A Preliminary Review of Republic Waste Services of Texas, Ltd and Texas Disposal Systems RFP Response Proposed Residential and Commercial Rates, as Compared to Negotiated Rates Adopted by the San Angelo Mayor and City Council on July 1, 2014

The following report raises the question - Have the Mayor, City Council and City staff violated their fiduciary responsibility to act in the best interest of the residents and businesses of San Angelo?

On August 1, 2014, the new 10-year contract between the City of San Angelo and Republic Waste Services of Texas, Ltd. (Republic) for solid waste and recyclables collection and disposal services, and the remaining life-of-site contract for landfill lease and operation, went into effect. A review of the rates initially proposed by Republic within their responses to the City's Request for Proposal (RFP), as compared to the negotiated rates later approved by the Mayor and City Council, raises questions about whether these two new contracts truly represent the greatest benefit to the residents and businesses of San Angelo, and whether the entire RFP process and subsequent contracts should be voided to allow for a new solicitation process to occur, which would allow open market competition for commercial dumpster and rolloff container services within the City of San Angelo.

Republic RFP proposed rates for residential services as compared to the negotiated rates adopted by the Mayor and City Council on July 1, 2014

The RFP issued by the City on February 11, 2014 allowed respondents to propose different levels of residential services for the City to consider. The City chose to contract with Republic for once per week curbside collection of solid waste, once per week curbside collection of single stream recyclables, and quarterly curbside collection of bulky waste. A review of the proposed residential rates included in Republic's RFP response, as compared to the negotiated residential rates adopted by the Mayor and City Council, reveals the following financial impact to San Angelo residents:

Negotiated and approved monthly rate for residential services	\$14.47 per month ¹
Republic RFP response proposed monthly rate for residential services	\$11.54 per month 1
The City allowed Republic to increase their quoted rate	\$2.93 per month

32,200 residential customers X \$2.93 per month \$94,346 per month \$94,346.00 per month X 12 months \$1,132,152 per year \$1,132,152.00 per year X 10 year contract term $$11,321,520^2$

- 1. Monthly rates include Republic's penalty (\$0.50 per home per month) for City residences not collectively producing the minimum 500 tons per month of residential single stream recyclables. Due to the exclusion of glass bottles and jars from the recycling program, it is highly unlikely that 500 tons per month of residential single stream recyclables will be generated. As such, the \$0.50 per home per month penalty will likely be implemented, perhaps as soon as January 1, 2016.
- 2. This figure does not include the following amounts:
 - Guaranteed 2.9% annual rate increases beginning on October 1, 2015 and each October 1st thereafter during the contract term.
 Consequently, effective October 1, 2015 the monthly rate for residential services, including the recycling penalty, likely will increase from \$14.47 to \$14.89.
 - Fuel surcharge adjustments
 - Any growth that may occur in the number of homes / customer base. Actual figure will likely be higher.

The increased residential rates adopted by Council equate to an additional \$18,006,240 in revenue to Republic over the life of the contract as compared to the 2013 rates in effect prior to adoption of the new contract, just from residential customers, not counting the compounded guaranteed 2.9% annual rate increases.

(\$14.47* x 12 months x 10 years x 32,200 homes) – (\$9.81** x 12 months x 10 years x 32,200 homes) = \$18,006,240 *2014 adopted rate **2013 rate (See Attachment 1)

Republic RFP proposed rates for commercial and rolloff services, as compared to the negotiated rates adopted by the Mayor and City Council on July 1, 2014

The solid waste collection and disposal services contract between the City and Republic grants Republic exclusive rights to collect, transport and dispose of commercial and rolloff solid waste generated within the City of San Angelo. According to the RFP issued by the City on February 11, 2014, there are nearly 2,500 commercial and 435 rolloff accounts within the City limits of San Angelo. A review of the proposed commercial rates included on page 309 of the Republic RFP response, as compared to the negotiated commercial rates adopted by the Mayor and City Council, reveals the following financial impact to San Angelo businesses:

Negotiated and approved monthly rate to service 2,497 commercial accounts	\$489,045 per month
Republic RFP response proposed monthly rate to service 2,497 commercial accounts	\$415,525 per month
The City allowed Republic to increase their quoted rates	\$73,520 per month
\$73,520 per month X 12 months \$882,240 per year X 10 year contract term	\$882,240 per year \$8,822,400 ³

- 3. This figure does not include the following amounts:
 - Guaranteed 2.9% annual rate increases beginning on October 1, 2015 and each October 1st thereafter during the contract term
 - Fuel surcharge adjustments
 - Added charges for container locks, unscheduled container extra pick-ups, container deliveries, container exchanges, container relocations, etc.
 - Any growth that may occur in the number of businesses / customer base. Actual figure will likely be higher.

A review of the proposed rolloff rates included on page 309 of the Republic RFP response, as compared to the negotiated rolloff rates adopted by the Mayor and City Council, reveals a similar pattern of allowed rate increases during the negotiation process as what occurred with residential and commercial rates.

Rolloff Containers: 20 cubic yard delivery rate 20 cubic yard haul rate 20 cubic yard disposal rate 20 cubic yard rental rate	RFP Proposed: \$71.50 \$143.00 Landfill gate rate \$0.00	Negotiated and Adopted: \$75.00 \$175.00 \$35.50 per ton \$3.00 per day
30 cubic yard delivery rate	\$71.50	\$75.00
30 cubic yard haul rate	\$143.00	\$175.00
30 cubic yard disposal rate	Landfill gate rate	\$35.50 per ton
30 cubic yard rental rate	\$0.00	\$3.00 per day
40 cubic yard delivery rate	\$87.50	\$75.00
40 cubic yard haul rate	\$175.00	\$175.00
40 cubic yard disposal rate	Landfill gate rate	\$35.50 per ton
40 cubic yard rental rate	\$0.00	\$3.00 per day

Detailed records of rolloff services within the City of San Angelo are necessary to estimate the effect of higher negotiated rates as compared to proposed rates. The rolloff customer information provided on March 17, 2014 as an addendum to the RFP is not sufficient for estimating the effect of higher negotiated rates. The City awarded Republic an exclusive service contract for all rolloff hauling services, even though state law appears to prohibit such exclusive contracts for waste collection from construction projects. Interestingly, though, the City's contract leaves it up to Republic to enforce the exclusive rolloff services protection. Republic is currently in litigation with Texas Disposal Systems to eliminate TDS as a competitor for servicing construction project rolloff containers within the City limits of San Angelo. Competing motions

are currently pending in federal court asking for a ruling as to whether Texas law forbids exclusive construction waste deals like the one between the City and Republic. Exclusion of all rolloff service rates results in a very conservative analysis and understated adverse impact on local businesses. Actual figures will much likely be of greater benefit to Republic than even this analysis shows.

The increased commercial rates adopted by Council, not counting the effect of the increased rolloff rates or the compounded guaranteed 2.9% rate increases, equate to an additional \$24,539,760 in revenue to Republic over the life of the contract as compared to the 2013 rates, just from commercial customers. (\$489,045* x 12 months x 10 years) – (\$284,547** x 12 months x 10 years) = \$24,539,760

*2014 monthly commercial revenue **2013 monthly commercial revenue (See Attachment 3)

<u>Differences in Republic proposed compensation schedule for landfill lease and operation, as compared to the</u> negotiated compensation schedule adopted by the Mayor and City Council on July 1, 2014

Description:	RFP Proposed:	Negotiated and Adopted:
Initial lump sum payment	\$1,000,000	\$ 3,600,000
Purchase of Cell 11A airspace	\$1,049,800	\$ 1,305,000 ⁴
Initial funding of Closure/Post Closure account	\$4,735,000	\$ 4,735,000
Sum of annual landfill lease payments	\$1,100,000	\$ 6,303,000 ⁵
Landfill gas infrastructure	\$ 0.00	\$ 670,000 ⁶
	\$6,835,000	\$15,308,000 ⁷

- 4. The Republic RFP response proposed to purchase landfill cell 11A airspace from the City for a rate of \$1.81 per cubic yard. However, the negotiated and adopted price per cubic yard for landfill cell 11A airspace is \$2.25 per cubic yard. Landfill cell 11A capacity was anticipated to be 580,000 cubic yards. The City had previously paid for excavation and construction of landfill cell 11A.
- 5. The Republic RFP response proposed lease payments of \$100,000 per year over the life of the landfill. However, the negotiated and adopted lease payments are \$573,000 per year over the life of the landfill. The sum of annual lease payments shown above is based upon the 2013 TCEQ Annual Report for the San Angelo Landfill, which reported a total of 11 years of estimated remaining disposal capacity. Republic Services RFP response unreasonably used an estimate of 18.9 years of remaining disposal capacity to calculate the value of its annual lease payments.
- 6. A payment from Republic of \$670,000 to fund the City's last two landfill gas infrastructure payments was committed in the form of two payments of \$335,000 each, as they become due.
- 7. The City's net financial benefit from the negotiated and adopted compensation schedule for landfill lease and operation is \$8,728,200. This figure does not include per ton host fee payments, as it is impossible to verify; beyond the future word of Republic Services on how many tons will fall into each host fee category.

Comparison Summary

The City's resistance to and delay of the public release of Republic's RFP response until 75 days after the execution of the Republic contracts makes sense considering that had Republic's RFP response been released before the execution of the contracts, stakeholders would have been aware that the City had negotiated much higher rates with Republic than in the RFP response, effectively acting not to secure the best rates for the citizens and businesses of San Angelo, but rather to secure the maximum benefit for Republic and the current City general revenue fund at the expense of the citizens and businesses. All this was done while the City staff and City Council refused to negotiate or even speak to TDS officials even once following TDS' submittal of its RFP response on March 21, 2014. Further, it appears that the increase in rates as adopted vs. those proposed in Republic's RFP response more than makes up for the increased upfront payments secured by the City as well as the reported six million dollars of unauthorized charges that Republic has reportedly elected to pay back to all businesses overcharged over the previous 14 years, even when not accounting for the positive effect for Republic of the increased rolloff rates and the provision of the contract giving exclusive construction project rights to Republic, which is of doubtful validity under state law. Republic is currently the defendant in a lawsuit seeking recovery of all Republic's unauthorized charges over the previous 14 years, not just the partial refund that Republic has provided

to some customers. Any Republic customer that believes it has not been fully compensated for the overcharges may join the lawsuit.

Given that the final rates adopted by Council are so much higher than those proposed by Republic in their RFP response, the question is raised whether the City negotiators and the Council really acted in the best interest of residents and businesses. Or, was there an intentional effort to conceal a substantial rate increase – which has the same effect as an enormous tax increase to the citizens and businesses of San Angelo – and did this possible concealment include allowing Republic to raise their rates during negotiations to such a degree that Republic would be able to recover from the rate payers far more than what the City was able to secure from Republic in upfront revenue that was only needed to temporarily relieve problems arising from questionable financial oversight and management of the City's solid waste and water utilities?

The combined rate increases for residential and commercial services equate to \$42,546,000 in additional revenue for Republic over the life of the contract as compared to the revenue that would have been generated under 2013 service rates, not counting the compounded guaranteed 2.9% annual rate increases. This number is the simple addition of the 48% residential rate increase and the 73% commercial rate increase adopted by Council. (See Attachments 1, 2 & 3)

Effect of higher negotiated residential rates over the 10 year contract term	\$11,321,520
Effect of higher negotiated commercial rates over the 10 year contract term	\$ 8,822,400
Estimated gross benefit to Republic for increased rates allowed	
through negotiation, not including the benefit of rolloff increases	\$20,203,920
Estimated gross benefit to Republic over the 10 year contract term	\$20,203,920
Less City's net financial benefit from negotiated landfill compensation	<u>(\$ 8,473,000)</u>
Estimated net benefit to Republic gained through negotiation;	
the amount the City officials allowed Republic to improve its	
position over and above the rates and payments quoted in its RFP response	\$11,730,920

The attached charts (Attachments 1, 2 & 3) illustrate TDS' proposed rates included in its RFP response, compared to the negotiated Republic rates recommended by City staff and adopted by the Mayor and City Council on July 1, 2014. TDS proposed several different rates for residential and commercial collection which differed based on landfill disposal costs of \$20, \$25, and \$30 per ton (see Attachments 2 & 3). Using the highest landfill disposal rate proposed by TDS to be paid to Republic or to the City in its RFP response, \$30 per ton, the costs for TDS commercial services are \$6,666,750 lower over the ten year contract term than the negotiated and adopted Republic commercial service rates over the same ten year contract term (see Attachment 3). While some of the residential rates proposed by TDS, for the exact same service levels (1x/week trash 1x/week recycle) are higher than those proposed by Republic in its RFP response, the net amount of the most favorable residential and commercial rates proposed by TDS over the ten year term of the contract is actually slightly less than that of the negotiated and adopted Republic rates; however, TDS' most favorable proposed residential rates, for much more conventional service levels (1x/week trash, 1x/ every other week recycle), are lower than those adopted by Council (see Attachment 1). If the City's evaluation team had allowed TDS to present its proposal options during the period set aside for negotiations with RFP respondents, it would have seen that the most favorable rates proposed by TDS were certainly worthy of consideration, rather than the outright dismissal TDS received. Further, given the drastic differences in Republic's RFP response and the final contract adopted by City Council, it appears Republic and the negotiation team exercised wide latitude in crafting the final agreement; such a negotiation process with TDS could have resulted in a far more advantageous agreement for the businesses and citizens of San Angelo. At the very least it could have provided leverage in negotiations with Republic, so that the City did not have to allow Republic to raise their rates sufficiently to reimburse local businesses more than \$9,200,000 in unauthorized overcharges over the previous 14 years (see Attachment 4. It is clear that the City did not use the competing RFP responses as negotiation leverage with the proposers, which is not consistent with a good faith effort to secure the best deal for the businesses and citizens of San Angelo. Accordingly, we believe the citizens would be better off if these contracts were voided, and a new solicitation be

initiated that allows for an open and competitive market for the provision of commercial services, and will allow for a contract to be crafted that truly protects the best interests of rate payers. We think the businesses and citizens should be concerned that the Council so grossly violated the expectation that they work to secure the best rates on the citizens' behalf. We urge the citizens and businesses to express these concerns to Council. And we urge the citizens to hold their public officials accountable.

The Bottom Line

It's time for the residents and businesses to ask themselves whether the City of San Angelo City staff and City Council members have truly acted in their best interest when it comes to managing solid waste and recycling, and to determine whether the 2014 RFP process should be the basis for the City's solid waste services contracts over the next 10+ years. First, it was fourteen years of millions of dollars in unauthorized overcharges by Republic to the commercial and rolloff customers in San Angelo. Now, it appears the City and Republic have agreed on increased service rates that have the effect of imposing an enormous tax increase to the residents and businesses of San Angelo. For these reasons, the current management and leadership of the City of San Angelo should no longer be entrusted to act in the best interest of local residents and business owners with regard to managing solid waste and recycling. TDS is continuing the gather information through the discovery process in the ongoing litigation with Republic. Additional information will be provided, as additional information becomes available to complete this review and report.

Copies of RFP responses from Texas Disposal Systems and Republic Services of Texas may be found of the following URLS:

TDS RFP Response www.texasdisposal.com/sanangelo/tdsrfp

Republic RFP Response www.texasdisposal.com/sanangelo/republicrfp

Comparison of San Angelo Residential Solid Waste Service Rates 2013 Ordinance rates, Rates offered by Republic in response to RFP-OP-01-14, Contracted rates effective August 2014, and Rates offered by TDS in response to RFP OP-01-14 and rejected by City staff and City RFP Review Committee

	Rate per month	% Increase fro 2013 rate		
2013 residential rate per City Ordinance - not including fuel adjustment fee	\$ 9.81			
Rate offered by Republic in response to RFP OP-01-14 - Trash and Recycle pickup once per week, bulky pickup 4 times per year and including recycled tonnage surcharge fee of \$.50 (1)	\$ 11.54	18%		
2014 Republic Contracted rate - Trash and Recycle pickup once per week, bulky pickup 4 times per year and including recycled tonnage surcharge fee of \$.50 (1)	\$ 14.47	48%		

TDS Proposal - Trash and Recycle pickup once per week, bulky pickup 4 times per year	Base Rate	% Increase from 2013 rate	% Difference - TDS proposed rates as compared to 2014 Contracted rate			
Landfill rate of \$20/ton	\$ 17.35	77%	20%	TDS is \$2.88 more than Republic		
Landfill rate of \$25/ton	\$ 17.75	81%	23%	TDS is \$3.28 more than Republic		
Landfill rate of \$30/ton	\$ 18.15	85%	25%	TDS is \$3.68 more than Republic		

TDS Alternate proposal - TDS Trash pickup once per week, Recycle pickup every other week, Bulky pickup twice per year	Base Rate	% Increase from 2013 rate	% Difference - TDS proposed rates as compared to 2014 Contracted rates				
Landfill rate of \$20/ton	\$ 13.93	42%	4%	TDS is \$0.54 less than Republic			
Landfill rate of \$25/ton	\$ 14.33	46%	1%	TDS is \$0.13 less than Republic			
Landfill rate of \$30/ton	\$ 14.73	50%	2%	TDS is \$0.26 more than Republic			

⁽¹⁾ This \$.50 per month per residence surcharge for all residences combined not generating a total of 500 tons of "recyclables" per month is almost assured to be charged for years to come, since glass is not included as recyclable and considering the way the contract is worded, Republic has no requirement to minimize the amount of residual (unsorted materials generally with a negative value) or maximize the amount of recyclables coming from the sorting of the single stream recycling program materials collected from residences. For example, if only half of the recyclable materials collected from residences are sorted from the single stream materials, then a minimum of 1,000 tons of single stream materials would need to be collected per month from residences to generate 500 tons per month of actual "recyclables".

⁽²⁾ Adding 2 more TDS bulky collection per year would add \$0.20 per month to the TDS charge per residence.

Comparison of San Angelo, Texas Non Residential (Commercial) Solid Waste Service Rates

2013 Ordinance rates, Actual rates billed by Republic for June 2014, Rates offered by Republic in response to RFP OP-01-14,
Contracted rates effective August 2014 and rates offered by TDS in response to RFP OP-01-14 and rejected by City staff and City
RFP Review Committee

Co	ntainers	2013 ORDINANCE RATES	ACTUAL RATES BILLED FOR JUNE 2014	RFP	AND CONTR 08	BY REPUBLIC IN F RACTED RATES E B/01/14+I4	FFECTIVE		В	Y CITY ST		TY RFP RE	VIEW CO	RFP OP-01- MMITTEE (4	1)	
		A B		С	D	% Increase -	F	G	Н		'			К		
Size	Pickup Frequency per week	COSA Published ordinance base service rate effective October 2013	Rate to customer including overcharge avount (1)	Republic proposed RFP base service rate (2)	Contracted rates effective August 2014 (3)	2014 Contracted rate (D) as compared to October 2013 ordinance rate (A)	Proposed rate (D) as compared to rate billed in June (B)	Proposed base service rate @ \$20/ton LF	% Difference - TDS proposed rates (G) as compared to Republic proposed rates (D)		compared to ublic proposed rate @		proposed rates (I) as compared to Republic proposed		% Differe proposed as comp	rates (K) ared to proposed
2	1	\$42.54	\$58.41	\$62.00	\$73.00	73%	25%	\$56.00	23%	LESS	\$58.00	21%	LESS	\$60.00	18%	LESS
2	2	\$70.01	\$96.14	\$102.00	\$120.00	73%	25%	\$102.00	15%	LESS	\$105.00	13%	LESS	\$108.00	10%	LESS
2	3	\$88.91	\$122.09	\$129.50	\$152.75	73%	25%									
_		\$109.01	\$149.70	\$159.00	ć107.00	73%	25%									
2 2	4 5	\$109.01	\$149.70	\$184.50	\$187.00 \$217.00	73%	25%		See note			See note			See note	
2	6	\$126.43	\$202.42	\$215.00	\$217.00	73%	25%		(6)			(6)			(6)	
3	1	\$147.41	3202.42	\$80.75	\$95.00	13/0	23/6	\$75.00	21%	LESS	\$78.00	18%	LESS	\$81.00	15%	LESS
3	2	1		\$127.25	\$149.75			\$142.00	5%	LESS	\$147.00	2%	LESS	\$152.00	2%	MORE
3	3	See note	See note	\$169.00	\$199.13	See note	See note	\$142.00	370	LL33	3147.00	2/6	LESS	\$132.00	2/0	MOKE
ľ	,	See Hote	See note	\$105.00	Ģ135.13	See Hote	See Hote									
3	4	(5)	(5)	\$213.50	\$251.25	(5)	(5)		See note			See note			See note	
3	5			\$252.75	\$297.75			1	(6)			(6)			(6)	
3	6			\$290.00	\$341.25											
4	1	\$68.24	\$93.71	\$99.50	\$117.00	73%	25%	\$88.00	25%	LESS	\$91.00	22%	LESS	\$94.00	20%	LESS
4	2	\$104.57	\$143.60	\$152.50	\$179.50	73%	25%	\$161.00	10%	LESS	\$168.00	6%	LESS	\$175.00	3%	LESS
4	3	\$142.98	\$196.34	\$208.50	\$245.50	73%	25%	\$234.00	5%	LESS	\$245.00	0%	LESS	\$256.00	4%	MORE
4	4	\$183.74	\$252.31	\$268.00	\$315.50	73%	25%	\$304.00	4%	LESS	\$322.00	2%	MORE	\$337.00	7%	MORE
4	5	\$220.38	\$302.64	\$321.00	\$378.50	73%	25%	\$382.00	1%	MORE	\$400.00	6%	MORE	\$418.00	10%	MORE
4	6	\$250.21	\$343.60	\$365.00	\$429.50	73%	25%						- 10/7		医的复数	LESS
6	1	4		\$117.50	\$146.25			\$113.00	23%	LESS	\$118.00	19%	LESS	\$123.00	16%	LESS
6	2	- 1, 1, 1		\$235.00	\$247.50		- 1	\$200.00	19%	LESS	\$211.00	15%	LESS	\$222.00	10%	LESS
6	3	See note	See note	\$352.50	\$337.50	See note	See note	\$288.00	15%	LESS	\$304.00	10%	LESS	\$320.00	5%	LESS
6	4	(5)	(5)	\$386.00	\$443.00	(5)	(5)	\$375.00	15%	LESS	\$397.00	10%	LESS	\$419.00	5%	LESS
6	5			\$457.50	\$538.25			\$461.00	14%	LESS	\$489.00	9%	LESS	\$517.00	4%	LESS
6	6	¢102.20	6140.24	\$549.00	\$631.25	720/	350/	\$549.00	13%	LESS	\$582.00	8%	LESS	\$615.00	3%	LESS
8	1	\$102.20	\$140.34	\$149.00	\$175.50	73%	25%	\$132.00	25%	LESS	\$139.00	21%	LESS	\$146.00	17%	LESS
8	2	\$183.74 \$250.21	\$252.31 \$343.60	\$268.00	\$315.50 \$429.50	73% 73%	25% 25%	\$238.00 \$344.00	25% 20%	LESS	\$252.00	20%	LESS	\$266.00	16% 10%	LESS
8	4	\$250.21	\$456.36	\$484.50	\$429.50	73%	25% 25%	\$450.00	20%	LESS	\$366.00 \$479.00	15% 16%	LESS	\$388.00 \$508.00	10%	LESS LESS
8	5	\$406.49	\$558.21	\$592.00	\$698.00	73%	25%	\$555.00	20%	LESS	\$479.00	15%	LESS	\$629.00	10%	LESS
8	6	\$485.06	\$666.10	\$707.00	\$832.75	73%	25%	\$662.00	21%	LESS	\$706.00	15%	LESS	\$750.00	10%	LESS
	v	\$405.00	7000.10	\$707.00	7032.13	, 3/0	23/0	3002.00	22/0	2233	7700.00	4370	1133	7/30.00	1070	LLJJ

⁽¹⁾ Includes fuel/environmental recovery fee of 33.2503% and the overcharge portion of the City franchise fee and sales tax as billed for June 2014.

⁽²⁾ RFP response rates as offered by Republic Services and obtained by TDS as a result of an open records request

⁽³⁾ Posted ordinance rates effective 08/01/14. Section 9(D) allows for an annual increase of 2.9% plus an annual fuel adjustment which will take effect October 2015 and each October thereafter.

⁽⁴⁾ TDS offered several rate options depending on the disposal fee to be paid to the City. The majority of the rates offered are less than the rates proposed by Republic.

^{(5) 3} and 6 cu yd containers were not listed in the City Ordinance as being offered to customers by Republic services during the previous contract period.

⁶⁾ TDS did not offer certain size and pickup frequency combinations if other combinations would more efficiently and less expensively provide the same service yardage.

Non Residential Service (Commercial) Contracted rates effective August 2014 applied to customer matrix information provided by City staff during the RFP process, compared to rates offered by TDS in response to RFP shows that TDS rates are lower than Republic contracted rates by 13%

Cu Yd	NC	CE CALCULATION	DIFFERENC	REPUBLIC CONTRACTED RATES EFFECTIVE 08/01/14 (2) RATES AS OFFERED BY TDS ON 03/21/14 IN RESPONSE TO RFP OP-01-14 AND REJECTED BY CITY STAFF AND CITY RFP REVIEW COMMITTEE (3)			RATES	S OFFERED BY ON 03/21/14 IN TO RFP OP-01- 14 (1)	REPUBLIC O	NANCE RATES	CUSTOMER MATRIX			
2 1 679 2 2 1 113 7 001 7,911 2 1 1 88.91 978 1 1 29.50 1,425 1 152.75 1,680 2 4 2 1 109.01 218 1 159.00 318 1 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 2 6 2 1 147.41 295 3 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 29.50 1,425 3 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	10 year total Difference			•	service	•		•		-		# Accts	•	
2 2 3 113 70.01 7,911 102.00 11,526 120.00 13,560 108.00 12,204 1,356 TDS lower than Republic 19.00 1 1,000 12.00 13.500 108.00 12,204 1.356 TDS lower than Republic 19.00 12.00 13.500 10.00 13.500 1.00 12.00 1.00 10.00 12.00 10.00 12.00 10.00 12.00 10.00 12.00 10.00 12.			\$8.827 TDS lower than Republic	\$40,740		\$49,567	\$73.00	\$42.098	\$62.00	\$28.885	\$42.54	679	1	2
2 3 11 88.91 978 129.50 1.425 152.75 1,680														
2 5 3 3 126.46 379 144.50 554 215.00 430 506 - 506 0 See note (4) 215.00 430 506 - 506 0 See note (4) 0 See note (4) 147.41 295 215.00 430 506 - 506 0 See note (4) 0 See n					-		152.75		129.50		88.91		3	2
2 6 2 147.41 295 215.00 430 253.00 506 - 506 0 See note (4) 3 1 1 1 80.75 81 95.00 95 81.00 81 14 TDS lower than Republic 3 3 0 See note 169.00 0 199.13 0 - 0 0 See note (4) 3 4 0 (5) 213.50 0 251.25 0 - 0 0 See note (4) 3 6 0 252.75 0 297.75 0 - 0 0 See note (4) 4 1 548 68.24 37,396 95.0 54,526 117.00 64,116 94.00 51,512 12,604 TDS lower than Republic 4 1 548 68.24 37,396 152.50 42,853 179.50 50,404 175.00 49,175 1,265 TDS lower than Republic 4 2 281 104.57 29,384 179.50 54,175 25,50			0 See note (4)	374	-		187.00	318	159.00	218	109.01	2	4	2
3			0 See note (4)		-		217.00		184.50		126.46	3	5	2
3			0 See note (4)	506	_	506	253.00	430	215.00	295	147.41	2	6	2
3 3 0 See note 169.00 0 199.13 0 - 0 0 See note (4) 3 4 0 0 (5) 213.50 0 251.25 0 - 0 0 See note (4) 3 5 0 0 252.75 0 297.75 0 - 0 0 See note (4) 3 6 0 0 250.00 0 0 341.25 0 0 0 See note (4) 4 1 548 68.24 37,396 99.50 54,526 117.00 64,116 94.00 51,512 12,604 TDS lower than Republic 4 2 281 104.57 29,384 152.50 42,853 179.50 50,440 175.00 49,175 1,265 TDS lower than Republic 4 3 101 142.98 14,441 208.50 21,059 245.50 24,796 256.00 25,856 1,061 TDS higher than Republic 4 4 5 183.74 551 268.00 804 315.50 947 337.00 1,011 65 TDS higher than Republic 4 5 2 6 2 20.38 5,730 321.00 8,346 378.50 9,841 418.00 10,868 1,027 TDS higher than Republic 4 6 8 2 50.21 2,002 365.00 2,920 429.50 3,436 - 3,436 0 See note (4) 5 117.50 118 146.25 146 123.00 123 23 TDS lower than Republic 6 3 0 See note 352.50 0 337.50 0 320.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 5 0 0 See note (4) 51 TDS lower than Republic 6 5 0 0 See note 340.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 1 1 192 102.20 19,622 149.00 28,608 175.00 33,600 175.00 33,600 175.00 33,600 175.00 30,500 70,224 13,068 TDS higher than Republic 8 2 2 66 183.74 48,507 268.00 70,752 315.50 83,292 266.00 70,224 13,068 TDS higher than Republic						95		81				1		3
3 4 0 (5) 213.50 0 251.25 0 - 0 0 See note (4) 3 5 0 0 252.75 0 290.00 0 0 341.25 0 - 0 0 See note (4) 4 1 548 68.24 37,396 99.50 54,526 117.00 64,116 94.00 51,512 12,604 TDS lower than Republic 4 2 281 104.57 29,384 152.50 42,853 179.50 50,440 175.00 49,175 1,265 TDS lower than Republic 4 3 101 142.98 14,441 208.50 21,059 245.50 24,796 256.00 25,856 1,061 TDS higher than Republic 4 4 3 183.74 551 268.00 804 315.50 947 337.00 1,011 65 TDS higher than Republic 4 6 8 250.21 2,002 365.00 2,920 429.50 3,436 - 3,346 0 See note (4) 6 1 1 1 1 1 17.50 118 146.25 146 123.00 123 23 TDS lower than Republic 6 2 2 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2			0 See note (4)	0	152.00	0	149.75	0	127.25			0	2	3
3 5 0 252.75 0 297.75 0 341.25 0 0 0 See note (4) 0 0 0 See note (4) 0 0 See note (4) 0 0 0 See note (4) 0 0 0 See note (4) 0			0 See note (4)	0	-	0	199.13	0	169.00	See note		0	3	3
3 6 0 0 0 0 0 341.25 0 0 0 0 0 0 See note (4)			0 See note (4)	0	-	0	251.25	0	213.50	(5)		0	4	3
4 1 548 68.24 37,396 99.50 54,526 117.00 64,116 94.00 51,512 12,604 TDS lower than Republic 4 2 281 104.57 29,384 152.50 42,853 179.50 50,440 175.00 49,175 1,265 TDS lower than Republic 4 3 101 142.98 14,441 208.50 21,059 245.50 24,796 256.00 25,856 1,061 TDS higher than Republic 4 4 3 183.74 551 268.00 804 315.50 947 337.00 1,011 65 TDS higher than Republic 4 5 26 20.38 5,730 321.00 8,346 378.50 9,841 418.00 10,868 1,027 TDS higher than Republic 4 6 8 250.21 2,002 365.00 2,920 429.50 3,436 - 3,436 0 See note (4) 6 1 1 1 22.20 444 20.50 33.750 <td< td=""><th></th><th></th><td>0 See note (4)</td><td>0</td><td>_</td><td>0</td><td>297.75</td><td>0</td><td>252.75</td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>3</td></td<>			0 See note (4)	0	_	0	297.75	0	252.75			0	5	3
4 2 281 104.57 29,384 152.50 42,853 179.50 50,440 175.00 49,175 1,265 TDS lower than Republic 4 3 101 142.98 14,441 208.50 21,059 245.50 24,796 256.00 25,856 1,061 TDS higher than Republic 4 4 3 183.74 551 268.00 804 315.50 947 337.00 1,011 65 TDS higher than Republic 4 5 26 220.38 5,730 321.00 8,346 378.50 9,841 418.00 10,868 1,027 TDS higher than Republic 4 6 8 250.21 2,002 365.00 2,920 429.50 3,436 - 3,436 0 See note (4) 6 1 1 1 17.50 118 146.25 146 123.00 123 23 TDS lower than Republic 6 3 0 See note 352.50 0 337.50 0 320.00 0						0	341.25	0	290.00			0	6	3
4 3 101 142.98 14,441 208.50 21,059 245.50 24,796 256.00 25,856 1,061 TDS higher than Republic 4 4 3 183.74 551 268.00 80.44 315.50 947 337.00 1,011 65 TDS higher than Republic 4 5 26 220.38 5,730 321.00 8,346 378.50 9,841 418.00 10,868 1,027 TDS higher than Republic 6 1 1 1 250.21 2,002 429.50 3,436 - 3,436 0 See note (4) 6 2 2 2 117.50 118 146.25 146 123.00 123 23 TDS lower than Republic 6 2 2 2 235.00 470 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 6 4 0 (5) 386.00 0 337.50 0 320.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 <t< td=""><th></th><th></th><td>12,604 TDS lower than Republic</td><td>51,512</td><td>94.00</td><td>64,116</td><td>117.00</td><td>54,526</td><td>99.50</td><td>37,396</td><td>68.24</td><td>548</td><td>1</td><td>4</td></t<>			12,604 TDS lower than Republic	51,512	94.00	64,116	117.00	54,526	99.50	37,396	68.24	548	1	4
4 4 3 183.74 551 268.00 804 315.50 947 337.00 1,011 65 TDS higher than Republic 4 5 26 220.38 5,730 321.00 8,346 378.50 9,841 418.00 10,868 1,027 TDS higher than Republic 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 250.21 2,920 429.50 3,436 - 3,436 0 See note (4) 0 0 See note (4) 0 0 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 23 TDS lower than Republic 23 TDS lower than Republic 23 TDS lower than Republic 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 51 TDS lower than Republic 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 247.50 445.50 247.50 495			1,265 TDS lower than Republic	49,175	175.00	50,440	179.50	42,853	152.50	29,384	104.57	281	2	4
4 5 26 220.38 5,730 321.00 8,346 378.50 9,841 418.00 10,868 1,027 TDS higher than Republic 6 1 1 1 429.50 3,436 -3,436 0 See note (4) 6 1 1 117.50 118 146.25 146 123.00 123 23 TDS lower than Republic 6 2 2 235.00 470 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 6 3 0 See note 352.50 0 337.50 0 320.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 4 0 (5) 386.00 0 443.00 0 419.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 5 0 457.50 0 538.25 0 517.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 6 0 549.00 0 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 8			1,061 TDS higher than Republic	25,856	256.00	24,796	245.50	21,059	208.50	14,441	142.98	101	3	4
4 6 8 250.21 2,002 365.00 2,920 429.50 3,436 3,436 0 See note (4) 6 1 1 1 117.50 118 146.25 146 123.00 123 23 TDS lower than Republic 6 2 2 2 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 6 3 0 See note 352.50 0 337.50 0 320.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 4 0 (5) 386.00 0 443.00 0 419.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 5 0 457.50 0 538.25 0 517.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 6 0 0 457.50 0 538.25 0 517.00 0 0 See note (4) 8 1 192 102.20 19,622 149.00 28,608 175.00 33,600 146.00 28,032<					337.00	947	315.50	804	268.00	551	183.74	3	4	4
6 1 1 1 1 1 17.50 118 146.25 146 123.00 123 23 TDS lower than Republic 235.00 470 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 235.00 0 337.50 0 320.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 6 4 0 (5) 386.00 0 443.00 0 419.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 6 5 0 0 457.50 0 538.25 0 517.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 6 6 6 0 0 549.00 0 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 649.00 See note (4) 649					418.00							26		4
6 2 2 2 2 35.00 470 247.50 495 222.00 444 51 TDS lower than Republic 352.50 0 337.50 0 320.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 6 4 0 (5) 386.00 0 443.00 0 419.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 6 5 0 0 558.25 0 517.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 6 6 0 549.00 0 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 645.60 0 549.00 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 645.60 0 558.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 645.60 0 See note (4) 645.60 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 O See note (4) 631.25					-					2,002	250.21	8	6	4
6 3 0 See note 352.50 0 337.50 0 320.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 4 0 (5) 386.00 0 443.00 0 419.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 5 0 457.50 0 538.25 0 517.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 6 6 0 54 0 549.00 0 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 8 1 192 102.20 19,622 149.00 28,608 175.00 33,600 146.00 28,032 5,568 TDS higher than Republic 8 2 264 183.74 48,507 268.00 70,752 315.50 83,292 266.00 70,224 13,068 TDS higher than Republic			·									1		6
6 4 0 (5) 386.00 0 443.00 0 419.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 5 0 0 457.50 0 538.25 0 517.00 0 0 See note (4) 6 6 0 0 549.00 0 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 8 1 192 102.20 19,622 149.00 28,608 175.00 33,600 146.00 28,032 5,568 TDS higher than Republic 8 2 264 183.74 48,507 268.00 70,752 315.50 83,292 266.00 70,224 13,068 TDS higher than Republic			•	444	222.00	495		470				2	2	6
6 5 0 457.50 0 538.25 0 517.00 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 0 615.00 0 0 0 See note (4) 631.25 0 0 O S			0 See note (4)	0	320.00	0	337.50	0	352.50	See note		0	3	6
6 6 0 549.00 0 631.25 0 615.00 0 0 See note (4) 8 1 192 102.20 19,622 149.00 28,608 175.00 33,600 146.00 28,032 5,568 TDS higher than Republic 8 2 264 183.74 48,507 268.00 70,752 315.50 83,292 266.00 70,224 13,068 TDS higher than Republic	,		0 See note (4)	0	419.00	0	443.00	0	386.00	(5)		0	4	6
8 1 192 102.20 19,622 149.00 28,608 175.00 33,600 146.00 28,032 5,568 TDS higher than Republic 8 2 264 183.74 48,507 268.00 70,752 315.50 83,292 266.00 70,224 13,068 TDS higher than Republic				0	517.00	0	538.25	0				0		6
8 2 264 183.74 48,507 268.00 70,752 315.50 83,292 266.00 70,224 13,068 TDS higher than Republic				0	615.00	0	631.25	0	549.00			0	6	6
					146.00		175.00		149.00					8
	,			266.00 70,224			315.50		268.00		183.74	264	2	8
				52,380			429.50					135	3	8
8 4 10 332.32 3,323 484.50 4,845 570.50 5,705 508.00 5,080 625 TDS higher than Republic	,							,					4	8
8 5 59 406.49 23,983 592.00 34,928 698.00 41,182 629.00 37,111 4,071 TDS higher than Republic													5	_
8 6 56 485.06 27,163 707.00 39,592 832.75 46,634 750.00 42,000 4,634 TDS higher than Republic			, ,				832.75						6	
Total Accounts 2,497 \$ 284,547 \$ 415,525 \$ 489,045 \$ 433,488 \$ 55,556 TDS lower than \$ 666,679	75 \$ 6,666,750	\$ 666,675	\$ 55,556 TDS lower than	\$ 433,488		\$ 489,045		\$ 415,525		\$ 284,547		2,497	Accounts	Total A
per month Republic per yea	ar in the first 10 years	per vear	per month Republic	"										

⁽¹⁾ RFP response rates as offered by Republic Services and obtained by TDS as a result of an open records request.

⁽²⁾ Posted ordinance rates effective 08/01/14. Section 9(D) allows for an annual increase of 2.9% plus an annual fuel adjustment which will take effect October 2015 and each October thereafter.

⁽³⁾ TDS offered several rate options depending on the disposal fee to be paid to the City. This comparison uses rates proposed with a \$30/ton landfill rate. TDS also offered rates assuming \$20 and \$25/ton.

⁽⁴⁾ TDS did not offer certain size and pickup frequency combinations if other combinations would more efficiently and less expensively provide the same service yardage.

^{(5) 3} and 6 cu yd containers were not listed in the City Ordinance as being offered to customers by Republic services during the previous contract period.

Attachment 4

Calculation of estimated unauthorized amounts invoiced by Republic Waste Services of Texas, LTD to individual businesses, schools and institutions in excess of City Council approved Ordinance rates for Commercial Frontload and Commercial Rolloff Customers in the City of San Angelo, Texas since 2000 and using reported revenue from Republic audited financial statements for the years 2011 and 2012

	non kepublic addited						Jeac						г			
			Commercia	l Frontload Service	es			Commercia	al Roll o	off Services			L	Combined Comn	nerci	al Services
	Year	Assumed Growth % (2)	Estimated Commercial Annual Ordinance Revenue (1)	Estimated Unauthorized Charges Per Year (3)	Estimated City Franchise Fee Portion of Unauthorized Charges (4)		Assumed Estimated Annual Growth % (2) Roll off Revenue (1)		Estimated Annual Unauthorized Charges (3)		Estimated Franchise Portion Unauthor Charges	chise Fee tion of thorized		Total Estimated Unauthorized Charges Per Year (3)		timated City anchise Fee Portion of nauthorized Charges (4)
1	1997		\$ 2,515,255	\$ 0	\$ 0	1	.0%	\$ 1,038,586	\$	0	\$	0	T	\$ 0	\$	0
2	1998	1.0%	2,589,777	0	0	1	.0%	1,069,358		0		0		0		0
3	1999	1.0%	2,883,126	0	0	1	.0%	1,190,486		0		0	١	0		0
4	2000	1.0%	3,009,872	94,422	1,888	1	.0%	1,242,821		38,988		780	١	133,410		2,668
5	2001	1.0%	3,040,275	95,375	1,908	1	.0%	1,255,375		39,382		788	ı	134,757		2,695
6	2002	1.0%	3,070,985	96,339	1,927	1	.0%	1,268,055		39,780		796		136,119		2,722
7	2003	1.0%	3,102,005	131,952	2,639	1	.0%	1,280,864		54,485		1,090	1	186,438		3,729
8	2004	1.0%	3,133,338	56,946	1,139	1	.0%	1,347,270		24,486		490	ı	81,432		1,629
9	2005	1.0%	3,290,643	136,316	5,453	1	.0%	1,414,907		58,613		2,345	ı	194,928		7,797
10	2006	1.0%	3,323,882	282,083	11,283	1	.0%	1,429,199		121,290		4,852	ı	403,373		16,135
11	2007	1.0%	3,357,456	322,918	12,917	1	.0%	1,443,636		138,848	7	5,554	Т	461,766		18,471
12	2008	1.0%	3,391,370	594,761	23,790	-12	.0%	1,288,960		226,051		9,042	ı	820,813		32,833
13	2009	1.0%	3,425,626	402,877	16,115	1	.0%	1,301,980		153,122		6,125	L	555,998		22,240
14	2010	1.3%	3,468,989	579,236	23,169	1	.3%	1,318,461		220,151		8,806	1	799,387		31,975
15	2011	1.5%	3,521,816	773,395	30,936	1	.5%	1,338,539		293,945	1	1,758	1	1,067,339		42,694
16	2012	2.1%	3,579,359	903,926	36,157	2	.1%	1,501,662		379,228	1	5,169		1,283,154		51,326
17	2013	2.5%	3,419,976	1,042,351	41,694	2	.5%	1,066,860		325,161	1	3,006		1,367,512		54,700
18	2014	2.8%	3,599,425	1,230,978	49,239	2	.8%	1,122,337		383,831	1	5,353	\perp	1,614,809		64,592
				\$6,743,875	\$260,254				\$ 2,4	497,359	\$ 95,	952	T	\$ 9,241,235	\$	356,206

Assumptions

- (1) Customer Matrix information (container quantities, sizes and frequency of service) provided by City staff during the RFP process applied to current ordinance rates yields estimated annual frontload container service charges of \$3,419,976 and annual roll off container service charges of \$1,066,860. These numbers were used to estimate amounts invoiced for 2013 and 2014. Republic audited financial statements obtained on May 15th though an Open Records Request to the City of San Angelo show commercial revenue from accounts within the San Angelo City limits of \$3,579,359 and \$3,521,816 and roll off revenue of \$1,501,662 and \$1,338,539 for the years 2012 and 2011, respectively. Reported revenue was used to estimate amounts invoiced for years prior to 2011. Actual annual invoice amounts will not be known until there has been a compete audit or litigation discovery to determine the actual gross revenues from which the unauthorized overcharges and the excess portion of the franchise fees were derived.
- (2) Prior year billings back to 1997 were calculated based on estimated growth rates of 1% to 2.8% as provided by the San Angelo Chamber of Commerce. A -12% decrease was used for roll off services for the year 2008. These numbers are an estimate, as TDS has no knowledge of actual billings other than those to Acme Iron and Metal Co. and a few other companies in the market. These assumptions and calculations are intended to show one method for the calculation of total estimated unauthorized charges. TDS believes the gross revenue, as well as the estimated overcharges to be greater than estimated above.
- (3) The rate ordinance adopted 8/3/04 appears to have allowed for a flat rate fuel surcharge to be charged to commercial customers based on container size and pickup frequency. TDS has found no record of previous commercial rate ordinances, and subsequent rate ordinances have indicated "no change" to fuel surcharge rates. The flat rate monthly fuel surcharge allowed over the past ten years for a 4 cu.yd. container serviced once per week apears to be \$1.32 per month. This amount was deducted from the Fuel/Environmental Recovery Fees (FERF) amounts invoiced to Acme in order to calculate the percentage used to estimate the total unauthorized charges.
- (4) City of San Angelo franchise overcharge portion of unauthorized charges was calculated using the authorized franchise fee % as approved by Ordinance. The amount was 2% thru August of 2004, and a total of 4% thereafter. The franchise fee was charged on all Fuel/Environmental overcharge amounts applied to invoices by Republic.