

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR THURSTON COUNTY

-	RECOMP OF WASHINGTON, INC., a	
	Washington corporation,	
	Petitioner,	98 2 00378 0 NO.
ľ	v. ,	110.
)	PETITION FOR REVIEW OF
	WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND	DECLARATORY ORDER OF THE
	TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, an)	WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
1	agency of the State of Washington, CITY OF)	TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
	BELLINGHAM, a municipality, SANITARY)	
	SERVICE COMPANY, INC., a Washington)	
	corporation, WASHINGTON REFUSE &)	00517
	RECYCLING ASSOCIATION, a Washington)	COPY
	corporation, and RECYCLING AND	
	DISPOSAL SERVICES, INC., a Washington)	
	corporation.	
1	Description (
	Respondents.	
)	

Petitioner RECOMP OF WASHINGTON, INC. ("Recomp") petitions as follows:

I. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PETITIONER

The name and mailing addresses of the petitioner is:

Recomp of Washington, Inc.

Attention: Frank Moscone, President

1524 Slater Road

Ferndale, WA 98248

Law Offices

KARR·TUTTLE·CAMPBELL

1	II. NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS OF PETITIONERS' ATTORNEYS
2	The names and mailing address of the petitioner's attorneys are:
3	James L. Austin, Jr.
4	Mark R. Johnsen
5	Karr Tuttle Campbell Suite 2900, Washington Mutual Tower
6	1201 Third Avenue
7	Seattle, WA 98101-3028
8	III. NAME AND ADDRESS OF AGENCY
9	The name and mailing address of the agency whose action is at issue is:
10	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
11	Attention: Secretary Chandler Plaza Building
12	1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.
13	P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250
14	
15	IV. AGENCY ACTION AT ISSUE
16	The agency action at is the Declaratory Order of the Washington Utilities and
17	Transportation Commission (the "Commission") dated January 13, 1998, entered in In The
18	Matter Of The Petition Of Recycling And Disposal Service, Inc. For A Declaratory Ruling
19	(Docket No. TG-971167), a copy of which is attached to this Petition as Exhibit A.
20	(Booket 100, 10 3/1107), a copy of which is attached to this I ctition as <u>Exhibit A.</u>
21	V. IDENTIFICATION OF PARTIES
22	Persons who were parties to the proceeding which led to the agency action at issue
23	
24	were:
25	City of Bellingham
26	Attention: R. Mark Asmundson, Mayor 210 Lottie Street
27	Bellingham, WA 98225
28	

1	Sanitary Service Company, Inc.
2	Attention: Paul Razore, President and Registered Agent 1001 Roeder Avenue
3	P.O. Box 1702
Bellingham, WA 98227	Bellingham, WA 98227
5	Washington Refuse & Recycling Association Attention: Harold E. LeMay, Registered Agent
6	711 S. Capitol Way, Suite 704
7	Olympia, WA 98507
8	Recycling and Disposal Services, Inc.
9	Attention: Craig P. Hayes, Registered Agent 4916 LaBounty Place
10	P.O. Box 399 Ferndale, WA 98248
11	
12	Also participating in that proceeding was the Staff of the Washington Utilities and
13	Transportation Commission (the "Commission"), whose mailing address is the Commission's
14	mailing address identified in Paragraph III above.
15 16	VI. FACTS DEMONSTRATING ENTITLEMENT TO RELIEF
17	5.1 On or about July 18, 1997, Recycling and Disposal Services, Inc. ("RDS") filed a
18	petition with the Commission seeking a declaratory order, a copy of which is attached to this
19	Petition as Exhibit B.
20	Cition as <u>Damoit D</u> .
21	5.2 Facts pertinent to RDS's declaratory order petition are set forth in the Statement of
22	Facts And Exhibit List submitted in that proceeding attached hereto as Exhibit C (all but
23	
24	Paragraph 20 of which were included as the Final Statement Of Facts submitted by the parties
25	and considered by the Commission), and are incorporated herein by reference.
26	
27	
28	

5.3 RDS has commenced an action in the United States District Court against the City of Bellingham (the "City"), Sanitary Service Company, Inc. ("SSC") and Recomp in which RDS seeks, among other things, a declaratory judgment to the effect that SSC is not required by the terms of its contract with the City to deliver all of the solid waste which SSC collects within the City to Recomp's facility.

5.4 A failure by the Commission to recognize and give effect to SSC's contractual obligation to deliver all solid waste which SSC collects within the City to Recomp, as the disposal facility designated by the City pursuant to that contract, jeopardizes (a) Recomp's ability to perform its obligations, both under Recomp's disposal contract with the City and under a Consent Decree with the Washington Department of Ecology, to dispose of ash from Recomp's incineration of residential and commercial City solid waste which is presently stored in a permitted temporary ash storage facility which Recomp established and utilized under contract with the City; (b) Recomp's right to performance by the City of the City's obligation under its contract with Recomp to require all solid waste collected within the City to be delivered exclusively to Recomp's facility; (c) the financial integrity of the City's collection contractor, SSC, by placing SSC at risk that it will be forced by the Commission to absorb disposal charges which SSC incurs in its delivery of solid waste to Recomp's facility as required by SSC's contract with the City; and (d) the stable, reasonable long-term rates for disposal services which the City has obtained through its disposal contract with Recomp.

26

27

28

26

27

28

VII. REASONS RELIEF SHOULD BE GRANTED

Relief should be granted because:

- 1. The Commission's conclusion that it is not required to recognize and to give effect for rate-making purposes to a provision in a contract between a city and solid waste collection company which requires delivery of waste collected under a Commission certificate of public convenience and necessity to a facility designated by the city pursuant to that contract is error as a matter of law, and its Findings Of Fact Nos. 12, 13 and 14 in support of that conclusion are erroneous in one or more respects.
- 2. The Commission's conclusion that Section 5.1 of the Residential Solid Waste And Curbside Collection Of Recyclables Agreement between the City and Sanitary Service Company, Inc. ("SSC") does not require SSC to deliver all of the solid waste which it collects within the City to the facility which the City has designated pursuant to that section, being contrary to both the literal language of that section and the intention of both the City and SSC, is error as a matter both of fact and of law, and its Finding Of Fact No. 11 in support of that conclusion is erroneous in one or more respects. Moreover, the Commission in making that finding considered, over the objections of Recomp and others, late-offered evidence improperly submitted after the parties had stipulated to the submission of agreed facts and exhibits in lieu of an evidentiary hearing, without giving opposing parties (including Recomp) the opportunity of to present rebuttal evidence at a hearing.

- 3. The Commission is estopped by its prior actions from refusing to require inclusion in SSC's base for rate-making purposes all disposal charges which SSC incurs in its delivery to Recomp of solid waste collected by SSC within the City.
- 4. The Commission improperly excluded from evidence the matters set forth in Paragraph 20 of the Statement Of Facts And Exhibit List attached to this Petition as Exhibit C.

VIII. RELIEF REQUESTED

Recomp requests the following relief:

- 1. Entry of judgment in favor of Recomp, reversing the Commission with respect to Paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of its Findings of Fact, and Paragraphs 4 and 5 of its Declaratory Order, and declaring that (a) the Commission as a matter of law is required to include in the base of a solid waste collection company for rate-making purposes all disposal fees which the collection company incurs in complying with the provisions of a contract between the collection company and a city requiring it to deliver all of the solid waste which it collects within the city to a disposal facility designated by the city; and/or (b) that the disposal charges incurred by SSC in delivering to Recomp solid waste collected by it within the City under its certificate of public convenience and necessity are ones which the Commission is required by virtue of RCW 81.77.160 to include in SSC's base for rate-setting purposes;
- 2. Entry of judgment in favor of Recomp, reversing the Commission with respect to Paragraph 11 of the Commission's Findings of Fact and Paragraph 5 of its Declaratory Order, and declaring that Section 5.1 of the agreement between the City and SSC requires SSC to deliver all solid waste which SSC collects within the City to Recomp or such other disposal

1	facility or facilities as the
2	Court should either reman
3	999 1 1 90
4	SSC and the City as to the
5	respect to the parties' inter
6	3. Any other reli
7	award of its costs.
8	
9	DATED this 13th d
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

facility or facilities as the City may designate pursuant to that section. Alternatively, t
Court should either remand the matter for an evidentiary hearing to determine the intention
SSC and the City as to the meaning of Section 5.1, or should receive evidence itself wi
respect to the parties' intention pursuant to RCW 34.05.562; and

3. Any other relief to which Recomp may be entitled, including, if applicable, an award of its costs.

DATED this 13th day of February, 1998.

KARR TUTTLE CAMPBELL, A Professional

Service Corporation

Attorneys for Recomp of Washington, I

James L. Austin, Jr. WSBA #2786 Mark R. Johnsen, WSBA #11080

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2900

Seattle, WA 98101-3028

Telephone:

(206) 223-1313

Fax:

(206) 682-7100

PETITION FOR REVIEW - 7

PETITION FOR REVIEW - 8

28

	n
1	
2	Recycling and Disposal Services, Inc. Attention: Craig P. Hayes, Registered Agent Attorney At Law
3	4916 LaBounty Place 2602 Westridge Ave. W., Suite M-301 P.O. Box 399 Tacoma, WA 98466
4	P.O. Box 399 Tacoma, WA 98466 Ferndale, WA 98248
5	
6	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the
7	foregoing is true and correct. DATED at Seattle, Washington, this 13th day of February, 1998.
8	
9	JAMES L. AUSTIN, JR.
10	·
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	,
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	