

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

RABANCO LTD., D/B/A EASTSIDE  
DISPOSAL, d/b/a REPUBLIC  
SERVICES,

Respondent.

DOCKET TG-250171

ORDER 02

DISMISSING COMPLAINT;  
ALLOWING REVISED TARIFF  
SHEETS FILED APRIL 15, 2025, TO  
BECOME EFFECTIVE.

**BACKGROUND**

- 1 On March 13, 2025, Rabanco Ltd., d/b/a Eastside Disposal, d/b/a Republic Services (Eastside or Company), filed with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) Tariff revisions that would generate approximately \$413,404 (6.5 percent) in additional annual revenue. The Company provides regulated solid waste collection service to approximately 11,000 residential and commercial customers in King County. The Company's last general rate increase became effective on May 1, 2024.
- 2 On March 14, 2025, the Company distributed customer notices regarding the proposed rate increases. Commission staff (Staff) received six comments on the proposed rate increase, all opposed. The King County Solid Waste Division shared concerns about the proposed rate increase and stated the County would discuss their concerns with the Company.
- 3 On April 15, 2025, the Company filed revised tariff pages with the Commission.
- 4 On April 24, 2025, this matter came before the Commission during its regularly scheduled Open Meeting. Staff recommended that the Commission take no action and allow the tariff to go into effect. The Company was in agreement with Staff's recommendation. However, a representative of King County appeared at the Open Meeting via Zoom and requested more time to review the proposed tariff revisions and

communicate with the Company regarding the County's concerns, indicating that communication between the Company and County had not been effective.

- 5 On April 30, 2025, the Commission issued Order 01 Complaint and Order Allowing Rates Subject to Later Review and Refund; Setting Matter for Adjudication (Order 01 or Complaint), which ordered the Tariff pages filed by the Company on March 11, 2025, and revised on April 15, 2025, to become effective May 1, 2025, subject to later review and refund. It ordered Staff to file a letter to the docket by May 30, 2025, to inform the Commission whether there was sufficient evidence to continue investigating the matter. If not, the Commission ordered Staff to request that the Commission issue a final order approving the rates and dismissing the suspension of the Tariff revisions. The Commission also directed King County to file a petition to intervene by May 30, 2025, if it wished to contest the rates allowed to become effective subject to refund.
- 6 On May 20, 2025, Staff filed its Order Recommendation Letter recommending that the Commission enter an order approving the rates and dismissing the suspension of the docket.
- 7 King County has not filed a petition to intervene in this docket.

### **DISCUSSION**

- 8 Staff has concluded its investigation into whether an evidentiary basis exists to continue investigating whether the Company's proposed rates are fair, just, reasonable, and sufficient and has determined that there is not an evidentiary basis to continue adjudication on this matter. Further, in Staff's letter in this docket, Staff informed the Commission that Staff met with King County and the Company, and that King County no longer has concerns or issues with the proposed rates and does not intend to challenge the rates. For these reasons, we agree with Staff that the Complaint against the Company should be dismissed and rates as filed on March 13, 2025, as revised on April 15, 2025, should become effective and are no longer provisional or subject to refund.

### **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 9 (1) The Commission is an agency of the state of Washington vested by statute with the authority to regulate rates, regulations, and practices of public service companies, including solid waste companies.

- 10 (2) Rabanco Ltd., d/b/a Eastside Disposal, d/b/a Republic Services, is a solid waste disposal company and a public service company subject to Commission jurisdiction.
- 11 (3) Pursuant to RCW 80.04.130(4), the Company bears the burden to prove that the proposed increases are fair, just, reasonable, equitable, and sufficient.
- 12 (4) The Company has met its burden to demonstrate that its revised additional revenue requirement of approximately \$413,404 (6.5 percent) is fair, just, reasonable, equitable, and sufficient.
- 13 (5) Staff has concluded its investigation into whether an evidentiary basis exists to continue to adjudicate this matter and has found none. For this reason, the Complaint against the Company should be dismissed.
- 14 (6) The Company should be required to pay the expenses reasonably attributable and allocable to the Commission's investigation consistent with RCW 80.20.020 as ordered in Order 01 in this docket.

**ORDER**

**THE COMMISSION ORDERS:**

- 15 (1) The Complaint and Order Allowing Rates Subject to Later Review and Refund filed against Rabanco Ltd., d/b/a Eastside Disposal, d/b/a Republic Services, on April 30, 2025, is dismissed with prejudice.
- 16 (2) The Commission retains jurisdiction over the subject matter and Rabanco Ltd., d/b/a Eastside Disposal, d/b/a Republic Services, to effectuate the provisions of this Order.

DATED at Lacey, Washington, and effective July 25, 2025.

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

/s/ Connor Thompson  
CONNOR THOMPSON  
Director, Administrative Law Division

### **NOTICE TO PARTIES**

This is an initial order. The action proposed in this initial order is not yet effective. If you disagree with this initial order and want the Commission to consider your comments, you must take specific action within the time limits outlined below. If you agree with this initial order, and you would like the order to become final before the time limits expire, you may send a letter to the Commission, waiving your right to petition for administrative review.

WAC 480-07-825(2)(a) provides that any party to this proceeding has 20 days after the entry of this initial order to file a petition for administrative review (Petition). Section (2)(b) of the rule identifies what you must include in any Petition as well as other requirements for a Petition. WAC 480-07-825(2)(c) states that any party may file an answer (Answer) to a Petition within 10 days after service of the petition.

WAC 480-07-830 provides that before the Commission enters a final order any party may file a petition to reopen a contested proceeding to permit receipt of evidence essential to a decision, but unavailable and not reasonably discoverable at the time of hearing, or for other good and sufficient cause. The Commission will not accept answers to a petition to reopen unless the Commission requests answers by written notice.

RCW 80.01.060(3) provides that an initial order will become final without further Commission action if no party seeks administrative review of the initial order and if the Commission fails to exercise administrative review on its own motion.

Any Petition or Response must be electronically filed through the Commission's web portal as required by WAC 480-07-140(5).