

Report on Residential Municipal Solid Waste Collection

City of Eden Prairie
Michael Barone, Assistant to the City Manager
Office of the City Manager department

December 21, 2005

Study Overview Questions

There are three questions to be addressed and answered in this report regarding the collection of residential municipal solid waste (MSW) and recycling. The questions are:

1. What are the basic models used by cities to insure the collection of residential MSW and recycling?
2. What are the customary monthly charges to residents for each model?
3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each model?

Quick Answers to Study Overview Questions

1. The basic models used are:

Open Refuse Hauling & Open Recycling	55 cities
Open Refuse Hauling & Contract for Recycling	22 cities
Contract for Refuse Hauling & Contract for Recycling	29 cities
City provided Refuse Hauling & City provided Recycling	1 city
City provided Refuse Hauling & Contract for Recycling	1 city
Total =	108 cities

More detailed information for each of these options are contained in the next pages of this report.

2. The monthly fees for both garbage collection and recycling for residential service are summarized in *Appendix A*. Additional information on the MLC cities and Chanhassen are detailed a little further in this report.
3. Advantages and disadvantages to each type of service are details at the end of this report.

Background Information

In this study, we are comparing the municipal solid waste and recycling information of the City of Eden Prairie to the other member cities of the Municipal Legislative Commission (MLC) and Chanhassen. The MLC cities are Apple Valley, Bloomington, Burnsville, Eagan, Eden Prairie, Edina, Maple Grove, Maplewood, Minnetonka, Plymouth, Shoreview, and Woodbury.

Municipal Solid Waste Overview

Attachment A to this report is a detailed listing of monthly fees for residential garbage and recycling services for the MLC cities and Chanhassen. Information has been collected on garbage rates only from the “Big 2” refuse companies (BFI and Waste Management), since these two companies combined serve a vast majority of the residential customers in the metropolitan area. BFI is also now known as Allied Waste.

BFI is the second largest provider of solid waste management services in the United States, serving over 10 million customers in the residential, industrial, municipal, and commercial market.

Waste Management is the largest provider of solid waste management services in the United States, serving over 21 million customers in the residential, industrial, municipal, and commercial market. Both companies have a major presence in the metropolitan area.

The rates listed in this survey are generally regarded as “introductory” rates. Both companies have multiple rates, with up to as many as 30 to 50 different rates that can be and are implemented to their customers. This large variety of rates is mainly due to the flexibility needed to compete in this very competitive business in today’s marketplace.

As an example, if you have a rate with one of these haulers and wish to switch, for whatever reason, a call to the other hauler may yield the same or slightly lower rate in order to secure your residential account. You may be offered a lower “introductory” rate for a period of time (maybe 3 to 6 months), with your rate then set at what you were paying previously in order to entice you to change refuse hauler companies.

Please note that both companies had different approaches when asked about their rates.

In contacting BFI by calling their three main district offices, I was able to obtain rate information from Customer Service Representatives without providing much explanation as to the reason for my inquiry. BFI has offices in Eden Prairie, Blaine, and St. Paul, each serving the cities located geographically in their respective areas. Calls were needed to all three offices to yield rate information in regards to the MLC in the survey.

In contacting Waste Management by calling their main office, I was not able to obtain rate information I wanted from the Customer Service representative when I identified myself and the reason for my inquiry. The Customer Service representative forwarded my contact information to the Customer Service manager to call me back. I eventually

ended up talking with the District Manager in order to ask about getting the refuse rates I desired. I received them via email the next business day, and those are also listed in Attachment A.

Attachment B lists all the licensed refuse haulers available to residents in each of the surveyed cities. From discussions with City representatives and looking at City websites, there are a total of 30 licensed refuse haulers that serve these 13 cities. This information is for residential service only, and does not include large multi-family, commercial, industrial, and construction (roll-offs for demolition and construction) related refuse and debris collection.

A list of licensed refuse haulers that serve the large multi-family, commercial, industrial, and construction segment of the overall market would include some of these same companies, but also would include other companies that specialize only in the “non-residential” segment of the market, so the total list of companies in the refuse collection business in the metropolitan area overall is quite large.

Attachment C in this report lists all the cities in the metropolitan area (not including townships) and their refuse hauling and recycling options. There are 108 cities listed in this Attachment.

By far, the most common refuse hauling designation is the “open hauling” designation, with 77 of the 108 cities (71.3% of market). This designation is also represents approximately 83% of all residents. An “open hauling” designation means that residents of that city have their choice from anywhere from 2 to 10 licensed refuse haulers to pick from as their residential refuse hauler.

There are 31 cities that do not use the “open hauling” designation, and of this total, 29 contract with a licensed hauler and only 2 cities are in the refuse hauling business. BFI with 6 ½ contracts and Waste Management with 10 contracts have a majority of the 29 cities. The remaining 12 ½ contracts are divided amongst six smaller refuse hauling vendors. The two cities that provide their own residential refuse hauling are Hopkins and Farmington. [½ contracts refer to cities that awarded contracts to two refuse hauling companies that “split” their cities refuse business.]

Typically, the cities that contract their refuse collection, or do it themselves, are smaller than 25,000 in total residential population. Only 3 of the 31 cities in this category exceed 25,000 in population, and they are Blaine (51,002 residents), St. Louis Park (44,513 residents), and Shakopee (28,913 residents).

Recycling Overview

There are a number of different ways that the MLC cities and Chanhassen deal with recycling in their cities. The following is city by city breakdown.

Open Hauling cities

The cities of Bloomington, Chanhassen, Eden Prairie, and Woodbury all are ‘open hauling’ cities, whereby residents select their refuse hauler from the list of licensed refuse haulers, and then the refuse hauler is responsible for providing the collection of recyclables. The rate charged customers for this system is set by the state of Minnesota and the counties, and is \$5 per month, or \$60 per year.

Residents in these open hauling cities will see the charge for recycling services on their refuse hauler bill, and these fees are not taxable.

Open System, but Joint Powers Agreement for Secondary Recycling Activities

The cities of Apple Valley, Burnsville, and Eagan have a joint powers agreement that created an entity called the Dakota Valley Recycling Association. But each of the three cities has an “open hauling” system for their recycling services whereby residents select their refuse hauler from the list of licensed refuse haulers, and then the refuse hauler is responsible for providing the collection of recyclables.

Dakota Valley Recycling doesn’t set recycling rates and isn’t in the business of collecting recyclable materials. Their function is to coordinate and promote recycling related work in these three cities, such as coordinating clean-up events, coordinating Earth Day and Recycling Day activities and events, administering grants obtained from Dakota County to help promote recycling overall in different segments of the communities. As an example, DVRA currently has a grant to increase recycling in multi-tenant properties in all three cities. There are two employees of DVRA, and they are housed in Burnsville

Contracted Recycling Services

There are a number of cities that contract their recycling services with some of the private refuse haulers in the business. The cities of Minnetonka, Plymouth, and Shoreview all contract with Waste Management. The cities of Edina and Maple Grove contract with BFI. The city of Maplewood contracts with Onyx Refuse through the end of 2005, and has a new contract with Eureka Recycling that begins January 1, 2006.

Cities of Plymouth and Minnetonka

The cities of Plymouth and Minnetonka coordinate with the City of Golden Valley in a three-city collaborative effort (but not via a Joint Powers Agreement) for their recycling services. They have been collaborating in this fashion since 1986. Together, these three cities utilize an RFP process to select one recycling services vendor, and then each City negotiates separate contracts with the selected vendor, currently Waste Management.

The cost effectiveness of this effort lies with the volume of recyclables available based on the number of households (hh) in the three cities (58,000 combined households = 22,000 hh in Minnetonka, 27,200 hh in Plymouth, and 8,800 hh in Golden Valley), which are sufficient to keep the recycling trucks busy for all five business days of the week.

The Waste Management recycling trucks work in Minnetonka on Mondays and Tuesday, in Plymouth on Wednesdays and Thursdays, and in Golden Valley, and a small part of

Plymouth, on Fridays. These communities just re-signed an extension of all their agreements for three years for 2006, 2007, and 2008 for their curbside recycling program.

The contracts with Waste Management have the costs for the recycling services negotiated based on a per household basis. There is also a cost to provide the yard waste program and site, to coordinate the recycling drop-off recycling centers, a couple of yearly special recycling collection days, other special events, recycling education materials, and general program administrative costs.

Revenues are derived from the per-household fee charged by the City (as a line item on the utility bill), plus any “rebates” paid back to the cities based on a formula for the sale of the collected recyclable materials generated by residents. These days, the rebates are such that the overall program costs end up providing each city with a positive revenue stream. But these ‘profits’ are subject to the market for the recyclable materials. The markets are more stable these days, as compared to the past, but there still is a level of vulnerability to it.

Each City is able to set the rate charged to residents separate from one another. Currently, Plymouth charges \$2.00 per month per household, and Minnetonka charges \$2.50 per month per household.

City of Shoreview

The City of Shoreview, like the cities of Plymouth and Minnetonka, also has a contract with Waste Management to provide recycling services to their residents.

The contract with Waste Management has the costs for the recycling service negotiated based on a per household basis. There is also a cost to provide the yard waste program and site, to coordinate the recycling drop-off recycling centers, a couple of yearly special recycling collection days, other special events, recycling education materials, and general program administrative costs.

Revenues are derived from the per-household fee charged by the City (as a line item on the utility bill), plus any “rebates” paid back to the cities based on a formula for the sale of the collected recyclable materials generated by residents. These days, the rebates are such that the overall program costs end up providing each city with a positive revenue stream. But these ‘profits’ are subject to the market for the recyclable materials. The markets are more stable these days, as compared to the past, but there still is a level of vulnerability to it.

Shoreview currently charges it residents \$7.55 per quarter per household (approximately \$2.50 per month or \$30.20 per year per household).

City of Maple Grove

The City of Maple Grove has a contract with BFI to provide recycling services to their residents.

The contract with BFI has the costs for the recycling service negotiated based on a per household basis. There is also a cost to provide the yard waste program and site, to coordinate the recycling drop-off recycling centers, a couple of yearly special recycling collection days, other special events, recycling education materials, and general program administrative costs.

Revenues are derived from the per-household fee charged by the City (as a line item on the utility bill), plus any “rebates” paid back to the cities based on a formula for the sale of the collected recyclable materials generated by residents. These days, the rebates are such that the overall program costs end up providing each city with a positive revenue stream. But these ‘profits’ are subject to the market for the recyclable materials. The markets are more stable these days, as compared to the past, but there still is a level of vulnerability to it.

Maple Grove currently charges it residents \$5.00 per quarter per household (approximately \$1.67 per month or \$20 per year per household).

City of Edina

The City of Edina has a contract with BFI to provide recycling services to their residents.

The contract with BFI has the costs for the recycling service negotiated based on a per household basis. There is also a cost to provide the yard waste program and site, to coordinate the recycling drop-off recycling centers, recycling education materials, and general program administrative costs.

Revenues are derived from the per-household fee charged by the City (as a line item on the utility bill), plus any “rebates” paid back to the cities based on a formula for the sale of the collected recyclable materials generated by residents. Edina just added the “rebate” portion of the recycling service in contractual negotiations with BFI for the first time in 2005. The city’s goal isn’t to provide a revenue stream, but instead to make the recycling program a break-even venture. Because they expect the rebates to do well in the next few years, they may reduce the rate charged to residents in future years.

Edina currently charges it residents \$6.30 per quarter per household (approximately \$2.10 per month or \$25.20 per year per household).

City of Maplewood

Now Onyx, then Eureka on 01-01-2006. Info pending a call back from DuWayne Konweko 651-249-2330

Minnesota Statute on MSW

Minnesota Statute 115A.94 “Organized collection” is the section of the state code that addresses the collection of municipal solid waste. Under Subd. 1, “Organized collection” is defined as a means or system for collecting solid waste in which a specified collector is authorized to collect, from a defined geographic service area or areas, some or all of the solid waste that is released by generators for collection.

Under Subd. 3, a local government unit may organize collection as a municipal service **or** by ordinance, franchise, license, negotiated or bidded contract, or other means, using one or more collectors or an organization of collectors.

Under Subd. 4, any city wanting to change how their organized collection is done must notice (a) at least 180 days before implementing an ordinance, franchise, license, contract or other means of organizing collection, a city or town, by resolution of the governing body (City Council), and shall announce its intent to organize collection and invite the participation of interested persons, including persons licensed to operate solid waste collection services, in planning and establishing the organized collection system, and (b) the resolution of intent must be adopted after a public hearing. The hearing must be held at least two weeks after public notice and mailed notice to persons known by the city or town to be operating solid waste collection services in the city or town. The failure to give mailed notice to persons or defect in the notice does not invalidate the proceedings, provided a bona fide effort to comply with notice requirements has been made.

Of the 180 days of notice period, a city would have two (2) 90-day periods with which to deal with. The first 90-day period following the resolution of intent, the city or town shall develop or supervise the development of plans or proposals for organized collection. During this 90-day planning period, the city or town shall invite and employ the assistance of persons licensed as of the date of the resolution of intent to operate solid waste collection services in the city or town. Failure of a licensed collector to participate in the 90-day planning period, when the city or town has made a bona fide effort to provide the person the opportunity to participate, does not invalidate the planning process.

During the second 90-day period, a city (after the date ending the first 90-day planning period) shall discuss possible organized collection arrangements with all licensed collectors operating in the city or town who have expressed interest. If the city or town is unable to agree on an organized collection arrangement with a majority of the licensed collectors who have expressed interest, or upon expiration of the 90 days, the city or town may propose implementation of an alternate method of organizing collection as authorized in subdivision 3.

The summary in regards to Organized Collection is that cities that want to move towards a single, unified contract for either (or both) garbage and recycling can do so in about six months, but the two majority refuse and recycling companies both indicated that there would probably be a lot of “rallying the troops” action to encourage residents to lobby elected officials to preserve the choice available in the market to consumers.

Also, the refuse and recycling companies that have a significant market share would challenge a City's ability to legally displace them from the marketplace, since their corporate economics are dependent on the market share currently in place.

Changes/Future Trends in the Recycling Industry

There are a few changes taking place in the recycling industry. The big change that is taking place now is the move to a "single-sort" recycling container. City of Eden Prairie residents that have Waste Management as their refuse hauler/recycler have already seen this change, with those residents that have BFI about to see this "single-sort" system in early 2006.

Single-sort is where residents place all their recyclable materials together in one (typically a 90 gallon) roll-off container with an attached lid for pickup. The traditional "multiple sort" with the accompanying open top recycling bin will soon be a thing of the past, where residents have to separate their recyclable by type (newspapers, plastic, glass & cans, cardboard, etc).

There are a number of advantages for both the resident and the recycler to move to a single-sort process. The main change is that recycling goes from a weekly collection with an open top recycling bin to an every other week collection with a recycling cart.

Advantages for the consumer is that you don't have to spend time sorting the materials, and the trips to the curb happen half as often as in the past. When taking the recyclables to the curb, the resident doesn't have to carry the container, but instead can just roll the recycling container, similar to the garbage container, to the curb. Initial research has shown that residents recycle about 25-30% more material with a single-sort system.

Advantages for the recycler include: (1) lessening of fixed costs, especially fuel costs, (2) ability to retain workers; and (3) lessening of workers compensation claims.

The move to an every other week collection versus a weekly collection of recyclables cuts in half the wear and tear on recycling trucks and equipment, and also saves fuel costs significantly. Also, the new single-sort system makes the actual pick-up of the materials "automated" where the truck collection arm can grab the recycling container, like trucks do now for garbage pick-up, and dump it into the recycling truck. Gone are the days where hired staff needs to climb on and off the truck, picking up the materials by hand and dumping them by hand into the separate material bins on the recycling truck. This change will help retain hired staff and lessen the workers compensation claims.

As for the argument concerning recycling stream breakage and recycling stream contamination, those are issues that are being dealt with. The breakage occurs, but not as much as one might think between single-sort and multiple sort. The contamination issue so far, has been offset by the increase in the capture of recyclable product between the two systems.

Another new change, that may not hold as much promise, is the collection of “wet” garbage. Wet garbage is any type of food scraps that currently go into the garbage stream. The move to separating wet garbage from other garbage has been taking place in small pockets in some major metropolitan areas where there is a robust food and hospitality industry available to concentrate the costs associated for collection in the past five or ten years, but now this type of recycling is trying to see its way to the residential market.

The reprocessing of wet garbage is where companies take either of two routes. Using primarily food waste to make a cooked slurry that is eventually processed and sold to pig farms as an alternative to regular feed, usually at a substantial savings; or combining food waste with green waste (yard waste) to create a similar product that can be made into a compost material for use in plantings, etc.

There are a few school districts doing this now, and some more school districts are trying it, as well, but the marketplace hasn’t developed to the point yet where it becomes economically viable for companies to go to a residential market for their wet garbage product.

Currently, the City of Wayzata has a pilot project to recycle “wet” garbage, but there aren’t any other communities planning to do it soon, and the two main refuse and recycling companies aren’t currently planning to do this at this time for their residential customers.

Advantages and Disadvantages of each Model

Open Refuse Hauling – Open Recycling (55 cities)

Currently the option that Eden Prairie has. This option’s advantages are that it preserves the choices available to residents to use whichever licensed hauler that they prefer. The disadvantages are that there are more trucks for garbage and recycling collection using city streets on collection day

Open Refuse Hauling – Contract for Recycling (22 cities)

Advantages are that it preserves the choice for refuse collection and potentially saves residents money for the purchase of recycling services; and there are fewer recycling trucks using city streets. Disadvantages are the probable increase in headcount for the City to manage the contract for the recycling program. Most cities have one FTE that has their primary duties related to the management of the recycling program and all the events that go with this function each year.

Contract for Refuse Hauling – Contract for Recycling (29 cities)

Advantages are that it saves residents money for both refuse collection services and recycling services; and there are fewer refuse and recycling trucks using city streets. Disadvantages are the probable increase in headcount for the City to manage the contract for both the refuse and recycling programs. Most cities have one FTE that has their

primary duties related to the management of the refuse and recycling program and all the events that go with these functions each year.

City provided Refuse Hauling – City provided Recycling (1 city)

Advantages - - If you want to control the refuse and recycling services for your community, this is the option to have. A city could structure this service into a money making venture. Disadvantages are that the City is now in the refuse collection and recycling business with all the fixed costs (trucks, equipments, staff, etc.) that go with providing the service to residents, displacing a predominantly private sector venture in the marketplace.

City provided Refuse Hauling – Contract for Recycling (1 city)

Advantages - - If you want to control the refuse service for your community, this is the option to have. Disadvantages are that the City is now in the refuse collection, but not into the recycling business, with all the fixed costs (trucks, equipments, staff, etc.) that go with providing the service to residents, displacing a predominantly private sector venture in the marketplace.

Minnesota Statutes - 115A.94 Organized collection.

Subdivision 1. **Definition.** "Organized collection" means a system for collecting solid waste in which a specified collector, or a member of an organization of collectors, is authorized to collect from a defined geographic service area or areas some or all of the solid waste that is released by generators for collection.

Subd. 2. **Local authority.** A city or town may organize collection, after public notification as required in subdivision 4. A county may organize collection as provided in subdivision 5.

Subd. 3. **General provisions.** (a) The local government unit may organize collection as a municipal service or by ordinance, franchise, license, negotiated or bidded contract, or other means, using one or more collectors or an organization of collectors.

(b) The local government unit may not establish or administer organized collection in a manner that impairs the preservation and development of recycling and markets for recyclable materials. The local government unit shall exempt recyclable materials from organized collection upon a showing by the generator or collector that the materials are or will be separated from mixed municipal solid waste by the generator, separately collected, and delivered for reuse in their original form or for use in a manufacturing process.

(c) The local government unit shall invite and employ the assistance of interested persons, including persons licensed to operate solid waste collection services in the local government unit, in developing plans and proposals for organized collection and in establishing the organized collection system.

(d) Organized collection accomplished by contract or as a municipal service may include a requirement that all or any portion of the solid waste, except (1) recyclable materials and (2) materials that are processed at a resource recovery facility at the capacity in operation at the time that the requirement is imposed, be delivered to a waste facility identified by the local government unit. In a district or county where a resource recovery facility has been designated by ordinance under section 115A.86, organized collection must conform to the requirements of the designation ordinance.

Subd. 4. **Cities and towns; notice; planning.** (a) At least 180 days before implementing an ordinance, franchise, license, contract or other means of organizing collection, a city or town, by resolution of the governing body, shall announce its intent to organize collection and invite the participation of interested persons, including persons licensed to operate solid waste collection services, in planning and establishing the organized collection system.

(b) The resolution of intent must be adopted after a public hearing. The hearing must be held at least two weeks after public notice and mailed notice to persons known by the city or town to be operating solid waste collection services in the city or town. The

failure to give mailed notice to persons or defect in the notice does not invalidate the proceedings, provided a bona fide effort to comply with notice requirements has been made

(c) During a 90-day period following the resolution of intent, the city or town shall develop or supervise the development of plans or proposals for organized collection. During this 90-day planning period, the city or town shall invite and employ the assistance of persons licensed as of the date of the resolution of intent to operate solid waste collection services in the city or town. Failure of a licensed collector to participate in the 90-day planning period, when the city or town has made a bona fide effort to provide the person the opportunity to participate, does not invalidate the planning process.

(d) For 90 days after the date ending the planning period required under paragraph (c), the city or town shall discuss possible organized collection arrangements with all licensed collectors operating in the city or town who have expressed interest. If the city or town is unable to agree on an organized collection arrangement with a majority of the licensed collectors who have expressed interest, or upon expiration of the 90 days, the city or town may propose implementation of an alternate method of organizing collection as authorized in subdivision 3.

(e) The city or town shall make specific findings that:

(1) describe in detail the procedures it used to plan and to attempt implementation of organized collection through an arrangement with collectors who expressed interest; and

(2) evaluate the proposed organized collection method in light of at least the following standards: achieving the stated organized collection goals of the city or town; minimizing displacement of collectors; ensuring participation of all interested parties in the decision-making process; and maximizing efficiency in solid waste collection.

(f) Upon request, the city or town shall provide mailed notice of all proceedings on the organization of collection in the city or town.

(g) If the city or town and all the persons licensed to operate mixed municipal solid waste collection services and doing business in the city or town agree on the plan, the city or town may implement the plan without regard to the 180-day period specified in paragraph (a).

Subd. 5. County organized collection. (a) A county may by ordinance require cities and towns within the county to organize collection. Organized collection ordinances of counties may:

(1) require cities and towns to require the separation and separate collection of recyclable materials;

(2) specify the material to be separated; and

(3) require cities and towns to meet any performance standards for source separation that are contained in the county solid waste plan.

(b) A county may itself organize collection under subdivision 4 in any city or town that does not comply with a county organized collection ordinance adopted under this subdivision, and the county may implement, as part of its organized collection, the source separation program and performance standards required by its organized collection ordinance.

Subd. 6. Organized collection not required or prevented. (a) The authority granted in this section to organize solid waste collection is optional and is in addition to authority to govern solid waste collection granted by other law.

(b) Except as provided in subdivision 5, a city, town, or county is not:

(1) required to organize collection; or

(2) prevented from organizing collection of solid waste or recyclable material.

(c) Except as provided in subdivision 5, a city, town, or county may exercise any authority granted by any other law, including a home rule charter, to govern collection of solid waste.

Subd. 7. Anticompetitive conduct. (a) A political subdivision that organizes collection under this section is authorized to engage in anticompetitive conduct to the extent necessary to plan and implement its chosen organized collection system and is immune from liability under state laws relating to antitrust, restraint of trade, unfair trade practices, and other regulation of trade or commerce.

(b) An organization of solid waste collectors, an individual collector, and their officers, members, employees, and agents who cooperate with a political subdivision that organizes collection under this section are authorized to engage in anticompetitive conduct to the extent necessary to plan and implement the organized collection system, provided that the political subdivision actively supervises the participation of each entity. An organization, entity, or person covered by this paragraph is immune from liability under state law relating to antitrust, restraint of trade, unfair trade practices, and other regulation of trade or commerce.

HIST: 1987 c 348 s 27; 1989 c 325 s 26,27; 1990 c 600 s 1,2; 1991 c 337 s 46; 1993 c 249 s 20,21

Copyright 2005 by the Office of Revisor of Statutes, State of Minnesota.

Municipality	Municipal Solid Waste System	MSW		MSW	
		BFI	Monthly Fees	Waste Mgmt	Monthly Fees
Apple Valley (Dakota County)	Open	32 gal	\$15.50	35 gal	\$14.45
		68 gal	\$16.50	64 gal	\$15.63
		95 gal	\$18.50	96 gal	\$18.01
Bloomington (Hennepin County)	Open	32 gal	\$14.95	35 gal	\$14.45
		68 gal	\$15.95	64 gal	\$15.63
		95 gal	\$16.95	96 gal	\$18.01
Burnsville (Dakota County)	Open	32 gal	\$15.50	35 gal	\$14.45
		68 gal	\$16.50	64 gal	\$15.63
		95 gal	\$18.50	96 gal	\$18.01
Chanhausen (Carver County)	Open	32 gal	\$14.95	35 gal	\$14.45
		68 gal	\$15.95	64 gal	\$15.63
		95 gal	\$16.95	96 gal	\$18.01
Eagan (Dakota County)	Open	32 gal	\$15.50	35 gal	\$14.45
		68 gal	\$16.50	64 gal	\$15.63
		95 gal	\$18.50	96 gal	\$18.01
Eden Prairie (Hennepin County)	Open	32 gal	\$14.95	35 gal	\$14.45
		68 gal	\$15.95	64 gal	\$15.63
		95 gal	\$16.95	96 gal	\$18.01
Edina (Hennepin County)	Open	32 gal	\$14.95	35 gal	\$11.45
		68 gal	\$15.95	64 gal	\$12.63
		95 gal	\$16.95	96 gal	\$15.01
Maple Grove (Hennepin County)	Open	32 gal	\$13.95	35 gal	\$11.45
		68 gal	\$14.95	64 gal	\$12.63
		95 gal	\$15.95	96 gal	\$15.01
Maplewood (Ramsey County)	Open	32 gal	\$12.95	35 gal	\$11.45
		68 gal	\$14.95	64 gal	\$12.63
		95 gal	\$15.95	96 gal	\$15.01
Minnetonka (Hennepin County)	Open	32 gal	\$14.95	35 gal	\$11.45
		68 gal	\$15.95	64 gal	\$12.63
		95 gal	\$16.95	96 gal	\$15.01
Plymouth (Hennepin County)	Open	32 gal	\$14.95	35 gal	\$11.45
		68 gal	\$15.95	64 gal	\$12.63
		95 gal	\$16.95	96 gal	\$15.01
Shoreview (Ramsey County)	Open	32 gal	\$13.95	35 gal	\$11.45
		68 gal	\$14.95	64 gal	\$12.63
		95 gal	\$15.95	96 gal	\$15.01
Woodbury (Washington County)	Open	32 gal	\$13.95	35 gal	\$14.45
		68 gal	\$14.95	64 gal	\$15.63
		95 gal	\$15.95	96 gal	\$18.01

Average Monthly Costs

	BFI	Average Monthly \$	WM	Average Monthly \$
small	32 gal	\$14.69	35 gal	\$13.07
medium	68 gal	\$15.77	64 gal	\$14.25
large	95 gal	\$17.00	96 gal	\$16.63

Average Per Gallon Costs

	BFI	Average \$ / Gallon	WM	Average \$ / Gallon
small	Per gal	\$0.46	Per gal	\$0.41
medium	Per gal	\$0.23	Per gal	\$0.25
large	Per gal	\$0.18	Per gal	\$0.18

Municipality	Recycling Collection System	Recycling Collection Residential Fees
Apple Valley (Dakota County)	Open & Dakota Valley Recycling Ass'n	Charged \$5/month (or \$60/year) on Refuse bill
Bloomington (Hennepin County)	Open	Charged \$5/month (or \$60/year) on Refuse bill
Burnsville (Dakota County)	Open & Dakota Valley Recycling Ass'n	Charged \$5/month (or \$60/year) on Refuse bill
Chanhassen (Carver County)	Open	Charged \$5/month (or \$60/year) on Refuse bill
Eagan (Dakota County)	Open & Dakota Valley Recycling Ass'n	Charged \$5/month (or \$60/year) on Refuse bill
Eden Prairie (Hennepin County)	Open	Charged \$5/month (or \$60/year) on Refuse bill
Edina (Hennepin County)	Organized - BFI	Charged \$2.10/month (or \$25.20/year)
Maple Grove (Hennepin County)	Organized - BFI	Res charged \$5/qtr (or \$20/year)
Maplewood (Ramsey County)	Organized - Onyx Refuse New Contract with Eureka Recycling on 01-01-06	unavailable
Minnetonka (Hennepin County)	Organized - Waste Management	Does RFP with Plymouth & Golden Valley Res charged \$2/month (or \$24/yr)
Plymouth (Hennepin County)	Organized - Waste Management	Does RFP with Minnetonka & Golden Valley Res charged \$2.50/month (or \$30/yr)
Shoreview (Ramsey County)	Organized - Waste Management	Charges residents \$30.20/yr (single & multifamily)
Woodbury (Washington County)	Open	Charged \$5/month (or \$60/year) on Refuse bill

Licensed Refuse Haulers by Cities

City	BFI	Waste Management	Ace	Armor	Aspen	Buckingham	Carey	Diek's	Gene's	Highland Sanitary	Horrigan	Lakeville	Maroney's	Master Waste	Michael Hall	Nitti	Onyx	Randy's	Red Arrow	T & L	Tennis	Tidy Disposal	Tidy Tim	TNT	Triangle	Troje's	Vierkait	Walter's	Walz Brothers	Waste Tech
Apple Valley	●	●										●						●												
Bloomington	●	●										●						●												
Burnsville	●	●		●		●						●						●												
Chanhassen	●	●																				●								
Eagan	●	●								●		●				●	●				●					●				
Eden Prairie	●	●				●																								
Edina	●	●			●																						●			
Maple Grove	●	●	●															●		●			●						●	●
Maplewood	●	●							●	●	●		●				●													
Minnetonka	●	●																												
Plymouth	●	●						●						●	●															
Shoreview	●	●	●																									●		
Woodbury	●	●					●			●			●				●		●		●			●		●				

Metropolitan Area Cities Refuse Hauling & Recycling Options

	City	Population	Hauling Option	Recycling Option
1	Bayport	3,132	BFI	BFI
2	Columbia Heights	18,600	BFI	BFI
3	Excelsior	2,400	BFI	BFI
4	Minnetonka Beach	618	BFI	BFI
5	North St. Paul	12,273	BFI	BFI
6	Tonka Bay	1,600	BFI	BFI
7	Elk River	20,240	BFI & Randy's	BFI & Randy's
8	Farmington	16,775	City Is Hauler	Uses Refuse Hauler
9	Hopkins	17,675	City Is Hauler	Waste Mgmt
10	Champlin	23,659	Consortium	Uses Refuse Hauler
11	Little Canada	9,890	Consortium	Uses Refuse Hauler
12	Vadnais Heights	13,270	Consortium	Uses Refuse Hauler
13	Shakopee	28,913	Dick's Sanitation	Dick's Sanitation
14	Forest Lake	16,800	Forest Lake Sanitation	Forest Lake Sanitation
15	Afton	2,945	Highland Sanitation	Highland Sanitation
16	Oak Park Heights	4,633	Onyx Sanitation	Onyx Sanitation
17	White Bear Lake	24,922	Onyx Sanitation	Onyx Sanitation
18	Ramsey	20,040	OPEN Hauling	Ace Solid Waste
19	Brooklyn Center	29,005	OPEN Hauling	BFI
20	Brooklyn Park	68,992	OPEN Hauling	BFI
21	Crystal	22,931	OPEN Hauling	BFI
22	Edina	48,050	OPEN Hauling	BFI
23	Fridley	27,088	OPEN Hauling	BFI
24	Maple Grove	56,754	OPEN Hauling	BFI
25	New Hope	20,748	OPEN Hauling	BFI
26	Lauderdale	2,330	OPEN Hauling	Eureka Recycling
27	Maplewood	35,892	OPEN Hauling	Eureka Recycling
28	Albertville	5,368	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
29	Andover	29,262	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
30	Anoka	18,150	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
31	Apple Valley	48,875	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
32	Arden Hills	9,620	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
33	Big Lake	8,303	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
34	Bloomington	85,442	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
35	Burnsville	61,425	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
36	Chanhausen	22,042	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
37	Chaska	21,478	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
38	Coon Rapids	62,243	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
39	Dayton	4,964	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
40	Eagan	65,764	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
41	Eden Prairie	60,460	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
42	Falcon Heights	5,560	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
43	Gem Lake	442	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
44	Greenwood	800	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
45	Hanover	2,188	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
46	Hugo	8,760	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
47	Independence	3,605	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
48	Inver Grove Heights	32,193	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
49	Lake Elmo	7,790	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
50	Lakeland	1,923	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler

51	Lakeville	49,097	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
52	Lexington	2,160	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
53	Lino Lakes	18,725	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
54	Long Lake	1,804	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
55	Medina	4,650	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
56	Mendota Heights	11,720	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
57	Mound	9,740	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
58	Mounds View	12,865	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
59	Newport	3,700	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
60	North Oaks	4,200	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
61	Oak Grove	7,455	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
62	Oakdale	27,657	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
63	Orono	7,728	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
64	Otsego	9,893	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
65	Prior Lake	21,156	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
66	Richfield	34,496	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
67	Rogers	5,760	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
68	Rosemount	17,740	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
69	Savage	24,018	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
70	South St. Paul	20,249	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
71	Spring Lake Park	6,805	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
72	Spring Park	1,659	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
73	St. Anthony	83	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
74	St. Francis	6,500	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
75	St. Michael	13,292	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
76	St. Paul	287,410	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
77	Victoria	5,480	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
78	Waconia	8,622	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
79	West St. Paul	19,481	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
80	Woodbury	50,050	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
81	Woodland	488	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
82	Corcoran	5,875	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
83	Golden Valley	20,674	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
84	Grant	4,180	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
85	Greenfield	2,820	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
86	Mahtomedi	8,105	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
87	Minnetonka	51,480	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
88	Minnetrista	5,250	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
89	New Brighton	22,333	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
90	Plymouth	70,682	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
91	Roseville	34,080	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
92	Shoreview	26,381	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
93	Shorewood	7,625	OPEN Hauling	Waste Mgmt
94	Cottage Grove	31,774	OPEN Hauling	Uses Refuse Hauler
95	St. Bonifacius	2,290	Randy's Sanitation	Randy's Sanitation
96	Wayzata	4,070	Randy's Sanitation	Randy's Sanitation
97	Loretto	622	Randy's Sanitation	Randy's Sanitation
98	Maple Plain	2,070	Randy's Sanitation	Waste Mgmt
99	Blaine	51,002	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
100	Centerville	3,644	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
101	Circle Pines	4,950	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
102	Deephaven	3,900	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
103	Hastings	20,546	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt

104	Hilltop	768	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
105	Osseo	2,522	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
106	Robbinsdale	13,950	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
107	St. Louis Park	44,511	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
108	Stillwater	17,215	Waste Mgmt	Waste Mgmt
		2,274,834		