

At Workshop 1, people asked for some information that was not readily available and at the end of the workshop some turned in cards with questions or comments. Information is provided below in response to specific questions and requests and to further explain topics presented at the workshop. Information related to some topics, including some cost information, will not be available until workshops 2 and 3.

- * *Historical recycling rates for the last 10 years, for single-family, multifamily, and total (single-family, multifamily, self-haul and non-residential):*

King County Recycling Rates
 2003 - 2012

Year	Single Family	Multifamily	Total	
2003	49%	n/a	40%	(1)
2004	51%	n/a	44%	(1)
2005	51%	n/a	44%	(1)
2006	53%	10%	44%	
2007	54%	10%	47%	
2008	55%	10%	48%	
2009	54%	10%	48%	
2010	54%	11%	50%	
2011	55%	12%	52%	
2012	56%	13%	n/a	(2)

(1) Multifamily data incomplete prior to 2006

(2) Data from Department of Ecology survey not available until Jan. 2014

- * *The average King County system recycling rate without cities that have not signed an extended ILA (Bellevue, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Medina, and Yarrow Point):*
 - Single family rate decreases from 56 to 55 percent
 - Multifamily rate decreases from 13 to 12 percent
 - The commercial rate and overall rate are not available by city
- *Would lowering the recycling goal from 70 percent impact the overall transfer system plan?*
 Lowering the 70 percent goal would not change the overall transfer system plan.
- * *Does transfer station recycling compete with private recycling efforts?*
 Recyclables collected at the transfer stations flow to the private recyclers – the efforts are complementary.
- *The percentage of garbage that is from multifamily:*
 In 2012, the percentage of garbage from multifamily residences was 15 percent.
- *Self-haul data by day of week:*
 See charts at the end of this document.
- *What about the Vashon and Enumclaw transfer stations?*
 The rural facilities were not part of the Transfer Plan and are outside the scope of this review.

* *Does having mandatory curbside collection affect transfer system needs?*

There is no evidence that having mandatory garbage collection throughout King County would affect the overall transfer system needs. The data shows that the majority of self-haulers are not using the transfer system to dispose of garbage that could normally be collected curbside. Residents of cities with mandatory collection make up large percentages of the self-haulers at the Algona, Bow Lake and Houghton Transfer Stations.

Mandatory curbside recycling would eliminate the need for collecting the curbside recycling mix at transfer stations, reducing cost and reserving space for bulky recyclable materials, such as scrap metal, carpet, and mattresses.

* *How much space is needed to add compaction at a site?*

Preload compactors could not be accommodated at the Renton or Algona transfer stations as there would be insufficient space for trailers to back-up to a compactor for loading; at least 200 feet of space is needed in front of the compactor to allow for maneuvering. Creating sufficient space is not feasible as it would require construction into sensitive and steep slope areas, and would cross onto neighboring properties. The drawings [compactor Algona](#), [compactor Renton](#), and [compactor Renton profile](#), depict installation of pre-load compactors at these sites, including distances required for trailer maneuvering and where crossing onto neighboring properties would be required.

There is sufficient space at Houghton to install one pre-load compactor. However, modification of the tipping floor would be required to allow loading of waste into the compactor. Such modification would result in a smaller tipping floor where only one commercial truck or five self-haul vehicles could dump at a time. The current configuration at Houghton allows four commercial trucks to dump while eight self-haul vehicles dump simultaneously.

This topic was covered in depth in [Appendix E to the Fourth Milestone Report](#) of the 2006 Transfer System Plan.

* *The foremost benefit(s) to the transfer system for waste compaction:*

Compaction reduces truck trips from transfer stations to disposal, which directly reduces hauling cost, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic.

* *Options related to waste-to-energy related to the transfer system:*

This will be addressed at Workshop 2.

* *What drives the cost of a constructing a transfer station?*

This will be addressed at Workshop 2.

* *Overall process—SWD facilitated versus independent process:*

[Ordinance 17619](#) directs the division to complete a review and report on the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan.

* *Density should be a factor in transfer station siting:*

We will consider density during siting processes.

- * *Has there been any discussion, or will there be any discussion about alternatives to publicly-owned transfer stations (namely private transfer stations, such as those that already exist for recycling)?*

That topic was covered in the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan, but is outside the scope of this review.

- * *What “regional decisions” increased costs? How were they evaluated?*

The regional decision process is described in the [2011 King County Auditor Performance Audit](#).

- * *Are some stations magnets for self-haul (comparing Bow Lake and Shoreline)?*

Data shows that Bow Lake receives relatively equal percentages of the system-wide tons and transactions (32 percent tons compared to 25 percent transactions) while at Shoreline, nearly half as many tons versus transactions are received (6 percent tons compared to 11 percent transactions).

Supportive of the “self-haul magnet” statement, Shoreline's transactions are 94 percent from self-haulers while Bow Lake's transactions are 77 percent from self-haulers. These percentages strongly reflect the respective locations of these facilities—Shoreline is located in a largely residential area while Bow Lake is located in an industrial center.

Viewed differently, though, Bow Lake's tons are predominantly from commercial customers (81 percent compared to Shoreline's tons, which are nearly equally commercial versus self-haul (52 percent commercial compared to 48 percent self-haul). This near 50-50 split at Shoreline indicates that it strongly serves each of the two customer types in the system and is needed equally by both commercial and self-haul customers.

- * *Cost of replacing the Factoria roof today versus the Houghton roof several years ago:*

The cost for raising and strengthening the roof at Houghton in 2011 was \$1.5 million with tax. In addition, the project also included construction of a sound wall, improved transfer trailer parking, a new wastewater detention vault, improvement of traffic control pavement markings, and frontage improvement along NE 60th Street which added \$1.3 million with tax in costs for total project cost of \$2.8 million with tax.

The cost for replacing the roof at Factoria is estimated at \$3.9 million with tax (2013\$). In addition to replacing the roof, other repairs would be needed to keep the facility operating including HHW improvement, wastewater system improvements, and tipping floor, scale, and pavement repairs at an added \$1.6 million with tax (2013\$).

- * *Transfer station repair and maintenance costs for past five years:*

Facility	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Algona	\$ 31,543	\$ 48,306	\$ 135,198	\$ 34,798	\$ 30,888
Factoria	\$ 68,724	\$ 73,251	\$ 38,517	\$ 55,876	\$ 128,293
Houghton*	\$ 60,916	\$ 86,222	\$ 72,171	\$ 156,813	\$ 54,134
Renton	\$ 18,794	\$ 60,753	\$ 16,088	\$ 74,641	\$ 33,024

* Does not include roof raising and mitigation project discussed above.











