March 15, 2016

Steven V. King, Executive Director and Secretary

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W.

P.O. Box 47250

Olympia, Washington 98504-7250

RE: *WUTC v. Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24*

 Docket TC-152296

Review of Safety Management Plan

Dear Mr. King,

In December 2015, commission staff (“Staff”) completed a compliance review investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 (“SeaTac Airport 24” or the “Company”). The compliance review investigation resulted in a proposed *unsatisfactory* safety rating for SeaTac Airport 24.

The factors that contributed to the proposed unsatisfactory rating were 47 violations of critical regulations.

Staff also found 1 violation of 1 critical type regulation but the violation found did not establish a pattern and therefore was not a factor in determining the proposed safety rating. Staff also found 1 recordkeeping violation of 1 non-acute/non-critical regulation.

Carriers that receive a proposed unsatisfactory safety rating have 45 days to request and receive a change to the proposed unsatisfactory safety rating. The request must be based upon evidence that the company has taken corrective actions to address the violations identified and that company operations currently meet the safety fitness standards, as specified in 49 CFR Parts 385.5 and 385.7.

SeaTac Airport 24 received notice of its proposed unsatisfactory safety rating on January 22, 2016, and the 45 day period to request and receive a safety rating upgrade ended on March 7, 2016. The Company also received a packet of information explaining the requirements it was to meet in its safety management plan.

In a February 9, 2016, Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate, the commission instructed the Company to submit its proposed safety management plan no later than 5:00 p.m. Friday, February 26, 2016.

The Commission held a hearing on March 7, 2016 to determine if SeaTac Airport 24 had submitted and had approval of an acceptable safety management plan. The hearing also addressed the pending penalty assessment against the Company under Docket TC-160187. After hearing from Staff and Mr. Maurou, in consideration of Staff’s recommendation, the administrative law judge ruled orally from the bench and canceled the Company’s operating authority effective March 8, 2016. The judge indicated she would contemplate the penalty assessment and issue an order both affirming the March 8, 2016, cancellation and delivering her decision on the penalty assessment within 10 days. The judge’s order – Order 01 in the consolidated Dockets TC-152296 and TC-160187 – was issued on March 15, 2016.

The administrative law judge also notified the Company that they had 30 days to submit an acceptable plan and if done, could apply for reinstatement. If this is not completed within 30 days, under commission rule (WAC 480-30-181) the Company would have to file an application for authority as new applicant and meet the conditions of new applicants.

**On March 9, 2016, after receiving extensive guidance from Staff, SeaTac Airport 24 submitted its final safety management plan. Staff reviewed and evaluated the plan and makes the following recommendation.**

Staff believes the Company’s safety management plan meets the requirements of 49 CFR Part 385, and recommends that SeaTac Airport 24’s safety rating be upgraded to conditional. Staff requests that the commission issue the attached letter to Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24.

Once the safety rating is upgraded, SeaTac Airport 24 can apply for reinstatement through April 7, 2016 (30 days from the March 8 cancellation). If the Company is successful in having its operating authority reinstated, Staff intends to conduct another compliance investigation within six months to ensure the Company is remaining in compliance with commission rules and requirements.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. O’CONNELL

Assistant Attorney General
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