Docket No. TE-161295 - Vol. I

In re the Application of Go VIP, LLC, d/b/a Go VIP Seattle

April 20, 2017



1325 Fourth Avenue • Suite 1840 • Seattle, Washington 98101

206.287.9066

www.buellrealtime.com

Olympia | 360.534.9066 | Spokane | 509.624.3261 | National | 800.846.6989

email: info@buellrealtime.com



1	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
2	UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
3	
4	In re Application of ODCKET NO. TE-161295
5	Go VIP, LLC d/b/a Go VIP)
6	Seattle)
7	For a certificate to operate) as a charter and excursion)
8	carrier)
9)
10	
11	BRIEF ADJUDICATIVE PROCEEDING, VOLUME I
12	Pages 1-129 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RAYNE PEARSON
13	
14	9:00 A.M.
15	APRIL 20, 2017
16	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
17 13 13 18	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest
	Olympia, Washington 98504-7250
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Takon Poforo:
24	Taken Before:
25	Laura A. Gjuka, CCR #2057 Certified Shorthand Reporter

1	APPEARANCES			
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:			
3	RAYNE PEARSON			
4	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission			
5	1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, WA 98504			
6	360-664-1136			
7	FOR COMMISSION STAFF:			
8	JEFF ROBERSON			
	Assistant Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, WA 08504			
10	Olympia, WA 98504 360-664-1188 iroberson@ute.wa.gov			
11	jroberson@utc.wa.gov			
12	For Go VIP:			
13	STEPHEN VALENTINETTI (Pro Se) Go VIP, LLC d/b/a Go VIP Seattle			
14	14644 Ninth Avenue SW Seattle, WA 98166			
15	206-423-5000 steve@GO-VIP.us			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

1	EXAMINATION INDEX
2	PAGE
3	STEPHEN VALENTINETTI
4	By Mr. Valentinetti9
5	By Mr. Valentinetti
6	
7	DOUG FERGUSON
8	By Mr. Valentinetti66 By Mr. Roberson72
9	MATHEW PERKINSON
LO	By Mr. Roberson74 By Judge Pearson89
L1	By Judge Pearson89 By Mr. Valentinetti89 By Mr. Roberson112
L2	EXHIBIT INDEX
L3	EXHIBIT INDEX
L4	EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE
L5 L6	MP-1 Airline Shuttle Compliance 82 Review,
L7	MP-2 AMI Coaches Compliance Review 83
L8	MP-3 Airline Shuttle Operating Status, 78 As of 4/14/17
L9 20	MP-4 AMI Coaches Operating Status, As 77 of 4/14/17
21	MP-5 Memo from Mr. Perkinson to 80 Mr. Pratt, 1/11/17
22	
23	
24	
25	

OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; APRIL 20, 2017.
 9:07 A.M.

--000--

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE PEARSON: Good morning. Today is Thursday, April 20th, 2017. The time is just after 9:00 a.m. This is Docket TE-161295, which is an application for a charter party and excursion carrier certificate filed by Go VIP, LLC. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the Administrative Law Judge presiding over the adjudicative proceeding. Let's take appearances from both parties and then we will talk about how we will proceed this morning. So let's start with commission staff.

MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Assistant attorney general Jeff Roberson, commission staff. My address is 1400 South Evergreen Park Southwest, PO Box 40128, Olympia, Washington 198504. My phone number is area code 360-664-1188. And my email address is jroberson@utc.wa.gov.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And for the company, if you can state your first and last name, spelling your last name, and provide your address, telephone number, and email address.

1	MR. VALENTINETTI: I'm sorry. I wasn't
2	paying attention. I thought we were going to hear from
3	that person.
4	JUDGE PEARSON: We are taking appearances
5	for the record. So you need to state your name and
6	spell your last name, and give us your address, phone
7	number, and email address.
8	MR. VALENTINETTI: Steve Valentinetti for
9	Go VIP, 14644 Ninth Avenue Southwest, Seattle 98166. My
10	email address is steve@go-VIP.us. Phone number is
11	206-242-2000.
12	
13	JUDGE PEARSON: Can you spell your last
14	name?
15	MR. VALENTINETTI:
16	V-a-l-e-n-t-i-n-e-t-t-i.
17	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So I
18	have just briefly provide a roadmap for today's brief
19	adjudicative proceeding. We are here today because the
20	commission issued a notice of intent to deny the
21	company's application for a charter party and an
22	excursion carrier certificate for failure to meet the
23	application requirements.
24	And Mr. Valentinetti, you requested a hearing to
25	have an opportunity to respond to the allegations and

1	explain why the application should be approved. So
2	after Mr. Roberson gives a brief overview of staff's
3	case, you'll go first and present your case. And then
4	after that, both parties will have a chance to make
5	closing statements. You will also, after Mr. Perkinson
6	testifies, have an opportunity to ask him questions,
7	just as Mr. Roberson will have an opportunity to ask you
8	questions. Okay?
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: And we have witnesses.
LO	At what time will they go? I think Mr. Ferguson is on a
L1	timeframe.
L2	JUDGE PEARSON: During your turn.
L3	MR. FERGUSON: I am here forever.
L4	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Roberson will make a
L5	brief opening statement, and then you'll get to go and
L6	do your testimony and call your witness at that time.
L7	MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay.
L8	JUDGE PEARSON: Go ahead.
L9	MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. As you've
20	noted, we are here because Go VIP has requested a
21	hearing after the commission issued a notice of intent
22	to deny their application for operating authority for it
23	operating as a charter and excursion carrier.
24	Staff recommended that the Commission deny the
25	application for two reasons: First, Mr. Valentinetti

1	has owned a
2	Coaches, LL
3	are under fed
4	safety violation
5	ratings for bo
6	safety fitness
7	deny the app
8	Independe
9	evade the ou
10	companies.
11	companies.
12	commission
13	JUD
14	Mr. Valentine
15	statement, yo
16	can start you
17	MR.
18	statement.
19	JUD
20	MR.
21	myself did ov
22	Airline Shuttl

24

25

has owned and operated two other companies, AMI Coaches, LLC and Airline Shuttle, Inc., both of which are under federal out-of-service orders because of safety violations, which produced unsatisfactory safety ratings for both companies. That indicates a lack of safety fitness, which should cause the commission to deny the application.

Independently, Go VIP appears to be an attempt to evade the out-of-service orders affecting those two companies. Essentially it's a reincarnation of those companies. Federal regulations incorporated by the commission prevent that kind of evasion.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Valentinetti, if you would like to make an opening statement, you can do so. Or I can swear you in and you can start your testimony.

MR. VALENTINETTI: I'll make an opening statement.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Steve Valentinetti or myself did own Airline Shuttle and AMI Coaches.

Airline Shuttle was the longest operating company out of Seatac Airport. And for the record, it has never had an accident or a violation until the WUTC's unwarranted attack in 2014 -- '13, make that.

Our safety record is not only the best in the state, but probably the best in the country. Not sure who the people in this room are, but I assume it's Evergreen Trails and Gray Line, who has weekly accidents. Ride the Ducks, who kills people and is back on the road has 400 violations. We are AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle, who has never had an accident. And I'm talking about a fender-bender. Never.

The violations that were assessed against

AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle were false and it was an attack by the DOT. We're here today to try and get

Go VIP on the road and give the DOT an opportunity to back down from their reckless disregard for the law and personal attacks.

But we're also here to establish for the record we'll address every violation that's been assessed against AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle and dispel all of those. At the end of today, if there is any negative impact after we've proved, we're going to continue it, we're going to call that continuing discrimination.

This isn't a "black lives matter" thing. This is everybody follows the law equally, whether you're Gray Line, whether you're MTR, Starline or Airline Shuttle or Go VIP. Everybody follows the same laws. And already, right this second, four minutes into

1	it, we're sure that Airline Shuttle has the best safety
2	record of anyone that's ever been in this office.
3	Unquestionable. And any time someone wants to deny
4	that, please tell me a company that's gone 24 years
5	without an accident. Thank you.
6	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And would you like
7	to present testimony at this time, because I can swear
8	you in.
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: Sure.
10	
11	STEPHEN VALENTINETTI, having been first duly sworn by
12	the Administrative Law Judge to
13	tell the truth, the whole truth,
14	and nothing but the truth, was
15	examined and testified as follows:
16	
17	JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So if you want
18	to go ahead and present your case for why your
19	application should be granted.
20	
21	TESTIMONY OF STEVE VALENTINETTI
22	
23	MR. VALENTINETTI: Like I said before, we
24	would like to that's the end of the story why it
25	should be granted. But we've received the negative

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

letter from Mr. Perkinson, and it's not personal. We received a negative letter from the WTC, which affects our ability to get insurance. It affects our ability to get contracts. It affects our ability to work in the future again.

It happened three years ago. It actually happened in the year 2000, but now it's happening again. So we're going to address everything that's on that letter, plus a little more. So if you would like me to start with that.

JUDGE PEARSON: Please.

MR. VALENTINETTI: I'll give you a history of Airline Shuttle. It started in 1989 at Seatac Airport. We started with just a few vans. We've always had insurance. We've always had qualified drivers. We've had drug and alcohol testing before there was an FMCSA, before you people knew what it was, before most of you probably had jobs.

We've never had an accident. We moved airline crew.

I'll just talk about Airline Shuttle for right now,
because there is two companies that we're talking about.

I think that probably very quickly we can dispel that,
not only are we a safe company and we're not trying to
evade, and I'm going to address that to Mr. Roberson.

But really the UTC and the FMCSA don't have jurisdiction

over it.

2.0

And thank goodness we have the state patrol here to help, in case -- me and Mr. Perkinson have already talked about it, but I still want to address those accused violations anyway, since they continue to affect us, and that's why we're here in this meeting.

Airline Shuttle -- well, let me back up and continue the story. Airline Shuttle started in 1989; operated fantastically until 2014. We did almost every airline crew at Seatac Airport during the late '90s and the early 2000, until about 2005, where we did 145 runs a day to downtown Seattle from Seatac Airport with airline crew.

After 9/11, the Twin Towers, the airlines had trouble. So they couldn't all pay their bills or they didn't want to. One or the other. But with filing bankruptcy, we lost some accounts and it was spooling down.

They asked us to work cheaper. And since we are a company that prides ourselves on being safe and doing the right thing and having great equipment, we said, No. This is the number that we need to have windshields, to have brakes, to have tires, to pay our people good so we can hire quality drivers. As the airlines dropped off, we just let that happen.

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

And basically by 2007 we had I believe it was
2007 two airlines left that we were transporting.
And those were two international carriers. And that
allowed me to travel at the end of almost 20 years at
the time, that allowed me to travel around the world and
take on professionals for a different professional sport
so I didn't have to be there.

In 2011, we started AMI Coaches. I came back, I'm done with professional sports, sport car racing. I came back, I bought a motor coach and I thought, Oh, this is nice. I'm going to do motor coaches, I think. And we started that business.

And because of the poor competition -- and when I say poor, I don't mean financially poor, I mean poor service that is offered because there is no competition at the level that it should be for motor coaches, there is not enough people that have the money to get into that business -- it was easy for AMI Coaches to grow very quickly. AMI Coaches within three months secured the cruise ship contract going from Seatac Airport to the downtown pier cruise ship. We worked for Microsoft, Amazon, Seattle Sounders, Seattle U, University of Washington with no negative impact, no breakdowns, no anything that would be a negative thing.

On April 8th, 2013, about four months into our

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

business with AMI Coaches, we had gone to Amtrak and
said we have buses. We didn't know that they bussed all
the time at the time, but we told them we did. And so
Amtrak said we have a long list of bus companies that we
call when there is some kind of an emergency and you are
last on the list. We said, Okay, great. We're new.
That's fine.
And April 8th there was a mudslide in Mukilteo. And
they called down their list. And since we're an airline
crew company and the other company,
Airline Shuttle we have to be quick responding and
have people on call and on duty all the time. You know,
we work from Airline Shuttle is used to working from
4:00 in the morning until 1:00 in the morning. You
know, we have people that are on call to do that.
So when Amtrak called us and said, We have an
incident in Mukilteo, can you send two motor coaches?
We said, Sure, we can do that. We were there in

45 minutes. They were shocked. They said, It takes
 your competitors four hours to get here. And I said,
 Why? And they said, We don't know why, but it does.

We picked up the passengers. We helped with the removal of passengers off the train through the mud. We transported those passengers to Seattle's King Street Station; where our competitors then had buses and

1	complained that Amtrak was using us instead of them;
2	where our competitors then transported the people that
3	were going beyond Seattle to Portland.
4	Amtrak put our coaches on standby. We stood by at
5	our office, which is about eight miles away from the
6	King Street Station. So we let our drivers go and just
7	stayed on call, and our drivers can respond in ten
8	minutes.
9	MR. ROBERSON: Objection, relevance. I'm
10	not sure how any of this is relevant to what's at issue
11	here today.
12	MR. VALENTINETTI: This is one of the
13	violations, Mr. Roberson.
14	JUDGE PEARSON: Which violation? What do
15	you mean "one of the violations"?
16	MR. VALENTINETTI: This is one of AMI's
17	violations and the reason we're here today. That's the
18	relevance.
19	JUDGE PEARSON: You're saying AMI Coaches
20	violated
21	MR. VALENTINETTI: In two more minutes
22	you'll get it.
23	JUDGE PEARSON: Who assessed violation?
24	MR. VALENTINETTI: The FMCSA and the WUTC.
25	You'll get this point in two minutes. And if you don't,

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

then you can sit me dow	SIL THE GOW	SILI	Carr	you	เมเตม	
-------------------------	-------------	------	------	-----	-------	--

JUDGE PEARSON: Just try to get to it quickly.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay. So we moved -we went to -- in four months into operation, we moved
passengers from Mukilteo to downtown Seattle, King
Street Station. Amtrak rewarded us, not with pay but
with accolades, and said that, You guys were so good,
you should bid for some of our contracts. So we said
okay.

So we were bidding a for a second -- because at the time we had just gotten the emergency services for Amtrak, we were bidding for a second contract, the X092 contract that goes from Seattle to Bellingham. Anyway, I'll get to the point, we can come back to it later.

So we're bidding for a contract, and the only complaint that we know we've gotten was from the competitors who called the WUTC, that's you guys, and said, These guys are killing us. Do something. So David Pratt, who is probably in this room, I don't know what he looks like personally.

JUDGE PEARSON: He's not present. Go ahead.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay. Wrote a letter to Amtrak and said, AMI Coaches is not qualified -- in

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

short, is not qualified to operate. Use somebody else.
I admit, I was very angry. We got negotiators to
contact the UTC and said we would like that letter
retracted since it's untrue. We got negative feedback
from the UTC that, We will do what we want to do. We're
the state of Washington. So we contacted attorneys to
get them to do that.
Then Mr. Pratt wrote a soft, soft, soft retraction

of the letter. He basically wrote the same letter, and in the last sentence said, Sorry for any inconvenience.

They have authority now. But in actuality, we had authority the whole time.

The relevance, Mr. Roberson, is we had authority the whole time, the state attacked us with that letter, trying to stop us from the Amtrak contract that was coming up, and then wouldn't retract the statement.

That's the relevance.

And in your letter, in Mr. Perkinson's letter to me identifying the violations that we have, the UTC accidentally forgot the biggest violation that was assessed against AMI Coaches, which was a \$25,000 fine for not having authority to operate. The FMCSA carries a forward stating, Well, that's what the WUTC found, it's not us. Now you guys are saying, Well, the FMCSA are the ones that shut you guys down. It's not us.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI
1	You guys are pointing fingers at each other, but it
2	started here at the WUTC from David Pratt, David Pratt's
3	letter and his refusal to take it back. The rest of
4	these violations are the same thing.
5	So Pratt's letter was May 15th, 2013. Which is
6	Your Honor, it's No. 12 in the exhibits there.
7	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So let me just stop
8	you for a second. We can take a look at the letter.
9	We're not going to walk through each of the violations
10	that were assessed by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety

that were assessed by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. Those findings have been determined.

We don't have jurisdiction to revisit those.

MR. VALENTINETTI: They were found by your guy. They were found by the WUTC.

JUDGE PEARSON: I thought you were referring to -- I don't see what you're referring to in here. I see photos and an email behind tab No. 12. And just to let you know, similarly, we're not going to revisit the past findings that the UTC made either.

MR. VALENTINETTI: You asked me -- you haven't, Mr. Perkinson asked why should we not -- You have a history of noncompliance, which isn't true at all. Again, we're the safest company in the United States probably. And that sounds funny, but is there any other company that's gone 25 years? We can

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

ask Mr. Ferguson. And you've listed publicly now a
bunch of violations Mr. Ferguson's letter or
Mr. Pratt, I'm not sure who wrote it you've said we
have a history of noncompliance. We would like to
address every one of those violations. And we have the
evidence now to dispute every one.

For instance, I'll just take one, and you've got me off track, but one is we don't have insurance. There is Mr. Ferguson and the evidence is going to show we do.

JUDGE PEARSON: So just let me stop you for a second. You're saying that the violations never occurred? Are you saying that Mr. Perkinson has incorrect information about what the Feds said or are you saying what the Feds determined is incorrect?

MR. VALENTINETTI: I'm saying

Mr. Perkinson is a new guy to the UTC and he doesn't know what's going on here, although he is very understanding of the CFRs, the UFCs, the WACs, and the RCWs. That's correct. I'm saying that those violations -- today, if you say we don't have insurance -- you know what? If you said, Steve, you're a bus owner, do you want to shut this company down? I would shut them down. I would do what the UTC believes they are trying do here. I would follow that. But I'm

here to show you and here to prove to you, with an

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

insurance broker right here, that when the violation
says you don't have insurance, you don't have an
MCS-90 which I'm not sure anyone in this room knows
what that is you don't have the proper level of
insurance, which I think Mr. Perkinson knows, I'm not
sure everyone knows what that is. I'm here to show
that, guess what, we did. And so that is why because
these violations are false, that is why Go VIP is
probably the next safest company in the United States
and should be turned on without any negative impact from
the UTC.

I'm not here to personally attack the UTC or Pratt for writing his letter. I'm here to move forward and operate a safe company, just like we did before. Your Honor, with all the respect in the world, I'm not going to allow even Mr. Perkinson, who is naive and nice, to say that we have a history of noncompliance without addressing it.

JUDGE PEARSON: So again, I'm just going to stop you right there and explain that I don't have any jurisdiction to revisit the findings that were made by the Feds.

MR. VALENTINETTI: I understand that.

JUDGE PEARSON: So there is no point walking through each of the violations and you trying to

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

prove that they did or not happen. I have to accept
them at face value and the conclusions that were drawr
by the Feds that they occurred. Period.

MR. VALENTINETTI: No, the conclusions were --

JUDGE PEARSON: Please don't speak over me. We have a court reporter in the room. We can only speak one at a time. I'm speaking now. I also can't revisit the findings that were made by the Commission because your opportunity to appeal those decisions has long since passed.

So if you want to set out your argument why today the company that you're operating is fit to operate and show that you now have insurance and you now meet all of the safety requirements, you are welcome to do that.

And I understand your position that you believe that the violations were made in error and that they didn't occur. But, again, we can't revisit that. So what you can do is show me today that you're fit to operate, that Go VIP is fit to operate and how that's true. So you're welcome to make that case.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Thank you, Your Honor.

I'm not asking you to revisit the violations that were
made by the UTC or the FMCSA. But what I am going to do
is dispel the statement on letter, which is on record

1	now, that we have a history of noncompliance. And so
2	the UTC understands, whether it is formally or
3	informally, when the statement is made and the violation
4	is listed you don't have the minimum levels of
5	insurance, that I'm going to address, because we do, we
6	did, and we do now again. That's why we're here today.
7	If you want to say we didn't have insurance, I'm going
8	to show you that we did.
9	And it's not from moving backwards to fix
10	AMI Coaches, it's not to fix Airline Shuttle, it's to
11	prove that we know what we're doing, we always knew what
12	we were doing, and we're going to know what we're doing
13	in the future. I'm not here today to fix AMI Coaches
14	and Airline Shuttle. That's already ruined. It's done.
15	It's finished. They can never come back.
16	Today it is about Go VIP. And today is about, Do we
17	know what we're doing? Do we know what the CFRs are?
18	Does the UTC know what they are? That's what we're here
19	about, I believe.
20	JUDGE PEARSON: Why don't you go ahead and
21	make your case for why Go VIP should be granted a
22	certificate, why Go VIP is doing everything correctly.
23	MR. VALENTINETTI: Go VIP, just like
24	AMI Coaches and just like Airline Shuttle, did

everything correctly, is doing everything correctly, and

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

just like the last two companies did also. We're here again in this meeting today because of the false accusations against AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle. And I know that the people in this room, if you come to these hearings very often, you're used to hearing like the guy who owns Ride the Ducks come in here and apologize and say, I'm sorry, you know, we killed five people. We didn't pay any insurance claims.

I would be too if we killed someone or if we even had an accident. I would have the same apologetic attitude. But no, instead we overpay our people, we have the best equipment, we've never had an accident, knock on wood, and we did everything right. This is an attack by the DOT.

And so I'm not going to apologize, and I'm not going to say that, you know, yeah, maybe we did this or not unless we did. If we made a violation, we'll pay the fine, we'll take the whatever result comes from that, as long as it's the standard that goes to every company. If it's different, meaning for three years -- and, Your Honor, I know that you're new to this part of the -- our case, for three years we have not had a chance to address any of these violations at all. Ever. And I know that sounds crazy too, but when you do a little bit of the research, you're going to find out,

1	never have we had a hearing. And we asked for it a
2	hundred times. And I can forward the documents to
3	Mr. Ferguson and you can look at them.
4	I think everyone in this room would agree when you
5	come especially Your Honor when we come to a
6	hearing you can get discovery, you can have subpoenas,
7	you can have witnesses like you've allowed today, which
8	is great. But we've been held back from that for three
9	years.
LO	So we've never addressed those. And it says in your
L1	letter on the back page I looked at, Mr. Perkinson's
L2	letter, it says you have 45 days to dispute it. We
L3	didn't have 45 days, we didn't have any time.
L4	JUDGE PEARSON: Which letter are you
L5	referring to? Because I'm not following what you're
L6	saying.
L7	MR. VALENTINETTI: Mr. Perkinson's is
L8	this your letter, Mr. Perkinson?
L9	MR. PERKINSON: Yes.
20	JUDGE PEARSON: Do you have a copy of
21	that? Is it in the binder?
22	MR. ROBERSON: It's exhibit MP-5.
23	JUDGE PEARSON: Let me get that out. So
24	this is from January 11th of 2107. And this is

25

you're looking at the memo from Mr. Perkinson to

Mr. Pratt?

2.0

MR. VALENTINETTI: I'm looking at the back page -- specifically, right now, I'm looking at the back page that says, "Go VIP appears to have a history of noncompliance with regulatory," you know, which Go VIP has never operated yet. But I think what Mr. Perkinson meant was Airline Shuttle and AMI Coaches. "Go VIP plans on offering school services, airline flight crew, cruise ship transfers, which is similar." That's true. We are going to do that. And those are services that are -- that were previously done by both AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle.

And before I forget, I want to get it out of the way because it makes me angry. When Mr. Roberson says we're trying to evade -- I'm not sure how you put it, Mr. Roberson. But I used my name. I used my address. I used our office. We're using the same vehicles. It has been three years where we've been shut down. Evade, that did I put Steve Valentinetti instead of Stephen? I put all of the honest stuff down on the application.

And we think that after three years -- number one, after three years maybe you guys get it. And secondly, after three years there is a different group in this office now than there was back then. Meaning, a guy like Mr. Perkinson, who does understand the WACs and the

1	RCWs, the UCSs and the CFRs. And thank goodness we have
2	a state patrol here too, we would like to talk to a
3	little bit.
4	JUDGE PEARSON: He's not a witness and you
5	can't call him as a witness.
6	MR. VALENTINETTI: What's he doing?
7	JUDGE PEARSON: He's here for security.
8	We always have those at hearings.
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: Real quickly. On these
10	violations, we can get rid of nine of them in one swoop.
11	MR. ROBERSON: Objection. I think
12	Mr. Valentinetti is collaterally estopped from
13	relitigating those violations. There has been a final
14	finding by the FMCSA. I mean, they happened. It's not
15	for him to relitigate them in this forum.
16	JUDGE PEARSON: I agree, so I'm going to
17	sustain the objection.
18	MR. VALENTINETTI: They haven't happened
19	and there is not a final order on that.
20	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Valentinetti, you need
21	to not speak over people. I've told you that already.
22	I guess I have a couple of questions for you. Do
23	you have more that you want to present?
24	MR. VALENTINETTI: Your Honor, I can stand
25	here for days to show why we're a safe company.

	TESTIMONT OF VALENTINETTI
1	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.
2	MR. VALENTINETTI: And I could also do the
3	same for both Airline Shuttle or AMI Coaches. I could
4	do this very fast, if that's what you want.
5	JUDGE PEARSON: Well, I just have a
6	question when I'm looking at this memo. This is the
7	first time I'm looking at this memo. It says that both
8	companies were given an opportunity to take action with
9	45 days to improve the safety rating. And I know from
10	personal experience presiding over these cases that
11	companies always have 45 days to submit a safety
12	management plan and have that approved and have their
13	safety rating upgraded. So are you saying that
14	opportunity wasn't presented to you?
15	MR. VALENTINETTI: Yes, I am. And I have
16	that evidence in that folder right here.
17	JUDGE PEARSON: Well, I'm not sure how you
18	can have evidence of a nonoccurrence.
19	MR. VALENTINETTI: I can show you.
20	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Where is it?
21	MR. VALENTINETTI: As I'm looking for it,
22	to see which one it is, again we're the
23	longest-operating company at Seatac Airport. We were.
24	And it also bothers me that the UTC thinks that

we're not smart enough to challenge false violations

1	within	45 da	ys
---	--------	-------	----

Your Honor, do you have another question while I dig for it?

JUDGE PEARSON: No, I'm just curious about that. Is it in Staff's exhibits?

MR. ROBERSON: No.

JUDGE PEARSON: No? So I guess I will say, Mr. Roberson, in Mr. Perkinson's memo on the last page, page 4, he said, (as read) "I believe it's in the interest of public safety to request that Go VIP submit a letter explaining any affiliations and any compliance history. The letter should explain why the company believes its compliance history should not have any bearing on the consideration of its pending application."

So to a certain extent I want to allow

Mr. Valentinetti to make that argument of why the
compliance history should not have any bearing on the
consideration of his pending application. However, like

Mr. Roberson said, Mr. Valentinetti, we cannot
relitigate the findings that were made by the Federal

Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

So it sounds to me, Mr. Valentinetti, like your position is this compliance history should not have any bearing on the present application because it didn't

	TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI
1	happen. That's your contention?
2	MR. VALENTINETTI: Your Honor, my
3	contention is that it's two things. I don't want you
4	to revisit. I know you don't have the authority to. I
5	would love to do that. I would love to do that, but I
6	know that's not what this hearing is about.
7	But when the WUTC makes a current statement that we
8	have a history of noncompliance and then lists them on a
9	paper, I want to address each one of those. And I can
10	do it very quickly.
11	And here is the letters they are in that book
12	somewhere, but I'm not sure where, because we were
13	late but this is an example. This is March 7th,
14	2014, that has look, they sent it UPS Ground. It's
15	all perfect.
16	Here is the one that says and this is just, We
17	want you to pay money. That's fine. Here is one that's
18	three days later that says we're going to shut you down.
19	JUDGE PEARSON: There is the 45-day
20	letter.
21	MR. VALENTINETTI: Yeah, but guess what?
22	It never came. How did it come? Is there a certificate
23	of service? No, there is nothing. It never came.
24	That's an after-the-fact creation.

And there, here is March 7th, March 10th,

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

April 28th. It's dated April 11th. They never sent it.
And then they backed up and sent it on they faxed it
to us on April 28th and said shut down three days
earlier. April 28th, they sent it; it says you're out
of service. April 25th. We never had an opportunity to
challenge that at all.

JUDGE PEARSON: So just for the sake of the record, I'll clarify what's in front of me right now. Mr. Valentinetti has given me three letters, the first of which is dated March 7th, 2014, from the US Department of transportation Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. And he has circled where it shows the UPS tracking number indicating that it was sent via UPS Ground service.

The second is a letter from March 10th, 2014, from the same office. And he is showing that -- he has put this forth to show that it doesn't have any tracking number on it or show how it was delivered.

And then the third is a letter from April 11th, 2014, from the same office, related to the same matter, showing that this does have a UPS tracking number.

And your contention is that you had didn't receive the one that doesn't have a tracking number on it?

MR. VALENTINETTI: And, Your Honor, I want to continue -- and I thought I had it in here, but I do

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

have it in this box if I don't. I have the UPS tracking number for that one, the April 11th letter that they really faxed us to April 28th, that they contend that gave us the time. I have the UPS tracking that said it never was delivered.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Never even attempted, and it's not that we didn't accept it. That's just part of what's going on here. I know you can't go back and revisit that. I'm not asking you to do. I just want you to get that this is not what you think it is here.

And I'm asking the court and Mr. Perkinson, who is new, and Mr. Roberson, who I want to know all this stuff, whether it be in a more informal hearing, I want you guys to understand what's really happening here. That's why I do want to address each one of these things.

It's not because I'm saying I'm perfect or my company is perfect. I'm saying that we followed all the rules. You don't get accident-free for 24 years by not following the rules. And actually, you know if -- you just don't. You have to work at. It's like sports. You work hard, you make it; you don't, you don't make it. That's what we did.

And so when a letter is written by the WUTC -- and nothing against Mr. Perkinson because he has a job to

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

make sure that you don't put unsafe companies on the
road, especially with the negativity that has come to
AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle. I understand why we're
here. I get why we're here. I think that we should be
here. Because if you guys are going to put Go VIP on
the road, you should do your due diligence and find out.

But, likewise, if you're going to stop Go VIP and you're going to hang onto the leg of Jeff James next door, you better make sure you know who you're hanging onto and what's happened. And you should know all that stuff. We're not going to get through it all in probably today's hearing. It's impossible. But before you just -- before you grab onto that and think, Well, our office is a half block away, we better do whatever they say, you should know who you're grabbing onto first.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So you said that you could very quickly explain the violations. How quickly can you do that? Can you do it in five minutes?

MR. VALENTINETTI: Probably for Airline Shuttle, yeah.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I'll let you do that. Just because, again, the memo says the company should explain why its compliance history should not have any bearing on the consideration of the

1	application, and I don't see a way to do that without at
2	least letting Mr. Valentinetti briefly make his
3	explanation as to why he thinks these violations didn't
4	occur, or there was competitors that were out to get
5	him, or whatever the theory is. So I'll give you five
6	minutes.
7	MR. VALENTINETTI: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	I have a violation list here unless you want me to use a
9	different one, Mr. Roberson or Matt. Do you know the
10	one I'm talking about? Is this what you have?
11	MR. ROBERSON: We have the actual safety
12	audit report, but
13	MR. VALENTINETTI: This is just a short
14	list of it.
15	MR. ROBERSON: That's fine.
16	MR. VALENTINETTI: First of all and
17	it's going to take more than five minutes if these guys
18	do a little research, but I can hit my things quick
19	while they look it up.
20	JUDGE PEARSON: Go ahead. You make your
21	presentation.
22	MR. VALENTINETTI: Mr. Perkinson, if you
23	could answer yes or no for me
24	JUDGE PEARSON: No, he's not
25	MR. VALENTINETTI: Well, he's going to let

2.0

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

the law know,	because I	don't think	everyone in	the ro	om
knows it.					

JUDGE PEARSON: He is not being --

MR. VALENTINETTI: Airline Shuttle is not regulated by the UTC; is that true or not?

JUDGE PEARSON: So you can make that argument. You cannot cross-examine him right now. He is not under oath. He's not on the stand. You are testifying right now, and then you will be subject to cross-examination. So you need to just put forth what facts you want me to consider.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay. Airline Shuttle is not under the regulation of the WUTC, not any way in the whole world, or the FMCSA. And that would be because of WAC 480-30-011. And I believe it's J, "Transporting transient air crew or in-transit airline passengers between an airport and temporary accommodations under an arrangement between the airline carrier and the passenger or transportation company." That is 480-30-011 and then it's number 9.

Then also for the federal side, it's 49 CFR 13506.

Which also state that there is no regulation for airline crew transport or hotel transport. The UTC or the Feds have a year to go backwards. If they go back to the year 2000, Airline Shuttle did transport passengers back

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

then. We had ilmousine permits, which is one of our					
exhibits. We had a limousine permit for the vehicle					
that we're talking about, No. 1725, which was inspected					
by the state patrol so they know all about it. The WUTC					
knows all about it. I'm going to go through the					
violations real quick. But the bottom line is you don't					
have jurisdiction over Airline Shuttle, so all those					
should be out					

"Failing to implement a random controlled substance and alcohol testing." Airline Shuttle drives one vehicle for two airline crews. There are 12 girls that come off a plane, 12 flight attendants, two times a day. And they go three miles to Southcenter, from Seatac to the hotel. The hotel pays us, not the airline. It's not direct payment. It's not even indirect payment. The payment goes from Hainan Airlines, to Nationwide Hospitality, to the hotel.

And for the hotel, since they don't have a big enough vehicle or someone that can lift the bags and load international crew, they said, Hey, Steve, can you move this crew for us? I said, Yes, we can do that. We work for the hotel. I have it in your -- Mr. Roberson in your book, I'm not sure which number standing here, but it shows that.

Anyway, the first violation is 49 CFR 382305, which

1	is, "Failing to implement a random substance or alcohol
2	testing program." So since I can't ask, I'll just
3	answer for him, do you have to drug test for a non-CDL
4	vehicle? The answer is no, you don't. Do I have a CDL
5	Class A? Yes. Did I have a combination license from
6	before you guys were born? Yes, which covers
7	everything.
8	You do not have to drug test, and that's why I was
9	hoping the state patrol could testify in case
10	Mr. Perkinson of course, he knows too. You do not
11	have to drug test a vehicle that is not a CDL vehicle.
12	A 14-passenger hotel van is not a CDL vehicle. So
13	violation No. 1 is out.
14	No. 2, 49 CFR 387.31, "Operating a
15	passenger-carrying vehicle without having in effect, the
16	required minimum levels of financial responsibility."
17	Again, a 14-passenger van requires, if it was a motor
18	carrier and it's not, it's a hotel van, so really it
19	requires nothing. Well, it requires hotel insurance.
20	But let's say we were a motor carrier, and we
21	weren't, it would require 1.5 million for a 14-passenger
22	van. And I have proof in there of that, in the evidence
23	book that you have and that Mr. Roberson has. So second
24	one is out.

25

"Failing to maintain proof of required financial

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

responsibility for passengers. That is
49 CFR 387.31(d). We have proof of insurance, it's in
the book, it's in the evidence book, and we also have
Mr. Ferguson here who is a broker. That one is out.

The next one is, "Failing to maintain driver

qualifications file for every driver employed." Now, down the road, that's impossible to prove. But we do have in our records that AMI Coaches had driver files. And since I owned both companies and our office is in the same place, one does airline crew, one does passengers. And the guys we are talking about, which is me and Jim Mondry and a couple other CDL drivers, we have drivers' files that are complete on that. The violation was written because on our driver file box it didn't separate this is Airline Shuttle, this is AMI Coaches.

And I'm going to throw a bone to the UTC and say, it wasn't complete complete. The reason it wasn't complete is because on my file I took a magic marker and blacked out the year I was born so my office staff didn't know how old I was. And they said, Oh, my God, look what you've done. And I said, Well, whatever, write the violation then. So anyway, that one should be out.

Next one, "Failing to require a driver to make a

record of duty status." I think as we all know, a hotel

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

doesn't have to do that. A notel van doesn't have to do
that. A record of duty status, for the people that
don't know in this room, is for a cross-country trucker
when he eats dinner in Boise and gets gas in
Salt Lake City, they can track how many hours he's been
on the road and make sure we know what he's doing.

For a hotel van that drives 3.5 miles, we fuel that vehicle once every three weeks. There is no record of your duty status. Second of all, again, because it's not a CDL vehicle, we don't have to keep a record of duty status. Again, since it's not a CDL vehicle, if we want the front desk super model in the hotel to drive our van in the snap of our fingers, it's legal to do that. It's not a hotel van. It's not a motor carrier. It's not regulated by the State or the Feds.

The next one is, "Failing to preserve records of duty status." Again, we don't save the gas receipts for it. We have a credit card slip, but we don't have the gas receipts.

The next one, "Failing to keep minimum records of inspection for the vehicle." Did we get our vehicle inspected? That's another one that actually is big.

Whether it's a rule or an RCW or federal rule or not, we have safe equipment. And we always get our stuff inspected in December, every vehicle we have, in

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

1	December of each year, December 1st through
2	December 30th. The Feds, did we have a federal
3	inspection? Did we have the FMCSA come out and inspect
4	our Airline Shuttle vehicle? No, we did not. That's
5	what that violation is. So that one should be out.
6	The next one, 49 CFR 396.11, "Failing to require a
7	driver to prepare a driver vehicle inspection report. A
8	DVIR. 49 CFR 396.11(a). A DVIR. No, Airline Shuttle
9	doesn't require our drivers to do that. It's a hotel
10	van, and they are within the hundred-mile restriction.
11	It's a hotel van. They can go back and forth and do
12	what they want. It's not regulated.
13	The last one is 49 CFR 396.17, using a commercial
14	motor vehicle not periodically inspected. No. 1, it's
15	not a commercial motor vehicle by the definition of
16	either the State or the Feds.
17	And if you want, Your Honor, I can give you the
18	definitions of "commercial motor vehicle."
19	JUDGE PEARSON: I'm familiar. Thank you.
20	MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay. It does not
21	meet, by any standard, any there is three definitions
22	of commercial motor vehicle that can be used, and none
23	of them does it meet.
24	So first of all, we do have them inspected. We're
25	all about safety. We don't have them federally

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

1	inspected when it is Airline Shuttle and they have
2	nothing do with us. Thirdly, it is not a commercial
3	motor vehicle and we did have annual inspections.
4	In closing, on just that part, I want to say that
5	just because you think, Oh, he's trying to slip out of
6	it because there is no jurisdiction over
7	Airline Shuttle, that's not the truth. Because we have
8	AMI Coaches, the big bus company, which has absolute
9	federal and state regulation. And we like the
10	regulation. We like safe companies. So we do the same
11	thing for Airline Shuttle as we do for AMI Coaches,
12	whether it's the law or not. It's not because I think
13	Mr. Perkinson is my dad and I want to do what he thinks;
14	it's because we want to be safe.
15	So we do the same thing for AMI Coaches, we follow
16	the same roadmap for AMI Coaches which is regulated,
17	which is regulated both by the Feds and by the State.
18	We follow that roadmap down into Airline Shuttle, with
19	the exception of every time someone hops in the hotel
20	van we don't have them do DVIRs, and we don't keep fuel
21	receipts and stuff like that for it. So really,
22	Airline Shuttle should be completely out and off that
23	page.
24	Your Honor, just in case some people don't know. I

25

don't know you and I don't know what you know. But I

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

1	know the state patrol knows, and Mr. Perkinson and maybe
2	Mr. Roberson, that really there is no jurisdiction over
3	Airline Shuttle. So all those violations should be off
4	the table. And it frustrates me that I can't address
5	them more deeply
6	JUDGE PEARSON: I understand what you're
7	saying, you've made your position clear, and it makes
8	sense to me. I'm ready to move on from Airline Shuttle.
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: Then let's go to
10	AMI Coaches then.
11	JUDGE PEARSON: And I need you to be a
12	little bit quicker when you go through the ones for
13	AMI Coaches. Keep in mind that I'm familiar with these
14	regulations, quite familiar.
15	MR. VALENTINETTI: Do you have that list?
16	Did you give that to me?
17	JUDGE PEARSON: So you don't need to
18	explain in depth what the violations are. Just briefly
19	walk through, and I'll give you another five minutes to
20	do that.
21	MR. VALENTINETTI: The first one, "Failing
22	to implement random controlled alcohol testing." That's
23	not true. We have it. It shows on paper. You don't
24	want to revisit it. We're not trying to reopen AMI.

But when this violation, the date that they did this was

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

November of 2013. We have it. Drug and alcohol testing.

Second one, "Knowing and permitting and allowing to operate a CMV when the driver have a current CDL or the proper endorsement." Guess what? I'm going to give you another bone. That's me. My "P" endorsement. And I think the state patrol would know for sure. I'm not sure, Matt, you've been here long enough to understand. When you have a combination license in the old days, combination means you can drive anything, truck, triples, doubles, bus, anything.

Then it came to a CDL where it changes and now there is endorsements. I had every endorsement except for hazmat. And when you look backwards in the driver's license thing, you should be able to find that.

And I drove for UPS for three years, you know, the big trucks. The big trucks that go down the road, not the ones that knock on your door, I drove for them. If I'm wrong or making a mistake, they must have made a mistake for three years too. So yes, we found that I personally somehow didn't have a "P" endorsement on my license. So I stopped driving until I got it back.

"Making a fraudulent or intentionally false entry."

This is one I want to address because it was also on

Mr. Perkinson's letter, which really makes me angry so

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

I'm going to take the most time on that.

We bought one bus when we started AMI Coaches, and business came so quickly that we bought three more. And we bought them and had annual inspections by MCI, the motor coach company.

They came to my office. You know, it's a used car. Being proud, we're fixing them up. We're cleaning them and doing all this stuff. And one of them had a rusty exhaust tip. So I said, Get it off and get a new one. We chopped it off -- and we had annual inspections -- we chopped it off and had a new exhaust tip that we bought from MCI. It's chrome. It's pretty. We had that. So when the inspection came out, that tip was cut off, the old one was off, and the new one was sitting in our shop. So yeah, it wasn't ready to roll down the road.

So they said you fraudulently made -- that's how crazy the DOT is -- you fraudulently said this bus was ready to go. And I said we didn't say it yesterday.

What happens when we come in and do an oil change two weeks from now. So you caught us with the tailpipe off and it's not welded back on. Big deal. We're upgrading this.

That bus had never, ever been on the road with passengers in it. We didn't put it on service yet. Was it insured? Yes, it was, because it came across the

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

country from MCI in Chicago to Seattle. And it had a
tip on it, a nasty old one at the time. So anyway,
that's the fraudulent entry. That's accusing me of
making a fraudulent entry. That makes me crazy. I
could really scream about that, but we're in a nice
hearing and

JUDGE PEARSON: And you're running out of time.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Yeah. "Using a driver before we received a negative preemployment." We hire our drivers like myself. Right this second, I drive for Clover Park School District. Which is a trick, you know. I drive the school bus, I can see everyone that drives -- we have a hundred drivers or something -- I can see who drives good and who drives bad. I can see who I want to drive for my company and who drives over curbs or drives recklessly or speeding.

So our drivers come from there. First of all, we know they have it. Second of all, we a copy of their drug and alcohol test before they ever drive. So when you say that, that's right, we let a guy drive before AMI Coaches had a negative preemployment test. But the law states you've got 30 days to get your own. We got a copy of his from Clover Park School District. We put it in his file. Then if we decide to keep him after a

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

couple days of driving, then we send him down to get his own drug test. I work with them. I know they have it.

But we have the copy too.

No. 5, "Using a driver not medically examined or certified." It's just not true. We always have that.

That's again, we're school bus drivers then you better go off the school district. Oh, you don't have jurisdiction.

"Failing to maintain inquiries to driving records and driver qualification files." That one, No. 6 is true. Did you understand what I said? I'm rambling. I'm trying to go fast.

"Failing to make inquiries to a driving record."

That's right. When AMI Coaches started, it was

November 2011. When I hired Jim Mondry, it was -- I'm

not sure what month, I think it was March 1989. So in

his record, I did not have his application from 1989. I

did not have his inquiry for employees from 1989. The

guy had been working for me for 20 years. So yeah, I

didn't have that one in his file from the date he was

hired in 1989.

No. 7, "Failing to require a driver to make a record of duty status." It's just not true. If we make -- our DVIRs also have -- driver vehicle inspection report -- in our DVIRs we incorporate start time and finish time.

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

Because as an employee or a driver or a bus driver or
whatever you are, you don't care about the paperwork
You're just driving around. But as an employer, you do
care. So in order to get these guys to fill out their
paperwork correctly, we include their time that they
worked on there. So that way if they don't turn in a
DVIR, they don't get paid. They're working for free.
When you do that, everybody does their paperwork.
That's what we did. No. So to say no record of duty
status, it's ridiculous.

"Failing to preserve driver's records of duty status for six months. Port of Seattle trip slip was issued to the driver. Did not maintain them." That's probably true. When we go to the Port, there is a gate that goes up and down to go into the south parking lot. And when you're doing charter work, they write a slip and say Okay, bus 2 or 3, here is your thing. Yeah, we didn't have one of those. That's right. Ken McAllister didn't keep one.

The next one -- there is only two more left,

Your Honor. "Using a commercial motor vehicle not
periodically inspected." That's just not true. We have
all the inspections. Not only do we have them, but so
does MCI Motor Coaches who we bought the buses from.
It's just not true.

TESTIMONY OF VALENTINETTI

The last one, "Failing to require a driver to make a
record of duty status." Again, they are trying to
switch back to the one where they are saying that the
guy didn't turn in this thing. If that's true, he
worked and didn't get paid. But it's just not true.

We're happy to follow the rules. Not because we want to, and like I said, not because Mr. Perkinson is my dad and I have to, it's because we want to have a safe company. That's what we do. We want to keep a 24-year, accident-free record going. We want to keep it forever. You know, as an owner, as an owner of the company, my fear is not do we make enough money or are my buses cool enough or is the DOT corrupt. My fear is getting a phone call 11:00 o'clock at night and finding out one of our buses is on its side like you see in California or like you see in Oregon or like you see the Ride the Ducks thing.

Which I'm not making the slightest bit of fun of that, attacking the Ride the Ducks guy. I'm not doing that. It's not funny. It's horrible. It's an accident. But I'm thankful that it's never happened to AMI Coaches or Airline Shuttle.

But that's my biggest fear, because I know that we follow the rules. And even when you follow the rules, sometimes accidents happen. And we've been lucky, I

EXAMINATION OF VALENTINETTI/ROBERSON

admit. But to say that for the UTC, a government
organization, or the FMCSA to say that you have a
history of, you know, unsafe activity and fraudulent,
you know, that makes me crazy.

Because we are -- unless someone else knows, and when you guys get to testify, I want you to tell me a company that's gone 24 years without an accident ever. I'm not talking about an insurance claim; I'm talking about an accident.

Okay. I'm done. I could continue on but --

JUDGE PEARSON: I think that's good for now. At this point, I will allow Mr. Roberson to ask you questions. And then if you want to call Mr. Ferguson, you're welcome to do that at that point.

So Mr. Roberson, I will turn it over to you.

MR. ROBERSON: I just have a couple quick questions.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERSON:

- Q So you say that between Go VIP, AMI Coaches, and Airline Shuttle, you said the same names, you are the owner and operator of all three companies?
- A AMI Coaches is dead now, because our DOT number is revoked and we can't get insurance. The same with

1	Airline Shuttle, it's dead now. And both have been
2	three years.
3	Go VIP, yes, I'm the owner, and yes I was the ov

Go VIP, yes, I'm the owner, and yes I was the owner of AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle.

Q You also said, I believe it's a direct quote, that it would be the same offices for all three companies?

A Correct. And can I address that for just a second?

8 Q Yeah.

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

A That's correct. I bought an office building right by
Seatac Airport. And then we got shut down and we're in
this big fight now. I sold the company to another
group, and the building. And in October or something,
they couldn't make the payment anymore and so I took it
back.

At that point I had to make a decision: Am I going to stay in the bus business or am I going to hit golf balls and lay in bed all day. I had to weigh it, what am I going to do? I decided, you know what? I really miss this. I love the people. I like the whole business. I'm going to do that. Not because I need more money. And I'm not trying to pat myself on the head, but I don't need to.

I'm -- I'm not going to say how old because I used to mark it out, but I could go home and ride my motorcycle and drive my car every day and not have to

EXAMINATION OF VALENTINETTI/ROBERSON

1	work.	But I	like	this	business.	That's	why	'l'm h	nere.
---	-------	-------	------	------	-----------	--------	-----	--------	-------

- 2 And people know that. That's why we get business.
 - That's why we get those good contracts.
- 4 When someone says -- and this is ten seconds of the
- 5 bad part -- when someone says, We have a bachelor party
- 6 and we want to go to nine bars in Seattle. We say,
- Okay, it's \$5,000 for the bus. They say, Well, we can
- 8 get it cheaper. We say, Great go do it. Because we
- 9 don't want those people. We want your mom and dad, my
- mom and dad, our grandparents on the bus going to a
- cruise ship, all happy. We want Microsoft going to a
- rah-rah meeting downtown. We want Amazon going to their
- thing. We don't want the weird people. We're just here
- 14 to do good work.
- Q So following up on what you just said, you said you sold
- the company; which company did you sell and buy back?
- 17 A I sold the buses and I sold the building.
- 18 | **Q** Okay.
- 19 A Because we have equipment.
- 20 Q So that leads, I guess, to my next question. You said
- 21 it would be the same vehicles --
- 22 A I repo'd it all.
- 23 Q Okay.
- 24 A So now I have the office back which is a mess. And you
- 25 can imagine. It's paper everywhere and stuff. And

1	we're doing work to get the computer and the phone
2	system and all that stuff back operational. I mean, it
3	is operational, but it's not as good as we had it when I
4	was the owner.
5	Q Okay. And so you love your work; is it fair to say that
6	the only way for you to engage in that line of business
7	is to incorporate Go VIP and carry out business under
8	its auspices?
9	A Well, I could sell the busses. I could sell the
LO	building. I could lay in bed, like I said. I don't
L1	want to. I can drive a school bus, which I do for a
L2	dollar an hour. I don't even know, but it's about a
L3	dollar an hour, I think. If I go to McDonald's, my
L4	paycheck is spent for the month. I do that because I
L5	like it. I like the kids. I like the organization. I
L6	think it's a good thing. It's a good group.
L7	Q But you can't carry out business under AMI Coaches or
L8	Airline Shuttle, correct?
L9	A That is correct.
20	Q So
21	A For two reasons: One, because those businesses are dead
22	because of what's happened not here, but starting
23	here; and, number two, because today even, there is
2.4	mudelinging with both Airline Shuttle and AMI Coaches

which disallows us to be able to get the business that

1	we had before. Meaning, the investigators and I'm
2	going to just go neutral on the thing went to and
3	I'm going to give you a tip of the iceberg I'm going
4	to try to say it politely went to Hainan Airlines
5	and yes, I'm single; yes, my girlfriend is a flight
6	attendant for Hainan Airlines but the investigator
7	went to Hainan Airlines and said, "By the way, Steve is
8	doing one of your girls," which is Chinese. And they
9	are way more prejudiced than anyone in this room.
10	So can I go back and get that account? Can I go
11	back and get that account when we've been shut down
12	because we're unsafe? And, if you want to fly to
13	America, you better get a different company. There has
14	been a lot of things said that we don't have time and
15	Your Honor has already said we're not going to address
16	here. But, believe me, there is a ton. There is a ton
17	of things. Could I bring those people? Some, yes, but
18	some are from China and long gone. But I can bring
19	those people that would say, Yeah, the guy came in the
20	office and said this. Yeah, we can't get those accounts
21	back. We can't. Never. It's dead.
22	No, I can't operate AMI Coaches. I could do another
23	corrective action plan. Which I just talked to

Jeff James, the FMCSA guy. Saying, Steve, look, saying

that you didn't do it, didn't work, even if it didn't

24

1	work. He said, It's not me. It's not me. He's
2	pointing the finger over here at you guys. He said, Why
3	don't you admit all violations and we'll turn it on and
4	just move forward. And I said, We're never going to
5	admit things we didn't do. That will ruin our future,
6	and it's always disrespectful to the people. You know,
7	when the people that worked for me before.
8	We had and I really am our worst employee. I
9	really am. I'm a professional athlete. I'm not nice.
10	I like the best of everything. So the people that I
11	hired are really good. Just like this. Just like these
12	three people right here. They are good people. When I
13	hire drivers, I do the same. I work at the airport
14	myself. I see who the drivers are. I see who drives
15	safe. If I follow you for five minutes on the freeway,
16	I know if you're a good driver or not.
17	We hired the best people. We had retired
18	firefighters from the City of Seattle. I had Mr. Bob,
19	who was the "X" dinner train guy. We had great people.
20	I had Jeff Barstow, who is a guy that's the head of the
21	PSIA ski instructor thing. These are really good
22	people.
23	And for you guys to write a thing and say we have a
24	history of noncompliance and we're unsafe just makes me
25	crazy because I have the best people ever. And it's not

1	because I love my company, and it's not because I love
2	myself and I do, I know it's because we hire that
3	way?
4	We pay more I pay my drivers more than I make
5	driving the school bus. I don't even know what I make.
6	It's not much, though. But we pay our drivers more than
7	that, way back before we were shut down in 2014. We
8	have the best people. We have the best insurance. We
9	have the best office staff. That's how you have a
10	company that doesn't mess up.
11	Q Okay. So given the out-of-service orders on
12	Airline Shuttle and AMI Coaches, the only way for you to
13	do what you love is to incorporate Go VIP and carry out
14	business under its auspices, correct?
15	A The FMCSA director, do you guys know who that is? No?
16	Q No.
17	A Jeff James. He's right over here, he's your neighbor.
18	He said, "Steve, if you want them to turn this on
19	I'll tell you a secret, admit all the violations and
20	they will turn it on." I said, "I'm not going to do
21	that no matter what." That was in a meeting two weeks
22	ago. And I said, "Besides, it's dead. Our reputation
23	is ruined."
24	So to move forward, to answer your question, yes,
25	this is the only way to move forward. So with a new

2.0

EXAMINATION OF VALENTINETTI/ROBERSON

company and, no, we're not trying to evade anything.
If you want to attack me and say, Steve, you didn't have
insurance, guess what? Here is Doug.

If you want to say you don't have maintenance files or drivers' files. I'll bring them. I didn't today, but I have them already for vehicles that haven't moved an inch, we haven't used.

I'm happy with your investigation, Mr. Roberson. I know you think, Oh, he is trying to -- maybe the perception is this guy is trying to slip by these things because Airline Shuttle is not regulated. That's not true because AMI Coaches is heavily regulated and it should be. Airline Shuttle probably should be too, but it's not. I'm not the one that writes the laws; we just follow them. We just do whatever.

So I like the fact that you guys are here. The UTC. I like that because I want other bus companies to be safe too. And there is bus companies that give us all bad reputation. You know that. You've seen the accidents.

I watch TV and I think, you know, if anything good came out of -- I'm going to just tell you, if anything came out of us being shut down, one thing is the Bellingham Airporter who was involved in the Ride the Ducks thing, that was our account. Those kids from

1	North Seattle Community College, we did that the year
2	before. That was our move. And I think, you know, why
3	is this happening? Why are these guys such jerks
4	meaning you guys and I think, you know, if there is
5	anything good came out of it, it's that my company and
6	my people weren't involved with that.
7	Accidents happen. It's so horrible. I just can't
8	even imagine it. I know that the Ride the Ducks guy
9	feels horrible. I know that Bellingham Airporter, even
10	though they have hid under the radar, I know they feel
11	horrible. Lots of lives were lost. Lots of damage.
12	I'm just glad we're not involved with that.
13	Q So let's turn to your jurisdictional argument. So your
14	contention is that Airline Shuttle just took people from
15	the airport to the hotel, correct? You operated it as a
16	hotel van?
17	A Not even people; only crew.
18	Q Okay. Did you ever take them anywhere else?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Where?
21	A From the hotel okay, let's use Hainan Airlines as an
22	example. Hainan Airlines is a Chinese carrier that

example. Hainan Airlines is a Chinese carrier that flies into Seattle. So they fly there. Our little van, 14-passenger, 12 girls get off. We pick them up. And you know the hotel, the real hotel van that's owned by

23

24

EXAMINATION OF VALENTINETTI/ROBERSON

the hotel is going to the airport and picking up passengers, you know, Mr. and Mrs. Smith and their three kids, and it's running around doing stuff.

With an airline crew, you have to be on time, you can't say, Hey, we will be there ten minutes. They have just flown 13 hours, and they are going to scream at you like crazy. So the hotel hired us to do their airline crew transportation.

So we drive to the airport. Actually, we take the crew from the hotel to the airport. Bye. See you later. Have a nice time in Beijing or Shanghai. And then we're sitting there for half an hour. And the plane in the meantime has landed and the other crew comes off the airplane and gets on the van. Hi, welcome to Seattle, and we drive them to the hotel. Okay. What are you going to do? We're going to go shopping, an outlet mall, go to Mt. Rainier, whatever. That's what they do.

So then we -- since they are Chinese, and I'm not -this is going to sound like I'm prejudice now -- but
since they are Chinese, they think their crew doesn't
know what they are doing. They, through another
company, set up, Steve, can your company take them to go
eat lunch and dinner twice a day? One time lunch; one
time dinner. And I said, Sure, we can do that.

EXAMINATION OF VALENTINETTI/ROBERSON

For sure that is not interstate. It is not
anything. It's from the hotel after they change clothes
and they turn into instead of their flight uniforms,
they have been in 11 to 13 hours, they change clothes
and everyone looks cute and weird. And then they come
out hopping into our van. And they go 1.5 miles to the
Chinese restaurant, and we sit there while they eat.
And then they take them back to the hotel. Bye, have a
nice day.

But never -- and when I say never, Jeff, I want to say that yes, if this was 2000, even 2004, yeah, if Mr. and Mrs. Smith said we need go to the airport and here's my kids and sorry we have a lot of luggage, we did that. We did that with limousine, Washington state -- it's in the book somewhere -- we did that with limousine permits through Washington state for our small vans. That's when we ran 30 vans at the time. Here it is right here. Here's a picture of it, and it's also in your book, I'm not sure which number. Yes, we used to pick up passengers.

But since 2009, I believe it was, and it might be '10 or it might be '08 even. Then we only pick up airline crew, and we only do it for the hotel. We never got a paycheck from anybody for Airline Shuttle within the last four years -- well, not since -- not once we

	EXAMINATION OF VALENTINETH/ROBEROOM
1	have been shut down but the last years of operation,
2	our paycheck for Airline Shuttle only came from the
3	hotel.
4	Q Okay. With regard to Airline Shuttle, you said that you
5	only had a was it a 14-passenger van?
6	A Yes.
7	Q I have one question: You were cited for having it
8	was one of the insurance violations with regards to a
9	24-passenger bus.
10	A That's correct. And I'm glad you asked that question
11	because I want to address that, and hopefully Your Honor
12	will give me three minutes to address that.
13	JUDGE PEARSON: I can give you about one
14	minute.
15	THE WITNESS: In 2002, Steve Valentinetti,
16	who owns every vehicle you know, the company doesn't
17	own anything else, Steve Valentinetti owns it and then
18	leases to my company, and back in 2002, it was called
19	Seattle Super Shuttle. So I would lease it to them,
20	which is really my company. But I leased it to them,
21	that way I just do.
22	Okay? So back in 2002 I bought this bus,
23	24-passenger bus, CDL required, drug and alcohol really
24	back then wasn't required but we had it anyway because I

was on the US ski team, and that's what did, so we did

EXAMINATION OF VALENTINETTI/ROBERSON

it. We used that for one airline crew, and that was Scandinavian Airlines who flew from wherever to Seattle and then went to the hotel. And they had 17 people. So we bought that 24-passenger bus.

In 2006, they stopped flying to Seattle so we parked that bus. We never used it again. It's sitting there getting dirty and nothing ever happens again. It didn't get licensed, it didn't get insured, it didn't do anything. And I have a bunch more vans still today even. Unfortunately, I have vans back in those days that don't work anymore. Well, they work, but they are not in use.

Then in 2011 I think, Hey, I'm going to have a bus company again -- or not again, I'm going to have a bus company. I'm going to -- because I've been tired -- well, I'm not tired but I told you I raced around the world. I came back and said I'm going back to work now. I'm done racing, and I'm going to have bus company, big guys, just like MTR the buses go up and down. I think that's so cool.

So bus No. 1 for me, which I already owned, was the AMI Coaches 24-passenger bus. There is a picture in there, isn't there? What number is it? There is a 24-passenger bus. I already own it. Steve Valentinetti is the owner in 2002, '03, '04, '05, and '06 I leased to

1	Airline Shuttle. But then it never worked again.
2	In 2011, still owned by Steve Valentinetti, we paint
3	it, we beautify, we insure it, we do an annual
4	inspection, put new tires on it, and we detailed it up.
5	And my coaches with the VIN number, the MC number, the
6	charter and excursion number, the gross vehicle weight,
7	the whole deal. That's bus No. 1. I'm so happy. I'm
8	starting a new company.
9	Then I bought bus No. 2, which is my first motor
10	coach. And now I'm off track.
11	JUDGE PEARSON: Get to the violation.
12	THE WITNESS: The registration shows
13	Steve Valentinetti, the owner, and it still, because I
14	never changed it when I started the new company, shows
15	Airline Shuttle as the registered owner.
16	Steve Valentinetti, the owner, and insured both two
17	times two times, double the amount one by
18	AMI Coaches, one by Steve Valentinetti. Five mill, five
19	mill. But the registration shows leased to
20	Airline Shuttle in 2006. My mistake. Kill me. I'm
21	wrong. But no, we never changed it. But that's an
22	AMI Coaches's bus. It's owned by Steve Valentinetti.
23	So the Feds were trying to say they picked one day,
24	and they couldn't find two. We used that a thousand
25	times a year it goes to the airport. A thousand times.

1	Probably really 800. Because it goes to the airport.
2	They picked one time where they could look at the
3	records where a flight crew was on the ground and that
4	bus came in the airport within an hour. And they said,
5	You used a 24-passenger bus to pick up a flight crew, so
6	now Airline Shuttle doesn't a 24-passenger bus
7	requires 5 million insurance, which we have and
8	Mr. Ferguson can show and plus I can show you here.
9	That bus was that particular bus exactly was insured
10	for, both AMI Coaches and Steve Valentinetti, for
11	5 million, including an MCS-90B, which is the form you
12	have to have. And with the actual VIN number right on
13	there, which I can show you in a second, that proves
14	that bus is insured and run and operated by AMI Coaches.
15	But the Feds, in trying to get us, said, Well, we think
16	the airline crew got on that bus because it was within
17	an hour of the pickup time. And I said, No, why would
18	we pick up airline crew, No. 1, with the big bus?
19	No. 2, the entry to the gate shows two different times.
20	That's in there too. It takes too long to explain.
21	But really the point is let me get to the end of
22	it. If we wanted to pick up airline crew with that bus;
23	too bad, we can. If we want to pick up the president;
24	we can. AMI Coaches had every authority to do it. But
25	the point is we didn't. We sent the normal crew bus

1	that picks up the crew every day. And AMI Coaches went
2	and picked up normal passengers you know what I mean?
3	Normal passengers for AMI Coaches, airline crew, airline
4	bus. 1.5 mill for the airline crew bus because it's
5	small, no CDL. 5 million for everything else. And
6	that's why Mr. Ferguson is here today.
7	JUDGE PEARSON: Got it.
8	THE WITNESS: Okay.
9	MR. ROBERSON: I think I'm done, I think.
10	THE WITNESS: Jeff, I want to give you a
11	hug. I'm listening to myself. I'm yelling at you. I
12	don't mean to yell at you.
13	MR. ROBERSON: It's totally fine.
14	
15	EXAMINATION
16	BY JUDGE PEARSON:
17	Q I have one question for you. So your position is that
18	Airline Shuttle is not subject to any regulation,
19	federal or state? Did Airline Shuttle have a
20	certificate with the Commission?
21	A No.
22	Q Airline Shuttle did not? Did AMI Coaches have a
23	certificate?
24	A Yes.
25	Q Okay. And AMI Coaches was the more recent of the two?

- A No, they both were operating at the same time.
- 2 Q Okay.

- A Airline Shuttle used to have a charter and excursion

 permit, but we let it expire because in the old days we

 used to go to, when there is only one company, we used
- go to people's houses and pick them up in the vans and
- 7 bring them to the airport --
- 8 Q In an airport shuttle type?
- A Yeah. So we had a charter and excursion permit. We
 also had a limousine permit.
- Q I don't need all that. I just wanted to clarify which of the companies had a certificate with the
- 13 Commission --
- A Both did in the old days. But in the new days, within
 the last -- I'm going to say four years just to be
 safe -- Airline Shuttle was only airline crew, only for
 the hotel. That's it.
- 18 **Q Okay**.
- 19 A And it was one van, one thing. And it was easy for me
 20 to go personally -- kind of like a retirement job
 21 almost. I could stay in the business, I know when the
- flight is coming, I rip over from my office on the
- 23 motorcycle.
- 24 Q I don't need all that. The Airline Shuttle was,
- 25 however, registered with the FMCSA?

- 1 | A No.
- 2 Q It was not?
- 3 **A No.**
- 4 | Q So why did they come in and do an audit?
- 5 A Retaliation. And I know it sounds crazy but I mean
 6 that.
- 7 | Q You had no sort of certificate through them?
- 8 A None.
- 9 Q I'm not sure what the certification process is, but you had a DOT number?
- 11 A We did have a DOT number.
- Q Okay. So by virtue of having a DOT number, does that not give them authority over you?
- A No. Well, it does if we do interstate. An MC number,
 like an MCS-90, which is the insurance document, "MC"
 means motor carrier and you have to apply. Just like
 we're applying right now to you guys for the charter and
 excursion permit, you have to apply for that. You don't
- just get it.
- Q That's my question then: Did Airline Shuttle ever make an application --
- 22 **A No.**
- 23 Q -- to the FMCSA for anything?
- 24 **A No.**
- 25 | Q You just had a DOT number?

1	A Yeah.
2	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. Did you
3	want to call Mr. Ferguson?
4	MR. VALENTINETTI: I would like to.
5	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. We're going to need
6	to keep this brief. We have to finish my noon today.
7	Hopefully, we will be done before then, but that's our
8	absolute drop-dead time. Let's try to make this quite a
9	bit briefer if you have a few things you want him to
LO	say.
L1	MR. VALENTINETTI: If you guys have
L2	questions, I'll answer them very quickly. But yes, I
L3	would like to call Mr. Ferguson.
L4	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Ferguson, if you could
L5	please stand and raise your right hand.
L6	
L7	DOUGLAS W. FERGUSON, having been first duly sworn by the
L8	Administrative Law Judge to tell
L9	the truth, the whole truth, and
20	nothing but the truth, was examined
21	and testified as follows:
22	
23	JUDGE PEARSON: You may be seated. And if
24	you could state your full name for the record and spell

your last name.

1	THE WITNESS: Douglas Ward Ferguson,
2	F-e-r-g-u-s-o-n.
3	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And what's your
4	position, your job?
5	THE WITNESS: I'm the owner of DW Ferguson
6	& Associates, Inc., a retail insurance agency. I'm the
7	president of Western Experts in Transportation, which is
8	a managing general agent writing business in 43 states.
9	We specialize since 1986 specialize in public
10	transportation, writing limousines, airport shuttles,
11	casino buses, throughout the country.
12	JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. So if you have
13	questions that you want to ask him.
14	MR. VALENTINETTI: I know the answers to
15	the questions, but I just would like the court to
16	understand them.
17	JUDGE PEARSON: Sure. So just in a
18	typical way, when a representative gives direct
19	examination to a witness.
20	
21	EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
23	Q Mr. Ferguson, what is the required minimum amount of
24	insurance for a charter bus?
25	A Five million.

1	Q And what is the required minimum amount of insurance for
2	a vehicle less than 16 passengers?
3	A In the state of Washington, it's 1,200,000, I believe.
4	MR. VALENTINETTI: Can I talk to you while
5	I'm doing this?
6	JUDGE PEARSON: If you have additional
7	testimony
8	MR. VALENTINETTI: I do. I'm going to ask
9	more questions but I want to address it before we got
10	off track.
11	JUDGE PEARSON: Just go ahead and finish
12	with him and then you can make a closing statement.
13	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
14	Q And MCS-90 Mr. Ferguson, can you describe what an
15	MCS-90 is?
16	A It's a specific endorsement to the policy for interstate
17	commerce, ICC requirements for the Department of
18	Transportation, and it's done for 5 million limit of
19	liability.
20	Q I think that you know, but to your knowledge, did
21	AMI Coaches have a \$5 million policy?
22	A Yes, they have 5 million. They have to, couldn't offer
23	it without it.
24	Q And I know this part, you probably don't know, but we're
25	going to look it up real quick. I built those books

2.0

EXAMINATION OF FERGUSON/VALENTINETTI

late last night, so these guys haven't seen them. In there, there is a -- not only is there an MCS-90 from Mr. Ferguson's company for AMI Coaches for 5 million that covers all the equipment we have, but there is also a particular form like we get in our personal cars that identifies the VIN number that's covered, and that's the 24-passenger bus that you asked me about. 6629. Do you understand what I mean?

MR. ROBERSON: Yes.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay. So that's from Mr. Ferguson's company, that covers our motor coaches and bus No. 1, which is our 24-passenger bus, for sure insured. Not only Steve Valentinetti insured it because I want to be safe, because I don't want to have to eat at McDonald's the rest of my life if something happens.

Steve Valentinetti was insured for 5 million, because I'm the owner of the bus. And my coaches is the leaser of the bus, it's also insured, and I believe the Port of Seattle is a rider --

THE WITNESS: It's an additional named insured.

MR. VALENTINETTI: -- on that. So I want the court to know, and the reason Mr. Ferguson is here is because, one, the violations, or some of the violations that were said -- and I'm not sure which ones

1	they are when I'm standing here are that they didn't
2	have insurance. The second one is we didn't have the
3	required minimum amounts.
4	And that is a trick again by our neighbor and I'm
5	not saying him personally but that is Airline Shuttle
6	doesn't have 5 million insurance this is in the book.
7	JUDGE PEARSON: I saw that in the book.
8	MR. VALENTINETTI: 6629.
9	Airline Shuttle that violation comes from
10	Airline Shuttle doesn't have 5 million insurance for the
11	AMI Coaches 24-passenger bus. Well, Steve Valentinetti
12	does and so does AMI Coaches.
13	So that's that violation. So we did get a violation
14	for that. And then, of course, the court said, Well
15	and they haven't decided still but they said, Well,
16	this isn't about AMI Coaches, so we're not letting you
17	produce that we had insurance for it.
18	That's the kind of crap that happens next door. I
19	shouldn't say that, but you know what I mean. That's
20	the kind of you've seen it? 6629 is the
21	24-passenger. I know you have to believe me when I say

that, but it is. I can prove that later, but that's the insurance and the document.

Mr. Ferguson is just here to -- you know briefly

Mr. Ferguson is just here to -- you know, briefly that's why I was going to try to get rid of him -- not

1	get rid of you, you can stay, I would love you to
2	stay but Mr. Ferguson is here to confirm, just in
3	case the people in the court don't know, it's 5 million
4	for a big bus, anything over 16 passengers. It's 1.5
5	for everything below. And we had both. It's in the
6	book. I could show you. I don't know what number it
7	is. This is the small
8	JUDGE PEARSON: Just quickly, was the
9	violation for failure to maintain insurance or failure
10	to maintain proof of insurance?
11	MR. VALENTINETTI: Well, it changes. The
12	bus changes. You know, that's another thing I wanted
13	to if we had more time. When the guy came to our
14	office and wrote the violation, we have his violation
15	list
16	JUDGE PEARSON: I just want a quick
17	answer to my question
18	MR. VALENTINETTI: It was both.
19	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.
20	MR. VALENTINETTI: It was three. One, not
21	having insurance; two, not having the required minimum;
22	and three, not having proof of insurance.
23	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.
24	MR. VALENTINETTI: If you look at his
25	violation list when he did the audit, the 24-passenger

1	bus is not even on it.
2	JUDGE PEARSON: So you're maintaining that
3	you had insurance, you had acceptable levels of
4	insurance, and you had proof of insurance?
5	MR. VALENTINETTI: Thank you, Your Honor.
6	I should have you testify for me. You are quicker and
7	better.
8	JUDGE PEARSON: I'm just
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: Yes.
LO	JUDGE PEARSON: paraphrasing. I got
L1	that. So do you have any more questions for
L2	Mr. Ferguson?
L3	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
L4	Q Mr. Ferguson, is there anything that I'm leaving out?
L5	A No, not that I know of.
L6	Q AMI Coaches, you know, had insurance; is that correct?
L7	A Yes.
L8	Q The proper level?
L9	A Yes. And you paid your bills on time.
20	MR. VALENTINETTI: Thank you.
21	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Roberson, do you have
22	any questions for Mr. Ferguson?
23	
24	
25	

EXAMINATION OF FERGUSON/ROBERSON

1	EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. ROBERSON:
3	Q Do you know if Mr. Valentinetti maintained proof of
4	insurance as required by the law at his office?
5	A Absolutely.
6	Q You know that for a fact?
7	A I did it.
8	Q Have you been to his office though and seen it there?
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: You mean the MCS-90?
L0	MR. ROBERSON: Yes.
L1	THE WITNESS: I issued it.
L2	BY MR. ROBERSON:
L3	Q Do you know that he had it at his office, though?
L4	A I have not been to his office. No, sir.
L5	MR. ROBERSON: I think that does it for
L6	me.
L7	THE WITNESS: But I mailed it.
L8	MR. VALENTINETTI: We provided it for
L9	them, too.
20	MR. ROBERSON: Okay.
21	JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.
22	MR. VALENTINETTI: Jeff, just to answer
23	your question deeper, what they are stating by that is
24	Airline Shuttle doesn't have proof of insurance for the
25	AMI Coaches' 24-passenger bus. We don't.

EXAMINATION OF FERGUSON/ROBERSON

1	Airline Shuttle doesn't have insurance for the 747 they
2	flew out on either. We don't. It's not our bus. It's
3	two different companies.
4	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Valentinetti, you're
5	done at this point? Ready to move on to Staff's
6	portion?
7	MR. VALENTINETTI: Sure.
8	JUDGE PEARSON: And you will have an
9	opportunity to ask questions within reason.
LO	So I would like to take a five-minute recess so
L1	everyone can have a quick break. We will be off the
L2	record for about five minutes and we will come back
L3	here.
L4	(Short break taken.)
L5	JUDGE PEARSON: We are back on the record.
L6	Mr. Roberson, if you would like to call your witness.
L7	MR. ROBERSON: Staff will call
L8	Matt Perkinson.
L9	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Perkinson, please
20	raise your right hand.
21	
22	MATHEW PERKINSON, having been first duly sworn by the
23	Administrative Law Judge to tell
24	the truth, the whole truth, and
25	nothing but the truth, was examined

EXAMINATION OF PERKINSON/ROBERSON 1 and testified as follows: 2 3 JUDGE PEARSON: You may be seated. Go 4 ahead. 5 **EXAMINATION** 6 7 BY MR. ROBERSON: 8 Q Would you please state your name and spell it for the record? 10 A Mathew Perkinson, M-a-t-h-e-w, P-e-r-k-i-n-s-o-n. 11 Q And who employs you? 12 A Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. 13 Q In what capacity does the Commission employ you? 14 A I supervise the motor carrier safety unit. 15 Q How long have you held that position? 16 A Eight months. 17 Q Can you describe any training that has prepared you to 18 carry out your duties? 19 A Leading up to my current position, I performed 20 compliance reviews for a couple of years. Previous to 21 that, I was an investigator with the Commission in both 22 consumer protection and transportation, and I've 23 received federal training as part of my certification 24 process. 25 Q Are you familiar with AMI Coaches, Airline Shuttle, and

- 1 Go VIP?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q And who owned AMI Coaches?
- 4 A Mr. Valentinetti.
- 5 Q Who managed AMI Coaches?
- 6 A Again, Mr. Valentinetti.
- Q And could you turn to the exhibit marked MP-4. Could you identify that document?
- 9 A This is a snapshot of the FMCSA portal, showing that
 10 AMI Coaches, LLC, is inactive and out of service.
- 11 Q And does the second page of that exhibit list
- 12 Mr. Valentinetti as the owner and manager of
- 13 | AMI Coaches?
- 14 **A Yes**.
- 15 Q And is that a true and accurate copy of that document?
- 16 **A Yes.**
- Q And are you familiar with the Federal Motor Carrier
- Safety Administration's practices?
- 19 **A Yes, I am.**
- 20 Q And how are you familiar with those practices?
- 21 A Again, when going through initial certification, I
- became federally certified on federal complaint
- investigations. I worked closely with the FMCSA to
- accomplish my certification.
- 25 Q Does FMCSA compose documents like Exhibit MP-4 in the

- 1 | normal course of its business?
- 2 | A Yes.
- 3 Q Does it compose those documents contemporaneously with
- 4 any safety audit?
- 5 **A Yes.**
- 6 Q And if FMCSA modifies a carrier's safety rating, does it
- 7 modify the portal showing whether or not the carrier is
- 8 active or inactive?
- 9 A Yes. They would update the carrier's current status.
- 10 Q And is it important that documents like this are
- 11 | accurate?
- 12 | A Yes.
- 13 | Q Why?
- 14 A Well, like in this case, they might be used for
- consideration of a new applicant.
- 16 Q Do you have access to documents like this to enable you
- to carry out your duties?
- 18 A Yes, I do.
- 19 Q Do you rely on those documents when carrying out your
- 20 duties?
- 21 **A Yes.**
- 22 | Q Why?
- 23 A It's critical for staff to be able to evaluate the
- 24 fitness of the carrier.
- MR. ROBERSON: Staff would move to admit

	EXAMINATION OF PERKINSON/ROBERSON
1	MP-4.
2	JUDGE PEARSON: I think I was looking at
3	MP-5. Okay. There it is. Okay.
4	MR. VALENTINETTI: We object, but allow
5	its admission as to non-truthful if that's the FMCSA
6	report on Airline Shuttle. I don't have it in front of
7	me.
8	JUDGE PEARSON: It's the AMI Coaches's
9	status of operating authority.
10	MR. VALENTINETTI: We object to the
11	contents we don't object to the admission of it, but
12	we object to that it's taken as truth.
13	JUDGE PEARSON: Understood. I will admit
14	that and mark it as Exhibit MP-4.
15	(Exhibit No. MP-4 admitted into evidence.)
16	BY MR. ROBERSON:
17	Q Turning to Airline Shuttle, do you know who owned
18	Airline Shuttle?
19	A Mr. Valentinetti.
20	Q Who managed Airline Shuttle?
21	A Again, Mr. Valentinetti.
22	Q Could you turn to the exhibit marked MP-3. Could you
23	identify that document?
24	A This would also be a document that's explaining Airline
25	Shuttle's operating status as out of service from FMCSA.

25

1	Q And it reflects that Mr. Valentinetti is the owner and
2	manager of that company?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And is that a true and accurate copy of that document?
5	A Yes.
6	MR. ROBERSON: Staff would move to admit
7	Exhibit MP-3.
8	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Valentinetti?
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: Same objection. We
10	would like to allow its admission, but the content is
11	wrong.
12	JUDGE PEARSON: Well, I understand that
13	you disagree with the basis for the status reflected,
14	but you would acknowledge that Airline Shuttle, Inc. has
15	been placed out of service, correct?
16	MR. VALENTINETTI: Absolutely, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Then I will admit
18	this and mark it as Exhibit MP-3.
19	(Exhibit No. MP-3 admitted into evidence.)
20	BY MR. ROBERSON:
21	Q Now, turning to Go VIP, who owns Go VIP?
22	A Mr. Valentinetti.
23	Q And who would manage Go VIP if the Commission grants it
24	operating authority?
25	A Mr. Valentinetti is listed as manager on the

- 1 application.
- 2 | Q Have you examined the business addresses of AMI Coaches,
- 3 | Airline Shuttle, and Go VIP?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 | Q And what did you notice about those addresses?
- 6 A They were the same.
- 7 Q And have you examined the services that AMI Coaches,
- 8 Airline Shuttle, and Go VIP would offer?
- 9 A Yes, I have.
- 10 Q And what did you notice about those services?
- 11 A That they were very similar in nature. They are the
- 12 type of service that was going to be provided.
- Q Can you turn to the exhibit marked MP-5? Could you identify that document?
- A This is a memorandum dated January 11, 2017, from myself
- 16 to -- sent to Dave Pratt.
- 17 | Q Is that a true and accurate copy of that document?
- 18 **A Yes.**
- 19 Q And in that document, do you identify the commonality of
- ownership, management and purpose of these three
- 21 companies?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q At the end of that document, did you recommend that the
- Commission offer Go VIP a chance to explain its
- 25 compliance history?

1	A Yeah. The recommendation was to request additional
2	information.
3	Q And why did you make that recommendation?
4	A To give Go VIP an opportunity to explain why they
5	believed that their compliance history shouldn't be
6	associated with the current application.
7	MR. ROBERSON: At this point staff would
8	move to admit Exhibit MP-5.
9	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Valentinetti, no
LO	objection?
L1	MR. VALENTINETTI: No objection.
L2	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Then I will admit
L3	that and mark it MP-5.
L4	(Exhibit No. MP-5 admitted into evidence.)
L5	BY MR. ROBERSON:
L6	Q You've mentioned you've had federal training. Are you
L7	familiar with the FMCSA safety audit process?
L8	A Yes.
L9	Q And could you describe how that process works?
20	A An overview of the process would be, come in, review
21	records, record any violations that we discovered. In
22	this case, if there was an unsatisfactory safety rating,
23	the carrier would be given some sort of documentation
24	and opportunity to request that that safety rating be
25	upgraded. And if there were violations that warranted

- penalties, penalties would be generated.
- 2 Q Does a carrier also have the opportunity to appeal the
- unsatisfactory rating if they think it's incorrect?
- 4 A Yes, they can request an upgrade.
- Does the FMCSA's inspector draft a memo about the safety
- 6 audit contemporaneously with close of the audit?
- 7 **A Yes.**
- 8 Q And is it important that those safety audit memos be
- 9 | accurate?
- 10 **A Yes**.
- 11 | Q And why is that?
- 12 A Because, as I said, it impacts the operating status of a
- company, and it can result in monetary penalties that
- 14 clearly impact companies.
- Q And do you have access to the FMCSA safety audit memos
- to allow you to carry out your duties?
- 17 **A I do.**
- 18 Q And do you rely on documents like those safety audit
- memos to carry out your duties?
- 20 **A Yes.**
- 21 Q Can you turn to the exhibit marked MP-1. Can you
- identify that document?
- A This is a compliance review performed on
- 24 | Airline Shuttle, Inc.
- 25 Q Is that a true and accurate copy of that document?

1	A Yes.
2	MR. ROBERSON: At this point Staff would
3	move to admit Exhibit MP-1.
4	MR. VALENTINETTI: No objection.
5	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I will admit that
6	and mark it as Exhibit MP-1.
7	(Exhibit No. MP-1 admitted into evidence.)
8	BY MR. ROBERSON:
9	Q Can you turn to the exhibit marked MP-2. Can you
10	identify that document?
11	A This is also a compliance review performed on
12	AMI Coaches, LLC in 2013.
13	Q And is that a true and accurate copy of that document?
14	A Yes.
15	MR. ROBERSON: At this point staff would
16	move to admit Exhibit MP-2.
17	MR. VALENTINETTI: I do object to it being
18	a true and accurate copy. It is not accurate, but it is
19	a true copy. And all the documents that have come in,
20	when we say true and accurate, Mr. Roberson doesn't know
21	if they are accurate or not and neither does
22	Mr. Perkinson. But he does know this is the form. And
23	to that I don't object. Do you understand what I mean?
24	JUDGE PEARSON: I do. It's a similar
25	objection to earlier. Lunderstand that you dispute

2.0

EXAMINATION OF PERKINSON/ROBERSON

whether these violations	occurred,	but you're	not
objecting to this			

MR. VALENTINETTI: Correct. And there is a lot of information, like "owns four," and we owned five. That can be proved. So there is a lot of mistakes in this, but that's okay.

JUDGE PEARSON: I understand. I will admit it and mark it as Exhibit MP-2.

(Exhibit No. MP-2 admitted into evidence.)

BY MR. ROBERSON:

- Q Turning now to the safety audit of AMI Coaches performed on November 7th, 2013. Can you describe the violations found by FMCSA during the course of that audit?
- A Just a general overview, there would be a failure to have a random controlled substance and alcohol testing program. As Mr. Valentinetti already spoke about, there was violations of operating a commercial vehicle without the proper endorsements. There was also making or causing to make fraudulent or intentionally false entry on annual inspection form. Those particular violations are acute violations. And --
- Q Before moving on, what is the significance of those violations being acute?
- A Acute is the highest level of risk associated with a violation, I guess would be one way to explain it.

1	Critical is the second level. And then no acute or
2	critical association would be more administrative, maybe
3	paperwork missing.
4	Q When you say "risk," what do you mean? Risk of what?
5	A Of an accident occurring or potential breakdown within
6	the company's operations that could impact the public.
7	Q Okay. And could you describe the remainder of the
8	violations?
9	A So next there was a using a driver before the motor
10	carrier has received a negative preemployment controlled
11	substance test result, using a driver not medically
12	examined and certified, failing to maintain inquiries
13	into driver's driving record in the driver qualification
14	file, failing to require drivers to make a record of
15	duty status, failing to retain those records for six
16	months, using a commercial motor vehicle that was not
17	periodically inspected, failing to require drivers to
18	prepare records of duty status.
19	MR. VALENTINETTI: Is that on the
20	AMI Coaches's one we're talking about?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes. And then the remainder
22	of the violations could be more administrative. Would
23	you like me to go through every one?
24	BY MR. ROBERSON:
25	Q That's fine. The last couple violations you've just

- 1 listed, those are all critical violations?
- 2 | A Yes, critical or acute.
- 3 Q Okay. And are you familiar with regulations underlying
- 4 the violations found during the safety audit?
- 5 **A Yes, I am.**
- 6 Q And how are you familiar with them?
- 7 A When I'm performing a compliance review, I have access
- 8 to databases that allow me to search all of these
- 9 violations. I'm not sure what you're --
- Q So the actual regulation itself, are you familiar with
- 11 the federal regulations?
- 12 A Yeah, absolutely. I've spent a couple of years going
- 13 through training and certification throughout the
- country, specific to the code of federal regulations.
- 15 Q Does state law incorporate those federal regulations?
- 16 A Yes.
- Q So would the conduct constituting these violations also
- constitute violations of state law?
- 19 | **A Yes**.
- 20 Q And does the FMCSA use the safety audit to determine a
- 21 proposed safety rating for a carrier like AMI Coaches?
- 22 **A Yes**.
- 23 | Q Did it do so here?
- 24 A Yes, it did.
- 25 | Q And what was that rating?

1	A Unsatisfactory.
2	Q And did that rating become final?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And does an unsatisfactory safety rating cause the
5	federal government to order a carrier out of service?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And did that happen here?
8	A Yes.
9	Q And does that out-of-service order remain in effect
10	today?
11	A As of April 14th, it was out of service, yes.
12	Q And that's reflected on Exhibit MP-4?
13	A Correct.
14	Q Turning to the safety audit of Airline Shuttle performed
15	on March 7, 2014, could you please describe the
16	violations found by the FMCSA during course of that
17	audit?
18	A Acute violations were identified as failing to implement
19	a random controlled substance and alcohol testing
20	program, operating a passenger-carrying vehicle without
21	having in effect the required minimum levels of
22	insurance, failing to maintain proof of that insurance
23	at the principal place of business, failing to maintain
24	the driver qualification file on each driver employee

25

I'm sorry, the last two of those violations were

- critical, as opposed to the first two that were acute.
- 2 Another critical violation for failing to require
- drivers to make a record of duty status, and then
- 4 failing to preserve those records for the required six
- 5 months, another violation of failing to keep minimum
- 6 records of inspection and vehicle maintenance, failing
- 7 to require drivers to prepare driver vehicle inspection
- 8 reports. Another critical violation, using a commercial
- 9 motor vehicle not periodically inspected.
- 10 Q So the last -- everything after the first two violations
- 11 you listed, those were all critical violations?
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 Q And the first two were acute?
- 14 | A Yes.
- 15 Q And there were more administrative violations?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 | Q And does the conduct giving rise to those federal
- violations, if you had found them, would they also be a
- 19 violation of state law?
- 20 A If operating in interstate commerce, yes.
- 21 | Q Did the FMCSA calculate a proposed safety rating based
- 22 on that audit?
- 23 **A Yes.**
- 24 Q What was that proposed safety rating?
- 25 A Also unsatisfactory.

- 1 | Q Did that rating become final?
- 2 **A Yes.**
- Q Did the FMCSA order Airline Shuttle out of service based
- 4 on that rating?
- 5 **A Yes.**
- 6 Q And that does out-of-service order remain in effect?
- 7 A As of April 14th also, yes.
- 8 Q And is that reflected in Exhibit MP-3?
- 9 A Yes, it is.
- 10 Q And how would you describe the regulatory history of
- 11 AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle?
- 12 A I would say, based on the violations, that there is a
- history of noncompliance as it relates to safety
- 14 violations.
- 15 Q And does the Commission consider a carrier's history of
- compliance with commission regulations when determining
- whether the carrier is fit for operating authority?
- 18 A Yes. The Commission is responsible for that by law.
- 19 Q And given that Mr. Valentinetti is going to be the owner
- and operator of Go VIP coaches, do you think that
- 21 history is relevant here?
- 22 **A Yes, I do.**
- Q And so given that safety history, do you recommend that
- the Commission deny Mr. Valentinetti's application for
- 25 operating authority?

1	A Yes.
2	MR. ROBERSON: I have no further
3	questions.
4	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.
5	Mr. Valentinetti, before I let you cross-examine
6	Mr. Perkinson, I just have a question.
7	MR. VALENTINETTI: Yes, Your Honor.
8	
9	EXAMINATION
10	BY JUDGE PEARSON:
11	Q These safety audits that are marked as Exhibit MP-1,
12	MP-2, did you receive copies of these at the time they
13	were performed?
14	A Yes.
15	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Go ahead.
16	
17	EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
19	Q Mr. Perkinson, you are familiar with the CFRs and USCs
20	because you had training in federal law as well as you
21	worked for the state?
22	A Yes, sir.
23	Q And the state law and the federal law is meant to
24	parallel, you said? What was your word, Mr. Roberson's
25	word?

1	A Yes, the Washington state adopts federal law.
2	Q Does the UTC work for the FMCSA?
3	A We have investigators that are trained to perform
4	federal investigation. We operate under a grant.
5	Q So sometimes the Washington State Utilities and
6	Transportation Commission investigator does the
7	investigation for the FMCSA?
8	A Yes.
9	Q When you say that you recommend the history of
10	compliance, when you see nine violations, I believe it
11	is, against Airline Shuttle, and you know that
12	Airline Shuttle's been in operation for 24 years, you
13	think that that is a history of noncompliance? Assuming
14	those were true, assuming the violations were true, nine
15	violations in 24 years is a history of noncompliance?
16	A I think given the recent nature of the violations, that
17	they were discovered a few years ago, yes.
18	Q And has Go VIP or Airline Shuttle sufficiently shown you
19	what the evidence that you have in the book in front of
20	you, that violation No. 1 that's acute, failing to
21	implement a random controlled alcohol and substance
22	testing, that that violation is not true? Do you
23	understand that?
24	MR. ROBERSON: Objection, I think this is
25	decided by the federal courts.

1	JUDGE PEARSON: I agree. I'm going to
2	sustain the objection. Move on to your next question.
3	MR. VALENTINETTI: Well, it's an acute
4	violation that the UTC is standing behind. And,
5	Your Honor, the violation originally came from the UTC
6	is what I'm saying.
7	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
8	Q My point is let me ask you a question: Do you know
9	who John Foster is?
LO	A Yes.
L1	Q Is John Foster a UTC investigator?
L2	A He was, yes.
L3	Q What is an MC let me see what it says here for him
L4	did Mr. Foster do the investigation for the FMCSA on
L5	AMI Coaches?
L6	A He performed a safety audit in June of 2013, and then,
L7	yes, a state compliance review July 2013.
L8	Q And what does "MCLE special investigator" mean?
L9	A I'm not exactly sure. It's motor carrier, similar to
20	what the title is.
21	Q So John Foster was a contract worker for the FMCSA?
22	A No.
23	Q No?
24	A No.
25	Q. He did an investigation can you look at exhibit

1	A John Foster worked for the Utilities and Transportation			
2	Commission.			
3	Q Can you look at Exhibit No. 12, John Foster's FMCSA			
4	review?			
5	JUDGE PEARSON: So I get what you're			
6	saying, this is on UTC letterhead. This came from the			
7	Commission, saying that			
8	MR. VALENTINETTI: He doesn't work for the			
9	FMCSA.			
10	JUDGE PEARSON: Correct. He is performing			
11	a safety audit, in accordance with the FMCSA			
12	requirements, which are adopted by the Commission.			
13	MR. VALENTINETTI: He also has there is			
14	also a letter, which I'm going do dig out while we're			
15	talking, that the parallel letters that are May 20th			
16	that say I'm doing an investigation for the WUTC, safety			
17	audit, and then this is the second one. The only reason			
18	I put that in there is because it's from the Feds. It's			
19	the same. Different letter, same day, same guy.			
20	JUDGE PEARSON: I'm not sure what you're			
21	trying to establish here because John Foster was a UTC			
22	employee.			
23	MR. VALENTINETTI: I know. He is the one			
24	who wrote the fault violations, and then the Feds			
25	adopted them. Do you understand what I'm saying, or			

1	should I explain it more?
2	JUDGE PEARSON: I understand.
3	MR. VALENTINETTI: He works for the UTC.
4	We know Foster from way back in 2000 or whenever. So
5	Foster came to our office and wrote well, I'll hit
6	that later.
7	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
8	Q But are you looking at No. 12, Mr. Perkinson?
9	A Yes.
10	MR. VALENTINETTI: If the Court needs to
11	see it, there is a parallel one dated the same day that
12	says, "I'm John Foster, I'm doing an investigation, a
13	safety audit for the WUTC." And this letter that says
14	two of them, separate, and now I'm doing the
15	investigation for the FMCSA. So my point is is that
16	Foster works he is a contract worker for the Feds.
17	MR. ROBERSON: Objection, relevance.
18	JUDGE PEARSON: Yeah, I'm going to sustain
19	the objection.
20	MR. VALENTINETTI: He's not then?
21	JUDGE PEARSON: No.
22	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
23	Q Do you guys work together or you don't?
24	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Valentinetti,
25	Mr. Foster was a long-time commission employee who is

	EXAMINATION OF PERKINSON/VALENTINETTI			
1	since retired. He doesn't work here anymore.			
2	MR. VALENTINETTI: I know.			
3	JUDGE PEARSON: He was not a contract			
4	worker for the FMCSA. You need to drop that			
5	MR. VALENTINETTI: He was not?			
6	JUDGE PEARSON: and move on.			
7	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:			
8	Q I guess I didn't get the answer, Mr. Perkinson. The			
9	nine violations in 24 years is a history of			
10	noncompliance?			
11	A Again, considering 2013/2014 violations and the severity			
12	of those violations.			
13	Q And with the evidence in front of you in the book that			
14	the violations are false, since you don't want to			
15	revisit it, do you still stand behind that statement?			
16	A I'm not clear on the question.			
17	Q What I'm saying is: One of the violations was we didn't			
18	have the effective since we have Mr. Ferguson here,			
19	I'll use that one we didn't have the effective			
20	required amount of insurance, and Mr. Ferguson, he is			
21	here in person, telling you that's not true.			
22	MR. ROBERSON: Objection. This is decided			
23	by the Feds.			
24	JUDGE PEARSON: Right. Okay. So I'm			
25	going to sustain the objection. Do you have any other			

1	questions for Mr. Perkinson?
2	MR. VALENTINETTI: Your Honor, Mr. Foster,
3	your employee, wrote that violation and the Feds adopted
4	it. So when you do that, I get what you're saying, that
5	was done by the Feds. No, it was done by the UTC, then
6	the Feds said, Well, that's what they said, and now
7	you're saying that's what they said. You're pointing
8	your fingers and trying to dance out of it. Foster
9	wrote it, it's your guy, we're proving it wrong.
LO	JUDGE PEARSON: So just to clarify. Do
L1	you know who prepared these audits?
L2	THE WITNESS: Yes, these were done I
L3	believe it was for AMI Coaches' 2013 report was
L4	Chad Lagerway is what my note reflects. And then
L5	MR. VALENTINETTI: And Nolan Rice.
L6	THE WITNESS: Nolan would be the '14.
L7	JUDGE PEARSON: So to your knowledge, did
L8	those two individuals go out and perform the audit and
L9	make the findings on their own?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	JUDGE PEARSON: They did not adopt what
22	John Foster found? That was a separate safety audit
23	that Mr. Foster did?
24	THE WITNESS: Correct.

JUDGE PEARSON: That hasn't been offered

25

	EXAMINATION OF FERMINGON VALENTINETTI			
1	today, correct?			
2	THE WITNESS: That's correct. We had a			
3	quick turnaround to get this hearing together.			
4	MR. VALENTINETTI: We did, too.			
5	JUDGE PEARSON: So it looks to me like			
6	these investigators from the FMCSA came out, did safety			
7	audits on your companies, they made these findings, not			
8	Mr. Foster.			
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay. That's not true,			
10	but okay, Your Honor. You're the boss.			
11	JUDGE PEARSON: I understand that that's			
12	your position, it's not true, but from what			
13	MR. VALENTINETTI: I'm going to show you a			
14	different example now.			
15	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:			
16	Q Mr. Perkinson, can you tell me the date on your			
17	exhibit I'm not sure what exhibit number it is			
18	your exhibit where the safety audit was done on			
19	Airline Shuttle?			
20	A I can tell you the closing date was March 7th, 2014.			
21	Q Okay. Then could you turn to Exhibit 1 in our book,			
22	please, to the second page.			
23	A "Statement of drug and alcohol testing"?			
24	Q Yes. Can you tell me the date on the top of that?			
25	A October 22nd, 2013.			

1	Q And to the left where it says "this certifies that,"	
2	what two companies are there?	
3	A AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle.	
4	Q And if you skim that document real quickly for the	
5	court, and I think you've looked at it before, would you	
6	say that that is a document that states that both	
7	AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle had a random drug and	
8	alcohol testing program on October 22nd, 2013?	
9	A I would not. I mean, I know in the course of my work,	
10	we would contact whatever the consortium is if there is	
11	a document like this to verify the carrier had drug and	
12	alcohol	
13	Q So there is a possibility that this was falsified like	
14	the exhaust pipe?	
15	A I did not say that.	
16	Q Well, it's a possibility?	
17	JUDGE PEARSON: Yeah, so I think what	
18	Mr. Perkinson is saying is that's not enough. If he	
19	were doing the audit, he would follow up and require	
20	additional information.	
21	MR. VALENTINETTI: I wish Mr. Perkinson	
22	did do the audit, Your Honor, or Mr. Roberson. It would	
23	have come out much differently.	
24	JUDGE PEARSON: And I understand you've	
25	already explained at length that you believed that you	

EXAMINATION OF PERKINSON/VALENTINETTI

were in compliance and had a drug and alcohol testing program in place.

MR. VALENTINETTI: This is real evidence.

JUDGE PEARSON: You need to move on to the next point.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Your Honor, for ten seconds, this is real evidence. A phone call could be made to these guys in one second, and these could run out of the room and say, Did they have it? Yes or no.

What I'm trying to say is, I know in a perfect world you guys stand around the water heater and say, We do a good job. We put bad operators out of business. That's not what's going on here. With two hours of time, you're not allowing me to address it. This is real evidence. Can I show you --

JUDGE PEARSON: No. I'm just going to just stop you right there, because I know enough about these audits to know that they look at the six months prior to the date that the audit occurred. And so just because you obtained this mid-October doesn't mean you had it in the months preceding that the auditor was looking at.

BY MR. VALENTINETTI:

Q Mr. Perkinson, do you have to drug and alcohol test for a 14-passenger bus?

1	A Before I answer your question, I want to point out that			
2	the violation in the report is for a trip for			
3	Mr. Valentinetti in May 2013. And the letter, if it			
4	were to be stating that he had a drug and alcohol, or			
5	the company had a drug and alcohol program, was			
6	effective I believe it was			
7	JUDGE PEARSON: October.			
8	THE WITNESS: October.			
9	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:			
10	Q I think May is not the that is for the I think May			
11	is the medical certificate that Ken McAllister did, but			
12	that's okay. Let's move on from it. So you don't			
13	obviously get what I'm saying.			
14	If you did the investigation, you would call?			
15	A Yes. We contact, standard course of business we contact			
16	the consortiums.			
17	Q In doing an investigation for Go VIP today, you know, or			
18	next week or two weeks ago, when a statement is made			
19	that this is untrue and evidence is produced, not only			
20	evidence from a live person that's a broker,			
21	Mr. Ferguson, but evidence that can be contested if you			
22	call U.S. HealthWorks, you wouldn't do that			
23	investigation to see if what I'm saying is true or not?			
24	Would that be too much to ask?			
25	A No. No.			

1	Q That's what I think should happen here. I think that			
2	you don't have to believe that this document is			
3	truthful. I would like you to on your own time, we			
4	can't do it now obviously I would like you to call			
5	and see.			
6	A I think what we identified was, is that this may show			
7	that the drug and alcohol program was in effect in			
8	October and the trip that was used for an example was in			
9	May.			
10	Q Thank you. That's not the right dates, but okay.			
11	So I want to ask you again then, since we'll move			
12	forward to it, does a 14-passenger non-CDL vehicle need			
13	a drug and alcohol testing program?			
14	A No.			
15	Q Okay. What if it's a 28-passenger vehicle, does it need			
16	drug and alcohol testing?			
17	A Yes. There are two definitions in the federal			
18	regulations that apply to size being 16 or more, which			
19	is commercial regulations, and then there is another			
20	section which defines, obviously, the less-size vehicle			
21	as safety-specific regulations.			
22	Q There is three, actually, there is three of the federal			
23	commercial motor vehicle laws, and all of them state			
24	that it's 26,001 pound, not 26,000, or 16 or more			
25	passengers seated, not passengers on the vehicle,			

1	because as we all probably know you can stand up on a			
2	bus. When you're going to Seahawks game there is 200			
3	people on a bus not our bus but the Metro buses.			
4	What you're saying is you don't have to drug and alcohol			
5	test for a 14-passenger van; is that correct?			
6	A That's correct.			
7	Q Does the WUTC have jurisdiction over a company that			
8	moves transient flight crew to and from the hotel?			
9	A I would say that there are exceptions from the rules			
10	that would allow for that type of operation, if that was			
11	solely what the operation was.			
12	Q Does the UTC have payment from, you know can they			
13	show payment to Airline Shuttle from anyone other than			
14	the hotel? No, I'll move on. It doesn't matter. You			
15	can't.			
16	So there is a possibility that the WUTC doesn't have			
17	jurisdiction for Airline Shuttle?			
18	A Anything is possible, yes.			
19	Q Well, I'll ask more directly then. In your opinion,			
20	does the WUTC have jurisdiction over Airline Shuttle, in			
21	referring to 480-30-011?			
22	A If you're providing services that are exempt from			
23	commission regulation, we would not require a permit, if			
24	that's what you're saying.			
25	Q Thank you. And moving flight crew to and from the hotel			

1	is what that is?
2	A I believe that's under the exemption.
3	Q Okay. So let me ask you this question, because you're a
4	federal and a state guy. And I'm listening to myself, I
5	sound like a smart-ass, and I don't mean to be, so I'm
6	going to back down a little bit.
7	Let's say that AMI Coaches let's say that
8	Airline Shuttle is business, you know, we're hitting
9	golf balls or laying in bed, and the airline crew is at
10	the airport, could AMI Coaches at the time that it
11	was in service, could AMI Coaches go with a 24-passenger
12	bus or a 56-passenger motor coach and pick up the flight
13	attendants and take them to the hotel?
14	A AMI Coaches would be if they had a charter permit
15	allowed to, yes.
16	MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay. Do you
17	understand the relevance of that, Your Honor, or do I
18	need to explain it?
19	JUDGE PEARSON: Please don't. Go ahead
20	and move on.
21	MR. VALENTINETTI: You do under
22	JUDGE PEARSON: I do. I understand what
23	you're getting at.
24	MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay. All right.
25	

1	BY MR	VALE		ILTTI.
	BY WK.	VALE	ENTIN	N⊏ I II.

- 2 | Q I want to ask Mr. Perkinson while I have Mr. Ferguson
- still, here can you tell me the insurance requirement
- 4 for a 56-passenger coach?
- 5 A Five million dollars.
- 6 Q For a 17-passenger motor coach?
- 7 A Again, we're going need five million.
- 8 Q How about for a 14-passenger van, bus, hotel van,
- 9 whatever you want to call it?
- 10 A For passenger transportation, it would be \$1.5 million
- 11 for intrastate operation.
- Q And is that also the requirement by the state if it has
- a limousine permit?
- 14 A I believe it is. The Department of Licensing would be
- the one imposing those insurance requirements, but I
- believe that's accurate.
- 17 Q Okay. And are you familiar with the Airline Shuttle bus
- that we're talking about with, I guess, the pictures we
- provided or have you seen it yourself?
- 20 **A No.**
- 21 Q Do you think, before you denied Go VIP's application,
- that you should be?
- 23 A That I should be what?
- 24 Q Familiar with the equipment that's going to be used and
- 25 how it would be used? Here is what I'm saying: Either

EXAMINATION OF PERKINSON/VALENTINETTI

Mr. Roberson or Mr. Perkinson has made statements that
we operate with noncompliance. And you do that by
pointing your finger across the street at the FMCSA.
But here, we're making an application to the State and
we're saying that 1.5 is what you need for a
14-passenger, five million you need for anything bigger
than 16; we're saying that for a CDL vehicle you need
drug and alcohol testing, which we had and we proved.
And if it's not been proved, then I'll do it again. And
for anything less than that, Mr. Perkinson has already
said, No, you don't have to drug and alcohol test. And
that's one of the big violations. That's the acute
violation on here. Does it make sense, Mr. Roberson?
JUDGE PEARSON: So he's not your witness
that you're cross-examining right now.
MR. VALENTINETTI: I just want to make
sure that we've we've talked about these violations.
If you're questioning my integrity, you can just say
that. That's okay.
THE WITNESS: We're not questioning the
integrity, and I think it's demonstrated in the letter

THE WITNESS: We're not questioning the integrity, and I think it's demonstrated in the letter that there was no finger pointing, as you claimed; that most of the associations were that it appears that these types of things have happened. Please explain why you believe it's relevant or not.

	EXAMINATION OF FERMINOON, VALEIVINGETH
1	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
2	Q Okay. Well, that's what I'm trying to do by addressing
3	each one of these violations. And like Your Honor said,
4	we have limited amount of time. So I want to get to the
5	acute ones, instead of all the critical ones like the
6	markings are not right on the bus. Does the hotel van
7	need to have a DOT number on the sign?
8	A There is, again, certain exemptions for that type of
9	service.
LO	Q Is it a yes or no? I'm confused.
L1	A I don't believe so.
L2	Q Does the hotel van have to do DVIR, driver vehicle
L3	inspection reports?
L4	A Again, I don't have that regulation in front of me for
L5	the exemption, but it clearly spells out the types of
L6	services that are exempt and it would be all of them.
L7	Q Thank you, Mr. Perkinson. It clearly spells out. There
L8	is no tricks I want to ask Mr. Perkinson, would you
L9	say in transportation law, since you're familiar with
20	federal law and state law, is there tricks that we don't
21	understand?
22	A Can you clarify "tricks"?
23	Q Yeah. I mean, like, when it says neither the board or
24	the secretary has jurisdiction over a hotel van owned or

operated by a hotel, is that a tricky thing that's too

25

1	much for me, I need an attorney to understand, or maybe
2	the people in the courtroom need?
3	A There are a lot of rules, a lot of regulations.
4	Q Does the WUTC have jurisdiction over a school bus?
5	A No.
6	Q Over a taxi?
7	A No.
8	Q Over a hotel van?
9	A No.
10	Q Okay. So what's in question here really for those half
11	of the things you've made the statement on not you,
12	the WUTC half of things you said we're noncompliant
13	on, we are pretty sure you don't have jurisdiction over,
14	for sure and then we can put it to bed?
15	MR. ROBERSON: Objection.
16	JUDGE PEARSON: Can you rephrase that?
17	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
18	Q Do you have jurisdiction over Airline Shuttle's hotel
19	van, 14-passenger, non-CDL, 800 GVW?
20	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Valentinetti, I think
21	that's been asked and answered. He has acknowledged
22	that that
23	MR. VALENTINETTI: He said there are
24	certain rules exempt. I just want a yes or no.
25	JUDGE PEARSON: The UTC. you didn't have a

1	certificate from us for Airline Shuttle.
2	MR. VALENTINETTI: I didn't need it.
3	JUDGE PEARSON: That's well established.
4	I'm not sure why you're continuing to ask it.
5	MR. VALENTINETTI: While the law is
6	parallel Mr. Perkinson said the law is parallel with
7	federal law, and the federal law is the same. CFR
8	4913506. Federal law is exactly the same. So if
9	Mr. Perkinson says the UTC doesn't have jurisdiction,
10	neither do the Feds. And that's what I'm trying to get
11	him to answer, since he is an expert on both WACs and
12	RCWs
13	JUDGE PEARSON: I don't think I'm going
14	to stop you right there. I don't think that anyone has
15	asserted that Mr. Perkinson is an expert on federal
16	jurisdiction of various motor carriers. That's not his
17	job. That's not what he does here. He works for the
18	Commission.
19	Do you have any more questions for him?
20	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
21	Q Have we sufficiently established that Airline Shuttle
22	does not need a random drug and alcohol or any testing
23	program whatsoever?
24	MR. ROBERSON: Objection.
25	JUDGE PEARSON: I'm going to sustain your

	EXAMINATION OF FERMINOON VALENTINETTI
1	objection. I don't think that Mr. Perkinson, again, is
2	qualified or should have to answer questions about the
3	federal jurisdiction. And this has already been decided
4	by the FMCSA. We've already been down that road. So
5	we're not
6	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
7	Q Does Go VIP need drug and alcohol testing for a
8	14-passenger bus moving airline crew to and from a
9	hotel?
10	A I'll read the exemption. It says, "Owned or operated by
11	or for a hotel and only transporting hotel patrons
12	between the hotel and the local station of a carrier."
13	That's the local exemption as it reads.
14	Q And to me, Mr. Perkinson, that means that the at the
15	top of that it says "The Board or the Secretary." And
16	that's the Board Or the Secretary of Transportation. To
17	me, that means they don't have jurisdiction; does that
18	mean something different to you?
19	A It would. If it met that criteria, yes.
20	Q Okay. Thank you. That's good. I've got a couple more
21	and then we will be done.
22	With Exhibit No. 1, if you continue to turn the
23	pages in our book. I'll just show you, No. 1, there is
24	a pile of

A I'm familiar.

1	Q Okay. You're familiar with No. 1? Those are documents
2	that easily Mr. Perkinson, after this hearing, could
3	check and see if they are accurate or false or whatever.
4	Since, not this commission, but the Feds said that we
5	falsified documents. You can check and see if we had
6	if these are real; is that correct?
7	A Yes, I could.
8	Q And will you do that?
9	A We could. Certainly.
10	Q You could, but will you before you make a decision?
11	A I'm not sure that it's needed. It says the dates of the
12	tests are
13	Q The date of the tests
14	A after the violations that are recorded.
15	JUDGE PEARSON: I'm going to stop you
16	right there, because the dates of these tests are all
17	recorded in the safety audit that was performed by the
18	FMCSA. So it's really moot. If we're accepting those
19	findings as done and decided, this doesn't prove
20	anything that's not also in the safety audit report. So
21	I'm not sure what you're getting at. I don't think
22	anyone is questioning the veracity of these documents.
23	MR. VALENTINETTI: Let me get to the end
24	of it. We did everything right. This is a corrupt,
25	racial, criminal attack. I didn't want to go there in

1	this meeting because really I just want to operate
2	Go VIP. But if you knew the things that John Foster
3	said, and if you look at No. 12, the girls that work in
4	our office, yeah, they all quit that day because of
5	Foster. Foster's personal threats of deportation and
6	stuff like that. And that's not where I want to go. I
7	want to operate a bus company and be happy.
8	MR. ROBERSON: Objection. Is he examining
9	Mr. Perkinson or is he testifying?
10	JUDGE PEARSON: Do you have any more
11	questions for Mr. Perkinson?
12	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
13	Q Are you going to do your own investigation
14	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Valentinetti, stop
15	speaking over me. When I'm speaking, you need to wait
16	until I'm finished. You can have an opportunity to say
17	all those things when you make your closing statement.
18	But you need to focus now on finishing up your line of
19	questioning with Mr. Perkinson.
20	BY MR. VALENTINETTI:
21	Q Can you look at Exhibit 3, please? Page 1. Can you
22	tell me what the date is on that?
23	A Which date?
24	Q April 1, 2013.
25	A Okay. Service date April 1, 2013.

1	Q Can you read the first sentence for me, please? And
2	this is for AMI Coaches.
3	A "The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's
4	preliminary grant of operating authority in this
5	proceeding has become effective but authority has not
6	been issued because the applicant has not complied with
7	the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's
8	regulations for" and it speaks to insurance.
9	Q Yes, it speaks to insurance. And Mr. Ferguson is here
10	to well, plus we sent that document to the FMCSA
11	immediately.
12	And then if you could go to No. 12, please. And
13	page 1 is a picture, page 2 is an invitation to Amtrak's
14	bidding thing, and No. 3 is David Pratt's letter to
15	Amtrak; is that correct? What's the date on that?
16	A May 15, 2013.
17	Q And then Mr. Foster, if you could go skip one page
18	and go to the second page. What's the date of
19	Mr. Foster's "we're going to do an audit"?
20	A May 20, 2013.
21	Q That's five days later?
22	A That is.
23	Q And are you aware of the violations that Mr. Foster
24	found against AMI Coaches?
25	A Yes, I'm not intimately aware, but I'm aware there are

EXAMINATION OF PERKINSON/ROBERSON

1	violations.
2	Q Do they parallel the federal violations?
3	A I don't think exactly, no.
4	Q Is there video surveillance at Seatac Airport?
5	A I don't know.
6	MR. ROBERSON: Objection, relevance.
7	JUDGE PEARSON: I don't know where you're
8	going with this. You need to get to your point.
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: It doesn't matter. I'm
10	done with Mr. Perkinson. I'll say the point is is
11	that it doesn't matter. I'll hit it in the end.
12	JUDGE PEARSON: Do you have any redirect
13	for your client?
14	MR. ROBERSON: Just a couple.
15	
16	EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. ROBERSON:
18	Q First question, I guess do you have the power to
19	reinvestigate a federal investigation or modify their
20	findings?
21	A No.
22	Q Mr. Valentinetti has spoken often about jurisdiction
23	over, I guess it's Airline Shuttle. He pointed you to
24	the definition in, I guess it is the WACs, about going
25	from a hotel to a carrier. Did Mr. Valentinetti admit

EXAMINATION OF PERKINSON/ROBERSON

thev	do	other	thinas	in	this	verv	hearing?
	40	01.101	90			• • •	

A Yes.

2.0

MR. ROBERSON: I think that's all I have.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So I have a couple of questions for you --

MR. VALENTINETTI: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: -- before you make your closing statement.

So I asked you earlier if you had received copies of these safety audits and you indicated that you had. And I noted that within the safety audits there is a fairly lengthy explanation about the procedure related to an unsatisfactory safety rating, that the carrier has 45 days to take the necessary steps to approve the rating and to request an upgrade. And I understand that you claim to have not received the letter from the FMCSA about this, but it is in the findings. So you had knowledge that these were the requirements by virtue of receiving a copy of the safety audit.

And I guess my question is: You failed to follow through either time, and I'm wondering why that is.

MR. VALENTINETTI: Thanks for saying that, Your Honor, because I'm happy to address that. When AMI Coaches -- and I'll do that one quick -- we were shut down. And I'll have you know, to this day we have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

never had a hearing like this.

And I think that as Mr. Perkinson might be the only one that knows, when you are shut down, the hearing needs to happen in ten days. But of course, since the violations are false, the Feds don't want to have it, and so they are hiding. DND International, if you want to research that and understand, DND International was shut down 25 days before us.

The hearing has to happen in ten days or it's out. We've never been afforded a hearing, ever. So again, as I don't have a very good attitude here today, I'm happy that we're here because this is the first hearing we had before for either Airline Shuttle or AMI Coaches. AMI Coaches, we had a gazillion dollar attorneys downtown that wrote corrective action plans, sent all this documentation to the Feds. Because they are covering up, they said, Yeah, we don't believe it. But they don't do an investigation. The Airline Shuttle, the reason it comes into -- and I want to ask Mr. -well, I guess we are past Mr. Perkinson, but has the -to your knowledge, has the Feds or the -- you don't even have to answer because I know you can't now -- the Feds or the WUTC ever even investigated a hotel van? Never in the history of the world has that happened.

So they shut down AMI Coaches with some horrible

Ü

things -- and I'm not going to go there now because it's not the thing. I started to a little bit with some horrible things that were said in my office to my staff and to me, because I guess I'm -- I don't know where I'm from but I'm from somewhere.

They shut down AMI Coaches, we filed a civil complaint against the UTC and the Feds, and they come back and come at Airline Shuttle as retaliation. As almost everybody in this room knows, you have never, ever done an audit or even issued a violation in the history of the WUTC against a hotel van. Ever. And for sure never one has been shut down. And if it has or if there was a violation, they were allowed to challenge it.

We have never had a chance to challenge and now we're making application to the UTC for Go VIP three years later. And I want to challenge all these things and today I guess we can't. But, you know, I think -- I'm making a statement that the DOT -- and that's UTC and FMCSA -- is hiding from these false allegations that they made and they can't substantiate it.

If you look up CFR 386.58, that means you guys have the burden of proof. You don't. But AMI Coaches and Airline Shuttle or in any type of investigation where you've made an allegation, once you make an allegation

now you have to prove it. I'm saying today that, in a nice way, you should do your job. You should investigate. But if you put on paper that we have a history of noncompliance and list violations, I'm not here to say you have to prove it, but I'm here to say that you don't -- or that they are wrong, and I don't want to be blocked from that. And I know we have a time limit, but --

JUDGE PEARSON: I want to stop you because you're not answering my question. The unsatisfactory safety rating explanation is very clear, that you have 45 days to take steps, that you have 90 days to request an appeal within the date of the proposed safety rating, but you should do it within 15 days. Did you file an appeal of either of these safety ratings?

MR. VALENTINETTI: Yes, Your Honor. And I'm glad you asked that because I was off track. You're right. We filed an appeal, and we did seven -- the first five through attorneys for AMI Coaches -- corrective action plans that are like a phonebook that show all this. And I did do my own after I got rid of the attorneys because I couldn't afford them anymore. I spent 1.2 million with these guys. I got rid of them after five rejected corrective action plans. I did two more myself.

1	And just so you know, when you think, Oh, we're the
2	good guys and I'm talking about you when I say
3	that we're putting the bad guys out of business.
4	Again, I want to make a comparison, so you understand
5	where this is going to go if it has to. Ride the Ducks
6	kills people; they are back on the road in three months.
7	Airline Shuttle has never had a violation, a ticket, a
8	speeding ticket probably a parking ticket but
9	nothing, and we're out of business for life without an
10	investigation. That's a problem. That's a problem for
11	even you guys.
12	And what I'm saying is: I know you're all innocent
13	now, but you're not going to be in the future if you
14	don't investigate this or let us dispute these false
15	violations.
16	JUDGE PEARSON: So I just wanted to
17	clarify, which you did, that there was follow-up
18	MR. VALENTINETTI: We did seven
19	corrective we asked for an immediate hearing for
20	AMI Coaches, we did
21	JUDGE PEARSON: I've got it.
22	MR. VALENTINETTI: Give me just one minute
23	or 30 seconds.
24	JUDGE PEARSON: No, you've already
25	explained this. I don't want to hear it again. I just

1	wanted to know if you ignored it or took action. It			
2	sounds like you took action but were unsuccessful. I			
3	don't have any further questions.			
4	MR. VALENTINETTI: We never had a hearing,			
5	ever, because they are hiding.			
6	JUDGE PEARSON: Gotcha. Do you have			
7	anything else you want to say?			
8	MR. VALENTINETTI: Yeah, that's not my			
9	closing. That's just me talking to his thing.			
LO	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So I believe			
L1	Mr. Roberson			
L2	MR. ROBERSON: I'm finished.			
L3	JUDGE PEARSON: So if you have anything			
L4	new you want to tell me in the next two minutes, you can			
L5	do so now. Please don't repeat anything you've already			
L6	said. Anything new you want me to consider, you have			
L7	two minutes.			
L8	MR. VALENTINETTI: Your Honor, what I			
L9	would like for the Commission to do because I realize			
20	these are new people, yourself included, to what's going			
21	on here we did a hearing way back in 2000, which none			
22	of you guys were here then. I was. I don't want you			
23	guys to point your fingers at the Feds and I know			
24	it's the government, and I'm making a joke a little bit,			

but I want you to do your own work.

3

4

5

6 7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

I want Mr. Perkinson to call U.S. HealthWorks. I want him to call Doug Ferguson and say did he have insurance or not? Because I am confused. He said he did and he didn't. We want to make sure if we put this guy on the road that he's got all this stuff or he's done it. We are confused now because we read this thing from the Feds, yeah, he is showing he's got evidence here that shows he does.

I want you to do your own work. I don't want you to say it's been found because they did that to you. They are pointing their finger at you now. They are saying John Foster, it wasn't us. And you're saying John Foster didn't work for the Feds. They said, Oh, yeah, he did. I'm just saying, in this tribunal here, let's focus on Go VIP. And so, Matt, when I give you an application, and I say, Yeah, we have drug and alcohol testing. We have insurance. You can check to see if we really do. That's No. 1. And No. 2, if you think -and I know you do, I get it, that's why we're here -- if you think there is noncompliance in the past, then do your own research, even though it's not your deal. Do your own research before you make a decision hanging on to the neighbor's leg thinking, Well, they must have done it, because they say you did it. They are pointing their finger back at Foster now.

And you know what? I'm just going it stop with that. But that's what I want you to do for Go VIP. Why should this -- why should you shut down and stop -- and when I say it, you guys probably giggle -- the No. 1 company in the United States, do you know a company that's gone 24 years without an accident? I don't. State patrol doesn't. Nobody has.

I worked for a school bus company that is great.

I'm not going to say which district. You can figure it out if you want. They are great people. They are good drivers. They are safe. They are all about kids. And in the first week of 2017, they had nine accidents.

Nine in seven days. And you know what? I don't see them sitting here. I don't see you guys saying, You know, we really don't have jurisdiction but we're going to step across the line and shut them down. It's not your thing. It's not.

And it's the same with Airline Shuttle. We have a great record. We have great customers -- or had, past tense -- and now we're shut down without a review forever. You say, Well, the other guy said this and the other guy said that. There has never been a hearing, there has never been witnesses, there has never been a Doug Ferguson or other people come to testify.

You said yourself, you don't think we have

2.0

jurisdiction. But that affects our future. For you to even write that letter, Mr. Perkinson, that's public record. So when we go to -- let's say we turn on Go VIP, and I go to Microsoft and say, Hi. Starline says, Yeah, that's that guy who was shut down. Look in the documents. He has a history of noncompliance. When we go to Amtrak, which you know is government owned, and that's a big deal, that's really why we're here. Do you understand that, Your Honor? I won't explain it, but do you understand that's why we're here.

JUDGE PEARSON: I do.

MR. VALENTINETTI: When we go to Amtrak and bid for a multimillion dollar busing contract where we're way better, way better than Starline and MTR, even though they have pretty buses and a nice office and the guy is rich, we respond quickly for them and do great work. When we go to do that, in their vetting process they are going to look at what you said. They are going to look at what John Foster said, which makes me crazy. Now you're adopting that.

So what I'm saying is I want you to do your own work. Don't adopt Foster. Don't adopt the Feds. You check yourself. That's what I'm asking this group to do. You're hanging on to a leg that you don't know -- you just really don't know what's coming. That's not a

threat, you just don't get it.

If we had two hours, if we were really off the record, I would tell you what's going on and you would say, Oh, my God. And you probably would believe 50 percent of it. Then you do a little investigation, and you would believe 90 percent. This is not a self-serving thing. This is Go VIP wants to do good service, we're going to do afterschool sports. We're going to try and do a flight crew again, even though you've -- not you but the DOT -- have ruined our reputation.

You know, it's fun stuff. That's why we do it. If
I wanted to make more money, I wouldn't work for a
school bus company working a bus route with 70 screaming
kids in the back. It's not about money for me. It's
about I like this business. And whether you guys are
the professionals or not, guess what, I do a better job
than you do at it. I know this business. I've been
doing it for 24 years. I know what safe is. That's why
we have a company that's operated this long without
accidents. I know who the good drivers are.

This isn't a Steve thing: I ski better than you. I drive better than you. I operate a company better than you. I know you have a job to do, and I appreciate that. But what I'm asking you is that you really do it.

1	Do your own investigation. Sorry, Your Honor. Go
2	ahead.
3	JUDGE PEARSON: Are you done?
4	MR. VALENTINETTI: Not really, but go
5	ahead.
6	JUDGE PEARSON: That was my question, is
7	whether you were done.
8	MR. VALENTINETTI: No, but go ahead.
9	JUDGE PEARSON: You're out of time. So
10	I'm not sure what else you want to add at this point. I
11	think you've been very thorough and you've given us a
12	lot of information.
13	MR. VALENTINETTI: I think that there is
14	no way that the UTC should ever try and stop as a
15	matter of fact, I'll go five more if this is my closing.
16	Is that what you're saying? Or is he going to do one?
17	JUDGE PEARSON: It is your closing. He
18	doesn't have anything else to say. You've already gone
19	past the two minutes that I gave you. I can't imagine
20	that you're going to say anything that you haven't
21	already said.
22	MR. VALENTINETTI: I am. If Go VIP is
23	stopped, from what you guys don't know, I gave you the
24	tip of the iceberg. This is not about safety, this is
25	not about violations, this is about discrimination. And

1	it's sad. Because I'll tell you, I was a professional
2	athlete. So you know what? I never see it. I grew up
3	never seeing it because I'm a cool guy. I'm the big
4	deal, and I made a lot of money. I never saw it.
5	But now, a few years later, it's okay for me to
6	drive a bus, but not own it. Now that I'm not a
7	professional athlete, all of a sudden I'm going, Oh, my
8	God. This is what it's like. I can't believe it. It's
9	disgusting. It's wrong.
10	And if you guys knew it I know it's hard for you
11	to get it. I know it's really hard for you to get it,
12	because I didn't get it through my years of growing up.
13	I thought discrimination, what's that? I make a lot of
14	money. I get whoever I want. I buy whatever cars I
15	want. I can do whatever I want. It's no problem. It's
16	years later I'm trying to run a big company and all of a
17	sudden the laws are different for me. All of a sudden,
18	we don't believe what you say. All of a sudden the
19	insurance
20	JUDGE PEARSON: Hold on. What basis do
21	you believe you're being discriminated against?
22	MR. VALENTINETTI: I believe that it's
23	differential treatment.
24	JUDGE PEARSON: On what basis?
25	MR_VALENTINETTI: Meaning basis

1	meaning? Do you want to hear a little bit of it?
2	JUDGE PEARSON: No, when someone alleges
3	discrimination, it's usually on a basis, such as race,
4	gender, sexual orientation
5	MR. VALENTINETTI: Race, color, two. I
6	don't want to go into it here, but I'm happy to if you
7	want to give me 15 minutes.
8	JUDGE PEARSON: No, I don't. I just
9	wanted to clarify.
10	MR. VALENTINETTI: I mean, why else would
11	the UTC be trying to stop a company that's never had an
12	accident, when you guys and I'll just throw the
13	stone you guys put Ride the Ducks back on the road
14	with 400 violations
15	JUDGE PEARSON: We've already talked about
16	that. I don't want to talk about it again. So you feel
17	you're personally being racially discriminated against?
18	MR. VALENTINETTI: I think our whole
19	office was. I think that Foster came in and thought,
20	Look, they are foreigners and they are taking our
21	friend's business, which is Evergreen Trails, which I
22	have all of that here too.
23	And it is new. I want to say so you get the big
24	picture from before. Evergreen Trails in 2011 who is
25	nobody, I know nobody knows who Evergreen Trails, it's a

1	big ghost, it's MTR, Starline, Shuttle Express they
2	filed with the Commission a certificate for convenience
3	to have all the transportation from Seatac Airport to
4	downtown Seattle for airline crew. They have never done
5	it in their life before, but they are trying to shut me
6	out. The Commission passed it. Who is
7	Evergreen Trails? We don't know. We've never heard of
8	them. But now that's there.
9	So let's say that Airline Shuttle comes back and
10	says, Hey, Delta Airlines, we want to do your
11	transportation like the old days. No, we can't do it.
12	We have to go through Evergreen Trails. Why is that?
13	Why would you pass that? Why would you do that? Yes, I
14	believe that we are my office, the Chinese girl, the
15	black girl, me, they think we're foreigners. Let's just
16	switch them and let's not let them have a review. Let's
17	not. Let's just say we reviewed it and that's it. And
18	that's where you're at.
19	That's why I'm asking you guys, who I know are not
20	part of that. You're normal people. But I don't care
21	if they worked here and it's your dad or whoever, your
22	friend, those guys aren't. There is a lot of money.
23	There is a \$54 billion transportation thing in the next
24	12 years here in Seattle, and people are scrambling

around for it. And the way they do that, since they

1	can't out-perform us, and they can't do a better job and
2	their marketing is worse than ours, they come to you
3	guys and say, Hey, Airline Shuttle is no good or
4	AMI Coaches is killing us. Can you take them out? And
5	you guys, Okay, we'll do it. I want you to do your own
6	homework.
7	JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Valentinetti, you're
8	repeating yourself. I'm done. We're good.
9	MR. VALENTINETTI: Okay.
10	JUDGE PEARSON: So before we adjourn, I
11	just want to let everyone know that I'm not going to be
12	able to issue an order within ten days as the APA
13	requires for adjudicative proceedings. I'm going to
14	need the transcript available to me when I'm making my
15	decision, and we usually receive that within 7 to
16	10 days after the hearing. I anticipate I will issue an
17	order five business days from the date that I receive
18	the transcript, at the latest. I just wanted to give
19	you a timeframe what you can expect. Okay?
20	Is there anything further before we go off the
21	record?
22	MR. VALENTINETTI: I have a tiny bit more.
23	I do.
24	JUDGE PEARSON: No. We're going to be
25	done for the day. Okay?

1	Thank you for coming here. Thank you for explaining
2	in detail. I understand very well what it is that
3	you're trying to say and what your position is here. So
4	I appreciate you taking the time out of your day to come
5	and make a presentation.
6	MR. VALENTINETTI: Well, I've had three
7	years time waiting for the first hearing.
8	JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Well, I'm happy we
9	could do that for you today.
LO	MR. VALENTINETTI: I wish it was a little
L1	sooner, but yeah.
L2	JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. Then we will
L3	be off the record and we are adjourned.
L4	(Proceedings concluded at 11:52 a.m.)
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
) L	

CERTIFICATE

I, Laura Gjuka, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, residing at University Place, Washington, authorized to administer oaths and affirmations pursuant to RCW 5.28.010, do hereby certify;

That the foregoing Verbatim Report of Proceedings was taken stenographically before me and transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of the proceedings, including all questions, objections, motions and exceptions;

That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;

That upon completion of signature, if required, the original transcript will be securely sealed and the same served upon the appropriate party.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 1st day of May, 2017.

Laura Gjuka, CCR No. 2057