

**STATE OF WASHINGTON**

UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

***1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W., P.O. Box 47250 ● Olympia, Washington 98504-7250***

***(360) 664-1160 ● www.utc.wa.gov***

April 13, 2016

**NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND TO PETITION FOR REVIEW**

**(By Wednesday, April 27, 2016, at 5:00 p.m.)**

**And**

**NOTICE EXTENDING TIME FOR DECISION ON REVIEW**

**(To Wednesday, May 11, 2016)**

RE: *In the Matter of a Penalty Assessment Against Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24,* Docket TC-160187

TO ALL PARTIES:

On March 15, 2016, the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) issued Order 01, Order of Consolidation; Initial Order Cancelling Certificate; Order Imposing and Suspending Penalties (Order 01) in Consolidated Dockets TC-152296 and TC-160187. Order 01 assessed a $25,200 penalty against Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 (SeaTac Airport 24 or Company), a $20,000 portion of which was suspended for a period of two years subject to conditions, including the requirement that SeaTac Airport 24 either pay the $5,200 portion of the penalty that was not suspended or file jointly with Commission staff (Staff) a proposed payment plan no later than March 25, 2016.

On March 25, 2016, SeaTac Airport 24 filed an “Application of Financial Hardship” with the Commission. Although the Company’s filing does not conform to the Commission’s formatting and filing requirements for petitions for review, we will exercise our discretion to accept the document as a timely-filed petition for review and consider it as such.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Accordingly, Commission Staff may respond to the Company’s petition by close of business on Wednesday, April 27, 2016. The Commission requests that Staff specifically address the following in its response:

1. Whether Staff supports or opposes any further mitigation of the penalty.
2. Whether Staff supports or opposes a payment plan. If Staff supports a payment plan, please include a proposed payment schedule.
3. Whether Staff supports or opposes reinstating the Company’s auto transportation certificate coincident with the approval of a payment plan and conditioning the status of the Company’s certificate on the Company making payments as agreed. If Staff opposes reinstating the Company’s certificate coincident with the approval of a payment plan, please explain Staff’s reasons for its opposition.

To provide the Commission with sufficient time to consider both the Company’s petition and Staff’s response, the Commission exercises its discretion to waive WAC 480-07-610(8) and extend its time to issue a decision on review until May 11, 2016.

**THE COMMISSION GIVES NOTICE That Commission staff must file any response to Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24’s petition for review by 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 27, 2016.**

**THE COMMISSION GIVES FURTHER NOTICE That the Commission extends the time to issue a decision on review until May 11, 2016.**

STEVEN V. KING

Executive Director and Secretary

1. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-07-610(7)(b) requires that written petitions for review contain an explanation of the party’s view of the matter, with a statement of the reasons why the initial order was incorrect, and a certificate of service. SeaTac Airport 24’s petition failed to include a certificate of service and was not properly formatted. WAC 480-07-395(4), however, provides that the Commission will liberally construe pleadings and motions with a view to effect justice among the parties. We find that the Company’s explanation of financial hardship contains substantive information that warrants both a response from Staff and consideration by the Commission. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)