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COMES NOW Polly L. McNeill as attorney for Respondent Waste Management of Washington, Inc. d/b/a Waste Management - Northwest, Waste Management of Seattle and South Sound, and Waste Management of Sno-King (“WMW”) and responds to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission’s November 20, 2013 Bench Requests as follows:

***Bench Request No. 1:***  *In WMW’s 2012 Puget Sound Labor Disruption Contingency Plan (2012 Contingency Plan), WMW prioritizes its temporary collection services provided by the “Green Team” during a labor disruption with “critical” facilities receiving restored service first. Please indicate whether the practice of restoring collection services initially to “critical” facilities will be continued under the Haulers’ Proposal. If so, why is such language absent from the Haulers’ Proposal?*

**WMW Response:** While the Haulers’ Proposal does not specifically address prioritizing “critical” facilities in the event of a labor disruption, WMW intends to continue this practice in the event of a future service disruption. Whether or not the prioritization of critical facilities is expressly spelled out, WMW believes that it is important for health and safety reasons that certain facilities and types of facilities are prioritized for collection.

WMW did not include language on critical facilities in the Haulers’ Proposal for several reasons. *First*, WMW understands that Item 30 is intended to address broadly the general expectations for service recovery as a result of weather or road conditions, disasters, labor disruptions and other service interruptions. WMW does not understand the intent of Item 30 to specify exactly how it should undertake its service recovery efforts.

*Second*, WMW believes the specific decisions about how best to muster resources must be left to the discretion of the hauler dealing with the specific situation, and that it would be imprudent and impractical for Item 30 to specify how companies should implement its service recovery efforts. Every service disruption situation will be different, and the specific tactics will depend on innumerable different considerations, such as weather conditions, time of year, location, type and extent of the disruption, mix of franchises and WUTC territories, tariff and franchise requirements, the anticipated duration of the service disruption, availability of substitute drivers and vehicles, and more.

*Third*, WMW is concerned that if Item 30 includes specific language about prioritizing “critical facilities”, it will only invite second-guessing later. As WMW has explained previously, it is very challenging to respond to a strike and implement service recovery efforts. Decisions need to be made and priorities set based on the hauler’s best judgment, the information available to it, and coordination with the WUTC and our municipal customers.

*Fourth*, neither the Commission’s regulations nor the tariffs recognize “critical facilities” as a class of customers, and WMW does not think that they should. The term is a functional one that is subject to discretion in the field. WMW strongly urges against undertaking an effort to define what is a “critical facility” because of the inherently subjective, circumstance-specific nature of what facilities are “critical”. Is a day care more critical than a nursing home? Should a hauler prioritize two day cares in close proximity over a pre-school located miles away? Is collecting from 10 “less critical” facilities better than from one “more critical” facility? Any hauler trying to recover from a service disruption should be allowed the flexibility and judgment to deploy its resources as it deems appropriate, subject to the broader service restoration principles that WMW has set forth in the Haulers’ Proposal.

While WMW is willing to accept a revision to Item 30 that generally requires the hauler to prioritize critical facilities for collection, WMW would not support a prescriptive standard that would undermine the flexibility needed to respond to the specific circumstances and conditions of each service disruption situation.

***Bench Request No. 2:*** *Has WMW updated its 2012 Contingency Plan? If so, please provide a copy of the updated plan. How often is this plan updated?*

**WMW Response:** No. While WMW periodically updates its Contingency Plan, it is not done on a specific schedule. Rather, WMW updates the plan from time-to-time and when it perceives a significant risk of a strike occurring. Thankfully, WMW does not believe that there is a current threat of a serious labor disruption for the foreseeable future.
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