	Daga 1	1	Dono 2
_	Page 1		Page 3
1	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE	1	HEARING VOLUME I: INDEX
2	UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	2	WITNESSES: PAGE
3		3	WITNESSES: PAGE MATT PERKINSON Examination by Mr. O'Connell 10
4	In the Matter of the Investigation of:)	4	DAVE PRATT
5	Investigation of:) Docket No. TC-152296 SANI MAHAMA MAUROU d/b/a SEATAC) AIRPORT 24)	5	Examination by Mr. O'Connell
6	AIRPORT 24)	6	Examination by Mr. O Conneil 90
7	For Compliance with WAC)	7	EXHIBITS FOR IDENTIFICATION NOTICED/ADMITTED
8	480-30-221) ′	8	1 - Notice of Intent to Cancel 9
9		9	Certificate as an Auto Transportation Carrier
10	CANCELLATION PROCEEDING	10	
11	VOLUME I, PAGES 1-101		Notice Rescheduling Brief Adjudicative Proceeding 9
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RAYNE PEARSON	11	MP-3 Auto Transportation Authority 12 Application
13		12	
14	9:30 A.M.	13	MP-4 Staff Assignment Report, 10/9/14 14
	MARCH 7, 2016	14	MP-5 Documentation provided during 17 Investigation
15	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest Olympia, Washington 98504-7250	15	MP-6 Documentation from Closing Interview 28
16	Olympia, Washington 98504-7250	16	MP-7 Application for Mitigation 31
17		17	MP-8 Email, dated 2/25/16 32
18		18	,
19	REPORTED BY: ANITA W. SELF, RPR, CCR #3032	19	DP-9 Memorandum of Recommended Penalty 61 Assessment 61
20	Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC. 1325 Fourth Avenue	20	DP-10 Notice of Penalties Incurred and Due 65 for Violations of Laws and Rules
21	Suita 1840	21	
22	Seattle	22	DP-11 Safety Management Plan 46
23	800:846.6989 National	23	DP-12 Response to Safety Management Plan 47
24	www.buellrealtime.com	24	
25			
		25	
		1	
		-	
_	Page 2		Page 4
1	Page 2 APPEARANCES	1	Page 4 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016
1 2	APPEARANCES	1 2	_
	_		OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016
2	A P P E A R A N C E S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON	2	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016
2	A P P E A R A N C E S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Washington Utilities and January Commission	2 3	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M.
2 3 4	A P P E A R A N C E S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Washington Utilities and January Commission	3 4	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M.
2 3 4 5 6	A P P E A R A N C E S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Washington Utilities and	2 3 4 5	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEAR SON Washington Utilities and Jansportation John Box Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504	2 3 4 5 6 7	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Washington Utilities and Janson Eyeggreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FORWASHINGTON UTILITIES AND	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Washington Utilities and Janson Eyeggreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FORWASHINGTON UTILITIES AND	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Washington Utilities and Janson Eyeggreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FORWASHINGTON UTILITIES AND	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON JUDGE: RAY	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Washington Junion Communication Communication Communication States of Every General Communication States of Communication Communica	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Transportation Commission 1300 Bo. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 EORWASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSISTED ALOUGH GENERAL O'CONN	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Washington Junion Communication Communication Communication States of Every General Communication States of Communication Communica	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON Transportation Commission 1300 Bo. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 EORWASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSISTED ALOUGH GENERAL O'CONN	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate as an Auto
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate as an Auto Transportation Carrier and Notice of Brief Adjudicative Proceeding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate as an Auto Transportation Carrier and Notice of Brief Adjudicative Proceeding. That same day, the Commission issued a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate as an Auto Transportation Carrier and Notice of Brief Adjudicative Proceeding. That same day, the Commission issued a penalty assessment in the amount of \$29,200 in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate as an Auto Transportation Carrier and Notice of Brief Adjudicative Proceeding. That same day, the Commission issued a penalty assessment in the amount of \$29,200 in the Docket TC-160187 for violations of vehicle and driver
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate as an Auto Transportation Carrier and Notice of Brief Adjudicative Proceeding. That same day, the Commission issued a penalty assessment in the amount of \$29,200 in the Docket TC-160187 for violations of vehicle and driver safety requirements.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate as an Auto Transportation Carrier and Notice of Brief Adjudicative Proceeding. That same day, the Commission issued a penalty assessment in the amount of \$29,200 in the Docket TC-160187 for violations of vehicle and driver safety requirements. On February 20th, the company filed an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: RAYNE PEARSON TAINS PEAR ON COMMISSION: ANDREW J. O'CONNELL ASSING SEPERATE OF WASHINGTON ON THE LAND CONNELL OF WASHINGTON ON	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, MARCH 7, 2016 9:30 A.M. PROCEEDINGS: JUDGE PEARSON: Then let's be on the record. Good morning. This is Docket TC-152296, which is captioned in the matter of the Investigation of Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport 24 for Compliance with WAC 480-30-221. My name is Rayne Pearson. I'm the administrative law judge presiding over today's brief adjudicative proceeding. Today is Monday, March 7, 2016, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. On February 9th, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Cancel Certificate as an Auto Transportation Carrier and Notice of Brief Adjudicative Proceeding. That same day, the Commission issued a penalty assessment in the amount of \$29,200 in the Docket TC-160187 for violations of vehicle and driver safety requirements.

4

6 7

8

9

10

12 13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

1

2 3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 5

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

included a request that these two matters be consolidated and heard at today's brief adjudicative proceeding.

And I'm assuming that Staff does not have any objection to consolidating these two dockets for the purpose of addressing both matters here today; is that correct?

MR. O'CONNELL: That's correct, your Honor. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Then those matters are consolidated, and we will hear from the parties on both dockets this morning. I will take appearances and hear from each party in just a moment.

The Commission issued both the Notice of 14 Intent to Cancel and the penalty assessment following a compliance review conducted by Commission Staff in December 2015, which resulted in the proposed unsatisfactory safety rating. The company had 45 days 18 from the day it received notice of the proposed unsatisfactory safety rating on January 22nd, 2016, to request and receive an upgraded safety rating.

And today, March 7th, is the 45th day. So at the conclusion of the hearing, I will be issuing a ruling from the bench with respect to the Commission's Notice of Intent to Cancel in Docket TC-152296.

And with respect to the penalty assessment,

My name is Andrew J. O'Connell, Assistant Attorney General, representing Commission Staff. My address is 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive SW, P.O. Box 40128, Olympia, Washington 98504. My telephone number is area code (360) 664-1192, my fax number is (360) 586-5522, and my e-mail address is

Thank you, your Honor.

A-o-c-o-n-n-e-l@UTC.wa.gov.

JUDGE PEARSON: And, Mr. Maurou, if you could state your name and address for the record and spell your last name for the court reporter.

MR. MAUROU: My name is -- first name is Sani, S like Sam, A like America, N like Nancy, I like India; and middle name is Mahama, M like mom, A like apple, H like home, A like apple, M like mom, A like apple; and the last name is Maurou, M like mom, A like apple, U like university, R like row, o-u.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And your address? MR. MAUROU: My address is 1800 South Jackson Street, Apartment 211, Seattle, Washington 98144.

JUDGE PEARSON: And your phone number? MR. MAUROU: My phone number is (206) 319-7076, and my e-mail address is my first name and last name, SaniMaurou@yahoo.com.

Page 6

I will issue a written order within ten days reflecting my decision.

When I call on each party to testify, I will swear you in with the oath of witness so that anything that you tell the Court will be under oath and will be considered sworn testimony. For the court reporter's benefit, please speak slowly and clearly and please be sure to use the microphone on the table in front of you. And once you are sworn in, you can present your testimony and you can also introduce any exhibits that you've pre-filed and I will rule on the admissibility of each of those.

Because Staff initiated both enforcement actions, Staff will go first this morning. And then following Staff's presentation, Mr. Maurou, you will have the opportunity to ask Staff's witnesses any questions, and then you may present your testimony after that. And once you're done testifying, Staff's attorney will likely have some questions for you. Okay?

Do you have any questions or does that all make sense?

MR. MAUROU: It makes sense, your Honor. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So first, let's take an appearance from Commission Staff, Mr. O'Connell. MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you, your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So Mr. O'Connell, you may proceed when you're ready.

I believe we have two matters to address today: The penalty assessment against SeaTac Airport 24 and the safety rating that you mentioned briefly before. Both of these issues arise from the critical violations of WAC 480-30-221 that Staff discovered during its compliance review of SeaTac Airport 24.

MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you, your Honor.

There were six categories of violations, and four critical violations were discovered. Those four are: Using a driver not medically certified; failing to maintain a complete driver qualification file on each driver; failing to keep minimum records of vehicle inspection and maintenance; failing to prepare daily vehicle inspection reports.

In total, Staff found that there were 292 occurrences of these violations, and this resulted in a penalty assessment against the company.

These critical violations also have an impact on the Company's safety rating. As a result of these critical violations, the company received a proposed safety rating of unsatisfactory.

Any company has 45 days to upgrade its

Page 8

Page 7

Page 9 Page 11 **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON** rating before being put out of service. A company can upgrade its safety rating by submitting an acceptable Commission? 1 2 safety management plan to Staff and to the Commission. 3 A. About five years. 3 Q. Do you receive regular training as a special 4 SeaTac Airport 24 has submitted a safety 4 investigator? 5 management plan to Staff, but Staff does not find it acceptable and will present evidence today to explain 5 A. Yes. 6 7 why it thinks the Company's authority to operate should Q. And were you, in fact, attending one of those 8 be cancelled. trainings last week from March 2nd through 4th? Briefly, your Honor, WAC 480-30-171, A. Yes, I was. 9 10 Subsection 2, states that the Commission may cancel a 9 Q. I'm sorry. I think I got the day wrong. certificate for cause. Staff believes the evidence 10 Was it March 1st through the 3rd? presented today will establish cause for cancelling 11 A. Yeah, last week. Travel day on Monday. 12 13 SeaTac Airport 24's authority to operate. 12 Q. So what are your duties as a special 14 Staff requests at this time that your Honor 13 investigator? take official notice of Exhibits 1 and 2. Thank you, 14 A. Conduct compliance reviews and review companies 15 15 for safety performance. 16 your Honor. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And those are the Q. Okay. Did you conduct an investigation of 16 17 Notice of Intent to Cancel and the Notice Rescheduling SeaTac Airport 24? 18 17 the Brief Adjudicate Proceeding, and I will take 18 A. Yes. 19 official notice of both of those exhibits. Q. Was that investigation a compliance review? 19 20 20 21 (Exhibits 1 & 2 noticed.) MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you, your Honor. 21 Q. What authority does SeaTac Airport 24 hold from 22 Commission Staff would ask that we proceed 22 the Commission? 23 by asking Investigator Matt Perkinson to testify. 23 A. SeaTac 24 has auto transportation authority and 25 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Perkinson, please 24 a charter permit. 25 Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the Page 10 Page 12 EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON** stand and raise your right hand. document that's been marked as Exhibit MP-3 for 2 identification. Will you please identify that document in that packet in front of you? 3 MATHEW PERKINSON, witness herein, having been 3 first duly sworn on oath, A. Okay. So this is the auto transportation 4 5 was examined and testified application submitted by SeaTac Airport 24. 6 as follows: Q. And have you reviewed this document? 7 7 A. Yes, I have. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. You may be seated. 8 Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the document 8 9 MR. O'CONNELL: And for the record, that you viewed? A. Yes. your Honor, I handed a packet of the exhibits to 10 10 Mr. Maurou right before this proceeding began. Staff 11 Q. Okay. 11 also has a copy. Are you in need of a copy? 12 MR. O'CONNELL: Staff offers Exhibit MP-3, 12 JUDGE PEARSON: I actually have everything. 13 the Company's Application for Authority. 13 Thank you. 14 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And I will take 14 15 MR. O'CONNELL: Okay. 15 official notice of this as a Commission record. DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 (Exhibit MP-3 noticed.) 16 17 BY MR. O'CONNELL: 17 MR. O'CONNELL: Okay. Q. So, Investigator Perkinson, would you please 18 BY MR. O'CONNELL: 18 Q. Are there -- so, Investigator Perkinson, are 19 state your name and spell it for the record? A. Mathew Perkinson, M-a-t-h-e-w P-e-r-k-i-n-s-o-n. there any limitations to the Company's grant of 20 20 21 Q. And what is your occupation? authority to operate? 21 22 A. Special investigator. A. Yeah. The Company can only operate from the 22 Q. Who is your employer? west end, downtown Seattle, to Seattle International 23 A. The Utilities and Transportation Commission. Airport, Snoqualmie Casino to the Seattle International 24 Q. How long have you been employed by the Airport, and from the Best Western Sky Valley Inn in 25

charter carrier?

company?

A. Yes.

A. Yes.

investigation?

A. Yes, they do.

under a single contract.

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1 2

3

5

8 9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

guide.

Company?

A. Yes.

your investigation?

A. Yes. I have.

identification.

In the Matter of the Investigation of: Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport Page 13 Page 15 EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON** Monroe to the Seattle International Airport. exhibit and mark it as MP-4. 1 2 Q. Does the Company also have authority as a (Exhibit MP-4 admitted.) 3 BY MR. O'CONNELL: Q. What prompted Staff's investigation of this Q. So what does this mean? 5 company? A. The Commission received complaints regarding the A. Basically, they're -- they have a permit that 6 would allow them to transport a group of individuals 7 Company's operating authority and where it was operating and determined that a compliance review was appropriate. Q. Okay. Does Staff have any history with this Q. Okay. Please explain what you did as part of 10 your investigation of this company. 11 A. There's a few stages of our investigations. The Q. And did you review this history as part of your first would be pre-investigation, which is basically 13 just reviewing all the Commission records, the history 14 that a company may have with the Commission. Q. What history does Staff have with the Company? 15 Next, an appointment was set up through e-mail A. Staff has sent several technical assistance 16 for November 3rd. A letter was sent that requests several documents be ready for review when we show up. letters to the Company regarding its operating 17 authority. SeaTac 24 was also visited for an initial 18 And then on November 3rd, we met with Mr. Maurou to review his records. And then SeaTac 24 provided technical assistance visit in October of 2014 by my boss 19 additional records November 11th. and one of my former colleagues at the time. 21 And then on January 22nd, a closing interview During the meeting, they went over hours of service, driver qualifications, insurance, vehicle 22 was done, which is when we go over the compliance review inspections, and provided Mr. Maurou with the safety 23 and give the Company any additional records that may be 24 needed. 25 Q. Okay. So in general, what does Staff look for Q. Is there a record of that interaction with the Page 14 Page 16 **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON** on a compliance review? 2 A. Just we're there to make sure that the operation Q. And have you reviewed that record as part of the 3 is being performed safely. 4 Q. Okay. And you mentioned that the Company produced some records for you to view. What records Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the were submitted by the Company? document that has been marked as Exhibit MP-4 for 7 A. The Company provided about five or six records, 8 a document that was -- resembled hours of service. Will you please identify that document? However, I couldn't make out -- or John or myself couldn't really make out what was on the record. It was like more like a scratch note, an incomplete application 11 12 for a driver Mr. Ndow, which was dated June 19th, 2015. 13 There was a driving abstract for Mr. Ndow, dated 14 October 21st, 2015, two driving abstracts for Mr. Maurou, one was May 19, 2014, and another June 11th, 15 2015. 16 17 There was another driving abstract for Mr. Said,

A. This is an assignment report completed by John Foster and Aaron Salinas.

Q. Is this the record that you were just speaking of that's the record of the interaction on October of 13 2014?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Okay. And have you reviewed this document? 16

Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the assignment report that you viewed?

A. Yes, it is.

MR. O'CONNELL: Staff offers Exhibit MP-4.

JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Maurou, do you have any

objection to admitting this exhibit? 23

MR. MAUROU: No, your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I will admit that

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

rotation.

another driver dated from 2013. And then a driver's

And one more document was -- it was just

different dates, March, July and September, like I said,

indicating oil change, general maintenance and tire

basically a listing of some oil changes, general

maintenance and tire rotations. There was three

license for Mr. Maurou issued in 2013.

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the 1 Q. Were they certified? 2 A. No. document that has been marked as Exhibit MP-5 for 3 identification. Q. How did you make this determination? 3 4 4 A. Basically, the Company provided no medical Can you please identify this documentation? A. This appears to be the records that were 5 certificates, and then I reviewed the driving --5 provided during the review and also the additional 6 drivers' time records. 7 driver time records that were submitted later on. 7 Q. Okay. And about the driver time records, can Q. Okay. Does this documentation include you please identify in Exhibit MP-5 what documentation 8 9 everything that was given you by the Company at your you considered when making that determination? And visit with Mr. Maurou and afterwards? And by 10 please identify for us where the driver time records afterwards, I mean as part of your investigation. 11 are. 11 12 A. Yeah. Yes, it appears so. 12 A. Sure. 13 Q. Okay. Have you reviewed all of these documents? 13 Q. I believe there are page numbers for your A. Yes, I have. 14 reference. 14 Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of all the 15 A. So page 11 looks like the beginning for Ndow 15 documents that you viewed? 16 Yankuba, and then it goes through to page 25, and that's 16 A. Yes. both Sani Maurou's time records and Ndow Yankuba's. 17 17 MR. O'CONNELL: Staff offers Exhibit MP-5. 18 Q. Okay. How many times did you determine that 18 19 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Maurou, do you 19 Mr. Yankuba drove without being medically certified? 20 20 have any objection to this exhibit? A. 114. MR. MAUROU: No, your Honor. Everything are 21 Q. And how many times did you determine that 21 22 Mr. Maurou drove without being medically certified? 22 correct. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Then I will admit 23 23 24 that and mark it as Exhibit MP-5. 24 Q. Are these critical violations? 25 25 (Exhibit MP-5 admitted.) A. Yes, they are. Page 18 Page 20 EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON BY MR. O'CONNELL: 1 Q. Why? Q. Investigator Perkinson, what, if anything, did A. For one, the Code of Federal Regulations you find concerning about these records produced by the 3 3 identifies them as critical. The Commission believes Company? that it's in the public's safety -- or that it's 5 A. I guess just a lack of records that were there. critical to public safety and that it's in the public's The driver qualifications files were incomplete. There best interest to prevent accidents, basically ensuring was no DVIRs, so no daily vehicle inspection reports, 7 that drivers are medically examined. and didn't appear to be any kind of a preventative 8 Q. Okay. Does this violate the requirements of WAC maintenance plan in place. There wasn't any vehicle 9 480-30-221? inspections being done, as far as I could tell. And 10 A. Yes. 10 probably the biggest concern was the lack of the medical 11 Q. So how many violations does it constitute that certificates in the files. 12 12 the Company didn't have medical certifications for its Q. Okay. Let me ask you a little bit about those 13 drivers? 13 in particular. 14 A. It would be two violations with 247 occurrences. 14 What sort of medical certification is needed for 15 Q. Did you also request that the Company present drivers such as are employed by this Company? its driver qualification files for each driver? 16 16 17 A. A driver is required, per the federal 17 A. Yes. I did. regulations, to be examined by a doctor from the 18 Q. Did the Company produce these files? 18 national registry. Basically, they ensure that the 19 A. A couple of files. driver's fit and qualified to operate a commercial motor 20 Q. Okay. What does Staff look for when evaluating 20 vehicle. 21 these files in particular? 21 22 Q. Okay. And did you determine whether Mr. Ndow A. That the file is complete and accurate. 22 and Mr. Sani Maurou were medically examined and 23 Q. Okay. What are these files required to contain?

Page 17

certified?

A. Yes.

24

25

24

A. The file is required to have a driver

application, a driver's initial abstract, annual

Page 19

Page 21 Page 23 **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON** driver's certification of violations, a road test, maintenance plan, there was no proof of repairs or 1 medical card, and then a note relating that the carrier receipts to back up the oil changes or tire changes or ensured that the medical card was issued by a doctor off items that had been done, and then no proof of annual 4 inspections. 4 of the national registry. Q. And were these files that the Company submitted 5 Q. Did the Company indicate anything to you about 5 complete? 6 why it could not produce more complete records of 6 7 A. No, they weren't. vehicle inspection and maintenance? Q. What was missing in the files that the Company A. Once again, just that that was all the records 8 8 9 gave to you? 9 that they had. A. The applications were incomplete. There was the 10 Q. How many vehicles does this Company have? initial abstract missing. The driver review record was 11 A. They have four vehicles and operate two of 11 missing. There was no road test, no medical card, and 12 those. 13 then also no note verifying that the medical card was 13 Q. Okay. Are these critical violations? issued by a doctor from the national registry. 14 14 Q. Did the Company indicate why these files were 15 Q. And does this violate the requirements of WAC 15 incomplete? 480-30-221? 16 16 A. No, just that that was all of the records that 17 A. Yes. 17 18 Q. So how many violations does this constitute? 18 he had. Q. So since you -- how many -- how many drivers 19 A. Two violations. 19 does this Company have? Q. And did you request that the Company present its 20 20 21 daily vehicle inspection reports? 21 A. Two. Q. And did you determine that the Company had 22 A. Yes. I did. 22 failed to keep driver qualification files for both 23 Q. Did the Company produce these records? drivers in this company? 24 A. No. 24 A. Yes. 25 25 Q. When are such reports expected to be filled out? Page 22 Page 24 **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON** Q. And are these critical violations? 1 A. Every day that the vehicle is operated. 1 2 2 A. Yes. Q. And did you determine whether Mr. Yankuba or Q. Does this violate the requirements of WAC Mr. Maurou operated a company vehicle without preparing 3 3 480-30-221? a daily vehicle inspection report? 4 5 A. Yes, I did. A. Yes. it does. Q. So how many violations does the Company's Q. How did you determine this; what did you look 7 at? failure to maintain complete driver qualification files constitute? 8 I used the drivers' time records. 9 A. Two. 9 Q. Are these critical violations? 10 A. Yes. 10 Q. And we'll move on to another area. Did you also request that the Company present 11 Q. Does this violate the requirements of WAC 11 12 480-30-221? 12 its records of vehicle inspection and maintenance? A. Yes, I did. 13 A. Yes. 13 Q. Did the Company produce these records? 14 Q. So how many violations did the Staff determine 14 this constitutes? 15 A. Again, just a limited record. 15 Q. Okay. What does Staff look for generally when A. It would be 41 violations. 16 16 Q. Okay. So in total, how many critical violations 17 evaluating these records? 17 did you find during your investigation of SeaTac Airport A. A preventative maintenance plan, receipts 18 18 24? 19 showing repair, and that there's some sort of a system 19 20 A. It would be four violations with 292 20 in place to -- for safety. 21 occurrences. Q. And were the records submitted to Staff by this 21 Company satisfactory to Staff? 22 Q. Has the Company done anything to remedy these 22 critical violations that Staff discovered? A. No. 23 23 Q. Why not? 24 A. Yes. 24 A. Again, there was no -- no preventative 25 Q. What has the Company done?

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON

A. We received a medical card for Mr. Ndow on December 11th following the compliance review and a couple other things. We have a safety management plan now.

There's been an attempt by Mr. Maurou to get a medical certificate. It appears that they resolved a daily vehicle inspection report issue, but there was about four other items I think we'll address later that were not included.

- Q. Yeah. I would like to come back to the safety management plan in just a moment.
- 12 A. Sure.
- 13 Q. Did you discover any other violations?
- 14

1

4

5

6 7

9

11

20

21

22

24

3

5

7

Q. What were those? 15

A. There was two other violations, basically 16 17 396.17, no periodic inspection for the vehicle; and then in 387 is proof of insurance on file at the principal 18 place of business. 19

Q. Okay.

MR. O'CONNELL: Your Honor, before I continue. Staff asks at this time that your Honor take official notice of WAC 480-30-999, Subsection 2. That's where the Commission adopts by reference Title 49 of Code of Federal Regulations, and Staff would also ask

Page 26

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON

that you take official notice of the relevant sections of Title 49.

JUDGE PEARSON: And I will take official notice of both of those things.

MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you, your Honor. May I continue?

JUDGE PEARSON: Yes.

BY MR. O'CONNELL: 8

- Q. Investigator Perkinson, did you have a closing interview with the Company to share the results of your 10 investigation? 11
- 12 A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Who did you speak with? 13
- A. Mr. Maurou. 14
- 15 Q. Did you give Mr. Maurou any documentation?
- 16
- 17 Q. And did you explain the documents to him?
- A. Yes, I did. 18
- 19 Q. What did you give him?
- 20 A. I gave Mr. Maurou a copy of my compliance review, the Capri report is what it's called; fitness 21
- safety rating explanation, it breaks down the rating; a 22
- table of violations; and then one other document, a
- 24 safety rating upgrade request, which basically informs
- 25 SeaTac 24 how they can request to have their rating

1

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

21

22

24

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

17

18

20

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON upgraded.

Page 27

Page 28

2 Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the document that's been marked as Exhibit MP-6 for identification. Will you please identify that 5 documentation?

- 6 A. This appears to be the documents that were provided to SeaTac Airport 24 during the closing.
- Q. Are these all the documents that you provided to 8 9 SeaTac Airport 24?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And is this a true and accurate copy of the documentation that you gave to the Company?

A. Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: Staff offers Exhibit MP-6. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Maurou, do you

16 have any objection to this exhibit?

MR. MAUROU: The only thing I can say regarding medical certificates, we -- I mean, I and my driver have medical certificates. When Mr. Perkinson came back, it was the only thing that was not recent --

> JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Let's save that --MR. MAUROU: -- but we have one. At

least we have -- everybody has it.

JUDGE PEARSON: Let's save that for when you're sworn in and giving testimony. Right now, we're

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON

just talking about this document and whether you object 2 to this.

3 MR. MAUROU: Oh, no. Everything is correct, your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Then I will admit that and mark it as Exhibit MP-6.

(Exhibit MP-6 admitted.)

MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you, your Honor.

9 BY MR. O'CONNELL:

- Q. Investigator Perkinson, does this documentation contain an explanation for calculating the Company's proposed safety rating?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Can you please turn and identify that page in the exhibit? 15
- A. Page 16. 16
 - Q. Now, what proposed safety rating did the Company receive?
- 19 A. Unsatisfactory.
- Q. Will you please explain how the factors on page 21 16 calculate or how they -- how the factors reach that proposed safety rating of unsatisfactory?
- 23 A. Sure. There was six different factors. When you do a compliance review, each violation or accident
- has a weight associated with it or a point value. In

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

no later.

Commission.

A. Yes.

mitigation?

A. Yes, he did.

A. February 25th.

A. Yes.

Company?

In the Matter of the Investigation of: Sani Mahama Maurou d/b/a SeaTac Airport Page 29 Page 31 **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON** this case, there were two factors that became 1 received it? 2 A. I forwarded it to John Foster, my boss, and Dave unsatisfactory due to two points of violations. As a result, the entire review becomes unsatisfactory if two Pratt, I believe, got a copy. Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the 4 or more categories go unsat. Q. Okay. So if a Company has two or more 5 document that has been marked as Exhibit MP-7 for categories that are themselves unsatisfactory, then they 6 identification. would receive an overall proposed safety rating of 7 Will you please identify that document? unsatisfactory; is that correct? 8 A. Yeah. That would be an application for A. That's correct. 9 mitigation. Q. Okay. And at your closing interview did you 10 Q. And is this the application for mitigation that inform the Company of its opportunity to upgrade its 11 Mr. Maurou sent to you? safety rating? 12 A. Yes. 13 A. Yes, I did. Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the document Q. And did the documentation you gave the Company 14 that you received? include a checklist to help guide the Company through 15 A. Yes, it is. this upgrading of their safety rating? 16 MR. O'CONNELL: Staff offers Exhibit MP-7. 17 JUDGE PEARSON: And I will take official Q. Have you had -- since the time of your closing 18 notice of that as a Commission record. interview, have you had any further interaction with the 19 (Exhibit MP-7 noticed.) BY MR. O'CONNELL: 20 A. Yeah. Mr. Maurou and myself have spoke on the Q. On Mr. Maurou's application for mitigation, what phone a couple of times. 22 box did he check? Q. And about when was that? A. Application for mitigation, I admit the A. The 19 -- February 19th of this year and violation, but I believe that the penalty should be February 24th. reduced for the reasons set out below. Page 30 Page 32 EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON Q. And what were those interactions about? 1 Q. Did he include any reasons why he believes that 2 the penalty should be reduced? A. On the 19th, we discussed the hearing today and then how to submit a safety management plan. I informed 3 A. No. him that it had to be submitted prior to February 26th, Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the document that has been marked for identification as And then I provided Mr. Maurou with several Exhibit MP-8. templates, documents that he could use in his safety 7 Will you please identify that document? management plan that he was going to submit back to the 8 A. This would be the received e-mail that I got from Sani on the 25th, and then I'm forwarding to the 10 And then February 24th, I received a draft records center asking them to add it to the docket, 160187. safety management plan from the Company, and I provided 11 feedback via the telephone and informed SeaTac again 12 Q. Okay. And is this a true and accurate copy of that the penalty assessment response was due no later 13 the e-mail trail that you sent? 14 A. Yes. than that day. Q. About the safety management plan, in your 15 MR. O'CONNELL: Staff offers Exhibit MP-8. conversation, did you indicate what supporting 16 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And, Mr. Maurou, do documentation he would need to provide? you have any objection to this e-mail being admitted? 18 MR. MAUROU: No, your Honor. Q. And did Mr. Maurou send you his application for 19 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I will admit that. mitigation of the Company's penalty assessment? 20 MR. MAUROU: Everything correct.

Q. When did you receive his application for

Q. And what did you do it with it after you

21

22

23

24

mark it as Exhibit MP-8.

BY MR. O'CONNELL:

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I will admit that and

Q. Mr. Perkinson, did you receive a proposed safety

(Exhibit MP-8 admitted.)

Page 33 Page 35 **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PERKINSON** EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT Commission. management plan -- a final proposed safety management 1 2 plan from the Company? 2 Q. How long have you been employed by the A. Yeah, I did. 3 Commission? 3 4 4 Q. And when did you receive it? A. I've been here 11 years. A. It would have been in the evening, 5 Q. And what are your responsibilities as the 5 February 29th. 6 assistant director? 6 A. I oversee the transportation safety program for 7 Q. What did you do with that safety management 7 plan? motor carrier safety and rail safety and also the 8 9 A. Again, it was forwarded to my boss, and Dave 9 licensing program for the Agency. Pratt received a copy. 10 Q. Are you familiar with the company SeaTac Airport Q. And who from Staff reviews the safety management 11 24 and/or its owner. Mr. Sani Maurou? 11 12 plan? 12 A. Yes, I am. 13 13 A. I did, and Dave Pratt reviewed it. Q. Do you recall what authority to operate this Q. Okay. If I could --14 company has from the Commission? 14 MR. O'CONNELL: Actually, I think I will 15 A. Yes. They currently have both auto 15 transportation and then charter and excursion, which is stop there. Thank you. 16 16 I have no more questions for Investigator a permit that comes together. 17 17 18 Q. Okay. What history does Staff have with this 18 Perkinson, your Honor. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. 19 19 company? Mr. Maurou, do you have any questions for 20 A. Well, the history, as I have it on record, goes 20 all the way back to July of 2013. We originally became 21 Mr. Perkinson? MR. MAUROU: No, your Honor. Everything is aware of this company as a non-permitted carrier. We 22 correct. received complaints from SeaTac Airport and a couple of 23 24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. regulated carriers complaining that he was operating in MR. MAUROU: Yeah. their territory without the proper authority. 25 Page 34 Page 36 **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT** JUDGE PEARSON: All right. Mr. O'Connell, 1 I continued to -- we reached out and contacted 1 2 if you'd like to call your next witness. Mr. Maurou back then. He did submit an application in MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. If I could, I'd like March of 2014. It took about six months for that to go 3 3 through the process. to now call Mr. Dave Pratt. 5 5 JUDGE PEARSON: All right. During that time, we communicated with him Mr. Pratt, if you will stand and raise your numerous times about what he needed to do or not to do 7 7 right hand. as far as his permit. We continued working with Mr. Maurou when he got his permit, which was in early 8 9 DAVID PRATT, witness herein, having been 2014, and we had a technical assistance visit. 10 When we have a new passenger carrier on board, first duly sworn on oath, 10 11 we -- we pay the carrier a visit, we inspect the 11 was examined and testified 12 vehicles they're going to use to transport passengers, 12 as follows: 13 and we provide technical assistance, which means we go 13 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. You may be seated. over all the requirements that are required for a 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 company like this to operate, specifically on the safety BY MR. O'CONNELL: requirements, and we do cover some of the operating 16 16 17 Q. And would you please spell -- state your name 17 authority as well. and spell it for the record? 18 Q. If I can, I'd like to direct your attention to 18 Exhibit MP-4 for identification -- I'm sorry -- what's 19 A. Yes. My name is David Pratt. David, then 20 been now admitted as Exhibit MP-4. 20 Pratt, P-r-a-t-t. 21 Q. And what is your occupation? A. Okay. 21 22 Q. Do you recognize this document? A. My title is the Assistant Director for 22 23 A. Yes. This is the report I mentioned that was --23 Transportation Safety. it's dated October 9th, 2014. It was a report from Q. And who is your employer? 24 A. Washington Utilities and Transportation Staff, John Foster and Aaron Salinas, when they gave the 25

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

initial technical assistance visit and vehicle 2 inspections.

Q. Okay. Did they pass inspection; did the Company's vehicles pass inspection?

A. Yes, they did.

3

4

5 6

7

8

11

18

20

21

22

25

3

4

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

20

21

22

23

Q. What else -- what else does Staff do at these inspections?

A. Besides doing vehicle inspections, Staff tries 9 to do their best to help educate the carriers to know what the basic requirements are for safety. They talk about the recordkeeping requirements, they talk about the retention, and specifically in this case, on the 13 report, Mr. Foster wrote that he provided technical assistance on hours of service, driver qualifications, 14 vehicle maintenance, including annual inspections, 15 insurance requirements, and then the daily vehicle 16 17 inspection reports. They show the carrier a copy of our safety guide, which we provide to all carriers on the first visit, which also contains all the forms required 19 for the recordkeeping requirements that the carrier can use to be in compliance.

Q. And about this document, is your signature on this document somewhere?

- 24 A. Yes, yes, page 4.
 - Q. So I stopped you briefly, and I'd like to give

Page 38

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

you an opportunity continue. You were elaborating upon your familiarity and the Staff's history with this company.

A. Yes. Staff has a long history with this company. Besides going back to when we first reached out to him as a non-permitted carrier and he started, he came into compliance and got a permit, but we have been following up with Mr. Maurou probably at least ten times since that date. I have letters and e-mails explaining to Mr. Maurou that he's operating way outside of his authority that was granted by the Commission and asking him to please comply. And Mr. Maurou has not been cooperative.

He has not corrected any of the issues we talked to him about. He repeatedly expressed his uncertainty with the rules and how to comply. So we continued to give him information. We continued to tell him what he could and couldn't do. We continued to remind him of what his auto transportation authority allows him to do, and what his charter authority allows him to do, and asked him to please make those changes.

We were especially concerned about his website which advertised trips from all over the state for fares that did not appear to be within his fare that he has 24 filed with the Commission. And one of my Staff even had EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

1 a conference call with Mr. Maurou back in August of last year to kind of personally talk to him to help him 3 understand, and yet we have not -- still not been able 4 to get him to comply. What we were attempting to do then was to try and show that he had not been compliant with his certificate and that he was not coming into 7 compliance.

When we could not get any records from Mr. Maurou or get any evidence, that's when I decided to schedule a compliance review. It was already on our books to be scheduled for the summer of -- earlier this 12 year -- or I'm sorry, late last year, and because we 13 couldn't get the other records, we went ahead and moved up the compliance review earlier, thinking we could go 14 there and do that, and that would have Staff actually on premises to gather the records that we could use.

Q. And I want to ask you some more questions about that review, but first I'd like to ask, have there been any past cases with this company?

A. Yes. And thank you for reminding me. Mr. Maurou also had a docket in front of the case -- in front of the Commission last year, TE-152 --I'm sorry, TE-151029. He did not file his 2014 annual report as required.

I will note that he did file it by August of

Page 40

Page 39

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

2015 that year, and that would be on there. He did only say that he had one vehicle and only paid for one vehicle on his regulatory fees. So he did file the report and pay the required fees, but he did not pay the penalty, which was a thousand dollars.

And in September of 2015, that debt was sent to collections by the Attorney General's office. As of today, I have no record of any payments being made.

MR. O'CONNELL: So, your Honor, at this time, Staff would ask that you take official notice of Commission record regarding Docket TE-151029.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And I will take official notice of that.

BY MR. O'CONNELL:

Q. And, Mr. Pratt, returning to the compliance review that's at issue in this case, how were you involved in this matter and in the compliance review concerning this company?

A. Okay. Well, as my role as the manager of this program, we have a protocol where my staff prepare the reports. Mr. Perkinson, he provides that to his supervisor, John Foster, who reviews it for accuracy and completeness. The two of them work on it to make sure it's in that condition, and then it is forwarded to me for review.

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

I have the final review to determine if I think it's -- it contains all the required elements, it's accurate and it's complete, and then I sign off on the report with recommendations if they're needed.

- Q. And -- okay. Are you aware that Staff found violations through its investigation of this company?
 - A. Yes, I am.

1

4

6 7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

3

5

7

9

10

12

14

16 17

18 19

20

23

- Q. And are you familiar with the penalty assessment related to those violations?
- A. Yes, I am. I instigated the penalty assessment.
- Q. And are you aware that the Company received an unsatisfactory safety rating resulting from those violations?
- A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Okay. I'd like to start by asking about the Company's unsatisfactory safety rating and the process that is triggered when any company receives this safety rating.

We've heard from Investigator Perkinson about his compliance review and the proposed safety rating of unsatisfactory. In general, what do these safety ratings signify; what do they mean?

A. Well, safety rating -- and there are three, I 24 might add. There's satisfactory, conditional or unsatisfactory, and through a formula and an algorithm

Page 42

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

that's used in the program that does this, you look at the number of violations, you look at sample sizes that are chosen, and it helps determine the condition of the company's safety program and their operations and helps determine whether or not the company has the proper safety management controls in place to operate safely.

Q. And in general, what happens or what is the process after a company received a proposed safety rating of unsatisfactory?

A. Okay. Well, as you mentioned earlier, through 11 adoption by reference, the Commission has adopted 49 CFR, specifically Part 385, and in that rule, Part 385 states that carriers that receive unsatisfactory safety ratings have 45 days to request and receive a change to 15 that proposed unsatisfactory rating. The request also must be based on evidence that the company has taken corrective actions to address the violations identified. and that they currently meet the safety fitness standard as is specified in Part 385.

In other words, what the company has to do is they have to prepare a safety plan to us that identifies 21 three basic characteristics; one, how did the violations 22 occur; two, what have they done to correct those violations; and then three, what have they done to 24 ensure they don't occur again in the future.

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

1 Q. And are you involved in making an evaluation of 2 that safety management plan?

A. Yes. I am.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

3

5

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

23

- Q. Okay. In general, what would be the problem caused by any company failing to keep its drivers with a current medical certification?
- A. Well, without having medical certification, it gives no assurances that the drivers do not have any medical issues which might impact their driving which could cause an accident or an incident that could endanger the passengers on the vehicle or the traveling public that's out there next to them.
- Q. Investigator Perkinson found other violations. He named the vehicle inspections and maintenance, the driver qualification files and the daily vehicle inspection reports.

What is the concern with these violations and how does it affect a safety rating?

A. I'd say the concerns are that there appears to be very, very little recordkeeping being done, which means the Company really has no idea if they're in compliance with the safety requirements. It has no idea if the vehicles are safe to operate. They do not do any daily checks to make sure that, on a daily basis, those vehicles have not had something occur from the day

Page 44

Page 43

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

before, or whether it should be corrected. And it just -- in a bigger picture, it outlines the fact that this company does not have a safety program in place to ensure that they're operating safely and protecting the passengers and the public.

- Q. Are you familiar with SeaTac Airport 24's efforts to upgrade its rating from its proposed unsatisfactory safety rating?
- 9 A. Yes. I have reviewed the safety management plan 10 that was submitted.
 - Q. And you already covered this a little bit, but I want to ask again to make sure we're clear. What did the Company -- what did the Company need to do to upgrade its unsatisfactory safety rating?
- A. Okay. Well, as mentioned earlier, in the Part 385 process, the Company has 45 days from the day of the proposed unsatisfactory rating, which would have been January 22nd, and in that 45 days, they have to provide a plan to us and give us enough time to review it to 20 ensure that they will meet the standards set in 385, 21 which, again, means that they need to provide a plan 22 that says, here's what allowed these violations to occur, here's what they've done to correct them, and here's what management controls they have in place to

ensure that these violations do not occur again in the

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

future, and it must also provide evidence and documentation.

An example I'll use there would be the medical cards. They would need to produce a copy of their valid medical card for each of the two drivers as part of the plan, and it would also need to include a process that they're going to have in place to make sure those cards do not expire in the future and the drivers do not drive without a valid medical card.

- Q. Now, the Commission ordered that the Company submit a safety management plan for approval by February 26th, 2016, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.

3

7

9

11

17

18

21

22

1

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

- Q. Did Staff receive a safety management plan from the Company on February 26th?
- 16 A. No, we did not.
 - Q. Did Staff at any time receive a safety management plan from this Company?
- A. Yes. We received a hard copy in the mail on the afternoon of Monday, February 29th.
 - Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the document that has been marked as Exhibit DP-11 for identification.
- A. DP-11. Okay. That's a copy of Mr. Maurou's safety management plan.

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

1 BY MR. O'CONNELL:

Q. Mr. Pratt, did Staff make an evaluation of this safety management plan?

Page 47

Page 48

- A. Yes. As per the process I described earlier,
 Mr. Perkinson took the first review of it. I believe he
 sat down with his supervisor, they talked about it, and
- then the three of us sat down together and went over the criteria and went over the plan very detailed and
- 9 reviewed each of the pieces that were there that were 10 required to be there.
- Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the document that has been marked as Exhibit DP-12 for identification.
- A. Yes. That would be the memo that I submitted on March 4th, 2016, to the judge regarding my review of the safety management plan.
- Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the document you wrote?
 - A. Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

5

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

MR. O'CONNELL: Your Honor, Staff would ask that you take official notice of this document that was submitted in this docket.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I will take official notice of that.

(Exhibit DP-12 noticed.)

Page 46

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

- Q. Have you reviewed this document?
- 2 A. Extensively, yes.
 - Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the document that you viewed?

A. Yes.

6 MR. O'CONNELL: Staff offers Exhibit DP-11, 7 your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: And, Mr. Maurou, do you have any objection to admitting that? It's the proposed safety management plan that you submitted to the Commission.

MR. MAUROU: Yes. But --

JUDGE PEARSON: I'm just wondering if you're okay with us admitting that into evidence. You can speak to it a little bit later.

MR. MAUROU: Okay. I will say yes, and I have some -- a little bit -- I don't know if I can call them changes or amendments.

JUDGE PEARSON: Well, we can take that up when it's your turn to testify, but right now, I just am asking if you have any objection to --

MR. MAUROU: No. It is correct, your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. All right. Then I
will go ahead and admit that and mark it Exhibit DP-11.

(Exhibit DP-11 admitted.)

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

1 BY MR. O'CONNELL:

Q. And, Mr. Pratt, can you please explain Staff's evaluation and recommendation regarding SeaTac Airport 24's safety management plan?

we look for three basic things: Were the violations correct or why were the violations allowed to occur?

Were they corrected, and do they have a plan in place to prevent them again in the future? And did they provide documentation. So we sat down and we went through each violation and made that assessment based on each one.

As you noticed on the other exhibit that we had

A. Sure. As mentioned, when we review this plan,

earlier -- it would be the 385 process, which was included in the packet that Mr. Maurou received at closing process on January 22nd -- it lists seven criteria that Staff reviews in reviewing a safety management plan. So my memo address each of those seven criteria.

I can go through those if you'd like.

- Q. If you could briefly, please.
- A. Okay. So basically the first criteria is: Does
- 22 the plan address each acute and critical violation and
- 23 does it also address the other violations that occurred.
- 24 Now, I would say, yes, Mr. Maurou did address each of
- 25 the six violation types.

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

these things have been corrected.

1

3

6 7

8 9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

1 2

3

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

20

21

22

24

Page 49

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

25

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

The second piece is: Identify why the violations were allowed to occur, and this is probably the one that causes me the most concern. Mr. Maurou repeatedly stated throughout his safety management plan that he did not understand the rules and that he had not received enough training. And I, Staff, take exception to that.

I believe, again, as I've talked earlier, I can -- I can identify at least ten occasions that we reached out to Mr. Maurou to explain what he could or couldn't do. With our original visit, we gave him a safety manual which had all the forms he needed to use.

And so as we went through the plan, we looked at that. Again, I don't think he accepted ownership that the violations occurred because he did not learn what the requirements were and he did not implement the requirements to be in compliance.

I will also say that, on his initial Application for Authority, under Section 7, he did sign his name 12 times stating that he was responsible for understanding and complying with all these rules; and in Section 8, he did sign again declaring that he, as an applicant, understands the responsibilities of a passenger transportation carrier and he's in compliance with all local, state and federal regulations.

2 I found many gaps in this part of my analysis, I 3 found many pieces missing from the safety management 4 plan, and my memo does describe them in detail. 5 Specifically, of the six violation types, I believe only two of them showed evidence of correction. Four have 7 not been corrected completely, if at all.

Driver qualifications files, I think, is an important one, which is the 391.51(a) violation. There are approximately nine criteria that must be met under that particular step. What was missing in that file was a note relating to the annual review of the drivers' driving record. That's important, so that it means they have that in their record that they can look to make sure that the drivers are in compliance.

There was not a listing or certificate related to the violations that were required under 391.27. There was not a note in the file which required verification that the medical cards were obtained from a provider that's on the national registry. That was the 391.51 violation.

Regarding the violation for not having medical cards, there were medical cards for both Mr. Maurou and his other driver in the plan. I have to say, though, Mr. Maurou's medical card was not valid. It was not

Page 50

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

I would also state that, as far as why the violations were permitted to occur, Mr. Maurou, as a business owner in the state of Washington, is required to know the rules he's required to follow. And my assessment of this criteria was that Mr. Maurou has not taken the time to learn what the safety requirements are that his company is obligated to follow.

Q. If I can, I want to interrupt you just for a moment. On the spectrum of companies that need little to no assistance from Staff and those companies that require a lot of assistance from Staff, where in your experience does this company lie in that need?

A. I'd say it's at the -- it's high up on the scale of a company that needs help, and that's why we've tried to repeatedly help him understand, with many things in writing, letters, phone calls to try and help him understand the requirements.

Q. Okay. I want to check -- I apologize for interrupting you. If you could please continue explaining your rating.

A. Okay. I would be moving on to criteria number 3, and that criteria says that you discuss the actions that were taken to correct the deficiencies that allowed the violations to occur, and this is where they have the chance to include the documentation or evidence that

Page 52

Page 51

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

obtained from a doctor that's on the national registry. So, therefore, it was not valid and not acceptable.

And I will say that again, during the technical assistance meeting, and in an e-mail that followed up later, Mr. Maurou was told about the national registry. He was provided a link in an e-mail note that took him to the national registry that he could look up and identify an appropriate doctor he could visit to get his medical certification.

Moving on from there. Regarding the 396.17, which is the periodic inspection violation, Mr. Maurou did not include any evidence or documentation that he had had his vehicles inspected or had a periodic inspection conducted within the last 12 months.

Q. And what kind of inspection is Staff expecting there to be records of?

A. This would be an inspection that's conducted by a DOT certified inspector. It's consistent with what we call CVSA, Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, inspection, which is what our Staff perform. We go through extensive certification to receive that.

Most major automobile companies, dealers and so forth, have mechanics on staff that have this certification. They can do an inspection and provide the documentation for that.

4

5

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

1 2

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

Q. Thank you. Please continue, Mr. Pratt.

JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. O'Connell, if I could interrupt you for one second. I am missing page 4 of that exhibit, for whatever reason. They didn't print it off or something happened to it. So if you have another copy --

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

MR. O'CONNELL: I do have another copy. If I may, I'll hand it right up to you.

JUDGE PEARSON: Sure.

MR. MAUROU: I am missing the same thing. MR. O'CONNELL: You're missing page 4 as

12 well?

1 2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

3

4 5

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

MR. MAUROU: Right.

THE WITNESS: So in the interest of double-sided, I'm on page 4. So I am on page 4 of that memo now. Thank you.

Then the next violation I looked at was the 396.3 violation, which requires carriers to maintain minimum records of inspection of vehicle maintenance. There really was not enough evidence provided to show that this violation was corrected.

The plan did have documents that showed he was starting to maintain some vehicle records. He had taken one form out of our safety guide and filled it out that showed some minor repairs, as Mr. Perkinson

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT 1 complete, but I will note that the date that he submitted was different than the date that was on the 3 DVIR by one day.

The next criteria -- so we looked at that criteria that talks about were the violations corrected. So in my opinion here, four of the six were not corrected.

So then we take the next step, which is we look at criteria 4, which outlines the actions that they're going to take to ensure that similar violations do not occur again in the future. They also must demonstrate here that operations meet safety fitness standard.

I believe Mr. Maurou has not demonstrated 15 that he has adequate safety management controls in place. His plan did not provide any documentation that the driver qualifications files were complete, no documentation that he had periodic inspections, he had an invalid medical card, and we have no scheduled maintenance plan.

I will say Mr. Maurou did indicate, though, his plan is to set up calendar reminders to ensure these things are done, but he did not provide any documentation to show those calendars reminders, and that would have been a nice benefit to be able to see

Page 54

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

testified. Tire rotations, oil changes, some things were in there, but it didn't show anything about a scheduled maintenance plan, which is a specific requirement of 396.3.

And it's 396.3(b)(2) requires a means to indicate the nature and due date of various inspection and maintenance operations. And what that means is the carrier has to have something in his files that says, we will have these vehicles looked at on this date. We will have the oil changes done. We will have 11 inspections done on these dates. All those are contained in the file which helps the carrier then stay on top of things. By doing his annual review of the files, he knows the dates that those things are due.

The next violation was 397.31, which is proof of insurance. The Company did not have proof of insurance at their home office. Mr. Maurou has corrected that one and did provide a copy of his insurance policy and stated in his plan that he was keeping a copy in his business office.

And then finally, the last violation was daily driver vehicle inspection reports. Mr. Maurou did provide a copy of one. We call these DVIRs for short. 24 He did find a copy of a DVIR that was completed by his driver from one day. I will accept that as being

Page 56

Page 55

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

those to show that they were set up.

The next criteria going down the list is an open-ended question that says, if there's anything else you wanted to talk about, including training, reorganization, purchasing things, that you're going to be doing to help implement these -- these -- these corrections and maintain them in the future, that this is the place to do it. He did not include any references in this and did not address this question.

However, Staff believes he should have some kind of training plan in place to ensure that his driver knows these requirements and that, if there's some changes that have occurred in the company, that the driver's aware of what he has to do.

Again, I'll give him credit to say he is planning -- indicated that he's created spreadsheets to track the medical card expiration dates and vehicle inspection dates.

One other criteria is criteria 6, that he's allowed to provide additional documentation relating to motor carrier safety in the prevention of crashes. He did provide a statement in his plan that stated he's never had an accident or vehicle stall or breakdown on the highways in the state of Washington, and I have no reason to believe otherwise from that.

7

8

9

11

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

23

24

Page 57

3

5

7

18

19

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

13

14

19

20

21

22

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT BY MR. O'CONNELL:

Q. And Mr. Pratt, I wanted to ask you a question. Stepping back for a moment, we've been talking a lot about these violations as critical violations, and that's what gave rise to a penalty assessment, that's what gave rise to the proposed unsatisfactory safety rating.

What makes a violation a critical violation, and why is that important for a safety rating?

A. Okay. And I do define this on page 2 of -- I'm sorry. Let me find this under another document I have. Okay. It looks like my memo on page 1. I just want to make sure my page is right.

Critical violations, one, they're identified by the federal government, and a violation can be a critical type. And in order for it to rise to critical, it has to be either more than one or a pattern, and that's based on a sample size.

So example, if we looked at ten files, you had to have at least more than one violation, or a pattern which would be more than 10 percent of a sample size, which in this case, more than one.

But the definition of critical violations is [as read] they're regulations that are identified where noncompliance relates to management or operational

Page 58

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

controls lacking, and they're an indicator of a breakdown in the carrier's management, controls, and through data and studies, pattern and noncompliance with 3 critical regulations, they're quantitatively linked to 5 inadequate safety management controls and what can lead to higher than normal average accident rate.

- Q. And would that -- if there are more critical violations, the more that there are, does that raise Staff's concern about the safety of the operations of any company?
- A. Absolutely, yes.
- Q. So, Mr. Pratt, ultimately, what is your 13 recommendation regarding SeaTac Airport 24's safety rating?

A. Well, I guess I would just summarize by saying the safety management plan that was submitted was not 16 17 adequate, it did not meet the requirements, and it was 18 lacking substantially in many areas to meet it. Based on that review there, and based on my review of the laws and the rules, I believe the plan, the management plan, 20 was not acceptable by the Commission, and under the 21 rules of 385, after the 45th day, Mr. Maurou should not 22 be allowed to operate.

My recommendation is that the Commission cancel 25 | SeaTac Airport 24's charter excursions and auto trans

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

1 operating authority effective midnight tonight, March 7, 2 2016.

- Q. And do you believe there is sufficient cause for the Commission to cancel this company's authority to operate?
- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. If cancelled, what options does this company have to regain its authority to operate? 8
- 9 A. Mr. Maurou would still be entitled to an 10 opportunity to submit a corrective action plan, but I 11 will note, under his auto trans authority, there's a 12 30-day period that he can be reinstated. If he does not 13 complete this within 30 days, under those rules, he has 14 to go through the whole formal docket process on auto 15 trans, which means it's subject to protest by other 16 carriers and has to come back up in front of the 17 Commission to approve his operating authority again.
 - Q. Okay. I want to switch gears and ask you about the penalty assessment in this case.
- 20 A. Okay.
 - Q. Are you familiar with the penalty assessment that SeaTac Airport 24 received?
 - A. Yes, I am.
 - Q. Is there a memorandum that Staff prepared regarding the penalty assessment?

Page 60

Page 59

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

- A. Yes.
- Q. Who wrote that, or who is that memorandum from?
- A. Okay. The memorandum is from me, but it is created and produced by one of my staff for me.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. It's kind of a -- it's a collaboration of my
- 7 recommendations, my notes, the investigator's review of
- the record of the file, of the rules, and then they
- draft it up, provide it to me, I help make final changes
- or the final edits, and then I approve the final
- 11 product, which is sent to the administrative law
- 12 division.
 - Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the document that's been marked as Exhibit DP-9 for
- 15 identification. Will you please identify that document?
- A. Yes. That is the penalty assessment that was 16 17 issued to Mr. Maurou under Docket TC-160187, and it was 18 served --
 - Q. If I -- if I can stop you right there.

Are you sure you're looking at the right document?

- A. I'm sorry. The penalty assessment was under --
- 23 Q. Can I ask you to look at Exhibit DP-9? I apologize if I might have misspoke there and asked the

wrong question.

4

5

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

22

25

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

A. It's all right.

1

2

3 4

5

6 7

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

1 2

3

8

9

10

11

12

14 15

16 17

18

20

Q. Can you please identify this document that's been marked as Exhibit DP-9?

A. Sure. DP-9 is the memo that I write to the administrative law division which describes my concerns and states why I believe a penalty assessment is appropriate. And so I issued this memo on the same date to the administrative law division, recommending a penalty assessment, which was recommended into the second document, which is my Exhibit DP-10.

Q. Okay. Is this exhibit that's been marked as Exhibit DP-9, is it a true and accurate copy of the memorandum that you sent?

A. Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: Staff offers Exhibit DP-9, your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Maurou, do you have any objection to the admission of this exhibit? MR. MAUROU: No, your Honor. It's correct. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Then I will admit that and mark it as Exhibit DP-9.

(Exhibit DP-9 admitted.)

BY MR. O'CONNELL:

Q. And, Mr. Pratt, are you aware that this company was assessed a penalty amount of \$29,200 for 292

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

operations into consideration, and then specifically 1 finish that up with a review of the compliance review 3 that occurred that led to the violations.

I also review my enforcement policy. The Commission has an enforcement policy which we use to guide us in penalty cases. Some violations are so serious that they're mandatory penalties. And so I look at those, and then I put it all together and come up with my recommendation based on all those factors and 10 what I believe is an appropriate penalty.

Q. Now, you mentioned that you viewed documentation that you received from the Company. Did you view the documents that Investigator Perkinson received through his investigation that are marked as Exhibit MP-5 in this case?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And did you also consider and view Investigator 17 18 Perkinson's compliance review report, which has been marked as Exhibit MP-6 in this case?

20 A. Yes. That was probably the biggest piece of my 21 review.

Q. Okay. And what, if anything, concerned you about this company's operations that would justify this penalty assessment?

A. Well, one, just the number of critical

Page 64

Page 63

Page 62 **EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT**

violations?

- A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Were these violations regarding the WAC 480-30-221 violations that Mr. -- Investigator Perkinson identified earlier?
- A. Yes, they are specifically connected to those 6 7 violations.
 - Q. Okay. And does this rule incorporate the safety regulations from Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations?
 - A. Yes, they do.
- Q. Okay. Who from Staff determined that the penalty assessment was appropriate? 13
 - A. That would be me.
 - Q. And what information or documentation did you consider when assessing this penalty amount?

A. Well, when I reach a case like this, especially with an unsatisfactory safety rating, I try and look at the entire history of the Company. We maintain compliance files on each company. So I go back and I

look at their history of any visits we've had with them 21 before, any interactions with them. I check into their 22

licensing files about their permits and their

24 requirements. I look at any communications we've had

with them via e-mail or letters, and I take the whole

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

violations. 292 critical violations is substantial. especially for a company this small. But also, my 3 concern was the Company's failure to comply with the repeated times we've talked to them, and their continuing to just state that they don't understand or 6 they're doing what they need to do.

And I believe we've given many, many chances to comply with operating within their authority, and many chances to understand the rules and requirements, and I believe they took no ownership in the safety of their company, and no ownership in saying, we need to do something here.

And I will state that it also, as I was preparing this, I kept waiting to see what was going to come in from Mr. Maurou regarding his safety plan, and I was pretty disappointed when it took 29 days from the day we issued a rating until Mr. Maurou called and asked for help, when he only had two weeks left after that date to file his safety plan. And so the plan reflected the effort he put into it, from my opinion, that he didn't spend enough time doing it and it's an inadequate plan.

So I kind of take all of those factors in mind to say, under a penalty assessment, we assess penalties of \$100 per violation. And so with 292 violations, it's

5 6

7

8

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

3

4

10

12

14 15

16 17

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 65

1

18

19

20

25

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21 22

23

24

25

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

A. Well, for two reasons. On the technical

standing, I guess I would say his request for mitigation

has a statement that he checked the box and signed that

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT \$29,200.

2 Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to the document that has been marked for identification as 4 DP-10.

Will you please identify that document?

A. Yes. This is the actual penalty assessment that was issued by the Commission.

Q. And how are you familiar with this document?

A. Well, I'm familiar because I helped draft one of these up for the administrative law judge, and then once it was issued, it became part of my file and it became the basis for the penalty.

Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the document that you viewed?

A. Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: Your Honor, Staff offers Exhibit DP-10, but would ask that you take official notice as it's been in the -- submitted in the docket of this case.

JUDGE PEARSON: Yes. I will take official notice.

(Exhibit DP-10 was noticed.)

MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you, your Honor.

24 BY MR. O'CONNELL:

Q. Mr. Pratt, if I could ask you about Exhibit

says, I ask to present evidence on the information I 5 provide here, and there's no evidence here. So he gave us nothing to prepare for why he believes he has mitigation. So that's one factor. 8 The factor it was late was the second piece, and 9 then the third part would simply be that the safety 10 management plan did not address the things that led to 11 this penalty, and there's a direct correlation. 12 MR. O'CONNELL: I have no further questions, 13 your Honor. 14 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Maurou, do you 15 have any questions for Mr. Pratt? 16 MR. MAUROU: Once again, I'm not sure how the procedure works. 17

Page 67

Page 68

JUDGE PEARSON: Can you talk a little bit closer to the microphone.

MR. MAUROU: Okay. Sorry. Once again, I was saying I'm not sure how the procedure works. But if I have to answer to Mr. Pratt, he's saying it takes me 29 days to call for help. I'm sorry. You don't know my problems. He knows a little bit. I came -- I went out -- I went overseas for 60 days, I had --

Page 66

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

DP-10 briefly. Does this document indicate how long the Company has in order to request a hearing for mitigation of the penalty assessment?

A. Yes, it does. On page 6 at the top, it does state that you must complete and sign this document and send it to the Commission within 15 days after you receive the penalty assessment. And then it gives him options to choose, whether they just want to pay the penalty or whether they want to request a hearing or whether they want to apply for a mitigation, and then 11 they sign and submit it.

Q. Have you also reviewed Exhibit MP-7, the Company's application for mitigation in this case? 13

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall when Mr. Maurou made his request for mitigation of the penalty assessment?

A. Yes. I will say that it is dated February 25th and the due date was February 24th. 18

Q. Okay. So setting aside the issue of the timing of Mr. Maurou's application for mitigation and the lack of any reasons why he believes the penalty should be mitigated, do you believe mitigation of the penalty assessment is justified in this case?

A. At this time, no.

Q. Why not?

JUDGE PEARSON: Can you speak closer to the 1 microphone? The court reporter is having trouble 3 hearing you.

MR. MAUROU: I say, I went overseas for 60 days. I have family emergency, and Mr. Perkinson knows about it. I came back on January 19th, and Mr. -once again, Mr. Perkinson knows when I will be back, and he called me that day.

And I pick up my phone. He told me, can we come 22nd? I say yes.

And when you come back after 60 days from overseas, you have too many things --

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Maurou, I'm going to need to swear you in if you're going to give testimony. Right now, I need to know if you have any questions for Mr. Pratt before we move on to your testimony.

MR. MAUROU: Yes. No. I was talking about the 29th date call for help, and then for -- and there was a confusion. I have received many times letters changing dates and a date and time for the hearing and postpone -- trying to postpone those dates and --

JUDGE PEARSON: Did you have a question for Mr. Pratt?

MR. MAUROU: Okay. At this time, I will say

Page 69 Page 71 1 no. talk about it, I have those forms with me here. So I --2 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 2 I will expect to give all these forms to you and them. 3 3 MR. MAUROU: I will say no. I have three copies. If you don't mind, I 4 JUDGE PEARSON: So I will swear you in in 4 can pass them and give them to you one by one. But the main thing for me is the medical certificates. just a moment. I do, however, need to take a brief two-minute recess. So we will go off the record for two 6 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. O'Connell? 6 7 or three minutes and then come right back. MR. O'CONNELL: Your Honor, Staff hasn't 7 8 MR. MAUROU: No problem. viewed these prior to today, but I think what Mr. Maurou is -- I think what Mr. Maurou is saying he is giving out 9 (A break was taken from 10 10:50 a.m. to 10:54 a.m. p.m.) is -- are exhibits that he only got on Friday. So I JUDGE PEARSON: We will go back on the 11 don't know --12 record. 12 JUDGE PEARSON: There's no response to the document that was filed on Friday. 13 And, Mr. Maurou, if you would stand and 13 14 14 raise your right hand, I will swear you in and then you MR. O'CONNELL: Correct. So I don't know if can give your testimony. there would have been any time for Staff to have 15 15 reviewed it before today. If I could have a moment 16 16 SANI MAHAMA MAUROU, witness herein, having been 17 to --17 first duly sworn on oath, 18 JUDGE PEARSON: Absolutely, sure. 18 was examined and testified 19 MR. O'CONNELL: -- look at those now. 19 as follows: 20 (Brief pause in the proceedings.) 20 21 21 MR. O'CONNELL: Your Honor, having briefly JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. You may be seated, looked at this exhibit, and possibly for any other 22 22 and I'll remind you to stay close to the microphone so exhibits that Mr. Maurou may offer, Staff would need to 23 that the court reporter can hear you. evaluate those exhibits. In particular, the exhibit 24 25 I did not receive any exhibits from you in 25 dealing with the medical certificate, Staff would need Page 70 Page 72 advance of the hearing today, so I assume that you will to confirm with the national registry whether the doctor just be presenting testimony; is that correct? is on the national registry and make other evaluations 2 3 of the exhibits. 3 MR. MAUROU: I have some exhibits to give you. 4 Staff hasn't had the time to do that at this 4 JUDGE PEARSON: But you did not submit those moment, so Staff is unable to offer a position based 5 in advance of the hearing, which you were required to 6 upon these things. do. So I assume Staff doesn't have a copy and hasn't a 7 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And that makes sense. 8 8 had a chance to review them. And, Mr. Maurou, because we really have MR. MAUROU: No. It's what they sent. The 9 reached the 11th hour here with respect to the clock on 9 letter I received yesterday said -- and I'm sorry, 10 the 45 days that's been run, I think that if Staff is 10 Mr. David send that again. He say four -- four things 11 willing to accept what you have brought, I won't admit 11 were missing. those documents into evidence, but perhaps they could go 12 12 JUDGE PEARSON: Oh, you're talking about the towards your attempt to reinstate your certificate 13 13 Staff's memo that was filed on Friday? 14 within the 30-day timeframe, if Staff would be willing 14 MR. MAUROU: Right. And I have all those 15 to accept them for evaluation on that basis. 15 16 16 four things that were missing. Is that acceptable to Staff? 17 MR. O'CONNELL: It is, your Honor. Staff --17 The first thing is medical -- medical 18 certificates. My doctor called me on Thursday and tell within the 30 days, my understanding is that Staff is me that he did receive call from UTC, and then he went 19 willing to accept any and all documentation which their 19 company would submit to it for consideration. through, explained to me what was the problem. So I 20 went the next day, which was Friday, and I get my 21 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So, Mr. Maurou, you 21 22 medical certificate. So I have my medical certificate may give those documents to Staff for further 22 23 evaluation, but you -- they're not going to be able to 23 here. 24 evaluate them here today. 24 I also have national registry examiners for medical certificate also. And also those forms that I 25 MR. MAUROU: I have -- I have searched for

Docket No. TC-152296 - Vol. I Page 73 Page 75 them for verification. I have it here with me. I will examiner with their ID. So what I just gave you is give them also right away. It will show that this 2 mine. For the other driver, they have verified already. 3 coming from a notarized doctor. I have all those

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I understand that, but I just want you to understand that there's no possible way that Staff is going to be able to complete a full evaluation of all the documentation that you are submitting today, and I am going to have to make my decision on what is in the record before me with respect to your certificate.

documents with me here. I will hand it to you right now

MR. MAUROU: I --

14 JUDGE PEARSON: But you're welcome to hand those documents over to Mr. Pratt and Mr. Perkinson. 15

MR. MAUROU: Okay. Your Honor, I also have the annual inspection reports for those two vehicles.

MR. O'CONNELL: Your Honor, before we go any farther, I want to ask a clarifying question.

JUDGE PEARSON: Sure.

MR. O'CONNELL: Has Mr. Maurou been sworn 22

in? 23

5

6 7

9

10

12

13

16 17

18

19

20

21

24 25

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

to verify.

JUDGE PEARSON: Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: Okay. I apologize. I

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Is that all the documents that you wish to provide to Staff?

MR. MAUROU: I also have -- I will also have -- they request document form and rules. I have a

mandatory training document to share that I will hand to them, and I have also another document, a rule for driver not respecting UTC regulation and rule.

And then the third document will be the request for annual review of the driver. You recall, I have it for myself, Sani Mahama Maurou, and for the -for the driver, Ndow Yankuba. I will hand them, all those four documents to them.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MAUROU: I also have driver reminder file for both driver, myself, Sani Mahama Maurou, and the second driver, Ndow Yankuba, and what the driver manual filed as is [sic], we list the items that may be needed and then the expire dates. That way, we will follow.

And by the same time that we have mention -we have mention in the demand document, we went to electronics, which mean we set up appointment on our cell phones and that will send us text message three

Page 74

missed it.

MR. MAUROU: This is my annual vehicle inspection report.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So I don't want these documents.

MR. MAUROU: Oh, you don't want them?

JUDGE PEARSON: No. I want you just to give them to Staff. There's nothing that I can do with these documents today.

MR. MAUROU: Okay. Okay. So I am giving them the annual --

JUDGE PEARSON: Here, you can speak into this microphone on the table.

MR. MAUROU: Sorry. I am giving them the annual vehicle inspection report for both vehicles.

16 Once again, I'm giving them the annual inspection for the two vehicles and the -- my medical -- medical card.

And also I have the statement of my mechanic who has been working with me for almost ten years, and I will give them also a copy of that.

Okay. Now, what I have here is national medical examine minus [sic] -- with -- with their ID. So I have two doctors here. I will hand them to -- for myself and then for the driver. Those are verification that those documents come from a notarized medical months before the due dates and then also send us the

e-mails. And I can show you -- if you want,

your Honor, I can show you one example on the cell phone that I use for work. If you don't mind, I can come and show you that --

JUDGE PEARSON: That be would something that Staff would have to evaluate.

MR. MAUROU: Okay. I can show them.

JUDGE PEARSON: And maybe at a later time.

Why don't you just give them what you have on paper right now.

MR. MAUROU: Right. Right. So right now, I have given them the driver reminder file for both drivers and show them how I can set up electronically.

For example -- for example -- for example, I will show Mathew and David how I set up the calendar electronical [sic]. Just for one example -- let me search for renew.

> JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Maurou. MR. MAUROU: Yes, your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: This might be something that would be more appropriate to show Staff at a later time because the evaluation of the items that you're submitting just isn't going to happen today.

Page 76

Docket No. TC-152296 - Vol. I Page 77 1 MR. MAUROU: Okay. 2 JUDGE PEARSON: So it's always possible you could take screenshots of that and put it into a 3 document and submit it to Staff at a later time. I'm 4 sure you'll have more contact with Staff after this and more opportunities, but I would like to wrap this up. 6 7 MR. MAUROU: Okay. 8 JUDGE PEARSON: So is that all of the 9 documentation that you have today? 10 MR. MAUROU: No. I have -- I have all that document. I have also the spreadsheet for vehicle reminder file. What vehicle reminder file does is we 12 put -- we write down the items and then the due dates, 13 14 and make some special notes. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 15 MR. MAUROU: So I have for both vehicle that 16 I will hand it to Mathew. 17 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Pratt, did you have a 18

comment? MR. PRATT: Yes. I guess I was just going to suggest that, if we're going to be making a ruling today on what we have, that it might be a better approach to give these documents back to Mr. Maurou and have him formally submit them as his addendum to his safety management plan so we know what they are and we 1 what I have here and --

2

5

6

7

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So I want to -- I want to move on to the penalty assessment mitigation. So what I'm going to suggest is, if you have more things that you want to give to Staff, you can do that at the conclusion of the hearing. And if Staff has feedback about a preferred way that they'd like to receive those documents, then you should get that feedback from Staff, and then I suggest that you follow whatever advice they give you.

But we're taking up a lot of time right now on things that, like I said, Staff simply will not be able to evaluate today. And so I'd rather address that outside the hearing. You can give them the documents when we're done.

MR. MAUROU: Yes, your Honor. You're right. What -- as I said, what I'm trying to do is at least give them what I have here --

JUDGE PEARSON: And I appreciate that. MR. MAUROU: -- and then later send them, probably during the week, and make sure my license not be suspended because of hardship I have on my vehicle.

And it has -- Mathew said -- Mathew knows a little bit about me for the few times when he visit me. I have two vehicle right now. I left for the family

Page 78

can evaluate the packet as it comes in compared to what we have.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. If that's your preference and that's your process, that makes sense.

MR. PRATT: That would probably make it -that would make it -- I think, that way, we'd know what he was giving us. Just a short cover letter that says, I'm sending you the rest of this information. Here it is.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

MR. MAUROU: Can I say something, 11

your Honor? 12

19 20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

JUDGE PEARSON: Sure.

MR. MAUROU: The problem we have here is I'm trying to do my best to give them the documents they need, and I have them here. And if I can give -because I have those documents with me here. They have changed the date of, what it's called, hearing many times.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: That was only changed one time. I'm the one who wrote the notice. 21

MR. MAUROU: I've seen too many letters, to be honest, so it's a little bit confusing.

So I'm trying to do my best. All documents you asked, I have them here, and I will give them, or emergency for 60 days, came back, too many things.

And right now, I am on hardship, and I have ordered two brand new vehicles waiting, not moving. So all those -- all those charges are very, very, very heavy on me. It was very, very difficult to explain.

So what I'm trying to do today is beg the Commission, give them the minimum document I have today, and make sure my license not be suspended, and then give me an extra time to give them all the document. But anything I have here, I give them.

And I think that's just what they need, from 12 what I read the last letter they send me on Friday. I did get it on Saturday. And what is needed, I have them here, and I am handing them today.

JUDGE PEARSON: So I understand that, and I appreciate you making the effort. The bottom line is, we have a 45-day requirement that is federal law. The Commission has no authority to be flexible with that timeframe. And so your best bet now is to attempt to get your certificate reinstated within that 30-day period.

22 MR. MAUROU: Yes. I do understand what the 23 general -- attorney general said. I think he has 24 explained, and I asked questions to David about one-month period, but the problem is, once again,

Page 80

Page 79

6

7

8

9 10

12

17

18

19

21

23

24 25

> 2 3

> > 4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Page 81

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

22

23

looking at the circumstances of where I stand right now, I have my bank account here that I will hand -- hand to you right now, your Honor, and my -- all my vehicles are in mint condition. They are very good.

And I am healthy, my drivers are healthy. The problem is medical certificate, and we are not -- I was not really -- I said I was not really -- I was not really trained with enough.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

MR. MAUROU: And most of my problem were --I didn't write it in my memorandum. Most of my problem were -- we didn't keep the minimum receipts.

13 Now we start asking when they fix, we start 14 asking them, give us a receipt. And when Mathew and John went to -- I assume -- they are brand new, 15 your Honor. They are brand new. Why I spend a lot of 16 money? I don't want those vehicles to be breaking down.

JUDGE PEARSON: I understand.

MR. MAUROU: That's why I spend a lot of money. And right now, I am financial in struggle. So 20 if my license is cancelled today, honestly, that would be a big catastrophic on my life. 22

JUDGE PEARSON: I understand that.

MR. MAUROU: So --

JUDGE PEARSON: I am going to go ahead and

any way. So the Commission will cancel your auto transportation and charter and excursion certificate, 3 which is certificate No. C-65615, effective at midnight tonight, which means that you may no longer operate as an auto transportation or charter and excursion carrier, which includes offering or advertising auto transportation or charter and excursion services.

Page 83

Page 84

So you are ordered to cease and desist all operations until such time that you are either able to get your certificate reinstated within the 30-day period, or if that doesn't happen, you'll have to reapply and obtain a new certificate from the Commission like Mr. Pratt explained earlier.

> Do you have any questions about any of that? MR. MAUROU: Yes. Yes, your Honor. JUDGE PEARSON: You have a question? MR. MAUROU: Yes, your Honor.

18 JUDGE PEARSON: What's your question? And 19 just about what I just told you. We're not going to 20 argue anymore about whether or not this is happening. 21 I've issued my ruling, and that's final.

MR. MAUROU: I --

JUDGE PEARSON: But do you have any logistical questions about what you can and can't do now that your certificate is cancelled effective at midnight

Page 82

issue a ruling on that right now. I want to dispose of this issue so we can turn to the mitigation of the penalty assessment.

MR. MAUROU: Yes, your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: But the bottom line is that Staff reviewed your proposed safety management plan. That's all that I have in front of me today to make a decision on.

Staff's recommending that the Commission cancel the Company's auto transportation certificate, including its charter and excursion authority, effective tonight at midnight.

And based on the testimony and evidence presented today, I'm left with no alternative but to find that the Company has failed to provide an acceptable safety management plan.

According to the evidence that Staff presented and Staff's testimony today, the Company has corrected only two of the six violations identified during the Staff's compliance review. And although, Mr. Maurou, you attempted to introduce additional evidence today, Staff simply does not have an opportunity to evaluate that before the 45 days is up.

And again, that is a federal law. The Commission has no authority to extend it or alter it in 1 tonight? 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

If you don't have any questions, I'd like to move on to the mitigation request for the penalty assessment.

MR. MAUROU: Okay, your Honor. I have a question.

I -- once again, I don't know how your procedure works. I was trying to give them all the documents and then come to have a chance to talk about what's called -- about those sanctions they gave to me.

JUDGE PEARSON: I understand that, but I've 12 explained to you multiple times today that we've simply run out of time.

MR. MAUROU: Okay.

JUDGE PEARSON: So after today, your best bet is to work on getting your certificate reinstated within the next 30 days. It looks like you are on a good path to make that happen. So you'll just want to work at that as quickly as possible so you can get your certificate reinstated.

MR. MAUROU: I know. I know that, your Honor, and I appreciate it. The problem we having from -- they say -- they say when they visit you they will come back after three years, two or three years. So I was visited in 2014, and then they supposed to come

Page 85 Page 87 to me in 2017. So I don't know why they came to me in 1 previously testified to. 2 2014, 2015. So that's another question I'm having. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So this is a written 3 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Well -statement that talks about how the Company is having 4 MR. MAUROU: I feel like I am being treated financial hardship and would like the penalty dismissed, unfairly. and it looks like a copy of Mr. Maurou's online banking 5 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Pratt said to you 6 6 account; is that correct? 7 earlier, Mr. Maurou, it had to do with the fact that you 7 MR. MAUROU: Yes, ma'am. 8 were provided technical assistance about operating 8 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Showing the balance in your bank account -- I don't know that you want this outside of your authority, and that raised a lot of red 9 10 flags for Staff. And that is kind of outside the scope admitted into evidence. It will become a public record. 11 of what we're talking about right now. MR. MAUROU: Yeah. That's fine. That's Because the fact remains that these 12 fine. I cannot hide. I cannot hide. 12 violations occurred, they are critical violations, you MR. O'CONNELL: And, your Honor, if I may --13 14 14 received an unsatisfactory safety rating, and you failed JUDGE PEARSON: Sure. to provide a proposed safety management plan that would 15 MR. O'CONNELL: You know, it is Staff's 15 give Staff any cause to update that safety rating -- or position that these are things that Mr. Maurou has 16 16 upgrade it, excuse me. So I'd like to move on to the 17 previously testified to, but --17 JUDGE PEARSON: I agree. penalty assessment at this time. 18 18 If you have evidence that you would like to 19 MR. O'CONNELL: -- as far as the 19 provide that would support what you believe should be --20 authenticity of all of this, Staff takes no -- can take 20 whatever reduced penalty you believe you should be for 21 21 no position. 22 the \$29,200, you requested a hearing to present evidence 22 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And I don't see any about why you believe the penalty should be lower or 23 reason to admit it into the record because it is -- it 23 waived. So I will give you the opportunity to do that is duplicative of the testimony that you've already 25 now. given. So your position on the penalty, then, is that Page 86 Page 88 MR. MAUROU: Okay. I have these for you. your Company is experiencing financial hardship and 1 2 JUDGE PEARSON: Wait. What is that before you're requesting that the penalty be waived because of 3 3 you come up here? that hardship? MR. MAUROU: This is a statement. This is a 4 4 MR. MAUROU: Yes, your Honor. 5 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Is there any statement. 6 JUDGE PEARSON: From? additional information that you'd like to provide with 7 MR. MAUROU: From the Company. respect to the financial hardship, any additional 8 JUDGE PEARSON: Like a written statement? 8 explanation or --9 9 MR. MAUROU: Yes. I was trying also -- I MR. MAUROU: Yes. 10 JUDGE PEARSON: In response to the told you I have two vehicles. And Matt and John have penalty --11 seen them. I have a picture of them here, but I don't 11 MR. MAUROU: Yes. 12 have -- I'm missing the registration. I don't know if 12 JUDGE PEARSON: -- assessment? 13 that would work. I have the picture here. 13 Those vehicles are seen right there. And Well, you'll have to show it to Staff first 14 14 and see if Staff has any objections to me accepting it. 15 all those things have been put on my credit -- on my 15 16 MR. O'CONNELL: Your Honor, this appears to 16 credit card. So there's too many things going on now. Staff to be a written restatement of Mr. Maurou's 17 17 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. 18 testimony about the financial hardship that the Company 18 MR. MAUROU: Yeah. I'm sorry. That's the is undergoing. So Staff doesn't have a problem as a 19 true story. There's not I can do. 19 20 written record, just -- Staff would just note it is JUDGE PEARSON: Okav. repetitive of what has already been testified. 21 21 MR. MAUROU: And it's very, very tough, JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. You can bring that to 22 difficult. And then comes another 30 days, not -- and 22

MR. O'CONNELL: And it is also a written

record of the bank account amount that Mr. Maurou

me then, Mr. Maurou.

23

24

23

since I came, I was most concentrated on this, on this

January 19th, and then Matt called me the same day. He

hearing, because I came back, as I said, on

9

10

16

17

19

21

22

23

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

14 15

16 17

18

20

21

22

Page 89

called -- he called me and requested to see me on the 22nd, which meant within two or three days I have to see 3 him, I have to sit down with him, and those things called that David -- David says they were called regarding my website. They were -- they were not called for training, it was just for a website problem.

And the training, when Mathew visit me, they visit me like two-hour visits. So I don't think even -even eight hours will not be enough to cover this book.

It's -- and which is not my first -- I'm sorry. English is not my -- that's another problem I'm having, English is not my first -- I speak French as first language, and the English comes as my second language. It's very difficult. I'm sorry. It's very 14 tough. It's very tough. 15

I cannot explain everything. I am the only person to know how I resent, how I feel. It is -- and David, I said that already. David talk about the 18 29 days to call for help. He's right. I know he doesn't under -- he doesn't know -- he doesn't know all 20 my problems. Okay?

And I am to go back to this book, take them part by part, go to the Internet, Google, and explain -have it translated in French, and then read it. I have to do that all the -- all this book since I came back,

Page 90

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT and that's too many things going on. It's very hard.

And I'm very, very sorry, you know. There's nothing I can do. There's nothing I can do, to be honest.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. Mr. O'Connell, do you have any questions for Mr. Maurou?

MR. O'CONNELL: Regarding the penalty assessment, which I believe is the issue that we're addressing at this moment --

JUDGE PEARSON: Correct.

MR. O'CONNELL: -- I have no questions for 13 Mr. Maurou. However, given his testimony about the financial hardship of the Company, I believe I am obligated to ask a follow-up question of Mr. Pratt regarding the financial -- reported financial situation of the Company.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

MR. O'CONNELL: And if I'm correct,

Mr. Pratt is still -- remains under oath.

JUDGE PEARSON: That's correct.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. O'CONNELL:

Q. Mr. Pratt, you testified earlier that you had 25 viewed the compliance review report written by

EXAMINATION BY O'CONNELL / PRATT

Investigator Perkinson that is Exhibit MP-6; is that 1 2 correct?

A. Correct.

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

24

25

1

2

3

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

Q. Are you aware of the reported gross revenue for this company from the year 2014 -- 2014?

A. Yes. As part of our compliance review, one of the pieces of data we collect is the gross revenue for the year ending prior to the year that we did the review in. In this case, it would have been the year ending December 31st, 2014.

Mr. Maurou reported a gross revenue of \$90,000. That was just -- we do not get previous years' financial. We only look at the current year.

MR. O'CONNELL: Okay. I don't have any more questions, your Honor.

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

Mr. Maurou?

MR. MAUROU: Can I say something? Yes. That's true that attorney general, we reported making 90,000, but we also have to buy gas, 45,000; we also have to pay insurance for 16,000, for both car; we also have to pay what's called the driver; I have to pay myself; I have a family of four people. Okay?

And those -- my wife is stay-at-home mom. She's going to school. She's in college. She has three

Page 92

Page 91

kids. She's not working. I am the only provider.

My rent, I don't have my check -- my book check now. I pay 2,000. I live in downtown. Matt knows that. It's very expensive. I pay 2,000 for my -for my -- what it's called -- my rent.

So how much I have left? I have to pay the other driver, 45 to buy gas, 16 for insurance, and then another amount for fixing -- fixing the car, like tires or oil change, all that things during the year, but I'm lucky. They are brand new car. And I also have to pay -- what it's called -- I have a loan that I pay to those cars. That's too many things. How much I have left? Nothing.

I have zero left in all the year, but I'm glad I'm helping people move on fuel in the state of Washington. I'm doing my best. I have never received one penny from the state of Washington. I have never received one penny from the federal government for help -- to help me with my business.

I start this business from scratch, and I'm doing my best. I don't want to see traffic on fuel. That's one of my -- one of my -- I don't like seeing traffic on -- and my -- my dad was a transporter. So when I do this, I feel really happy to help people. I feel happy.

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

> 1 2

> > 4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

Page 93

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm not making nothing on this business. I'm not making million in this business. That's the true story. But I'm glad I'm helping people get around, see them, their face, they're happy.

We take them to the airport. You take them to the -- you take them to see -- what's called, dinner. I get around them, they're happy. I am very glad for that, and this my report, and I stick with that report. So I am not making nothing.

But I'm glad you brought 90,000 revenue. That is the gross revenue. It's absolutely nothing when you take -- as I said, when you take out all those things. How much I have left? Nothing. Nothing.

And I also have had emergency. I have a copy of my travel. If you request it, I will give it to 15 you. And Mathew knows about it.

And for I left -- I went over there for --18 what's called -- I left for emergency to overseas for 60 days. My mom, this is my mom, I went to see her. She's sick. I cannot let her down for what she did to me. So I went to -- I didn't work for 60 days.

So honestly, I just tell him what is true. There's nothing to hide. Thank you so much.

> JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you, Mr. Maurou. Mr. O'Connell, does Staff have anything

1 do, and yet, he has failed to change his behavior. His advertisements are still showing that he goes all over the state with trips to the airport.

I would also like to comment that we could have been on this much, much sooner. Your review was done in November of 2015. We called the week after the review to try and set up the final to get this moving on, and you had left the country for approximately two months. And so we weren't able to complete the review and finish that for a two-month period in there, or we've been way past this time there.

And I guess, just besides the pattern of being late and with just continued failure to come into compliance with our rules, and the continued -- what I consider failure to attempt to come into compliance, and today would be a good example of where he had 45 days to get these documents to us, and it took three quarters of that time before he even asked us what he should do to get these in, and then still didn't get them in to us on

And so based on all that, I -- while I'm sympathetic to his plight with where he's at with his family, you know, we all have problems, we all have issues we're dealing with every day, and I do not think that forgiving this penalty will bring him into

Page 94

Page 96

Page 95

further?

MR. O'CONNELL: Your Honor, if I could, Staff would like -- I would like to defer to Staff to make a final comment on the penalty assessment.

JUDGE PEARSON: Sure.

MR. PRATT: I guess I'd like to start by saying, one, I'm sympathetic to Mr. Maurou's plight. I understand and I'm sorry for that, what you're dealing with, but I'm concerned with the long pattern of noncompliance. And so I'd just like to make a few points for the judge to consider as we're moving forward.

Mr. Maurou did state that he'd never been late on a payment to the State, and yet in Docket 151029 there was a thousand dollar penalty that was never paid. It has gone to collections.

And more of my concern is that Mr. Maurou's pattern to us has been continually asking for more time to do things, and continually asking for an extension, but never really providing us what we need. With at least ten times that we contacted him since October of 2014 to try and get him to come into compliance with what his certificate says he can do, operating only from the three hotels, Mr. Maurou, to the airport, we've clarified that to him that that's all he's allowed to

compliance. And that's my goal, is to have him in compliance in following the rules.

3 And I believe that a penalty that is upheld 4 will be further incentive to maybe come into compliance, if he can do what he needs to do to get his permit back. I hope Mr. Maurou understands that and that he still does have a chance to get his permit back, but I believe 8 the penalty should hold his -- over his head as an incentive. Thank you. 9

JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Maurou, do you have a brief comment before we close?

MR. MAUROU: Yeah. I heard what the Director David says. Director, they sent -- for annual reports, they send me thousand dollars for sanction and --

JUDGE PEARSON: Can you speak closer to the microphone, please?

MR. MAUROU: Once again, Director David, I heard what you said, and I had a ticket for thousand dollars for not -- for being late to apply for annual -annual -- annual reports, and I did send a letter to solve this problem, and then they ask me to pay 250. I did pay.

And then later, they send me another bill

Page 97 Page 99 again for a thousand saying that I have to do the annual understand that you are stating that you have financial report again. I said, I did it already. What annual 2 hardship, and that for many different reasons you haven't been given the help that you need. I completely 3 report are you asking me? get those points. So unless you have anything further 4 And they just say, no, you have to do to add, I would like to wrap this up. 5 separately because you have two different certificates. JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Maurou, this is 6 MR. MAUROU: No. I think I am done, your 6 7 kind of outside the scope of what we're doing. 7 Honor. 8 MR. MAUROU: Yeah. I'm answering to what 8 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. All right. So I just David just said. I need to tell him. That way, you want to reiterate that I did cancel your auto 9 10 know as a judge. transportation charter and excursion certificate So -- and they said they send me again effective at midnight tonight. So you do need to cease 12 another thousand. That thousand, I asked them why, and and desist all operations until you either get your they told me I have two different certificates. permit reinstated within the 30-day time frame or you 14 I say, no, I have only one certificate, 14 reapply and obtain a new permit from the Commission. under one certificate and this same business. And then 15 Okay? 15 I did apply. I did -- I did -- I did my annual report 16 MR. MAUROU: (Nods head.) 16 17 already. JUDGE PEARSON: All right. So if there's 17 nothing further from Staff --18 And then they say, no, I need to pay. 18 And then I sent a letter -- what's called --19 MR. O'CONNELL: No, your Honor. 19 I send a letter for that explaining. They never got 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Then thank you all 20 21 back to me. The only thing I heard is they sent to the 21 for coming here today. 22 And as I stated earlier, I will be issuing 22 collection. It's -- it's -- it's disgusting. They sent to collection. Right now, it is in collection. 23 an order within ten days reflecting the Commission's 23 So when I get out here, I need to go and decision related to the penalty assessment. Okay? 24 call them. And when I saw that, I have to send another 25 MR. MAUROU: Okay. Page 98 Page 100 letter to UTC. They never got back to me. 1 1 JUDGE PEARSON: All right. Then we are 2 So I love to follow rules. Rules are rules. adjourned. Thank you. 3 3 Everybody has to follow rules. Without the rules, where (Hearing adjourned at 11:45 a.m.) would we be? I love follow rules, but the problem is a 4 lack of understanding. You know what, I'm having 5 -000problem understanding. 6 6 7 I remember when John came to me first time. 7 8 8 He say, this book, just take look, but mostly you're not in trouble. Those -- those would take more than 16 --9 15 passenger and more, plus truck driver, than the one 10 10 more in problem. 11 11 12 12 So -- and I had only one -- one vehicle, and in this book, I just read in this book last time, it say 13 13 when you have one vehicle, you're exempt of all those 14 14 things. 15 15 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Mr. Maurou, I get 16 16 what you're saying. 17 17 18 MR. MAUROU: Yeah. So it's -- it's --18 honestly, I love following rules. I do. 19 19 20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Let's wrap this up. 20 21 21 Mr. Maurou. Mr. Maurou --MR. MAUROU: It's a little confused. 22 22 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Maurou, I'm speaking to 23 23 24 you. I'd like to wrap this up. 24 I understand what you're saying. I 25 25

