Station Fixed 429,448

T-Station
Variable
6,540
242,953

Total <u>Fixed</u> 3,335,354

Total
Variable
50,792

1,713,892

1,840,298

1,436,000

3,407,357 3,193,616

4,843,357

1,277,231

3,566,126

13,709,565

8,303,141

5,406,424

3,193,616

448,124

0 513,103

.113,602 626,705

140,197 766,902 \$17.88

325,107

44,398 581,759 123,017

7,228 94,705

51,625

676,464

676,464 123,017 3,193,616

123,017 3,193,616

٠	

Operating Income

Rev/Exp.

Landfill Analysis-Final

N
8
6
7
ō
Φ
2
0

Operating Income	Rev/Exp.	Revenue per chargeble ton	Total	Landfill / other (E.I., wood, salvage, fluff) Misc Interest	Tipping Fees Loss 28% Allied tonnage Other Commercial Inbound	Cost per ton	Total	Other Commercial Inboun	Transfer station - ECDC	Landfill / other (wood, salvage, fluff) Total Landfill tons	Landfill / clean fill Landfill / tipping face Loss 28% Allied tonnage	Tons excludes clean	Total	Contract-Haul Cost	Depreciation Health Dept Fee Haul/Dispose (ECDC)	Operating Closure/Postclosure	Personnel	Description	
\$3,898,946	\$7.84	le - \$23.96	11,918,631	924,275 163,302 3,000,000	8,846,002 ge (1,014.943) xund	\$16.12	497,459	un 0		113,602 497,459	429,991 e (46.134)		8,019,685	0	1,083,482 279,918	410,000 599,375	Total 2,828,065	Landfill	
	•					\$13.18	•						6,557,155	0	1,083,482 21,240 0 0	410,000	Fixed 2,793,243	Landfill	
						\$2.94					·		1,462,529	0	258,679.		<u>Variable</u> 1 34,822 1 169 029	Landfill	
		\$28.60	3,719,444		3,719,444	\$10.90	130,059		130,059				1,418,180		581,759 105,148	0 44,398	375,354 311.522	T-Station	
							130,059		130,059				3,313,779	0	94,705 3,100,030 0	7,228	61,104 50,713	T-Station T-S Hauling	
(\$1,012,515)	-\$7.79	\$28.60	3,719,444		3,719,444	\$25,48 \$36.38 \$11.07	130,059	ő	130,059 0	. 00	0 0	o .	4,731,959	0	3,100,030 0	51,625	436,458 362,235	T-Station	.000 1 10]00
			•		•	\$11.07							1,440,166	0	7,604 137,286	51,625	429,955 137,233	T-Station Fixed	,
			,			\$25,31		٠,					3,291,793		97,544 2,962,744 0	000	6,503 225,002	T-Station	
\$2,886,431	\$4.60	\$24.92	15,638,075 	924,275 163,302 3,000,000	12,565,446 12,565,446 (1,014,948)	\$20.32 	627,518	0	130,059	113,602 497,459	429,991 (46,134)	- -	12,751,644		385,066 3,100,030 0	410,000 651,000 759,946	3,264,523 3,181,079	Total	
			٠	٠.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2 \$12.74							7,997,321		28,843 137,286 0	410,000 651,000 1,759,946	3,223,198 1,787,048	Total Fixed	
						\$7.5	!						4,/54,32	15.400	356,223 2,962,744		41,325 1,394,031	Total Variable	

Operating Income	Rev/Exp.	Revenue per chargeable ton	Total	Landfill / other (ET, wood, salvage, fluff) Misc Interest	Tipping Fees Loss 60% Allied tonnage Other Commercial Inbound	Cost per ton	Total	Other Commercial Inboun	Transfer station - ECDC	Landfill / other (wood, salvage, fluff) Total Landfill tons	fill/ET Landfill / clean fill Landfill / tipping face Projected Allied lost tons	Total Tons excludes clean		Haul/Dispose (ECDC) Contract-Haul Cost	Indirect Depreciation	Operating Closure/Post closure	Description Personnel	
\$2,665,673	\$6.42	\$25.66	10,649,956	900,000 157,400 2,950,000	8,754,556 (2,112.000)	\$19.24	415,033	0	6,515	113,602 408,518	390,916 (96,000)	7,984,283	1001000		599,961 1,112,450 0	2,881,465 435,400	<u>Total</u> 2,955,008	Tandill
						\$16.27						0,/51,635	6 751 635	000	599,961 1,112,450	1,677,869 435,400	Fixed 2,925,955	Sandfill
			,			\$2.97						1,202,040	1 222 648	000		1,203,596	Variable 29,052	Landfill
		\$22.54	3,719,444		3,719,444	\$9.06	165,000		165,000			170	1 494 912		597,313 0	461,543		2007 Reque
			0			\$24.38	158,485		158,485			j	4.023.225	3,//9,86/ 0 0	97,237	7 0 0	63,751	est Budget If C T-S Hauling
(\$1,798,693)	-\$10.90	\$22.54	3,719,444		3,719,444	\$33.44	165,000	0	165,000 0	0 0	0 0	,	5,518,137	3,778,007 0	694,550	51 675	<u>Total</u> 455,366 536,678	2007 Request Budget If Contract with Allied was Continued. T-Station T-S Hauling T-Station T-Station T-Station
-						\$8.00							1,320,820	000	694,550	51 675	Fixed 447,116 127 478	led was <u>Con</u> T-Station
						\$25.44					, 		4,197,317	0 0	0 0 0		<u>Variable</u> 1 8,250 409,200	
\$866,980	\$1.49	\$24.77	14,369,400	900,000 1 157,400 2,950,000	1 12,474,000 1 (2,112,000) 1 0	\$23.28	580,033		171,515	113,602	390,916		13,502,420	0	1,807,000 0 3,779,867	435,400 651,636	3,410,374 3,373,072 3,418,143 1 - 1,805,347	Total
	,*					\$13.92						•••.	8,072,455	0	1,807,000 0 0	435,400 651,636	3,373,072 -1,805,347	Total
• .		٠.			·	¥9.36							5,429,965	0	3,779,86	00	37,302 1,612,796	

2007 Budget Request

Operating Income	Rev/Exp.	Revenue per chargeble ton	Total	Landfill / other (ET, wood, salvage, fluff) Misc Interest	Tipping Fees Loss 80% Allied tonnage Other Commercial Inbound	Cost per ton	Total	Other Commercial Inboun	Transfer station	Landfill / other (wood, salvage, fluff) Total Landfill tons	fill/ET Landfill / clean fill Landfill / tipping face Loss of Allied tonnage	Tons excludes clean	Total	Contract-Haul Cost	Indirect Depreciation	Personnel Operating CharrelPostchsure	Description
<u>\$1,512,407</u>	\$2.55	\$16.92	10,023,956	900,000 157,400 2,950,000	8,832,556 (2.816.000)	\$14.37	592,518	52,000	165,000	113,602 375,518	389,916 (128,000)		8,511,549	0	599,961 1,112,450 0	2,967,432 3,396,307 435,400	Landfill
			0		. , .	\$11.39					80%		6,751,635	000	599,961 1,112,450 0	2,925,955 1,677,869 435,400	Landfill
						\$2.97		٠			. •		1,759,914	0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	41,476 1,718,438	Landfill
		\$22.43	4,867,444		3,619,444 1 1,248,000	\$7.41	217,000	52,000	165,000				1,608,053		44,441 597,313 0	393,851 572,448 0	T-Station
	• .		.0			\$7.05	195,000		195,000				1,529,276	0 1,267,500	7,235 97,237 0	64,115 93,189 0	T-Station T-S Hauling
\$1,730,114	\$7.97	\$22.43	4,867,444		3,619,444 1,248,000	\$14.46	217,000	52,000	165,000	00	00		3,137,330	0. 1,267,500	51,675 694,550 0 0	457,966 665,638 0	T-Station
					•	\$6.09							1,320,820	00	694,550 0 0 0	447,116 127,478 0	T-Station Fixed
		٠				\$7.05 : \$14.46 () \$6.09 () \$8.37							1,816,510	1,267,500	0000	10,850 538,160 0	T-Station Variable
\$3,242,521	\$5.47	· \$25.13	14,891,400	900,000 1 157,400 2,950,000	12,452,000 (2,816,000) 1,248,000	 \$19.00	592,518	52,000	165,000	113,602 375,518	389,916 (128,000)	_	11,648,879	1,267,500	1,807,000	3,425,398 4,061,945 435,400 651,636	Total
•						, \$ 13.02			٠				8,072,455	0	1,807,000	3,373,072 1,805,347 435,400 651,636	Total Fixed
	٠											,	3,576,424	1,267,500		2,256,598 0 0	Total Variable