BEFORE THE

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of Determining the Proper Carrier Classification of:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ENOCH ROWLAND d/b/a KLEENWELL)
BIOHAZARD AND GENERAL ECOLOGY)
CONSULTANTS)

DOCKET NO. TG-920304

ORIGINAL

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1313 West Meeker Kent, Washington

Wednesday, May 13, 1992

This matter came on for hearing, pursuant to Notice, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE: LISA ANDERL

Administrative Law Judge

70: IN 11 NF 26.

* * * * *

1	
2	APPEARANCES:
3	On behalf of the Applicant:
4	JAMES T. JOHNSON, Attorney at Law Two Union Square
5	Suite 3000 601 Union Street
6	Seattle, Washington 98101-2324
7	
8	On behalf of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission:
9	STEVEN W. SMITH, Assistant Attorney General
10	1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W. Olympia, Washington 98504
11	
12	On behalf of the Intervenors:
13	Rabanco Companies:
14	RICHARD A. FINNIGAN, Attorney at Law
15	1201 Pacific Avenue Suite 1900
16	Tacoma, Washington 98402
17	
18	Washington Waste Management Association:
19	JAMES SELLS, Special Counsel 510 Washington Avenue
20	Bremerton, Washington 98310
21	
22	Ryder Distribution Resources, Inc.:
23	BOYD HARTMAN, Attorney at Law 11000 Main
24	Bellevue, Washington 98004
	1

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

22

23

24

25

APPEARANCES (Cont.)

On behalf of the Intervenors:

American Environmental Management Corporation:

DAVID W. WILEY, Attorney at Law 1700 Bellevue Place 10500 N.E. 8th Street Bellevue, Washington 98004

<u>Clark County Disposal, Inc., and Buchmann Sanitary Service, Inc.</u>:

CINDY HORENSTEIN, Attorney at Law 900 Washington Street Suite 900 Vancouver, Washington 98660

* * * * *

INDEX

WITNESSES Applicant's:	(Johnson) <u>DIRECT</u>			(Finnigan) CROSS	(Sells) CROSS		(Horenstein <u>CROSS</u>) BY THE <u>Court</u>
Enoch Rowland	23	53	77	87	98	99	108 1	
	REDIRECT	RECROSS	RECROSS	RECROSS	RECROSS	RECROSS	BY THE <u>recross</u>	COURT
Enoch Rowland	114		115		118	119		117
WITNESSES Commission's:	(Smith) <u>DIRECT</u>		(Hartman) <u>CROSS</u>		(Sells) CROSS		(Horenstein <u>CROSS</u>) BY THE <u>Court</u>
Wayne Turnberg	120	131	136			139		
No	REDIRECT		RECROSS	RECROSS	RECROSS	<u>recross</u>	BY THE <u>recross</u>	COURT
Wayne Turnberg								
	(Finnigan) <u>DIRECT</u>	(Johnson) <u>CROSS</u>		(Hartman) <u>CROSS</u>		• .	(Horenstein) CROSS	
Stan Robinson	142	147						150
	REDIRECT	RECROSS	RECROSS	RECROSS	<u>RECROSS</u>	RECROSS	BY THE <u>recross</u>	COURT
Stan Robinson		151		***		~-		
WITNESSES Intervenor's:	(Wiley) <u>DIRECT</u>	(Johnson) <u>CROSS</u>	(Smith) CROSS	(Hartman) <u>CROSS</u>	(Finnigan) <u>CROSS</u>	(Sells) CROSS	(Horenstein) <u>CROSS</u>	BY THE Court
Jeff Daub	152	170	176					
	REDIRECT	<u>RECROSS</u>	RECROSS	<u>recross</u>	RECROSS	RECROSS	BY THE <u>recross</u>	COURT
Jeff Daub	179	178						

I N D E X (Cont.)

•	_	3	
,		•	
•		•	

3	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	<u>IDENTIFICATION</u>	ADMITTED	REJECTED
4	1	24	114	
5	2	24	114	
6	3	24	53	
7	4	24	53	
8	5	25	114	
9	6	25	114	
10	7	25	114	****
11	8	25	114	
12	9	25	53	
13	10	25	53	
14	11	26	35	
15		(1)	Withdrawn)	
16	12	45	53	
17	13	62	63	
18	14	95	113	-
19	15	101	104	
20	16	101	104	
21	17	141	147	
22	18	141	147	
23	19	145	147	
24	20	161	170	
25				

$\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}$ (Cont.)

3	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	<u>IDENTIFICATION</u>	ADMITTED	REJECTED
4	21	161	170	Allen Grafa
5	22	164	170	
6	23	165	170	
7	24	182	187	
8	25	183	187	Adda Spins
9	. 26	183	187	State 5490
10	27	183	187	
11	28	183	187	-
12	29	183	187	

PROCEEDINGS

9:30 a.m.

JUDGE ANDERL: This hearing will please come to order.

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission has set for hearing at this time and place, Docket No. TG-920304, before Administrative Law Judge, Lisa Anderl. The hearing is being held at the Commission hearing room in Kent, Washington; today's date is May 13, 1992.

This is a classification proceeding, and it is captioned, "In the Matter of Determining the Proper Carrier Classification of Enoch Rowland, d/b/a Kleen-well Biohazard and General Ecology Consultants."

I'd like to take appearances at this time, beginning with the Commission, please.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, my name is Steven W. Smith, Assistant Attorney General. My business address is South 1400, Evergreen Park Drive S.W., Olympia, Washington, 98504.

JUDGE ANDERL: The Respondent?

MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I am James T. Johnson. My address is Suite 3000, Two Union Square at 601 University Street in Seattle, Washington, 98101-2324.

I'm the attorney appearing on behalf of -- while this

procedure is in the name of Enoch Rowland, d/b/a Kleen-well Biohazard and General Ecology Consultants, I think the operations that are involved are actually those of Kleenwell Biohazard and General Ecology Consultants, Incorporated.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Hartman?

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, Your Honor, Boyd Hartman, Attorney at law, 11000 Main, Bellevue, Washington, 98004, requesting this morning intervention on behalf of Ryder Distribution Resources, Inc. I have submitted this morning for Your Honor and for the parties my petition.

JUDGE ANDERL: We'll take comments on the Petitions to Intervene in just a minute. We'll get the names and the appearances on the record first.

Mr. Finnigan?

MR. FINNIGAN: Thank you. Rick Finnigan with the firm of Vandeberg and Johnson. The address is 401 Pacific Avenue, Suite 1900, Tacoma, Washington, 98402. This morning, I'm appearing on behalf of the Rabanco Companies, operating under permit 212.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Sells?

MR. SELLS: Thank you, Your Honor. James Sells, Attorney at law, 510 Washington Avenue, Bremerton, 98201, appearing on behalf of proposed intervenor,

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Wiley?

MR. WILEY: Yes, Your Honor, I'm David Wiley, Attorney at Law, 1700 Bellevue Place, 10500 N.E. 8th Street, Bellevue, Washington, 98004; appearing today on behalf of the proposed intervenor, American Environmental Management Corporation.

JUDGE ANDERL: And is it Ms. Horenstein?

MS. HORENSTEIN: Cindy Horenstein. Business address is 900 Washington, Suite 900, Vancouver, Washington, 98660; appearing on behalf of proposed intervenors Clark County Disposal, Inc., and Buchmann Sanitary Service, Inc.

JUDGE ANDERL: I'd like to go ahead and take the Petitions to Intervene at this time. I believe I've received petitions from each of the proposed intervenors in writing. Mr. Hartman, why don't we start with you and state briefly the basis for your intervention.

MR. HARTMAN: My intervention is basically in the interest of my client that I appear since it is a classification proceeding, and we are presently involved in a proceeding before the Commission in which that proceeding has raised a good number of issues regarding the appropriate classification for both the

shipper we represent or contract with, and for Ryder Distribution Resources, which is a contract carrier. The issues that result in this proceeding may have an impact upon the determination for the application we now have pending. I participate for the purpose of developing the record on classification points if necessary.

JUDGE ANDERL: Any comments on the Petition to Intervene?

MR. JOHNSON: As I understand this proceeding, it's to make a determination as to the status of the operations of Kleenwell. I'm not so sure what these various other carriers can add to the record on that, but — in any event, the only effect of allowing all the interventions would be to prolong this proceeding, so I oppose the interventions.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith, any comments?

MR. SMITH: No, I have no objection to the intervention of Ryder.

JUDGE ANDERL: I believe that Ryder has stated a sufficient basis to intervene in the proceeding, and that petition will be granted.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Finnigan?

MR. FINNIGAN: Thank you. The Rabanco Companies operates the authority sought, or the authority

they have under Certificate 212. Under that certificate, they do engage in the hauling and disposal of medical and infectious waste, and in fact, they have been impacted by the operations of Kleenwell and have lost customers and accounts to Kleenwell under its unlicensed operations. We have a very substantial interest in this proceeding, and on that basis seek to intervene.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson, any comments?

MR. JOHNSON: No, I think what I've said applies to each of these.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: No objection.

JUDGE ANDERL: Rabanco's petition will also be granted.

MR. JOHNSON: What was your ruling?

JUDGE ANDERL: Granted. The petition is granted and the intervention is allowed.

Mr. Sells?

MR. SELLS: Thank you. If Your Honor, please, the Washington Waste Management Association is a trade association which represents virtually all the privately owned solid waste haulers in the state of Washington. We were a party to the previous Kleenwell proceeding. We have been parties, or intervenors, or

protestants to virtually every solid waste proceeding in the last five to ten years in the state. Some of our members are individually represented here, Clark County Disposal and Rabanco because they have a special interest in this application. However, we represent some numerous other members who would be impacted by this application.

We're also gravely concerned about the constitutional issues as they relate to the solid waste industry in this state.

JUDGE ANDERL: Anything other than what you've added before, Mr. Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: I have no objections.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: I have no objection.

JUDGE ANDERL: The Petition to Intervene -- and in each of these cases, unless the parties specify otherwise, it's considered as a General Petition to Intervene rather than a Special Intervention. That petition is also granted.

Mr. Wiley?

MR. WILEY: Yes, Your Honor, just to briefly summarize what my previously filed Petition to Intervene said; essentially, American Environmental is a specialty solid waste hauler who holds statewide

authority from this Commission to transport precisely the same type of material that Kleenwell is transporting. American Environmental is uniquely situated to the extent that it's an out-of-state corporation holding authority from this Commission, and disposing of its material, both out of state and in the state of Washington. As such, it is keenly interested in the outcome of this proceeding, and is feeling the effect of the operations of the intervenor on a daily basis, who was previously a protestant in the proceeding by which Kleenwell's authority was denied by the Commission, and thus, seeks intervention on those numerous basis.

JUDGE ANDERL: Any opposition to that petition?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

JUDGE ANDERL: There being none, that petition will also be granted.

And finally?

MS. HORENSTEIN: Your Honor, we represent most of, or all of the Clark County area, Clark County Disposal and Buchmann Sanitary Services. We feel our particular interest in this procedure is with a unique background in this in that we've had the experience of unfettered competition down in the Clark County area,

and as Mr. Sells' raised, we have concerns about the constitutional issues that may be raised in this case, and the particularly bearing on us because we are a board community that connects to Oregon, which possesses unregulated powers and the effect that would have on our territory.

JUDGE ANDERL: Any opposition to that petition?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

JUDGE ANDERL: That petition will also be granted.

Is there anything further that we need to address, or any other preliminary matters?

[NO RESPONSE]

Mr. Johnson?

Stituted by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission on its own motion to determine whether Enoch Rowland d/b/a Kleenwell Biohazard and General Ecology Consultants is in the business of transporting solid waste for collection and disposal for compensation over the public highways in this state and territory for which it holds no certificate authority for the transportation of solid waste as required by RCW 81.77.040 and WAC 480-70-070.

22

23

The respondent concedes that it is engaged in the transportation of biohazardous or medical waste and that the material it transports from various generators in the state of Washington is ultimately transported to an out of state disposal facility that meets all local. state and federal environmental regulations. urges that under the reasoning of a decision entered January 22, 1992, by the United States District Judge John T. Copenhaber, Jr., in the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia at Charleston in the case of Medigen of Kentucky, Inc. and Medigen of Pennsylvania, Inc. v. Public Service Commission of West Virginia, et al., Civil Action No. 2:09-076, any effort by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to require transporters of infectious medical waste who are common carriers by motor vehicle engaged solely in the interstate transportation of infectious medical waste to obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity prior to providing those services would be a violation of rights protected by the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

We believe the evidence will show that the essential character of the shipments transported by Kleenwell is determined from the shipper's fixed and

persisting transportation intent at the time of ship-ment, citing <u>Baltimore & Ohio Southwest Railway Company</u>, v. Settle, 260 U.S. 166 (1992). The intent is ascertained from all the facts surrounding the transportation. <u>Armstrong</u>, <u>Inc.</u> - Transportation Within Texas, 2 ICC 2d 63, 69 (1986), and <u>Pacific Coast Building Products</u>, <u>Inc.</u> - Petition for Declaratory Order decided January 6, 1989 (not printed), at page 3.

The transportation in question can be considered of the subsequent movement in interstate commerce. We believe the evidence will show beyond any doubt that the services performed by Kleenwell fall within the parameters of the <u>Medigen</u> case.

In the <u>Medigen</u> case, it was pointed out that Medigen of Kentucky transports medical waste from West Virginia to a disposal facility in Kentucky and that Medigen of Pennsylvania transports medical waste from West Virginia to a waste processing facility in Pennsylvania.

After the briefing in the matter was completed, West Virginia Enacted a Medical Waste Act, West Virginia Code Section 20-5J-1 through 20-SJ-10. The act provides that effective July 1, 1991, transporters of infectious medical waste shall be regulated by the PSC under the Common Carriers of Motor Vehicles Act;

The Common Carriers Act requires a prospective common carrier transporter to first obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity from the PSC before commencing operations in the state. Upon application for the certificate, a legal notice, like our docket of the application is published in the foremost and existing transporters are given opportunity to oppose the application. If no protest is made, the certificate may be granted without hearing. If protest is received, the applicant must appear at a hearing and demonstrate that the public convenience and necessity require the proposed service.

Existing transporters may present contradictory evidence. Thus, it is evident that the West Virginia Act is virtually identical to the regulatory scheme in the state of Washington.

On July 27, 1990, a member of the West Virginia PSC staff contacted Medigen of Kentucky and advised it to cease transporting medical waste from West Virginia customers until it had obtained the necessary certificate. In our case, a penalty notice was given to Kleenwell.

In <u>Medigen</u>, the sole issue before the court was whether defendants can require plaintiffs to obtain

a certificate of convenience and necessity prior to transporting medical waste from West Virginia to another state for disposal.

As is our position here, it was the contention of the plaintiffs in the West Virginia case that requiring a certificate of convenience and necessity is unconstitutional and violates the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution because it is in direct regulation of interstate commerce and because its purpose is economic protection as it is designed to prevent free competition.

The plaintiffs in the West Virginia case and Kleenwell in this case maintain that the requirement violates the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution because Congress has preempted the field of market or economic regulation of motor carriers operating in interstate commerce.

Kleenwell acknowledges that at the present time the ICC has declined to exercise jurisdiction over the interstate transportation of waste, concluding that it is not "property" within the meaning of the Interstate Commerce Act. Nonetheless, Kleenwell maintains that Congress, through the ICA, has so entirely occupied the entire field of economic regulation of interstate motor carriage in favor of the competitive forces

of the marketplace that the state's ability to require a certificate of convenience and necessity is impliedly preempted.

As did the plaintiffs in the West Virginia case, Kleenwell offers in support of its position the following portion of <u>Castle v. Hayes Freight Lines</u>, 348 U.S. 61, 63 (1954):

"Congress in the Motor Carrier Act, now recodified as part of the Interstate Commerce Act, adopted a comprehensive plan for regulating the carriage of goods by motor truck in interstate commerce. The federal plan of control was so all embracing that former power of states over interstate motor carriers was greatly reduced. No power at all was left to states to determine what carriers could or could not operate in interstate commerce."

Kleenwell contends that the state statutes at issue here are per se invalid because they are an attempt to effect direct regulation of interstate commerce and because their purpose and effect is economic protection. The principal cases relied upon by plaintiffs in the Medigen case and Kleenwell here are Buck v. Kirkendahl, 267 U.S. 307 (1925), and George W. Bush & Sons v. Malloy, 267 U.S. 317, a 1925 case, both decided on the same day.

25

Both before and after Buck and Bush, it has been consistently held that a state may not require a certificate of convenience and necessity from a carrier engaged exclusively in interstate commerce before it can operate within the state's borders. E.g., Sprout v. South Bend, 277 U.S. 163, 171, a (1928) case; ("the privilege of engage in interstate commerce is one which a state cannot deny"); Interstate Buses Corp. v. Holyoak Street Railway Co., 273 U.S. 45, 51, a (1927) case ("no certificate of public convenience and necessity is required in respect of transportation that is exclusively interstate"); Barnett v. New York, 232 U.S. 14, Local police regulations cannot go so far 31 (1914). as to deny the right to engage in interstate commerce, or to treat it as a local privilege, and prohibit its exercise in the absence of a local license.

The case of <u>Port of Seattle v. Washington</u>

<u>Utilities & Transportation Commission</u>, 597 P.2d 383,

390 (Wash. 1979) ("state's certification requirements
for carriers cannot be applied to a common carrier engaged in exclusively interstate commerce").

In <u>Brown v. Foreman</u>, 476 U.S. at 579, it is indicated that state statutes which directly regulate interstate commerce or discriminate against interstate commerce are generally invalid per se.

In the <u>Medigen</u> case, the court concluded that the defendants' requirement of a certificate of convenience and necessity as a condition of allowing plaintiffs to operate in interstate commerce is a direct rather than an incidental burden on interstate commerce.

In <u>Medigen</u>, the court concluded that to the extent the state agency requires motor carriers to make a showing of convenience and necessity prior to engaging in the interstate transportation of infectious medical waste, the requirement violates plaintiff's rights under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

With that, I'm prepared to call my first witness.

JUDGE ANDERL: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

I don't know if the other parties would like an opportunity to make opening statements at this time, or if they would like to wait until --

MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, my hearing is pretty bad, and I would appreciate it if you could speak up a little.

JUDGE ANDERL: I was asking if the other parties would like an opportunity to present opening statements at this time, or if they would waive that,

1		DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. J	OHNSON:
3	Q Wil	1 you please state your name?
4	A Eno	ch Rowland.
5	Q And	what is your business address?
6	A It'	s 17800 Des Moines Memorial Drive, Seattle, Washing-
7	ton	• .
8	Q And	in what form do you conduct the medical waste
9	tra	nsportation business in which you're engaged; is it
10	ас	orporation, an individual?
11	A Yes	, it's a corporation.
12	Q Wha	t is the name of the corporation?
13	A Kle	enwell Biohazard Medical Waste Ecology and Asso-
14	cia	tes.
15		JUDGE ANDERL: I'm sorry, can you repeat that
16	aga	in, please? I'm not sure that I got that correctly.
17		THE WITNESS: Kleenwell Biohazard and Medical
18	Was	te and Ecology Consultants.
19		MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I have a set of ex-
20	hib	its here and ask that they be marked.
21		JUDGE ANDERL: I have been handed a packet of
22	sev	eral documents. Would you like those all identified
23	at	this time?
- 1	H	MB TOTALON M

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

24

25

JUDGE ANDERL: Exhibit 1 for identification

1	is a certificate for Medical Laboratory personnel.
2	[EXHIBIT NO. 1 MARKED FOR
3	IDENTIFICATION]
4	Exhibit 2 is a certificate from the American
5	Society
6	MR. JOHNSON: Excuse me, I missed a couple
7	here.
8	MR. HARTMAN: Thank you.
9	JUDGE ANDERL: Has everyone got their copies
10	now?
11	MR. JOHNSON: I believe so.
12	JUDGE ANDERL: Exhibits 1 and 2 are certifi-
13	cates.
14	[EXHIBIT NO. 2 MARKED FOR
15	IDENTIFICATION]
16	Exhibit 3 is a Certificate of Incorporation.
17	[EXHIBIT NO. 3 MARKED FOR
18	IDENTIFICATION]
19	Exhibit 4 for identification is a cover sheet
20	from the Department of Licensing.
21	[EXHIBIT NO. 4 MARKED FOR
22	IDENTIFICATION]
23	Exhibit 5 is a Seattle King County Public
24	Health Permit.
25	* * * *
- 1	

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

24

[EXHIBIT NO. 5 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

Exhibit 6 is a letter from the Seattle King County Department of Public Health.

[EXHIBIT NO. 6 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

Exhibit 7 is a letter from the U.S. Department of Transportation.

[EXHIBIT NO. 7 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

Exhibit 8 is another letter from the Seattle King County Department of Public Health dated September 24, 1990.

[EXHIBIT NO. 8 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

Exhibit No. 9 is a document entitled Insurance Binder.

[EXHIBIT NO. 9 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

Exhibit 10 is an application for registration of Interstate Motor Carrier Operations.

[EXHIBIT NO. 10 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

And Exhibit 11 is a single sheet. It says "Kleenwell" at the top.

25 Rowland - Direct (Johnson)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

A Yes, I am.

Q And that was issued in June of 1988, is that correct?

A Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Q And Exhibit 2 is a certificate from the American Society for Microbiology. Is that also issued to you?

- A Yes, it is, or was.
- Q And will you please give us what your academic background is that qualifies you to handle issues relating to medical waste?
- A I have a bachelor's degree in medical technology from
 Long Beach State College; a pharmacy degree from the
 University of California at Los Angeles; I have a
 Master's degree in clinical microbiology from the University of California.

I have an honorary doctor's degree now from the National Certification Agency for Medical Laboratory Personnel, Inc. My certifications are through the American Society of Clinical Pathology; American Society of Microbiology; National Certification Agency for Medical Laboratory Personnel, and the Medicare Act Laboratory Personnel.

My affiliations are among staff at Highline Community Hospital laboratory services for 18 years; on staff at Quantum Laboratory for two years; on staff at Shoreline Community College as a teacher of medical technology and microbiology for the last 18 years for the medical technician and nursing program.

Q And is there any of your work history that you haven't

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

28

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

Rowland - Direct (Johnson)

Uh huh, yes. Α 1 Do you have an operational plan? 2 Uh huh, we do. 3 What is it? 4 We have methods set up for if there's a spillage within 5 the truck and how the truck's cleaned, or if there is 6 spillage on the ground and materials used to clean that 7 up; the personnel which would be dealing with that 8 material, if they spill something on themselves, they 9 would have information on how to clean up. 10 You train your drivers; that's what you're talking 11 about. I take it, is a part of that, is that -12 (Witness nods head affirmatively) Uh huh. 13 -- is that right? Q 14 Yes, I am. Α 15 And who does the training? I do. Α 17 You teach them such matters as packaging requirements Q 18 and personal hygiene matters? 19 Yes, that's right. 20 Is this in writing, or is it oral or what? Q 21 Well, we have a --22 MR. SELLS: Your Honor, I'm going to object 23 to the leading nature of these questions. This is an 24 enforcement proceeding. Normally, I don't object at 25

37

all if it's an administrative hearing, but this is an enforcement proceeding, and counsel -- we may as well put Mr. Johnson up on the stand. He's feeding him the answer as he goes along.

MR. JOHNSON: I said is it in writing or is it oral. I don't see how that's leading.

JUDGE ANDERL: I'll have to agree that that last question wasn't so leading; however, on the other questions, they were quite leading, and if you could not suggest the answer with the question.

MR. JOHNSON: I also disagree that it's an enforcement proceeding. A classification is what they call it in the title.

- (By Mr. Johnson) Once the material -- I mean, when a doctor's nurse, for instance, gets the material that is medical waste, what does she do with it? She puts it in a container, I take it. Does she touch it after that?
 - Well, they're not supposed to. I can't guarantee they do. The materials that they put into the containers are sub-divided into sharps, which would include needles and syringes, and glass slides, and tubes, and things like that that are sharp or breakable, and they go into a hard -- either a bucket or hard sharps containers that are made specifically for that use.

Gauze, and such things as that that are not sharp goes

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

your operation?

A Well, I talked to you about what we might do next, and you wrote a letter to the Interstate Commerce interpreter, and he wrote you back saying that --

MR. WILEY: Objection, Your Honor --

MR. SELLS: Objection, Your Honor, unless the document is available.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, we got a response, any-way.

MR. SELLS: Wait a minute.

JUDGE ANDERL: No, wait a minute, Mr. Johnson. There's an objection pending and I haven't ruled on it. I think at this point it's well taken. Are you going to present that document as an exhibit?

MR. JOHNSON: I --

MR. HARTMAN: The "document" being the request or the response?

JUDGE ANDERL: Either or both.

MR. JOHNSON: I have them, but they're --

JUDGE ANDERL: Do you have copies of them for distribution?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, but I don't have extra copies. Let me find it here.

(Pause)

It was in the exchange correspondence, and I have one copy of it. I'd have to make extra copies of

the response by the Chief of Interpretations from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

JUDGE ANDERL: Do you also have a copy of the letter you sent?

MR. JOHNSON: My letter, I have one copy of it. I'll withdraw the question.

JUDGE ANDERL: Okay.

(By Mr. Johnson) Anyway, how did you change the operation?

MR. WILEY: Well, Your Honor, I object to that question. It is leading because we don't know that he changed his operation at this point. I think the question ought to be rephrased. It's leading.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson, can you rephrase the question, please?

THE WITNESS: Maybe we could take -- Your Honor, could we take maybe a break and then we can discuss it?

MR. WILEY: I would object to that, Your Honor.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson, I know that there is a copy facility here. I know that it's a common practice for people to offer exhibits and then provide copies in an hour or so.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, it isn't to prove the

truth of it. If allowed to do so, I would say that the witness would simply state that based on some inquiries made to the Interstate Commerce Commission, we started bringing the waste to a disposal site out of state, and that's all we're trying to accomplish. I'm not trying to prove the truth or the accuracy of any position.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, my objection -- and I would join Mr. Sells' objection at this point -- I have reviewed that correspondence because Mr. Johnson provided it to some parties. I don't believe that's a correct characterization of it. I would like it to come in if there are any questions about its contents whatsoever or conclusions because I don't think it is helpful necessarily to the respondent's position. So I don't want there to be any questions on it unless it comes in.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson, I believe it would be appropriate if the witness is going to testify about actions he took as a result of inquiries and responses to know what those inquiries and responses were.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I'm not in a position to supply seven copies of this correspondence at this time, and it isn't an important part of my case, so I will withdraw any question about it. I don't have to

rely on that at all.

MR. SELLS: If that's the case, Your Honor, I would move that the last comments of counsel be stricken because they appear to me to an offer of proof. If it's an offer of proof and the document is not going to be offered, then that should be stricken. It's up to him whether he wants to offer the document or not, but I'm not going to have an offer of proof and then have no document to follow it up.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I would join that, and also, I wouldn't have an objection if during the break, as you alluded, we make copies, which is frequently done in hearings at the copy center next door, then I wouldn't have an objection.

JUDGE ANDERL: Yeah, I don't understand what the problem is. If counsel wants to offer the document, there are copy facilities nearby. If counsel doesn't, then I believe that references to it --

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I'm not going to offer it.

JUDGE ANDERL: -- will not be considered.

MR. HARTMAN: You're granting the motion to strike his offer?

JUDGE ANDERL: I'm not sure how those motions to strike actually work in terms of whether it gets

43 Rowland - Direct (Johnson)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

deleted from the record, or -- I will grant the motion to the extent that it's not something I will consider.

MR. JOHNSON: There is a second letter of response, and I don't have that here, and so I believe if I put it in at this time, it would -- I'll just save it for a later time.

I would request a brief recess. I'm dry and need a glass of water.

JUDGE ANDERL: You're not done with your witness yet, are you?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

JUDGE ANDERL: It's 10:30 and we might as well go ahead and take our morning break at this time. Let's be back at quarter to 11:00. We're off the record.

[BRIEF RECESS TAKEN]

JUDGE ANDERL: We're back on the record after our morning break.

Mr. Johnson, you can continue with your witness.

MR. JOHNSON: I'd like this letter marked for identification. It's my only copy.

JUDGE ANDERL: I have a two page document which I'll mark for identification as Exhibit 12; the first page is on the letterhead of Security

Environmental Systems, and the second page at the top is entitled "Certificate of Destruction."

[EXHIBIT NO. 12 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

Do the parties want to take a look at this at this time? Mr. Johnson has assured me he will provide copies.

[DOCUMENT BRIEFED BY COUNSEL]

- Q (By Mr. Johnson) Showing you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit 12, on the second page of that, can you examine it and tell me what it is?
- A It's a Certificate of Destruction and a receipt for the number of pounds that was delivered to the Security Environmental Systems.
- Q And you received that from whom?
- A Security Environmental Systems.
- Q And it shows what; it shows that they destroyed a certain number --
- A Number of pounds.
- Q 4,740 pounds of biohazardous waste.

MR. FINNIGAN: I'm going to object again. He just gave his client the answer, and nothing could be more misleading -- or, excuse me -- leading than that question. If he's going to have his client identify the document, that's fine. If he wants his client to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

47

Q

(By Mr. Johnson) And have you received any advice from any lawyer to the effect that the interstate transportation of medical waste is not subject to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission's regulations --

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I'm going to object to that question. I think it seeks to elicit a highly self serving response, and it's total hearsay. If he's trying to indicate that — he said in his opening statement, as I recall, that that was the issue that he was pursuing here. If he's trying to elicit an answer that yes, Mr. Johnson said that was interstate commerce. I think it's self serving from the applicant and the applicant's counsel's standpoint. That's the issue that we're addressing here. Whether he so advised is irrelevant.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson, if you want to comment on that?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, it explains why he's -the answer would explain why he has been engaged in
this transportation in spite of the statutory scheme.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, whether it's under advice of counsel or not, he's not trying to cloak himself in the mantle of State law; I mean, counsel isn't. So whether it's under the advice of counsel or

not doesn't have any bearing on the issues we're addressing.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith, any comments on that?

MR. SMITH: I don't have any objection to the question, Your Honor, if it's just going to whether he received some advice from counsel and he changed his operations for that reason. I don't want to get into any legal argument with the witness, but if it's limited to that extent, I don't have any problems with it.

MR. JOHNSON: It doesn't suggest whether counsel is right or not. It's just whether he received that advice.

JUDGE ANDERL: Right, I kind of am a little puzzled, I guess, by the question since I don't think — this isn't like an application proceeding where we're concerned with an applicant's fitness and what he may or may not have done under advice of counsel, but it is somewhat self serving, but I don't really have a problem with the question. I guess I'll overrule the objection and allow the witness to answer the question.

Do you remember what it was?

Yes, I continue to operate on Mr. Johnson's advice.

MR. JOHNSON: I think that's all I have, Mr.

50 Rowland - Direct (Johnson)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

JUDGE ANDERL: And you've offered the exhibits 1 through 12, with the exception of 11, which is withdrawn?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

JUDGE ANDERL: Let's deal with the objections to the exhibits, if any, at this time, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I have no objections to 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 12. I'd like to reserve my objections to 1, 2, 5 and 7 until after cross.

MR. JOHNSON: I have no objection to reserving a ruling.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Hartman?

MR. HARTMAN: I have no objection to the exhibits.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Finnigan?

MR. FINNIGAN: I would like to reserve my objections until after cross, although I will note at this time that when the witness was asked about Exhibit 8, he indicated they're not using that anymore, so I don't think Exhibit 8 would be appropriate.

JUDGE ANDERL: I think actually it was
Exhibit 11 that he was referring to, and that's been withdrawn, although --

MR. FINNIGAN: I understand that, but I

believe he also made the same statement, or a similar statement as to Exhibit 8 when he was identifying that, and he's shaking his head yes, so --

JUDGE ANDERL: Exhibit 8 is a letter, is it not?

MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, but he's indicated that - my memory is that he indicated that that reflected
circumstances that are not longer existent.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Sells?

MR. SELLS: I would join with Mr. Smith. I have no objections to the ones that he has no objection to, but I would like to cross on the others.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Wiley?

MR. WILEY: Yes, Your Honor, I would join those objections, and pay particular focus on Exhibit 6, which I believe is not a complete exhibit to the extent that previous correspondence regarding the status has not yet been admitted, and I would like to seek to admit that through my cross before we admit Exhibit 6 and offer them all at the same time after that.

JUDGE ANDERL: And Ms. Horenstein, any objections?

MS. HORENSTEIN: No.

JUDGE ANDERL: Well, it looks like there are

no objections outstanding to Exhibits 3, 4, 9, 10 and 12 -- wait a minute -- Mr. Finnigan, you wanted me to withhold --

MR. FINNIGAN: No, as to those which Mr. Smith identified that he does not have an objection, I also do not have objections.

JUDGE ANDERL: It looks as though we can admit Exhibits 3, 4, 9, 10 and 12 at this time, and I'll reserve ruling on the others.

[EXHIBIT NOS. 3, 4, 9, 10 AND 12 FOR IDENTIFICATION WERE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE]

Mr. Smith, cross?

MR. SMITH: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. SMITH:

Q Mr. Rowland, my name is Steve Smith. I'm with the Attorney General's office, representing the Commission in this matter.

If I refer to "Kleenwell" in my questions, I'm always referring to Kleenwell Biohazard unless I indicate your other company.

Now you indicated that Kleenwell Biohazard is a corporation, is that correct?

THE WITNESS: 1,300 miles.

Q (By Mr. Smith) Now you applied to the UTC for permanent authority to operate as an infectious waste collector in the state, is that correct?

- A Yes.
- Q And as a result of that proceeding, you indicated you were denied permanent operating authority.
- A That's right.
 - And the grounds for that denial was that you had shown yourself to be unfit to receive operating authority, and that you had not complied with the UTC's rules, is that correct?
 - A I don't remember the exact reasons.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I have an exhibit I'd like marked next in line.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm going to object to this line of questioning. I don't think the question here is whether this is an activity that's subject to the Commission's regulation, State regulation; and reasons for denying some prior application, I don't think are an issue.

JUDGE ANDERL: On the grounds of relevancy, then, Mr. Smith, do you have a response to that?

MR. SMITH: Well. Your Honor, one of the

MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, one of the items they have to establish in a Commerce clause, it

depends to which jurisdiction, is that the matter subject to regulation is a matter of legitimate local interest within the state, and our position is that the hauling of infectious waste is a matter of interest, particularly if it's being hauled by some other company unfit to handle what we consider to be a dangerous commodity. And Mr. Rowland's position is that he is not subject to our jurisdiction, and the fact that he has been found unfit in a prior proceeding, which, by the way, was opened up by Mr. Johnson by his testimony about his operation, is relevant to show the State's local interest in regulating Mr. Rowland's operation.

JUDGE ANDERL: But wouldn't that interest be the same whether he had ever been determined to be fit or not?

MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor, it would be the same, but I think if the State's interest is even keener if because of disposing out of state unfit operators can operate on the highways in the state of Washington hauling infectious medical waste.

MR. JOHNSON: Activities either subject to the State's regulation or it's not. They can't pick a particular individual and say this guy's not safe, and zero in on him. It's not the way it works.

JUDGE ANDERL: I'll overrule the objection

and allow Mr. Smith to continue on that line of questioning. The exhibit, of course, is just marked for identification at this time as 13. It's identified as Order No. M.V.G. No. 1480.

[EXHIBIT NO. 13 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

The one you're distributing now will be 14. What are you distributing now?

MR. SMITH: I'm distributing the same one.

JUDGE ANDERL: The initial one, I'm sorry.

That's 13. I thought he was already on another

- Q (By Mr. Smith) Mr. Rowland, do you have before you what has been marked for identification as Exhibit 13?
- A Yes.
- Q And do you recognize that as a proposed order of the Administrative Law Judge in your application for permanent authority?
- A Yes, I do.

exhibit, sorry.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I will move for entry of Exhibit 13, either on Mr. Rowland's identification, or ask the Commission to take official notice of it as a UTC Order.

MR. JOHNSON: I object on the grounds it has no relevancy. It was a classification proceeding.

1		Corporation subsidizes the infectious waste collection
2		corporation?
3	Α	It has.
4	Q	And has that always been the case?
5	Α	Probably.
6	Q	And does the ICC regulate your rates in any way?
7	Α	No.
8	Q	And your position is that the Utilities and
9		Transportation Commission has no jurisdiction to
10		regulate your rates, is that correct?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	Now your competitors that you discussed a minute ago,
13		are they companies whose rates are regulated by the
14		Commission?
15	Α	Yes, as far as I know.
16	Q	And you can underprice your competitors at will, is
17		that accurate?
18	A	I suppose that would be accurate. I don't do it
19		automatically, but if my rates are lower than theirs, I
20		would say so, yes.
21	Q	In fact, you testified that you were able to actually
22		operate at a loss; that was your testimony?
23	Α	Just now, you're talking?
24	Q	Yes.
25	A	Yes.

73 Rowland - Cross (Smith)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

74

Rowland - Cross (Smith)

75 Rowland - Cross (Smith)

25

Rowland - Cross (Smith)

questions.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Hartman?

MR. HARTMAN: Yes. First I would like to have a copy of Exhibit 12.

JUDGE ANDERL: Well, I have the only copy.

Mr. Johnson will provide copies, I think, after lunch, so you can look at this one.

MR. HARTMAN: I take it this is intended to be a two page --

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. HARTMAN: -- exhibit; the first page of which is dated 5/5/92. It says "Generator, Kleenwell Biohazardous Waste and Ecology Consultants.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARTMAN:

- Q Is that a correct description of that document?
- A Yes.
- And is that intended to cover the total -- it was intended, I take it, to cover the total shipment consisting of product from a number of local generators, is that correct?
- A That's true.
- Q As to the local generators, what type of documentation, if any, is prepared for them when you make a pick-up?

77 Rowland - Cross (Hartman)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

1

2

3

4

5

_

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rowland - Cross (Hartman)

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- When our shipment goes, there's a copy of each one of those, of their receipts that go with that shipment, and it's given to the SES for destruction. When we get the certificate back, we send them their copies, along with a copy of their copies.
- When that documentation then is returned to them, is there any other correspondence or anything else that goes with it?
- No.
- When the pick-up is made and the signature of the document, which we do not have in evidence that's made, is there any regulations or information which you submit that instructs them or your people as to how that documentation is to be prepared?
- To our clients, you're saying that?
- Yes, or any instructions that you submit to your employees?
- My employees are trained on how to fill out the forms and fill out the log book.
- I'm asking if there's anything in writing as to how--
- Yeah, our procedural -- I have a procedural manual that I put together for them.
- And do you have a copy of that?
- Not here.

Rowland - Cross (Hartman) 79

Rowland - Cross (Hartman):

that type of thing.

- Q Do you have a copy of that packet?
- A No.
- Q Is it an identical packet submitted to each account?
- A Yes.
- Q And what is that -- is there any reference in that information in respect to the manner of shipment or destination of the shipment?
- A Yes, there is.

MR. HARTMAN: Your Honor, again, I would think that would be something that could be produced.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, sure we can, but I'll have to go back to the office to get it.

JUDGE ANDERL: Well, yes. I think we already had a second day scheduled. Mr. Hartman, what are you proposing, just that you want to have an opportunity to look at it, or did you --

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, I'm not requesting that it be marked as an exhibit at this point, but only be made available for examination.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I will be able to provide Mr. Hartman with a copy of that at the lunch break, so maybe that will answer his --

JUDGE ANDERL: All right.

81 Rowland - Cross (Hartman)

Rowland - Cross (Hartman)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Α

83 Rowland - Cross (Hartman)

Yes, we figured it out, and, again, things change; gas

85 Rowland - Cross (Hartman)

be considered exempt from Chapter 8177 and be

recycle at that time, is that correct?

considered subject to Chapter 8180 because you are a

23

24

25

Rowland - Cross (Finnigan)

Mr. Rowland, I'm directing you to the eight day maximum

Q

92

Rowland - Cross (Finnigan)

gallon or 12 gallon. It's a large and a small is all the identification that I saw.

MR. FINNIGAN: In a response to a question by Mr. Smith, Mr. Rowland indicated that his rates for a ten gallon box was \$12.00, and his rate for a larger box is \$20.00, and I'm simply trying to find out the size of the larger box.

MR. JOHNSON: I withdraw the objection.

JUDGE ANDERL: There being no objection, then, go ahead and answer the question.

- A I think it holds about 18 gallons or something.
- Q (By Mr. Finnigan) Approximately 18 gallons?
- A I think so, yes.
- Q How many of your customers use this larger box?
- A Not an awful lot. Most of my customers are using the small. I would say maybe ten percent.

MR. FINNIGAN: May I have this marked as the next exhibit?

JUDGE ANDERL: Exhibit 14 for identification is a single sheet entitled "Kleenwell Biohazard Waste and General Ecology Consultants."

[EXHIBIT NO. 14 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, since questions have come up about the packet of information that is

95 Rowland - Cross (Finnigan)

handed to customers, and I have what I believe is a copy of that packet -- but it may be appropriate to take the noon recess and I could confirm that with Mr. Rowland and his counsel because that would be my next line of questioning.

JUDGE ANDERL: I was actually kind of hoping to get through cross on this witness anyway before lunch. Maybe not. I just saw the looks on your faces.

MR. JOHNSON: Why wait?

JUDGE ANDERL: Then does anyone have any objection to breaking for lunch at this time?

MR. WILEY: No.

JUDGE ANDERL: Let's do that, then, and we'll be back at 1:15. We're off the record.

[HEARING RECESSED FOR LUNCH AT 12:05 P.M., TO RECONVENE AT 1:15 P.M.]

* * * * *

AFTERNOON RECESS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. .

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE ANDERL: We're back on the record.

1:20 p.m.

Mr. Finnigan?

MR. FINNIGAN: Thank you. It was profitable to take a break at that time because we were able to determine that the packet I had was no longer in use, and so I just have one question.

CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. FINNIGAN:

Q Would you please look at Exhibit 14, the exhibit I distributed to you just before lunch?

MR. JOHNSON: Which one was that?

Can you show me?

JUDGE ANDERL: Here you go, here's my copy.

- Q (By Mr. Finnigan) Based upon our discussions that we had just after the break for lunch, is it true that Exhibit 14 was a flier that has, in the past, been used by you but is no longer in use?
- A That's right.
- Q And you modified the flier somewhat related to some of the information that's at the bottom of that?
- A Yes.
- Q But otherwise, the information that's on the top half

1	of this flier is still information that you distribute?
2	A Yes.
з	MR. FINNIGAN: Thank you.
4	JUDGE ANDERL: Is that it?
5	MR. FINNIGAN: That's it.
6	JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Sells?
7	MR. SELLS: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	
9	CROSS EXAMINATION
0	BY MR. SELLS:
11	Q Mr. Rowland, I have one question, and that is is it my
2	understanding that the sole purpose that you are
3	carrying medical waste to the state of California is to
4	avoid regulation by the Washington Utilities and
5	Transportation Commission?
6	A I can only answer that yes or no, right?
7	Q Yes.
8	A No, that's not the case.
9	Q What other reason is there for carrying these materials
20	to California rather than to Bellingham, for example?
21	A Because I believe I'm interstate and not intrastate.
22	Q But the reason you're interstate is because you're
23	going to California, is that not correct?
24	A That's true.
25	Q And the only reason you're going to California is so
	98 Rowland - Cross (Sells)

permit with King County was revoked because of violations found by the King County Board of Health on your storage practices?

- A That's on record, yes.
- And by "on record," are you referring to correspondence from the Seattle/King County Department of Public Health that was transmitted to you in the winter of 1990?
- A That's true, yeah.

MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I object to testimony concerning this ancient history. It's long since been reinstated and I don't see where it has any bearing on any issue in this proceeding.

MR. WILEY: Well, first, I guess I better have it identified by you.

JUDGE ANDERL: Well, yes, I would imagine the objection is both to any questions that you are about to pose, and to the documents themselves which are being handed out. I will identify for the record -- did you want --

MR. WILEY: The January 5th letter first, please, Your Honor.

JUDGE ANDERL: The January 5th letter will be Exhibit 15.

* * * *

And the February 15th letter will be Exhibit

IDENTIFICATION]

16, both from the Seattle/King County Department of

[EXHIBIT NO. 16 MARKED FOR

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, the objection has now come before I have attempted to lay any foundation, so I guess I'm at a loss. I would like to lay some foundation then argue for admissibility.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll withhold my objection.

JUDGE ANDERL: Go ahead, Mr. Wiley.

- Q (By Mr. Wiley) Mr. Rowland, would you please -- do you have copies of those exhibits in front of you?
- A Yes.
- Q You referred to communication from the Seattle/King County Department of Public Health regarding your storage practices.

I would ask you first of all to look at the exhibit that has been identified as 15 for admission. It's not yet been admitted. And tell us who Mr. Bob Sanders is, please.

- A He was a gentleman that was working for me back in January of 1990.
 - 101 Rowland Cross (Wiley)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

itself is the best evidence.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I'm trying to lay foundation based on the objection that I understood would come to these exhibits. If they are not being objected to and will be admitted into the record, I don't know that we need to go into anymore foundation questions.

JUDGE ANDERL: Right, yes. They are not a part of the record yet, Mr. Johnson. Would you object to their admission and there probably would not be any testimony required about them, about what they say, anyway.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I don't know why my objection should require Mr. Rowland to analyze and tell us what the exhibit says. It speaks for itself.

MR. WILEY: I'm not trying to do that, Your Honor. I'm trying to lay foundation and to characterize the communication and correspondence, and the response thereto. I'm not trying to get into the contents to any degree.

JUDGE ANDERL: The objection is overruled.

(By Mr. Wiley) Mr. Rowland --

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I don't know if I've formally offered these, but I would do so at this time, and I assume your objection overruling would allow

103 Rowland - Cross (Wiley)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

Ŭ

their admission, is that correct?

JUDGE ANDERL: Well, if Mr. Johnson wants to make a formal objection to their admission, he can do so. Mr. Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I have no objections for what it's worth.

JUDGE ANDERL: Exhibits 15 and 16 will be admitted as identified.

[EXHIBIT NOS. 15 AND 16 FOR IDENTIFICATION RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE]

(By Mr. Wiley) And Mr. Rowland, calling your attention back to Exhibit 6, this letter was issued after lengthy or hearings at the King County Board of Health that sought to review your storage and handling practices and the revocation of your King County Health Department permit for infectious waste hauling, is that correct?

A That's true.

- Now you indicated that you had expanded your storage facilities for the holding of infectious waste. I didn't understand the date at which that occurred.
- A I'm not sure exactly. Within the last six months.
- Q Within the last six months?
- A Yes.

operational practices, and I wanted to understand who

106

language on the face of Exhibit 5, that that permit is issued subject to state law regulating the 2 transportation and collection of medical waste? 3 MR. JOHNSON: Well, Your Honor, the exhibit 4 speaks for itself. It says subject to all state laws. 5 MR. WILEY: I'm asking his understanding of 6 what the permit allows or doesn't allow. 7 JUDGE ANDERL: I'll allow the question. 8 I've read that, yes. 9 (By Mr. Wiley) And is that your understanding? 10 Yes. 11 MR. WILEY: No further questions, Your Honor. 12 JUDGE ANDERL: Ms. Horenstein? 13 MS. HORENSTEIN: Just a few more questions, 14 Mr. Rowland. 15 16 CROSS EXAMINATION 17 BY MS. HORENSTEIN: 18 My understanding from your previous testimony is that 19 your services are primarily provided to the Medical 20 Services Corporation customers? 21 Yes, the majority, except for about ten percent. Α 22 Where are those other ten percent located? Q 23 Well, they're in the same areas generally, in Burien or 24 Seattle, or Bellevue. 25

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

108

Rowland-Cross (Horenstein)

- Q The kind of urbanized areas, then?
- A Yeah.
- I also recall that you testified that you've got plenty of business right now; you've guys have got enough to keep you busy. Do you have some type of internal policy that you decide if you were contacted by somebody else whether or not you could handle those additional customers?
- We've never turned any away, but we're not out actively promoting new business right now.
- Q If perhaps you were contacted by somebody outside of that urbanized area, would you be able to service them, or would you need to -- would you be able to service them?
- A As long as it was Seattle, King County, we could, yes.
- Q If, for instance, you were contacted by somebody that was outside of that area, how would you handle that?
- A We would just tell them we're not equipped and ready to do that.
 - And I have clarification on your rates; the way that they were set and how they were calculated. You talked about -- apparently, it was just the transportation costs and -- the pick-up and transportation costs that the factors of those rates. Does the distance for picking up for those customers have any bearing on

109 Rowland-Cross (Horenstein)

1	
1	that, or do you charge all your customers the same
2	amount for small boxes, large boxes?
3	A About the same.
4	Q About the same?
5	A I should say the same, yes.
6	Q They are the same?
7	A (Witness nods head affirmatively) Uh huh.
8	MS. HORENSTEIN: No further questions.
9	JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Rowland, I have a few
10	questions.
11	
12	EXAMINATION
13	BY THE COURT:
14	Q In the beginning of your testimony when you talked
15	about training, you mentioned something about Quantum
16	Laboratories training?
17	A I'm on the staff there and we utilize their training
18	facilities for we train all our technicians through
19	the WISHA and the OSHA, and the KLEA regulations, and
20	they get the same basically that I've given my
21	daughter and myself have gone through the same
22	training.
23	Q And what is Quantum Laboratories?
24	A It's a large medical laboratory.
25	Q And what is your position on the staff there?
	AAA Bard (Brothe Count)
- 1	110 Rowland (By the Court)

Rowland (By the Court)

- When we ship, we ship with a packet that has all of the -- each box is identified and each receipt is copied 3 and goes with that packet, so SES does have a packet when they receive that.
 - Do they keep those receipts? Q
 - They keep those, yes, and then we receive the certificate. And then we -- actually what we do is make two copies and one copy goes with each one of the certificate or whatever; how many copies there are, how many times we picked up for them. We send a receipt along with their certificate back to them.
 - And the accounts for which you collect medical waste at this time, is that on a -- do you pick-up on a prearranged basis or on an on-call basis from them?
 - Both.
 - Just depending on what the account prefers?
 - Yes.

JUDGE ANDERL: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Johnson, redirect?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

JUDGE ANDERL: Well, actually, probably before you do that, it might be appropriate to address the exhibits then.

Mr. Finnigan, I believe you offered Exhibit

Rowland (By the Court) 112

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. 624-3731

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14, is that correct?

MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson, any objection to

that Exhibit 14?

MR. JOHNSON: Exhibit 14 is --

JUDGE ANDERL: Yes, you're looking at it.

No. I have no objection to MR. JOHNSON:

that.

JUDGE ANDERL: Exhibit 14 will be admitted.

[EXHIBIT NO. 14 FOR IDENTIFI-

CATION RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE]

And I'd like to know if any of the intervenors will renew any of their objections to the previously identified exhibits before the Commission does, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: I have no objections to any of the exhibits.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Hartman?

MR. HARTMAN: No objection.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Finnigan?

MR. FINNIGAN: The only one that I object to is Exhibit 8, which was identified by Mr. Rowland as describing what was true in 1990 but it does not describe what is true today.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Sells?

1	MR. SELLS: Just Exhibit 8, Your Hønor.
2	JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Wiley?
3	MR. WILEY: I join in the objection to
4	Exhibit 8, Your Honor.
5	JUDGE ANDERL: Ms. Horenstein?
6	MS. HORENSTEIN: No objection.
7	JUDGE ANDERL: The objections to 8 will be
8	overruled and the previously identified exhibits which
9	have not yet been admitted will be admitted at this
10	time, noting that Exhibit 11 has been withdrawn.
11	[EXHIBIT NOS. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7
12	AND 8 FOR IDENTIFICATION
13	RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE]
14	Now Mr. Johnson, we'll proceed with redirect
15	
16	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. JOHNSON:
18	Q Mr. Smith asked you whether you can charge different
19	customers different rates for the same service. If yo
20	were to do that, would that be something you would do?
21	A No, I haven't done that yet, no.
22	Q Would you consider it good business practice to charge
23	different customers different rates?
24	A No.
25	Q Do the various regulations strike that.
I	II.

114 Rowland-Redirect (Johnson)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

115 Rowland - Recross (Hartman)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

116 Rowland - Recross (Hartman)

Rowland - (By the Court)

25

- 11	
1	MR. HARTMAN: I'm sorry, I can't hear.
2	A I say we do stop and go through the process of
з	California, but the truck stops, the weigh stations and
4	so forth.
5	Q (By the Court) But that's all?
6	A Yes.
7	JUDGE ANDERL: Anything further for this
8	witness?
9	MR. FINNIGAN: No.
0	MR. JOHNSON: No, not for me.
1	MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I have one question
2	following up to yours.
3	JUDGE ANDERL: Go ahead, Mr. Wiley.
4	
5	RECROSS EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. WILEY:
7	Q Mr. Rowland, are you aware of any permitting
8	requirement for infectious waste imposed by the State
9	of California Department of Health regarding the
0	transportation of infectious waste through the State o
11	California, or any stickering requirement for
2	transportation related thereto?
:3	A No, in Oregon we have to stop and check, but there's
4	nothing in Oregon, and California, I've forgotten. We
5	did have to buy I think we had to buy a permit or
	118 Rowland - Recross (Wiley
ı	

1	something. I'm not sure.
2	Q Have you inquired of California regulators regarding
3	their requirements for the transportation of infectious
4	waste within California?
5	A Yes, we have, actually. We have talked with them.
6	Q And you understand they do have a permitting or trailer
7	stickering requirement when you bring infectious waste
8	into California?
9	A Yes, right.
10	Q And you do abide by those regulations imposed by the
11	State of California?
12	A We stop at the border, yes.
13	Q And I asked you, do you abide by those regulations
14	proposed by the State of California?
15	A Yes, yes.
16	MR. WILEY: No further questions.
17	JUDGE ANDERL: Okay.
18	MR. SELLS: May I ask one based upon that,
19	Your Honor, just one.
20	JUDGE ANDERL: Okay, and then I want to call
21	an end to it.
22	
23	RECROSS EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. SELLS:
25	Q Do you put a State of California Health Department
	119 Rowland - Recross (Sells)

sticker on your Budget rent-a-truck? 1 No, I do not. Α 2 MR. SELLS: That's all. 3 Thank you. You may step down. JUDGE ANDERL: 4 [WITNESS EXCUSED] 5 Mr. Smith, during the break, you discussed 6 presenting a witness out of order? 7 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. It may be in 8 order. I don't know whether Mr. Johnson is done or 9 not, but I do have a witness who, for scheduling 10 purposes, I would like to put on now. 11 JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson? 12 MR. JOHNSON: I have no objection to --13 JUDGE ANDERL: Do you have other witnesses? 14 MR. JOHNSON: No. I'm not contemplating any. 15 JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith? 16 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I call Mr. Wayne 17 Turnberg, please. 18 19 having been first duly sworn on WAYNE TURNBERG 20 oath, was called as a witness on behalf of the Commission and 21 testified as follows: 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. SMITH: 24 Would you please state and spell your name for the Q 25 Turnberg - Direct (Smith) 120

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

- A My name is Wayne Turnberg, T-u-r-n-b-e-r-g.
- Q And Mr. Turnberg, what is your business address?
- A It's the Washington State Department of Ecology, P.O. Box 47600, Olympia, Washington, 98504.
- Q Could you briefly describe your educational background?
- Yes, I earned a bachelor of science degree from the University of Massachusetts in 1975; a Master of science and public health degree from the University of Washington in 1980.
- Q And in what capacity are you employed by the Department of Ecology?
- A I am an environmental planner in the solid waste support section with the Department, working with solid waste issues.
- Q Could you briefly describe your duties as an environmental planner?
- A Yes, I am responsible for -- well, my primary responsibility is advising the State of Washington Solid Waste Regulations. I also have a major component of my work involved with medical waste issues.
- Q Other than your present position, do you have any other work experience in the field of medical waste or infectious waste?
- A Yes, I do. I began working with medical waste in 1987
 - 121 Turnberg Direct (Smith)

with the Seattle/King County Health Department. At the time, the issue was just concerned with the issue. It was just arising in the King County area. So I conducted a -- served as a project manager for an examination, a risk evaluation of infectious waste in King County, Washington. The reason for the study was to determine whether the risks to human populations were presented from medical waste, and to develop recommendations on how to regulate that waste stream, if it needed regulation at all.

Based on the study, we worked on regulations for biomedical waste or infectious waste. In King County, I was the primary author of the regulations that were passed by the King County Board of Health in the fall of 1988.

Following that, the Washington State Legislature, under a substitute Senate Bill 6264 --

MR. JOHNSON: Senate Bill what?

THE WITNESS: 6264. That was the 1988 legislature.

Mandated the Department of Ecology to conduct an examination of infectious waste as well on a state-wide level, so I was obtained to manage the particular project. That study was conducted over the latter part of 1988 and 1989. We developed our reports, our

122 Turnberg - Direct (Smith)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

findings and presented our recommendations to the 1990 legislature, so that was the purpose of that project.

- (By Mr. Smith) Do you have any experience on the Q federal or national level?
- Yes, I do. Just having worked with the State, I became involved with federal activities as a state representation, and as an individual in the country who had -- because of the time I had spent with the issue -- had developed expertise with the issue.

I served as a panel member and advisor to the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment for their report to Congress, as well as an advisor and panel member to the Council of State Governments for their report to the state governments of the country.

- Turning to the 1988 legislature Substitute Senate Bill 6264, was a report prepared as a result of that legislative directive?
 - Yes, it was. The legislature had a number of questions based on the medical waste stream in the state. Washington state had never addressed the medical waste stream as a special waste stream, and had little information at the time. When the legislature passed this bill, this was back in 1988 when medical waste wash-ups were occurring on the east coast and there was a wave of concern across the country as to the health

effects resulting from improperly disposed medical waste. So what they did was outline about 20 issues that they wanted addressed, and they wanted presented in a report back to them. So this report focused on those points that the legislature wanted addressed and provided recommendations to the legislature based on our findings.

- Q And what was your role in that report?
- A I was the project manager and the senior author, the primary author of the report.
- Q And as a result of the study, you indicated you made some recommendations to the legislature?
- A We did. The three primary recommendations, first of all, was that we recommended that the state develop a medical waste regulation.

MR. JOHNSON: A medical waste what?

THE WITNESS: Regulation.

We felt that the waste stream should be defined and regulated in a specific way. We also wanted to address the need to provide information to medical waste generated from homes, and we also wanted to provide information and education to the waste industry workers regarding medical waste handling; what to do when medical waste is encountered. And I'm using the term "medical waste" very loosely here. This is a term that

has taken on many different terms. I believe the current word that is used that was just passed by the 1992 legislature is biomedical waste. The term that we are using in 1989 was infectious waste, but this refers to a specific, clearly defined part of the waste stream.

Q (By Mr. Smith) In your report and your studies, did you identify any dangers to waste industry personnel from exposure to infectious waste or medical waste?

A We did. This we viewed as a -- well, the waste works

We did. This we viewed as a -- well, the waste workers as the group, or that part of our population that is facing the major exposure if there is an exposure. We conducted a survey, which we sent out to 940 waste workers, including collectors, landfill operators, transfer station operators, et cetera, asking them in the survey what kind of exposures they were facing. We had a number of multiple choice questions. What we found is that there is exposure occurring, particularly with regard to the waste collectors. Of 240 waste collectors that responded to the survey, ten percent over the course of the year preceding the survey reported having been stuck by a needle, and we felt that that was a significant exposure.

We didn't identify disease transmission resulting from these exposures, or any transmission resulting

from any exposure in the country. So the actual transmission has not been identified, but we have certainly have identified an exposure problem, particularly with regard to hypodermic needles.

And I take it from your recommendation, notwithstanding the fact that you could not identify any actual infections, you still believe that this segment of the waste stream should be regulated?

MR. JOHNSON: I object to the question as being highly leading and suggestive.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, I don't believe it is leading. I haven't suggested the answer other than to state what he stated previously, which is already on the record as his testimony. I can rephrase it if you like. I really don't see the need.

JUDGE ANDERL: I'll overrule the objection.

I think it is just a restatement of what he's already testified to, so you can answer the question if you remember.

I think just a brief explanation of the findings: We looked at the world's literature identifying studies that have examined the presence of organisms in the waste stream. We concluded that the entire waste stream contains organisms that are capable of causing

infection in humans in the right circumstances. Humans shed human pathogens, and they find their way into the waste streams from a number of sources. So the entire waste stream, from the strict term of infectious, it could be considered to be infectious. But we did identify particular components of the waste stream that appeared, based on our findings, to present a greater risk to human population than that would normally be found in the waste stream.

A greater risk was based on the ability to puncture the skin, for instance, or the concentration. Hypodermic needles, for instance, when loose in the waste stream, these are devices that have been in contact with human blood, and if not handled properly, they can puncture the skin inadvertently of a waste worker or an individual, and cause a potential for disease transmission.

Laboratory wastes, stocks and cultures of grown, pure infectious agents present concentrations that are just not normally found in the waste stream, and if contact with that component of the waste stream occurs, again, the risk would be increased for potential transmission.

Looking at studies that have examined infections occurring within medical institutions, particularly

Laboratories have a long list of reported documented cases of disease transmission resulting from improperly handled cultures or stocks. So though it has not been identified in the environment, we felt that it was still potentially -- well, it was possible for disease transmission to occur based on exposures to this particular component of the waste stream after it leaves the medical institution and enters the environment.

- Q (By Mr. Smith) When you talk about risk of exposure to infectious waste, what are the major concerns, or major diseases that are possible.
 - Well, the focus has been -- the issue has arisen because of the HIV, the AIDS virus. This certainly has brought the issue to the front of the public's concern. In fact, the studies of HIV in the environment show that the virus itself is very fragile, and that contact with waste is not really a way that this organism is

going to be transmitted, but there are other organisms, particularly with regard to the Hepatitis B virus. Hepatitis B can survive in the environment for periods of time, and can remain infective, and can potentially be transmitted from a needle stick injury or contact with waste blood down the stream. So for blood borne pathogens, that is the primary pathogen of concern. In your report to the legislature, did you draw any conclusions as to whether the regulation of infectious waste was a matter with which the State should be concerned?

MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I'm going to object. Obviously, this report has been reduced to writing. We haven't been favored with a copy, and if the witness is going to testify concerning the contents of this report, it seems to me only appropriate that copies be supplied.

MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, I can ask the questions without regard to the report, and I'll be happy to drop that reference if that will help.

> JUDGE ANDERL: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, we'll see.

JUDGE ANDERL: Okay, go ahead and rephrase the question.

(By Mr. Smith) Mr. Turnberg, in your view, is the Q

> 129 Turnberg - Direct (Smith)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

24

25

level for disease waste, pathological waste and sharps waste.

Are you generally familiar with those categories?

- A Yes, I am.
- And the Commission's rules impose certain requirements on collectors of those categories of waste. In your opinion, is there a basis for the Commission to categorize these types of waste in terms of protection of the public health?
- A Yes, I do. There is a rationale for finding these wastes separately from the rest of the waste stream.

 The definition itself came from an analysis of potential health risk.
- In your opinion, do those rules on infectious waste promote the safe management of the waste stream to the extent it consists of biomedical or biohazardous waste?
- A Yes, I believe they do.

MR. SMITH: Those are all my questions.

Thank you, Mr. Turnberg.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson?

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. JOHNSON:

- Q Mr. Turnberg, in your study of recommendations, you didn't address the question of whether or not a
 - 131 Turnberg Cross (Johnson)

Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity should be assessed by a transporter of these types of commodities, did you?

- A We looked at impacting regulations and statutes, and we had one chapter, or one attachment of the report addressing that, and we did identify the requirement, the UTC requirement for that.
- Q Can you suggest to us in what way safety is promoted by the imposition of a economic regulation requiring a certificate?

MR. SELLS: Your Honor, I'm going to object to that question as beyond the scope of direct examination. Mr. Turnberg testified regarding the risks associated with exposure to infectious waste. Mr. Johnson is getting into the area of economic regulation, entry into the market, and we will sponsoring another witness who will testify on that subject.

MR. JOHNSON: We have no objection to -we're in perfect agreement that infectious medical
waste is a hazardous commodity and needs to be treated
carefully. What we object to and believe there is no
basis, no scientific or other basis for is a
requirement that transporters obtain Certificates of
Public Convenience and Necessity. So if this testimony

is directed solely to the issue of safety, we have no objection.

JUDGE ANDERL: Okay, and then will you withdraw that question?

MR. JOHNSON: What's that?

JUDGE ANDERL: Would you withdraw the question?

(By Mr. Johnson) You referred to a number of people involved in disposing medical waste or transporting it as having suffered injuries from sharps. Can you identify any other specific problem that has developed with personnel, other than these punctures from sharps?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, and I'll go to another.

- A There was a percentage -- I don't remember the statistic, so -- I do have a copy of the report with me that includes exposures to blood on the job -- so there was that reported as well.
- Q A reported incident?
- A Well, this is based on the study, based on the survey.

 They reported on the survey that they had --
- Q That these are possible?
- That this had occurred to them. But the question focused on whether or not this had ever happened to them, and what the most recent occurrence was, so they had to put a yes or a no, had it happened; and then, if

Α

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they put a "yes," they had to put down a date when it last happened, a month and a year.

- Q But by far, the most frequently reported type of injury was from the sharps?
- A Well, that was the one we were most concerned about, and it was the most frequently reported.
- Q And what kind of measures did you recommend to reduce the incidence of injuries?
 - Well, that came on two levels: The first was -actually three levels: We felt that a state-wide regulation would help with medical facilities. thought that getting the -- hospitals, for the most part, had been focusing more on proper management of medical waste, but there are just hundreds of smaller facilities, the dentists and the doctors offices that have not been as in tune to proper management as the larger facilities. So we felt that that regulation would help. We wanted to address the public -- the sharps coming from homes; for instance, in the state of Washington, there are about 30,000 insulin using diabetics, and we applied to the EPA for a grant funding, which we got. We just completed a study -actually, it goes beyond a study. It was specifically designed for developing and providing recommendations to home users of sharps on their proper disposal,

Q How long have your recommendations be implemented in the form of changes in the law?

- They, with the Department of Ecology, took the recommendations and went to the legislature to request legislation attempting to establish a statute that would have given the Department authority to write rules, biomedical or infectious waste rules. That was in 1990, and the attempt was to feed it in the House, and the agency did not go back; did not seek that legislation the following year.
- So there's been no change in the law as a result of your report?
 - Well, the Hospital Association was feeling that they were being impacted by what has happened is that the State doesn't have a uniform program for medical waste management. A number of local governments have picked up their own, or adopted their own programs, such as Seattle/King County, or Tacoma/Pierce County, for instance. But the definitions between counties have differed. So the Hospital Association wanted to get an even playing field in terms of definition, and got backing for a bill that was just adopted by the legislature, passed by the legislature during this last session that defined medical waste state—wide, pre—

Α

think this is the witness of the Attorney General, and I'm the only one who is able to cross-examine him.

JUDGE ANDERL: My experience is rather

limited in these things, but it was my understanding
that intervenors could participate fully in crossexamination. Does the Assistant Attorney General have
any objection?

MR. SMITH: I have no objection so far, anyway. But it has been typical for all parties to cross all witnesses, and at some point, I guess the line is drawn, but that has been the typical practice in general.

JUDGE ANDERL: I'll allow the intervenors to cross this witness. Go ahead, Mr. Hartman.

- (By Mr. Hartman) I just wanted clarification. As I understand, the legislature has only adopted a definition of biohazardous waste?
 - Yes, what the bill did was establish that definition, and it gave the Department of Health, in consultation with the Department of Ecology and local health departments, the authority to review new biomedical waste treatment technologies, or any biomedical waste treatment technology; and it also gave the Department of Health the authority to write rules for how they go about doing that assessment. It's not an approval, but

137 Turnberg - Cross (Hartman)

- Q Other than the specific counties that have been enumerated, by giving consideration to the rules adopted by the Utilities and Transportation Commission, are there any other state-wide rules that apply to this transportation?
- A Not to the transportation, no; not that I'm aware of.
- Q Or I should say the handling in transportation.
 - The handling internally, the state -- the federal OSHA, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, has regulations for how -- well, it's blood borne pathogen protection regulations. And those regulations which were just recently published in December, I believe it was, have a component for how medical wastes are handled internally within medical facilities. They have certain packaging requirements, labeling requirements. But once it reaches the back door facility, that's where those regulations end. Once it enters the environment, we'll call it, that's either the local regulations in our state have to apply, or the UTC regs.
- I guess that gets to my question -- at that point -- or it leaves a door -- are there any other state-wide regulations, other than those published the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission that regulate

138 Turnberg - Cross (Hartman)

the transportation of this waste?

A Not that I'm aware of.

MR. HARTMAN: That's all I have.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Finnigan?

MR. FINNIGAN: No questions.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Sells?

MR. SELLS: No questions, Your Honor.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Wiley?

MR. WILEY: I just have one, Your Honor.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. WILEY:

Q Nice to see you again, Mr. Turnberg.

I missed what you're doing currently at the Department of Ecology involving solid waste. Are you still in involved in infectious or medical waste, as we call it?

Yes, my primary function right now is the project manager for revising the State's solid waste regulations. This is Chapter 173.304 WAC. The Department of Ecology doesn't have any direct authority over the biomedical waste stream, other than providing guidance because I have done the work in the past, I'm the one answering the questions, primarily for the public.

139 Turnberg - Cross (Wiley)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. 624-3731 (206)

140

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, some of the intervenors are going to have witnesses testifying today. By agreement with counsel, their own counsel will do the direct with them, and I don't know who is going to go first, though.

JUDGE ANDERL: But you have no other witnesses today?

MR. SMITH: That's correct.

JUDGE ANDERL: Have you arranged that amongst yourselves, or do we need to go off the record for a minute to discuss that?

MR. WILEY: We'll go off the record.

MR. FINNIGAN: Just a few minutes, Your Honor.

JUDGE ANDERL: We'll go off the record.

[BRIEF RECESS TAKEN]

[EXHIBIT NOS. 17 AND 18 MARKED

FOR IDENTIFICATION]

We're back on the record.

Mr. Smith, I understand that you have one other witness who will be presented the next time we convene.

MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. I've arranged for him to come June 11th, and we wouldn't finish with

him even if he were here today, so he'll have to come 1 back that day, so that's correct. 2 JUDGE ANDERL: All right, we'll take that 3 witness when we reconvene then. And the intervenors 4 are going to present some witnesses today. Have you 5 decided amongst yourselves who will go first? 6 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, Your Honor, I'll be 7 calling Mr. Stan Robinson. 8 JUDGE ANDERL: Will you step up to the 9 witness chair, please. 10 11 STAN ROBINSON having been first duly sworn on 12 oath, was called as a witness on behalf of the Intervenor and 13 testified as follows: 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. FINNIGAN: 16 Mr. Robinson, would you please give us your business 17 address for the record? 18 54 So. Dawson, Seattle, Washington. 19 Can you tell us by whom you are employed and in what 20 capacity? 21 I'm the general manager of Sure-Way Medical Services, 22 Inc. 23 Can you tell us what the relationship between Sure-Way 24 Medical Services, Inc. and Rabanco, LTD? 25

142

Robinson-Direct (Finnigan)

A It's basically an equipment list that we presently own.

MR. HARTMAN: I didn't get the identification number on the permit.

JUDGE ANDERL: Exhibit 17.

- Q (By Mr. Finnigan) Is all of this equipment that you have listed on Exhibit 18 being used to its full capacity today?
- A I'm sorry to say, no.
- Are you ready, willing and able to provide service to all accounts for medical and infectious waste within your service area if you are allowed to serve them?
- A Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm going to object to this type of testimony. We're not here on an application for authority. We're performing certain services which we contend are exempt from regulation because of their interstate nature. To take the time for all these parties to put in their authority, their equipment and their usual consistency to handle a lot more traffic is not, to me, any issue in this case. This is not an application for Convenience and Necessity. It's an opportunity for us to describe our services and to buttress our contention that it's not subject to state regulation. And I think this type of testimony is

144 Robinson-Direct (Finnigan)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

beyond the issues in the case.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Finnigan, would you like to respond to that?

MR. FINNIGAN: Sure. First of all, the question was asked and answered. Secondly, I have but one more question along these lines, and that is — and the purpose for which this testimony is offered to show the effect on the regulated carriers that the unregulated activity has had, and I think that is something that should be considered.

JUDGE ANDERL: Okay, I'll allow the line of questioning and the objection is overruled.

MR. FINNIGAN: May I have the next exhibit marked for identification?

JUDGE ANDERL: Did you give me one?

MR. FINNIGAN: I will give you one.

JUDGE ANDERL: The next document then for identification will be Exhibit 19.

[EXHIBIT NO. 19 MARKED FOR

IDENTIFICATION]

- Q (By Mr. Finnigan) And Mr. Robinson, will you identify what Exhibit 19 is?
- A I don't have one.

[DOCUMENT PROFFERED TO WITNESS]

This is basically a list of accounts that we've

145 Robinson-Direct (Finnigan)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

formerly customers of Kleenwell that you have taken

147

Robinson-Cross (Johnson)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

148

Robinson-Cross (Johnson)

1	Q	And some of Pierce apparently, looking at the very
2		first
3	A	Well, even a smaller portion of Pierce County.
4	Q	But if an area is served by, say you're familiar
5		with Nick Raffos, are you not?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	Does he not serve a large portion of King County?
8	A	No.
9	Q	He does serve some of King County, is that right?
10	A	I believe so, yes.
11	Q	And the portions he serves, you don't, and visa versa,
12		isn't that correct?
13	A	No, I think there's overlapping territories in some
14		areas there.
15	Q	Oh, I see.
16		MR. JOHNSON: That's all I have of Mr.
17		Robinson.
18		JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith?
19		MR. SMITH: I have no questions.
20		JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Hartman?
21		MR. HARTMAN: No questions.
22		JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Sells?
23		MR. SELLS: None, Your Honor.
24		JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Wiley?
25		MR. WILEY: None.
		149 Robinson-Cross (Johnson)

JUDGE ANDERL: Ms. Horenstein? 1 MS. HORENSTEIN: None. 2 JUDGE ANDERL: Anything further for this 3 witness? 4 MR. FINNIGAN: No. Your Honor. 5 JUDGE ANDERL: Thank you, Mr. Robinson. You 6 may step down. 7 [WITNESS EXCUSED] 8 I'm sorry, I have a question. You're going 9 to have to come back up here, just so you're by the 10 microphone, and this is a question on Exhibit 19. 11 12 **EXAMINATION** 13 BY THE COURT: 14 Some of the accounts don't indicate a termination date. 15 Could you just explain that briefly? 16 I don't know why she didn't put that. I can't explain 17 that. 18 But is your testimony that whether there's a 19 termination date there or not, that these are all 20 people who were previously customers of yours who are 21 no longer taking service from you? 22 Yes. 23 JUDGE ANDERL: Anything else? That's all I 24 have. 25 150 Robinson (By the Court)

1	MR. JOHNSON: I would like one other
2	question.
3	JUDGE ANDERL: Go ahead.
4	
5	RECROSS EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. JOHNSON:
7	Q You show here on Exhibit 19 some 14 different accounts
8	How many active accounts does your company have at this
9	time in this aspect of your operation of Sure-Way?
10	A In our certificated area?
11	Q Yes no, your well, whatever Sure-Way is doing.
12	A Well, that would be in our certificated area.
13	Approximately 480.
14	MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.
15	JUDGE ANDERL: Thank you
16	Q (By Mr. Johnson) Well, those do include large
17	generators, like hospitals and so on. They're not all
18	small like these are?
19	A Very few hospitals.
20	JUDGE ANDERL: Is there anything further for
21	this witness?
22	[NO RESPONSE]
23	That's it, then. Thank you, Mr. Robinson.
24	[WITNESS EXCUSED]
25	Mr. Finnigan, did you have other witnesses?
	151 Pohincon-Postage (Johnson

1	MR. FINNIGAN: No, I do not.
2	JUDGE ANDERL: And the next intervenor to
3	call a witness?
4	MR. WILEY: By mutual agreement, I think
5	that's myself, Your Honor. I'd call Jeff Daub to the
6	stand.
7	JUDGE ANDERL: Would you step up to the
8	witness chair, please.
9	
10	JEFF DAUB having been first duly sworn on oath, was called as a witness on
11	behalf of the Intervenor and testified as follows:
12	
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. WILEY:
15	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Daub. Could you please state and
16	spell your last name for the record, and provide your
17	business address?
18	A Yes, Daub, D-a-u-b, and the business address is 14102
19	N.E. 189th Street, Woodinville, Washington, 98072.
20	Q And by what company are you employed, please?
21	A American Environmental Management Corporation.
22	Q And what is your position with that company?
23	A I'm a sales representative and the Eastern Washington
24	Sales Manager.
25	Q And how long have you occupied that current position?

I've been sales representative for over three-and-a-

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

153

Yes, we did.

Q Did you also amend your temporary permanent similarly?

A Yes, we did.

And at the time that you shifted disposal to

California, did you have any discussions with the

Commission staff regarding whether your operations

continued to be regulated by the Washington Utilities

and Transportation Commission?

MR. JOHNSON: Objected to as immaterial and irrelevant. This carrier is not an applicant here and we're not an applicant. To give all the details of what's happened with respect to their operating authority is wasting time.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I do want to back up and ask one question prior to that, but in response to Mr. Johnson's objection, I think the nature of the operations of this company is probably more relevant than almost any other factual issue in this proceeding. This is a company that is headquartered outside the state of Washington and has subjected itself to regulation by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, whether or not it disposed of the material in the state of Washington. And its experience and background, and compliance pattern is

very relevant, I believe, to your addressing of the legal issues in this proceeding.

JUDGE ANDERL: Well, I don't know if I'm convinced of that. Clearly, based on what Mr.

Johnson's position is --

MR. JOHNSON: Well, my position is to go into all the details of what this carrier has done in order to maintain its monopoly status is of no consequence in this classification to determine whether --

JUDGE ANDERL: Well, see, that's what I was getting at, is my understanding of whether AEMC considers itself to be subject to Commission regulation or not doesn't really affect Mr. Johnson's position --

JUDGE ANDERL: -- in this proceeding, so maybe you could explain to me a little bit more why we need to go into this.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I think it's--

MR. WILEY: Okay. Again, I think we need to adduce some facts here as to whether — I don't know what the legal argument is going to be made in brief by the Respondent here, if there's any protection argument that might be offered in terms of Constitutionality in addition to burden on interstate commerce. I think we have a relevant position on that to adduce facts on. I think also the treatment, the uniform treatment of all

companies collecting and transporting waste in the state of Washington by this Commission is relevant, and the experience of this company as to how it was to be treated when it shifted disposal sites out of the state and what the regulatory issues were with regard to that are pertinent to whether, at least factually, we're going to get into any king of equal protection argument by law, as far as whether this is unconstitutional, et cetera. I think we should be allowed to show what we were led to understand by the staff and whether we complied with that, and whether we were burdened as an out of state corporation districtly than some other entity would be.

So I agree that as to the classification proceeding per se, the legal issue as to their operations is all that you're looking at. But I do think that the operations of competitors, regulated competitors, in their particular circumstance is relevant, at least as to some weight to your ultimate decision.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I would stipulate that
American Environmental is transporting their medical
waste that they pick up to an out of state destination;
and that they also happen to have authority from the
WUTC, but to into all the details, we have no way of

checking what they did and what they represented.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith, any comments on—MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I have no objection to the question, the impact on the regulatory scheme, and on regulated carriers of Kleenwell's operation is relevant. I'm not sure how far Mr. Wiley is going to go by way of background.

JUDGE ANDERL: I think that to the extent that it might be helpful in terms of having this background on the record and not knowing what kinds of legal issues or constitutional arguments are going to be raised on brief, it might be beneficial to have some of this background. But let's not go into too much detail or take too much time with it.

MR. WILEY: I agree, Your Honor, and I'll try to keep it very short.

- Q (By Mr. Wiley) Mr. Daub, based on your -- what is your understanding of the shift in disposal sites in late 1988 and the regulatory treatment by this treatment of your company's operations when you move disposal of instate material out of state?
 - Well, at the time, we had questioned whether or not where the authority lie, so there was a meeting between an individual at the Attorney General's office and Mr.

 Joe Keefe, and we were informed that we would still

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

160

immaterial. I don't care if they lost all their business to Kleenwell. That has no bearing on whether or not Kleenwell's activities are subject to the Commission regulations.

MR. WILEY: We've had this objection, Your Honor, before, and it relates to Mr. Robinson's testimony. This will be brief, but it is making a record about economic deprivation caused by the respondent on my client's regulated operations.

MR. JOHNSON: I should have objected to that, but I didn't, but I am objecting to this.

JUDGE ANDERL: I'll overrule the objection and allow the line of questioning. Keep it fairly brief, Mr. Wiley, please.

- (By Mr. Wiley) Mr. Daub, my question is have you reviewed your records to determine some identities of generators lost to Kleenwell?
 - Yes, we have. On a monthly basis, it looks like we've lost about \$300 a month on an account base, and as we see it, it looks like there's probably been about five to six accounts that we've lost in the last month-and-a-half to two months, and there have been a number of accounts that we have solicited, approximately 17, 18 which we've gone in and Kleenwell has already been taking care of.

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

164

which shows a number of cube truck vehicles that we use for pick-up at generators; additionally, it shows semitruck trailers, and a number of different trailers that we use to transport the waste on long-hauls. It shows pallet jack and forklift, and miscellaneous office equipment.

- And have you brought a sales brochure that demonstrates some of your equipment for admission into the record in this proceeding?
- A Yes, I have.

MR. WILEY: Would you please, Your Honor, mark as the exhibit next in line.

JUDGE ANDERL: I do have a copy of that.

It's an advertising brochure, and I'll mark that as Exhibit No. 23.

[EXHIBIT NO. 23 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION]

- Q (By Mr. Wiley) Mr. Daub, would you identify an exhibit for identification 23, please?
 - Yeah, this is just a brochure that states what American Environmental does; what we're authorized to do, how we do it. It explains our containers, lockers that we can provide; it states something about our insurance and our Certificate of Destruction that's provided to our customers.

from someone in Neah Bay, or up in Twisp, Washington, even though it may be a single small box, that company is still required, under the same tariff that I pick up inside King County, to go to those outlying areas and pick it up.

- Q Do you, in fact, provide that service state-wide?
- A Yes, we do.
- Q Could you give us an example, other than Neah Bay, of an outlying area that you serve in Eastern Washington?
- A Yeah, we serve points in the Colville Indian
 Reservation. We have served accounts in Omak,
 Washington. There are a number of small areas that we
 go to that will be a single account, and it will be two
 to three hours away from anywhere else that we service.
- Q Do you service these outlying areas at the same rate levels under your tariff regulated by the Commission as you serve more densely populated areas, such as Seattle and Tacoma?
- A Yes, we do.
- Q Have you ever refused service to a generator because of its location or its modest price that would be generated?
- A No, we have not.
- Q Has your company invested resources in the state of Washington?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It makes it tough for our company that does have to go to an area like Twisp and pick up one box under the same rate, and where you see some of these new companies entering the market place that, so to speak, cream-skim highly, densely populated areas like Seattle and Tacoma. So definitely, if companies like that were able to stay, we would probably have to cut out service to those generators in outlying areas. would question whether or not we would continue with our plant in Richland, Washington. We'd probably have to let go of some staff and try to reduce equipment. Could you tell us, in conclusion, Mr. Daub, why you are

- here today providing testimony in opposition to the operations of Kleenwell Biohazard, Inc.?
- Yeah, I'm here testifying on the fact that we've

entered this market place. We're a California corporation. We've utilized our incinerated in Rancho Cordova, California. Our own company has looked into the interstate commerce and not being regulated by the State Utilities and Transportation Commission. We've adhered to their requirements. We've adhered to their tariffs, and have serviced the whole state, and to see companies entering the market place unregulated essentially infests like a company like ours; does not allow us to do business, making reasonable profits. And so basically, it destroys the backbone of the business.

MR. WILEY: No further questions, Your Honor.

I'll tender the witness.

JUDGE ANDERL: And offer the exhibits?

MR. WILEY: Yes, I'm sorry, Your Honor, yes.

JUDGE ANDERL: That's all right. I'm just trying to keep track.

Mr. Johnson, any objection to Exhibits 20, 21, 22 or 23?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I object to all of them as not relevant to any issue.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: I have no objection.

JUDGE ANDERL: Any of the other intervenors

1	have an objection?
2	[NO RESPONSE]
3	Those objections will be overruled, and those
4	four identified exhibits will be admitted.
5	[EXHIBIT NOS. 20, 21, 22 AND
6	23 FOR IDENTIFICATION RECEIVED
7	IN EVIDENCE]
8	Do you have any cross-examination for this
9	witness?
10	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
11	
12	CROSS EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. JOHNSON:
14	Q First of all, I don't believe you gave your first name.
15	A Jeff.
16	Q Jeff?
17	A Yeah.
18	Q And I think you indicated how long you've been with the
19	company, but I didn't hear.
20	A Yes, since October 1, of 1988.
21	Q And so your first employment with the company was when
22	you came to the state of Washington and your company

170 Daub - Cross (Johnson)

Yeah, I went to work with them soon after they had

started operations in this state?

opened up the office in --

23

24

25

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

situation, which by analyzing the situation the Commission concludes that it has no authority to regulate operations such as those conducted by Kleenwell, that no amount of crying on your part is going to enable the Commission to regulate an activity that the law says is beyond its regulation?

MR. WILEY: Objection to the form of the question. I t's unduly argumentative, Your Honor, and I don't believe it even poses a question. It is really is --

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I asked him if he understood that.

MR. WILEY: Well, apparently, at the end, but it included a lot of objectionable, argumentative, provisions; "an undue amount of crying," et cetera. I don't need to characterize it, Your Honor. I'd ask it to be rephrased.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson, do you suppose you could simplify that question a little bit; do you want to pair it down to its essentials?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I'll withdraw the question.

JUDGE ANDERL: Anything further?

MR. JOHNSON: I have no further questions.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith?

3

BY MR. SMITH:

over.

5

6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CROSS EXAMINATION

If the Commission does not have jurisdiction over Kleenwell or American Environmental -- let me start

If, because of the crossing of state lines the Commission does not have jurisdiction over your company or Kleenwell, will you continue to serve Neah Bay and the Makah Indian Reservation, or the Omak area and other and more areas of the state?

- Most likely not. It wouldn't be economical for us to do that, and I would imagine we would have to reduce our annual operating budget and prepare ourselves for other firms entering the market place at reduced rates, and hope that we can withstand entry of new companies into the market place.
- And based on your experience in this industry and the market in Washington state, if you left those remote markets, do you think someone else would be coming in to fill that void?
- Absolutely not.
- And why is that?
- It's uneconomical. Eastern Washington and over in the

Daub - Cross (Daub) 176

island counties, there is no way -- I shouldn't say "no way," but it's not very possible that you can provide service to those customers and expect to make any form of profit. It's just transportation is going to kill you. Accounts are too few and far between.

MR. SMITH: Those are all my questions.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Johnson, we wanted to go a whole round on cross if there was any.

Mr. Hartman?

MR. HARTMAN: It's tempting but I'll pass.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Finnigan?

MR. FINNIGAN: No.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Sells?

MR. SELLS: No.

JUDGE ANDERL: Ms. Horenstein?

MS. HORENSTEIN: No questions.

MR. WILEY: Did you have some questions before?

JUDGE ANDERL: Let me see. I don't believe that I did, actually. Do you have redirect?

MR. WILEY: Yes, just on one question that Mr. Johnson asked.

JUDGE ANDERL: Okay. Why don't we let Mr. Johnson get his question in, then, and then maybe you can cover everything else on redirect. Go ahead, Mr.

177 Daub - Cross (Daub)

2

BY MR. JOHNSON:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You mentioned Neah Bay, was that an isolated, or relatively isolated example, or do you keep going back to Neah Bay every week?

RECROSS EXAMINATION

- A We go there, and it's not on a weekly basis, but it's a regular account. They expect service on a regular basis. I believe there are a number of outlying areas that we service on an every other week basis.
- Q Who is that regular account in Neah Bay, is it a hospital, or a clinic or what?
- A It's an individual doctor's office, I believe.
- Q And how about the Indian reservation At Colville?
- A There's a clinic up there that we service.
- Q Did you solicit these accounts, or did they come to you?
- A The one on Colville Indian reservation, they called us up. The one in Neah Bay, I don't recall. That was quite a while ago.
- Q You haven't served it for quite a while, I take it?
- A Excuse me?
- Q You haven't served it for quite a while, I take it?
- A Oh, yes, we have served it. I just don't recall --

MR. JOHNSON: Nothing else.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Wiley?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WILEY:

- Q Mr. Daub, you indicated in answer to Mr. Johnson's question that the market was changing rapidly. And without mentioning specific competitors names, would you just characterize what you meant by that, please?
- A Yeah, we've, in the last year, seen two other firms enter the market place, and because they are calling themselves recyclers, they are apparently not following tariff, or believe they're exempt from tariffs, and so we have lost an account base from that.
- Q With respect to the statement that the market is changing rapidly, is that causing you to rely more on small generator accounts; and if so, why?
 - Yes, it is. Again, I think earlier I had mentioned that in higher populated, or more densely populated areas where the larger hospitals are, that that seems to be target of these companies entering into the market place, and so, you know, we're attempting to cover ourselves by obtaining as many small accounts as

179 Daub - Redirect (Wiley)

Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates, Inc. (206) 624-3731

we can in the event that we lose these large generating hospitals.

- Have you found that the acquisition of the quantity of generators has any relationship to the dollar volume that you generate on a monthly basis if you are to lose large accounts, for instance?
- A I don't understand your question.
- My question is does your reference to adding new generators and small generators, does that have any bearing on the -- if you lose a big account, do you have to have a lot more smaller accounts to make up for the loss?
- A Oh, yeah, yeah, absolutely. If you lose a hospital account, it's going to take, in some instances, 50 to 100, 150 small accounts to make up lost revenue.
- Q And in the last, say, since the first of the year, how many large accounts would you estimate you've lost?
- A Well, I would say we've lost approximately 12.

MR. WILEY: No further questions, Your Honor.

JUDGE ANDERL: Anything on recross for this witness, Mr. Johnson?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ JOHNSON: I do have one in response to ${\operatorname{Mr}.}$ Wiley.

* * * * *

BY MR. JOHNSON:

Q The decision in the <u>Medigen</u> case relates that 80 percent of the medical waste that's generated is generated at hospitals. You apparently don't experience that in your operation.

- Absolutely not. Our environment is an unregulated state. We still have quite a few hospitals throughout the state of Washington that are landfilling materials. You have a number of hospitals, I believe, even in regulated counties that are not tendering completely what those individual regulations are requesting them to do so; and additionally, enforcement is weak. There are many hospitals that realize that it's cheaper to obtain a fine from a county health official than to tender what's required —
- Q Well, in this area, don't a lot of the medical -- don't a lot of the hospitals have their own disposal facilities and don't utilize carriers?
- A No, that's not accurate. There are very, very few. In fact, I can only think of two in King County that are still utilizing their own disposal sites.
- Q Is that Swedish, for one?
- No, that would not be. The VA in Seattle is the one that comes to mind, and then there's an out-patient

facility that had an incinerator up in Seattle, and I don't even know if they're still running that one or not. It may be closed down.

- Q So your problems don't all center around Kleenwell's and the hospitals. You don't like what they're doing either?
- A Oh, yeah. I mean, if some of these facilities were following their regulations to a tee, I'm sure there would be additional business there.

MR. JOHNSON: That's all.

JUDGE ANDERL: Anything else.

MR. WILEY: No further questions.

JUDGE ANDERL: Thank you, Mr. Daub. You may step down.

[WITNESS EXCUSED]

Mr. Smith, I'm sorry, I didn't look at you to give you a chance to --

MR. SMITH: No, I have no further questions.

JUDGE ANDERL: Is there anything further today?

MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor, I'm going to distribute a little packet. The packet contains six "G" certificates. I'm not positive everything's in the same order.

JUDGE ANDERL: Let's go off the record to

make sure that we have the documents straight.

[DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD]

[EXHIBIT NOS. 24, 25, 26, 27,
28 AND 29 MARKED FOR

IDENTIFICATION]

JUDGE ANDERL: Back on the record.

We've identified Exhibits 24 through 29, and maybe I should go through those individually now.

Exhibit 24 is Certificate G-25. Exhibit 25 is Certificate G-107. Exhibit 26 is Certificate G-37. Exhibit 27 is Certificate G-173. Exhibit 28 is Certificate G-178, and Exhibit 29 for identification is Certificate G-206.

Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, each of those exhibits bear the certificate of Paul Curl, the Secretary of the Commission and the custodian of the Commission's records. Under the Commission's procedural rules, among the things the Commission can take official notice of are the contents of certificates, and I would ask the Bench to take official notice of Exhibits 24 through 29 and move for their admission into the record.

MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I object. I think that without some testimony as to operations being

conducted pursuant to these certificates that this will only clutter the record; and, for instance, the first one authorizes only the transportation of dry sludge from a Longview plant. That has no bearing on any issue in this case. And these others, unless they are engaged in hauling medical waste do not either. And so I'm going to object to the admission of those exhibits.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith, would you like to respond to that, and perhaps explain for the record what purpose you'd like these admitted.

MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. At the outset, in his opening argument, Mr. Johnson claimed that Chapter 8177 was at least applied to an out of state carrier, was an example of economic protectionism forbidden by the Commerce Clause of the Federal Constitution.

As you are aware, there is a number of economic factors these dealings that we can examine: one if the out of state disposal site; one is the out of state carrier. The purpose of these exhibits is to show that the Commission has, in the past, granted these certificates to out of state companies, and in some cases, as you will see from reading these permits, they are for service territories, which would be, for the most part, exclusive service territories to the

One of the arguments involving economic protectionism is that the state regulation favors instate interests at the expense of out of state interests. These documents show that the Commission has granted under the existing regulatory scheme operating authority in the state of Washington to out of state companies.

MR. JOHNSON: We don't claim economic protectionism. We claim that the transportation we're engaged in is interstate in nature, and therefore not subject to regulation. It does no great harm, but it's certainly cluttering the record.

MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, the opening argument said that 8177 is a case of economic protectionism and that it was directed -- the purpose of the statute was directed at interstate commerce.

JUDGE ANDERL: Does anyone have any comments on these exhibits?

MR. WILEY: If you don't mind, I am concerned, if Mr. Johnson is waiving arguments by his responses, that he is not going to claim that -- I had understood in his opening statement that that's exactly one of his premises, and I don't think we should be

foreclosed in our legal argument from addressing all of these issues. I think these exhibits go directly to that issue. That's why I also wanted the testimony from my client on the burden issue, the economic protectionism allegation.

So I think these exhibits are absolutely indispensable to a complete record on that issue.

JUDGE ANDERL: Mr. Smith, I've just been looking these over very quickly. Do any of them purport to authorized transportation outside of the state of Washington, these certificates, such as what - I guess what AEMC had in their originals, which is to disposal sites outside of the state. I don't know if any of these do, and I thought if you knew off-hand, you could --

MR. SMITH: I don't know.

JUDGE ANDERL: That's okay, I can read them.

MR. SMITH: I don't know, and I don't believe they do, Your Honor.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, in response to your question to Mr. Smith, I just don't want there to be a misconstruction on Exhibit 20 to the extent that it was restricted to our facility. It did not say where those facilities were, so that in the future --

JUDGE ANDERL: Okay, thank you for clarifying

1

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. WILEY: -- the PC&N future issue, we would be covered if we had put a facility in the state.

JUDGE ANDERL: I guess I was thinking of the way it was in fact. It was out of state. Thank you for clarifying that.

I think I'm reading to make a ruling, and I will admit those exhibits and overrule the objection, and that's 24 through 29.

[EXHIBIT NOS 24 THRU 29 FOR IDENTIFICATION RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE]

Anything further?

MR. SMITH: Not today, Your Honor.

JUDGE ANDERL: Then I believe that the parties have agreed to the next scheduled hearing date in this matter as June 11th, is that correct?

MR. SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor.

JUDGE ANDERL: And that will be here at 9:30 in the morning, and do we anticipate being able to finish at that time?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: You did say 9:30?

JUDGE ANDERL: Yes.

MR. FINNIGAN: We didn't hear from Mr.

MR. JOHNSON: I see no reason why we shouldn't.

MR. WILEY: Your Honor, I don't think it's premature also to talk about briefing schedules so that we can get transcripts ordered from today on, and we talked about that. So could we maybe address that, if you want, off the record?

JUDGE ANDERL: Yes, let's go off the record and talk about that, and then come back on the record.

[DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD]

JUDGE ANDERL: Back on the record.

I'll just briefly state that we've had some discussions about the next hearing date, which was scheduled and briefing dates, which has been agreed that Mr. Johnson will file an opening brief on -- and this is a tentative schedule which we'll confirm at the next hearing -- but on July 10th, that would be a filing date with the Commission, but it would also, as a courtesy to the other parties, attempt to be served, that they would receive it on the 10th so they could then file response briefs by the 17th, and then Mr. Johnson, since you would have a lot of them to read probably, to file his answer two weeks from them by the

31st of July.

Anything else?

[NO RESPONSE]

Well, actually, should we reconvene at 9:00? Would that be better?

MR. JOHNSON: No, no.

JUDGE ANDERL: June 11th, 9:30, right here. We're off the record.

[HEARING ADJOURNED AT 3:45 P.M.]

* * * *

CERIIFICAIE

This is to certify that the attached proceeding before the WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of Determining)
the Proper Carrier Classifi-)
cation of:)
DOCKET NO. TG-920304
ENOCH ROWLAND d/b/a KLEENWELL)
BIOHAZARD AND GENERAL ECOLOGY)

Date: May 13, 1992

CONSULTANTS

Place:

Kent, Washington

were had as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the files of the Commission.

RELECCAS: Cain
Official Reporter