LAW OFFICES OF

### McCluskey, Sells, Ryan, Uptegraft & Decker, Inc., P.S.

510 WASHINGTON AVENUE, SUITE 300 BREMERTON, WASHINGTON 98310 (206) 479-4545

FAX: (206) 377-4581

TERRY K. McCLUSKEY JAMES K. SELLS JAMES E. RYAN DARRELL D. UPTEGRAFT, JR.

TARRELL S. DECKER

November 21, 1994

JEFFREY D. GOODWIN ANNE M. HANSON

GORDON WALGREN OF COUNSEL

Mr. Steve McLellan, Secretary Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission P. O. Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250

The Disposal Group, Inc., et al v. Waste Management Disposal Services of Oregon, Inc., et al Docket No. TG-941154

Dear Mr. McLellan:

Enclosed for filing in the captioned matter is an original and three copies of Post Hearing Brief of Intervenor Washington Refuse & Recycling Association.

Very truly yours,

McCLUSKEY, SELLS, RYAN, UPTEGRAFT & DECKER

JAMES K. SELLS

JKS:cs encs.

Mr. J. P. Jones cc:

Mr. Dave Wiley

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

THE DISPOSAL GROUP, INC., d/b/a Vancouver Sanitary Service and Twin City Sanitary Service, a Washington Corporation (G-65)

Complainant,

vs.

WASTE MANAGEMENT DISPOSAL SERVICES OF OREGON, INC., d/b/a Oregon Waste Systems, a Delaware Corporation, and T & G TRUCKING & FREIGHT CO., an Oregon corporation,

Respondents.

DOCKET NO. TG-941154

POST HEARING BRIEF OF INTERVENOR WASHINGTON REFUSE & RECYCLING ASSOCIATION

COMES NOW Intervenor Washington Refuse & Recycling Association and respectfully submits the following for the Commission's consideration.

OVERVIEW OF PROCEEDINGS: This proceeding was initiated by a formal complaint filed by The Disposal Group, a certificated solid waste carrier, pursuant to RCW 81.04.110 and WAC 480-09-420(5). the complaint alleges that Respondents are illegally engaged in the transportation of solid waste for compensation over the highways of the In particular, the allegation is that Respondent State of Washington. T & G Trucking & Freight Co. is transporting an industrial sludge material from a site in Clark County to a railroad siding near Portland, It is stipulated that the movement involves travel over the public highways of Washington. Stipulated Facts, (11).

The sludge is loaded on railroad flat cars and eventually is delivered to a landfill in Arlington, Oregon, owned and operated by Respondent Oregon Waste Systems, a wholly owned subsidiary of Waste Management Inc., now apparently renamed "WMX". Stipulated Facts, (2).

McCluskey, Sells, Ryan, Uptegraft and Decker
ATTORNEYS AT LAW 510 Washington Ave., Suite 300

Bremerton, Washington 98337 (206) 479-4545

The parties have reached agreement on the facts in this matter, which are contained in the "Stipulated Facts" furnished to Hearing Examiner Prusia. Witness affidavits and various documents have also been furnished, eliminating the necessity for a hearing or other oral presentation. Thus, the stipulated facts, affidavits and documentary evidence submitted comprise the record in this matter.

ISSUES: The ultimate issue here, of course, is whether T & G Trucking & Freight is operating illegally as a transporter of solid waste and should be ordered to "cease and desist". The answer to that question appears to Intervenor to be contained in the classification of the material itself. The basic issue, thus, is whether the material being transported is solid waste or something else. If it is solid waste, and it is being picked up and transported over the public highways of this state for compensation, that collection and transportation must be done by a certificated carrier, in this instance The Disposal Group. RCW 81.77.040; WAC 480-70-070.

Thus, Intervenor will urge the Hearing Examiner to first define this commodity which, once done, will resolve any and all other issues which may be peripheral to this proceeding.

<u>INDUSTRIAL SLUDGE IS SOLID WASTE:</u> The commodity involved here is "industrial sludge"; that is, it clearly is not "sewage sludge" as defined by <u>RCW 70.95.030(18)</u> because it is not "generated from a wastewater treatment system", nor is it a "biosolid" or "municipal sewage sludge" and, thus, is not subject to the various provisions and programs of <u>RCW Chap. 70.95J</u>.

There are various definitions of, and/or inclusions of, the term "sludge" in several RCW and WAC provisions. There is, however, one clear theme which runs throughout the various provisions, and that is the inclusion of sludge in the definitions and/or references to solid waste.

 $\underline{RCW}$  81.77.010(9) refers to  $\underline{RCW}$  70.95.030 for the definition of solid waste. That definition is:

"Solid wastes" or "wastes" means all putrescible and nonputrescible solid and semisolid wastes,

This definition must be read in conjunction with other clarifications and definitions of the term. It specifically does include "sewer sludge" (which the commodity at issue is not); and "industrial waste" (which the commodity at issue is).

There are two other terms for "solid waste" which appear in the statutes and regulations, those being "garbage" and "refuse". **RCW** 81.77.015 clarifies that the term garbage and refuse are to be used interchangeably, and RCW 70.95.030(19) further clarifies that the terms garbage and refuse are incorporated into the perhaps more "politically correct" term "solid waste".

This material is "semisolid", rather than a liquid, as it is mixed with a thickening agent for transportation.

#### WAC 480-70-050(6) defines "refuse" as:

all commercially worthless, discarded, rejected or refused material, offal and animal and vegetable waste materials; also it includes scrap, waste materials, rubbish, lamp black, waste acid, sludge, noncommercial broken building and fire bricks, discarded rubber tires, noncommercial sawdust, debris, trade waste, discarded articles, and industrial waste . . . . (emphasis added).

This commodity is industrial sludge generated by an Alcoa plant. WAC 480-70-050(6) is specific in including Stipulated Facts, (3). industrial sludge in the definition of refuse which, in turn, is solid waste.1

There simply is no other category into which this commodity can be It is an industrial semisolid waste, commonly called sludge, which fits squarely into the various definitions of solid waste.

McCluskey, Sells, Ryan, Uptegraft and Decker ATTORNEYS AT LAW 510 Washington Ave., Suite 300 Bremerton, Washington 98337 (206) 479-4545

sludge.

28

27

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

26

WAC 173-304-100(39) defines industrial waste to include "waste byproducts from manufacturing operations such as scraps, trimmings, packing and other discarded materials not otherwise designated as dangerous waste under Chapter 173-303 WAC." The material at issue has been determined to be nondangerous. Ex. 6

If this material were a "recyclable", the solid waste statutes may not apply. However, it simply does not fit into any statutory definition applicable to recycling. <a href="RCW 70.95.030(15)">RCW 70.95.030(15)</a> defines "recyclable materials" as:

. . . Those solid wastes that are separated for recycling or reuse that are identified as recyclable material pursuant to a local comprehensive solid waste plan . . .

This material has not been "separated for recycling or reuse", it is a waste byproduct of the aluminum manufacturing process. Alcoa obviously has no intent to do anything other than to get rid of it. Nor has there been, nor can there be, any showing that this material is "identified as recyclable material" by the "local comprehensive waste plan". It is either solid waste or a recyclable, and it clearly is not a recyclable.

It is also instructive to note the regulatory definition of a "landspreading disposal facility" found in <u>WAC 173-304-100(43)</u>, which is:

. . . a facility that applies <u>sludges or other</u> <u>solid wastes</u> onto or incorporates solid waste into the soil at greater than vegetative utilization and soil conditioners/immobilization rates. (emphasis added).

The use of the phrase "sludges or other solid wastes" obviously confirms that the Washington Department of Ecology considers sludge that is used as cover at a landfill to be "solid waste".

# THE COMISSION HAS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED INDUSTRIAL SLUDGE TO BE SOLID WASTE:

In <u>In re Application of Inland Transportation, Inc.</u>, Order M.V. No. 142137 (Oct. 1990), the Commission considered a motor carrier application to transport fruit processing sludge to a disposal facility where it was spread directly on the ground. The Commission determined that since the shipper paid the destination site owner to "allow application", the commodity had "no value" and, thus, was subject to regulation under Chap. 81.77, rather than 81.80, the motor carrier statute.

McCluskey, Sells, Ryan, Uptegraft and Decker
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
510 Washington Ave., Suite 300

510 Washington Ave., Suite 300 Bremerton, Washington 98337 (206) 479-4545

7

6

9

8

10 11

12 13

14

#### 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

2425

2627

28

This is exactly the same situation here. The industrial sludge is transported to a landfill where it is spread, and there is a charge to the shipper for the application. Thus, as in <u>Inland</u>, the commodity has "no commercial value", and therefore is solid waste, not a "commodity".

## LIKE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, OREGON ALSO CLASSIFIED THIS COMMODITY AS SOLID WASTE:

Although Oregon's classification of this material is not binding upon the Commission, it is helpful in that the ultimate destination of the sludge is in the State of Oregon. The Oregon Administrative Regulations define "solid waste" as:

. all useless or discarded putrescible and nonputrescible materials, including, limited to, garbage, rubbish, refuse, ashes, paper sewer sludge, septic tank and and cardboard, cesspool pumpings or other sludge, useless or discarded commercial, industrial, demolition and discarded or construction <u>materials</u>, abandoned vehicles or parts thereof, discarded home and industrial appliances, manure, vegetable or animal solid and semi-solid materials, dead animals and infectious waste. (emphasis added).

#### OAR 340-93-030(75).

It is also relevant to note that Oregon's "approval" of the use of this sludge as "alternate daily cover" is merely authorization to conduct a test study, ending April 30, 1995. (Ex. 9). The communication to CRLRC specifically refers to the material as "waste", and requires CRLRC to follow its "special waste management protocol" in dealing with it.

It is interesting to speculate upon the consequences if Oregon either discontinues the "test" or disallows further use as ADC when the test is completed. In that event, apparently there would have to be a readjustment of the posted gate rate reduction in effect now.

In any case, it is clear that the State of Oregon considers this material as being solid waste, and it is defined as solid waste by the State of Washington. It becomes difficult to imagine what else it could be.

**4** 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

49 CFR 1090.2

### INTERSTATE COMMERCE IS NOT AN ISSUE IN THIS PROCEEDING:

insist that "trailer-oncontinue to the Respondents flatcar/container-on-flatcar" regulation2 which exempts that type of service from state regulation is controlling here. That analysis may well be correct if the material being transported is "property". not property, it is solid waste. The ICC does not regulate the transportation of waste in any manner. Joray Trucking Corp. Common Carrier Application, 99 MCC 109, 110 (1965).

Any solid waste which is collected within the State of Washington and transported over the state's public highways is subject to the Commission's regulatory powers pursuant to RCW Chap. 81.77. This is the case whether the destination is in or out of state. The Commission's regulation of collection and transportation of waste (while in the state) is "without regard to the location of the ultimate disposal site". In the Matter of Enoch Rowland, d/b/a Kleenwell Biohazard and General Ecology Consultants, Order M.V.G. No. 1445 (Oct. 1990). see also In re Evergreen Waste Systems, TG-1911 (May, 1986); In re Arrow Sanitary Service, Inc., d/b/a Oregon Paper Fiber, TG-2197 (Dec., 1989).

The interstate commerce argument simply is not applicable to this situation.

<u>SUMMARY:</u> As previously indicated, this action is very simply resolved. If the material at issue is solid waste, its collection and transportation within the state of Washington is subject to Commission regulation. If the material is property, Respondent's position is probably correct.

Both the states of Oregon and Washington classify and/or define industrial sludge as solid waste. The material is being transported to a landfill which is being paid to receive it. It is not "property"; if it were, the payment would travel in the opposite direction. One does not need to be an economist to understand that one does not pay another to take property, one pays another to take waste.

1	An order should issue directing Respondents to immediately cease	
2	and desist	the subject activity.
3		Respectfully submitted,
4		Dance O. Watranott & Foi
5		JAMES K. SELLS ( WSBA No. 6040
6		Attorney for Intervenor Washington Refuse & Recycling Association
7		
8	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
9	I hei	reby certify that on this day a true copy of the foregoing was
10	served by	first class mail, postage prepaid, addressed to:
11		Hon. John Prusia Administrative Law Judge 2420 Bristol Court SW
12		P. O. Box 42489
13		Olympia, WA 98504-2489
14		Mr. Jack R. Davis Suite 1200
15		IBM Building Seattle, WA 98101
16		Mr. Steven W. Smith Asst. Attorney General
17		Heritage Plaza Building 1400 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW
18		Olympia, WA 98504-0128
19		Mr. Bill Rasmussen Davis Wright Tremaine
20		2600 Century Square 1501 Fourth Ave.
21		Seattle, WA 98101-1688
22		Ms. Cindy Horenstein
23		P. O. Box 694
24		Vancouver, WA 98666
25		
26		
27		JAMES K. SELLS

McCluskey, Sells, Ryan, Uptegraft and Decker
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
510 Washington Ave., Suite 300
Bremerton, Washington 98337
(206) 479-4545

28