

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 RUSSELL E. DAVIES  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Q. WHAT IS YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?

A. My name is Russell E. Davies. 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 Analyst with the  
King County Solid Waste Division (KCSWD). I manage the KCSWD  
waste monitoring program and am responsible for collecting  
and maintaining waste characterization data.

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
TG-940411 T-63v

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

1 Q. HOW LONG HAVE YOU HELD THIS POSITION?

2 A. Since December of 1992.

3  
4 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.

5 A. I have a B.S. in Geography and have completed a masters  
6 thesis and coursework in Environmental Planning from Ohio  
7 University. I also am a third year law student at the  
8 University of Puget Sound.

9  
10 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE SUBJECT MATTER OF DOCKET NO. TG-  
11 940411?

12 A. Yes, I have reviewed King County's Complaint in this matter  
13 as well as King County's Petition for Reconsideration of  
14 Docket #TG-931585.

15  
16 Q. WHAT AREAS WILL YOU ADDRESS IN YOUR TESTIMONY?

17 A. I will address the KCSWD 1990 and 1993 Waste Characterization  
18 Studies and compare the recyclables disposed in the  
19 residential waste streams for these two years.

20  
21 Q. COULD YOU BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY?

22 A. Yes, between 1990 and 1993 the residential disposed waste  
23 stream decreased significantly both in tonnage and in the  
24 amount of recyclable paper disposed. During this same  
25 period, King County and the suburban cities implemented

1 virtually all of the current curbside recycling programs. I  
2 believe that these curbside programs have been a significant  
3 factor in causing the decrease in tonnage disposed and  
4 recyclable paper disposed.  
5

6 **Q. DO YOU OR ANYONE YOU SUPERVISE MANAGE OR MAINTAIN WASTE**  
7 **COMPOSITION DATA FOR KING COUNTY?**

8 **A.** Yes, I was the project manager for the 1993 King County Waste  
9 Characterization Study and currently maintain this data as  
10 part of my job responsibilities. I also maintain the 1990  
11 waste characterization study data. Both these data sources  
12 provide detailed waste composition information for the years  
13 1990 and 1993.  
14

15 **Q. WHAT WAS THE PURPOSE OF THE 1990 and 1993 WASTE**  
16 **CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES?**

17 **A.** These studies were intended to determine what materials are  
18 found in the waste stream, whether these materials were  
19 generated by residential or nonresidential sources, and  
20 generally where they originated in the county. These studies  
21 are used for tracking progress toward our goals and for  
22 facility and program planning.  
23

24 **Q. ARE THE 1990 AND 1993 WASTE CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES**  
25 **COMPARABLE?**

1 A. These two studies have nearly identical material categories.  
2 The exception being how construction, demolition, and land  
3 clearing wastes were defined between the two studies. Also,  
4 the 1990 study uses a much broader generator classification,  
5 but the 1993 classes can be aggregated neatly into the 1990  
6 classes. Consequently, the two studies are very comparable.  
7

8 Q. DO THESE STUDIES DISTINGUISH RECYCLABLE, COMPOSTABLE, AND  
9 NONRECYCLABLE OR NONCOMPOSTABLE MATERIALS?

10 A. These studies sorted the waste stream into nearly seventy  
11 material categories. This detail provides clear and accurate  
12 identification of recyclable, compostable, and  
13 nonrecyclable/compostable materials. Consistent with King  
14 County's waste reduction and recycling goals and definitions,  
15 I would like to note that all compostable material is  
16 recyclable by definition.  
17

18 Q. DO THESE STUDIES IDENTIFY CURBSIDE RESIDENTIAL GENERATORS?

19 A. Yes, in fact, these studies can identify not only curbside  
20 residential waste streams but also what recyclable and  
21 nonrecyclable materials these residential generators have  
22 disposed.  
23  
24  
25

1 Q. IN COMPARING THE 1990 AND 1993 RESIDENTIAL CURBSIDE DISPOSED  
2 WASTE STREAMS, WHAT WAS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT MATERIAL FOUND  
3 IN THE WASTE STREAM?

4 A. As a single material class, paper was the largest component  
5 of the waste stream in both 1990 and 1993. See ~~Ex \_\_\_\_\_ (RED-1)~~  
6 See Ex 64a More precisely, recyclable paper was the  
7 single largest component of the waste stream. ~~See Ex \_\_\_\_\_~~  
8 ~~(RED-1)~~ See Ex 64a

9 Q. DID THESE STUDIES IDENTIFY ANY CHANGE IN THE AMOUNT OF PAPER  
10 FOUND IN THE WASTE STREAM FROM 1990 TO 1993?

11 A. Proportionately, recyclable paper was reduced by 4% overall.  
12 Recyclable paper in the residential curbside waste stream was  
13 reduced by 5% from approximately 29% in 1990 to 24% in 1993.  
14 ~~See Ex \_\_\_\_\_ (RED-1)~~ See Ex 64a Using these percentages,  
15 we estimate that recyclable paper in the waste stream was  
16 reduced 25,926 tons from 1990 to 1993 and that curbside  
17 residential recyclable paper was reduced by ~~30,851~~ 27,493  
18 tons. ~~See Ex \_\_\_\_\_ (RED-1)~~ See Ex 64a

19 Q. IS RECYCLABLE PAPER, AS DEFINED IN THESE STUDIES, COLLECTED  
20 IN CURBSIDE RESIDENTIAL RECYCLING PROGRAMS?

21 A. Yes. Curbside programs collect newsprint, cardboard, and  
22 mixed recyclable waste paper, which includes high and low  
23 grades. Recyclable paper is thus defined as these three  
24 materials.

1 Q. AGAIN COMPARING THE 1990 AND 1993 RESIDENTIAL CURBSIDE  
2 DISPOSED WASTE STREAMS, WHAT WAS THE SECOND MOST SIGNIFICANT  
3 MATERIAL FOUND IN THE WASTE STREAM?

4 A. Wood and yard waste was the second largest component of the  
5 waste stream in both 1990 and 1993. See Ex \_\_\_\_\_ (RED-1) See Ex  
6 64a More precisely, recyclable yard waste was the second  
7 largest component of the waste stream. See Ex \_\_\_\_\_ (RED-1) See  
8 Ex 64a

9 Q. DID THESE STUDIES IDENTIFY ANY CHANGE IN THE AMOUNT OF  
10 RECYCLABLE YARD WASTE FOUND IN THE WASTE STREAM FROM 1990 TO  
11 1993?

12 A. Proportionately, yard waste increased by 1%. And, yard waste  
13 in the residential curbside waste stream increased by less  
14 than 1%. See Ex \_\_\_\_\_ (RED-1) See Ex 64a Using these  
15 percentages, we estimate that yard waste increased by 15,960  
16 tons from 1990 to 1993. Yet, the curbside residential yard  
17 waste decreased by ~~1,687~~ 3,372 tons. See Ex \_\_\_\_\_ (RED-1) See  
18 Ex 64a

19 Q. IS THE RECYCLABLE YARD WASTE YOU HAVE DISCUSSED HERE  
20 COLLECTED IN CURBSIDE RESIDENTIAL RECYCLING PROGRAMS?

21 A. Yes. Yard waste is collected in curbside programs.

22 Q. ARE THERE OTHER SIGNIFICANT MATERIAL CHANGES FROM 1990 TO  
23 1993?

1 A. No significant changes. Recyclable plastics, metals, and  
2 glass are collected by curbside residential recycling  
3 programs, and each of these materials was reduced by  
4 approximately 1,000 to 2,000 tons from 1990 to 1993 in the  
5 curbside residential waste stream. ~~See Ex \_\_\_\_\_ (RED-1)~~ See Ex  
6 64a

7 Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER SIGNIFICANT TONNAGE CHANGES FROM 1990 TO  
8 1993?

9 A. The most significant change is that total disposal increased  
10 by 46,588 tons, yet the curbside residential tonnage  
11 decreased by an estimated 22,772 40,800 tons. ~~See Ex \_\_\_\_\_~~  
12 ~~(RED-1)~~ See Ex 64a Consequently, it appears that the  
13 nonresidential waste stream has continued to grow over this  
14 period. While, the residential waste stream has achieved a  
15 marked reduction.

16 Q. WERE THERE ANY OTHER SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE WASTE  
17 DISPOSAL SYSTEM FROM 1990 TO 1993?

18 A. Yes, between 1990 and 1993, virtually all of the curbside  
19 residential recycling programs were implemented in King  
20 County and the suburban cities.

21 Q. BASED ON THIS INFORMATION, DO THE TONNAGE OR PERCENTAGE  
22 COMPARISONS BETWEEN 1990 AND 1993 DEMONSTRATE THAT  
23 RESIDENTIAL CURBSIDE RECYCLING PROGRAMS HAVE IMPACTED THE  
24 DISPOSED WASTE STREAMS?

25

1 A. I believe that there is a positive connection that is  
2 supported by the data.

3

4 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

5 A. Yes, this concludes my testimony.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25