

# Rate Change Request





#### **Refuse Rates Board Hearing #3**

#### June 26, 2023

### **Cost Control Mechanisms**

- - Programmatic Reserve
    - Fund to pay for service requests outside of rate order
    - Controls annual costs of these service requests
    - Forward-looking
  - "Elective" Expenses
    - RRA review of variances in costs submitted during rate process

    - Backward-looking
- Balancing account to regulate profit
  - Caps profit at approved level if adjusted at 100%

Major cost control mechanisms in this Rate Order, each with distinct purpose

Designed to incentivize cost control if balancing account adjusted at 100%



## **Cost Control Mechanisms**

#### Pre-authorization of costs for future additional service

# Holds profit at

Programmatic Reserve

#### Balancing Account

authorized level

#### RRA review of expense variances

#### "Elective" Expenses

## **Programmatic Reserve**

- RRA proposes a Programmatic Reserve to pay for service requests from City that are not included in rate order
- Controls costs for services outside rate order by capping annual funding
- Funding amount should be tied to revenue, not corporate allocations
- Recology proposes funding as percentage of actual collections net revenue retained



### "Elective" Expenses

- Response to concerns on incentivizing cost control if balancing account adjusted at 100%
- Allows RRA to review "elective" expenses and determine exclusion in target profit calculation used to adjust balancing account
- Variance analysis comparing actual expenses to approved projected expenses
- Carve-outs for cost changes due to changes in volumes, fuel, etc.
- Annual line-item materiality threshold of \$500,000

- Mechanism designed to hold Recology to the profit level approved in Rate Order
- Profits on OR-eligible expenses consistent with OR target profit if adjustments are based on 100% of profit variance
- A different adjustment percentage could allow significant variances
- RRA argues for 100% adjustment for certain items (e.g., pension)
- Impact of balancing account on rate volatility depends on multiple factors

## **Balancing Account**





YE26	YE28	YE32
(3 years)	(5 years)	(long-term)
100%	99%	97%

- SF Companies' share: ~\$16M in each rate year
- Long-term rate funding required must consider ERISA funding obligations
- Two funding triggers proposed (1) funding status falls below 98% after reaching 100% (2) required cash contributions under ERISA regulations
- If either trigger occurs, rate funding should increase to cover shortfall

## Pension

#### Actuarial funding status projection with \$17M annual contribution for 3 years





- Annual rate adjustment for RY 202 event next rate cycle delayed
- COLA would continue to be applied except for years when Rate Board sets new rates
  - Helps align rates with cost changes
  - Factors to approximate most recent cost structure
  - Weighting adjusted annually based on actual costs
- Including COLA mechanism in current rate order provides clarity

Annual rate adjustment for RY 2026 and beyond to provide backstop in the

## Weekend Clean-up Events

- Supports proper disposal and reduces material left in the public right of way
  - Complements BIR, which targets larger items
  - 22 events across the City each year (2 per district)
  - Material collected at Weekend Clean-ups is subsequently sorted to increase recovery
  - Assumes a third-party will participate in reuse / e-waste component
  - Estimated annual cost = \$608K
- Alternative "3-bin" and reuse events
  - Source-separated disposal increases logistical complexity
  - Additional labor and other costs

  - Unclear if possible in each district due to additional space required • Assumes a third-party will participate in reuse / e-waste component
  - Estimated annual cost = \$850K



### Contamination

- Replace 6 existing cameras with 6 higher resolution cameras 1 additional FTE to evaluate photos, manage data, track impacts, and
- manage warnings
- Estimated annual cost = \$200K
- Estimated additional revenue from contamination fees:

#### **Additional Contamination**

**Commercial customers** 

Percent of commercial customers impacted

Additional accounts identified

Average contamination revenue per custome contamination per month

Est. monthly revenue

Est. annual revenue

Revenue Estimate		
	15,538	
	2%	
	311	
er with	\$55	
	\$17,092	
	\$205,102	



# Organics Pre-Processing

- Electric trommel purchase in lieu of renting diesel-powered trommel
- Diesel-powered trommel not permitted under Air District regulations
- Lower cost than 2-year rental cost
- Estimated project cost: Purchase: \$328K Electrification: \$37K Pollution offset credits: \$150K Total: \$515K
- Annual cost: \$74K in RY 2024 / \$59K in RY 2025



- Support concept of a capital reserve fund
- Significant capital expenditures likely in coming years
- Up to \$100M may be necessary in San Francisco

#### Zero Waste Capital Reserve



# Thank you



