

# King County vs Eastside Disposal

①

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION	CAUSE: TG-940411
T-1	7/14 7/14 ✓ ✓	Hansen	(RGH-T)(36 pp) Hansen prefiled testimony	
2	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-1)(3 pp) pages I-15→I-17, re planning process participants and their roles.	
3	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-2)(27 pp). Volume II, Appendix K, of comprehensive plan, re WUTC cost assessment	
4	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-3)(2 pp.) 9/15/92 letter, WUTC to King County	
5	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-4)(5 pp). staff memo from 10/28/92 open meeting, w/ recommendation(TG-921023)	
6	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-5)(13 pp) 10/29/92 letter, WUTC comments on King County draft Plan	
7	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-6)(3 pp) cover letter 10/28/92, and press release re review of Plan	
8	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-7)(2 pp) 10/27/92 King County letter re press release	
9	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-8)(16 pp) annotation of comments rec'd to 1992 draft Plan	
10	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-9)(1 p.) excerpt from Chapter IV, Section A, re "institutional & incentive rates"	
11	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-10)(49 pp) Chapter III of Plan - "Waste Reduction & Recycling"	
12	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-11)(2 pp.) pages III-49 and III-38 of Plan	
13	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-12)(3 pp) discussion re rate incentives	
14	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-13)(3 pp) rate incentives recommendations	
15	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-14) 1991 King County Code, Chapter 10.18	
16	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-15) July 1993 amendments to Chapter 10.18 (Ordinance No. 10942)	
17	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-16)(1 p.) excerpt from Chapter I, Plan Development	
18	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-17)(1 p.) Table 5-2, re estimated landfill life	
19	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-18)(1 p.) 1988 monthly collection rates (# and participation)	
20	✓ ✓	"	(RGH-19)(1 p.) rate differentials for Eastside, 1988-1994	

# King County vs Eastside Disposal

(21)

CAUSE: TG-940411

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION
21	7/14 7/14 ✓✓	Nansen	(RGH-20) (10 pp) rate differentials for other King County certificated haulers
22	✓✓	"	(RGH-21) (1 p.) September 1991 collection rates
23	✓✓	"	(RGH-22) (1 p.) January 1992 collection rates
24	✓✓	"	(RGH-23) (1 p.) July 1992 collection rates
25	✓✓	"	(RGH-24) October 1993 collection rates
26	✓✓	"	(RGH-25) March 1994 collection rates
27	✓✓	"	(RGH-26) list of current King County tip fees
28	✓✓	Cross Nansen by Thomas.	(2pp) Eastside's Current Rates/Differentials in King Cty Ordinance (entered for illustrative purposes only)
T-29	✓✓	Gaisford	(JAG-T) (15 pp.) Gaisford prefiled testimony
30	✓✓	"	(JAG-1) (43 pp.) variable rates study by Skumatz (note also was LAS-2)
31	✓✓	"	(JAG-2) (2 pp) Seattle service level distribution
32	✓✓	"	(JAG-3) (1 p.) Bellevue service levels, downsizing since 1989
33	✓✓	"	(JAG-4) (1 p.) Bellevue, waste stream breakdown, 1993
34	✓✓	"	(JAG-5) (2 pp) City of Lake Forest Park, rates and statistics
35	✓✓	"	(JAG-6) (1 p.) City of Mercer Island statistics: service levels, 1991-92
36	✓✓	"	(JAG-7) (2 pp) 1993 single-family recycling, yard waste & garbage totals (King Cty area).
37	✓✓	"	(JAG-8) (1 p.) 1993 single-family recycling, yard waste & garbage - compare Sea Tac w/ other King County.
38	✓✓	"	(JAG-9) (1 p.) 1993, single-family vs multi-family recycling, yard waste & garbage
39	✓✓	"	(JAG-10) (1 p.) yard waste particip: Lynnwood, & dmonds (Snohomish County)
40	✓✓	"	(JAG-11) (11 pp) Attachment B, unincorporated service areas

# King County vs Eastside Disposal

(41)

CAUSE: TG-940411

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION
41	7/14 7/14 ✓ ✓	Gaisford	(JAG-12)(1 p.) single-family customers in unincorp. areas: recycling, yard waste, garbage
42	✓ ✓	"	(JAG-13)(9 pp.) information from other companies re yard waste violations
43	✓ ✓	"	(JAG-14)(3 pp.) single-family yard waste collection, Jan 93 → Feb. 94
T-44	✓ ✓	Gaisford	(JAG-rebuttal-T)(29 pp) Gaisford prefiled rebuttal test.
T-45	7/15 7/15 ✓ ✓	Dougherty	(DAD-T)(10 pp) Dougherty prefiled test.
46	✓ ✓	"	(DAD-1)(1 p.) biography
47	✓ ✓	"	(DAD-2)(187 pp, plus addendum) Economics of Recycling & Recycled Materials, rev. Dec. 93
48	✓ ✓	"	(DAD-3)(1 p.) market price report (note also was NSP-8)
T-49	✓ ✓	Bealy	(NSP-T)(10 pp.) Bealy prefiled test
50	✓ ✓	"	(NSP-1)(9 pp.) memo Teresa Osinski to Commissioners
51	✓ ✓	"	(NSP-2)(1 p.) Seattle's service level distributions
52	✓ ✓	"	(NSP-3)(85 pp.) Working Paper #1 Program on Solid Waste Policy, Oct 1992
53	✓ ✓	"	(NSP-4)(1 p.) refers to DAD-2
54	✓ ✓	"	(NSP-5)(1 p.) Seattle's variable can rates since 1981
55	✓ ✓	"	(NSP-6)(5 pp.) City of Seattle Dec. 1993 garbage report
56	✓ ✓	"	(NSP-7)(5 pp.) January 94 report of December 1993 figures
57	✓	by agreement of counsel	(response to BR #1) study, or counsel letter
T-58	7/15 7/15 ✓ ✓	Albert	(KRA-T)(9 pp.) Albert prefiled test.
59	✓ ✓	"	(KRA-1)(14 pp.) Working Paper on Residential Waste Generation Model for King Cty.
60	✓ ✓	"	(KRA-2)(8 pp.) King County Tonnage Forecast Model 4/28/94

## King County vs Eastside Disp.

(61)

CAUSE: TG-940411

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION
T-61	7/15 7/15 ✓✓	Albert	(KRA- Rebuttal T)(10 pp) Albert prefiled rebuttal test.
C-62	✓✓	"	(KRA-3)(1 p.) CONFIDENTIAL "footnote, page 9"
T-63	✓✓	Davis	(RED-T)(8 pp) Davis prefiled test.
64	✓✓	"	(RED-1)(1 p.) total disposed waste/ residential curbside disposed waste
64A	corrected chart - entered 7/19		(LAS-T)(23 pp)
T-65	✓✓	Skumetz	Skumetz prefiled test.
66	✓✓	"	(LAS-1)(21 pp) resume
67	✓✓	"	(LAS-3)(48 pp) Seattle Solid Waste "Garbage By the Pound", pilot project summary.
68	✓✓	"	(LAS-4) comparison of garbage/recycling rates in California study area (1 p.)
69	✓✓	"	(LAS-5)(13 pp) draft paper on forecasting tonnage
70	✓✓	"	(LAS-6)(44 pp) "Variable rates in Solid Waste" handbook - manual re conducting study
71	✓✓	"	(LAS-7)(6 pp) staff backup memo & recommendation flow opportunity 2/9/94
72	✓✓	"	(LAS-8)(1 p.) evaluation of proposed rates and staff-recommended rates
T-73	✓✓	"	(LAS- Rebuttal T)(22 pp) (revised 7/8/94) Skumetz prefiled rebuttal test.
C-74	✓✓	"	(LAS-9)(1 p.) CONFIDENTIAL chart-comparison of caw rates
C-75	✓✓	"	(LAS-10)(1 p.) CONFIDENTIAL one paragraph comparing caw rates used.
T-76	7/18 7/18 ✓✓	Glasgo	(PLG-testimony)(17 pp). Glasgo prefiled testimony
C-77	✓✓	"	(PLG-1)(5 pp) CONFID. "trial balance", prepared in allocating costs
C-78	✓✓	"	(PLG-2)(5 pp) CONFID. separating revenues & expenses; resid garb, commerc garb & recyl; drop box
C-79	✓✓	"	(PLG-3)(5 pp) CONFID. allocating among customers in regulated area & 3 Ks.
C-80	✓✓	"	(PLG-4)(5 pp) CONFID allocating residential garbage collection; regulated, vs 3 Ks

King County vs Eastside Disp

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION	CAUSE: TG-940411
C-81	7/18 7/18 ✓ ✓	Glasgo	(PLG-5)(5pp) test period revenues & expenses before pro forma adj's, & others	CONFIDENTIAL.
C-82	✓ ✓	"	(PLG-6)(5pp) CONFIDENTIAL effects of future changes, & Staff pro forma	
C-83	✓ ✓	"	(PLG-7)(5pp) CONFIDENTIAL effect of proposed rates on Eastside's regulated operations	
C-84	✓ ✓	"	(PLG-8)(1p.) CONFIDENTIAL disposal fees allocated among resid, comm & drop box customers	
C-85	✓ ✓	"	(PLG-9)(7pp) CONFID. allocation revenues & expenses, garb & recycle; regulated & 3 K areas	
C-86	✓ ✓	"	(PLG-10)(5pp) CONFID. methods used to allocate costs commercial garb & recycle/different levels service	Ex: C-85
C-87	✓ ✓	"	(PLG-11)(3pp) CONFID. methods to allocate costs resident garbage for levels of serv., Ex. C-80	
T-88	✓ ✓	Colbo	(RGC-1)(24pp) Colbo prefiled testimony	
89	✓ ✓	"	(RGC-2)(1p) qualifications	Oct 1991
90	✓ ✓	"	(RGC-3) draft and final staff reports, NOI on solid waste rate design (July 92)	
91	✓ ✓	"	(RGC-4)(10pp) recycling, yard waste, medical waste implementation study - carriers	all
92	✓ ✓	"	(RGC-5)(24pp) Eastside tariff	
C-93	✓ ✓	"	(RGC-6)(1 page) CONFIDENTIAL history of rate increases	
94	✓ ✓	"	(RGC-7)(19pp) examples of rate ineffect, incl. yard waste subscription (more populated counties)	
T-95	7/19 7/19 ✓ ✓	Demas	(LCD-1)(12pp) Demas prefiled testimony	
96	✓ ✓	"	(LCD-2)(6pp) staff backup memo fr. open mtg 2/9/94, showing effects of co & staff rates	
C-97	✓ ✓	"	(LCD-3)(1p.) (CONFIDENTIAL) company cost of service study	
98	✓ ✓	"	(LCD-4)(1p.) from Meeks' testimony, weight and stop times	
99	✓ ✓	"	(LCD-5)(1p.) Eastside customer statistics 11/93 and 4/94	
100	✓ ✓	"	packet of responses to data requests Nos. 1-44 (note No 7 only is CONFIDENTIAL)	

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION
T-101	7/19 7/19 ✓ ✓	Popoff	(PJP-1)(32 pp) Popoff prefiled testimony
102	✓ ✓	"	(PJP-1)(2 pp) summary of background
103	✓ ✓	"	(PJP-2)(1 p.) demand curve
104	✓ ✓	"	(PJP-3)(1p) effect of change in preference on demand (Eastside's COS study)
105	✓ ✓	"	(PJP-4)(1 p.) illustration of demand elasticity
106	✓ ✓	"	(PJP-5)(1 p.) simultaneous price increase & shift in demand
107	✓ ✓	by agrmt of counsel	stmts/letters/materials brought to public hearing; "fact sheet"; sign-in sheets (for illustrative purposes)
108	✓ ✓	"	(for illustrative purposes) letters rec'd by WUTC
109			
110			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
0			