

Page 147

1 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
 2 UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

---

3 In Re: Application )  
 4 TC-143691 )

5 SPEEDISHUTTLE WASHINGTON, ) Dockets TC-143691 and  
 6 LLC, D/B/A SPEEDISHUTTLE ) TC-160516  
 7 SEATTLE, )

8 For a Certificate of Public )  
 9 Convenience and Necessity to )  
 10 Operate Motor Vehicles in )  
 11 Furnishing Passenger and )  
 12 Express Service as an Auto )  
 13 Transportation Company )

---

14 PREHEARING CONFERENCE, VOLUME II  
 15 Pages 147 - 167  
 16 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RAYNE PEARSON

---

17 10:03 A.M.  
 18 AUGUST 2, 2016

19 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission  
 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest  
 Olympia, Washington 98504-7250

20 REPORTED BY: SHERRILYN SMITH, CCR# 2097

21 Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC  
 1325 Fourth Avenue  
 22 Suite 1840  
 Seattle, Washington 98101  
 23 206.287.9066 | Seattle  
 360.534.9066 | Olympia  
 800.846.6989 | National

24 www.buellrealtime.com

Page 149

1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; AUGUST 2, 2016  
 2 10:03 A.M.  
 3 -o0o-

4 JUDGE PEARSON: Let's be on the record  
 5 in Docket TC-143691 captioned In re: The application  
 6 of SpeediShuttle Washington, LLC, d/b/a SpeediShuttle  
 7 Seattle, for a Certificate of Public Convenience and  
 8 Necessity to Operate Motor Vehicles in Furnishing  
 9 Passenger and Express Service as an Auto  
 10 Transportation Company, and Docket TC-160516 captioned  
 11 Shuttle Express, Inc., verse SpeediShuttle Washington,  
 12 LLC, d/b/a SpeediShuttle Seattle.

13 Today is Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016, at  
 14 approximately 10:00 a.m., and we are here for a  
 15 prehearing conference to discuss scheduling and other  
 16 procedural issues in these two documents. My name is  
 17 Rayne Pearson, I am the administrative law judge  
 18 presiding over these cases.

19 Let's just start by taking short appearances.  
 20 I have everyone's notices of appearance on file,  
 21 obviously.  
 22 We will just start with Staff.

23 MR. BEATTIE: Representing Commission  
 24 Staff, Julian Beattie, with the Washington State  
 25

Page 148

1 A P P E A R A N C E S  
 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:  
 3 RAYNE PEARSON  
 4 Washington Utilities and  
 5 Transportation Commission  
 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW  
 P.O. Box 47250  
 Olympia, Washington 98504  
 360.664.1136

6 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  
 7 JULIAN BEATTIE  
 8 Attorney General's Office of Washington  
 9 P.O. Box 40128  
 10 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive SW  
 Olympia, Washington 98504  
 360.664.1187  
 jbeattie@utc.law.gov

11 FOR SPEEDISHUTTLE WASHINGTON, LLC:  
 12 DAVID W. WILEY  
 13 Williams Kastner  
 14 601 Union Square, Suite 4100  
 15 Seattle, Washington 98101  
 206.628.6600  
 dwiley@williamskastner.com

16 FOR SHUTTLE EXPRESS, INC.:  
 17 BROOKS E. HARLOW  
 18 Lukas Nace, Gutierrez & Sachs, LLP  
 19 8300 Greensboro Drive  
 20 Suite 1200  
 21 McLean, Virginia 22102  
 703.584.8680  
 bharlow@fcclaw.com

22 -o0o-

Page 150

1 Attorney General's Office.  
 2 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.  
 3 And for Shuttle Express?  
 4 MR. HARLOW: Thank you, Your Honor.  
 5 Good morning. Brooks Harlow, representing Shuttle  
 6 Express, the complaint and petitioner.  
 7 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 8 And for SpeediShuttle?  
 9 MR. WILEY: Yes. Dave Wiley, attorney  
 10 for the applicant and the respondent, SpeediShuttle.  
 11 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So as a  
 12 preliminary matter, I will just ask now whether there  
 13 is any party seeking intervention.  
 14 Okay. Hearing nothing we will move on.  
 15 So the notice of prehearing conference noted  
 16 that aside from standard procedural and scheduling  
 17 matters, we will address three issues today. So the  
 18 first is Shuttle Express's petition for rehearing.  
 19 Also, Shuttle Express's motion to strike, quote,  
 20 answers to petition and complaint, and Shuttle  
 21 Express's motion to consolidate these dockets, which  
 22 was in the original petition and complaint.  
 23 So I have reviewed all of the filings made by  
 24 the parties and I am ready to rule on each of these  
 25 items. I will start with Shuttle Express's petition

Page 151

1 for rehearing.  
 2 Shuttle Express has requested that the  
 3 Commission exercise its discretion to rehear certain  
 4 matters in Docket TC-143691 and to cancel or restrict  
 5 SpeediShuttle's certificate based on material  
 6 misrepresentations made by SpeediShuttle, errors and  
 7 omissions in prior proceedings, and changed conditions  
 8 previously not considered. SpeediShuttle filed a  
 9 response opposing the petition, and Staff also filed a  
 10 response. Staff supports Shuttle Express's petition  
 11 for rehearing, but recommends that the Commission  
 12 conduct a brief adjudicative proceeding that limits  
 13 the scope of the issues.  
 14 So I am going to grant Shuttle Express's  
 15 petition for rehearing without adopting Staff's  
 16 recommendation, because I think it is in the best  
 17 interest of the parties that we undertake a thorough,  
 18 and what I expect to be a final exploration of the  
 19 issues that are presented here. And I think it makes  
 20 the most sense to hear the petition and complaint  
 21 simultaneously, which brings us to Shuttle Express's  
 22 motion to consolidate the two dockets. And because  
 23 the petition and complaint share common issues of law  
 24 and fact, I am going to grant Shuttle Express's motion  
 25 and consolidate Dockets TC-143691 and TC-160516.

Page 152

1 So with respect to Shuttle Express's motion to  
 2 strike both Staff's answer to the petition and  
 3 SpeediShuttle's answers to the complaint and the  
 4 petition, I have had an opportunity to review both  
 5 Staff's and SpeediShuttle's answer to the motion. I  
 6 am going to deny it.  
 7 With respect to Staff's answer, I agree with  
 8 Staff that the response was appropriate, in light of  
 9 what Shuttle Express's petition proposed, and that  
 10 weighing in on the Commission's decision to rehear the  
 11 petition was exactly what was called for when the  
 12 Commission provided Staff with an opportunity to  
 13 respond.  
 14 And with respect to SpeediShuttle's answer, I  
 15 think it is clear from reading the answer which  
 16 allegations SpeediShuttle admits and which it denies.  
 17 I don't think it is necessary to allow Shuttle Express  
 18 the opportunity to respond because there will be  
 19 plenty of opportunities for Shuttle Express to address  
 20 the issues raised in the answer, in the prefiled  
 21 testimony, hearing, and posthearing briefing stages of  
 22 this proceeding.  
 23 So I am assuming, and it sounds like the  
 24 parties have agreed, that the discovery rules should  
 25 be made available in this case; is that correct?

Page 153

1 MR. HARLOW: That's certainly our  
 2 position, Your Honor, for the petitioner.  
 3 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Wiley?  
 4 MR. WILEY: Excuse me. Which question  
 5 specifically do you want me to respond to right now?  
 6 JUDGE PEARSON: I only had one question,  
 7 and that is, do the parties want the discovery rules  
 8 to be available?  
 9 MR. WILEY: Well, Your Honor, I think  
 10 the scope of the discovery rules are going to be the  
 11 rub. I also think that there is -- as you know, under  
 12 the rules there is a possibility of an interlocutory  
 13 appeal on the consolidation ruling that you have just  
 14 made. I would think that we would want to await the  
 15 outcome of that to determine whether the scope is  
 16 appropriate.  
 17 We certainly oppose, as you can well  
 18 anticipate, the consolidation of the proceedings, as  
 19 we so argued. I believe under the rule, specifically  
 20 480-07-320, ultimately the Commission itself will  
 21 resolve that, if we in fact take interlocutory appeal  
 22 of your ruling on the consolidation matter.  
 23 I don't think discovery -- discovery will be  
 24 affected by whether there is or is not consolidation.  
 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

Page 154

1 MR. HARLOW: If I may, Your Honor?  
 2 JUDGE PEARSON: Sure.  
 3 MR. HARLOW: Since we are getting into  
 4 it, the rule on discovery, WAC 480-07-400, this is  
 5 (2)(b). No. 2 starts out "When discovery available,"  
 6 and (b) says, "If the commission finds that an  
 7 adjudicative proceeding meets one of the following  
 8 criteria, the methods of discovery described in  
 9 subsections (1)(c)(iii) through (vi) of this section  
 10 and in WAC 480-07-410 and 480-07-415 will be available  
 11 to the parties."  
 12 Now, we had -- okay. I've got to go down now  
 13 to 3 under that because it says "the following  
 14 criteria." No. 3 says, "Any complaint proceeding  
 15 involving claims of discriminatory or anticompetitive  
 16 conduct, unjust or unreasonable rates, violations of  
 17 provisions in Titles 80 and 81 RCW." I think all of  
 18 those elements are in our complaint, with the  
 19 exception of Title 80. Title 81 is covered in great  
 20 degree.  
 21 So with all due respect to Mr. Wiley -- and we  
 22 did have some discussions and would be willing perhaps  
 23 to limit the overall number of requests, perhaps the  
 24 number of depositions or the time for depositions.  
 25 But the rule, I think, is, A, quite clear, that

Page 155

1 discovery is available, it's mandatory in this kind of  
 2 a complaint; and secondly, the scope should not be  
 3 limited in terms of the type of discovery, whether  
 4 depositions are allowed or not. The rule says all  
 5 types of discovery, essentially, including  
 6 depositions, which is the reference to WAC 480-07-410,  
 7 depositions.  
 8 So there really shouldn't be any dispute on  
 9 the scope. If you are ready to make a ruling this  
 10 morning, I think we could save some time and be able  
 11 to map out our schedule better, knowing there will be  
 12 discovery.  
 13 MR. WILEY: No one is disputing that in  
 14 complaint proceedings, Your Honor, that discovery is  
 15 available. My issue is a consolidation of the  
 16 proceedings with a petition for rehearing, and whether  
 17 there will be an interlocutory appeal, which I will  
 18 strongly recommend on your ruling on consolidation.  
 19 And I believe WAC 480-07-320 on consolidation  
 20 leaves -- again, leaves that ultimate ruling to the  
 21 Commission. There is case law supporting that view  
 22 that I can cite you to.  
 23 That will, of course -- then the scope of  
 24 discovery will be clarified, if we know -- if a  
 25 petition to rehear is going to be combined with the

Page 156

1 complaint, and if the proceedings are going forward  
 2 together, or if there is a reversal of your ruling,  
 3 for instance, on granting the petition for rehearing.  
 4 I do think -- we are not disputing that in a  
 5 complaint proceeding discovery is available. What we  
 6 are raising is the intertwining of the proceedings and  
 7 the nature of the questions in discovery that would  
 8 ensue based on that.  
 9 JUDGE PEARSON: I understand the  
 10 distinction.  
 11 I am going to go ahead and make the discovery  
 12 rules available. I think that when you set the  
 13 schedule for discovery, most likely that will  
 14 accommodate any time period during which you could  
 15 request review of my decision to consolidate, or you  
 16 could keep that in mind. And in the event that that  
 17 is reversed, then the discovery schedule would apply  
 18 only to the complaint and not the petition for  
 19 rehearing. I don't see a problem with moving forward  
 20 with discovery.  
 21 MR. HARLOW: Well, that's great. And we  
 22 could make a finer point, but I think we can probably  
 23 address it in response to the interlocutory appeal, so  
 24 I'll save it.  
 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

Page 157

1 Does Staff have anything?  
 2 MR. BEATTIE: I want to clarify two  
 3 points, Judge Pearson. First, just to be clear, are  
 4 you exercising your discretion to rehear --  
 5 JUDGE PEARSON: Correct.  
 6 MR. BEATTIE: -- and not entertaining  
 7 any petition as a matter of right?  
 8 JUDGE PEARSON: That's correct.  
 9 MR. BEATTIE: Okay.  
 10 Secondly, Staff had hoped to avoid  
 11 participating in the complaint proceeding, but now we  
 12 are being brought into it by means of the petition for  
 13 rehearing, which we did respond to. I just want to  
 14 clarify on the record that Staff is now a party in the  
 15 complaint proceeding as well, or I guess in the  
 16 consolidated dockets.  
 17 JUDGE PEARSON: That's correct.  
 18 MR. BEATTIE: I don't believe we need to  
 19 file a motion for intervention.  
 20 JUDGE PEARSON: No.  
 21 MR. BEATTIE: Okay.  
 22 JUDGE PEARSON: You do not.  
 23 I will say it is at your discretion how much  
 24 you want to participate in the petition versus -- the  
 25 petition and the complaint are so intertwined at this

Page 158

1 point.  
 2 MR. BEATTIE: Right.  
 3 JUDGE PEARSON: Staff can decide at what  
 4 point they want to file prehearing testimony, if they  
 5 want to, or posthearing briefs, and how much they want  
 6 to participate, and what portions of the hearing they  
 7 want to participate in. I will leave that up to  
 8 Staff.  
 9 MR. BEATTIE: Okay. That clarification  
 10 is very much appreciated. Thank you.  
 11 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 12 So do the parties consent to electronic  
 13 service if the Commission decides to serve documents  
 14 in that manner?  
 15 MR. HARLOW: Yes, Your Honor.  
 16 MR. WILEY: Yes. Absolutely.  
 17 MR. BEATTIE: Yes, for Staff.  
 18 JUDGE PEARSON: So that brings us to the  
 19 schedule. We can take a recess at this point and the  
 20 parties can discuss the schedule.  
 21 I do have -- do you have a computer with you?  
 22 MR. BEATTIE: Mr. Young has a computer.  
 23 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you can see my  
 24 calendar and the hearing room calendar as you are  
 25 discussing.

Page 159

1 MR. BEATTIE: Yes, Judge.  
 2 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 3 So is there anything else before we take a  
 4 recess?  
 5 MR. WILEY: Yes, one point of  
 6 clarification. Is the proceeding that you are  
 7 envisioning in the consolidated proceeding a brief  
 8 adjudicative proceeding for auto transportation  
 9 company applicants or is it a conventional hearing?  
 10 JUDGE PEARSON: It's a conventional  
 11 hearing. I will give it one day, I will tell you that  
 12 right now, so keep that in mind.  
 13 MR. HARLOW: We will move as fast as we  
 14 can.  
 15 JUDGE PEARSON: So we will be in recess.  
 16 Mr. Beattie or Mr. Young, if you would just  
 17 come get me in my office when you are ready.  
 18 MR. BEATTIE: Absolutely.  
 19 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.  
 20 (A brief recess.)  
 21 JUDGE PEARSON: We will be back on the  
 22 record following a recess.  
 23 During the break, did the parties agree on a  
 24 procedural schedule?  
 25 MR. HARLOW: Thank you, Mr. Beattie.

Page 160

1 We, I think, recognize there is a lot of  
 2 uncertainty potentially in how the schedule plays out.  
 3 I am going to let Mr. Wiley address that because it  
 4 relates to his contemplated motions.  
 5 We have agreed that we can schedule the  
 6 one-day hearing for February the 1st, if that works  
 7 for the Commission. That is a compromise between the  
 8 parties. One side wanting it sooner; the other side  
 9 wanting later.  
 10 I think, as the petitioner, that will probably  
 11 work, despite contemplated motions. If it doesn't, we  
 12 will just have to move it. I think it's good to have  
 13 an end post in the ground here, at this point.  
 14 Something to work toward.  
 15 The second thing we agreed to, assuming the  
 16 Commission feels it can enter one, is a protective  
 17 order. I believe under RCW 34.05.446, which says very  
 18 simply, "The presiding officer may issue subpoenas and  
 19 may enter protective orders" -- I don't think it  
 20 matters that this is a transportation matter. I think  
 21 the fact that this is now an adjudicative proceeding  
 22 and that's where the RCW I just read falls --  
 23 JUDGE PEARSON: Can you read it to me  
 24 again because it was kind of mumbled?  
 25 MR. HARLOW: Okay. RCW 34.05.446(1),

Page 161

1 "The presiding officer may issue subpoenas and may  
 2 enter protective orders." The Commission's rule  
 3 tracks that very closely, and that would be WAC  
 4 480-07-420.  
 5 I don't think it matters that there is no --  
 6 there is no confidentiality provision in Title 81,  
 7 like there is in Title 80. I think the APA provisions  
 8 in the Commission's rules on protective orders trump  
 9 that and allow you to enter a protective order. Both  
 10 the petitioner and respondent would like one.  
 11 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 12 MR. HARLOW: And then we wanted to -- do  
 13 you want to ask about the last question or do you want  
 14 me to? The testimony.  
 15 MR. BEATTIE: I'm sorry, I wasn't sure  
 16 what the last question was. I think Mr. Harlow is  
 17 referring to whether you envision there will be  
 18 prefiled testimony and that the hearing that is  
 19 contemplated to be one day will be a cross-examination  
 20 hearing or --  
 21 JUDGE PEARSON: That's correct.  
 22 MR. BEATTIE: Okay. Thank you.  
 23 MR. HARLOW: That's all I have at this  
 24 time, Your Honor.  
 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

Page 162

1 Mr. Wiley, did you have something?  
 2 MR. WILEY: Yes, Your Honor. We  
 3 weren't -- you know, we were prepared to offer  
 4 argument on the motion to consolidate pursuant to the  
 5 notice of prehearing conference that you sent out  
 6 about a month ago. You obviously felt that you had  
 7 sufficient, shall we say, rationale provided in the  
 8 submissions. We clearly did not -- while we oppose  
 9 the intertwining of the proceedings, and we are very  
 10 clear on that in our submissions, we clearly do oppose  
 11 the consolidation of the proceeding. We believe that  
 12 that is something that is appropriately submitted to  
 13 the Commission by motion by the moving party. We will  
 14 take an interlocutory appeal of that ruling because it  
 15 certainly affects also the outcome of the ruling on  
 16 the petition to rehear, which we believe should be the  
 17 subject of an appeal by the respondent party.  
 18 So noting that, that is clearly what has  
 19 clouded the ability to move forward on a lot of the  
 20 more housekeeping matters in this proceeding.  
 21 I also want to take a look at 34.05.570 to  
 22 determine or at least advise my client as to whether  
 23 decisions on a petition to rehear and to consolidate  
 24 are an appealable order that might be entertained in  
 25 superior court.

Page 163

1 I raise those now, not to be at all  
 2 argumentative, but to place it on the record that we  
 3 reserve the right to make those arguments, either  
 4 before the full Commission and potentially superior  
 5 court.  
 6 I also wanted some clarity from you. In  
 7 looking at WAC 480-07-320, if we are running an  
 8 appeal, an interlocutory appeal to the Commission,  
 9 will that be based upon your oral ruling from the  
 10 bench or are you intending to issue a written --  
 11 JUDGE PEARSON: I will issue a written  
 12 order.  
 13 MR. WILEY: Okay. And that would then  
 14 trigger the ten-day, it appears, appeal period.  
 15 My other concern procedurally is that the  
 16 decision on the petition to rehear would appear to me  
 17 to be an initial order that would be subject to a  
 18 20-day response period.  
 19 Again, these are issues that have never arisen  
 20 before.  
 21 JUDGE PEARSON: Right.  
 22 MR. WILEY: In 37 years I have never had  
 23 a petition to rehear granted, so I apologize for not  
 24 being nimble on knowing the answers to these legal  
 25 issues, but -- but they are troubling to me in terms

Page 164

1 of being able to commit to deadlines or to -- to  
 2 advise as to what our course of action is going to be.  
 3 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So I will just  
 4 say that those things will be addressed.  
 5 MR. WILEY: In the order?  
 6 JUDGE PEARSON: In my order, yes.  
 7 MR. WILEY: That will be helpful, Your  
 8 Honor.  
 9 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 10 MR. WILEY: Based on what you have just  
 11 said, I will await a written order before calendaring  
 12 any of the interlocutory appeal or judicial appeal  
 13 issues.  
 14 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 15 MR. WILEY: Thank you.  
 16 JUDGE PEARSON: Anything else?  
 17 MR. HARLOW: Not from petitioner, Your  
 18 Honor.  
 19 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 20 Mr. Beattie?  
 21 MR. BEATTIE: Nothing from Staff.  
 22 Thank you.  
 23 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 24 I will go ahead and schedule the hearing for  
 25 Wednesday, February 1st.

Page 165

1 Given that you will only have one day, do you  
 2 want a 9:30 start time or do you want an earlier start  
 3 time?  
 4 MR. WILEY: Earlier from me, from the  
 5 respondent's standpoint.  
 6 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.  
 7 MR. HARLOW: How early are you thinking?  
 8 JUDGE PEARSON: 8:30 is the earliest I  
 9 am willing to do.  
 10 MR. HARLOW: 8:30 would be fine.  
 11 MR. WILEY: I will compromise on 9:00,  
 12 Your Honor. If we run a little past 4:30, I hope you  
 13 will be --  
 14 JUDGE PEARSON: I'm okay going until  
 15 6:00, honestly.  
 16 MR. WILEY: Okay. Thank you.  
 17 MR. HARLOW: So we're starting at 9:00  
 18 and going until 6:00 potentially?  
 19 JUDGE PEARSON: Potentially, yes.  
 20 MR. HARLOW: Okay.  
 21 JUDGE PEARSON: And I will give 90  
 22 minutes for lunch because you can't do anything in an  
 23 hour around here.  
 24 MR. HARLOW: It sounds very civilized.  
 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So I will

Page 166

1 schedule that with a 9:00 a.m. start time. That will  
 2 be reflected in the order.  
 3 So if there is nothing further, then thank you  
 4 all for coming here today. We are adjourned.  
 5 MR. BEATTIE: Thank you.  
 6 (Proceedings adjourned 11:25 a.m.)  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

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

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF WASHINGTON  
COUNTY OF KING

I, Sherrilyn Smith, a Certified  
Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington,  
do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is  
true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill  
and ability.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SHERRILYN SMITH