

Response to Bench Request No. 1
Cameron Brewer d/b/a Reliance Moving
Regarding **Docket TV-180213**

I, Cameron Brewer am, requesting an exemption from WAC 480-15-302(2) and (8)(a) so that I might obtain a permit to operate as a motor carrier of household goods.

WAC 480-07-110(2)(c) states that the factors considered in determining whether or not an exemption should be granted include:

1) Whether the rule imposes an undue hardship on the requesting person of a degree or a kind different from hardships imposed on other similarly situated persons.

As stated in my testimony on May 15, 2018, my wife and I have invested all of our personal savings into Reliance Moving. I am the sole provider for our family of four and in order for the business I have invested in to begin generating income, I need to obtain the permit required by the UTC. If made to wait several years to receive this permit, it would present a significant financial hardship to my family and myself. I have met all other criteria mandated by the UTC for this permit and it is my intent to fulfill and maintain all requirements to operate legally as a motor carrier of household goods in the state of Washington.

2) Whether the effect of applying the rule to the requesting person would be contrary to the underlying purposes of the rule and the public interest.

The purpose of the rule is to protect the public. It stands to reason that if it were my intent to mislead or harm the public in any way, that I would not be applying for a permit from the UTC, traveling to hearings three hours from my home, investing all of the money at my disposal, and trying to grow Reliance Moving, by the book. I take pride in my work and see this company as a reflection of myself. In life and in business, I act with integrity and when necessary, make every attempt to right wrongs. Barring a petty theft conviction within the last five years, I have met all criteria required by the UTC for this permit, including all insurance coverage limits and background checks for potential employees. Again, it is my intention to remain in good standing with the UTC for the entirety of this business venture.

In response to the commission staff's reply to Bench Request No. 1, regarding its recommendation and its assertion that I may have intentionally provided inaccurate testimony, I have attached documents provided by my legal counsel, The Law Offices of Earl Carter. As I testified, I was unable to attend all legal proceedings in California regarding a petty theft case. My lawyer appeared on my behalf for two cases at the same time, one of which was the petty theft and one of which was for unpaid traffic violations. Communication between my lawyer and I was minimal, at best. I spoke mostly to his legal assistant and only as regularly as I needed to issue them payment. I received counsel on which documents to sign, which programs to enroll in (including electronic monitoring), and which fines to pay. I did not question what I was advised to

do and I never received clarification about which programs and fines pertained to which cases. It appears that I was also confused about the definition of summary probation, as I believed that all cases were closed, per a letter from legal counsel. I still, looking over the documents in my possession, have trouble understanding the forms and the legal terms used within them. I simply followed instructions, completed programs and paid fines so as to avoid a failure to appear and a warrant for my arrest. It has never been my intention to mislead the commission and in hindsight, it would have been in my best interest to bring all of my documents to the hearing so that we all might have a clear understanding of the case in question.

I appreciate the careful consideration of this case as it is certainly unique and I would be happy to speak directly with commission staff, legal counsel, or the Judge overseeing this case, should further information be required.