

TABLE 10: SOLID WASTE FEE ESTIMATES PER GENERATOR (NO ACTION)

Generator	Percent of Total 2010 Trash ¹ Volume	Estimated Total 2013 Trash ¹ Volume (tons)	Estimated Annual Fixed Fee ² (\$/year in FY 2014)	Estimated Total Annual Fee ³ (\$/year in FY 2014)	Estimated Total Monthly Fee ⁴ (\$/month in FY 2014)
NPS	19.7%	20.4	\$3,643	\$20,237	\$1,686
Stehekin Lodge and Resort	22.1%	22.9	\$4,086	\$22,702	\$1,892
Stehekin Valley Ranch	11.6%	12.0	\$2,145	\$11,916	\$993
Stehekin Pastry Co.	11.9%	12.3	\$2,200	\$12,224	\$1,019
Other Businesses	0.1%	0.1	\$18	\$103	\$9
Private Residents ⁵	34.6%	35.8	\$6,398 , 367	\$43,007 35,543	\$3,584 2,962
Total	100.0%	103.4	\$18,490	\$102,725	

1. Trash = MSW disposed.

2. The distribution of fixed fee has not yet been determined. The fee shown here is representative only and is based upon the percent of 2010 trash volume by generator multiplied by the total cost of recycling in FY 2013 (\$18,490).

3. Total O&M costs multiplied by percent of total 2010 trash volume; Estimated Total Annual Fee includes Estimated Annual Fixed Fee.

4. Estimated Total Monthly Fee includes Monthly Fixed Fee and assumes a 12-month operating season.

5. Private Residents includes all 155 seasonal and year-round residents of Stehekin. Estimated fees are for the total population and would be distributed on a per-person or per-household basis in accordance with designated user groups.

Source: NPS 2014d.

The Stehekin Lodge and Resort (NPS concession), Stehekin Valley Ranch, Stehekin Pastry Company, and other businesses could incur total combined annual fees of nearly \$50,000 (Table 10), depending upon the amount of solid waste generated. These fees constitute additional operating costs that would reduce profit margins, resulting in an adverse financial impact. The high fees being passed on to these businesses are reflective of the volume of trash being generated by each business and the high cost of providing solid waste management services to the Stehekin community. The resulting economic impact on each business cannot be quantified at this time because it will largely depend on individual profit margins, the ability for each business to absorb the additional cost, and individual efforts to reduce fees by diverting waste or increasing recycling activities. Due to the high level of variability associated with each business's finances and potential changes in behaviors, the new fees would result in a minor to moderate adverse impact on Stehekin businesses. Per the recommended mitigation listed in section 2.5.9, the NPS could coordinate with Stehekin businesses to increase waste diversion and recycling activities in an effort to reduce fees. This could reduce the intensity of economic impact to minor adverse.

The estimated combined or total annual fee for private residents is ~~\$43,007~~~~35,543~~. This would be distributed amongst Stehekin's 75 year-round and 80 seasonal residents. The fee distribution has not yet been determined by the NPS. However, if the fee is evenly distributed based upon the number of months each resident is physically in Stehekin, and it is assumed that seasonal residents are in Stehekin four months per year (resulting in 1,220 total person-months), the monthly fee per resident would be approximately ~~\$35,252~~~~9,13~~ per month. This amount includes the combined or total fixed fee for all private residents, estimated at ~~\$9,367~~~~6,398~~ per year. The fixed fee component equates to approximately ~~\$7,685~~~~24~~ per person per month. The total annual fee for year-round residents would be approximately ~~\$545~~~~350~~, representing 12% of the per capita income of \$27,882. The total annual fee for seasonal residents would be approximately ~~\$172~~~~117~~. These estimated annual fees represent full cost recovery, which is not anticipated for many years given a reduced initial rate and annual rate increase capped at 10%. This reduction in discretionary income is considered a minor adverse impact on local residents.

The new fee structure would cover all costs of operating and maintaining the existing solid waste facility. The cost recovery is considered a beneficial impact for the NPS, which would have a stable revenue stream to fund its trash and recycling operations.