

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

KING COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF)
PUBLIC WORKS, SOLID WASTE)
DIVISION,)
Complainant,)
vs.)
SEATTLE DISPOSAL COMPANY,)
RABANCO, LTD., d/b/a/EASTSIDE)
DISPOSAL AND CONTAINER)
HAULING,)
Respondent.)

DOCKET NO. TG-940411
TESTIMONY OF
JEFFREY A. GAISFORD

Q. WHAT IS YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?

A. My name is Jeffrey A. Gaisford. My business address is
King County Solid Waste Division, Room 600, 400 Yesler
Way, Seattle, WA 98104-2637.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by King County as a Program Supervisor in
the Waste Reduction and Recycling (WR/R) Section of the
King County Solid Waste Division (KCSWD). I have worked

1 for the Solid Waste Division for almost 6 years. I am
2 responsible for supervising staff that administer the
3 residential recycling collection programs, pursuant to
4 King County Code 10.18, including collecting and
5 maintaining data on the residential recycling programs
6 in unincorporated King County. My staff is also
7 responsible for: developing and implementing waste
8 reduction and recycling (wr/r) education programs for
9 schools; implementing mass media public education
10 campaigns; and administering wr/r grant programs for
11 cities in King County.

12
13 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.**

14 **A.** I have a Bachelor of Science in Urban Planning from the
15 University of Utah, and a Master of Environmental
16 Planning from Arizona State University.

17
18
19 **Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE SUBJECT MATTER OF WUTC DOCKET NO.**
20 **TG-940411?**

21 **A.** Yes. I have been involved in this matter since Seattle
22 Disposal Co., Rabanco Ltd., d/b/a Eastside Disposal and
23 Container Hauling (Eastside) filed for increased
24 residential garbage and residential recycling rates,
25 WUTC Docket No. TG-931858.

1 Q. WHAT ARE THE AREAS YOU WILL ADDRESS IN THIS TESTIMONY?

2 A. I will address the waste reduction and recycling goals
3 contained in the 1992 King County Comprehensive Solid
4 Waste Management Plan. I will address the effect of
5 price changes for solid waste collection service and the
6 subsequent demand for collection service for residents
7 of unincorporated King County and other King County
8 jurisdictions. I will also address the service
9 territory and number of customers affected by the new
10 rates approved for Eastside Disposal Company in February
11 1994, and the operation of the curbside yard waste
12 collection program in King County.

13
14 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.

15 A. Rate incentives and the availability of recycling
16 services have resulted in a substantial change in the
17 disposal habits of citizens in King County. That is,
18 residents have lowered their levels of garbage service
19 and are recycling more of their waste stream. Based on
20 the data collected for incorporated and unincorporated
21 areas of King County financial incentives do have a
22 direct impact on participation in recycling programs and
23 in the amount of materials diverted from disposal. I
24 will also address the specific questions raised by the
25 WUTC regarding the number of Eastside customers affected

1 by the rate increase, and information regarding the
2 participation in yard waste collection programs and the
3 effect of the curbside yard waste ban.
4

5 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE 1992 KING COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE
6 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN?

7 A. Yes.

8
9 Q. DOES THE 1992 COMP. PLAN CONTAIN WASTE REDUCTION AND
10 RECYCLING GOALS.

11 A. Yes.

12
13 Q. WOULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE THOSE GOALS?

14 A. Yes. King County has a goal to reduce and recycle 65%
15 of its waste stream by the year 2000; interim goals of
16 50% by 1995, and 35% by 1992 have also been set. King
17 County met its 35% goal in 1992 and is well on its way
18 to meeting its other waste reduction goals.
19

20 Q. TO WHAT DO YOU ATTRIBUTE KING COUNTY'S ACHIEVEMENT OF
21 THE 35% GOAL?

22 A. Achieving the 35% goal has primarily been due to the
23 expansion of residential recycling programs county-wide
24 in the last three to four years and the willingness of
25

1 citizens to participate in the recycling programs and
2 reduce their level of garbage service.

3
4 Citizens have been willing to participate in recycling
5 programs for environmental reasons, but also because the
6 recycling services were offered in conjunction with rate
7 structures that rewarded their recycling behavior. That
8 is, those residents who recycle and produce less garbage
9 should pay less than those who do not recycle.

10
11 Q. HAVE YOU LOOKED AT THE EFFECT OF RATE INCENTIVES UPON
12 WASTE REDUCTION AMONG RESIDENTS OF UNINCORPORATED KING
13 COUNTY?

14 A. Yes. As can be seen from the following chart, King
15 County residents have reduced their level of garbage
16 service due to rate incentives and the availability of
17 recycling and yard waste services:

18 Waste Management SnoKing & Rainier (Unincorporated KC
19 customers)

	1991	1993	
	Pre-rate incentives	Post-rate incentives	
	& recycling	& recycling	
	-----	-----	
24	Mini-can	0% n/a	2% 6% <i>all</i>
25	One can	37%	51%

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Two can or
more

~~53%~~
64%⁰

all

42%

As the chart shows, almost 60% of their customers are now mini and one can customers; prior to rate incentives and recycling services over 60% were two can or more customers. This information was obtained from Michael Weinstein, Waste Management.

Q. HAVE YOU EXAMINED WASTE REDUCTION AND RATE INCENTIVES IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS WITHIN KING COUNTY?

A. Yes.

Q. WHAT HAVE YOU FOUND?

A. Seattle noted a decline from 3.5 33-gallon cans per household to 1.7 cans after the implementation of variable rates. Further decline to 1.0 can per household after the implementation of more aggressive rates and a curbside recycling and yard waste program (Source: Variable Rates for Municipal Solid Waste Implementation: Implementation Experiences, Economics & Legislation. Lisa Skumatz, Ph.D., Reason Foundation, June 1993, Policy Study No. 160). See Exhibit ___ (JAG 1).

1 Seattle currently has 93% of its customers with one can
2 or less service: 62% = one can; 25% = mini-can; 6% =
3 micro-can. See Exhibit ___ (JAG 2).
4

5 **Bellevue** has noted similar shifts in garbage service
6 levels over the period that recycling services were
7 initiated and rate incentives put in place. In 1989 89%
8 of Bellevue's single family customers were 2 can or more
9 customers, while only 13% had one can or less. By
10 December 1993, 57% of the city's single family customers
11 had one can service or less and 43% had two can service
12 or more. See Exhibit ___ (JAG 3). The city is also
13 recycling almost 33% of its total waste stream and 61%
14 of its residential waste stream through recycling and
15 yard waste collection programs. See Exhibit ___ (JAG
16 4).
17

18 **Lake Forest Park and Mercer Island** have also seen a
19 dramatic shift in customer service levels. Eastside
20 Disposal provides recycling services to both of these
21 cities.
22

23 **Lake Forest Park.** Prior to the initiation of its contract
24 with Eastside Disposal the overwhelming majority of customers
25

1 used 90-gallon toters. As of December of 1993 (two to three
2 years into the contract) the customer mix is as follows:

3 1 can or less = 53%

4 2 can = 25%

5 3 cans or more = 22%

6 See Exhibit ____ (JAG 5)

7
8 **Mercer Island.** Between mid-1991 and late 1992 (when the
9 city initiated its contract with Eastside Disposal)
10 customer mix changed as follows:

11 Mini-can subscription increased 32%

12 One can subscription decreased 4%

13 32 gallon toter subscription increased 10%

14 Two can subscription decreased 13%

15 60 gallon toter subscription increased by 2%

16 90 gallon toter subscription decreased by 10%

17 See Exhibit ____ (JAG 6).

18
19 **Q. TO WHAT DO YOU ASCRIBE THE CHANGES IN WASTE REDUCTION**
20 **AND RECYCLING IN THESE COMMUNITIES?**

21 **A.** A number of factors may be involved, including education
22 and customers' concern for the environment, but the
23 evidence indicates that customers have responded
24 positively to rate incentives by reducing waste and
25 recycling.

1 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

2 A. The willingness of customers to increase recycling and
3 reduce garbage production is strongly influenced by
4 financial incentives contained in the garbage rate
5 structure. There is good information that suggests
6 financial incentives are an important component in
7 affecting people's changes in behavior. This fact is
8 clear in a couple of instances where the customer does
9 not receive financial incentives for recycling and
10 reducing waste, namely the single family recycling
11 program in the City of SeaTac and in the multi-family
12 collection programs.

13
14 City of SeaTac. The City of SeaTac residents pay an
15 extra charge for recycling. This rate structure
16 provides a disincentive for city residents to recycle.
17 In fact, the City of SeaTac only recycles 3.5% of its
18 residential waste stream, while the average for cities
19 in King County is almost 21%. See Exhibit ___ (JAG 7),
20 which list diversion percentages and tons collected for
21 all cities in King County for 1993; See also, Exhibit
22 ___ (JAG 8), which compares SeaTac diversion and
23 tonnages with other areas of King County.

24

25

1 **Multi-family recycling programs.** The cost of garbage and
2 recycling collection for multi-family complexes in
3 unincorporated King County is paid by the building owner or
4 manager. This is different from single family homes where
5 the residents that put out the garbage and recyclables also
6 pay directly for these services. In short, multi-family
7 residents do not receive a direct financial incentive to
8 recycle by seeing a lower garbage bill as a result of their
9 recycling efforts. Multi-family residents also recycle
10 considerably less than single family residents. The
11 percentage of recyclables diverted from the multi-family
12 waste stream ranges from almost 5% to almost 20% in the
13 unincorporated service areas in King County. In contrast,
14 the percentage of recyclables diverted from the single family
15 waste stream (not including yard waste) ranges from 20% to
16 over 31%. See Exhibit ____ (JAG 9).

17
18 **Q. HAVE YOU LOOKED AT WHAT HAPPENS TO WASTE REDUCTION AND**
19 **RECYCLING RATES WHEN RATE INCENTIVES ARE REMOVED.**

20 **A.** When rate incentives are removed, participation in
21 recycling programs drop. In 1993 the WUTC discontinued
22 allowing universal yard waste fees in Snohomish County,
23 resulting in a separate charge for yard waste service.
24 In King County's original complaint filed with the WUTC
25 regarding Eastside Disposal's rate increases, we

1 included information that showed a large decrease in
2 participation in some yard waste collection programs in
3 Snohomish County since the WUTC's action. Since that
4 time we have received new information from Snohomish
5 County that indicates our initial data was inaccurate.
6 Despite these inaccuracies there has still been a
7 decrease in participation in the yard waste programs in
8 two Snohomish County cities, see Exhibit ____ (JAG 10).
9 There was an initial 6% drop in participation in the
10 City of Edmonds' program, and a 9% drop in the City of
11 Lynnwood's program. When the WUTC discontinued allowing
12 universal yard waste fees in these cities, it was
13 assumed that all residents wanting yard waste services
14 would need to sign up for that service, even if they
15 were already using the service. The decrease in
16 participation in the yard waste programs was minimized
17 by the way the cities handled these new sign-ups. Yard
18 waste customers were required to sign up for yard waste
19 service, but if the disposal company did not hear from
20 the customer, it was assumed that they wanted to
21 continue their yard waste service.

22
23 **Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE SERVICE TERRITORY AND THE**
24 **NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS AFFECTED BY THE RATE INCREASE**
25

1 GRANTED TO EASTSIDE DISPOSAL IN WUTC DOCKET NO. TG-
2 931585?

3 A. Yes. The service territory affected by the rate
4 increase granted to Eastside Disposal in Docket No. TG-
5 931585 is unincorporated urban area 2, as defined by
6 King County Code 10.18, Attachment B, dated March 30,
7 1993. See Exhibit ___ (JAG 11). As of February 1994,
8 the number of single family customers in unincorporated
9 service area 2 was 19,297. See Exhibit ___ (JAG 12).

10
11 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE CURBSIDE YARD WASTE COLLECTION
12 PROGRAM IN UNINCORPORATED KING COUNTY?

13 A. Yes.

14
15 Q. WHAT IS EASTSIDE DISPOSAL COMPANY'S DISPOSAL FEE PER TON
16 OF YARD WASTE?

17 A. This information has not been provided to the Solid Waste
18 Division by Eastside Disposal.

19
20 Q. WHAT IS THE NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS RECEIVING CURBSIDE YARD
21 WASTE COLLECTION IN THE SERVICE TERRITORY AFFECTED BY
22 THE RATE INCREASE GRANTED TO EASTSIDE DISPOSAL IN DOCKET
23 TG-931585?

24 A. As of February 1994 (the most current figures available) 4987
25 single family customers were signed up for yard waste

1 collection service in service area 2. See Exhibit ____ (JAG
2 12). This figure represents almost 26% of the total number
3 of customers in service area 2. See Exhibit ____ (JAG 12).
4

5 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE KING COUNTY BAN ON THE
6 DISPOSAL OF YARD DEBRIS IN THE MIXED WASTE STREAM THAT
7 IS CURRENTLY IN EFFECT?

8 A. Yes.
9

10 Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF DOCUMENTED INCIDENTS IN WHICH SOLID WASTE
11 CUSTOMERS AND SELF-HAULERS WHO ARE NOT REGISTERED FOR
12 CURBSIDE YARD WASTE COLLECTION HAVE PUT YARD WASTE IN THE
13 MIXED MUNICIPAL WASTE STREAM IN VIOLATION OF THE BAN?
14

15 A. Self-haulers are not registered for curbside yard waste
16 collection and are not affected by the ban because the ban
17 affects only garbage collected at the curb. Currently, self-
18 haulers can bring yard waste mixed with municipal solid waste
19 to King County transfer stations. King County plans to
20 prohibit the disposal of yard waste mixed with municipal
21 solid waste at its facilities in 1996. Information regarding
22 documented violations of the curbside ban has not been
23 provided by Eastside Disposal. Pursuant to KCC 10.18, as
24 amended by King County Ordinance 10942 (July 23, 1992), the
25 certificated haulers may be required upon the request of the

1 Solid Waste Division, to provide the number of customers that
2 received notification tags on refuse containers because they
3 contained yard waste. Other haulers serving unincorporated
4 King County provided some information on the number of tags
5 placed on containers of yard waste mixed with garbage. These
6 ranged from approximately 50 tags/month in one service area
7 to over 2900 tags/month in another service area. See Exhibit
8 ____ (JAG 13).

9
10 Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF DATA REGARDING ANY CHANGES IN THE BEHAVIOR
11 OF RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS WHICH ARE DOCUMENTED SINCE THE
12 COUNTY BANNED THE DISPOSAL OF YARD DEBRIS IN THE MIXED WASTE
13 STREAM, AND ANY SIMILAR DATA SINCE ADOPTION OF THE RATE
14 CHANGE APPROVED IN WUTC DOCKET NO. TG-931585?

15
16 A. King County has seen a large increase in participation in our
17 yard waste collection program since the curbside ban went
18 into effect. Exhibit ____ (JAG 14) summarizes the number of
19 customers signed up for yard waste collection services for
20 all unincorporated service areas in King County from January
21 1993 - February 1994. In January 1993 participation rates
22 ranged from 7% - 18%. By February 1994 participation rates
23 ranged from 12% - 36% (not including new rural service
24 areas). We do not yet have data for the months following the
25 rate change approved in Docket No. TG-931585.

1 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

2 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TESTIMONY OF
JEFFREY A. GAISFORD - 15
WUTC\Gaisford.tes

Norm Maleng
Prosecuting Attorney
CIVIL DIVISION
E550 King County Courthouse
Seattle, Washington 98104-2312
(206) 296-9015
FAX (206) 296-0191