

APPROVED

Skagit County  
Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)  
Microsoft Teams Meeting Minutes  
Skagit County Conference Room, 1800 Continental Place, Mount Vernon, WA  
Thursday, May 11, 2023

**Members Present**

Andy Hanson  
Brian Dempsey  
Dan Christopher  
Jacob Anderson  
Jeffery Barcenas  
Kate Smith  
Leo Jacobs  
Margo Gillaspay  
Michael See  
Olivia Carros

Pinky Vargas

Robin Freedman  
Scott Thomas  
Shelly Jensen  
Steve Gilmore  
Todd Reynolds  
Torrey Lautenbach  
Nick Harbert

**Representing**

City of Mount Vernon, Solid Waste  
City of Burlington  
Klickitat County, Commissioner  
Klickitat County  
Republic Services  
Agriculture  
City of Sedro-Woolley  
Skagit County Public Works/Solid Waste Division, non-voting  
Skagit County Public Works, Assistant Director  
Department of Ecology, Regional Planner & Grant Manager,  
non-voting, *virtual*  
Republic Services, Municipal Relations,  
Skagit County Account Manager  
Waste Management, Hauler  
Town of La Conner, *on-line*  
City of Anacortes  
Republic Services  
Skagit River Steel & Recycling, Recyclers, *on-line*  
Lautenbach Recycling, District 3, Citizens  
Haulers

**Members Absent**

Carolyn Moulton  
Dale Patrick  
  
Landon Campbell  
Marcella Manibusan  
Nick Harbert

**Representing**

District 1, Citizens  
Environmental Public Health, Skagit County Public Works,  
non-voting  
City of Mount Vernon, Solid Waste  
Waste Management, Hauler/Public Sector, Manager  
Waste Management, Hauler

Not Represented  
Vacant  
Vacant  
Vacant

District 2, Citizens  
Town of Lyman  
Town of Hamilton  
Town of Concrete

APPROVED

**Visitors**

Britt Pfaff-Dunton  
Jacob Anderson

**Representing**

Skagit County Health Department  
Klickitat County, Commissioner

**Introductions**

Margo Gillaspy, requested introductions of all in attendance. Names and business titles were offered by each attendee prior to addressing agenda items.

**Call to Order**

Ms. Gillaspy, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. at the Skagit Conference Room, Mount Vernon, Washington.

**Public Comments**

Ms. Gillaspy, opened the floor for public comments.

There were no Public Comments.

**Review and Approve Minutes**

Ms. Gillaspy opened the floor to discuss the minutes of April 12, 2023, and April 26, 2023.

Ms. Gillaspy, requested a Motion to Approve the April 12, 2023 minutes as written. A Motion to Approve was made by Leo Jacobs, City of Sedro-Woolley to approve the minutes as written. The Motion to Approve was seconded by Andy Hanson, City of Mount Vernon. By a vote of the Membership, the Motion was unanimously passed. Ms. Gillaspy, declared the minutes of April 12, 2023 to be approved as written.

Ms. Gillaspy, requested a Motion to Approve the April 26, 2023 minutes as written. A Motion to Approve was made by Brian Dempsey, City of Burlington to approve the minutes as written. The Motion to Approve was seconded by Leo Jacobs, City of Sedro-Woolley. By a vote of the Membership, the Motion was unanimously passed. Ms. Gillaspy, declared the minutes of April 26, 2023 to be approved as written.

APPROVED

Agenda Items

A Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting, open to the public, was held on May 11, 2023 for anyone to speak on any topic on the agenda, or items not listed on the agenda:

a. Long Haul RFP Discussion and Vote

In the last meeting, we presented at the Committee that reviewed the Proposals within Skagit County, was recommending Waste Management for the Long-Haul Contract. I requested that you review the Proposal and raise any questions. Today, would like to vote on whether the SWAC approves, and then move forward in the approval process.

Will there be any discussion in today's meeting regarding questions and answers raised in the April 26, 2023 meeting Public Comment period addressing the added carbon footprint of added trucking component for Waste Management from here to Seattle for the rail?

E-mail Chat:

Will there be future plans for electric cars and contract for those in the Long-Haul contract?

Will Waste Management be using electric vehicles with the Long-Haul contract, and what kind of future plan exist for that with a contract company, are those in the plans for the future?

Waste Management is very interested in using electric technology, unfortunately, we do not believe that it is quite ready for prime time, so Waste Management is not using electric service vehicles yet. They are being piloted in different parts of the country, with plans to pilot in the very near future with a collect vehicle in the Puget Sound.

There are two hauling sites currently using electric vehicles for all of support in Woodinville. Both of the hauling sites service a number of Waste Management contracts.

The type of vehicles expected to be used in this contract are tractors that are used for short haul between Skagit and Seattle type of trips. They will meet or exceed the Tier-4 EPA Emission Standards. The Tier-4 Diesel Engine Standards are the strictest EPA Emissions for requirement for diesel engines. Waste Management will be purchasing 2024 vehicles that meet or exceed Tier-4 standards, to be used in the Long-Haul Contract.

There is a long-haul contract company in the RFP, namely BCT. Waste Management will be operating the vehicles due to the short lead time, Waste Management could not purchase trucks in 3-4 months. There is an arrangement with Waste Management and BCT to provide service for no longer than six months. Their vehicles will be Tier-3 and not brand new. Depending on technology changes in the next 15 years, there will be more discussions relating to vehicles.

No, the DOT has not been notified.

## APPROVED

Rail yards are open 24-7 down in Seattle. Intentions are to run most of those vehicles at night to avoid traffic, daily heat, and rush hour in order to have enough containers available for the Transfer Station. The plan is to go to the Transfer Station and fill them up during the day and move them out at night. There will be 23 chassis with containers. It is stated in their Proposal that there will be 20 empties stacked up. They currently have a couple of spares.

For both Republic Services and Waste management, the rail goes down the I-5 Corridor.

The Proposal has been Waste Management at \$89.00/ton for transportation cost. Republic Services has \$88.50/ton with all cost built into that fee, including expansion of the Inter-Modal. So, it is \$0.50 cents cheaper with Republic with the same cost built in with he versus the trucking transportation and the rail transportation. The concerns at the rail were addressed. Republic is offering in their Proposal a trucking option if we have concerns at the rail spur. So, we are back to apples to apples with the trucking option of something goes wrong with the rail spur.

It doesn't have to be trucked as far. It can be trucked to Ferndale if needed or go to Everett. So, if something happens at the rail spur, Republic can offer trucking options as Waste Management can offer trucking options for the Proposal. Waste Management has different rail spurs, so they are not all contingent on each other.

So, weren't the issues in the past with Inter-Modal, it was just with rail service itself, right?

Maybe clarify the question because it's all Inter-Modal service.

That's fine, I just I want to make sure that everyone's clear that it wasn't a problem with the functioning of the Inter-Modal yard itself, the past service problems were related to the service from the rail provider?

No, that's not accurate. Every Inter-Modal has different service. For example, in Everett, the main delta lien there is parallel to Waste Managements line in Everett. So sometimes we are waiting for BNSF to finish in the Delta yard to come over to Switch over to us. So, each different Inter-Modal has service related to that Inter-Modal. They are exclusive of each other. They are not connected. So, there is no switch here. Do you understand what I'm saying? They are individual. You can go to another one.

Yes, we don't need to get into an argument here in front of everybody.

I'm not arguing. I'm just saying that's not accurate.

The question on the accuracy of that is that if all of a sudden, we are back to we can't get containers because of the rail spur, Republic is offering an option to truck it, just like Waste Management is, so we continually have containers. There is that option with both contractors. So, we understand that is an option for both companies.

APPROVED

Correct.

There is a difference, that's what I was trying to point out.

Does not require rail at all. Its from Skagit County directly, to the landfill by truck. Say there is a mud slide down in the Centralia, and it blocks the track going south. Both railroads are out of business. It doesn't matter how many Inter-Modal yards you have up North, the rail is shut down. We can drive to Wanatchee. If Republic Service reaction is to another Inter-modal yard, it still requires rail service. Understand what I'm saying? Ours cuts out the rail. They are not apples to apples. Does that make sense?

When a container is leaving Skagit County, we anticipate it's leaving at \$88.50/ton rate whether they have to truck it to New York or wherever they have to truck it, to our cost is \$88.50/ton. And its being trucked and its leaving and we're getting new containers in. The container leaves from Waste Management, its at \$89.00/ton no matter where they have to take it to. I'm trying to address our concern at Skagit County for not only ourselves in Mount Vernon, but also Sedro-Woolley and Anacortes. If we're looking at a cost breakdown, we have a less expensive contractor who can potentially provide the same option that the higher contractor is offering us. That's what I'm trying to clear on. If I'm not understanding that right, then I want to be educated on that. Our cost is cheaper with Republic, however they see fit to get it to their landfills, we're paying \$88.50/ton. However, Waste Management sees fit to get it to their landfill, we're paying \$89.00/ton.

My next question is \$88.50/ton, \$0.50 increase is a big difference increase when we look at the overall tonnage that the Counties producing right? We're all in the same together because its an estimate. We're at 127, 860 tons last year that the County produced.

I have you at 132,000 tons that we processed last year. At \$0.50 cents, that's \$66,000 in one year will be your increase. And if course, you are growing so that will be expediential each year.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but that's the first time that we've heard that number increase of \$66,000 between that right? That's the difference in the contract, per year. I can only assume that the County is not going to absorb that cost of \$66,000. That cost is going to get spread out amongst Mount Vernon, Anacortes and Sedro-Woolley, everybody that's taking to that Transfer Station, right?

Correct.

Sixty-six thousand (\$66,000) is a significant amount of an increase on top of the roughly \$26.00 increase we're already going to see from the current contract?

Correct.

That's a significant impact to all of us, that's an additional \$66,000. That's an employee cost for some of us if that's increase based on where we're at. I'm not disputing either

## APPROVED

one. It's my job. I think Shelly and Leo and maybe Torrey would probably feel the same way on an on-ground operation cost that directly affects us that's presented to our residents, because the County is not going to absorb this. Its going to be pushed to us, that changes our rate effects to our customers. That's a significant amount. I want to make sure that this is clearly laid out to us on the table so we can absorb what's in front of us so we can speak to our higher powers of what's in front of us to make sure our counsel wants to approve that. I don't feel good voting on this today without presenting this to our Public Works Director and our Counsel.

I thought you would have done that in the time that you had.

I've never seen the \$66,000 increase on there. That's significant on there. We've never talked about that. That goes back to my question to where if we have transportation cost, leaving Skagit County on apples to apples, then as we've all looked at, then we have to look at both options for us. If the lowest bidder is an option for us, then why wouldn't we select the lowest bidder?

I think its not completely apples to apples. One other issue, containers have been an issue, not just this last year, but especially in the last five years, we've never had enough containers, especially in the summer. I know Republic is always trying to get us more containers. Another issue last summer, why did we not have trucks bringing us containers from Everett or Ferndale is because they did not have enough bins so its not entirely on the railroad, it was also on the service from Republic. Yes, there is \$66,000 more per year that we would pay spread out over the residents of Skagit County, that's \$0.50 per person per year.

So, the \$66,000 is spread over the residents of Skagit County? So, we're talking about all of our Municipalities?

That is where we get our funding.

How many tons did you bring in last year?

I would have to go back and look at it.

What's it worth to make sure the Transfer Station is open every day?

I'm not taking one side or the other. When you guys voted on this, when the Committee went one way or the other, of that \$66,000, was there \$66,000 in disruptions and that's why they justified? We had a \$100,000 in disruptions based on you guys couldn't haul garbage. I have no idea how you guys how it cost your operations. So, I'm just asking you guys was that evaluated – why this decision was made? Why did they choose the extra \$0.50? There's got to be reasoning around that.

We felt that Waste Management was going to have more backup and was going to provide that better service. Look at how many days we were closed last year. I haven't

APPROVED

calculated that, but it probably would work out to significant disruptions to our Solid Waste System.

That's why I'm asking. That's the only point that I'm trying to make. I have different things in place to where I can do different things and its not disrupting to me.

These guys its different. Again, I'm not trying to take sides. From my perspective, I would look at it, well how much did the disruptions cost me? Why did they choose the extra \$0.50 cents right, there has got to be reasoning around that?

We felt that Waste Management had more back up and provide better services. When we look at how many days we were closed last yar, I hadn't calculated that, it probably would work out to significant disruption to our Solid Waste System for the time spend by everyone.

That's what I'm looking at. I have things in place to where its not disruptive to me, I can do different things. These guys, it's a little different. I have different things I can do. Again, I'm not trying to take sides. From my perspective, I would look at it, well how much did the disruptions cost me. \$66,000 seems like a lot of money, but in the grand scheme of things, of multi- million dollars, it's not very much money.

I'm not sitting here picking sides, I'm trying to address operation cost that affect everybody across Skagit County. How do we do that? Because we internally, have to do the same thing within our own Divisions own Municipalities that happen on that. I can say from the largest Municipalities, to your credit, we were never told we couldn't bring, it was, can you work with us to bring it here. What it did affect was the County residents. And so, not our City residents. The Municipalities were fortunate to be able to bring our Solid waste. I'm a Cuntly resident, I don't live in the City.

That's what I'm trying to do for you. Because you have to bring it to your Counsel and how do I justify this. Was there \$10,000 worth of disruptions to where I can say, well, its going to cost me an extra \$10,000 a year but I have \$20,000 in disruptions. Again, I'm not taking sides, I'm just trying to work it through.

I would like to address a couple of comments you made. One of the things we talked about was the supply chain issues all over the world. We had 300 containers that we waited almost two years to get. We have those containers. They now cost us \$40,000 each, which we secured for this location. We build that in. We build the expansion Inter-Modal, which will give you fifty cars per switch. In order to do all of those things, it takes a while. And yes, there were service issues last year. Everyone ha them. And I know that Nicky said you didn't have them, but we get containers from you occasionally and I know when we were told that you guys couldn't give up containers either.

So, I know that's not valid. So, if we're talking equal across the board, and I'll forward those e-mails to you if you don't believe me. If we're talking about the fact that we had a bad year, yep we did. And you know what, 30 years in a marriage, everyone has a bad

## APPROVED

year. We were hoping that the consistency of the service and the fact that we are trying to improve the service here. It's a good system, it works really well. Last year, it had some bad bumps. But we're doing everything to right now make sure it runs as smoothly as possible in the future by doing that with a lower cost. So, we're just a little bit confused about why, after 30 years, we are being measured on one year, and we're not in the value of sustainability for that lower cost.

A couple of points, if I may. Our railroad had some bumps for about a month. Our Municipal customers weren't even aware because none of the were short containers. When someone from outside of our system like you guys wanted equipment, while we were dedicating that equipment to our regular customers to make sure they were taken care of, and that lasted on only a month. The only thing that Torrey brought up, we are a large collector as well. It's really important to us that the Transfer Station be open tous. So that's an incentive. I know Republic wants to make sure their system works. We have that extra piece to it. We're here, and we're picking up garbage. The last thing we want is to hear that we're going to have to delay. Then you get into overtime and this and that and the other. If you can't get everybody, then it snowballs on you. Fortunately, the County was pretty good about that with us as well, so we didn't have issues. We both have rail issues occasionally, its just the nature of that beast. So that's why we have this backup so that if issues pop up, we have places to go.

I would like to add Andy onto my \$66,000. Don't forget we're getting ready to go to Request For Proposals for Operations and Cost Analysis aren't we. So, I think that the \$66,000 is not just going to be \$66,000, its going to be more because the cost of Operations has gone up over all. I know its separate to consider, but there is another cost coming.

Its Skagit County say, responsibility, its Skagit County has to make the decision on what contractor they want to use, that best suits them. In the end, it all trickles down to us. And everybody that's working in this County. We're going to see a \$26.00 increase from what the current contract is potentially. Do we have an idea of when we will see this increase or when the implementation of when the contract, long-haul Proposal goes in place? A year, six months?

The contract has to start October 1, 2023, that's when our current contract expires with Republic Services, at the end of September. The Rate Study will take what it takes. So, we're going to be paying this higher rate then.

You an anticipate seeing a new rate in 2024? Rate Studies do take time, we all know how that process goes.

The Operational cost increase will go into effect on October 1, 2023.

We've all been working in the business a long time. Another thing that is difficult to measure, that I think weighed heavily on staff and that's why they made the recommendation that they did, is customer service. I know what its like to be inundated



APPROVED

with frustrated, angry, confused customers. When customers can't get rid of their garbage, they act very angry and frustrated and they generate a tremendous amount of calls. You may not be able to measure that financially, but that is, I believe, one of the reasons that staff have recommended Waste Management. Because they believe that there is a lot of redundancy in our approach in this Long-Haul Contract that will safeguard getting your materials to where they need to go on a timely fashion. I think it is important to mention the customers in which we service and how frustrated and angry they were when they couldn't use the Transfer Station.

Could someone speak a little more about the evaluation factors regarding the Transportation. It seems like I was understanding that it was not apples to apples. That Waste Management offered a direct trucking option without involving the rail at any point. That in my mind is a very valuable asset to have for those instances when either containers are not available, or the rail is not available to have that option. I think that should be a factor in the decision making.

I'll speak as a Member of that review panel. The way the proposed or usual operations at the rail spur would be is trucking to their rail yard in Seattle. From there, it would be loaded on a train and then go to the Columbia Ridge Landfill in Oregon. If there were disruptions to the rail service, they do have trucking options to the Wanatchee Landfill so we do have that option. Republic Services is offering the service that they've been providing there, which is we get loaded onto the train on the rail spur right by the Transfer Station. Then we continue on train to that Roosevelt Landfill, so it's a little different.

Has this gone to the Governance Board?

The review process is, no, the approval process is from here, asking for a vote on it, then it goes before the Governance Board. I am finalizing a meeting with them for late May or early June for their review and approval. Then from there it goes to the Commissioners, and they would sign their Resolution awarding the Contract. Then we finally sign the Contract. There is a Public Hearing after the Governance Board. This is the first step before the Governance Board.

So, Andy, you sounded like you were not ready to vote on this, or you needed to discuss this more? I don't know how you're feeling.

My job is to present options and materials to our staff and let our Administration in on that. I don't feel good going back today with a vote saying this happened without talking to at least our Public Works Director and presenting to him that things are pretty similar in this one contractor is higher, but there's an increase we're going to see. We're talking \$66,000 higher, in October when this hits. Who is it going to hit? How is that going to get past on to us? Do we have to be prepared for a \$26.00 increase for Municipality in October? That doesn't give us enough time.

It's not going to happen in October.

APPROVED

The rate is going to go into effect in October, right?

Our rate. What the County pays. Our bill is going to go up in October.

You're going to absorb the \$26.00 increase until a Rate Study happens with the County? Where that \$26.00 per ton is going to be spread out in the new Rate Study?

We can't increase our rates without going through the full process.

I know, we all know that.

How long before the Rate Study comes into factor? The County is going to swallow a \$26.00 a ton for however months?

The Commissioners make those decisions, right? So, we have our process. We made Recommendations. This is the process. We are letting you know. Then you are welcome to write letters on your concerns, or call, probably best to just write letters to our Commissioners, and you could get a census with a yay or nay with your recommendations. Our Commissioners are the ones that make all the decisions. We do know that increases will happen on our end, but we are also following a process to where we just can't go pass it along yet. We also have our own Budget that we have to be adhering to. So, we will be bringing it, just like the Ferry Study. Any other increases, we are going through the process of asking for that evaluation as soon as we can. It is also dependent on when we can schedule a hearing, when we can schedule with the Commissioners. We are just letting you know that we will be starting that process concurrently now that we know the data.

The other thing to, Andy, I think the Mayor from each City is on the Governance Board to you can ultimately state your case. We're just kind of pushing it along to them to make the decisions.

This is an advisory vote of the SWAC today. Governance Board with all of the Mayors and one Commissioner Member will make a vote that will then get passed on to Commissioners to make that ultimate call because they are the only ones that can actually sign that contract.

I just wanted to support Margo as one of the staff that was part of the Evaluation, and also emphasize the importance that the SWAC make in decisions to keep the process moving forward. That October 1 date will come very quickly. There is also a lot of time that will be needed to contract negotiations, even once we're passed the hearing and all the internal procedural steps have been completed. I just want to emphasize that it's important to keep the process moving here. I do know that we provided the documentation several weeks ago, so I think there's been ample enough time to review the documents and respond back to Margo with questions.

## APPROVED

It is a bit of a risk, because if we don't, the existing contract ends in September. If this negotiation or coordination exceed that, there is a risk that we don't have a contract. Everybody doesn't want that. I do understand that if you need to go back, please make it quick, and not wait another week or two. Hopefully, just a couple of days, so we can continue along with this process.

I guess I would like to ask if enough of the group feels comfortable voting that we can vote on this and then you can go back and discuss it with your Counsels, your Public Works Director for the Cities.

This is an advisory vote, as Britt said, we can take it under advisement, and we can take it to the Governance Board as well for their review.

One more thing I want to make a note of as well. Its like \$66,000 before, \$88.50/ton versus \$89.00/ton after. It's not like \$66,000 a year now and option A is \$67.00 and option B is \$90.00. If you're talking about before, none of the options are on the table that go back to the before price. We need to keep it separate. The price really is not the sole factor. It really a very minimum factor of the Recommendation. Both options in front of the table are very similar in their price.

For those who don't know me, I just kind of stepped in, I am the Public Works Director and County Engineer for Public Works. I was meeting back-to-back, so whenever I finish that one, I come in late on this one. Grace Kane.

She's supposed to be here.

I am leaving for vacation tomorrow, so I have a lot of things doubled up today.

I will ask for a vote. So, like Torrey said, there is a Governance Board and other chances for Public Comment. And you will be recusing yourself?

That's what I was going to ask – I'll be recusing myself.

You should recuse yourself, yes. I hope all of the SWAC Members remember who they are on the Board. So, if you would, I guess, I need to make a Motion if people want to approve the choice of WM (Waste Management), and we can move forward from there. If we don't get that, then we'll just move on to the next topic.

*Motion to Approve Recommendation, Waste Management, as selected Vendor:*

Torrey Lautenbach, Lautenbach Recycling, I'll make the Motion, I trust the County, and the Advisory Board too.

*Second Motion to Approve Recommendation, Waste Management, as selected Vendor:*

Todd Reynolds, Skagit River Steel and Recycling

APPROVED

*All in Favor:*

Three.

*Any Opposed?*

What's the third Option?

Abstain.

The rest *Abstains*. Ok.

Let's make sure. I've got four, yes.

I've got four, *I's*.

*Any Nays?*

Leo Jacobs, City of Sedro-Woolley  
Andy Hanon, City of Mount Vernon

This is important, I have as *I's*:  
Brian Dempsey, City of Burlington  
Kate Smith, WSU Skagit Extension, Agriculture  
Shelly Jenson, City of Anacortes  
Todd Reynolds, Skagit River Steel & Recycling, Recycler  
Torrey Lautenbach, Lautenbach Recycling, District 3 Citizens

*Abstained:*

Leo Jacobs, City of Sedro-Woolley  
Andy Hanson, City of Mount Vernon

*Recused:*

Nick Harbert

b. Rate Study Discussion and Vote

Looking at the increase that we'll have coming one way or the other, I would like to start doing a Rate study as soon as I can. And just because this is going to be an expense. Last time, we spent about \$30,000. It will probably be in the realm of \$30,000-\$45,000 for a Rate Study. Kitsap County just did one that I read over and it looked good. I'd like to have them look this time at the minimum charge that we have at the Ovenell site as well as the Sauk site and what we charge at Clear Lake. I do know that a lot of the operating cost can be from the self-haulers. They just take a lot more time and a lot more employee time there. I think we should think about more accurately representing

APPROVED

that when they come through. Because I know what you guys pay in Municipalities there, to try to make it a little more balanced.

The point that we are trying to get across is that we are subsidizing the remote sites. We're not subsidizing all of us. We're not subsidizing those people who do not want to drive halfway across the County, or don't want to pay for collection service. That's what I'm envisioning with this Rate Study. So, it would be helpful if you guys can approve it, and I will take it to the Governance Board as well, so that they know it's coming.

You're going over our head? Twice now?  
(room laughter)

Yes, I guess so. We're being honest.  
(room laughter)

At least we're clear about it.  
(room laughter)

I know, I just had to break it.  
(room laughter)

I think our Rate Study was done shortly after yours, right, and Chris Bell was the Consultant. We used Chris as well, he was really good last time. We did ours just before COVID. It was much different after COVID when we had to implement it.

In the Rate Study, will you set to see what the subsidized cost are for both of those?

The last time that Chris did our Rate Study in 2018, and he did look at how much we lost at running and how much the remote sites cost.

Does the County purposely subsidize the remote locations to help with litter and people just purposely throwing their garbage out.

Yes.

It was a political decision way back in the day before Margo.

One thing that Kitsap did was they really wanted to look at what is the cost for each minimum charge that comes through. We get a lot that is still just the minimum. Our minimum is now \$20.00 for 360 pounds, and we get people coming through will less than that, so how much is it costing us to accept these self-haulers? We're adding extra people on the weekend just for self-haulers.

It is helpful if the minimum goes up as much as you can to get and encourage people to the curb.

APPROVED

When the contracts last for 20-30 years, and so the decisions to subsidize or not, the Commissioners do make those decisions often. So, every time when we do a Rate Study, they have the opportunity to make changes, or not, as they need it. So, a lot of times they do take into account they equity piece of it so that's why they make decisions, but that's also a different Board, and now we have different Board Members on it. That may or may not change. I can't speak for the Commissioners. I just want to make sure the expectations are clear.

Can I have a Motion To Approve the Rate Study?

*Motion To Approve*

Brian Dempsey, City of Burlington

These are essential to business. The more you do them, the easier it is for the County Commissioners.

*Second Motion To Approve*

Andy Hanson, City of Mount Vernon

*All in favor?*

All.

*Any Abstain?*

Come on Leo, you can say it.  
(room laughter)

I gave my *I* on that.

They usually go through roll calls.  
(room laughter)

**Announcements/New Business**

There were none.

**Public Comments**

Ms. Gillaspy, opened the floor to address any public comments.

Jacob Anderson, Klickitat County, Commissioner

The Roosevelt Landfill is within our County and I didn't see it as part of the Recommendation or consideration. We have a 30-year relationship between our Counties and all of the tons go into a Landfill that has nearly 200 employees within Washington State. I didn't see when there was decisions being made about any potential community benefits. I understand it is a hard decision to make when you guys are looking at increases like this. I know right now our binds are coming in at 20%-40% over our

APPROVED

Engineers estimate on a regular basis. We know our pickup is going to go up 20%-27%, and while these increases seem astronomical, we're seeing it across the board in everything we do. Thank you for making the hard decisions. The one thing I can say is that I've found in my life, is that the most efficient things always wins in the long run. When I look at all the ways that waste has moved in our Washington State, in our 30 year relationship, you guys have had one of the most efficient processes known to man. It is literally the closet haul to get on a train and training is so much cheaper than anything else. When you look at the long -haul and the long distance and where the price of fuel is going, you guys have a really good option and really good opportunity here. We've really enjoyed the relationship that we've had with you. We've enjoyed all of the employment we've had in our County for our economically distressed areas. We thank you for your entire time that we've worked together. I am really sorry for the 15 days that you were down last year. I get calls when the snow lands or when the trash doesn't get picked up and I can tell you how that feels from the perspective of an Elected. I can tell you that when you look at the 15 days that you were down last year, over the 30-year relationship, that's a 99.9% up time, and you don't even see that high up-time in regards to your power. So just think about how amazing that it's been that long-term relationship. If it comes to an end, that's too bad. Thank you guys for all your hard work you guys put a lot into it. I know how hard it is to make a decision against two competing. You'll put every ounce effort you can into making the best decision you can for your constituents. So, thank you.

Anyone else in virtual who wants to speak? Anyone on virtual team, please raise your hand. I don't see anyone.

I don't see anyone either. This will be the end of the Public Comment.

**Announcements/New Business**

I don't have any announcements or new business. Does anyone else have any?

There were none.

**Adjourn**

Ms. Gillaspy, thanked everyone and called the meeting to an end.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:55 p.m.