

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Selection of Solid Waste Service Provider
DEPARTMENT: Public Works
PRESENTED BY: Mark Relph, Public Works Director; Jesus Sanchez, Operations Manager; Rika Cecil, Environmental Programs Coordinator

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

On February 28, 2008, the City's current contract for solid waste services expires. In order to find a service provider with the best package of services at the lowest price for residents and businesses, a Request for Proposals (RFP) was published on June 20, 2007, with the intent to complete the RFP process, finalize a contract, and allow sufficient start-up time to implement the contract prior to March 1, 2008.

Staff is seeking Council concurrence on the new service level options and on the recommended service provider, in order to finalize the contract for Council approval on October 22.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The highest ranked proposal was also the lowest cost proposal. The following table shows the estimated annual costs for the contracted services from the three proponents based on their original submittals:

| Allied Waste Services | Waste Management Northwest | CleanScapes |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| \$6,940,979 | \$5,590,372 | \$5,308,631 |

Even under the lowest cost proposal, rates for most¹ residential and commercial customers will increase compared to current costs. The major factors involved in this increase include:

- An increase in the King County tipping fee at transfer stations from \$82.50 per ton to \$95.00 per ton effective January 1, 2008.
- Inflationary increases for labor, fuel and materials since the last contract procurement cycle in 2000.
- An increased administration fee to help fund City sponsored Clean Sweep Recycling and storm debris events.

¹ The new contract has a defined rate structure that rewards those residents who generate less garbage with a lower rate.

- An aggressive business recycling program where CleanScapes would go to all businesses in the City and help them to reduce their garbage generation and increase their recycling generation as much as possible.

The changes in the tipping fee and the CPI index will go into effect on January 1 and will increase the rates charged by the current service provider to all customers.

The new contract has a more aggressive residential rate structure which further rewards those residents who generate less garbage with a lower rate. For example, residents who choose the micro-can (10 gallons) or mini-can (20 gallons) option will actually see a rate decrease in their garbage rate compared to current rates (garbage service only). Those with larger cans (64 and 96 gallons) will show a larger increase than those with a 32 gallon container.

CleanScapes has offered several ways that Shoreline customers can reduce the cost of service, such as optional electronic (internet/e-mail) billing for commercial and residential customers, and reducing the recycling costs for commercial recycling accounts compared to current rates.

RECOMMENDATION

No final action is required. Staff is recommending new service level enhancements and CleanScapes as the new service provider and is requesting Council discussion and concurrence. If Council concurs with the staff recommendation, the next step is to bring back a contract for Council review and adoption.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney _____

INTRODUCTION

On February 28, 2008, the City's current contract for solid waste services expires. In order to find a service provider with the best and most cost-effective package of services for residents and businesses, a Request for Proposals (RFP) was published on June 20, 2007, with the intent to complete the RFP process, finalize a contract, and allow start-up time to implement the contract prior to March 1, 2008.

Staff is seeking Council concurrence on the new service level options, as well as on the recommended service provider.

BACKGROUND

In 2000, the City went out to bid for solid waste collection services. Council approved the selection of Waste Management Northwest as the service provider with a seven year contract.

On June 18, 2007, Council recommended that the RFP be published with the service level enhancements.

DISCUSSION

1. Evaluation Process

The City's Evaluation Team was composed of Debbie Tarry, Finance Director; Mark Relph, Public Works Director; Jesus Sanchez, Operations Manager; Jerry Shuster, Surface Water & Environmental Services Manager; and Rika Cecil, Environmental Programs Coordinator.

In response to the RFP, three solid waste service providers submitted a proposal: Allied Waste, CleanScapes, and Waste Management Northwest.

Criteria for rating the proposals and corresponding points included:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| • Responsiveness / Completeness | pass/fail |
| • Minimum General Qualifications | pass/fail |
| • Price Evaluation (lowest proposal total/subject proposal total) | 80 |
| • Customer Service Approach, Ability and References | 10 |
| • Diversion Approach, System Design and Operations | <u>10</u> |
| Total points: | 100 |

In addition, each company was interviewed at least once, and all received follow-up questions to answer.

Evaluation Team scores for proposals, reference checks, and interviews provided the following consistent results from highest to lowest: CleanScapes, Waste Management, and Allied Waste.

Exceptional ratings for CleanScapes were seen in the areas of customer service, commitment to sustainability, rates and technology.

2. Community Input

To collect input from residents about potential service level options, a random, statistically valid telephone survey (Attachment A) was conducted in May 2007 of 467 Shoreline residents, living in single family and multi-family units. Four hundred (86%) of those residents currently have curbside garbage service.

- When asked how important an Annual Curbside Spring Cleanup would be, 51% said it was very important. Of these, 57% were willing to pay at least \$1 per month for the service.
- When asked about receiving weekly yard debris or recycling collection, it was not important to the majority of residents.

Throughout the past 7 years of the existing solid waste contract, unsolicited telephone calls and emails have been sent to the City, requesting a change in the solid waste contract. Although the number of calls is not statistically relevant, they do consistently indicate the following:

- a desire to add food debris and compostable paper to yard debris for recycling
- the addition of universal recycling availability for multi-family units

3. Service Level Enhancements

Based on Council direction on June 18, 2007, as well as community input from the telephone survey and unsolicited requests, the following new or expanded services are offered in the new contract:

- a) Universal garbage carts will be used by residents to save money and reduce employee back injuries, time and noise in neighborhoods. There is no added cost for this service.
- b) Organic Material, such as food and compostable paper will be added to yard debris, in order to minimize solid waste rates. This new service is supported by unsolicited telephone calls and emails to the City, in response to the success of this program throughout King County. Cost for service is embedded in the yard debris subscription charge.
- c) Expanded Recycling will include plastics #3-7, motor oil, scrap metal (including small appliances meeting size requirements), and fluorescent light bulbs.
- d) Multi-family Recycling Service is provided to all multi-family (MF) garbage customers as part of the garbage rate to ensure that MF recycling is available at no additional cost to all sites, just as is done for single family customers. This added service will support sustainability, build stewardship, increase recycling and minimize future solid waste rate increases.

In addition, Curbside Spring Clean-up is an alternative service in the contract, which could be offered one time per year for items that are no larger than 3' X 3' X3' in size, if approved by Council on an annual basis. The cost for this embedded service is \$0.48 per month for residential customers with a single 32-gallon can, and would be pro-rated for all other can sizes. The Curbside Spring Clean-up would allow subscribers to get rid

of tricycle size items that do not fit in their cans. Since rates are already increasing and residents can easily bring 3' X 3' X 3' size items to the Recycling Events twice each year, staff recommends that the service remain as an alternative for future Council implementation, if desired, and not be included as a regular, annual service at this point.

Although a new service for "large, bulky garbage items" was supported by 57% of telephone survey respondents, the cost for collecting items that are the size of a mattress and couch would increase rates beyond the resident-supported \$1 - \$6 per month. In both the new and existing contract, residents can call the service provider for pick-up of large, bulky items for a fee that is paid by the individual service subscriber.

4. Service Provider

Although they are a relatively new company, staff is recommending CleanScapes, due in large part to their employee's vast experience, their credible financing proposals, and their innovative, service-based approach. These points are detailed below:

(1) CleanScapes's principal staff are currently made up of many former local Waste Management (WM) employees with decades of experience. That experience is represented both from the corporate management, district management, and route manager levels. For example, their Chief Operating Officer has 38 years of experience in the waste industry in the Seattle Area, much of it with WM; and their proposed Operations Manager has 27 years of experience, mostly with WM in King County, including being responsible for routes in the north end of Seattle. CleanScapes also intends to hire pre-selected experienced drivers.

(2) CleanScapes as a corporate entity has established an operational base in collection, urban clean-ups and construction/demolition processing. As a result they are not just a start-up, rather a company with cash flow and staff available to implement this contract. While the company does not currently have a municipal contract of this nature, they have presented a credible financing and operations plan.

(3) The evaluation committee reviewed the three proponents and believes that CleanScapes has offered the City a service package with a high level of customer service, innovation, sustainability and effective use of technology. CleanScapes leadership is not tied to the out-of-area corporate systems used by their two competitors, making it more convenient to address local issues efficiently and timely; and in addition they have given a lot of thought to changing the way solid waste collection occurs and how to maximize waste reduction and recycling. This is evidenced by their customer service approach which includes an excellent web-based interface which allows customers to monitor their account, discounts for auto-pay, and other enhancements we believe will benefit Shoreline customers.

5. Rates

Each company that submitted a proposal determined its own rate structure for various levels of residential and commercial services. To evaluate which was the lowest cost service provider, the current number of businesses and residents at each service level was multiplied by the proposed rates. This provides an estimated total revenue for each service provider, if they were awarded the contract.

The recommended service provider, CleanScapes, is also the lowest bidder. The following table shows the predicted total annual revenues for the contracted services from the three proponents based on their original submittals:

| Allied Waste Services | Waste Management Northwest | CleanScapes |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| \$6,940,979 | \$5,590,372 | \$5,308,631 |

Even with the lowest bidder, rates for most residential and commercial customers will increase compared to current costs. Based on the table above, average rate increases for all residents and business will be approximately in the 28% to 32% range. There are many major factors that make-up this increase from current rates.

The tipping fee at King County transfer stations will increase from \$82.50 per ton to \$95.00 per ton effective January 1, 2008. Attachment B from King County provides further explanation of this issue. Current customers will most likely see an increase in their rates from the current service provider, as a result of this change. In addition, the City's contract with Waste Management includes an annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) increase. The exact increase in January-February 2008 fees under the current contract has not been finalized.

Both the existing and proposed new contracts include an administrative fee paid by the service provider to the City for oversight of the contract and funding of various environmental programs. The current fee is approximately \$55,000 per year. The proposed new contract includes an administrative fee of \$198,840. The additional funds will be used to expand the environmental services programs offered by the City to solid waste subscribers, while reducing the amount of general fund dollars used for these programs. In addition to covering the cost of contract administration and overhead (Public Works, Legal, and Finance), this fee will help pay for the City-sponsored Clean Sweep Recycling events, a new annual storm debris service, and any outside re-negotiation costs during the seven year life of the contract. A new litter collection fee of \$60,000 per year, paid to the City, is also included in the proposed new contract.

The new proposed contract also includes reasonable accommodations for the service provider to change rates based on changes in fuel and labor costs that are not found in the current contract.

The proposals did have an alternative to the residential rate structure if mandatory residential collection was implemented. CleanScapes and Allied Waste Services had no impact to the rates, while Waste Management had a reduction of \$.15 per month¹.

¹ Based upon a 32 gallon residential container.

However, staff is not recommending mandatory residential collection based upon no impact to the rates and the direction from Council at a previous workshop.

CleanScapes is proposing an aggressive, proactive business recycling program, in which they would go to all businesses in the City to help them reduce their garbage generation and increase their recycling as much as possible. This program is embedded in the rates.

The new contract has a defined rate structure which further rewards those residents who generate less garbage with a lower rate. For example, residents who choose the micro-can (10 gallons) or mini-can (20 gallons) option will actually see a rate decrease in their garbage rate compared to current rates (garbage service only). Those with larger cans (64 and 96 gallons) will show a larger increase than those with a 32 gallon container.

CleanScapes has offered several ways that Shoreline customers can reduce the cost of service, such as optional electronic (internet/e-mail) billing for commercial and residential customers, and reducing the recycling surcharge for commercial accounts compared to current rates. They estimate electronic billing would save residential and commercial customers approximately 0.20 per month.

6. Commercial Recycling Alternative

Commercial customers currently negotiate their own commercial recycling rates with Waste Management or any other provider they choose. Those customers negotiate their own rate, based on the material they choose to recycle (e.g. cardboard versus a larger range of materials), the container size and frequency of collection.

The RFP process requested alternative prices for universal commercial recycling service as part of basic garbage service as is currently done for residential recycling. Cleanscapes proposed a relatively low rate for commercial recycling. Under their proposal, \$2.82 would be added for each cubic yard of monthly *garbage* container capacity if the alternative were accepted.

The rate impacts will vary by customer. In general:

- Customers who currently recycle large amounts will save money;
- Customers who currently recycle some materials and then expand to the full range of recyclables (and downsize their garbage container) will likely save money;
- Customers who do not currently recycle and start recycling (and downsize their garbage container) will likely save money; and
- Customers who do not recycle will have their rates increased.

A sampling of rate impacts is provided in the table on p. 8. It is difficult to draw firm conclusions, other than that under existing levels of service, some customers will have overall bills reduced and others will see their bills increase, depending on the level of current and future recycling efforts. However, commercial customers who fully utilize

recycling services under an embedded commercial recycling scenario will likely see their costs reduced below current levels.

Since the base commercial rates are increasing under the new contract, embedded commercial recycling provides an opportunity for customers to avoid or moderate rate increases by starting or expanding existing recycling programs. If commercial recycling is not embedded, all customers will unavoidably experience increased overall rates if private commercial recycling costs continue to be charged at current or increased levels.

Staff recommends that the new contract include universal commercial recycling service as part of basic garbage service for businesses, in order reduce solid waste and to provide an opportunity for customers to avoid or moderate rate increases by starting or expanding existing recycling programs.

Rate Impact Examples for Embedded Commercial Recycling

| Current Containers (weekly service) | Current Rates | Proposed 2008 Rates (w/o recycling) | Proposed 2008 Rates (w/recycling) |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 2x4 yd Garbage | \$ 366.96 | \$ 469.62 | \$ 567.18 |
| 1x3 yd Recycling | 84.63 | 84.63 | included |
| Total | 451.59 | 554.25 | 567.18 |
| 1x3 yd Garbage | 145.73 | 186.81 | \$ 223.40 |
| 1x3 yd Recycling | 84.63 | 84.63 | included |
| Total | 230.36 | 271.44 | 223.40 |
| 90 gallon cart Garbage | 23.30 | 35.17 | \$ 40.97 |
| 90 gallon cart Recycling | 27.45 | 27.45 | included |
| Total | 50.75 | 62.62 | 40.97 |
| 1x6 yd Garbage | 243.81 | 330.79 | \$ 403.97 |
| No Recycling | - | - | included |
| Total | 243.81 | 330.79 | 403.97 |
| 1x3 yd Garbage | | | 223.40 |
| 1x3 yd Recycling | | | included |
| Total | | | 223.40 |

Note:

2008 rates include King County tipping fee increase as well as costs of new contract.

Proposed 2008 Rates assume that individual recycling rates will continue at current rates. They may, in fact, be higher.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending new service level enhancements and CleanScapes as the new service provider and is requesting Council discussion and direction. If Council concurs with the staff recommendation, the next step is to bring back a contract for Council review and adoption.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Solid Waste Telephone Survey
- B. New Solid Waste Disposal Rates Effective January 1, 2008 (King County)



Carolyn Browne Associates

3420 Camano Vista St. • Greenbank, WA 98253 • 360-222-6820

**CITY OF SHORELINE: GARBAGE COLLECTION SURVEY
ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES OF
SHORELINE HOUSEHOLDS**

Conducted April 2007

Prepared for

**City of Shoreline
17544 Midvale Avenue North
Shoreline, WA 98133-4921**

Prepared by

**Carolyn Browne Tamler, Principal
Carolyn Browne Associates**

Table of Contents

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Introduction and Methodology | 1 |
| Definitions and Report Organization | 2 |
| Overview of Survey Results | 3 |
| Major Themes..... | 3 |
| Current Curbside Collection Service Users (Table 1) | 6 |
| Curbside Collection Service Patterns (Table 2) | 8 |
| Participation in, and Attitudes toward, Recycling (Table 3)..... | 10 |
| Responses to Suggestions for Improving curbside services (Tables 4 and 5) | 12 |
| Alternative Suggested for Improving Curbside and Recycling Services | 13 |
| Demographics of respondents (Table 6)..... | 14 |
| Type of residence/own or rent | 14 |
| Age of Head of Household | 14 |
| Number in household | 14 |
| Children in household..... | 14 |
| Years as a resident of Shoreline | 14 |
| Languages spoken in the home..... | 14 |
| ZIP Codes..... | 14 |
| Gender of respondent | 15 |
| Users vs. Non-users of curbside garbage and recycling collection services | 15 |
| Appendix..... | 17 |
| Additional Responses from Open-End Questions | 18 |
| Survey Questionnaire | 19 |

**City of Shoreline
Garbage Collection Survey
Conducted April 2007**

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

The City of Shoreline is in the process of evaluating curbside garbage collection and recycling services offered to city residents. Results of the survey will be used to help design future solid waste and recycling pickup services. As part of this process, a survey of residents was conducted to learn more about their current practices and their attitudes toward the services currently being offered and possible new services.

Carolyn Browne Associates, conducted the survey with 467 heads of households living within the city. Respondents were selected at random from lists obtained by the data collection firm.

GMA Research of Bellevue conducted the interviews from their Bellevue phone center. Data was tabulated by GMA. Carolyn Browne Tamler, principal of Carolyn Browne Associates, completed the questionnaire design, coordinated the data collection and coding, analyzed the data, and prepared this report.

A total of 467 interviews were completed. The goal was to interview 400 residents who were purchasing curbside collection services. Initially, respondents were asked if they have curbside collection services. Of those contacted, about 14% were not currently using these services. The tabulations in this report are based upon interviews with 400 heads of households who completed a full survey, including questions about their current practices. The additional 67 people, not purchasing these services, were given a short survey asking, "What would encourage you to purchase curbside services?" and some demographic information.

Many questions were asked in an open-end format with no suggested responses supplied by the interviewers. Thus, the responses for many of the questions accurately reflect what was on peoples' minds at the time they were surveyed. For some of the tables, a statement in parentheses - "Multiple, open-end responses; do not add to 100%" - indicates that people were allowed to answer the questions without any prompting or suggestions, and were permitted to have more than one answer to the question. Responses were coded based upon the patterns in the answers. The responses that did not fit into coding patterns (in other words, where few others had the same response) are listed for each question in the Appendix of this report.

The random sample of 400 heads of households using curbside collection services provides data that is projectable to the total population from which it is drawn, with an error range of +/- 4.9% with a 95% confidence. Where data is based upon 200, the error range is +/- 6.9% with the same confidence level. When base sizes are less than 200, care should be taken in drawing conclusions, as the error range increases sharply as the sample size drops below 200.

Definitions and Report Organization

Tables in this report include data for the 400 respondents who are using the garbage collection and recycling services; demographic data and responses to a question about what would make people participate, or participate more, were collected from all 467 residents called.

When cross-tabulations were examined, there were many statistically significant differences between those who have been residents of Shoreline for less than 16 years compared with those who have lived in the community for 16 years or more. These cross-tabulations are included in all of the tables in this report.

For purposes of clarity, the following terms are used in this report:

Total Sample/total respondents – The 467 male and female heads of households who were interviewed in the City of Shoreline.

Curbside Service Users/service users/participants – The 400 respondents who currently use Waste Management's garbage and recycling services.

Long-time/short-time or newer residents – Long-time residents of Shoreline are defined as heads of households who have been residents of the community for 16 or more years; short-time or newer residents have lived in the community for less than 16 years.

Additional cross-tabulations are available in the Detailed Tabulations on file at the City of Shoreline, including:

Service users/non-users

Very satisfied/less than very satisfied customers

Under 55/55 years and older

Recycling participants/non-participants

Single family/multi-family residents

Children under 18 in household/no children

ZIP Codes: 98133/98155/98177

The Detailed Survey Results include tables that document the information contained in each section. Individual responses to the open-end questions and a copy of the survey questionnaire are in the Appendix.

Detailed Survey Tabulations, which include the cross-tabulations identified above, are in a separate, bound volume at the City of Shoreline.

OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESULTS

Eighty-six percent (86%) of Shoreline residents currently purchase curbside garbage and recycling services; 14% live in apartments or take care of disposing of the trash and recyclables on their own.

Shoreline residents are generally satisfied with the curbside and recycling services they currently receive. Most of those who use the service recycle, and have largely selfless reasons for doing so. Those who are not purchasing the yard waste service have no need for the service, compost it on their own property or arrange to have someone else haul it away.

A high proportion (42%) of curbside service users participate in the City's recycling events.

The annual spring cleanup curbside collection was seen as the most important alternative service by a majority (51%) of the respondents. A majority of those who rate a spring cleanup collection as important say they are willing to pay \$1 or more additional dollars per month to receive the service.

Those who have lived in the Shoreline community for a longer period (16 or more years compared to those who have lived in Shoreline for 15 years or less) are more likely to subscribe to curbside garbage and recycling services, participate in city recycling events and be satisfied with the service they are receiving. Short-time residents are more likely to need more help with information about the services, to live in a household with three or more people, and are more likely to live in a household where a language other than English is spoken.

MAJOR THEMES

Curbside service subscribers:

- Nearly all (96%) of those who use curbside services are satisfied with the service they receive, and 63% say they are "Very satisfied."
- Most service users (69%) purchase both garbage collection and yard waste pickup services. However, 30% use only garbage and 1% buy just yard waste pickup services.
- Most of those who do not purchase yard waste service have little or no yard waste to haul away (38%), compost it on their own property (21%), have it hauled away by a gardener or yard service (12%), or take it to a transfer site (12%).

Sources of information:

- Waste Management is the primary source for learning about curbside services. Nearly half (46%) of those surveyed say that they contact the company or receive information or a calendar that gives them information. A much smaller proportion of users get information from the City newsletter, the City website, or by calling the City.

Recycling:

- Nearly all (92%) of those who purchase curbside services say they placed some recyclables out for pickup in the month prior to the survey.
- A high proportion (42%) participates in City of Shoreline recycling events.
- People recycle because:
 - It's good for the environment (48%);

- It's the right thing to do (35%);
 - There is less garbage and waste to throw away (25%);
 - There is less garbage going to a landfill (12%);
 - It's easy and convenient to do (7%).
- Nearly half (47%) of the users believe they are doing all the recycling they can right now. The few who offered ideas to encourage more recycling suggested:
 - Being able to recycle more types of materials;
 - Having some monetary incentive to recycle;
 - Receiving more information about how and what to recycle.

Additional services wanted:

- Of three suggestions for service improvements, only one – annual curbside spring cleanup collection – was rated as important (receiving a 5 or 4 rating on a 5-point scale) by a slim majority (51%) of the respondents; the other two suggestions – weekly yard waste and debris collection and weekly recycling collection - were each given high importance ratings by just 20%.
- Of those who gave a high rating to the annual curbside spring cleanup collection, 57% were willing to paying at least \$1 or more per month for this service; 35% were willing to pay \$3 or more per month for the additional service.

Long-time (16 years or more) vs. short-time (15 years or less) Shoreline residents:

Compared with short-time residents, long-time Shoreline residents are:

- More likely to subscribe to curbside services (90% vs. 80%);
- Less likely to contact Waste Management for information (43% vs. 52%);
- More likely to be "Very satisfied" with yard waste collection (62% vs. 52%);
- More likely to have participated in the City's recycling events (45% vs. 38%);
- Less likely to suggest they recycle because it is good for the environment (43% vs. 53%), but more likely to say it is the right thing to do (40% vs. 31%);
- More likely to live in a single-family residence (94% vs. 79%);
- More likely to own their home (92% vs. 72%);
- More likely to be 55 and over (69% vs. 35%);
- Less likely to live in a household with three or more people (37% vs. 56%);
- Less likely to have children in the household (24% vs. 47%);
- More likely to live in a household where English is the only language (83% vs. 70%).

**DETAILED
SURVEY RESULTS
AND
SUPPORTING TABLES**

CURRENT CURBSIDE COLLECTION SERVICE USERS (TABLE 1)

Current users

Most Shoreline residents are currently purchasing curbside garbage collection services. Of the 467 randomly selected households in the survey, 400, or 86%, currently say they are using the garbage collection and recycling services provided by Waste Management Services for the City of Shoreline.

A significantly higher proportion of the older residents of the city - those who have lived in Shoreline for 16 years or more - are subscribers, compared to those who have lived in Shoreline for less than 16 years (90% vs. 80%).

Satisfaction with curbside services

The great majority (63%) of garbage collection users are "Very satisfied" with the services they are receiving, and an additional 33% are "Somewhat satisfied;" only 4% say they are "Somewhat" or "Very dissatisfied."

While over two-thirds (68%) of the long-time residents say they are "Very satisfied" with curbside services, a smaller proportion of the newer residents (56%) have this opinion.

Sources of information for garbage services

The most frequently mentioned source for information about garbage services is Waste Management. Nearly half (46%) of the respondents say that they hear about what is happening from Waste Management, either through mailings or from the Waste Management Calendar, or they simply call the company. A much smaller proportion of citizens learn about garbage services from the City newsletter (8%), the City website (4%), or by calling the City (3%). Over a third (35%) have no recollection of where they get their information about curbside services.

Waste Management is a greater source of information for the newer, compared with, the long-time residents (52% vs. 43%).

Table 1: Current Curbside Collection Service Users

| Question/ Response | Total Sample | Years in Shoreline | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|
| | | Under 16 | 16 or More |
| | (Base=467) | (Base=224) | (Base=242) |
| Q2. Do you currently have curbside garbage collection services? | | | |
| Yes | 86% | 81% | 90% |
| No | 14 | 19 | 10 |
| Q3. Overall, how satisfied are you with the current garbage and recycling services you are receiving? (Of those receiving services) | (Base=400) | (Base=182) | (Base=217) |
| Very satisfied | 63% | 56% | 68% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 33 | 37 | 29 |
| Somewhat/very dissatisfied | 4 | 7 | 3 |
| Q6. How do you learn about your garbage services? (Multiple, open-end responses; do not add to 100%) (Of those receiving services) | (Base=400) | (Base=182) | (Base=217) |
| Waste Management | 46% | 52% | 43% |
| City newsletter | 8 | 7 | 10 |
| City website | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| Call the City | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Can't recall | 35 | 28 | 41 |
| Other responses; see Appendix | | | |

CURBSIDE COLLECTION SERVICE PATTERNS (TABLE 2)

Services purchased

While over two-thirds (69%) of those purchasing curbside services are using both garbage and yard waste pickup, 30% purchase only garbage pickup, while just 1% have yard waste service only.

Yard waste services

The primary reasons given by those who do not use the yard waste collection service are: they have little or no yard waste and no use for the service (38%); they compost on their property (21%); a yard service/gardener hauls it away (12%); or they self-haul it to a transfer site (12%).

The great majority (87%) of those who purchase yard waste pickup service are satisfied, and most users of this service (57%) say they are "Very satisfied." A small proportion (8%) is "Somewhat dissatisfied," and only 3% are "Very dissatisfied" with the yard waste service; and 2% have no opinion.

| Table 2. Garbage Collection Service Patterns | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Question/ Response | Service Users | Years in Shoreline | |
| | (Base=400) | Under 16 (Base=182) | 16 or More (Base=217) |
| Q4a. Are you subscribing to curbside collection, yard waste collection, or both services? | | | |
| Both services | 69% | 68% | 70% |
| Curbside only | 30 | 30 | 29 |
| Yard waste only | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Not sure | * | 1 | -- |
| Q4b. (Asked of those not subscribing to yard waste collection) Why are you not subscribing to yard waste collection services? (Multiple, open-end responses; do not add to 100%) | (Base=121) | (Base=57) | (Base=63) |
| No use for it/little or no yard waste | 38% | 35% | 41% |
| Compost on property | 21 | 25 | 19 |
| Yard service/gardener hauls away | 12 | 12 | 13 |
| Self-haul to transfer site | 12 | 11 | 13 |
| Don't know | 7 | 11 | 3 |
| Other mentions: See Appendix | | | |
| Q4c.. (Asked of those subscribing to yard waste collection) Overall, how satisfied are you with the yard waste collection service you are receiving? (Multiple, open-end responses; do not add to 100%) | (Base=279) | (Base=125) | (Base=154) |
| Very satisfied | 57% | 52% | 62% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 30 | 33 | 28 |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 8 | 10 | 6 |
| Very dissatisfied | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Not sure | 2 | 3 | * |

*Less than 1%.

PARTICIPATION IN, AND ATTITUDES TOWARD, RECYCLING (TABLE 3)

Participation in recycling

Nearly all (92%, plus 1% who usually do) of the respondents in the survey said they had placed recyclables out for pickup in the month prior to the survey.

In addition, a sizeable portion (42%) has participated in City recycling events.

A slightly higher proportion of long-time, compared with newer, residents went to City recycling events (45% vs. 38%). A few said they tried to participate, but were put off by long lines.

Perceived benefits to recycling

Those who recycle do so for a variety of reasons, but the primary motivators appear to be selfless. Nearly half (48%) say they recycled because, "It's good for the environment;" 35% simply stated, "It's the right thing to do." Other reasons given included: less garbage and waste to throw away (25%); less garbage going to a landfill (12%); and it's easy and convenient to recycle (7%). A few (3%) responded that they believe it is a law or a requirement to recycle.

Only 2% of those surveyed could not think of any response to the question about recycling benefits.

Newer residents appeared to be somewhat more motivated by environmental reasons (53% vs. 43%), while a higher proportion of long-time residents said, "It's the right thing to do" (40% vs. 31% of the newer residents).

Encouraging people to recycle more

When asked what would encourage them to recycle more, nearly half (47%) of the respondents said they were recycling all they could now. Suggestions to encourage more recycling included: being able to recycle more types of materials (9%); receiving some type of monetary incentive to do so (6%); and providing more information about how and what to recycle (5%).

Table 3. Participation in/Attitudes toward Recycling

| Question/ Response | Service Users (Base=400) | Years in Shoreline | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | Under 16 (Base=182) | 16 or More (Base=217) |
| Q5a. Have you placed recyclables out for pickup in the last month? | | | |
| Yes | 92% | 94% | 91% |
| No | 7 | 4 | 8 |
| No, but usually do | 1 | 2 | * |
| Q7. Have you participated in any of the City's recycling events? | | | |
| Yes | 42% | 38% | 45% |
| No | 57 | 61 | 53 |
| I tried but the line was too long | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Q5b. (Asked of those who placed recycling out in the past month) What are the major reasons you currently recycle? (Multiple, open-end responses; do not add to 100%) | (Base=373) | (Base=173) | (Base=199) |
| Good for the environment | 48% | 53% | 43% |
| It's the right thing to do | 35 | 31 | 40 |
| Less garbage/waste to throw out | 25 | 26 | 24 |
| Less garbage going to landfills | 12 | 9 | 14 |
| Easy/convenient to do | 7 | 6 | 8 |
| Believe it is a requirement to do so | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Will lower rates over time | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Can't think of any reasons | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Additional mentions: See Appendix | | | |
| Q8. What, if anything, would encourage you to recycle more? (Multiple, open-end responses; do not add to 100%) | (Base=400) | (Base=182) | (Base=217) |
| Nothing; already doing all I can | 47% | 45% | 49% |
| Ability to recycle more things | 9 | 8 | 10 |
| If City provides monetary incentive | 6 | 7 | 4 |
| More information about recycling | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| Putting kitchen waste with yard waste | 2 | ** | ** |
| Can't think of anything | 24 | 23 | 24 |
| Other suggestions: See Appendix | | | |

* Less than 1%.

** Numbers too small for significance.

RESPONSES TO SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING CURBSIDE SERVICES (TABLES 4 AND 5)

Additional services wanted

Those surveyed were asked to rate the importance of three possible garbage and recycling improvements. Only one – “Annual curbside spring cleanup of large, bulky garden items” – was seen as important by more than half (51%) of the respondents.

Percentage of Respondents Giving 5 or 4 Importance Rating
(Where 5 is “Very Important” and 1 is “Not at all Important”)

- 51% - Annual curbside spring cleanup collection of large, bulky garbage items
- 20% - Weekly yard waste and debris collection, instead of every other week
- 20% - Weekly recycling collection instead of every other week

Willingness to pay for additional services

Those who gave these top importance ratings were then asked how much they would be willing to pay per month for the additional service. Over half (57%) of those who gave the 5 or 4 rating to the annual spring cleanup said they would be willing to pay at least \$1 more per month, and many (35%) were willing to pay \$3 or more per month for this service.

Although the actual number of people who said that a weekly yard waste pickup is important is small (83), most said they would be willing to pay something for the service.

The small number of people who said weekly recycling collection is important, would not be generally inclined to pay for this service.

Table 4. Responses to Alternatives Suggested for Improving Services

Question: "The City of Shoreline is exploring alternatives to improve the current garbage and recycling services for residents. For some of these improvements, curbside collection costs might increase by about 10%. Please tell me how important it is to you to have any of the following additional services, on a 5-point scale, where 5 is "Very important" and 1 is "Not at all important." (List was rotated to eliminate bias.)

| Alternative Suggested for Improving Curbside and Recycling Services (Arranged in order of most important) | Importance of Suggestion Very important-----Not at all important | | | | | Don't Know | Don't Want to Pay More |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|-----|------------|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Annual curbside Spring cleanup collection of large, bulky garbage items | 34% | 17% | 12% | 8% | 23% | 2% | 4% |
| Weekly yard waste and debris collection instead of every other week | 12 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 52 | 3 | 4 |
| Weekly recycling collection instead of every other week | 14 | 6 | 13 | 13 | 51 | * | 3 |

Table 5. Extra Amount Willing to Pay for Service

Question: "I notice you rated _____ as important to you. About how much more per month would you be willing to pay for this additional service?"

| Alternative Rated Important (5 or 4) | Amount person is willing to pay per month for additional service | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Nothing | \$1 to \$2 | \$3 to \$5 | \$6 or more | Don't know |
| Annual curbside Spring cleanup collection of large, bulky garbage items (Base = 202) | 27% | 22% | 18% | 17% | 16% |
| Weekly yard waste and debris collection instead of every other week (Base = 83) | 27 | 7 | 28 | 27 | 11 |
| Weekly recycling collection instead of every other week (Base = 78) | 42 | 4 | 21 | 17 | 17 |

DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS (TABLE 6)

Those living in Shoreline tend to be relatively younger households with children.

Type of residence/own or rent

Most Shoreline residents live in single-family homes (87%); 13% are in multi-family housing. Long-time, compared to short-time, residents are more likely to live in single-family homes (94% vs. 79%).

Eighty-three percent (83%) of those contacted own their homes, while 17% rent. Long-term residents are considerably more likely to be homeowners than those who have lived in Shoreline for 15 years or less (92% vs. 72%).

Age of Head of Household

Over half (52%) of the Shoreline heads of households interviewed are 55 or older; 9% are under 35; 16% are 35 to 44, 23% are 45 to 54; 37% are 55 to 64; and 15% are 65 and older.

Short-time, compared to long-time residents, are younger; 42% vs. 8% are under 45 years of age. Conversely, 69% of the long-time residents compared to just 35% of the short-time residents, are 55 and older.

Number in household

One in five (20%) of those surveyed live in single-person households; 35% have two in the households; 20% have three; and 25% have four or more. Short-time residents are more likely to live in households with two people (40% vs. 30% of the long-term residents), while 58% have three or more household members (compared to just 37% of the short-term residents).

Children in household

Just over a third (35%) of the Shoreline households have children under 18; 17% have one child; and 18% have two or more children. Short-term residents are considerably more likely to be in households with children (47% vs. 34% of the long-term households).

Years as a resident of Shoreline

Some 71% of the residents surveyed have been residents of Shoreline for more than five years; 29% have lived in the community for six to 15 years; 19% for 16 to 25 years; 22% for 26 to 45 years; and 11% for more than 45 years.

Languages spoken in the home

Nearly one-fourth (24%) of the Shoreline households surveyed speak a language, in addition to English, in their homes. Some of the languages spoken include Spanish (6%), German (3%), Chinese, Filipino, French (2% each), and many others.

Short-term, compared to long-term residents are considerably more likely to speak another language in their homes (30% vs. 17%).

ZIP Codes

Respondents were chosen randomly, but relatively proportional to population, within the three ZIP Codes: 98155 (40%); 98133 (36%); and 98177 (24%). A higher proportion of short-time residents live in the 98155 ZIP Code (44% vs. 37%); while there is a higher proportion of long-time residents in the 98177 ZIP Code (27% vs. 19%); about the same proportion live in the 98133 ZIP Code (37% vs. 36%).

Gender of respondent

Interviewers were instructed to obtain a sample with about an even proportion of men and women. Overall, 59% of the respondents were female and 41% were male.

Users vs. Non-users of curbside garbage and recycling collection services

Interviewers were instructed to call households at random until 400 surveys were completed with users of the curbside services. At the time the 400 full surveys had been finished, there were also 67 short-surveys that had been conducted with Shoreline residents who are not currently purchasing curbside services.

Those respondents completing the short survey were asked, "What, if anything, would encourage you to purchase curbside services?" The sample size of 67 is too small to draw statistically significant conclusions; still there were two primary answers to this question: 61% said nothing would encourage them to purchase the services; 25% said they lived in an apartment and there was no curbside service available; a handful suggested providing financial incentives.

Table 6. Demographics of Respondents

| Question/ Response | Total Sample | Years in Shoreline | | Use Collection Services | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | | Under 16 | 16 + | Yes | No |
| | (Base=467) | (Base=224) | (Base=242) | (Base= 400) | (Base=67)* |
| Q12. Type of residence | | | | | |
| Single family | 87% | 79% | 94% | 95% | 40% |
| Multi-family | 13 | 21 | 6 | 5 | 60 |
| Q13. Own or rent | | | | | |
| Own | 83% | 72% | 92% | 88% | 51% |
| Rent | 17 | 28 | 8 | 12 | 49 |
| Q14. Age of respondent | | | | | |
| Under 35 | 9% | 16% | 2% | 9% | 10% |
| 35 to 44 | 16 | 26 | 6 | 15 | 21 |
| 45 to 54 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 25 | 15 |
| 55 to 64 | 37 | 30 | 44 | 38 | 34 |
| 65 and over | 15 | 5 | 25 | 14 | 19 |
| Q15a. Number in household | | | | | |
| One | 20% | 17% | 22% | 16% | 43% |
| Two | 35 | 30 | 40 | 37 | 27 |
| Three | 20 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 18 |
| Four or more | 25 | 37 | 17 | 28 | 12 |
| Q15b. Children under 18 | | | | | |
| None | 65% | 53% | 76% | 64% | 69% |
| One | 17 | 21 | 14 | 17 | 22 |
| Two or more | 18 | 26 | 10 | 19 | 9 |
| Q16. Years as resident of Shoreline | | | | | |
| 5 years or less | 19% | 40% | -- | 17% | 31% |
| 6 to 15 years | 29 | 60 | -- | 28 | 31 |
| 16 to 25 years | 19 | -- | 36% | 21 | 9 |
| 26 to 45 years | 22 | -- | 42 | 23 | 18 |
| 46 years or more | 11 | -- | 22 | 11 | 11 |
| Q17. Languages spoken (Multiple responses) | | | | | |
| English only | 76% | 70% | 83% | 77% | 73% |
| Spanish | 6 | 8 | 5 | ** | ** |
| German | 3 | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Chinese, Filipino, French – 2% each | 6 | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Other languages: See Appendix | | | | | |
| ZIP Code | | | | | |
| 98155 | 40% | 44% | 37% | 40% | 44% |
| 98133 | 36 | 37 | 36 | 35 | 44 |
| 98177 | 24 | 19 | 27 | 25 | 12 |
| Sex of respondent | | | | | |
| Female | 56% | 70% | 83% | 55% | 58% |
| Male | 44 | 30 | 17 | 45 | 42 |

*Sample size is very low; error range is high; ** Numbers too small for significance.

APPENDIX:

**INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO OPEN-END QUESTIONS
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

ADDITIONAL RESPONSES FROM OPEN-END QUESTIONS

(Number of responses, beyond one, shown in parenthesis)

Q.4b. Why are you not subscribing to yard waste collection?

Too expensive (5); don't know about service (2); planning on doing it; I wish I could dispose of the sharp containers for my used needles; I use the neighbor's; containers are too bulky; someone else pays for it; just haven't got it yet; haven't received it yet.

Q.5b. What are the major reasons you currently recycle?

Habit (4); I've always done it (2); to clean house; set a good example for the kids; energy; they closed the dump; not wasteful; I deliver newspapers and have a lot of extras; get rid of yard waste; my daughter came home from school and said we must and we have been doing it ever since.

Q6. How do you learn about your garbage services?

Automatic phone message (5); The Enterprise (3); TV.

Q8. What, if anything, would encourage you to recycle more?

More recycling events (5); knowing it helps protect the environment (4); more frequent pickups (4); if I knew I would make a difference (3); bigger recycling bin (3); a consistent schedule; getting my husband to clean the cans; more recycle bins in the Shoreline area; a recycle bin for indoors; manufacturers using more recyclable materials; more TV ads; if we had a truck; if they picked up the trash they spilled; if they would make sure they emptied the entire can; make it more convenient; charge by the pound; driveway is too long to haul materials down.

Q17. What other languages are spoken in the household?

Japanese (5); Norwegian (5); Italian (4); Korean (3); Vietnamese (2); Urdu (2); Greek (2); Tigrinya(2); Hebrew (2); ASL (2); Haitian; Swedish (2); Amharic (2); Indian; Persian; Dutch; Romanian; Pigniya; Portuguese; French; Tocalic; Arabic; Alba; Hungarian; Albanian; Triug; Polish, Russian; Tagalog; Fujian; Cambodian.

Carolyn Browne Associates
3420 Camano Vista St;
Greenbank, WA 98253
360-222-6820

INTERVIEWER _____
START _____
STOP _____
TOTAL _____
Person Called: _____

Phone: _____

City of Shoreline
Survey of Attitudes toward Curbside services
April 2007

1. Are you a resident of the City of Shoreline?
 - 1 Yes
 - 2 No – TERMINATE POLITELY
2. Do you currently have curbside garbage collection services?
 - 1 Yes
 - 2 Not sure – verify they are receiving curbside collection services
 - 3 No – **SKIP TO QUESTION 11**
3. Overall, how satisfied are you with the current garbage and recycling services you are receiving? Are you:
 - 1 Very satisfied
 - 2 Somewhat satisfied
 - 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
 - 4 Very dissatisfied
 - 5 Not sure/No opinion (DON'T READ)
- 4a. Are you subscribing to curbside collection, yard waste collection or both services?
 - 1 Curbside only
 - 2 Yard waste only)
 - 3 Both) **SKIP TO QUESTION 4c**
- 4b. Why are you NOT subscribing to yardwaste collection services?

- 4c. Overall, how satisfied are you with the yard waste collection service you are receiving? Are you:
 - 1 Very satisfied
 - 2 Somewhat satisfied
 - 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
 - 4 Very dissatisfied
 - 5 Not sure/No opinion (DON'T READ)
- 5a. Have you placed recyclables out for pickup in the last month?
 - 1 Yes
 - 2 No, but usually do (away on trip, etc.)
 - 3 No) **SKIP TO QUESTION 6**

4 Did not know I could/don't know how to do it)

5b. What are the major reasons you currently recycle?

6. How do you learn about your garbage services?

7. Have you participated in any of the City's Recycling Events?

1 Yes

2 No

3 I tried, but the line was too long

4 Wasn't aware this happened

8. What, if anything, would encourage you to recycle more? (DON'T READ; MARK ALL THAT APPLY, PROBE)

9. The City of Shoreline is exploring alternatives to improve the current garbage and recycling services for residents. For some of these improvements, curbside collection costs might increase by about 10%. Please tell me how important it is to you to have any of the following additional services, on a 5-point scale where 5 is "Very important" and 1 is "Not at all important." (ROTATE LIST) First, how about.....

| Alternative | Very important---Not at all important | | | | | Don't Know | Don't Want to Pay More |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | |
| A. Weekly recycling collection, instead of every other week? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| B. Weekly yardwaste and debris collection, instead of every other week? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| C. An annual curbside Spring Cleanup collection of large, bulky garbage items? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 7 |

10. (ASK ONLY ABOUT ITEMS RATED 5 OR 4 IN Q.9) I notice you rated (ABOVE) as important to you. About how much more per month, would you be willing to pay for this additional service? (WRITE "0" LEGIBLY IF PERSON DOES NOT WANT TO PAY)

A. Weekly recycling collection: \$ _____

B. Weekly yard waste collection \$ _____

C. Annual Spring cleanup collection \$ _____

NOTE: SKIP QUESTION 11, IF PERSON IS PURCHASING CURBSIDE SERVICES (SEE Q2).

11. What, if anything, would encourage you to purchase curbside services?

Now I am going to ask a few demographic questions for classification purposes only. Your responses will not be identified with your name.

12. Do you currently reside in a single family home or in a multi-family building?

- 1 Single family
- 2 Multi-family

13. And, do you rent or own your home?

- 1 Rent
- 2 Own

14. What is your age? _____

15a. How many people, including yourself, are in your household? _____
(IF 1, SKIP TO QUESTION 16)

- 15b. How many children under 18 years of age are in your household? _____
16. How many years have you been a resident of Shoreline? _____
17. What languages, other than English, are spoken in your home?
1 None
Other: _____
18. Gender of respondent:
1 Male
2 Female

19. What is your home zip code?

Thank you very much for taking the time to help us with this survey.

Solid Waste Disposal Facilities

Algona Transfer Station

35315 West Valley Highway, Algona

Hours: Mon-Fri: 6:15 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Sat-Sun: 8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Bow Lake Transfer Station

18800 Orillia Rd. S, Tukwila

Hours: Weekdays: Midnight Sun – 7 a.m. Sat

Sat-Sun: 8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Cedar Falls Drop Box

16925 Cedar Falls Rd., SE, North Bend

Hours: Mon, Wed, Fri, Sat, Sun: 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Closed: Tues & Thurs

Enumclaw Transfer Station

1650 Battersby Ave. E., Enumclaw

Hours: Fri-Tues: 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Closed: Wed & Thurs

Factoria Transfer Station

13800 SE 32nd St., Bellevue

Hours: Mon-Fri: 6:15 a.m. – 11:30 p.m.

Sat-Sun: 8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Household Hazardous Waste

Drop-Off: Tues – Sun: 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Houghton Transfer Station

11724 NE 60th St., Kirkland

Hours: Mon-Fri: 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Sat-Sun: 8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Renton Transfer Station

3021 NE 4th St., Renton

Hours: Mon-Fri: 6:30 a.m. – 4 p.m.

Sat-Sun: 8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station

(Formerly "First Northeast")

2300 N. 165th St., Shoreline

NOTE: Station Re-Opens Early 2008 – Call first!

Hours: Mon-Fri: 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Sat-Sun: 8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.



Vashon

**All facilities
are closed on
Thanksgiving,
Christmas, and
New Year's
Day.**



King County

Department of
Natural Resources and Parks
Solid Waste Division
King Street Center, Suite 701
201 S. Jackson St.
Seattle, WA 98104-3855
www.metrokc.gov/dnrps/swd

Skykomish Drop Box

74324 NE Old Cascade Hwy., Skykomish

Daily Summer: 9 a.m. – 6 p.m. (Daylight Savings Time)


Hours: Winter: 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. (Standard Time)

Vashon Transfer Station

18900 Westside Hwy. SW, Vashon

Hours: Mon, Wed, Fri, Sat, Sun: 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Closed: Tues & Thurs



**Secure Your Load
For Safer Roads!**




It's the Law!

New Solid Waste Disposal Rates

Effective January 1, 2008

First increase in nine years

- Efficient and reliable service
- Protection of public health and the environment
- Value for your money



King County

Department of
Natural Resources and Parks
Solid Waste Division


Why are the rates going up?

The rate increase will help finance major capital improvements to the county's aging transfer system infrastructure. Most of the county's solid waste transfer stations were built in the mid-1960s and are operating at or over capacity to keep pace with the nearly one million customer transactions and over one million tons of garbage handled each year.


The rate increase will also pay for increased fuel, equipment, and maintenance costs, and the many programs and services offered by King County Solid Waste Division. Despite having implemented operating efficiencies, the Solid Waste Division can no longer absorb these increased costs or delay needed capital projects. The last rate increase was in January 1999. Even with this latest rate increase, King County's disposal fees remain among the lowest in the region.

This rate increase will affect your curbside garbage collection bill. The impact of this change on the average customer with one-can service will be an increase of \$0.73 per month.

The rate increase is based on projections of solid waste tonnage and the costs to operate the solid waste management system in the upcoming three-year rate period.



Distribution of Forecast Costs 2008-2010



What do your disposal fees pay for?

Here are some of the many programs and services available to county residents and businesses:



- Ten geographically dispersed solid waste transfer facilities, many of which also accept recyclables.
- Waste reduction and recycling programs in your city or community are funded in part by King County grants – such as recycling collection events.
- The award-winning Cedar Hills Regional Landfill – the useful life of which has been extended through operational efficiencies and your recycling efforts.
- A hotline to report illegal dump sites
- Green building resources for homeowners and businesses to increase the efficiency of the energy, water and materials used in residences and commercial buildings.
- Assistance to businesses to expand markets for recycled materials.
- Workshops on environmental stewardship and conservation in schools.
- Assistance with clean up of contaminated sites for reuse and redevelopment.

Solid Waste Disposal Fees – Effective January 1, 2008

| Commodity Types | King County Basic Fee | Moderate Risk Waste Surcharge | WA State Refuse Tax (3.6%) | TOTAL |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Garbage | | | | |
| • Per Ton Fee | \$95.00 | \$3.50 | \$3.55 | \$102.05 |
| • Minimum Fee | \$15.31 | \$1.34 | \$.60 | \$17.25 |
| Separated Yard Waste and Wood Waste for Recycling Only* | | | | |
| • Per Ton Fee | \$82.50 | N/A | N/A | \$82.50 |
| • Minimum Fee | \$13.25 | N/A | N/A | \$13.25 |

Passenger cars (sedans) pay the minimum fee.
Visa and MasterCard (Credit / Debit), Cash and Checks Accepted.

* Separated yard waste and wood waste are accepted for recycling at a limited number of our facilities. At most of our facilities, we lack space for separate yard waste and wood waste collection and it is disposed as garbage at the garbage rate. Call or visit our Web site for information.

For More Information

Solid Waste Division Web site www.metrokc.gov/dnpr/swd
 General Information 206-296-4466, Toll-free: 1-800-325-6165, ext. 6-4466
 24-Hour Recorded Information 206-296-6540
 Household Hazards Line 206-296-4692 Toll-free: 1-888-869-4233
 King County Illegal Dumping Hotline 206-296-SITE (7483), Toll-free: 1-866-431-7483
 Report Unsecured Loads & Litterers 1-866-LITTER-1 (1-866-548-8371)
 Use TTY Relay: 711 for all numbers listed above

Alternate Formats
 Provided Upon Request.
 Call 206-296-4466,
 1-800-325-6165 ext. 6-4466,
 TTY Relay: 711

 **King County**
 Department of
 Natural Resources and Parks
 Solid Waste Division

