



Date: 06/06/2018

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

To: South Cariboo Joint Committee

And To: John MacLean, Chief Administrative Officer

From: Tera Grady, Supervisor of Solid Waste Management

Date of Meeting: South Cariboo Joint Committee_Jun11_2018

File: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Short Summary:

South Cariboo Solid Waste Function Boundary

Voting:

Document Description

Memorandum:

The 2018 Business Plan for the South Cariboo Solid Waste (SCSW) function includes the **Goal** to: “Investigate incorporating all South Cariboo refuse sites into one service.” The **Strategy** states: “Review past requisition amounts for Rural Refuse (RR) and South Cariboo Solid Waste functions to identify if requisition amounts are reflective of levels of service in each function.”

South Cariboo Refuse Sites:

The SCSW function includes the 100 Mile House Landfill, the Lac La Hache, Forest Grove and Lone Butte transfer stations.

The Watch Lake, Interlakes and Mahood Lake landfills and the Eagle Creek transfer station are the other refuse sites in Electoral Areas G, H and L that are NOT included in the SCSW function. Of these sites, only the Eagle Creek site generates waste that is disposed of at the 100 Mile House landfill, the other landfills operate independently of the 100 Mile House facility.

Requisition Rates:

The table below provides five years of requisition rates for Rural Refuse and South Cariboo Solid Waste functions, as well as a calculated amount for what the combined requisition rate would have been each year.

Due to the small number of properties contributing to the SCSW function the requisition for this area fluctuates more than RR, but the difference in the five year average for both functions is \$1.30 per \$100,000 of assessment.

The five-year average for RR was \$54.48 and SCSW was \$55.78. If the functions were combined the five year average would have been \$54.78, which would equate to a \$0.30 increase to RR requisition and a \$1.00 decrease for SCSW.

| Year | Service | Tax Req | Assess Val | Tax Rate \$/\$1,000 | Conv Assess | Resid Tax Rate \$/\$100,000 |
|------|-------------|-----------|---------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2014 | RR (1008) | 2,804,602 | 3,931,858,779 | \$ 0.7133 | 518,791,065 | \$ 54.06 |
| | SCSW (1016) | 1,037,380 | 1,344,313,227 | \$ 0.7717 | 182,138,079 | \$ 56.96 |
| | Combined | 3,841,982 | 5,276,172,006 | \$ 0.7282 | 700,929,144 | \$ 54.81 |
| 2015 | RR (1008) | 2,806,258 | 3,900,668,292 | \$ 0.7194 | 513,068,691 | \$ 54.70 |
| | SCSW (1016) | 1,037,380 | 1,317,430,095 | \$ 0.7874 | 178,439,630 | \$ 58.14 |
| | Combined | 3,843,638 | 5,218,098,387 | \$ 0.7366 | 691,508,321 | \$ 55.58 |
| 2016 | RR (1008) | 2,862,383 | 4,011,372,520 | \$ 0.7136 | 530,561,774 | \$ 53.95 |
| | SCSW (1016) | 1,037,380 | 1,346,662,973 | \$ 0.7703 | 182,776,516 | \$ 56.76 |
| | Combined | 3,899,763 | 5,358,035,493 | \$ 0.7278 | 713,338,290 | \$ 54.67 |
| 2017 | RR (1008) | 2,919,631 | 4,101,807,956 | \$ 0.7118 | 538,468,239 | \$ 54.22 |
| | SCSW (1016) | 1,037,380 | 1,423,631,211 | \$ 0.7287 | 192,110,621 | \$ 54.00 |
| | Combined | 3,957,011 | 5,525,439,167 | \$ 0.7161 | 730,578,860 | \$ 54.16 |
| 2018 | RR (1008) | 3,065,612 | 4,245,994,111 | \$ 0.7220 | 552,217,702 | \$ 55.51 |
| | SCSW (1016) | 1,037,380 | 1,474,503,479 | \$ 0.7035 | 195,533,863 | \$ 53.05 |
| | Combined | 4,102,992 | 5,720,497,590 | \$ 0.7172 | 747,751,565 | \$ 54.87 |

SWSW Function Expansion:

If all the “South” refuse sites and their associated tax base were included in the SCSW function, there would be a short-term decrease in requisition; however, this would cause an increase to the requisition for the RR function, and Staff do not have an argument to support this shift.

In the long term, the requisition for the expanded SCSW function could increase dramatically if the 100 Mile House and Interlakes landfill sites have to shift to engineered sites.

One Function:

As a result of this assessment, Staff would recommend that the SCSW function be merged with the Rural Refuse function. The difference in the five year average for the two functions of \$1.30 per \$100,000 of assessment does not justify two functions to budget and manage separately, especially when the services provided in each function area are essentially the same.

All CRD landfills will have to be assessed against the new Landfill Criteria and Staff anticipate that solid waste costs will be increasing over time throughout the region. Having all sites managed under one function will allow for the allocation of costs over a broader assessment base, thus reducing the impact on individual taxpayers of significant anticipated cost increases resulting from the new Landfill Criteria.

Attachments:

None

Financial Implications:**Policy Implications:**

None

Alignment with Strategic Plan:

- Ensuring Sufficient and Sustainable Funding
- Building on our Relationships
- Providing Cost Effective High Quality Services
- Focusing on Being Well Governed

[Click here to enter text.](#)

CAO Comments:

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Options:

- 1) Endorse recommendation
- 2) Receipt and other action
- 3) Defer

Recommendation:

That the agenda item summary from Tera Grady, Supervisor of Solid Waste Management, dated June 6, 2018, regarding the South Cariboo Solid Waste function, be received. Further, that the South Cariboo Solid Waste Function be combined with the Rural Refuse function starting with the 2019 budget.