



RESOLUTION # 10 - 4/10

TO: HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE LA CROSSE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

ITEM # 4/42

BOARD ACTION

Adopted:
For: 28
Against: 2
Abstain: -
Abs/Excd: 5
Vote Req: _____
Other Action: _____

PUBLIC WORKS & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE ACTION

Adopted:
For: 5
Against: -
Abstain: 7
Abs/Excd: 1

RE: APPROVAL OF SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION EVALUATION

WHEREAS, due to changes occurring across the country in how solid waste and recyclables are collected; improvements are available in such areas as customer service, worker safety and collection costs; and,

WHEREAS, La Crosse County has made a significant financial commitment to its Landfill Complex and to the French Island RDF Facility pursuant to its contract with Northern States Power Company (NSP); and,

WHEREAS, any changes in how the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska manage and fund solid waste and recycling collection services will impact La Crosse County's Solid Waste Disposal System; and,

WHEREAS, the evaluation will provide information to County and City policymakers about potential options available for future solid waste and recycling collection services, including issues related to customer service, sustainability and coordination of services among different local governmental bodies; and,

WHEREAS, NSP and the governing bodies of the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska have agreed to contribute to the cost of the study based on tonnage delivered from each municipality; and,

WHEREAS, the study will be performed by Foth Infrastructure and Environmental Services, LLC (Foth) pursuant to its existing agreement for professional services with La Crosse County under a proposal to provide such services at a cost not to exceed \$50,000.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the County Board does hereby approve Foth to perform the solid waste and recycling collection evaluation for a cost not to exceed \$50,000 pursuant to an addendum to its existing agreement with the County and the Finance Department is authorized to make any necessary budget adjustments.

FISCAL NOTE: La Crosse County Share: \$22,500, budgeted in Org. 6526 Ash Monofill Expansion, Account 64056 will be transferred to Solid Waste Operations Org. 6500-64056. Balance of \$27,500 paid as follows: \$5,000 by NSP, remaining \$22,500 prorated between cities of La Crosse and Onalaska based on tonnage delivered to the County Landfill.

Date: 4-12-10

Date: 4/12/10

[Signature]
PUBLIC WORKS & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE CHAIR

[Signature]
RECORDING CLERK

	Reviewed Only	Recommended	Not Recommended
Co. Admin.	_____	<u>SO</u>	_____
Fin. Director	_____	<u>GI</u>	_____
Corp. Counsel	_____	<u>WAS</u>	_____
Board Chair	<u>SO/ma</u>	_____	_____

Requested By: Hank Koch
Date Requested: March 26, 2010
Drafted By: Corporation Counsel

Adopted by the La Crosse County Board this 20TH Day of APRIL, 2010

STATE OF WISCONSIN
COUNTY OF LA CROSSE

I, Linda A. Stone, County Clerk of La Crosse County do hereby certify that this document is a true and correct copy of the original resolution required by law to be in my custody and which the County Board of Supervisors of La Crosse County adopted at a meeting held on the 20th day of April, 2010.

[Signature]
Linda A. Stone, La Crosse County Clerk

**La Crosse County Solid Waste Department
La Crosse, Wisconsin
Solid Waste and Recycling Collection Evaluation**

January 22, 2009

I. Executive Summary – Meeting Your Needs

Changes have been occurring in how solid wastes and recyclables are collected in many communities. Improvements are available in customer service, worker safety, and in areas related to sustainability. In addition, local governments in Wisconsin face significant financial pressures on their general fund revenues. It is timely to look for other options to fund solid waste and recycling collection related costs.

The La Crosse County Solid Waste Disposal System is a complex system including many different participants and services. The County has made a significant commitment to their Landfill Complex and the contract with Xcel for the waste-to-energy facility. Any changes for the Cities in how they manage and fund solid waste and recycling collection services will impact La Crosse County's Solid Waste Disposal System.

This evaluation is structured to inform City and County policy makers about the potential options available for the future solid waste and recycling collection services and to provide descriptions about the pros and cons of each option. The evaluation will provide not only key information related to large financial impacts but also will address issues related to customer service, sustainability, and coordination of services among different local governmental bodies.

II. Our Understanding of Your Project

Historical Context

La Crosse County and the cities in the County have a long history of solid waste planning and implementation of facilities, programs, and services. This is evident by the financial commitment to the La Crosse County Landfill Complex and the contract with Xcel to process waste to capture energy. The La Crosse County Disposal System is a complex arrangement including:

- ◆ County ownership and management
- ◆ City participation and individual collection program management
- ◆ Coordination and participation by surrounding counties and
- ◆ Partnerships with several private companies to provide the actual services.

The La Crosse County Disposal System has been built upon the long term vision of the elected officials who serve the area.

This project involves examining future options for collecting solid wastes, recyclables, and the funding for those services. Both La Crosse County and the city of La Crosse are committed to sustainability. Included in the recent Sustainability Plan was the need to address potential future solid waste and recycling collection changes that could improve sustainability. In addition, both the city of La Crosse and the city of Onalaska have expressed specific interest in evaluating coordination of solid waste and recycling collection as a way to improve services and be more cost effective.

There is pressure on local governments regarding the amount of taxes and the use of their general funds. For most communities in La Crosse County (including the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska), waste

collection and disposal is paid for out of the general fund. This project will provide information on other approaches that are user fee based.

Project Concept Development

Leaders from La Crosse County and the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska met to start development of this joint project. There is significant interest from residents in the city of La Crosse to increase the types of materials collected in the curbside recycling program. There is also recognition of the need to systematically plan for what services to include in the next solid waste and recycling collection contract that will start in July, 2012. The city of Onalaska is interested in improving services for residents and considering automated collection, single-stream recycling, yard waste collection, and pay as you throw funding options. La Crosse County recognizes that major changes in collection service and funding for the cities may have an impact on the County Disposal System. Also, historically other communities in La Crosse County have modeled their garbage and recycling collection services after the approaches implemented by the city of La Crosse. Any changes made by the "lead city" are likely to impact surrounding communities within La Crosse County.

This solid waste and recycling collection evaluation will be developed for City and County policy makers to use in making decisions regarding the future solid waste and recycling collection and funding systems. The evaluation will provide an understanding of the

- ♦ Existing collection system
- ♦ Trends in the industry
- ♦ Benchmarking selected communities elsewhere
- ♦ Options for collection and funding of garbage, recyclables, yard wastes, and bulky wastes
- ♦ Organizational structure options and
- ♦ Methods to secure wastes to the La Crosse County Disposal System for maintaining long term financial sustainability.

In addition, projections will be provided regarding the impact on greenhouse gas (GHG) generation for some potential changes in recycling.

Financial Considerations and Other Benefits

It is important to note that this planning process can have significant financial and customer service impacts. For example, the city of La Crosse annual budget for solid waste was stated to be approximately \$1 million. Contracts typically have five (5) year terms, meaning decisions made as a result of this evaluation will impact a \$5 million dollar service contract for just the city of La Crosse. Cost impacts for the city of Onalaska will be relatively similar to the city of La Crosse allowing for community size differences. Total annual costs for the La Crosse Disposal System facilities are estimated to be over \$9 million for 2010. There is a considerable amount of money tied up in solid waste services in the La Crosse Disposal System that bears careful planning for the future.

Besides the financial aspects, there are customer service benefits to consider. Services such as automated collection and expanded recycling would affect all single family households. These services have been viewed very favorably by customers and constituents in other communities. Shifting funding to user fees could provide more room in general fund levy limits. Increasing recycling will reduce GHG generation providing improved steps toward sustainability.

III. Scope of Services - Steps for Success

The Foth staff involved in this evaluation has a good understanding of the current collection and funding system in the area. We have participated in several previous area planning processes and have listened closely as representatives from La Crosse County and the Cities have worked to develop the scope for this

project. We have also been closely involved with planning and implementing collection system changes in other communities and will draw from that experience for this project.

The primary "audience" for the resulting evaluation report is anticipated to be local elected officials. The options and associated issues will be described and the "pros and cons" of each option identified. The report will be a policy guidance document. The following tasks and descriptions are built around the anticipated sections of the report rather than the process to develop the report.

Task 1 – Existing System/Trends Description

The first step in analyzing future options is to gain a good understanding of existing conditions. Foth will develop written descriptions of the current solid waste, recyclables, yard wastes, and bulky waste collection systems in the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska. The primary focus will be on single family residential collection. This will include collection methods, available information on costs, status of contracts, funding methods, delivery locations, and facility highlights. The La Crosse County Disposal System will be addressed as necessary to describe and relate to collection issues, projected life expectancies, and long term commitments. The historical perspective of the long term vision and past decisions will be described along with how the entire system fits together.

A second aspect of this section will be to describe collection related trends occurring outside of the La Crosse area. These are anticipated to include items such as:

- ♦ Automated garbage collection
- ♦ Single-stream and dual stream recycling collection
- ♦ Separate food waste collection
- ♦ Coordinated collection
- ♦ Recycle Bank
- ♦ Revenue sharing

The collection trend descriptions will provide a brief explanation of the typical concept and the relative frequency of occurrence.

Task 2 – Benchmarking/Case Study Summaries

This section will provide some specific information from other communities for comparison to the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska as well as pertinent aspects of the La Crosse County Disposal System. Foth anticipates using information obtained from projects completed for other communities outside of the La Crosse County area to augment specific additional communities targeted for this project. The survey results from the report for the city of Janesville will be reviewed for pertinent information. Foth will collect information from selected communities, counties, or authorities that have organized collection and develop summaries of the available information.

Task 3 – System Carbon Footprints

Increasing focus is being placed on the GHG impacts of solid waste and recycling. Foth has utilized the EPA Waste Reduction Model (WARM) in other projects. This readily available and widely accepted model provides projections for the difference in GHG emissions associated with different approaches to managing solid wastes and recyclables within a service area. Foth will develop baseline scenarios that represent the existing system using data specific to the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska. Waste composition data from recent characterization studies in Wisconsin will be applied to the waste generation quantities for the cities. Different GHG projections for the quantity of different materials that can be recycled versus sent to waste-to-energy versus landfilled will be developed. This can provide policy makers with knowledge regarding the GHG generation benefits of different management approaches for recycling versus waste-to-energy versus long haul to landfill.

Task 4 – Collection Options

This section will address collection options for garbage, recyclables, yard wastes, and bulky wastes. The descriptions will address the basic technologies for each such as:

- ♦ Manual versus automated for garbage
- ♦ Single-stream versus dual stream for recycling
- ♦ Leaf vacuuming versus bags and carts versus drop offs for yard wastes
- ♦ Manual versus automated for bulky wastes

In addition to brief descriptions of the technologies and the pros and cons of each will be described and summarized in comparison tables.

The recycling review will first compare the types of materials that are collected locally to the materials typically collected in other communities. Recycling approaches will need to address not only collection, but also processing the recyclables to meet market specifications as the processing needs for dual stream are different than single stream. Local capacity exists for dual stream processing. Single stream processing capacity does not currently exist but could be developed or even provided via transfer hauling out of the area. In addition, the recycling collection analysis will address the requirements of “responsible units” and the potential for La Crosse County to become the responsible unit rather than individual municipalities. A description of the pros and cons will be provided along with a summary table.

Yard waste will also be addressed relative to the primary delivery locations and the pros and cons of these locations (such as Isle La Plume versus Dummer Farms versus La Crosse County Landfill Complex).

In addition to the technological approaches, this section will also address service delivery options such as:

- ♦ City contracts
- ♦ Open, subscription systems
- ♦ Municipal collection
- ♦ Coordinated collection

A brief description of each will be provided with the pros and cons of each summarized in tables and text.

Task 5 – Funding Options

There are some basic approaches to paying for residential solid waste services. The first step is understanding all the potential different components of the costs. Typically there are costs associated with collection that include:

- ♦ The truck, crew, and operating costs
- ♦ There may be costs associated with carts for automated and single stream collection
- ♦ A cost for disposal at the Xcel Facility (the tipping fee)
- ♦ Costs associated with processing recyclables or yard wastes
- ♦ Costs associated with billing and administrative overhead
- ♦ There may be costs associated with public education

Foth will provide a description of each of these potential cost components.

Currently the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska fund their solid waste related costs via their general funds. Foth will briefly summarize the current systems and identify the pros and cons with a summary table. Other options for funding include:

- ♦ Municipal utility bills
- ♦ Haulers direct billing
- ♦ Sale of bags or tags

Foth will provide descriptions of each and describe the pros and cons in text and summary tables.

With the use of the non-general fund approaches comes the ability to charge flat rates or unit-based approaches (a.k.a., pay as you throw, variable rate pricing, etc.) wherein customers pay based upon their level of usage. Foth will provide descriptions of each of these and the pros and cons will be described in text and summary tables.

Task 6 – Organizational Approaches (Governance)

Historically solid waste and recycling collection has been a municipal function and processing and disposal has been a county or regional government led function. With the increased focus on improving efficiency in government and the potential for economies of scale, there is more interest in coordinating solid waste and recycling collection services for multiple local government entities. The section will provide examples of different approaches that have been used such as the Tri-County agreement in Brown, Outagamie, and Winnebago Counties, Wisconsin; the Clark County and Portage County examples that combined cities into collection contracts; Southern Trempealeau County with their cooperative agreement; or other similar organizations.

This section will also identify and describe the statutory authority available to the Cities and County for organizational structure. A discussion of the pros and cons will be provided and summarized in tables.

Task 7 – Waste Stream Security

The La Crosse County Disposal System includes a complex system of participants, contracts, and financial commitments. The centerpieces include the contract with Xcel to process garbage into fuel and the La Crosse Landfill Complex complete with an MSW landfill, ash monofill, household hazardous waste facility, pharmaceutical collection program, and other recovery operations such as wood waste, shingles, etc. This is a user fee based payment system, not supported by the general fund. Processing waste into fuel costs more in the short term than simply landfilling. However, the County decision makers have favored waste-to-energy over landfilling for many years due to sustainability, reduced long term liability, and a significantly reduced need to site new landfill capacity for many years into the future.

With higher current costs than landfilling, the La Crosse County Disposal System uses a number of tools to assure wastes are delivered to the Xcel facility and Landfill Complex. Initially, a flow control ordinance was adopted to direct waste to the waste-to-energy facility. Subsequently, the County developed incentive programs such as rebates to encourage haulers or generators to deliver waste. In addition, the County worked with cities to include language in municipal collection contracts that require the contracted hauler to deliver wastes to the appropriate facility.

These approaches work well in some instances and not in others. Waste deliveries to Xcel have been down this year potentially not reaching the 73,000 tons per year “put or pay” requirement of La Crosse County to Xcel. At the December 16, 2009 Solid Waste Policy Board, there was some discussion regarding the status and options for Waste Security. Hank Koch, the County Solid Waste Director, summarized the options as:

- ♦ Enforcement
- ♦ Incentive
- ♦ Education

This section of the report will describe the currently used methods for waste stream security and potential additional options. Foth will interview representatives of the County and Cities regarding this topic including County Corporation Counsel. Preliminary analysis of the options or modifications to the incentive rebate programs will be provided. Foth will summarize the pros and cons of each approach.

Task 8 – Project Management, Meetings, and Report

Foth will initially provide a "Data Needs List" to La Crosse County to gather and provide pertinent information needed for the project. The data is anticipated to include items such as:

- ♦ Statistics for the participating Cities and County overall such as households, tons, Responsible Unit reports, etc.
- ♦ Copies of pertinent contracts such as collection contracts for the Cities
- ♦ Copies of the current rebate programs in place
- ♦ Waste composition information if not readily available from the Wisconsin DNR
- ♦ Pertinent data (if available) on yard wastes and bulky wastes
- ♦ Other data or documents that may be identified during the project, to the extent they are readily available to the County or Cities

Foth will review the available information and begin assembling a working draft of the report. There may be a need for a Project Kick-off meeting to discuss ongoing data needs or gaps. There will be a need for Foth to interview select stakeholders such as haulers, City and County staff, and representatives of the case study communities. This will be done outside of any formal meetings.

An additional interim meeting may be required with the City/County team that developed the project concept. This meeting may be helpful to provide direction regarding questions that arise as the report text is developed.

Each of the tasks will result in development of a section of the report. These will be compiled and provided to the City/County team in draft form for preliminary review and comment. Foth anticipates a meeting with the City/County team to review the entire working draft of the report.

It may be desirable for the City and/or County officials to organize a meeting to solicit additional feedback on options and pros and cons from interested citizens. This could be done in conjunction with the above meeting to review the working draft.

Foth anticipates a final "set" of meetings with representatives of the city of La Crosse, city of Onalaska, and La Crosse County where Foth will present the report and explain the different options with the associated pros and cons.

Deliverables

The primary deliverables from the project will be working drafts of the report, the final report, power point presentations prepared for meetings, and the presentations themselves. The final document will be formatted to serve as an amendment to the La Crosse County Solid Waste Management Plan.

IV. Owner Responsibilities

La Crosse County is responsible for the following information and activities:

- ♦ Provide a single contact source for review, comment, and decision making on all issues related to the project.
- ♦ Provide the requested information in the Data Needs list (to the extent it is available).

- ♦ Provide a summary table of the current collection arrangements for the cities, villages, and towns in La Crosse County.
- ♦ Coordinate and provide readily available data from the County and/or the Cities.
- ♦ Schedule meeting locations and facilities.
- ♦ Provide timely review of working draft documents.

V. Project Management and Project Team

Jim Miles-Polka, P.E. is the client liaison for La Crosse County. Jim will be involved in this project to assure overall client satisfaction and coordinate quality control activities.

Warren Shuros will be the Project Manager and primary client contact. Warren will attend the meetings, make the presentations, and develop much of the report content. Warren will lead the team effort in completing the evaluation report activities.

Professional staff will include Jessie Graveen involved with benchmarking, EPA WARM Modeling, researching, and report development. Craig (Coop) Cooper will review technical aspects of the collection methods and participate in development of the pros and cons of various options. Dan Krivit will participate in research on options and development of the pros and cons.

This is the same Project Team that has completed several other recent solid waste collection projects.

VI. Schedule for Success

Foth proposes to complete the project according to the following schedule, unless circumstances beyond our control require modification of the schedule.

Based on our current understanding, the project may commence approximately April 1, 2010. Foth anticipates the project requiring approximately 3 to 4 months to complete. Thus, with an April start, the project will be completed by the end of July. Foth understands that the primary schedule driver is to meet the needs of the city of La Crosse related to their upcoming collection contract in July 2012, the potential need to order trucks, manage a procurement process, develop the preferred organizational structure, etc. The schedule identified above will meet these needs.

VII. Reimbursement

Foth proposes to complete the work described in our scope of services in this proposal on a time and materials basis with a Not-to-Exceed total cost of \$50,000.

VIII. Agreement to Proceed

Professional services will be provided subject to terms and conditions of our existing agreement for professional services. Should you accept this proposal, a completed addendum will be forwarded to you for signature to authorize us to begin. Should you desire to authorize our services through the use of Purchasing Order, the previously referenced Terms shall govern and replace those on the Purchase Order. Should we start services upon a verbal authorization, it is with the understanding they are provided in accordance with the above referenced Terms. Should you have any questions regarding these terms and conditions, or any other matter, please contact us. If the above Terms are not acceptable, please notify us in writing before we begin providing services.