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| **Agenda Item:** | 6 | **Name:** | Terra Rose |
| **Proposed No.:** | 2021-0449 | **Date:** | March 9, 2022 |

**SUBJECT**

Proposed Ordinance 2021-0449 would restructure how the Solid Waste Division collects revenues that are generated by commercial haulers depositing waste at County facilities.

**SUMMARY**

The County's solid waste system is currently supported by fees that are approved by the Council and are primarily based on the weight of waste being disposed. Under this fee structure, the amount of revenue generated for the Solid Waste Division (SWD) fluctuates year to year depending on the tons of disposed material received by the County. Executive staff indicate that this fee structure is at odds with the County's goal to achieve zero waste of resources[[1]](#footnote-1) by 2030 because as the County diverts more waste from disposal through prevention and recycling efforts, less revenues are generated than if the diverted materials had been disposed. SWD is in the process of finalizing the Re+ Plan[[2]](#footnote-2) that will outline the steps needed to make progress towards the zero waste goal. Executive staff further note that many SWD expenditures, such as debt service for current and completed capital projects, are fixed regardless of the amount of solid waste tonnage received by the County, which sets up the possibility of revenue gaps when tonnage significantly declines.

Proposed Ordinance 2021-0449 would, beginning in 2023, restructure how SWD collects revenues that are generated by commercial haulers depositing waste in the County system. Specifically, the proposed ordinance would: 1) introduce a fixed fee referred to as the *fixed-annual charge (FAC)*, which is the total dollar amount that SWD would collect annually from *billing entities* -- either commercial haulers or cities that bill curbside customers directly; and 2) reduce the weight-based fee charged to commercial haulers from the current $154.02 per ton to $123.82 per ton. Under the proposed ordinance, each billing entity would pay a share of the FAC for each distinct service area it serves that is based on the percentage of tons that service area contributed to the total commercially-hauled tons the County received in the most recent calendar year for which data is available. The proposed ordinance sets the FAC at $19.7 million in 2023 until changed by ordinance. According to Executive staff, moving to this mix of fixed and variable fees would help to mitigate the loss of revenue that occurs when tonnage declines.

To implement the fee restructure, the narrative accompanying the proposed ordinance (Attachment A) indicates that some cities and haulers will likely be required to update the terms of their collection and billing contracts, as well as update their associated billing systems. Executive staff are seeking action on the proposed ordinance early in 2022 such that cities and haulers have at least nine months lead time between when the new fee structure is adopted by the Council and the first bills are sent to customers.

Because it is ultimately up to the city and hauler to decide how the FAC will be passed on to curbside customers, Executive staff indicate that at this point it is not possible to know the ultimate impact of the proposed ordinance on curbside customers.

Both solid waste advisory committees provided input in the development of the fee restructure proposal and provided advisory notes in support of the fee restructure proposal.

The Budget and Fiscal Management Committee received a briefing on PO 2021-0449 on February 23, 2022.

**BACKGROUND**

**Regional Solid Waste System Overview and Finances.** The King County Solid Waste Division (SWD) is responsible with providing solid waste planning, management, transfer, and disposal services through 2040 for 37 partner cities that have signed interlocal agreements (ILAs), a service area which encompasses approximately 1.5 million people.[[3]](#footnote-3) SWD operates eight transfer stations and two drop boxes distributed throughout the region, the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill, and waste prevention and recycling programs for the unincorporated area and partner cities.

Under the ILAs and state law,[[4]](#footnote-4) the partner cities manage solid waste handling within their jurisdictions. Most cities contract with a commercial hauler for curbside collection service within the city limits and these haulers are referred to in King County Code as a *contract hauler*.[[5]](#footnote-5) Cities also may do their own waste collection with municipal employees. In the unincorporated area and in cities that have opted not to use their contracting authority for collection services, curbside services are provided by commercial haulers operating under certificates issued by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC). These haulers are referred to in King County Code as a *certificated hauler*.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The County receives the solid waste at its transfer stations and drop boxes from commercial haulers such as certificated and contract haulers, as well as self-haul customers. These waste loads are consolidated, transferred onto trailers, and transported by truck by the County to the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill in unincorporated Maple Valley, which is owned and operated by King County.

Executive staff indicate that the County then sends disposal invoices each month to the city or hauler, depending on the entity responsible for billing customers directly, for the tons of waste a hauler brings from an individual city or unincorporated area to either a County-operated transfer station or directly to the landfill. Haulers then pass those charges through to curbside customers in their monthly bill. Table 1 summarizes the potential collection and billing arrangements for both cities and the unincorporated areas.

**Table 1.**

**Potential Collection and Billing Arrangements for Cities and the Unincorporated Area in the County's Solid Waste System**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **City or Unincorporated Area** | **Potential Providers of Curbside Collection Services** | **Entity Responsible for Billing Curbside Customers** |
| **City** | **Contract Hauler.** City contracts with commercial hauler that provides service. | Contract Hauler or City |
| **Certificated Hauler.** City opts not to use contracting authority and service is provided by commercial haulers operating under certificates issued by the state UTC. | Certificated Hauler |
| **Municipal Hauler.** City provides service with own employees. | City |
| **Unincorporated Area** | **Certificated Hauler.** Service is provided by commercial haulers operating under certificates issued by the state UTC. | Certificated Hauler |

*Solid Waste System Fees.* SWD is an enterprise fund[[7]](#footnote-7) agency currently supported by a variety of fees that are approved by the Council and that vary based on the type of material collected (e.g., solid waste, yard waste), the type of customer vehicle (e.g., certain vehicles pay a flat fee versus the per-ton fee), and the facility receiving the material (e.g., facilities with/without scales). Customers who come to a King County solid waste facility are required to show proof they live or do business within the County's service area, which excludes the cities of Seattle and Milton.

Table 2 lists the current Council-adopted fees for most materials that went into effect on January 1, 2022.[[8]](#footnote-8)

**Table 2.**

**Current Council-Adopted Solid Waste Fees**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Facility Type** | **Material Type** | **Customer Type** | **Current Fee** |
| **Fees for use of solid waste facilities with scales, except Cedar Hills** | **Solid Waste** | Fixed-rate vehicles[[9]](#footnote-9)  (e.g., hatchback or sedan) | $24.64 per entry |
| Per-ton-rate vehicles  (e.g., minivans, wagons, SUVs, trucks)[[10]](#footnote-10) | $154.02 per ton |
| Charitable organizations | $118.60 per ton |
| Minimum (less than 320 lbs.) | $24.64 per vehicle |
| Charitable organizations - minimum charge | $18.89 per entry |
| **Source-separated yard waste, clean wood waste, or any combination** | Fixed-rate vehicles | $16.00 per entry |
| Per-ton rate vehicles | $100.00 per ton |
| Minimum (less than 320 lbs.) | $16.00 per vehicle |
| **Major appliances (formerly referred to in past fee ordinances as “white goods”)** | Major appliances with refrigerants (formerly “White goods” with refrigerants) | $30.00 per unit |
| **Mattresses** | Fixed-rate vehicles and per-ton-rate vehicles | $30.00 per unit |
| **Fees for use of solid waste facilities without scales**  **(based on cubic yard or fraction thereof)** | **Solid Waste** | Fixed-rate vehicles | $24.64 per entry |
| Per-ton-rate vehicles | Compacted: $44.67 per cubic yard  Uncompacted: $24.18 per vehicle |
| Minimum (less than 320 lbs.) | $26.64 per vehicle |
| **Source-separated yard waste, clean wood waste, or any combination** | Fixed-rate vehicles | $16.00 per entry |
| Per-ton-rate vehicles | Compacted: $29.00 per cubic yard  Uncompacted: $17.00 per cubic yard |
| Minimum (less than 320 lbs.) | $16.00 per vehicle |
| **Fees at Cedar Hills Regional Landfill** | | Regional direct | $131.00 per ton |
| Per-ton-rate vehicles | $154.02 per ton |
| Per-ton-mattresses | $1,090.00 per ton |

**Executive Rationale for Fee Restructure.** Executive staff indicate that, under the current fee structure, solid waste system revenues are highly dependent on the tonnage of waste received, citing that approximately 90 percent of system revenues come from weight-based fees charged to dispose of waste at solid waste facilities. Executive staff indicate they describe these as a variable revenue source because the number of tons the solid waste system receives can fluctuate from year to year. They further note that many SWD expenditures, such as debt service for current and completed capital projects, are fixed regardless of the amount of solid waste tonnage collected annually.

Additionally, the narrative accompanying the proposed ordinance (Attachment A) emphasizes that the current fee structure is at odds with the County's environmental goals, in particular the goal to achieve zero waste of resources by 2030 with an interim goal of a 70 percent recycling rate.[[11]](#footnote-11) Executive staff highlight that as SWD takes further recycling and waste prevention steps to be outlined in the forthcoming RE+ Plan,[[12]](#footnote-12) more tonnage may be diverted from disposal resulting in less revenue to SWD than if the materials had been disposed. Executive staff indicate, for example, that if disposal tonnage decreases from 870,000 tons to 350,000, which is equal to a 60 percent reduction, the weight-based fee would need to increase to $350 per ton to generate the same amount of revenue needed to continue existing services.

Given these factors, Executive staff seek to diversify the revenue stream with the proposed ordinance such that part of the revenue is from fixed sources that change very little over a specified time horizon because they are based on more stable factors.

**Fee Restructure Proposal Development.** SWD engaged with a local consultant specializing in public utility fee design, FCS Group, to complete a cost-of-service fee study with a multi-year financial forecast, as well as evaluate and propose options for restructuring the fees so they are less dependent on landfill tons. The full FCS Group report is included in Attachment A to the proposed ordinance.

For the cost-of-service fee study, FCS Group determined how different customer types (e.g., contract haulers, self-haul customers) use the system in different ways and therefore impose different costs on the system. For example, commercial transfer station customers move more quickly through the scale house due to automated billing and spend less time on the tipping floor than self-haul customers. However, they also account for more tonnage, and therefore require more County transfer drivers to haul the material from the transfer station to the landfill. The consultant recommended focusing on the commercial customer class revenue stream for the fee restructure because it represents the single largest revenue stream for SWD and therefore has the greatest potential for stabilizing revenue.

Executive staff indicate that SWD also convened a Rate Restructure Task Force comprised of subject matter experts, stakeholders, an interested community members to review options and provide feedback on elements of the restructure.

The narrative accompanying the proposed ordinance states that SWD, with input from the Rate Restructure Task Force and the consultant, identified five key objectives for the restructure, which are summarized below:

1. *Improve Rate Stability*: Maintain existing services while avoiding large fee increases caused by decreasing tonnage;
2. *Revenue Neutrality*: Generate the same amount of revenue that would be collected under the status quo fee structure, but in a more stable and sustainable way;
3. *Maintain**Intraclass Cost Equity:* Maintain cost equity between customers who use the County system in similar ways such that customers within the same class of service face uniformly applied charges;
4. *Preserve Intercity Cost Equity:* Avoid shifts in disposal costs between cities;
5. *Incentives:* Preserve the existing incentives for cities and their residents and businesses to reduce waste and recycle or compost more, thereby helping the County meet its waste reduction goals.

Additionally, SWD also sought input from the two solid waste advisory committees. According to Executive staff, six meetings were held with each the Metropolitan Solid Waste (Management) Advisory Committee and with the Solid Waste Advisory Committee in 2021. Of the fee restructure options considered, Executive staff note that the fixed-annual charge, which is what is proposed by the ordinance, was identified as the preferred option by the two advisory committees and that the majority of the membership present at the September meetings voiced support or stated their neutrality. Advisory notes in support of the solid waste fee restructure proposal from both committees are provided as Attachments 5 and 6 to this staff report.

The Budget and Fiscal Management Committee received a briefing on PO 2021-0449 on February 23, 2022.

**ANALYSIS**

Proposed Ordinance 2021-0449 would, beginning in 2023, restructure how SWD collects revenues that are generated by commercial haulers depositing waste in the County system. Specifically, the proposed ordinance would: 1) introduce a fixed fee referred to as the *fixed-annual charge (FAC)* that would not change based on system tons disposed; and 2) reduce the weight-based fee charged to commercial haulers from the current $154.02 per ton to $123.82 per ton. According to Executive staff, moving to a mix of fixed and variable fees would help to mitigate the loss of revenue that occurs when tonnage declines.

**Fixed-Annual Charge.** As noted above, the proposed ordinance would introduce in 2023 a fixed-annual charge (FAC), which is the amount SWD would collect annually and collectively from *billing entities* -- either commercial haulers or cities that bill curbside customers directly -- to recover a portion of the costs of the Division's non-disposal activities.

Executive staff indicate that a fixed-annual charge arrangement is not used in any other solid waste system in Washington state, however noted that the following regional wholesale public utilities assess fixed charges or use rate structures that are not dependent on actual metered use of utility services: Bonneville Power Administration (electric); Cascade Water Alliance (water); Discovery Clean Water Alliance (wastewater); Oregon Metro (solid waste).

*How the FAC Amount was Derived.* The proposed ordinance would set the FAC at approximately $19.7 million for 2023 and until changed in the future by ordinance. According to the narrative accompanying the proposed ordinance, the FAC is based on the consultant cost-of-service analysis, and specifically is the estimate of the non-disposal-related portion of the commercial customer class cost of service, which includes the zero waste of resources work (now known as the Re+ program), regional planning, and regulatory compliance work. Using financial information for 2022, the commercial customer class share of these non-disposal-related costs is estimated at approximately $19.7 million.

Executive staff expect to update the basis for the FAC every three to five years or whenever the Division makes significant changes in the cost structure of Division services. They further anticipate that the basis for the fixed-annual cost may change over time and not always be tied only to the non-disposal portion of the customer class costs. According to Executive staff, however, the amount of the FAC is expected to change year over year with updated financials.

*Implementation of the FAC.* Under the proposed ordinance, each billing entity -- either the city or hauler -- would pay a share of the FAC, for each service area it serves, that is based on the percentage of tons that service area contributed to the total commercially-hauled tons the County received in the most recent calendar year for which data is available.[[13]](#footnote-13) *Service area* in the proposed ordinance is defined as "a city or unincorporated area serviced by a commercial hauler" and the ordinance notes that a commercial hauler may provide service to more than one service area and that each service area remains distinct even if serviced by the same commercial hauler.

Executive staff expect to provide the billing entity with a monthly disposal invoice that would include both the share of the FAC and the fee for the tons of waste a hauler brought from an individual city or unincorporated area to a County solid waste facility. According to Executive staff, the process of SWD invoicing the billing entities and not curbside customers would remain the same under the proposed ordinance.

Table 3 graphically depicts the status quo fee structure for billing entities compared to the structure proposed by the ordinance, as well as provides an illustrative example. Additional information about the proposed reduction to the weight-based fee is discussed later in this staff report.

**Table 3.**

**Fee Structure for Commercially-Hauled Tons -- Current vs. Proposed**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **For Commercially-Hauled Tons, Billing Entities Currently Pay** | **Under PO 2021-0449, For Commercially-Hauled Tons, Billing Entities Would Pay** |
| **Variable Fee** (weight-based)  Per-ton-rate fee: **$154.02 per ton**  X  tons | **Variable Fee** (weight-based)  Per-ton-rate fee: **$123.82 per ton**  ANDD  **Fixed Fee** (non-weight-based)  Proportional share of fixed-annual charge |
| **Example:** Republic Services currently has a contract with the City of Bellevue to provide curbside collection services to residents and businesses/institutions and bills those customers directly.  Each month, SWD sends Republic Services a disposal invoice for the tons of waste it brings from Bellevue to the transfer stations using the per-ton-rate fee of **$154.02 per ton**. | **Example:** Under the proposed restructure, Republic Services would receive a monthly invoice from SWD, but there would be two components to the invoice:   1. The **variable component**, which would cover the tons of waste Republic Services brings from Bellevue to the transfer stations using the per-ton-rate fee of **$123.82 per ton**; and 2. The **fixed component,** which would be Republic Services' proportional share of the fixed-annual charge for Bellevue. For example, if Bellevue residents, businesses, and institutions generated 10 percent of all commercially-hauled tons in the most recent calendar year for which data is available, its billing entity -- in this case, Republic Services -- would be billed 10 percent of the FAC, or approximately $1.97 million, over the course of the year. |

**Variable (Weight-based) Fees.** Under the proposed ordinance, the weight-based fee charged to commercial haulers would be reduced from $154.02 to $123.82 per ton. In addition, the proposed ordinance would also modestly reduce solid waste disposal fees for other types of users. Table 4 lists all the fees proposed to be changed by the ordinance compared to the current adopted fees.

**Table 4.**

**Solid Waste Fees Proposed by PO 2021-0449**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Facility Type** | **Material Type** | **Customer Type** | **Current Fee** | **Fee Proposed by PO 2021-0449** |
| **Fees for use of solid waste facilities with scales, except Cedar Hills** | **Solid Waste** | Fixed-rate vehicles[[14]](#footnote-14)  (e.g., hatchback or sedan) | $24.64 per entry | $24.54 per entry |
| Per-ton-rate vehicles  (e.g., minivans, wagons, SUVs, trucks)[[15]](#footnote-15) | $154.02 per ton | Commercial hauler: $123.82 per ton |
| Self-hauler:  $153.37 per ton |
| Charitable organizations | $118.60 per ton | $118.09 per ton |
| Minimum (less than 320 lbs.) | $24.64 per vehicle | $24.54 per entry |
| Charitable organizations - minimum charge | $18.89 per entry | $18.90 per entry |
| **Fees for use of solid waste facilities without scales**  **(based on cubic yard or fraction thereof)** | **Solid Waste** | Fixed-rate vehicles | $24.64 per entry | $24.54 per entry |
| Per-ton-rate vehicles | Compacted: $44.67 per cubic yard  Uncompacted: $26.18 per vehicle | Compacted: $44.48 per cubic yard  Uncompacted: $26.07 per vehicle |
| Minimum (less than 320 lbs.) | $24.64 per vehicle | $24.54 per vehicle |
| **Fees at Cedar Hills Regional Landfill** | | Per-ton-rate vehicles | $154.02 per ton | Commercial hauler: $123.82 per ton |
| Self-hauler:  $153.37 per ton |

*How the Updated Fees were Derived.* According to the narrative accompanying the proposed ordinance, the consultant cost-of-service analysis determined that providing service to transfer station commercial customers costs the County approximately $100 million each year. Therefore, Executive staff indicate that the amount of the FAC and the revenue generated from the weight-based fee on commercially-hauled tons should equal the total cost of providing disposal services to that customer class. Subtracting the FAC amount ($19.7 million) from the estimated costs of service ($100 million) yields approximately $80 million in costs that would need to be generated by the weight-based fee. Executive staff then assumed 650,000 tons of commercial waste annually from which to recover the $80 million and estimated that a $123.82 per ton fee would be needed to generate sufficient revenue (compared to the current fee of $154.02 per ton).

However, it is important to note that Executive staff anticipate sending a fee proposal ordinance for 2023-2024 later this year after Division budget development work for the next biennial budget is completed. By adopting this ordinance, the Council would be setting these fees for 2023, however, they may not ultimately go into effect if the Council approves a fee ordinance later this year with different fee amounts.

**Financial Analysis.** Executive staff indicate that there is no fee increase associated with the proposed ordinance, as it assumes the same revenue requirement as was used as the basis for the fees that went into effect in 2022, and therefore the restructure should generate the same amount of revenue that would be collected under the status quo fee structure.

Additionally, according to Executive staff, the restructure proposal would not increase the total disposal cost burden for cities or shift costs from one city to another as was the case with other restructure options considered. Avoiding intercity cost shifts was a key concern for members of the Rate Restructure Task Force and the Metropolitan Solid Waste (Management) Advisory Committee. For example, two of the restructure options considered but ultimately rejected, would have shifted some of the disposal cost burden from cities that have a high concentration of business and institutional waste to cities that have mostly residential waste.

Furthermore, by using the most recent calendar year of tonnage data to set FAC shares the consultant report notes that billing entities have more certainty about the amount of revenue they need to raise from curbside customers to cover their disposal costs.

**Anticipated Impacts.** According to the narrative accompanying the proposed ordinance, the fee restructure will likely require some cities and haulers to update the terms of their collection and billing contracts. The narrative further states that most contracts handle disposal charges as a pass-through based on the percent change in the weight-based fee whenever it changes. However, since the proposed ordinance would introduce the FAC, the contract language in these instances may need to be updated thereby opening the contracts up for negotiation.

Additionally, Executive staff indicate that billing entities -- cities and haulers -- will also need time to update their billing systems to reflect the new structure. The consultant recommended allowing at least nine months lead time between when the new fee structure is adopted by the Council and the first bills go out.

Billing entities will also have to determine how the FAC will be passed on to the curbside customers. While there are a number of potential ways this could be done (e.g., divide a billing entity's share of the FAC by the total number of accounts), it ultimately is up to the city and hauler to decide. Executive staff therefore indicate that, at this point, it is not possible to know the ultimate curbside impacts of the proposed ordinance across the County.

Besides billing updates and potential contract renegotiation, Executive staff do not anticipate any other operational impacts for haulers resulting from the proposed ordinance. Likewise, no major operational impacts for SWD are expected outside of changes to the billing environment, according to Executive staff.

**Timing Considerations and Future Legislation.** As noted above, Executive staff emphasize that cities and haulers have expressed a need for certainty on the fee structure to be used in 2023 and require at least nine months' notice so that they can begin to update their billing systems and contracts.

This ordinance has a ten-day public noticing requirement and therefore it would not be possible to expedite this legislation and complete the noticing period.

By approving the proposed ordinance, the Council would be authorizing the new fee structure described in this staff report and fee amounts in Table 4 to go into effect on January 1, 2023. However, as described, Executive staff anticipate transmitting a 2023-2024 fee ordinance later this year after completion of budget development work. Therefore, it is possible that the specific fee amounts included in this ordinance may not ultimately go into effect if the Council approves a 2023-2024 fee ordinance later this year with different fee amounts.

**AMENDMENT**

To implement the fee restructure, the transmitted ordinance would add the new defined terms in King County Code Title 10 of *billing entity*, *fixed-annual charge*, and *service area*, as well as provide a formula for the calculation of each billing entity's share of the fixed-annual charge for each service area. In conversations between Executive staff and Council staff, some necessary revisions to the transmitted ordinance were identified to match the proposed code language with Executive staff intent. The primary issues that were identified are summarized below:

* Executive staff intended for a billing entity's share of the FAC to be calculated using tons of *municipal solid waste (MSW)*[[16]](#footnote-16) and not *solid waste*,[[17]](#footnote-17) which is a much broader term that, for example, includes construction and demolition waste. According to Executive staff, the FAC calculation was also intended to be limited to County-operated facilities and not encompass other solid waste facilities;
* Additionally, the calculation for a billing entity's share of the FAC and the associated terms were tied to the term *commercial hauler,[[18]](#footnote-18)* and therefore did not account for cities that provide solid waste collection using their own employees. The definition of commercial hauler in code is also broader than was intended by Executive staff; and
* A self-hauler fee for the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill was inadvertently included in the transmittal.

**Striking Amendment S1** would address these issues and make clarifying edits to the proposed ordinance developed in collaboration with Executive staff. Specifically, S1 would:

* Revise language to clarify that the formula for the FAC is limited to municipal solid waste deposited at County-operated facilities and does not include other types of solid waste deposited at other facilities;
* Use the existing term solid waste collection entity[[19]](#footnote-19) in the following definitions as opposed to commercial hauler in order to account for cities who use their own employees for collection services, as well as make clarifying edits to conform to the Executive intent of the proposed ordinance: billing entity, service area, fixed-annual charge;
* Make general technical and grammatical edits; and
* Delete the self-hauler per-ton-rate vehicle fee for the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill, which Executive staff indicate was inadvertently included in the transmittal.

**INVITED**

* Pat McLaughlin, Director, Solid Waste Division
* John Walsh, Strategy, Communications & Performance Section Manager, Solid Waste Division

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Ordinance 2021-0449 (and its attachments)
2. Amendment S1
3. Transmittal Letter
4. Fiscal Note
5. Metropolitan Solid Waste (Management) Advisory Committee - Advisory Note
6. Solid Waste Advisory Committee - Advisory Note

1. K.C.C. 10.14.020; 2019 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Ord. 18893); 2020 King County Strategic Climate Action Plan (Motion 15866). In this context, "zero waste" does not mean that no waste will be disposed, but instead proposes that maximum feasible and cost-effective efforts be made to prevent, reuse, and reduce waste. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Formerly Zero Waste Plan [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. All cities in King County except Seattle and Milton have executed ILAs with the County; 2019 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. R.C.W. 81.77.020 and 36.58.040 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. K.C.C. 10.04.020.V [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. K.C.C. 10.04.020.H [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. "Enterprise fund" means a fund that is used to account for any activity for which a fee is charged to external users for goods or services (K.C.C. 4A.10.251) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Ord. 19329; Fees are shown pre-tax and without the moderate-risk waste surcharge that funds hazardous waste programs throughout the County. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. "Fixed-rate" vehicles, which include hatchbacks and sedans, pay a flat amount equivalent to the minimum fee charged for customers disposing less than 320 pounds of solid waste. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. "Per-ton-rate" vehicles, which include, but are not limited to, minivans, vans, sport utility vehicles, trucks, and commercial vehicles, pay a per-ton fee based on the weight of solid waste being disposed. (Under 320 pounds, per-ton-rate vehicles are charged the minimum fee.) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. K.C.C. 10.14.020; 2019 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Ord. 18893); 2020 King County Strategic Climate Action Plan (Motion 15866). In this context, "zero waste" does not mean that no waste will be disposed, but instead proposes that maximum feasible and cost-effective efforts be made to prevent, reuse, and reduce waste. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Formerly referred to as the Zero Waste of Resources Plan [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Excludes Regional Direct tons. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. "Fixed-rate" vehicles, which include hatchbacks and sedans, pay a flat amount equivalent to the minimum fee charged for customers disposing less than 320 pounds of solid waste. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. "Per-ton-rate" vehicles, which include, but are not limited to, minivans, vans, sport utility vehicles, trucks, and commercial vehicles, pay a per-ton fee based on the weight of solid waste being disposed. (Under 320 pounds, per-ton-rate vehicles are charged the minimum fee.) [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. K.C.C. 10.04.020.MMM [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. K.C.C. 10.04.020.UUUU [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. K.C.C. 10.04.020.N [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. K.C.C. 10.04.020.VVVV [↑](#footnote-ref-19)