May 27, 2014

Nancy McDermid, Chair Norma Santiago, Board Member JoAnn Conner, Board Member South Lake Tahoe Basin Waste Management Authority 1901 Airport Road South Lake Tahoe CA 96150

VIA EMAIL (Hard Copy to Be Mailed)

Dear Board Members:

Enclosed is our management representation letter and 2015 base year rate application.

We have calculated our rate adjustment based on the Solid Waste Rate Setting Policies and Procedures Manual effective March 30, 2012. We have calculated a rate increase effective January 1, 2015 of 3.71% for the City of South Lake Tahoe and Douglas County and a 3.48% increase for El Dorado County. The variance in these rates is primarily attributable to profit calculations.

We have forecasted revenues to increase slightly at approximately 1.95% compared to FY2014 and 2.66% compared to FY2013. This is caused by increased transfer station and commercial revenues slightly offset by recycling revenue decrease. We have continued our efforts to reduce costs while increasing diversion. Specifically, we have reduced our dump fees by approximately 6% primarily due to our enhanced greenwaste recycling efforts facilitated by the new RRF facility. Furthermore, we have reduced our repairs and maintenance costs by 21% due to the newer transfer fleet. Workers compensation has also decreased significantly at approximately 21% based on our continued safety efforts resulting in a reduced experience modification factor.

In regards to cost allocations and methodologies on page 1-14 of the rate guide, we have made the following assumptions. While we have done a different profit calculation for El Dorado County as dictated under the rate guide, for purposes of allocating the different JPA jurisdictions, we have followed the historical methodology of allocating costs based total collection revenue percentages for all categories. This generally allows the rate increase for each jurisdiction to be roughly the same percentage increase. No attempt has

been made to allocate actual costs to either a specific franchise area or different service types within a franchise area. Such allocations typically cause greater rate increases in rural versus urban franchise areas as well as a greater increase in residential versus commercial customer types.

Additionally, we have prepared an alternative to the rate application which could mitigate exposure to floating rates and gain predictability in debt service costs through the use of an interest rate swap. Attached is a presentation from Bank of America outlining their interest rate risk management proposal. This would reduce the current rate request by approximately 1.60% to 1.85%. We look forward to exploring this option with you.

Management reviews and accepts responsibility of the rate application. The application is based upon management's judgment of the most likely set of conditions and course of action. All significant relevant information has been made available. Assumptions are reasonable and accurate.

Sincerely yours,

Jeffor R. Tillman

This signature provides a certification of the franchise hauler that the application is complete, accurate, and consistent with the instructions provided in the rate manual.

Enclosures:

- 2015 Base Year Rate Application, pages 1-3
- Proposed rate schedule for residential and commercial accounts excluding city surcharges and infrequent services (included on pages 1 and 3 of the 2015 Base Year Rate Application)
- June 30, 2013 Audited Financial Statements
- Support documentation (Due to the volume of calculations we have provided an electronic copy only since hard copy would not be practical)
- Reconciliation of the rate application to the audited financial statements (included within the support documentation above)
- Bank of America Interest Rate Risk Management Proposal

Base Year Rate Application

Rate Change

Summary

Percent Rate Change Requested (City of South Lake Tahoe and Douglas County) 3.71% Percent Rate Change Requested (El Dorado County) 3.48% Residential Rate Schedule Rate Schedule Current Rate Rate Adjustment (per customer, per month) **New Rate** City of South Lake Tahoe 2.1. Unlimited service 25 40 | \$ 0.94 5 26.34 2.2. Mandated pickup per 32-gallon can/bag 5.42 0.20 5.62 2.3. Mandated pickup per cubic yard 36.30 1.35 37.65 2.4. Qualified senior rate 21.58 0.80 22.38 2.5. House service - 1 can 29.09 1.08 30.17 2.6. House service - 2 cans 32.78 1.22 34.00 2.7. House service - 3 cans 36.47 37.82 2.8. Residential - All other services 3 **Douglas County** 3.1. 1, 32-gallon can 16.95 0.63 \$ 17.58 3.2. 2, 32-gallon cans 32.64 1.21 33.85 3.3. 3, 32-gallon cans 49.78 1.85 51.63 3.4. 4, 32-gallon cans 65.46 67.89 2.43 3.5. One extra 32-gallon can 4.26 0.16 4.42 3.6. On-call 32-gallon can billed monthly/arrears 3.7. Per cubic yard 27.39 1.02 28.41 3.8. 1, 45-gallon can 20.56 0.76 21.32 3.9. 2, 45-gallon cans 39.52 1.47 40.99 3.10. 3, 45-gallon cans 60.23 2.23 62.46 3.11. One extra 45-gallon can 5.18 0.19 5.37 3.12. On-call 45-gallon can billed monthly/arrears 3.13. Residential - All other services 78.21 2.90 81.11 El Dorado County 4.1. Unlimited service 29.20 \$ 1.02 \$ 30.22 4.2. Mandated pickup per 32-gallon can/bag 6.12 0.21 6.33 4.3 Mandated pickup per cubic yard 35.02 1.22 36.24 25.89 4.4. Qualified senior rate 0.90 26.79 4.5. House service per can 3.70 0.13 3.83 4.6. Residential - All other services

Certification

To the best of my knowledge, the data and information in this application is complete, accurate, and consistent with the instructions provided by the South Lake Tahoe Basin Waste Management Authority.

11 Fich

Name: Jeffery R. Tillman

Title: President

Signature:

Date: S

(1) Rate-does not include the street sweeping (\$0.25), the nuisance abatebatment (\$0.25), or the clean community surcharges (\$0.40)

Fiscal Year:

2015

Page 1 of 3

Base Year Rate Application

		Section IAllowab	ole Operating	Actual Audited Prior Year All Three Jurisdictions 6/30/2013	Estimated Current Year All Three Jurisdictions 6/30/2014		jected e Year	El Dorado County 6/30/2015
5	Direct Labor	Southern Institution in		\$ 5,235,780	\$ 5,525,553	\$ 4.585,475	Ts	1,118.774
6	Equipment Costs and Facility Costs			1,224,309	1,173,355	923.845	1	225,402
7	Landfill Disposal Costs			1,154,816	1,042,302	870,595		212,410
8	Office Salaries			978,717	995,424	823,109		200,824
9	General and Administrative Costs			3,825,707	3,568,647	2,998,326		734,392
10	MRF Principal and Interest Payments (El Dorado Coo	inty)		18,084	17,594	0	-	17,984
11.	RRF Principal and Interest Payments (El Dorado Cou	nty)		219,344	237,623	0	-	249,539
00	Other Interest Expenses			9,976	9,716	0		10,092
12	Total Allowable Operating Costs			\$ 12,666,733	\$ 12,570,214	\$ 10,201,350	13	2,769,417
		Section IIAllowal	ble Operating	Profit				
13.	Operating Ratio			87,00%	87.00%	87.009		89 00%
14	Allowable Operating Profit			\$ 1,892,730	\$ 1,878,308	\$1,524,340		\$342,287
_		Section IIIPass Through C	Costs without	Franchise Fees		color state of		
	MDE Discount De monte (City and Davislas)		Edward Philosophy	\$61,619	\$61,619	\$61,619	1	\$0
15.	MRF Principal Payments (City and Douglas) RRF Principal Payments (City and Douglas)			723,510	723,510	763,705	+	0
17.	MRF and RRF Interest Expenses (City and Douglas)			188,193	261,116	271,367	+	0
1.71	Other Interest Expenses			40,895	39.832	41,363	-	0
18	RRF Fund Credit			0	0	-632.707		-154,340
19.	Recycling Revenue Bonus			404,720	351,217	284,160		60,230
20	Total Pass Through Costs			\$1,418,937	\$1,437,293	\$789,506		-\$94,110
-		Section IV-Revenue Require	ement withou	Franchise Fees	TOUR DESIGNATION			
21	Total Allowable Operating Costs (Line 12) plus Allow	able Operating Profit (Line 14) p	lus Total Pass				1.	
	Through Costs (Line 20)			\$ 15,978,400	\$ 15,885,815	\$ 12,515,196	5	3,017,594
_	feet and the state of the	Section V-Revenues witho	ut Rate Chan	e in Base Year	210 222	de la composición de		
		Current		Projected				
Resi	dential Revenues	Rate/Month	Months	Accounts		1	otal	
City	of South Lake Tahoe	The results of the second of t		Name and the second	200		etter etter	
22	Unlimited service	\$ 25.40	12	13,549		\$ 4,129,735	3	
23	Mandated pickup per 32-gallon can/bag	5.42	12	0		0	-	
24	Mandated pickup per cubic yard	36.30	12	0		0		
25	Qualified senior rate	21.58	12	57	1	17,350	1	
26	House service - 1 can	29.09	12	5		1,745		
27	House service - 2 cans	32.78	12	1		.393		
28	House service - 3 cans	36.47	12	0		0		
29	Residential - All other services		12	0		0		
n.				1				
	glas County	40.00		1 1017	1		77	
30	1, 32-gallon can	\$ 16.95	12	1,247		\$ 253,840		
31	2, 32-gallon cans	32.64 49.78	12	259		101,445		
32	3, 32-gallon cans	65.46	12	15		8,960		
33	4, 32-gallon cans One extra 32-gallon can	4.26	12	0		3,142	-	
35	On-call 32-gallon can billed monthly/arrears	4.20	12	0		0		
36	Per cubic yard	27.39	12	0		0		
37	1, 45-gallon can	20.56	12	328		60,924		
38	2, 45-gallon cans	39.52	12	53		25,135		
39	3, 45-gallon cans	60.23	12	1		723		
40	One extra 45-gallon can	5.18	12	0		0		
41	On-call 45-gallon can billed monthly/arrears	* ·	12	0		0	1	
42	Residential - All other services	78.21	12	1		939		
					•		-	
	orado County	[(***	1		-	
43	Unlimited service	\$ 29.20	12	6,074			\$	2,128,330
44	Mandated pickup per 32-gallon can/bag	6.12	12	0				0
45	Mandated pickup per cubic yard	35.02	12	0 27			-	9 389
45	Qualified senior rate House service per can	25.89 3.70	12	5				8,388 222
48	Residential - All other services	3.70	12	0				0
					9		1	
49	Residential Revenues Subtotal					\$ 4,624,132	1 5	2,136,940
50	Less: Allowance for Uncollectible Resid	ential Accounts				(6,510		(3,871)
51	Total Residential Revenues (without Rate Change in	Base Year)		\$ 6,697,744	\$ 6,738,400	\$ 4.617,622	5	2,133,069
52	Commercial Revenues				The state of the s	S 5,024,923		199,479
53	Less: Allowance for Uncollectible Comm	ercial Accounts				(1,627		(968)
54	Total Commercial Revenues (without Rate Change in			\$ 5,005,089	\$ 5,112.145	\$ 5,023.296		198,511
55	Transfer Station and RRF Revenues (AND FOREST)	1,590,625	1,736,487	1,538,722		375,421
56	Recycled Material Sales		<u> </u>	1,962,572	1,774,118	1,440,823		333,294
57.	Total Revenues (Lines 51 + 54 + 55 + 56)			\$ 15,256,030		- Parlicina de la constante de	-	3,040,295
	HERE THE WAR	Section VI-Net	Shortfall (Sur	plus)				
58	Net Shortfall (Surplus) without Franchise Fees (Line	VIA WORK		\$ 722,370	\$ 524,065	\$ (105,267	1 1	(22,701)
90.	Het anomai (aurpus) without Franchise Fees (une	Ex-Eme ary		4 122,310	3 329,000	100,201	11.0	(22,101
59.	Residential and Commercial Franchise Fees			\$ 620,503	\$ 621.669	\$ 519,484	Te	116.823
**	Residental and Continental Plancing Pees			4 040,003	4 021009	313,404	1.	110.023
60	Net Shortfall (Sumble) with Examples Face II and II	• F.Q1		\$ 1,342,873	\$ 1,146,534	\$ 414,217	1.	94,122
965	Net Shortfall (Surplus) with Franchise Fees (Lines 58	1 49)		1,342,873	1,146,534	414,217	3	94,122
_	The state of the s	6		Dates				
		Section VII-Perce	ent Change in	Rates	Action Lot			
61	Total Residential, Commercial, Transfer Station, and Percent Change in Existing Residential/Commercial/					\$ 11,179,640 3,719		2,707,00 3,48

Fiscal Year: 2015 Page 2 of 3

Base Year Rate Application

Operating Information

Commercial Yard Waste Tons

El Dorado - per 32 gal can/bag

Prior Year Current Year Base Year Audited Estimated Percent Projected Information Information Change Information

Percent

Change

48.81%

All Three All Three City of SLT and El Dorado Jurisdictions Jurisdictions **Douglas County** County

-20.34%

2.86%

3,583.0

0.00

559.2

6.33

3.43%

Section VIII--Operating Data

63	Residential Accounts	18,252	18,251	-0.01%	12,033	6,080	-0.76%
64.	Multi-family Accounts	3,459	3,491	0.93%	3,497	26	0.92%
65.	Commercial Accounts	870	881	1.26%	826	55	0.00%

64.	Multi-family Accounts	3,459	3,491	0.93%	3,497	26	0.92%
65.	Commercial Accounts	870	881	1.26%	826	55	0.00%
66.	Total Accounts	22,581	22,623	0.19%	16,356	6,161	-0.47%

67.	Residential Refuse Tons	25,379.8	21,045.6	-17.08%	18,963.0	2,959.5	4.17%
68.	Residential Recycling Tons	40,189.2	33,326.0	-17.08%	29,059.5	4,535.3	0.81%
69	Residential Yard Waste Tons	3,025.0	2,508.4	-17.08%	3,228.8	503.9	48.81%
70	Commercial Refuse Tons	29,318.0	23,354.4	-20.34%	21,043.3	3,284.2	4.17%
71.	Commercial Recycling Tons	46,425.5	36,982.0	-20.34%	32,247.5	5,032.8	0.81%

72	"Free" Drop Boxes Provided (Monthly)	5	3	%	3	0	0.00%
73	"Free" Bins Provided	38	38	%	38	0	0.00%

3,494.4

Section IX--Change in Commercial Rates

2,783.6

74	2 Yard BinOnce per Week			%			%
75.	3 Yard Bin-Once per Week			%		670	%
76.	4 Yard BinOnce per Week			%			9/
77.	5 Yard BinOnce per Week			%			%
78	6 Yard BinOnce per Week		100	%			9/
	City - per cubic yard	28.55	29.35	2.80%	30.44	0.00	3.71%
	Douglas - per cubic yard	24.23	24.89	2.72%	25.81	0.00	3.70%
	El Dorado - per cubic yard	34.07	35.02	2.79%	0.00	36.24	3.48%
	City - compacted per cubic yard	40.07	41.18	2.77%	42.71	0.00	3.72%
	Douglas - compacted per cubic yard	31,31	32.16	2.71%	33.35	0.00	3.70%
	El Dorado - compacted per cubic yard	45.61	46.88	2.78%	0.00	48.51	3.48%
	City - per 32 gal can/bag	3.93	4.04	2.80%	4.19	0.00	3.71%
	Douglas - per 32 gal can/bag	3.81	3.91	2.62%	4.06	0.00	3.84%
				The second secon			

Fiscal Year: 2015 Page 3 of 3