

Docket No. TC-181008 - Vol. I

In re the Application of: Bremerton Kitsap  
Airporter, Inc.

March 18, 2019



1325 Fourth Avenue • Suite 1840 • Seattle, Washington 98101

**206.287.9066**

[www.buellrealtime.com](http://www.buellrealtime.com)

Olympia | 360.534.9066 Spokane | 509.624.3261 National | 800.846.6989

email: [info@buellrealtime.com](mailto:info@buellrealtime.com)



Page 1

1 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
2 UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

---

3  
4 In re the Application of ) DOCKET NO. TC-181008  
5 )  
6 BREMERTON KITSAP AIRPORTER, )  
7 INC., d/b/a THE SOUND )  
8 CONNECTION AND FT. LEWIS )  
9 McCHORD AIRPORTER )  
10 For an Extension of Existing)  
11 Auto Transportation )  
12 Certificate C-903 )

---

13 BRIEF ADJUDICATIVE PROCEEDING, VOLUME I  
14 Pages 1-130  
15 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAURA CHARTOFF

---

16 March 18, 2019  
17 9:00 a.m.  
18 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission  
19 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest  
20 Olympia, Washington 98504

21 REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358  
22 Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC  
23 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840  
24 Seattle, Washington 98101  
25 (206) 287-9066 | Seattle  
(360) 534-9066 | Olympia  
(800) 846-6989 | National  
www.buellrealtime.com

Page 2

1 A P P E A R A N C E S  
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:  
3 LAURA CHARTOFF  
4 Utilities and Transportation  
5 Commission  
6 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW  
7 Olympia, Washington 98504  
8 (360) 664-1160  
9 laura.chartoff@utc.wa.gov

10 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  
11 NASH CALLAGHAN  
12 Assistant Attorney General  
13 PO Box 40128  
14 Olympia, Washington 98504  
15 (360) 664-1187  
16 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov

17 FOR BREMERTON KITSAP:  
18 BLAIR I. FASSBURG  
19 Williams Kastner  
20 Two Union Square  
21 601 Union Street, Suite 4100  
22 Seattle, Washington 98101  
23 (206) 628-2772  
24 bfassburg@williamskastner.com

25 FOR PACIFIC NORTHWEST  
TRANSPORTATION:  
26 JOHN E. FRICKE  
27 JAMES FRICKE  
28 PO Box 2163  
29 Olympia, Washington 98507  
30 (360) 92-7680  
31 johnf@capair.com

32 \* \* \* \* \*

Page 3

1 EXAMINATION INDEX  
2 EXAMINATION OF RICHARD ASCHE PAGE  
3 By Mr. Callaghan. . . . . 15  
4 By James Fricke. . . . . 19

5 EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE  
6 By Mr. Callaghan. . . . . 60  
7 By Mr. Fassburg. . . . . 67

8 EXHIBIT INDEX  
9 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE  
10 BKA-1 6  
11 BKA-2 6  
12 BKA-3 6  
13 BKA-4 6  
14 BKA-5 6  
15 BKA-6 6  
16 BKA-7 6  
17 BKA-8 6  
18 BKA-9 6  
19 BKA-10 6  
20 BKA-11 6  
21 BKA-12 6  
22 CA-1 30  
23 CA-2 30  
24 CA-3 30

Page 4

1 EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.)  
2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE  
3 CA-4 30  
4 CA-5 30  
5 CA-6 30  
6 CA-7 30  
7 CA-8 30  
8 CA-9 30  
9 CA-10 30  
10 CA-11 30  
11 CA-12 30  
12 CA-13 30  
13 CA-14 30  
14 CA-15 30  
15 CA-16 30  
16 CA-17 30  
17 CA-28 31  
18 CA-29 40  
19 CA-30 43

Page 5

1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; MARCH 18, 2019  
 2 9:00 A.M.  
 3 --oOo--  
 4 P R O C E E D I N G S

5  
 6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Let's be on the  
 7 record. This is Docket TC-181008, captioned regarding  
 8 the application of Bremerton Kitsap Airporter, Inc.,  
 9 doing business as The Sound Connection and Ft. Lewis  
 10 McChord Airporter for the -- for an extension of  
 11 existing auto transportation certificate C-903.  
 12 My name is Laura Chartoff. I'm an  
 13 administrative law judge presiding over today's brief  
 14 adjudicative proceeding.  
 15 Today is Monday, March 18th, 2019, and the  
 16 time is 9:04 a.m.  
 17 So the purpose of today's proceeding is to  
 18 hear objections to the application filed by Bremerton  
 19 Kitsap Airporter made by an existing auto transportation  
 20 company, Capital Aeroporter Airport Shuttle.  
 21 RCW 81.68.040 and WAC 480-30-136 allow  
 22 existing auto transportation companies to object to an  
 23 application for new or extended authority only if the  
 24 objecting company holds a certificate that authorizes  
 25 the same service and the company provides the same

Page 6

1 service to the Commission's satisfaction. WAC  
 2 480-30-116 provides that the adjudication will be  
 3 limited to the question of whether the objecting company  
 4 holds a certificate to provide the same service in the  
 5 same territory, whether the objecting company provides  
 6 the same service, and whether an objecting company will  
 7 provide the same service to the satisfaction of the  
 8 Commission. And the term "same service" and satis- --  
 9 "service to the satisfaction of the Commission" are  
 10 defined in WAC 480-30-140.  
 11 So before we went on the record, the parties  
 12 have stipulated to the admission of Bremerton Kitsap  
 13 Airporter's prefiled exhibits, and those are marked  
 14 BKA-1 through BKA-12.  
 15 (Exhibits BKA-1 through BKA-12 admitted.)  
 16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So when I call on each  
 17 party to testify, I will swear any witnesses in with the  
 18 oath of witness so that anything you tell the Court will  
 19 be under oath and can be considered sworn testimony.  
 20 For the court reporter's benefit, please speak slowly  
 21 and clearly and please use the microphone on the table  
 22 in front of you. And once you're sworn in, you can  
 23 present testimony and call witnesses, and you can also  
 24 introduce exhibits that you have prefiled, and I will  
 25 rule on those.

Page 7

1 So the applicant will go first today  
 2 followed by Capital Aeroporter, and my understanding is  
 3 that Staff will not be presenting any witnesses today?  
 4 MR. CALLAGHAN: That's correct, Your Honor.  
 5 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. But Staff may wish  
 6 to ask parties clarifying or follow-up questions, and  
 7 that's fine.  
 8 So each of the parties will have the  
 9 opportunity to ask questions of each other, and I will  
 10 let you know when it's your turn to do that.  
 11 And then finally, I won't be making any  
 12 decisions from the bench today. I will take it under  
 13 advisement, and I'll issue an order within ten days or  
 14 if I determine that I need the transcript prior to  
 15 writing the decision, it will be ten days from when I  
 16 get the transcript. So I'll let you know at the end.  
 17 Okay. So let's begin by taking short  
 18 appearances starting with Staff.  
 19 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash  
 20 Callaghan, Assistant Attorney General, on behalf of  
 21 Commission Staff.  
 22 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 23 MR. FASSBURG: Morning. Blair Fassburg with  
 24 Williams Kastner & Gibbs in Seattle, Washington, on  
 25 behalf of Bremerton Kitsap Airporter.

Page 8

1 JAMES FRICKE: Good morning, Your Honor.  
 2 James N. Fricke, President and CEO of Pacific Northwest  
 3 Transportation Services, Inc., d/b/a Capital Aeroporter.  
 4 PO Box 2163, Olympia, Washington 98507-2164, appearing  
 5 on behalf of the objector.  
 6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 7 JOHN FRICKE: Good morning, Your Honor.  
 8 John E. Fricke, Vice President Operations, Chief  
 9 Operating Officer Pacific Northwest Transportation  
 10 Services, Incorporated, d/b/a Capital Aeroporter. Same  
 11 address details as mentioned by James Fricke.  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 13 Okay. So, Mr. Fassburg, you'll be going  
 14 first today.  
 15 MR. FASSBURG: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor.  
 16 First I'd like to say that pursuant to WAC 480-07-610, a  
 17 brief adjudicative proceeding is supposed to be a  
 18 streamlined proceeding and not a full-blown  
 19 adjudication. It provides in subpart 5, the parties may  
 20 offer written exhibits for inclusion in the record and  
 21 may make oral statements in support of their positions.  
 22 The presiding officer also may permit parties to present  
 23 one or more witnesses to testify.  
 24 Because those are optional and we believe  
 25 that the record that we have submitted speaks for itself

Page 9

1 and the exhibits have all been admitted by stipulation,  
 2 we don't intend to offer a witness in addition to the  
 3 sworn statements that were offered today. So long as we  
 4 are permitted to make argument sort of tying together  
 5 what we believe the evidence shows, I think that we can  
 6 reserve the discussion of much of what's been presented  
 7 for that presentation after the taking of testimony.  
 8 I will say, just to make sure this is up  
 9 front, what we believe is that the objecting auto  
 10 transportation company does not, in fact, have  
 11 certificate authority that provides for the same  
 12 service. And that if it does, and I think it's -- it's  
 13 arguable that it does not, but it's not clear that it  
 14 does not, if its certificate authorizes that service, it  
 15 isn't actually providing that service. And even if it  
 16 could say that it were, we don't believe its service is  
 17 being offered at the satisfaction of the Commission.  
 18 The primary differences are in the fact that  
 19 its authority is for a zone for a particular location to  
 20 SeaTac Airport as opposed to specific locations. Its  
 21 time schedule does not state specific locations as would  
 22 be required for scheduled service, which is what the  
 23 applicant is applying for, and its locations that are  
 24 provided on its time schedule are a locations by zone,  
 25 not specific locations.

Page 10

1 And so I think as we'll walk through more  
 2 specifically when I have an opportunity for argument,  
 3 the evidence of their time schedule on its face  
 4 demonstrates they aren't providing the service being  
 5 applied for, which to be clear, is -- Bremerton Kitsap  
 6 Airporter provides scheduled service along a fixed  
 7 route.  
 8 It provides two separate routes; one that  
 9 goes from the West Sound, Kitsap and Pierce County, and  
 10 frankly, I don't have it memorized off the top of my  
 11 head, but one route that comes from the West Sound and  
 12 another that goes from JBLM, and they're applying to add  
 13 to that route the Holiday Inn Express down to SeaTac.  
 14 The particular route that's applied for is  
 15 listed in a time schedule to which there will be an  
 16 added stop clearly dictating the route that the -- the  
 17 vehicle will travel. And that route, as a result of its  
 18 configuration, will provide essentially direct express  
 19 service from that Holiday Inn Express to SeaTac Airport,  
 20 which is something the protesting party does not offer.  
 21 We believe that an additional stop is needed  
 22 due to security issues at JBLM and because that location  
 23 provides overflow to JBLM to people that aren't able to  
 24 stay at JBLM. But, again, I'll -- I'd like to go  
 25 through all of the details more succinctly and

Page 11

1 specifically during sort of the closing argument if I  
 2 may.  
 3 And with that, I think we have nothing else  
 4 to add since our exhibits have been admitted.  
 5 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 6 Okay. I'm going to take a two-minute recess  
 7 because I have to clarify a procedural question I have.  
 8 So we'll just do -- we're in recess for two minutes.  
 9 (Recess was taken from 9:13 a.m.  
 10 until 9:17 a.m.)  
 11 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. We're back on the  
 12 record. My -- my concern that I needed to get some  
 13 clarification on was that, because there is -- what  
 14 appears to be -- there is a supplemental -- oh, what was  
 15 it? I know there are some statements of Mr. Asche in  
 16 some of these exhibits, and it -- if the other parties  
 17 do want to ask Mr. Asche questions, that seems like the  
 18 fair thing to do. Do -- does anyone want -- I guess I  
 19 would ask the other parties if they do want to cross  
 20 Mr. Asche with respect to the exhibits that were  
 21 entered.  
 22 JOHN FRICKE: Yes, Your Honor. We certainly  
 23 would like to cross-examine the statement of Mr. Asche.  
 24 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Staff?  
 25 MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

Page 12

1 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Um --  
 2 MR. FASSBURG: Okay. I -- I think it's  
 3 unusual to cross-examine someone on statement when they  
 4 haven't offered testimony, but I guess we won't object  
 5 to that.  
 6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you. Thank you. So  
 7 is Mr. Asche present?  
 8 MR. FASSBURG: Mr. Asche?  
 9 MR. ASCHE: Present.  
 10 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, another procedural  
 11 question before we continue. Also pursuant to WAC  
 12 480-07-470, Section 2, hearing guidelines, oral  
 13 appearance at a hearing does not substitute for the  
 14 requirement for written notice of appearance in the --  
 15 the adjudicative proceeding. There's been no written  
 16 appearance, written notice of appearance of Mr. Fassburg  
 17 to represent Bremerton Kitsap Airporter in this matter.  
 18 On the application on page 8, it listed a Dave Wiley as  
 19 the attorney for the applicant, and according to  
 20 480-07-345, Section 2, with the written notice of  
 21 appearance and a withdrawal by counsel or other  
 22 representative is required.  
 23 Stated in Section A, attorneys who wish to  
 24 appear on behalf of a party or person seeking party  
 25 status must file a written notice of appearance with the

Page 13

1 Commission and serve all parties to the proceeding prior  
 2 to acting in a representative capacity --  
 3 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. All right. I'm  
 4 going to cut you off there. I believe Mr. Fassburg is  
 5 in the same firm as Mr. Wiley?  
 6 MR. FASSBURG: That is correct. And beyond  
 7 that, Mr. Fricke served me personally with a copy of his  
 8 exhibits last week. He was aware of my involvement in  
 9 this case, and Mr. Callaghan had, in fact, emailed all  
 10 the parties indicating it was his understanding that I  
 11 would be appearing and asking me to advise if that was  
 12 incorrect. I did not respond because that was a correct  
 13 statement. Everybody understood I would be here today.  
 14 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Yeah.  
 15 JOHN FRICKE: If I may, Your Honor. Section  
 16 D requires any attorney listed to -- who wishes to  
 17 withdraw from the -- representing a party to file a  
 18 separate written notice of withdrawal with the  
 19 Commission and serve all parties. It does not -- it  
 20 does not specify law firm, it specifies attorney  
 21 representing the party.  
 22 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. I'm going to  
 23 overrule your objection.  
 24 Okay. So let's -- where should Mr. Asche  
 25 sit that makes sense?

Page 14

1 MR. FASSBURG: It doesn't matter.  
 2 Mr. Asche, would you like to take a seat  
 3 here?  
 4 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So can you pull the  
 5 microphone a little closer to you and make sure it's on.  
 6 MR. ASCHE: Push this button, I guess.  
 7 Okay. It's on.  
 8 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Can you state your  
 9 first and last name for the court reporter?  
 10 MR. ASCHE: Richard E. Asche, A-s-c-h-e,  
 11 spelling the last name.  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: And what's your position  
 13 with the company?  
 14 MR. ASCHE: I'm the president, CEO of  
 15 Bremerton Kitsap Airpporter, Inc., d/b/a Sound Connection  
 16 and also JBLM -- or Ft. Lewis McChord Airpporter.  
 17 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. I'm going to swear  
 18 you in.  
 19  
 20 RICHARD ASCHE, witness herein, having been  
 21 first duly sworn on oath,  
 22 was examined and testified  
 23 as follows:  
 24  
 25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Mr. Fassburg, is he

Page 15

EXAMINATION OF ASCHE / CALLAGHAN

1 available for cross?  
 2 MR. FASSBURG: Yes, Your Honor.  
 3 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. We'll start with --  
 4 we will start with Staff. Mr. Callaghan?  
 5  
 6 E X A M I N A T I O N  
 7 BY MR. CALLAGHAN:  
 8 Q. Good morning, Mr. Asche.  
 9 **A. Morning.**  
 10 Q. Mr. Asche, in your application, you submitted a  
 11 statement with respect to your application to extend; is  
 12 that correct?  
 13 **A. That's correct.**  
 14 Q. And in that application, you also submitted a  
 15 statement from the hotel's manager; is that correct?  
 16 **A. That's correct, Holiday Inn Express.**  
 17 Q. All right. And did you speak with -- who --  
 18 what's the name of the general manager at the hotel?  
 19 **A. The name escapes me right now. It's a lady.**  
 20 MR. FASSBURG: Mr. Asche, do you have the  
 21 exhibits here? You can look at those to refresh your  
 22 memory.  
 23 BY MR. CALLAGHAN:  
 24 Q. And, Mr. Asche, if you could let me know which  
 25 exhibit you're referring to.

Page 16

EXAMINATION OF ASCHE / CALLAGHAN

1 **A. I don't have it available to me right now. It's**  
 2 **here someplace. Okay. The name -- the name of the**  
 3 **individual was Teresa Simplot. She's the general**  
 4 **manager of the Holiday Inn Express & Suites and the**  
 5 **exhibit number is --**  
 6 Q. I'm sorry. Mr. Asche, could you remember to  
 7 speak into the microphone? Thank you.  
 8 **A. The exhibit number is BKA-2.**  
 9 Q. All right. So, Mr. Asche, did you reach out to  
 10 Ms. Simplot?  
 11 **A. Yes, we did.**  
 12 Q. All right. And when you -- did she ever reach  
 13 out to you to see if you would offer service to this  
 14 hotel?  
 15 **A. No, we asked her. We didn't -- she didn't reach**  
 16 **out to us. We asked her if she would be all right,**  
 17 **because we understood that the Holiday Inn Express was**  
 18 **an overflow facility for the two Expresses that --**  
 19 **housing at JBLM at Ft. Lewis and McChord as an overflow.**  
 20 **So they sent their overflow guests to the Holiday Inn**  
 21 **Express, because they're all part of the same chain.**  
 22 **It's the Holiday Inn Express at both JBLM facilities.**  
 23 **So they're one and the same chain.**  
 24 Q. And, Mr. Asche, in your application, how much do  
 25 you propose to charge individuals for the service from

Page 17

EXAMINATION OF ASCHE / CALLAGHAN

1 the hotel to SeaTac Airport?  
 2 **A. The fare will be \$20. Same as it is at McChord**  
 3 **pick-up location.**  
 4 Q. And how many times per day do you propose that  
 5 there's a scheduled pick-up?  
 6 **A. Right now, we provide nine daily trips to and**  
 7 **from JBLM. We propose with this new -- with this new**  
 8 **addition, that we'll propose 13 trips a day and they'll**  
 9 **be spaced an hour and a half apart.**  
 10 Q. And what is Bremerton Kitsap's expectation in  
 11 terms of the number of passengers or customers that you  
 12 expect to get from this stop?  
 13 **A. We don't have an exact number what we expect to**  
 14 **get from this stop, but we do expect that we will**  
 15 **increase our passenger counts simply because two**  
 16 **reasons; basically, our low, low fares, and secondly,**  
 17 **the increased duration of the number of trips we take.**  
 18 **So which reduces the -- the interval between trips from**  
 19 **two and a half hours to one and a half hours.**  
 20 Q. And are you proposing to provide a scheduled  
 21 service by reservation only?  
 22 **A. Reservation only to the airport. From the**  
 23 **airport, it's first come, first serve as it is in our**  
 24 **Kitsap route.**  
 25 Q. And when you say "first come, first serve," what

Page 18

EXAMINATION OF ASCHE / CALLAGHAN

1 do you mean by that?  
 2 **A. Well, we don't have them yet, but we're going to**  
 3 **have kiosks at the airport, and a passenger walks up to**  
 4 **the kiosk, he inserts his credit card or his reservation**  
 5 **number if he's already made a prepaid reservation and --**  
 6 **on going to the airport, and it spits out his name and**  
 7 **what trip he's on and he's ready to go. Kicks out his**  
 8 **ticket, takes the ticket to present to the driver and**  
 9 **he's on his way.**  
 10 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you. No  
 11 further questions, Your Honor.  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 13 Okay. Mr. Fricke?  
 14 JAMES FRICKE: And I -- we want to  
 15 distinguish by my identifying myself as Jim or James and  
 16 John as John so that the record will be clear who's...  
 17 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Sure.  
 18 JAMES FRICKE: Okay.  
 19 MR. FASSBURG: Your Honor, they -- they are  
 20 a mutual party. I think it would be correct if only one  
 21 of them has an opportunity to cross-examine. Normally,  
 22 parties don't have two different attorneys cross-examine  
 23 the same witness, and I would think it would be the same  
 24 even when they are layperson representatives in a pro se  
 25 capacity.

Page 19

EXAMINATION OF ASCHE / JAMES FRICKE

1 EXAMINATION  
 2 BY JAMES FRICKE:  
 3 Q. Okay. Mr. Asche, did you prepare the exhibits  
 4 that have been entered on behalf of Bremerton Kitsap  
 5 Airporter?  
 6 **A. Yes, I did.**  
 7 (Phone ringing.)  
 8 THE WITNESS: It's a spam call.  
 9 **A. Yes, I did.**  
 10 **BY JAMES FRICKE:**  
 11 Q. Do you have copies of the exhibits in front of  
 12 you?  
 13 **A. Yes, I do.**  
 14 Q. Okay. I draw your attention to BK Exhibit No.  
 15 1, which is identified as additional supporting  
 16 comments. And I note that in the introductory sentence  
 17 that you indicate that as one of the supplemental  
 18 reasons here that you were operating the JBLM route at a  
 19 monetary loss; is that correct?  
 20 **A. At times. During slow periods, it is at a loss.**  
 21 **During peak periods, like holiday season, it's**  
 22 **profitable.**  
 23 Q. Well, on an annual basis, is it operated at a  
 24 loss?  
 25 **A. That's questionable. Sometimes it is and some**

Page 20

EXAMINATION OF ASCHE / JAMES FRICKE

1 years it isn't. It does -- appears to be this year.  
 2 Q. Okay. So have you, then, prepared the numbers  
 3 or do you have the numbers for the ending year of 2018?  
 4 Was that a profit or loss?  
 5 **A. We don't have those figures yet. We don't have**  
 6 **the profit statements for that period.**  
 7 Q. How about the year 2017?  
 8 **A. It was at a slight gain.**  
 9 Q. Repeat, please.  
 10 **A. It was a slight profit.**  
 11 Q. So your statement here is in slow months,  
 12 basically, you might be operating at a loss and other  
 13 months you're operating at a profit. But on an annual  
 14 basis, you apparently are operating at a profit?  
 15 MR. CALLAGHAN: Objection, Your Honor. At  
 16 this point, I would object based on relevance. As you  
 17 stated in the beginning of this hearing, the scope of  
 18 today's hearing is narrow. It's based on WAC  
 19 480-30-116, Subsection 3, and that is limited to the  
 20 question of whether the objecting company holds the same  
 21 certificate, whether they are providing the same  
 22 service, and whether the objecting company is providing  
 23 the same service to the satisfaction of the Commission.  
 24 I don't think this line of questioning is relevant.  
 25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, I -- I agree.

Page 21

EXAMINATION OF ASCHE / JAMES FRICKE

1 Mr. Fricke, can you please keep --

2 JAMES FRICKE: Your Honor, if I may state

3 before you rule. My concern, and why I'm raising this

4 question, is that information including this

5 supplemental part of the application would suggest that

6 perhaps the real reason that Bremerton Kitsap is

7 applying for this location is to stabilize the -- the

8 financial condition of this route.

9 MR. CALLAGHAN: And I'm sorry, Your Honor,

10 if I could add. And even if that were true, I don't

11 believe that that would be relevant to today's hearing.

12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, I -- I agree that

13 this line of questioning is not relevant. The issue is,

14 you know, whether the objecting company holds a

15 certificate to provide the same service in the same

16 territory and whether the objecting company will provide

17 the same service to the satisfaction of the Commission.

18 So your questions need to be limited to that.

19 JAMES FRICKE: Okay. So I guess I don't

20 understand what the purpose of this exhibit is, then. I

21 guess I'll ask that question.

22 BY MR. FRICKE:

23 Q. What is the purpose of the exhibit, Mr. Asche?

24 MR. FASSBURG: I'm going to object. Calls

25 for a legal conclusion as to what is the relevance of

Page 22

1 evidence. It's essentially what he's asking is, what is

2 the relevance of the evidence that's submitted. If

3 there is an objection after the fact to its

4 admissibility, I'd be happy to address that from a legal

5 perspective. If he's asking something other than

6 relevance, I think it would be helpful if he restated

7 the question.

8 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, sustained.

9 JAMES FRICKE: Your Honor, I -- I would move

10 that the supportive information that is provided in

11 Exhibits 2, 3, and 4 be with -- withdrawn or not

12 accepted on the basis that the manager of the Inn is not

13 truly an independent public witness.

14 MR. FASSBURG: I'm not sure I understand the

15 basis of the objection. The manager of the Holiday Inn

16 Express, whose exhibit has already been admitted, is

17 providing testimony relevant to the satisfaction of the

18 Commission question that may or may not be addressed

19 here with respect to the service being provided by

20 Capital Aeroporter.

21 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, I -- I agree that it

22 is relevant to that.

23 Mr. Fricke, perhaps some of the points you

24 want to make will be better made in direct testimony or

25 in your oral statement that you give when you put your

Page 23

1 side of the -- your case on the stand. Excuse me, when

2 you present your case.

3 JAMES FRICKE: Okay.

4 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Those exhibits have been

5 admitted. You will get the opportunity when you present

6 your case to, you know, explain the weight they should

7 be given or to state why, you know -- why, you don't

8 think they're relevant.

9 JAMES FRICKE: Okay. Your Honor, then I

10 would have no further questions at this time, but would

11 reserve the right to recall this witness for any

12 clarification in -- and further in this -- later in this

13 hearing.

14 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.

15 MR. FASSBURG: And just for the record, Your

16 Honor, we would object to witnesses being recalled out

17 of sequence.

18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Maybe I didn't understand

19 what you just said. Can you repeat that?

20 JAMES FRICKE: Me?

21 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, Mr. Fricke.

22 JAMES FRICKE: That I would reserve the

23 right to -- to recall the witness in relation to any

24 questions further in this proceeding.

25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, I -- I can't do that.

Page 24

1 I can't allow that.

2 JAMES FRICKE: Okay. Again, I would go back

3 and ask for -- object to 2, 3, and 4 on the basis that

4 we do not have this person here to cross-examine her

5 support of the application.

6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. And your objection

7 is overruled. We routinely accept this type of

8 testimony in these proceedings.

9 Okay. So, Mr. Fassburg, do you have any

10 redirect?

11 MR. FASSBURG: No, I don't believe I do.

12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.

13 MR. FASSBURG: Mr. Asche, I think you're

14 free to step down from the witness stand.

15 THE WITNESS: Okay.

16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. And, Mr. Fassburg,

17 you have no further -- oh, you already told me. You

18 have no additional witnesses and you want to put on

19 closing?

20 MR. FASSBURG: That -- that's correct,

21 assuming that I am correctly understanding, since we do

22 not have post-hearing briefing, I would be permitted an

23 opportunity to argue and tie together what the evidence

24 reflects. And if -- if that is correct, then I don't

25 intend to use any more time on our direct case.

Page 25

1 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Thank you.  
 2 Okay. So -- so, Mr. John Fricke and  
 3 Mr. James Fricke, it's your turn to present your case.  
 4 Do you both intend to make statements today?  
 5 JAMES FRICKE: Yes, Your Honor.  
 6 JOHN FRICKE: Yes, Your Honor.  
 7 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. So I will swear you  
 8 both in.  
 9 (John Fricke and James Fricke sworn.)  
 10 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So who will be speaking  
 11 first today?  
 12 JAMES FRICKE: Your Honor, I have written  
 13 down essentially my testimony. It was not offered  
 14 earlier as an exhibit. To facilitate the manner, I  
 15 could offer that as an exhibit if it would be  
 16 acceptable.  
 17 MR. FASSBURG: I think we would object, only  
 18 in the sense that we didn't have an opportunity to  
 19 review in advance and prepare. If he wants to provide  
 20 oral testimony in form of reading his statement, I  
 21 wouldn't object to that.  
 22 JAMES FRICKE: Okay. I will do that, then.  
 23 Pardon, but I have a vision problem and -- if you  
 24 haven't already figured that out, so I will try to --  
 25 try to do this.

Page 26

1 I, James N. Fricke, president and CEO of --  
 2 am president and CEO of Pacific Northwest Transportation  
 3 Services, Inc., d/b/a Cap Aeroporter and would wish to  
 4 submit the following in opposition to the extension of  
 5 the application in this proceeding.  
 6 Pacific Northwest Transportation Services,  
 7 Inc., holds auto transportation authority under  
 8 certificate C-862, which includes in part Holiday Inn  
 9 Express & Suites Tacoma South - Lakewood, address 11751  
 10 Pacific Avenue Southwest, Lakewood, Washington 98499,  
 11 which is applied for. Capital Aeroporter has provided  
 12 scheduled aeroporter service for points within Pierce  
 13 County, et al., since 1973. Scheduled service has been  
 14 provided from the Holiday Inn Express & Suites at the  
 15 above named add- -- or before-mentioned address and its  
 16 predecessor on the same site since the inn or hotel was  
 17 built.  
 18 The number of scheduled runs has been  
 19 increased over the years from eight to 23 to help  
 20 passengers better match their flights depart --  
 21 departing from as early as 5:00 a.m. in the morning,  
 22 which is earlier than the schedule that is proposed by  
 23 the applicant.  
 24 The frequency of departures varies from as  
 25 short as 40-minute intervals. These intervals and

Page 27

1 departures are adjusted from time to time based upon  
 2 semiannual reviews of our passengers' waited flight  
 3 times. To our knowledge, this is done by no other  
 4 carrier out of SeaTac Airport to facilitate and update  
 5 connection times to make them smoother for our  
 6 customers.  
 7 Airport shuttle services -- service between  
 8 SeaTac Airport and -- and a city, for example, Lakewood  
 9 or Tacoma, by very -- can be accessed by customers by  
 10 the very commonly used method of Google Search, which  
 11 will -- which refer inquirers to Capital Aeroporter's  
 12 website by link. And on that website, they may make  
 13 reservations directly or they can call us by phone to  
 14 make reservations.  
 15 We offer link portals to hotels or inns for  
 16 their websites to facilitate their guests' airport  
 17 schedule needs and reservations. Reservations are  
 18 required to assure seat abil- -- abili- -- availability  
 19 to and from SeaTac Airport. On -- on-site air --  
 20 airport coordinator staff, this is at the airport, now  
 21 monitor flights, flight arrivals to accommodate  
 22 passengers who we therefore discern are going to be  
 23 arriving early or late in relation to the scheduled  
 24 departure time that they originally been placed on and  
 25 to accommodate potential customers who need

Page 28

1 transportation that walk up to our counter on a space  
 2 available basis without a reservation.  
 3 Passengers may make reservations, as I noted  
 4 earlier, by website or by telephone. We -- we affirm --  
 5 confirm reservations with passengers for their  
 6 reservations by email, by text, and by telephone. And,  
 7 in fact, we actually reconfirm them either the day  
 8 before or the day of travel depending on the time of the  
 9 day.  
 10 We make effort -- every effort to  
 11 accommodate passengers even on a short notice basis. An  
 12 example, if we had a trip going up the freeway and even  
 13 if we were called or communicated with five minutes  
 14 before in this particular location, since it's a quick  
 15 on and off and we have a seat available, we would  
 16 accommodate the -- the customer at that point in time.  
 17 Passengers after their ride are texted by a  
 18 process that's referred to as Rate My Ride. This is to  
 19 communicate with customers on how we can make  
 20 improvements in -- in our services to the traveling  
 21 public. Capital Aeroporter is unaware of any service  
 22 issues or service failures not caused by extraordinary  
 23 events such as ice and snow that dumped on us in early  
 24 February in relation to our scheduled service at the  
 25 Holiday Inn Express & Suites Tacoma South - Lakewood.



Page 29

1 This testimony is intended to show that --  
 2 that we are responding to customers' needs and that we  
 3 have increased almost triple -- we essentially tripled  
 4 the number of trips over the years to offer more choices  
 5 of people that better fit their needs. And we believe  
 6 that this addresses many of the questions related to the  
 7 fact that we are providing to the -- should be providing  
 8 to the satisfaction not only of the customers but of the  
 9 Commission in our scheduled service option.  
 10 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 11 Okay. Before we move on to cross, I did  
 12 want to talk about the exhibits. So -- okay. So you  
 13 have offered 27 exhibits.  
 14 Are there objections to these exhibits?  
 15 MR. FASSBURG: Yes, Your Honor. I'll repeat  
 16 my objection of earlier in the sense that they don't  
 17 have labels. It's difficult to identify by exhibit  
 18 numbers which we have objections to. But we have  
 19 objections to a number of exhibits due to their  
 20 relevance to the three factors to be considered by the  
 21 Commission, which are whether they have a certificate to  
 22 provide the same service, whether they are providing the  
 23 same service, and whether they're providing that to the  
 24 satisfaction of the Commission. And I take it back,  
 25 they are numbered, I was just looking in the wrong part

Page 30

1 of the page. We have objections specifically to CA-18  
 2 through 27. We do not object to Exhibits CA-1 through  
 3 17.  
 4 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So, Mr. Fricke, I -- when I  
 5 reviewed these -- these exhibits earlier, I did come to  
 6 the same conclusion that CA-18 through 27 did not seem  
 7 relevant to the limited issue that we're dealing with  
 8 here.  
 9 JAMES FRICKE: I understand, so we'll  
 10 withdraw those.  
 11 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. So --  
 12 JAMES FRICKE: 18 on.  
 13 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. So we are admitting  
 14 Exhibits CA-1 through CA-17.  
 15 (Exhibits CA-1 through CA-17 admitted.)  
 16 JAMES FRICKE: And I would still offer this  
 17 as a new exhibit.  
 18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, you would like to offer  
 19 the statement you just made?  
 20 JAMES FRICKE: I'm sorry. This -- does this  
 21 have a number? This -- I don't think this one's  
 22 numbered yet.  
 23 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, you -- you want to  
 24 offer the statement you just read into the record?  
 25 JAMES FRICKE: Yes.

Page 31

1 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Any objections?  
 2 MR. FASSBURG: I don't necessarily have an  
 3 objection to its admissibility as testimony that he just  
 4 offered that should now be part of the record, and I --  
 5 I hope to make this clear and not overly difficult.  
 6 You haven't submitted a paper exhibit for me  
 7 to have a record of what your testimony should now be  
 8 part of the record. And so I see no need to admit it as  
 9 a separate exhibit.  
 10 JUDGE CHARTOFF: I'm going to go ahead and  
 11 admit it. Do you have copies for counsel?  
 12 JOHN FRICKE: Yes.  
 13 JUDGE CHARTOFF: And we will number that  
 14 CA-28.  
 15 (Exhibit CA-28 admitted.)  
 16 MR. FASSBURG: Thank you.  
 17 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, would you like a  
 18 copy as well?  
 19 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yes. Please approach.  
 20 Okay. And for the record, Exhibits CA-18  
 21 versus CA-17 are not admitted.  
 22 Thank you.  
 23 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you.  
 24 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So --  
 25 JAMES FRICKE: Your Honor, I would like to

Page 32

1 shift, then, to John here for the remainder of...  
 2 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Let me -- let me ask the  
 3 parties, would you like to cross Mr. -- Mr. John  
 4 Fricke -- John Fricke -- James Fricke first or should --  
 5 Mr. John Fricke, would it be easier if he provides his  
 6 statement and then you cross them both? Wait, that  
 7 won't work. Forget that.  
 8 MR. FASSBURG: Your Honor, we've -- we've  
 9 actually done that here before.  
 10 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, really?  
 11 MR. FASSBURG: I've actually offered  
 12 witnesses as a panel and then allowed cross-examination  
 13 of them as a panel. I actually don't have an objection  
 14 to doing that today if that's what they would prefer.  
 15 MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection, Your Honor. I  
 16 think that that makes sense just to understand who has  
 17 knowledge of what in the company.  
 18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Go ahead.  
 19 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, I too have  
 20 prepared a typed version of my -- what will be my oral  
 21 testimony in this proceeding, and also would like to  
 22 offer it as an exhibit.  
 23 MR. FASSBURG: Do you have a copy of it?  
 24 JOHN FRICKE: I certainly do.  
 25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Please provide copies to

Page 33

1 counsel and myself, and I will want you to read it into  
 2 the record since it wasn't provided earlier. But I will  
 3 admit it as CA-29.  
 4 MR. FASSBURG: Before it's admitted, can we  
 5 have an opportunity to review? I think the substance of  
 6 what the statement contains may have some relevance to  
 7 its admissibility.  
 8 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Right.  
 9 MR. FASSBURG: When senior Mr. Fricke read  
 10 his statement, I intended to make objections if I had  
 11 any, and so here if I can at least review it and have an  
 12 opportunity to object, that would be preferable.  
 13 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. That makes sense.  
 14 So...  
 15 Thank you.  
 16 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you.  
 17 MR. FASSBURG: Do you have an extra copy?  
 18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. And for the record,  
 19 CA-29 has been offered, there is an objection, and I  
 20 will rule on its admissibility after the testimony has  
 21 been presented.  
 22 Whenever you're ready, Mr. Fricke.  
 23 JOHN FRICKE: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor,  
 24 I, John E. Fricke, Vice President Operations, Chief  
 25 Operating Officer of Pacific Northwest Transportation

Page 34

1 Services, Incorporated, d/b/a Capital Aeroporter am  
 2 submitting the following in opposition to the extension  
 3 application in this proceeding.  
 4 Capital Aeroporter, referred to as Capital,  
 5 has provided and will continue to provide scheduled  
 6 service between the Holiday Inn Express & Suites Tacoma  
 7 South - Lakewood, located at 11751 Pacific Highway  
 8 Southwest, Lakewood, Washington 98499, and the  
 9 Seattle-Tacoma International Airport located in the city  
 10 of SeaTac.  
 11 Capital continues to monitor the needs of  
 12 the ground transportation marketplace and steady ways to  
 13 improve the service provided to the general public and  
 14 guests of the Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood. These  
 15 improvements include increasing the number of trips,  
 16 adding additional vehicles during peak travel times and  
 17 high demand, convenient online booking options, email  
 18 and text booking confirmations, and most recently, our  
 19 newly added interactive service features, Airport  
 20 Instructions Guidance, Where's My Van, Driver on  
 21 Location, and Rate My Ride, all of which utilize GPS  
 22 tracking of all our vehicles.  
 23 By adding additional convenient features  
 24 like these to our service, as well as our innovative  
 25 fleet tracking system, we are increasing our efficiency

Page 35

1 and ensuring safety. The service delivered to our  
 2 customers is timely, punctual, frequent, and  
 3 expeditious. Our drivers and customer service staff  
 4 work hard with courtesy and respect to provide all  
 5 customers with exceptional service including driver  
 6 luggage handling for every customer.  
 7 Our scheduled service times are conveniently  
 8 available online through our website to all consumers or  
 9 as they consider what optional pick-up and drop-off  
 10 times work best with their desired pick-up time or  
 11 flight itinerary as well as over the phone with our  
 12 customer service representatives. We are committed to  
 13 maintaining our schedules for the best customer service  
 14 possible.  
 15 Capital operates essentially the same  
 16 service as the applicant, Bremerton Kitsap Airporter,  
 17 yet to a higher degree of service, specifically 23 trips  
 18 to SeaTac compared with applicant's proposed 13 trips.  
 19 Scheduled times that allow for actual travel distance of  
 20 32 miles by road compared to Applicant's impossible 25  
 21 minutes allowed by proposed time schedule.  
 22 Per WAC 480-30-140, Capital provides  
 23 scheduled service between the Holiday Inn Express &  
 24 Suites Tacoma South - Lakewood and satisfies the public  
 25 convenience and necessity by providing the same service

Page 36

1 as proposed by the applicant and does so to the  
 2 satisfaction of the Commission. We offer numerous  
 3 options to the general public. In fact, over the past  
 4 six months, we have been exploring new ways to improve  
 5 our scheduled service options, including testing market  
 6 fare elasticity to attract new customers with lower fare  
 7 options at different stops along the I-5 corridor.  
 8 Specifically in October 2018, we contacted  
 9 the Holiday Inn Express Tacoma South - Lakewood to  
 10 inquire how we could better serve their guests. I  
 11 scheduled an appointment with Amanda Richardson, front  
 12 office manager, and Teresa Simplot, general manager, on  
 13 October 22nd, 2018, for a 1:00 p.m. meeting.  
 14 Unfortunately, Ms. Simplot was unable to attend the  
 15 scheduled meeting; however, Mr. James Fricke, Jim  
 16 Fricke, and I were able to provide Ms. Richardson with  
 17 all the details of our scheduled service.  
 18 I followed up with an email in early  
 19 December 2018 with details discussed at the meeting and  
 20 details about a portal link setup with a discount  
 21 offering for guests of the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood.  
 22 We also stopped by the hotel again on December 12, 2018,  
 23 at 11:30 a.m. in an attempt to meet with Ms. Simplot.  
 24 Again, she was unavailable. I also reached out numerous  
 25 times via phone and email to follow up and continue to

Page 37

1 foster our business relationship.  
 2 Fortunately, in early January 2019, I was  
 3 able to speak directly with Ms. Simplot to confirm she  
 4 received the emails and ask how we could better serve  
 5 the Holiday Inn Lakewood guests. She told me she  
 6 received the emails and that we could drop off some of  
 7 our brochures. On January 21, 2019, one of our company  
 8 representatives stopped by and briefly spoke with  
 9 Ms. Simplot and dropped off brochures.  
 10 I, again, followed up with another email in  
 11 February of 2019. Ms. Simplot only reached out once via  
 12 phone on Monday, March 11, 2019, at 9:30 a.m. During  
 13 that conversation, she again acknowledged receiving the  
 14 emails.  
 15 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Thank you.  
 16 Are there any objections to the admission of  
 17 CA-29?  
 18 MR. FASSBURG: There are, Your Honor. To  
 19 articulate this will be a little difficult, but a  
 20 section of what Mr. Fricke has just read, beginning on  
 21 the second page, the fourth paragraph down, beginning  
 22 with, (as read) We offer numerous service options to the  
 23 general public, et cetera, what Mr. Fricke has just  
 24 described, and which should be stricken from the record,  
 25 are attempts to improve service after the application.

Page 38

1 In fact, although this application was filed  
 2 in December, it originated in a September 10, 2018  
 3 application for tariff revision by Bremerton Kitsap  
 4 Airporter. It was determined that that should have been  
 5 filed as an application as opposed to a tariff revision.  
 6 And so that docket I believe was closed and a new  
 7 application filed.  
 8 Per its statement or per Mr. Fricke's  
 9 statement, these attempts to improve service occurred in  
 10 October 2018 after Bremerton Kitsap Airporter attempted  
 11 to seek service at that additional stop. Post  
 12 application service improvements are inadmissible and  
 13 irrelevant to the application of Bremerton Kitsap  
 14 Airporter by rule.  
 15 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, if I may?  
 16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yes.  
 17 JOHN FRICKE: That application was submitted  
 18 in December 2018 for the extension of authority.  
 19 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. I -- I am reading  
 20 the rule. Rule 1, 480-30-140 does say that the -- when  
 21 looking at whether service is to the satisfaction of the  
 22 Commission, you look at the objecting company's  
 23 performance prior to the date of application and you  
 24 look back generally no more than one year.  
 25 Is that what you're referring to?

Page 39

1 MR. FASSBURG: That is the rule I'm  
 2 referring to, but what I'm noting is that this was  
 3 originally -- this -- it's a new docket number, but this  
 4 attempt by Bremerton Kitsap Airporter to expand service  
 5 to the Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood was initiated in  
 6 September 2018 as a -- what I'll state was erroneously  
 7 as a tariff revision when instead it really needed to be  
 8 a new application.  
 9 And so the post-application service  
 10 improvement rule should relate back to the original  
 11 filing. Here on its face, and according to Mr. Fricke's  
 12 reading of his statement, these service improvement  
 13 attempts occurred after Bremerton Air -- Bremerton  
 14 Kitsap Airporter attempted to expand service to that  
 15 location.  
 16 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, again, the  
 17 application was submitted in December 2018. Bremerton  
 18 Kitsap's attempt to ignore WAC and RCW -- or RCW 81.68  
 19 and WAC 480-30 regarding the rules of application for  
 20 extension of authority were that was not an application  
 21 submitted in September. That was an attempt to add  
 22 authority that they did not have. That was -- there was  
 23 no application provided until December 2018.  
 24 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. I -- the -- the  
 25 testimony is already -- he read it into the record.

Page 40

1 MR. FASSBURG: Sure.  
 2 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So I am going to admit  
 3 CA-29.  
 4 (Exhibit CA-29 admitted.)  
 5 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So at this time, do you  
 6 have anything further or are you available for cross?  
 7 JOHN FRICKE: Nothing further from our  
 8 testimony. I do have one additional exhibit to offer  
 9 the proceeding. It is -- and it did not become apparent  
 10 that -- that it was necessary until Bremerton Kitsap's  
 11 exhibit list and exhibits were contributed on this past  
 12 week in reviewing, but the supplemental state -- the  
 13 supplemental customer support statement where the -- the  
 14 support statement, the supplemental support statement  
 15 suddenly included the name Capital Aeroporter in the  
 16 statement, which was not previously provided back on the  
 17 signed statement of November 2018.  
 18 I do have an email chain of communication to  
 19 the Holiday Inn Express & Suites Lakewood - Tacoma  
 20 South, and it provides additional factual information to  
 21 support the fact that Capital Aeroporter provides  
 22 scheduled service between SeaTac Airport and the Holiday  
 23 Express Tacoma South - Lakewood.  
 24 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Can you provide  
 25 copies to counsel and myself?

Page 41

1 JOHN FRICKE: Yes, I can.  
 2 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So, Mr. Fassburg and  
 3 Mr. Callaghan, once you've had a chance to review it --  
 4 MR. FASSBURG: Sure.  
 5 JUDGE CHARTOFF: -- let me know if you have  
 6 any objections.  
 7 MR. FASSBURG: Your Honor, we do have an  
 8 objection, and frankly, reading this over, I wanted to  
 9 see if this was something that contained information of  
 10 a third party. It appears to be a chain of emails from  
 11 Mr. Fricke to Teresa Simplot and Amanda, whose last name  
 12 I am not seeing, but apparently someone at the Holiday  
 13 Inn Express in Lakewood, and these appear to be emails  
 14 strictly from Mr. Fricke to those people.  
 15 And in which case, they appear to be solely  
 16 self-serving attempts from Mr. Fricke to communicate to  
 17 the Holiday Inn Express his point of view. I think  
 18 there's no value in this exhibit. If Mr. Fricke wants  
 19 to testify about the services being offered by Capital  
 20 Aeroporter, he would be free to do so relevant to this  
 21 proceeding.  
 22 MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Commission Staff  
 23 would also object. Because the statements in Exhibit 28  
 24 and 29 were essentially testimony that were written into  
 25 the record, I didn't find it objectionable that those

Page 42

1 exhibits weren't provided on March 11 as was required by  
 2 the prehearing order. However, this exhibit is an email  
 3 chain, and it appears that the last email was sent on  
 4 February 20th of 2019, and I find that the explanation  
 5 that this wasn't provided because its relevance wasn't  
 6 apparent to the parties, I don't find that to be  
 7 credible.  
 8 I mean, this is a set of emails between  
 9 the -- well, this is to the manager of the hotel that is  
 10 the stop in question. I don't believe it's fair to the  
 11 parties that this was provided after March 11th. I  
 12 think the relevance was clear and so I -- on procedural  
 13 grounds, I would ask that this not be admitted.  
 14 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, again, it provides  
 15 more facts and details regarding the communication  
 16 and -- and building relationships with not only the  
 17 Holiday Inn Express, but it -- it specifically is a  
 18 continuation of the communication made with and  
 19 interaction meeting with the hotel front desk manager,  
 20 Amanda Richardson, from back in October. And -- and  
 21 pertains to the -- the fact of providing same service as  
 22 proposed by the applicant.  
 23 MR. FASSBURG: Your Honor, his --  
 24 Mr. Fricke's statement about this somehow relating back  
 25 to October isn't apparent from the face of the exhibit.

Page 43

1 This email chain, the earliest dated email is  
 2 December 11, 2018, which is clearly after the  
 3 application date. Notwithstanding Mr. Fricke's argument  
 4 about the technical date of application, that was  
 5 December 4, 2018.  
 6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. I am ready to rule.  
 7 I am going to admit this exhibit. I think it's  
 8 relevant. I think it has limited probative value, but  
 9 I'm not -- I can't say at this time that it's not at all  
 10 relevant. So I am going to admit it.  
 11 (Exhibit CA-30 admitted.)  
 12 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, also added  
 13 additional to my testimony, I would like to speak to  
 14 Exhibits CA-1 through CA-17.  
 15 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 16 JOHN FRICKE: As well as Exhibit BKA-1  
 17 through BKA-5.  
 18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Please proceed.  
 19 JOHN FRICKE: Also providing support  
 20 statement from an independent witness of the public, we  
 21 have Exhibit No. CA-1 from Ms. Debra Curner who was the  
 22 best -- manager at the Best Western Liberty Inn located  
 23 in DuPont and very familiar with our operations in  
 24 Pierce County inclusive of Lakewood, DuPont, JBLM area.  
 25 Do I need to describe the details within the letter

Page 44

1 or...  
 2 JUDGE CHARTOFF: No, I -- I have read all  
 3 the exhibits.  
 4 JOHN FRICKE: Okay. Okay. Okay. Okay.  
 5 Additional and as well as Ms. Debra Curner is available  
 6 via telephone. We can have her call in to the -- the  
 7 bridge line to be available to provide additional  
 8 testimony and available for cross-examination.  
 9 Additionally, we have a second supporting  
 10 witness again affirming the fact of Capital Aeroporter's  
 11 offering and providing the scheduled service from  
 12 Exhibit No. CA-2, Shelly Grundon, who is a front desk  
 13 guest services at the TownePlace Suites in Lakewood  
 14 right next door to the Holiday Inn Express Suites in  
 15 Lakewood.  
 16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 17 JOHN FRICKE: Exhibit No. CA-3, the  
 18 certificate of authority CA-62, section -- section 2,  
 19 part B, providing passenger service between  
 20 Seattle-Tacoma International Airport and specifically  
 21 Lakewood named in our authority, of which the Holiday  
 22 Inn Express Suites Tacoma South - Lakewood, it falls  
 23 within the city of Lakewood.  
 24 Also making note of section 7 of our  
 25 authority in certificate CA-62, combined operations

Page 45

1 under the certificate may be combined in one vehicle for  
 2 operational convenience of the carrier in which Capital  
 3 Aeroporter combines both door-to-door service and  
 4 scheduled service when convenient for the customer and  
 5 the operator.  
 6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So I have a clarifying  
 7 question. So on -- I'm looking at schedule 72, is that  
 8 what you were just talking about?  
 9 JOHN FRICKE: I was referring to certificate  
 10 CA-62.  
 11 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, okay. You're on the  
 12 previous.  
 13 JOHN FRICKE: But yes, now on to C --  
 14 Exhibit CA-4, time schedule No. 72.  
 15 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So I see that the schedule  
 16 provides the times that you leave the airport and the  
 17 times that you arrive at the airport.  
 18 JOHN FRICKE: That is correct.  
 19 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Do you have a schedule that  
 20 lists any other stops?  
 21 JOHN FRICKE: Our -- our schedule of -- of  
 22 pick-ups are we operate under scheduled line runs, which  
 23 are basically timed out pick-up points along the route.  
 24 We operate an irregular route as -- as opposed to the  
 25 regular route of the applicant where we -- we operate

Page 46

1 based upon reservations.  
 2 So dependent upon the reservations and the  
 3 time, which allows operational efficiencies for  
 4 customers for the most efficient ride to the airport,  
 5 we -- we stand by this arrival time at the airport and  
 6 provide the pick-up time to the customer for both  
 7 scheduled service and for door-to-door service.  
 8 So the -- the pick-up times may vary  
 9 slightly, but, again, it is -- it is a schedule that is  
 10 operated for the efficiency of the customers and all  
 11 operated by reservation only to the airport similar to  
 12 the applicant.  
 13 From the airport, we do require reservations  
 14 and that is so that we have a good understanding of the  
 15 passenger loads that are expected so that during peaks  
 16 of -- during times of high demand, such as holiday time,  
 17 when a high number of people will be coming into the  
 18 airport, we add additional vehicles for convenience of  
 19 the customers so we aren't overloading the vehicles and  
 20 leaving people behind at the airport for a couple hours.  
 21 And that is operated on a scheduled -- scheduled  
 22 departure times as well.  
 23 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh --  
 24 JOHN FRICKE: Did you have a -- did you have  
 25 a question for this or should we wait for questions?

Page 47

1 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, yeah, please move on  
 2 and --  
 3 JOHN FRICKE: Okay. Okay. Exhibit  
 4 No. CA-5, Tariff No. 4, the rates that are set and  
 5 passenger rules for operation. There you can see  
 6 section 4 discount fares that we offer as another added  
 7 convenience and to enhance the service to meet the  
 8 market demands and needs of potential customers  
 9 providing military discounts to those service members,  
 10 active service duty members in and around JBLM as well  
 11 as student, senior discounts, airline employee  
 12 discounts, and numerous other discounts.  
 13 Additional rules to provide for operational  
 14 safety and efficiency. We then have our 25th revised  
 15 page 4-A, which displays our schedule of fares. And  
 16 this is for -- it's notated with zone letters that are  
 17 related to specific cities and areas within our  
 18 authorized service area. The double letter zones are  
 19 the fares, base fares and max fares, as we operate under  
 20 the flexibility fare rule. The double letter zones are  
 21 the inns and regular stops fares for our scheduled  
 22 service. And the single letter zones are for  
 23 door-to-door fares. And also shows different service  
 24 options of direct nonstop service that we provide in  
 25 zones AC through zone GG and zone J.

Page 48

1 Next page, 20th revised page 4 is the key  
 2 for the zones. The one zone that pertains to this  
 3 proceeding is zone DD, where it's notated -- notated  
 4 98499 Lakewood. So that would refer to the scheduled  
 5 service options in Lakewood 98499.  
 6 Again, footnoted on 15th revised page 4-G  
 7 you will see the inn's regular stops equals motels,  
 8 hotels, or other commercial lodging facility or  
 9 designated stop, which is designated by Capital  
 10 Aeroporter for pick-up for scheduled service, in -- in  
 11 contrast to the door-to-door service at home locations  
 12 where the stop is designated by the customer.  
 13 Next we have Exhibit No. CA-6, which  
 14 provides a full list of our fleet that we utilize to  
 15 provide our services. You will see the majority of them  
 16 are 2016 vehicles, so fairly new vehicles to provide the  
 17 best service possible for the customers. We operate in  
 18 the majority Mercedes Sprinter fleets, with a couple  
 19 Mercedes Metris, which are smaller vans, and  
 20 additionally, a couple Ford Transit vans, one higher  
 21 capacity 14-passenger van as well as a Ford Starcraft  
 22 van, which seats up to 28 customers.  
 23 Next exhibit, No. CA-7, is a screen shot of  
 24 a search on Google for a scheduled Lakewood, Washington  
 25 airport shuttle. You'll see the first result on there

Page 49

1 is an ad that we pay for for SeaTac Airport Shuttle.  
 2 The second listing, which is the first organic result  
 3 when someone from the public searches online, Lakewood  
 4 Airport Shuttle, Capital Aeroporter Tacoma, (as read)  
 5 Check out our airport shuttle packages from SeaTac to  
 6 Lakewood with scheduled service and door-to-door service  
 7 near Ft. Lewis-McChord, JBLM.  
 8 The next result is SeaTac Airport Shuttle  
 9 Seattle and Tacoma, Capital Aeroporter, described with  
 10 our SeaTac Airport Shuttle door-to-door and scheduled  
 11 transportation service offers. Airport shuttles also  
 12 serving in Auburn, Federal Way, Kent, Lacey, and  
 13 Lakewood.  
 14 Next exhibit we provided is Exhibit  
 15 No. CA-8. This is the web page that is shown from  
 16 previous Exhibit No. CA-7. If you click through from  
 17 that top organic result from Google, you get our page  
 18 for Lakewood airport shuttles. Is it necessary to  
 19 describe the details within that or --  
 20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: No.  
 21 JOHN FRICKE: -- have you -- you've reviewed  
 22 those?  
 23 JUDGE CHARTOFF: And it is 10:30. I want  
 24 to -- we have to take a break at some point, and I want  
 25 to get a sense for how much more testimony you're going

Page 50

1 to give.  
 2 JOHN FRICKE: I can probably finish this  
 3 portion through our -- the exhibits offered by Capital  
 4 Aeroporter in the next ten minutes.  
 5 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 6 JOHN FRICKE: And then I would prob- -- I  
 7 would need until -- we can wait until after the break to  
 8 continue with the BKA exhibits. Maybe possibly --  
 9 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 10 JOHN FRICKE: -- 20 minutes of testimony  
 11 upon the BKA exhibits.  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: 20 minutes, okay. Well,  
 13 keep it moving.  
 14 JOHN FRICKE: Okay. Let me know when you'd  
 15 like me to stop.  
 16 Okay. So Exhibit No. CA-9, this is a screen  
 17 shot of our reservation page online. This in particular  
 18 relates to -- in testing our fare elasticity, as  
 19 mentioned previously in my testimony, where we have  
 20 tested a \$20 discount from the standard fare of what we  
 21 charge. Our standard fare is \$43 for one adult, where  
 22 this is offering \$23, and then each additional passenger  
 23 is \$11. And it displays the share ride scheduled van  
 24 option from the Holiday Inn Express & Suites Lakewood -  
 25 Tacoma South.

Page 51

1 The next exhibit, CA-10, displays again the  
 2 same option, however, with two passengers. So the --  
 3 the price we have tested with only \$34 for two customers  
 4 so that breaks down to only \$17 per -- per person for  
 5 the shared ride scheduled van option. And this  
 6 specifically is for the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood -  
 7 Tacoma South.  
 8 Exhibit No. CA-11 shows our reservation data  
 9 for scheduled pick-up dates from December 1, 2016, to  
 10 November 30, 2017. And you can see listed about  
 11 two-thirds of the way down, Holiday Inn Express  
 12 Lakewood. During that 12-month period, we had 20  
 13 reservations, ten of them were made online for a total  
 14 of 26 customers, which comes out to about 1.2 customers  
 15 per month from the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood.  
 16 Exhibit No. CA-12 shows the scheduled  
 17 pick-up dates from December 1, 2017, to  
 18 November 30, 2018, pretty much fully within one year of  
 19 the application of the applicant. Shows Holiday Inn  
 20 Express Lakewood. For some reason, there's one --  
 21 separate one up above, but if you add the one with the  
 22 ten, there is a total of 11 reservations booked, six  
 23 online, and a total of 12 passengers, which actually  
 24 shows a decline then of only one customer per month for  
 25 that year.

Page 52

1 Then again, most recently we show the  
 2 scheduled pick-up time, Exhibit No. CA-13. Scheduled  
 3 pick-up dates February 18, 2019, to March 10, 2019.  
 4 This is to display the most recent activity at -- from  
 5 the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood where we have over a  
 6 three-week period two customers booked -- or two  
 7 reservations booked with a total of two customers.  
 8 Exhibit No. CA-14 shows scheduled pick-up  
 9 dates by drop-off location, so this would be from SeaTac  
 10 Airport, for example, to Holiday Inn Express Lakewood.  
 11 December 1, 2016, to November 30, 2017, here we are  
 12 shown 27 booking reservations online, 13 made on the web  
 13 for a total of 33 customers. So that shows about two  
 14 and a half customers from the airport to the Holiday Inn  
 15 Express Lakewood. And the majority of those were  
 16 walk-on, added at the airport, as there was no other  
 17 available service at the time the customers wanted to go  
 18 to the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood or nearby to JBLM.  
 19 Exhibit No. CA-15, scheduled pick-up dates  
 20 December 1, 2017, to November 30th, 2018, again, by  
 21 drop-off location. So that would be from SeaTac Airport  
 22 to the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood. Shows 18  
 23 reservations, eight made online, and the total of 36  
 24 passengers. For an average of two and a half -- or  
 25 sorry, three customers per month.

Page 53

1 And then Exhibit No. CA-16, scheduled  
 2 pick-up dates by drop-off location from SeaTac Airport,  
 3 February 18, 2019, through March 10, 2019, which shows  
 4 two reservations booked for a total of two customers, so  
 5 that would be about one and a half customers average per  
 6 week.  
 7 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Can I ask a clarifying  
 8 question? So on your form, it says "average fare" and  
 9 then "average fare PP," is -- what is the difference  
 10 between those two?  
 11 JOHN FRICKE: On which exhibit are you  
 12 referring?  
 13 JUDGE CHARTOFF: I think it's on --  
 14 JOHN FRICKE: Oh, average fare would be per  
 15 reservation, average fare PP would be per person.  
 16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, okay. So the total  
 17 passengers would be total passengers, average passengers  
 18 per trip; is that --  
 19 JOHN FRICKE: Average -- average fare, so --  
 20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, no, I mean, and then  
 21 further along --  
 22 (Multiple speakers.)  
 23 JOHN FRICKE: That -- that would be average  
 24 passengers per reservation to or from that location.  
 25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.

Page 54

1 JOHN FRICKE: And then the total is for the  
 2 total fare during that time period, for example, the  
 3 entire year for one of the one-year test periods.  
 4 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, okay.  
 5 JOHN FRICKE: And then you can see during  
 6 the February 18, 2019, to March 10, 2019, for example,  
 7 by drop-off location Holiday Inn Express Suites  
 8 Lakewood, if you go over and you see total fare 66,  
 9 average fare is 33, average fare per person 33, that  
 10 would mean one was booked at our standard fare of 43 and  
 11 then one was booked at the promotional discounted fare  
 12 of 23.  
 13 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 14 JOHN FRICKE: Where's the exhibit list?  
 15 So then the only other exhibit left is  
 16 CA-17, but I believe that is also -- that is Bremerton  
 17 Kitsap Airporter's time schedule No. 23, which is also  
 18 an Exhibit BKA-11. I'll speak to that after the break.  
 19 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Would everyone -- is  
 20 there anyone who wants to take a break now or -- yes?  
 21 Okay. We -- we will be in recess for ten minutes at --  
 22 okay. Thank you.  
 23 (Recess was taken from 10:39 a.m.  
 24 until 10:49 a.m.)  
 25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: We are back on the record.

Page 55

1 Mr. John Fricke is continuing his testimony.  
 2 You are still under oath. Please proceed  
 3 when you're ready.  
 4 JOHN FRICKE: Yes, Your Honor. Before I  
 5 move on to the Bremerton Kitsap exhibits, I would like  
 6 to make note to Exhibit -- Exhibit No. CA-30 admitted  
 7 today. So, again, this is communication to the  
 8 manager -- management, both managers at the Holiday Inn  
 9 Express & Suites Lakewood - Tacoma South reiterating the  
 10 contents of our meeting from October 2018. Just  
 11 clarifying the number of trips that we offered, 23  
 12 scheduled trips to them, in fact, I had listed out every  
 13 scheduled pick-up time available.  
 14 Listed are standard one-way fares of one  
 15 passenger, 43; two passengers, \$54; three passengers for  
 16 \$65; and four passengers for 76. As well as the  
 17 promotional fare of a \$20 discount with one passenger at  
 18 \$23, two passengers at \$34, three passengers at \$45, and  
 19 four passengers at \$56.  
 20 This test period went on for a period of 90  
 21 days, and I received no -- we received no additional  
 22 requests for service to or from the Holiday Inn Express  
 23 Lakewood as we had previously had in comparison to the  
 24 standard fare \$43 that we had been charging. So it  
 25 showed no change in demand for service, which remained

Page 56

1 at the same level.  
 2 Okay. Continuing on to Bremerton Kitsap  
 3 Exhibit BKA-2. This is a letter provided by Teresa  
 4 Simplot, general manager, Holiday Inn Express & Suites  
 5 Lakewood. I don't see a date on this letter, so I'm not  
 6 sure when it was written. The letter makes no mention  
 7 of Capital Aeroporter or our service that we provide  
 8 in -- to or from the hotel. And it does note at -- at  
 9 this time when this letter was written, (as read)  
 10 Transportation that is cost-effective and available has  
 11 a two-and-a-half-hour interval between runs, which  
 12 simply will not accommodate guests' needs.  
 13 So the frequency that we have been operating  
 14 and were operating at the time of this letter, since it  
 15 was apparently not before 2013 when we made our last  
 16 schedule change, we operate an average of every 60  
 17 minutes to and from the hotel.  
 18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 19 JOHN FRICKE: And then furthermore, it -- it  
 20 notates, (as read) I appreciate any company that will go  
 21 out there not -- to try to not only expand the service,  
 22 but to work on a more efficient and cost-effective means  
 23 of transportation. So it speaks directly to the needs  
 24 of the guests only. It does not -- it does not provide  
 25 any information or support for any non-hotel guest to or

Page 57

1 from the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood.  
 2 Exhibit No. BKA-3, again, it addresses the  
 3 question of description of transportation service that  
 4 is needed, that the hotel services all types of guests  
 5 in need of transportation to and from the airport, which  
 6 Capital Aeroporter provided and does provide. To have  
 7 additional times, the transportation runs back and forth  
 8 would be extremely beneficial. Again, our -- our  
 9 service is more frequent than that proposed by the  
 10 applicant.  
 11 (As read) Are transportation needs being met  
 12 now? No. So the statement says that they are not, the  
 13 cost is prohibitive and times of transportation do not  
 14 fit the needs of guests. (As read) We need to have  
 15 other options that are more convenient; more times, more  
 16 runs. Again, Capital Aeroporter has been providing and  
 17 will continue to provide more times and more runs than  
 18 that offered by the applicant.  
 19 (As read) If the request is denied, would it  
 20 have an effect on the business? Yes. We see some  
 21 guests will check out early and move to an airport hotel  
 22 the day before they fly out. So this isn't convenient  
 23 to get them from our hotel to SeaTac.  
 24 So, again, we do provide and have provided  
 25 service very early morning until late at night. And so

Page 58

1 this statement is not acknowledging that fact, and, in  
 2 fact, supporting the applicant to financially support  
 3 the hotel.  
 4 Exhibit BKA-4, supplemental support  
 5 statement provided March 8, 2019. In this statement,  
 6 our company, Capital Aeroporter, is now specifically  
 7 mentioned, not at the time of application, but three --  
 8 more than three months after application for this  
 9 service. (As read) Briefly describe the transportation  
 10 service you need. Some guests have complained that the  
 11 fares charged by Capital Aeroporter for transportation  
 12 to SeaTac are too high. Ms. Simplot never reached out  
 13 regarding any customers or any complaints about our  
 14 fares.  
 15 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 16 JOHN FRICKE: Even with the discounted fares  
 17 offered before this date of March 8, 2019.  
 18 (As read) Are transportation needs being met  
 19 now? No. The cost of using Capital Aeroporter can be  
 20 prohibitive and the times of transportation do not fit  
 21 the needs of our guests. If there are lower -- other  
 22 lower price options with additional times and more runs,  
 23 it would be more convenient.  
 24 Again, well before March 8, 2019, I had  
 25 indicated the services and prices we were offering in

Page 59

1 that string of emails, Exhibit No. CA-30, with lower  
 2 prices and more additional times than that proposed by  
 3 the applicant.  
 4 Next, Exhibit No. BKA-5. This is the  
 5 verified statement of the applicant. I won't go through  
 6 the beginning details, but down in the third paragraph,  
 7 Mr. Asche speaks to all BKA drivers must be pre-screened  
 8 and all individual passenger military identifications  
 9 are checked upon entry to the base. This results in  
 10 delays. This does not -- how do I say this? Again, we  
 11 provide the scheduled service available to and from  
 12 Holiday Inn Lakewood where this is not an issue. There  
 13 is no security issues at that location.  
 14 Further down, the last paragraph on the page  
 15 1 of 2, (as read) The Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood is  
 16 a spillover lodging site for overflow guests at both  
 17 Evergreen Lodges at JBLM. Again, the Holiday Inn  
 18 Express Lakewood is in our Capital Aeroporter  
 19 certificated authority and we service that location.  
 20 Next, I will address BKA -- BKA-10, Tariff  
 21 No. 10, which -- in which we, Capital Aeroporter, offers  
 22 reservations, again, to and from the airport to allow  
 23 convenience and frequency to the traveling public, where  
 24 this is not an option from the applicant with this --  
 25 with the service proposed and vehicles could become

Page 60

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / CALLAGHAN

1 overloaded or not have rides for customers without  
 2 reservations.  
 3 Next we have BKA-11, time schedule No. 23.  
 4 This shows locations not authorized by our -- us for to  
 5 provide same service. However, again, the service that  
 6 Capital Aeroporter provides, we allow adequate travel  
 7 time for traffic issues to make sure that we get our  
 8 customers to the airport at scheduled times, which is  
 9 not necessarily practical upon this schedule.  
 10 And then I believe that will be all for my  
 11 testimony at this time.  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you. Thank you.  
 13 We'll move to cross.  
 14 Mr. Callaghan?  
 15 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. And,  
 16 Your Honor, I only have questions for Mr. John Fricke.  
 17  
 18 E X A M I N A T I O N  
 19 BY MR. CALLAGHAN:  
 20 Q. So, Mr. Fricke, earlier in your testimony, I  
 21 think that you stated that the \$23 fare amount was a  
 22 promotional figure; is that correct?  
 23 A. That's correct.  
 24 Q. And for a single scheduled fare, what is the  
 25 current amount that Capital charges?



Page 61

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / CALLAGHAN

1 **A. For -- for a standard fare is \$43 one-way.**  
 2 **Standard fare -- the discounted fare military, student,**  
 3 **airline employee, et cetera, is \$40.**  
 4 Q. Okay. So that is the amount that you charge for  
 5 a single person on a shared reservation from the  
 6 Lakewood Holiday Inn hotel to SeaTac Airport; is that  
 7 correct?  
 8 **A. That's -- that's what we charge for a scheduled**  
 9 **shared service from the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood,**  
 10 **yes.**  
 11 Q. Okay. And in your testimony, you stated that  
 12 you had spoke with the hotel manager, Ms. Simplot, on  
 13 Monday, March 11th; is that correct?  
 14 **A. Yes, that's correct.**  
 15 Q. And at that time, had you reviewed the  
 16 statements that she had signed and which were filed as  
 17 exhibits by Bremerton Kitsap in this case?  
 18 **A. In October?**  
 19 Q. I'm sorry, March 11 --  
 20 **A. Oh, oh.**  
 21 Q. -- 2019?  
 22 **A. March, I'm sorry. Can you restate the question?**  
 23 Q. Yes. At the time that you spoke with  
 24 Ms. Simplot on the phone on Monday, March 11, 2019, had  
 25 you reviewed the exhibits that were the signed

Page 62

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / CALLAGHAN

1 statements of Ms. Simplot that were the proposed  
 2 exhibits from Bremerton Kitsap?  
 3 **A. There were no exhibits submitted until 4:30 p.m.**  
 4 **on Monday, March 11th by Bremerton Kitsap Airporter.**  
 5 Q. All right. At the time you spoke with  
 6 Ms. Simplot, did you ask her about any customer  
 7 complaints about Capital's service at the hotel?  
 8 **A. Yes, I certainly did. I asked Ms. Simplot, have**  
 9 **we ever refused service or had any complaints about**  
 10 **service to or from your hotel location for your guests,**  
 11 **and she replied --**  
 12 MR. FASSBURG: I'm going to object. He's  
 13 attempting to offer a hearsay statement from a person  
 14 who is not here to discuss what she said.  
 15 JOHN FRICKE: Certainly --  
 16 MR. FASSBURG: Can you wait --  
 17 JOHN FRICKE: Sorry, sorry.  
 18 MR. FASSBURG: -- until she rules on my  
 19 objection?  
 20 MR. CALLAGHAN: And, Your Honor, given that  
 21 this is a brief adjudicative proceeding, I believe that  
 22 hearsay is allowed and that it can simply be offered and  
 23 given the appropriate weight given that it normally  
 24 would be considered hearsay.  
 25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. I will allow it.

Page 63

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / CALLAGHAN

1 You may respond.  
 2 JOHN FRICKE: Okay.  
 3 **A. I'm sorry, I forgot where I was at in my**  
 4 **statement.**  
 5 BY MR. CALLAGHAN:  
 6 Q. So, Mr. Fricke, what was Ms. Simplot's response  
 7 to your question about the adequacy of Capital --  
 8 Capital's service to the hotel?  
 9 **A. She said, I have not had any problems with my**  
 10 **hotel guests traveling with you. However, she was a bit**  
 11 **dismayed about during the snowstorm, where we had to**  
 12 **operate particularly along the I-5 corridor in February,**  
 13 **that we had dropped off some customers at the hotel**  
 14 **location because it was a safe, warm lodging facility**  
 15 **that were not guests of the hotel. And she was not**  
 16 **pleased. Other than that, she said we provided service**  
 17 **just fine, but she was not actively utilizing our**  
 18 **services.**  
 19 Q. Did Ms. Simplot have any complaint regarding the  
 20 frequency of scheduled pick-ups from the hotel?  
 21 **A. No, she did not.**  
 22 Q. And in your testimony, you stated that Capital  
 23 picks up customers from the hotel 23 times a day; is  
 24 that correct?  
 25 **A. That's correct, by reservation only.**

Page 64

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / CALLAGHAN

1 Q. And the 23 trips, are those all at scheduled  
 2 times?  
 3 **A. Yes, and those are the times that are listed in**  
 4 **Exhibit CA-30.**  
 5 Q. All right. And have you reviewed the Bremerton  
 6 Kitsap's Exhibit No. 2?  
 7 **A. Yes, I have, the letter from Ms. Simplot.**  
 8 Q. And so in Ms. Simplot's statement, did you  
 9 review the second paragraph in which she states that the  
 10 cost-effective transportation is available in  
 11 two-and-a-half-hour intervals?  
 12 **A. Did I review it?**  
 13 Q. Yes.  
 14 **A. Yes, I did.**  
 15 Q. And if Ms. Simplot is referring to Capital  
 16 Aeroporter, is that accurate in terms of the amount of  
 17 time in between your scheduled pick-up intervals?  
 18 **A. No, that is an inaccurate statement. I believe**  
 19 **it refers to that of Ft. Lewis McChord Airporter**  
 20 **operated by Bremerton Kitsap Airporter to and from JBLM.**  
 21 Q. And I'm sorry, what -- what leads you to believe  
 22 that?  
 23 **A. In reviewing the Exhibit BKA-11, the time**  
 24 **schedule No. 23 as well as checking online, the**  
 25 **frequency of service is every two and a half hours of**

Page 65

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / CALLAGHAN**

1 Ft. Lewis McChord Airporter.  
 2 Q. But Bremerton Kitsap doesn't currently serve the  
 3 Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood; is that correct?  
 4 **A. That is correct.**  
 5 Q. And, Mr. Fricke, did you review Bremerton  
 6 Kitsap's Exhibit No. 4?  
 7 **A. Yes, I reviewed Exhibit No. 4, BKA-4.**  
 8 Q. And is this a statement from Teresa Simplot?  
 9 **A. There's no way to verify for sure. However, the**  
 10 **signature seems to match that of the statement provided**  
 11 **approximately four months prior.**  
 12 Q. And --  
 13 **A. Sorry, in Exhibit BKA-3.**  
 14 Q. And have you reviewed Exhibit 4, have you read  
 15 its contents?  
 16 **A. Yes, I have.**  
 17 Q. When -- in answer to I believe the second  
 18 question, Ms. Simplot states that Capital Aeroporter's  
 19 costs can be prohibitive for some of the guests. Have  
 20 you reached out to Ms. Simplot to discuss that?  
 21 **A. I attempted to reach out to Ms. Simplot numerous**  
 22 **times via phone, email, and appearing at the hotel twice**  
 23 **in which none of those times she was available except**  
 24 **for one in early January 2019, I was able to speak with**  
 25 **her to confirm receipt of the emails. And then when she**

Page 66

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / CALLAGHAN**

1 called on Monday, March 11th at 9:30 a.m., and she did  
 2 not speak to our costs being prohibitive or anything  
 3 about guests complaining.  
 4 Q. And you stated earlier that the promotional  
 5 price of \$23 for a single person at a scheduled time did  
 6 not increase the amount of customers you were receiving;  
 7 is that correct?  
 8 **A. There was no significant change. Well, a slight**  
 9 **change prior to the -- the year prior to that, we had an**  
 10 **average of one customer per month. In the -- the latest**  
 11 **test period there of February, the -- the previous three**  
 12 **weeks, February 18 through March 10, I believe as in the**  
 13 **exhibit I previously mentioned, there were three**  
 14 **customers in two weeks.**  
 15 **So that was actually -- I'm sorry, two customers**  
 16 **in three weeks which would make that approximately one**  
 17 **and a half customers per month, which is -- which is not**  
 18 **a significant amount of income.**  
 19 MR. CALLAGHAN: Nothing further, Your Honor.  
 20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 21 MR. FASSBURG: I think similarly, all of my  
 22 questions will be for John Fricke.  
 23 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 24 ////  
 25 ////

Page 67

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 **EXAMINATION**  
 2 BY MR. FASSBURG:  
 3 Q. Mr. Fricke, who at Pacific Northwest  
 4 Transportation is in charge with regulatory compliance?  
 5 **A. I am in charge of regulatory compliance as well**  
 6 **as Chris Dunmore, our safety and compliance director.**  
 7 Q. Are you familiar with the rules at the UTC that  
 8 relate to auto transportation companies?  
 9 **A. Yes, I am.**  
 10 Q. Okay. Under the application standard for auto  
 11 transportation, at WAC 480-30-140, it provides in  
 12 Subsection 2(g), door-to-door service and scheduled  
 13 service in the same territory will not be considered the  
 14 same service. Are you familiar with that?  
 15 **A. I am familiar with that, yes.**  
 16 Q. You provided in your statement submitted today,  
 17 which was I believe labeled Exhibit CA-29, Capital --  
 18 and this is on the second page, second paragraph, (as  
 19 read) Capital operates essentially the same service as  
 20 the applicant, Bremerton Kitsap Airporter, yet to a  
 21 higher degree of service, and I'm not going to complete  
 22 reading that sentence. Do you recall that part of your  
 23 statement?  
 24 **A. Yes, I do.**  
 25 Q. When the UTC considered changes to the

Page 68

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 application standards in 2013, did you take part in that  
 2 rulemaking?  
 3 **A. I attended a couple of the workshops, yes.**  
 4 Q. Have you read the order adopting rulemaking in  
 5 Docket TC-121328 General Order 572, R-572?  
 6 **A. I have not read it in great detail. I believe**  
 7 **James Fricke has.**  
 8 Q. Do you have a copy of Bremerton Kitsap  
 9 Airporter's exhibits in front of you?  
 10 **A. Specifically BKA-6?**  
 11 Q. That's correct.  
 12 **A. Yes, I do.**  
 13 Q. Will you turn to page 7 of that exhibit?  
 14 **A. Okay.**  
 15 Q. Commencing on paragraph 21, the bottom of page 7  
 16 states, (as read) Mr. Fricke, Capital Aeroporter, stated  
 17 that he supports continued regulation of the industry.  
 18 Do you know whether that refers to you or your father?  
 19 **A. That would be James Fricke.**  
 20 Q. That would be your father?  
 21 **A. Yes.**  
 22 Q. Have you read this paragraph before?  
 23 **A. I think maybe five years ago.**  
 24 Q. Okay. Well, let's read through it. That  
 25 paragraph states, (as read) Mr. Fricke, Capital

Page 69

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 Aeroporter, stated he supports continued regulation of  
 2 the industry. He identified several concerns about the  
 3 cost and complexity of current rate regulation. For  
 4 that reason, he supported the proposed fare flexibility  
 5 rule, yet raised a concern he had expressed in prior  
 6 comments with a 25 percent maximum rate and 5 percent  
 7 annual increase might not be sufficient and that limited  
 8 exceptions to the rule should be allowed. Mr. Fricke  
 9 also repeated concerns he had identified in prior  
 10 comments. Next page. One, the Commission should  
 11 include in WAC 480-30-001 a policy statement that  
 12 balances the interest of new applications --  
 13 THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Fassburg, can you  
 14 slow down a little bit?  
 15 MR. FASSBURG: I will.  
 16 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.  
 17 BY MR. FASSBURG:  
 18 Q. The Commission should include in WAC 480-30-001  
 19 a policy statement that balances the interest of a new  
 20 application with the interest of the greater public  
 21 siting a company's prior experience when the Commission  
 22 granted competing service to Centralia SeaTac Express;  
 23 Two, the term, quote, same service, end quote,  
 24 in WAC 480-30-140(2) should be interpreted as  
 25 essentially the same or similar;

Page 70

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 Three, the distinction between door-to-door and  
 2 scheduled service should refer to routes as door-to-door  
 3 can also be scheduled;  
 4 And four, in the third sentence of WAC  
 5 480-30-126(5) regarding financial requirements for  
 6 applicants who are not should be removed to require a  
 7 full analysis of the financial fitness.  
 8 Have you read that before, Mr. Fricke?  
 9 **A. I'm not that familiar with it, but obviously**  
 10 **Mr. James Fricke is very familiar with it.**  
 11 Q. Can you please turn to page 13. In page --  
 12 paragraph 38, it states, (as read) The proposed rule  
 13 clearly distinguishes between scheduled service along a  
 14 route and door-to-door service within a territory allows  
 15 companies to choose to offer those two services and  
 16 enables the Commission to more properly judge whether a  
 17 company is providing the same service the applicant  
 18 proposes to provide.  
 19 Are you familiar with that paragraph?  
 20 **A. Yes, I am.**  
 21 Q. And then in footnote 6 on that page, it states,  
 22 (as read) While we recognize that door-to-door service  
 23 also can be a scheduled service, when we refer to a  
 24 scheduled service in this order, we are referring to  
 25 service between points designated by the company,

Page 71

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 whereas door-to-door service is between a point  
 2 designated by the customer and a point designated by the  
 3 company.  
 4 Are you familiar with that footnote?  
 5 **A. I am familiar, as I stated in my testimony, the**  
 6 **distinction between the two.**  
 7 Q. If you'll turn to the next page, paragraph 40,  
 8 it states, (as read) SeaTac Shuttle and Capital  
 9 Aeroporter both express concern that the Commission's  
 10 interpretation of the statutory phrase, quote, same  
 11 service, end quote, is too narrow and suggests that the  
 12 Commission modify the term to read, quote, essentially  
 13 the same, end quote, or, quote, similar, end quote.  
 14 As discussed above, the Commission interprets  
 15 the statute to reflect clearly the state's interest that  
 16 it should draw a bright line between the service  
 17 offerings. The proposed rule describes adequately the  
 18 factors the Commission will consider in determining on  
 19 the facts whether the proposed service is the same as  
 20 the service currently provided.  
 21 As it has in prior cases, the Commission can and  
 22 must draw distinctions between what is the, quote, same,  
 23 end quote, service in a particular market. For example,  
 24 in Subsection 2(e) of the proposed rule, states the  
 25 Commission may consider the topography, character, and

Page 72

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 condition of the territory.  
 2 In using these factors, the Commission expects  
 3 that whether an alt- -- alternative route has a  
 4 convenience benefit to customers and is therefore a,  
 5 quote, separate and different service, end quote, may be  
 6 very different and different environments.  
 7 Are you familiar with that paragraph?  
 8 MR. CALLAGHAN: Objection, Your Honor. Your  
 9 Honor, at this point, I -- I'd object based on relevance  
 10 and being duplicative. This has already been admitted  
 11 into evidence. If Mr. Fassburg wants to present a legal  
 12 argument regarding the rules and interpretation of  
 13 Commission rules and statute, he may do so at closing  
 14 argument.  
 15 Simply rereading parts of this order into  
 16 the record and asking Mr. Fricke if he's familiar with  
 17 them when he's already stated that he has not read the  
 18 order, I don't believe that this is relevant, and I  
 19 believe it's duplicative given that the exhibits have  
 20 been admitted.  
 21 MR. FASSBURG: Your Honor, Mr. Fricke  
 22 offered his statement in Exhibit 29 that's been admitted  
 23 stating that Capital operates the -- essentially the  
 24 same service, and he provides in a later provision that  
 25 it provides the same service. These are legal

Page 73

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 conclusions. I believe I'm entitled to probe the  
 2 foundation of the statements made by Mr. Fricke in his  
 3 exhibits.  
 4 JUDGE CHARTOFF: I will allow it. I'm -- it  
 5 may be that he doesn't -- I don't know what -- it's  
 6 funny, I don't know how to explain what I'm trying to  
 7 say, but please just get to the point.  
 8 MR. FASSBURG: Sure. It'll take a couple  
 9 more questions before I do, Your Honor, if you'll --  
 10 JOHN FRICKE: I'm sorry --  
 11 MR. FASSBURG: -- allow me some leeway.  
 12 JOHN FRICKE: I'm sorry, are you asking me  
 13 questions or reading?  
 14 MR. FASSBURG: At that point -- right now  
 15 I'm addressing the judge, but I will -- I will get to  
 16 the point, but I have a couple more before I can.  
 17 BY MR. FASSBURG:  
 18 Q. And so I think the question was still on the  
 19 table. Mr. Fricke, are you familiar with the provision  
 20 I just read?  
 21 **A. I am familiar as that relates to WAC 40 --**  
 22 **480-30 in the rules in which we operate and how we**  
 23 **operate both scheduled service and door-to-door service**  
 24 **sometimes separately, sometimes combined as allowed in**  
 25 **our certificate of authority.**

Page 74

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 Q. So that was a "yes," you're familiar?  
 2 **A. Yes.**  
 3 Q. Are you familiar with the definition of  
 4 door-to-door service provided in WAC 480-30-036?  
 5 **A. Not the specific details. Can you read them?**  
 6 Q. Yeah, I can read it to you. (As read) An auto  
 7 transportation company service provided between a  
 8 location identified by the passenger in a point  
 9 specifically named by the company in its tariff filed  
 10 and time schedule.  
 11 Are you familiar with the definition of  
 12 scheduled service in WAC 480-30-036?  
 13 **A. Yes, I am. That is when a customer chooses a**  
 14 **pick-up or drop-off point designated by the company.**  
 15 Q. So more specifically, the rule says an auto  
 16 transportation company providing passenger service at  
 17 specified arrival and/or -- and/or departure times at  
 18 points on a route.  
 19 Mr. Fricke, we discussed the time schedule of  
 20 Bremerton Kitsap Airpporter earlier, or rather, you did  
 21 during your testimony. I'll refer you back to your  
 22 exhibit.  
 23 **A. Are you referring to the Capital Aeroporter**  
 24 **exhibit or the Bremerton Kitsap exhibit?**  
 25 Q. Right now we'll refer back to yours, which was

Page 75

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 CA-4. You testified I believe that on page 2 was your  
 2 scheduled runs; is that right?  
 3 **A. On page 2 and page 3, yes.**  
 4 Q. Okay. Is it your testimony that this is the  
 5 time schedule of a scheduled service?  
 6 **A. That is the time schedule of our scheduled**  
 7 **service and it is the time schedule of our door-to-door**  
 8 **service.**  
 9 Q. So if I understand your answer correctly, this  
 10 is a combined schedule for both services?  
 11 **A. It is a schedule that we abide by with departure**  
 12 **and/or arrival times to provide our scheduled service**  
 13 **and the same schedule, yes, that we abide by to provide**  
 14 **our door-to-door service.**  
 15 Q. Mr. Fricke, on this time schedule, does it list  
 16 times of arrival and/or departure from intermediate  
 17 points?  
 18 **A. It refers to "R" for reservations required and**  
 19 **states transportation from all points to and from SeaTac**  
 20 **will require reservations.**  
 21 Q. So my question was a little different. Does it  
 22 include times of arrival and/or departure from  
 23 intermediate points?  
 24 **A. No, it does not, as those are dependent upon**  
 25 **reservations.**

Page 76

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 Q. Does it list the schedule of arrival at and/or  
 2 departure from all termini?  
 3 **A. Yes, it does.**  
 4 Q. So if someone is traveling to -- or I'm sorry,  
 5 from SeaTac Airport, where on here can we determine the  
 6 time of arrival at the terminus of that route?  
 7 **A. That depends on reservations, road conditions,**  
 8 **traffic, just the same as Bremerton Kitsap Airpporter and**  
 9 **time schedule No. 23.**  
 10 Q. So your -- your answer's a little different than  
 11 my question. What is the estimated time of arrival at a  
 12 terminus provided on this time schedule?  
 13 **A. There is not an estimated arrival time.**  
 14 Q. So if a passenger wanted to travel from SeaTac  
 15 Airport to a point on a route that you allege Capital  
 16 Aeroporter runs, they cannot determine that from this  
 17 time schedule?  
 18 **A. No, they cannot, just the same as Bremerton**  
 19 **Kitsap's proposed time schedule from the airport.**  
 20 Q. If a person wants to know what the route is so  
 21 that they can determine for themselves whether this is a  
 22 route they would like to be on, when they book a fare or  
 23 book -- book a ride with Capital Aeroporter, can they  
 24 determine from your time schedule what that route will  
 25 be?

Page 77

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 **A. They certainly can. We provide an estimated**  
 2 **arrival time when they input flight information or**  
 3 **preferred requested pick-up time from the airport.**  
 4 Q. So I will refer you back to page 13 of General  
 5 Order R-572 to ask it slightly differently. I read to  
 6 you and you said you were familiar with the language --  
 7 **A. I'm sorry, which page was that from?**  
 8 Q. This was page 13, paragraph 36. (As read) While  
 9 every route serves a territory in the sense that  
 10 consumers who ride along the company's route are drawn  
 11 from populations that live within a reasonable distance  
 12 of that route. Door-to-door -- I'm sorry. I'm reading  
 13 the wrong provision.  
 14 Okay. Page -- paragraph 38. (As read) The  
 15 proposed rule clearly distinguishes between scheduled  
 16 service along a route. And door-to-door service within  
 17 a territory allows companies to choose to offer the two  
 18 services and enables the Commission to more properly  
 19 judge whether the Commission is providing the same  
 20 services as the applicant proposes to provide.  
 21 And then -- lost my place. Okay. Let's go with  
 22 paragraph 37 on the same page. (As read) SeaTac Shuttle  
 23 with concurrence of Wickkiser and Bremerton Kitsap  
 24 asserted that proposed rules in 480-30-142(f) eliminate  
 25 the distinction between territories and routes.

Page 78

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 That subsection states that the Commission may  
 2 consider for scheduled service the propout- -- proposed  
 3 route's relation to the nearest route served by an  
 4 existing certificate holder. The Commission views  
 5 routes narrowly for the purpose of determining whether  
 6 service is the same. Alternative routes that may run  
 7 parallel to an objecting company's route, but which have  
 8 a convenience benefit to customers, may be considered a  
 9 separate and different service.  
 10 And I didn't ask you earlier, are you familiar  
 11 with that paragraph 37?  
 12 **A. Yes, I am now familiar with it.**  
 13 Q. Okay. So going back to your time schedule, if a  
 14 customer wants to determine whether the route being  
 15 offered is the one that they prefer due to its  
 16 convenience, are they able to determine from your time  
 17 schedule what route they will go along in terms of the  
 18 physical roads traveled?  
 19 **A. I'm sorry, the -- the route? Are you talking**  
 20 **about the route or the time?**  
 21 Q. The route, the path traveled by the vehicle.  
 22 **A. They are not able to tell the route, but there**  
 23 **is only one road route usable between SeaTac Airport and**  
 24 **Holiday Inn Express Lakewood, which is Interstate 5.**  
 25 Q. Mr. Fricke, my question was different. Can they

Page 79

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 determine the route a vehicle will take from your time  
 2 schedule?  
 3 **A. No, because the route can be -- it can be an**  
 4 **irregular route.**  
 5 Q. In fact, because you combine door-to-door and  
 6 scheduled service passengers in a vehicle pursuant to  
 7 section 7 of your certificate, there are times when a  
 8 person who books scheduled service will be taken to  
 9 points that were reserved by a door-to-door passenger;  
 10 isn't that right?  
 11 **A. Some -- at some times that is correct and**  
 12 **sometimes it is just scheduled service.**  
 13 Q. So if a person were to book a reservation with  
 14 Capital Aeroporter at the Holiday Inn Express in  
 15 Lakewood, could they conceivably be taken along the way  
 16 to that hotel anyplace within Capital Aeroporter's  
 17 certificate territory?  
 18 **A. They would be picked up at the scheduled time**  
 19 **and dropped off at the -- at the scheduled arrival time.**  
 20 **And the route, again, is determined by other customers,**  
 21 **traffic, and other considerations.**  
 22 Q. Mr. Fricke, that wasn't my question. I will ask  
 23 you slightly differently.  
 24 Capital Aeroporter provides door-to-door service  
 25 in Tacoma; does it not?

Page 80

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 **A. Yes, Tacoma is part of our certificated**  
 2 **authority.**  
 3 Q. Capital Aer- -- Capital Aeroporter provides  
 4 door-to-door service in Federal Way and Kent and  
 5 Tukwila; does it not?  
 6 **A. Yes, it does.**  
 7 Q. And if you combine a person who has booked a  
 8 scheduled reservation for the Hilton in Lakewood, they  
 9 could be taken first to someone's home in Federal Way or  
 10 Kent or Tacoma before they would go to the hotel in  
 11 Lakewood; is that right?  
 12 **A. First of all, from your question, I don't**  
 13 **believe there is a Hilton in Lakewood, and --**  
 14 Q. I'm sorry. Let me -- let me rephrase that. The  
 15 Holiday Inn Express is what I intended to ask about. If  
 16 someone booking a reservation for the Holiday Inn  
 17 Express in Lakewood getting on a vehicle in SeaTac could  
 18 ver- -- could first be taken to homes in any location  
 19 within Federal Way, Kent, or Tacoma before going to the  
 20 Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood, correct?  
 21 **A. We generally separate those stops out by adding**  
 22 **additional vehicles to the trip, so it's not likely that**  
 23 **a customer to the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood would go**  
 24 **to those locations. However, it is, again, allowed**  
 25 **under our certificate for combined operations to combine**

Page 81

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 those scheduled service and door-to-door service in the  
 2 same vehicle.  
 3 Q. Okay. Now, going back to your time schedule, if  
 4 someone is trying to determine the route the vehicle  
 5 will take, the answer is they can't because they won't  
 6 know in advance what other passengers will be grouped  
 7 into their vehicle; is that correct?  
 8 **A. They know in advance before the -- the shuttle**  
 9 **leaves as -- if they inquire. Are you talking about at**  
 10 **the time of booking or at the time of service?**  
 11 Q. If they want to know that before they book a  
 12 reservation, is that information available to them?  
 13 **A. I'm -- I don't think that they would -- no, they**  
 14 **wouldn't know the route, but in our experience in 47**  
 15 **years as a company, there really aren't -- that question**  
 16 **is not asked, like what is -- what is the route we're**  
 17 **taking. They are given a scheduled pick-up time and an**  
 18 **estimated arrival time, again, dependent upon traffic**  
 19 **conditions and other customers.**  
 20 Q. So I think your answer with a little surplus is  
 21 they would not know before they booked the reservation  
 22 where else the vehicle might go; is that right?  
 23 **A. That's probably correct, yes.**  
 24 Q. I assume since you're one of the two people  
 25 responsible for regulatory compliance for Capital

Page 82

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 Aeroporter, you're also familiar with the time schedule  
 2 rules in WAC 480-30-281; is that correct?  
 3 **A. Not the details of it.**  
 4 Q. I will read to you in 480-30-281, Subsection 2,  
 5 it provides in Subsection B, (as read) The time schedule  
 6 filed by an auto transportation company that provides  
 7 scheduled service must contain, but is not limited to;  
 8 one, the times of arrival at and/or the departure from  
 9 all termini;  
 10 Two, the times of arrival at and/or departure  
 11 from all intermediate points served;  
 12 Three, the distance between all points shown in  
 13 the scheduled;  
 14 Four, a list of all flight stops at which the  
 15 company will provide service.  
 16 And I will stop there. Are you familiar with  
 17 that portion of the rule?  
 18 **A. I'm sorry, which rule was it again? 480-30...**  
 19 Q. 480-30-281, Subsection 2.  
 20 **A. I was not familiar with that before you just**  
 21 **read that to me, no.**  
 22 Q. Do you agree with me that the time schedule that  
 23 has been filed by Capital Aeroporter does not comply  
 24 with that provision of the rule?  
 25 **A. Which section of the rule?**

Page 83

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 Q. Why don't I take them one by one. Subsection  
 2 2(b)(1) provided that it must include the times of  
 3 arrival at and/or the departure from all termini.  
 4 Does your time schedule include the times of  
 5 arrival at and departure from all termini at which you  
 6 provide scheduled service?  
 7 **A. "Termini" is referring to SeaTac Airport?**  
 8 Q. Either end of a run.  
 9 **A. So yes, our schedule would show the times of**  
 10 **arrival or departure from termini, yes.**  
 11 Q. Is it your understanding that "termini" is  
 12 plural or singular?  
 13 **A. Oh, we also operate to and from Pier 66, Pier**  
 14 **91, so I guess those would be multiple termini.**  
 15 Q. Would a single run go from SeaTac to Pier -- the  
 16 piers?  
 17 **A. Yes.**  
 18 Q. Okay. Would that be a separate route from  
 19 someone going from SeaTac Airport to --  
 20 **A. I'm sorry.**  
 21 Q. -- the Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood?  
 22 **A. Would that be a separate route? Yes, that would**  
 23 **be a separate route.**  
 24 Q. Okay. So focusing on the route that would go  
 25 from the Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood to SeaTac

Page 84

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 Airport, are both termini's arrival and departure time  
 2 listed in your time schedule?  
 3 **A. The time of arrival at SeaTac for a pick up from**  
 4 **the Holiday Inn Express is listed in our time schedule.**  
 5 Q. My question is different, and I think -- I think  
 6 you're alluding to the answer. The answer is they're  
 7 not both in your time schedule; is that right?  
 8 **A. They're not both listed in our schedule.**  
 9 Q. Okay.  
 10 **A. Referred to as "R," by reservation only and**  
 11 **depends on the -- the reservations.**  
 12 Q. Okay.  
 13 **A. Taken for that particular route.**  
 14 Q. So for this hypothetical passenger that's going  
 15 to be traveling from SeaTac Airport to the Holiday Inn  
 16 Express in Lakewood who, as you conceded, could have  
 17 stops in Federal Way, Kent, and Tacoma along the way,  
 18 which would be intermediate points, does your time  
 19 schedule list the times of arrival at and/or departure  
 20 from all intermediate points served?  
 21 **A. As I stated in my previous answer, customers**  
 22 **going to Federal Way, Kent -- I'm sorry, what was the**  
 23 **other one?**  
 24 Q. Tacoma.  
 25 **A. And Tacoma, are a majority of the time split off**

Page 85

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 on an additional vehicle because we try to make it as  
 2 convenient and -- and quick as -- as it can for the  
 3 customer. So I'm sorry, can you restate your question  
 4 one more time?  
 5 Q. So my question reworded is that intermediate  
 6 points would include points along the way between the  
 7 termini. In a route, which you've again conceded could  
 8 include stops in Federal Way, Kent, and Tacoma on the  
 9 way to the Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood, does your  
 10 time schedule include the times of arrival at or  
 11 departure from the intermediate points?  
 12 **A. I'm sorry, you said from SeaTac Airport?**  
 13 Q. The answer is "no," correct?  
 14 **A. Are you answering for me?**  
 15 Q. Is the answer, is it "yes" --  
 16 **A. I'm clarifying the question --**  
 17 Q. Let me ask you --  
 18 **A. -- was that question from SeaTac Airport or to**  
 19 **SeaTac Airport?**  
 20 Q. Let me --  
 21 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 22 **A. I -- I don't --**  
 23 **JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, let's -- I -- I think**  
 24 **your questions are getting duplicative.**  
 25 MR. FASSBURG: If the witness would answer

Page 86

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 my questions. I haven't yet asked you to instruct  
 2 the --  
 3 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry --  
 4 MR. FASSBURG: -- my questions because I  
 5 feel like we can get through this without that, but he  
 6 isn't answering my questions. And so there is a  
 7 reason --  
 8 THE WITNESS: Your question is very long and  
 9 detailed. What -- was that from SeaTac Airport to the  
 10 Holiday Inn Express?  
 11 MR. FASSBURG: I'm sorry. Is -- is she an  
 12 attorney?  
 13 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, what -- what is that?  
 14 THE WITNESS: She -- she said she wants to  
 15 take a break, me to take a break --  
 16 MR. FASSBURG: Let's get --  
 17 THE WITNESS: -- but I'm fine.  
 18 MR. FASSBURG: -- through this first.  
 19 BY MR. FASSBURG:  
 20 Q. Okay. I'm going to -- I'm going to try to make  
 21 this as simple as possible.  
 22 Do you agree with me that your time schedule  
 23 does not list intermediate points because the only point  
 24 it lists is SeaTac Airport?  
 25 **A. It does not list intermediate points from SeaTac**

Page 87

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 Airport, similar to that of the applicant, with their  
 2 proposed schedule. To the airport, it does not list  
 3 intermediate points to the airport, it lists the  
 4 scheduled arrival time at SeaTac Airport.  
 5 Q. Okay. Now, you're familiar with the Bremerton  
 6 Kitsap Airporter time schedule because you've filed it  
 7 as an exhibit. I'll refer you, though, to BKA-11. On  
 8 the second page, the list runs and it shows departure  
 9 times. So daily run one, which departs at 2:45 a.m., we  
 10 have a departure time, and then we have a departure time  
 11 of Lewis Waller Hall at 2:55 a.m., and then at 3:00 a.m.  
 12 departure time from Lewis Rainier Lodge. We could go  
 13 on, but I won't go through the entire run No. 1. Then  
 14 it reflects an arrival time at SeaTac Airport of 4:10  
 15 a.m.  
 16 Would you agree with me that this reflects the  
 17 departure times of each point along a route?  
 18 MR. CALLAGHAN: Objection, relevance. Your  
 19 Honor, again, I -- I think that this hearing, as we've  
 20 stated before, is focused on the question of whether the  
 21 current certificate holder is providing the same service  
 22 and whether it is providing the same service to the  
 23 satisfaction of the Commission. I don't find the  
 24 applicant's current schedule to be relevant to that  
 25 question. Thank you.

Page 88

**EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG**

1 MR. FASSBURG: So, Your Honor, the witness  
 2 claimed that the time schedule provided by Capital  
 3 Aeroporter was similar to that provided by Bremerton  
 4 Kitsap Airporter, which I believe is factually false.  
 5 And I think it is material to the question of whether  
 6 Capital Aeroporter is, in fact, providing scheduled  
 7 service. And so I'm highlighting the distinction  
 8 between what is a genuine scheduled service tariff and  
 9 time schedule versus a door-to-door time schedule.  
 10 JUDGE CHARTOFF: I -- I agree with  
 11 Mr. Callaghan. I think you -- you've provided -- you've  
 12 entered the, you know, your time schedule into evidence,  
 13 and you will speak about it in your closing statement.  
 14 I don't think Mr. Fricke's opinion of your time schedule  
 15 is really relevant. So --  
 16 MR. FASSBURG: I'll move on.  
 17 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 18 BY MR. FASSBURG:  
 19 Q. Mr. Fricke, you stated that Kitsap -- I'm sorry,  
 20 Capital Aeroporter's standard fare for scheduled service  
 21 from Holiday Inn Express is I believe you said \$43; is  
 22 that correct?  
 23 **A. That's what we've charged since the last fare**  
 24 **flexibility increase as of May 1, 2018.**  
 25 Q. Has Capital Aeroporter since the date in May of

Page 89

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 2018 sought to increase its fares pursuant to the fare  
 2 flexibility rules again?  
 3 **A. We have filed for fare flexibility max fare  
 4 increase as of May 1, 2019.**  
 5 Q. I'm sorry, you say May 1? Did you mean March 1?  
 6 **A. Effective May 1 --**  
 7 Q. Oh, effective?  
 8 **A. -- of 2018, yes.**  
 9 Q. Okay. The base fare that Capital Aeroporter  
 10 charges on its current tariff for scheduled service to  
 11 Lakewood is what amount?  
 12 **A. I would have to get that in front of me here.  
 13 One moment. The base fare listed in our tariff under  
 14 fare flexibility filing for the Holiday Inn Express  
 15 Lakewood would be \$27; however, with fare flexibility,  
 16 we have the discretion to charge from one cent up to the  
 17 maximum fare of \$43.07.**  
 18 Q. Mr. Fricke, are you familiar with the reduced  
 19 rate rule in WAC 480-30-396?  
 20 **A. No, I am not.**  
 21 Q. I'll read to you. It says in that rule, (as  
 22 read) No auto transportation company will charge,  
 23 demand, collect, or receive a greater, lesser, or  
 24 different compensation for transportation of persons in  
 25 the rates that are contained in that company's effective

Page 90

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 tariff filed with the Commission.  
 2 And then in Subsection 2, (as read) An auto  
 3 transportation company wishing to provide service at  
 4 free or reduced rates must first publish those free or  
 5 reduced rates in a tariff in accordance with RCW  
 6 81.28.080.  
 7 When you provided your promotional rates, did  
 8 you first amend your tariff?  
 9 **A. Our tariff states at the bottom, (as read)  
 10 Flexible fares means the authority to charge at the  
 11 company's discretion fares in any amount between one  
 12 cent and the maximum fares.**  
 13 **JUDGE CHARTOFF: Mr. Fassburg, what -- how  
 14 is this relevant to the legal issue?**  
 15 MR. FASSBURG: Your Honor, if I could  
 16 establish rule violation, and maybe I can't, they would  
 17 be directly relevant to whether the incumbent is  
 18 providing service to the satisfaction of the Commission  
 19 pursuant to Commission order.  
 20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: I'm going to take a look at  
 21 the statute that we're applying. I want to ask, so  
 22 wouldn't we be looking at the one-year period prior to  
 23 the filing of the application?  
 24 MR. FASSBURG: Sure, that is the relevant  
 25 time period, I think we need to establish that. But the

Page 91

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 question was relevant in terms of if there's a  
 2 Commission rule violation in the period, it would be  
 3 relevant.  
 4 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Are you trying to get at  
 5 violations that would occur in that period?  
 6 MR. FASSBURG: I'm trying to determine if  
 7 when in fact occurs.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I could help clear  
 9 this up, if I may?  
 10 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 11 THE WITNESS: WAC 480-30-420 fare  
 12 flexibility.  
 13 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Oh, okay. You --  
 14 THE WITNESS: Section 3, a company may file  
 15 a tariff with the Commission to charge flexible fares.  
 16 Because the filing authorizes a company to increase or  
 17 decrease any fare at any time singly or in any  
 18 combination, the tariff must be filed within 30 days of  
 19 the Commission under RCW --  
 20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Hold on. I'm going  
 21 to put a stop to this. I don't think -- I think we  
 22 would be interested in violations that were found by the  
 23 Commission during that period, but I'm not going to -- I  
 24 think it would be beyond the scope of this proceeding  
 25 for me to go through the rule and find new violations

Page 92

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 that haven't been cited.  
 2 MR. FASSBURG: With all due respect, Your  
 3 Honor, that was the -- one of the major bases of the  
 4 Commission's finding in the final order in the rehearing  
 5 of the SpeediShuttle application. The incumbent,  
 6 Shuttle Express, in that proceeding, granted there was a  
 7 combined proceeding involving a complaint against  
 8 Shuttle Express, but in that combined proceeding, that  
 9 was one of the major bases of the Commission's findings  
 10 that the incumbent was not providing service to the  
 11 satisfaction of the Commission.  
 12 And so I think it's worth exploring here a  
 13 little further if the company is admitting to in this  
 14 proceeding in an attempt to disprove the validity of a  
 15 point being made by the applicant that it violated  
 16 Commission rules.  
 17 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. I'm not aware of --  
 18 my understanding in that case is that there was a  
 19 history that the -- that the Commission was looking at  
 20 the history of action of -- of violations that had  
 21 occurred. I'll give you, you know, a couple more  
 22 questions to -- to get to your point on this issue.  
 23 MR. FASSBURG: Okay. So I think  
 24 Mr. Fricke's attempt to clarify directed us to the rule  
 25 that he believes supports the practice that he has



Page 93

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 described here today.  
 2 BY MR. FASSBURG:  
 3 Q. Mr. Fricke, can you point to the provision in  
 4 WAC 480-30-420 that permits an auto transportation  
 5 company operating under flexible fares to charge below  
 6 its base fare?  
 7 **A. Yeah, 480-30-420, Section 7, (as read) Any**  
 8 **change in fares charged by a company at or below the**  
 9 **maximum fares down to one cent, it's referring later on,**  
 10 **is not considered a tariff change and is not subject to**  
 11 **tariff filing rules, publication rules, and notice**  
 12 **requirements under this chapter.**  
 13 **Companies may provide notice of changes in fares**  
 14 **that the company will charge by posting their actual**  
 15 **fares on the website or notices or brochures provided to**  
 16 **customers subject to the requirements in Subsections 8**  
 17 **and 14. I mean, are we -- are we reading this whole --**  
 18 Q. I'm asking --  
 19 **A. -- section or --**  
 20 Q. -- specifically what you relied upon in  
 21 providing your testimony.  
 22 **A. Section 15, an example of maximum fare -- okay.**  
 23 **I'm sorry, that's maximum fare calculation. Well, I**  
 24 **guess back up to section 2(d) as I stated before.**  
 25 **Flexible fares -- I could start with section A. (As**

Page 94

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 read) Base fare means the fares set forth in the  
 2 company's tariff except for tariff supplements in effect  
 3 on the date that the company files a proposed tariff for  
 4 flexible fares as a means to establish maximum fares.  
 5 B, (as read) Definition of flexible fares means  
 6 the authority to charge at the company's discretion  
 7 fares in any amount at or below the maximum fares. It  
 8 does not specify that you cannot go below the base fare.  
 9 In fact, this rule provided in Section 6 will  
 10 essentially allow you to charge one cent from any  
 11 location. Section 6 reads, (as read) If a company seeks  
 12 to offer free fares, then the company must file tariff  
 13 revisions if not already contained in the tariff in  
 14 compliance with WAC 480-30-396 and all other filing  
 15 requirements including tariff publication rules in those  
 16 requirements.  
 17 Therefore, this 480-30-420 fare flexibility,  
 18 again, establishes flexible fares meaning the authority  
 19 to charge at the company's discretion fares in any  
 20 amount at or below the maximum fares.  
 21 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, at this  
 22 point, I would object to continuing this line of  
 23 proceeding. It took me a while to find the correct  
 24 citation, but under WAC 480-30-140, Subsection 3(b), the  
 25 question of whether the objecting company is providing

Page 95

1 service to the satisfaction of the Commission is based  
 2 on the company's -- the objecting company's performance  
 3 regarding criteria in Subsection A prior to the date the  
 4 application for proposed service is filed with the  
 5 Commission.  
 6 Now, Subsection A is what we have been  
 7 discussing as the criteria and -- and the question in  
 8 this case, but it does not list any violations.  
 9 Specifically what it says is that there are questions  
 10 about whether the objecting company provides service in  
 11 a manner that is convenient, safe, timely, direct,  
 12 frequent, expeditious.  
 13 So any kind of violation of the tariff in  
 14 order to be relevant, it would have to speak to those --  
 15 those considerations that are outlined in Subsection  
 16 3(a). I don't believe that this is covered by  
 17 Subsection 3(a)(i) through 4. And so I would object on  
 18 relevance.  
 19 MR. FASSBURG: Again, Your Honor, with all  
 20 due respect, I have pulled it up so that we can all be  
 21 clear. In Docket TC-143691, Order 20, the Commission  
 22 ruled that Shuttle Express was not providing service to  
 23 the satisfaction of the Commission as a result of its  
 24 rule violations. Those were not the factors that  
 25 Mr. Callaghan just cited to specifically. But the

Page 96

1 Commission, nonetheless, determined that rule violations  
 2 are relevant and, in fact, were a significant basis for  
 3 the Commission's decision.  
 4 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I don't have  
 5 that case in front of me, but if the rule violations  
 6 were relevant to the question of convenience, safety,  
 7 timeliness, were relevant to the questions laid out in  
 8 Subsection 3(a), then those violations would be  
 9 relevant.  
 10 The violation or potential violation that  
 11 we're talking about here is not necessarily -- it's --  
 12 there's no demonstration that they have impacted  
 13 customers in terms of safety, convenience, the frequency  
 14 of the service offered. And so I don't believe that  
 15 it's relevant today unless Bremerton Kitsap can  
 16 demonstrate that there has been some harm to consumers  
 17 as a result of this potential violation of Commission  
 18 rules. Thank you.  
 19 MR. FASSBURG: So, Your Honor, I'll say in  
 20 response to that, this case is really about what the  
 21 service actually is and what is attempted or what has  
 22 been attempted by Capital Aeroporter after the  
 23 application to try to persuade the Commission not to  
 24 allow a new application.  
 25 The rules have been clear for almost time

Page 97

1 and more in memorial at the UTC that post-application  
 2 service improvements are irrelevant and, in fact,  
 3 Capital Aeroporter knows that because they appealed all  
 4 the way to the Court of Appeals an overlapping  
 5 application that was granted. And the Court of Appeals  
 6 said in that case, Pacific Transportation Northwest, I  
 7 don't have the citation for you presently, the reason  
 8 post-application service improvements are not considered  
 9 in part of the application process is if every time  
 10 someone applied for overlapping authority, the incumbent  
 11 could just improve its service and then nobody could  
 12 ever be granted a new application that overlapped with  
 13 an existing carrier's territory.  
 14 So the reason these questions are relevant  
 15 are, one, to establish that Capital Aeroporter is only  
 16 attempting to make efforts to improve service as a  
 17 result and in response to the application; and two, they  
 18 demonstrate that they aren't providing service to the  
 19 satisfaction of the Commission.  
 20 I think whether or not it's a rule  
 21 violation, the issue of the price that was temporarily  
 22 offered up by Capital Aeroporter has been offered up as  
 23 a reason not to grant the application, and I think it  
 24 merits full discussion.  
 25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Hold on. So when

Page 98

1 were these promotion fares offered?  
 2 THE WITNESS: This was from December  
 3 through -- December, January, February, essentially the  
 4 middle of December through the middle of March or March  
 5 10th.  
 6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. So that is --  
 7 THE WITNESS: And -- and it was not -- it  
 8 was not done as a way to --  
 9 JUDGE CHARTOFF: That's okay.  
 10 THE WITNESS: -- persuade the UTC. If I may  
 11 respond --  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: No.  
 13 THE WITNESS: No?  
 14 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Yeah.  
 15 THE WITNESS: It was --  
 16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: What happened after the  
 17 application was filed is not relevant to this  
 18 proceeding. So yeah, I'd like -- I'm going to sustain  
 19 the objection. Let's move on.  
 20 MR. FASSBURG: Sure, we -- we can move on.  
 21 That was going to be my next question, and anything else  
 22 I have on that, if I need to, I can make an argument. I  
 23 just needed to lay some of the foundation here to  
 24 respond to what Capital Aeroporter has been arguing.  
 25 Just a few more questions, I believe.

Page 99

EXAMINATION OF JOHN FRICKE / FASSBURG

1 BY MR. FASSBURG:  
 2 Q. Mr. Fricke, when you spoke to Teresa Simplot at  
 3 the Holiday Inn Express, she did not dispute providing  
 4 statements in support of Bremerton Kitsap Airporter's  
 5 application, did she?  
 6 A. She did not dispute that fact.  
 7 Q. Did Ms. Simplot repudiate to you any of the  
 8 statements made in her support statement?  
 9 A. No, she did not.  
 10 MR. FASSBURG: I think we have no further  
 11 questions. Thank you.  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 13 Do you have anything you want to clarify as  
 14 a result of the questioning --  
 15 JOHN FRICKE: Yes, I -- I -- I would like to  
 16 clarify an understanding that the Commission does not  
 17 view any changes made to service after the application  
 18 is submitted. Capital Aeroporter did not do so in an  
 19 attempt to match the service or were -- try to copy the  
 20 applicant as suggested by Bremerton Kitsap's counsel.  
 21 We operated that fare in a way to show the  
 22 sustainability of the service of scheduled service from  
 23 and to the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood where, in fact,  
 24 if we are -- if we -- if we have one to two customers  
 25 per month for our company operating from that location

Page 100

1 with scheduled service, if an additional scheduled  
 2 service would be operating from and to that location, we  
 3 would have half of a customer per month to one customer  
 4 per month between the two services.  
 5 And the purpose was to illustrate the fact  
 6 that it's not the specific fare of \$43 or \$23, it's  
 7 the -- the -- the density at that location is not  
 8 sustainable for more than one scheduled service.  
 9 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Thank you.  
 10 MR. FASSBURG: May I ask one follow-up  
 11 question to that?  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: I -- no, no, sorry. We're  
 13 gonna move on.  
 14 So it's noon, and are you planning on  
 15 calling additional witnesses?  
 16 JOHN FRICKE: No, Your Honor.  
 17 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. So we can do --  
 18 Are you okay to continue?  
 19 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.  
 20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Is everyone okay to  
 21 continue and do closing?  
 22 MR. FASSBURG: Can we take a two- or  
 23 three-minute break first?  
 24 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. So we can do -- you  
 25 want to start up at 12:10?

Page 101

1 MR. FASSBURG: Sure.  
 2 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. We're in recess.  
 3 (Recess was taken from 12:07 p.m.  
 4 until 12:10 p.m.)  
 5 JUDGE CHARTOFF: We're back on the record.  
 6 I just have to do a brief housekeeping matter.  
 7 Commission rules require us to list the witnesses  
 8 responsible for sponsoring the exhibits. So with regard  
 9 to Bremerton Kitsap's exhibits, I would list Richard  
 10 Asche as the sponsor of those exhibits?  
 11 MR. FASSBURG: Yes, that's correct.  
 12 JUDGE CHARTOFF: And then with regard to  
 13 Capital Aeroporter's exhibits, can I list John -- or  
 14 James -- who -- who would like to sponsor the exhibits?  
 15 JOHN FRICKE: I will sponsor them, John  
 16 Fricke.  
 17 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. John Fricke will  
 18 sponsor the exhibits except for the one exhibit that  
 19 James Fricke read into the record. I believe that's  
 20 CA-28.  
 21 Okay. So I'll allow the parties to make a  
 22 brief closing statement, starting with Mr. Fassburg.  
 23 MR. FASSBURG: Thank you, Your Honor. Your  
 24 Honor, as I'm sure you're familiar, the -- the statute  
 25 that has long been in place in Washington to permit UTC

Page 102

1 to regulate the entry of auto transportation companies  
 2 into the market in Washington provides that if there is  
 3 an incumbent providing service in the same territory,  
 4 and I'm paraphrasing, then the -- an applicant can only  
 5 be granted a certificate if they demonstrate the  
 6 incumbent is not providing service to the satisfaction  
 7 of the Commission.  
 8 In 2013, a rulemaking was initiated in some  
 9 degree as a result of a 1998 court proceeding in which  
 10 Pacific Northwest Transportation, Capital Aeroporter,  
 11 lost an overlap case, and the Court of Appeals ruled  
 12 that the Commission has broad discretion to determine  
 13 when an applicant seeking territory or seeking the route  
 14 for auto transportation service in a territory already  
 15 served should be authorized.  
 16 One of the reasons the Court of Appeals  
 17 believed the Commission had that broad discretion,  
 18 because the Commission, unlike in other transportation  
 19 industries it regulates, promotes competition for the  
 20 benefit of consumers.  
 21 In that auto transportation rulemaking  
 22 documented by General Order R-572, which has been filed  
 23 as an exhibit for your easy reference, the Commission  
 24 discussed its policy in creating bright line rules that  
 25 would distinguish between different service offerings

Page 103

1 for determining what is considered the same service.  
 2 Because when you apply for auto transportation  
 3 authority, it is only considered overlapping if you  
 4 provide the same service as that provided by the  
 5 incumbent.  
 6 The Commission has created in rule some  
 7 clear distinctions, one of which is in 480-30-140(2)(g)  
 8 and it states explicitly, (as read) Door-to-door and  
 9 scheduled service in the same territory will not be  
 10 considered the same service.  
 11 And then in (f) -- oh, I'm sorry, let me  
 12 back up even further. In 2(a), it states, (as read) The  
 13 certificate authority granted to the existing companies  
 14 and whether or not they are providing service to the  
 15 full extent of that authority is a factor to be  
 16 considered.  
 17 In (d), (as read) The population density is  
 18 a factor, but in (e), (as read) If the topography,  
 19 character, and condition of the territory in which the  
 20 objecting company provides service in which the proposed  
 21 service is a factor. And for scheduled service, the  
 22 proposed route's relation to the nearest route served by  
 23 an existing certificate holder.  
 24 The Commission views routes narrowly for the  
 25 purpose of determining whether the service is the same.

Page 104

1 Alternative routes that may run parallel to an objecting  
 2 company's route, which have a convenience benefit to the  
 3 customers, may be considered a separate and different  
 4 service. In keeping in mind the policy of the  
 5 Commission in promoting competition to enhance the  
 6 customers' experience, the efficiency and the economy of  
 7 the companies including price.  
 8 The proposed service from Bremerton Kitsap  
 9 Airporter is not, in fact, the same service as that  
 10 which is provided in reality by Pacific Northwest  
 11 Transportation. That starts with the certificate  
 12 itself. In Capital Aeroporter's certificate, their  
 13 authority to provide service in Lakewood does not state  
 14 it is scheduled service. It states, (as read) Between  
 15 Seattle International Airport and the cities of Kent,  
 16 Tukwila, Auburn, Algona, Pacific, Sumner, Puyallup,  
 17 Parkland, Lakewood and Steilacoom and Pacific Lutheran  
 18 University.  
 19 If you read the definition of door-to-door  
 20 service, which I raised earlier, it provides, (as read)  
 21 An auto transportation company service provided between  
 22 a location identified by the passenger in a point  
 23 specifically named by the company in its filed tariff  
 24 and time schedule. That point refers to the territory,  
 25 the zone, or an area. Not a specific address or

Page 105

1 location.

2 So on its face, the certificate of Capital

3 Aeroporter provides service between one point, SeaTac

4 Airport and an area, city of Lakewood. They have

5 authority to provide service anywhere in that territory,

6 but it is not limited to a specific route or specific

7 points. That is by definition door-to-door service.

8 And, in fact, according to the time schedule

9 operated by Capital Aeroporter, they provide by

10 definition door-to-door service. Their time schedule

11 for what they call scheduled runs, in fact, says on page

12 2 of 3, this is the schedule for -- I'm sorry, the time

13 schedule for scheduled door-to-door share ride service.

14 Nowhere on here does it state this is scheduled service.

15 And while the word "scheduled" is used just like in the

16 Commission order, R-572 that we addressed earlier, in

17 footnote 6 on page 13, it says, (as read) While we

18 recognize that a door-to-door service also can be a

19 scheduled service, when we refer to scheduled service in

20 this order, we are referring to a service between points

21 designated by the company.

22 The time schedule rules take this one step

23 further. Provide that if you're going to provide

24 scheduled service, your time schedule must contain the

25 times of an arrival at and/or departure from all

Page 106

1 termini, the times of arrival at and/or departure from

2 all intermediate served, the distance between all points

3 shown in the schedule a list of all flight stops at

4 which the company will provide service and more.

5 The time schedule actually operated by

6 Capital Aeroporter does not provide the termini. It

7 only provides one terminus. And then it provides times

8 for service in all other locations. Those are zones,

9 not points. Those, therefore, are door-to-door service

10 and a time schedule for door-to-door service, not a

11 scheduled service.

12 By contrast, the time schedule for Bremerton

13 Kitsap Aeroporter, as was highlighted earlier, includes

14 the times for arrival at and depart from all termini

15 including all intermediate points. And it also includes

16 the distance between those points. This time schedule

17 is a scheduled service time schedule., and that is the

18 one that Bremerton Kitsap Aeroporter seeks to expand upon

19 by adding a single point. That point would be one

20 nearest to SeaTac airport.

21 On their proposed route, a customer looking

22 at their time schedule will know exactly all the stops

23 they will take, they will know approximately how long it

24 should take, and the distance between those stops so

25 they can make a choice. Even if Bremerton Kitsap

Page 107

1 Aeroporter were proposing to provide scheduled service on

2 a route similar to a route of Bremerton -- I'm sorry,

3 Capital Aeroporter, although we know that route does not

4 in fact exist for Capital Aeroporter.

5 Again, the Commission has stated that if

6 there are convenient benefits to an alternative route,

7 then the Commission can determine that the applicant

8 does not propose to provide the same service.

9 We heard from Mr. Fricke that a vehicle

10 departing SeaTac Airport to the Holiday Inn Express in

11 Lakewood could, in fact, stop at intermediate points

12 anywhere on their certificate territory that are between

13 SeaTac and the Holiday Inn Express in Lakewood. And

14 while I did not review every single one of those points

15 in their territory by geography, there are more points,

16 in fact, than just Kent, Federal Way, and Tacoma. But

17 Kent, Federal Way, and Tacoma are, in fact, all points

18 someone could stop on that so-called schedule service

19 route for Capital Aeroporter.

20 The proposed service for Bremerton Kitsap

21 Aeroporter would allow that that is the first stop on the

22 route, the Holiday Inn Express. So for someone who is

23 departing SeaTac Airport heading to the Holiday Inn

24 Express, they have essentially what is an express

25 service. For someone who is heading to SeaTac Airport

Page 108

1 from the Holiday Inn Express, they have what is in

2 effect an express service because there is no

3 door-to-door service with which they will be combined.

4 There is no possibility that they will be taken on a

5 zigzag route across South King County on the way from

6 Pierce County to SeaTac Airport.

7 Now, Capital Aeroporter has attempted to

8 interject post-application service improvements in this

9 case. And as I have repeatedly objected, those are not

10 relevant to this proceeding. I will also point out that

11 Mr. Fricke's last comment about the purpose of his

12 experiment with \$23 pricing occurred, as he stated,

13 starting in December heading through -- I'm not entirely

14 sure of when that went through, but I believe he said it

15 was a three-month period. So I think we can assume

16 basically December to March. And he believes that

17 somehow establishes there is an insufficient density of

18 ridership.

19 Had I been allowed to follow up, what I

20 would have pointed out, and I think is apparent to

21 anyone who knows this industry, is that the months

22 during which his so-called experiment occurred were the

23 slow season. If you want to know truly what density of

24 ridership there would be, you need to look at a 12-month

25 period, because auto transportation service has

Page 109

1 seasonality. Typically, the peak period is when the  
 2 cruise ships are running, because that's when people  
 3 come to this area for vacation. More or less whether or  
 4 not it's for the cruise ships, the seasonality of  
 5 transportation services runs high in summer when people  
 6 are visiting Washington during our beautiful summer.  
 7       However, there is, in fact, a significant  
 8 price point difference between these two services. That  
 9 experiment attempting to show what service density there  
 10 would be or what ridership density would there be,  
 11 highlighted truly the price differences. Capital  
 12 Aeroporter's standard base rate that they charge  
 13 customers -- and maybe I shouldn't use the word "base  
 14 rate," because that's a specific tariff term, but their  
 15 standard rate that they charge people Mr. Fricke said is  
 16 \$43 per passenger. Cap Aeroporter therefore is pricing  
 17 their service at more than 100 percent higher than what  
 18 Bremerton Kitsap Airporter proposes to provide and has  
 19 been providing to JBLM.  
 20       The reason why Capital Aeroporter -- or I'm  
 21 sorry, Bremerton Kitsap Airporter, however, is seeking  
 22 to expand the service is for the convenience of its JBLM  
 23 customers. In fact, it has served JBLM for a  
 24 significant period of time, but as Mr. Asche stated in  
 25 his support statement, there is a post-911 inconvenience

Page 110

1 to passengers that are seeking to go to JBLM. Once upon  
 2 a time, pre-911, when those passengers traveled to JBLM,  
 3 the vehicles could pass through security without  
 4 significant stop -- without a significant stop, without  
 5 significant security protocols applying, and people  
 6 could go to their point of destination without delay.  
 7       Some passengers would prefer not to go  
 8 through that delay and receive service at an adjacent  
 9 point. And so the Holiday Inn Express is proposed to be  
 10 provided as an adjacent point where there's no need to  
 11 go through security, delaying passengers to their  
 12 ultimate point of destination.  
 13       And as Ms. Simplot indicated in her  
 14 statement, there are, in fact, passengers who would  
 15 prefer a lower price point from the Holiday Inn Express.  
 16 And as a result of the pricing, they instead of staying  
 17 at the Holiday Inn Express on the final night of their  
 18 vacation or their trip to Washington, they relocate to a  
 19 hotel closer to the airport so they don't have to pay  
 20 that high price. So allowing this additional service  
 21 would both benefit those customers and the business  
 22 there at the Holiday Inn Express.  
 23       We believe that this is, in fact, going to  
 24 be a growing service. It is not uncommon that people  
 25 choose between competing services based on price, and

Page 111

1 the Commission recognizes that. In fact, in General  
 2 Order R-572, the Commission responded to comments made  
 3 by Capital Aeroporter that if you were to raise your  
 4 price too high, someone might file for overlap and point  
 5 out that the higher price was not providing service to  
 6 the satisfaction of the Commission. And if you'd like  
 7 the citation for that discussion, I can find it for you,  
 8 although I don't have it at the moment.  
 9       So to recap, the certificate held by Capital  
 10 Aeroporter does not expressly provide that it is  
 11 providing scheduled service. The time schedule of  
 12 Capital Aeroporter reflects that it is not truly  
 13 providing scheduled service, it is providing a sort of  
 14 modified door-to-door service, and I believe the  
 15 testimony of Mr. Fricke supports that.  
 16       There is no route along which vehicles run.  
 17 To the contrary, Bremerton Kitsap offers a clear route  
 18 with estimated times for all intermediate points. We  
 19 believe that's not only a benefit to the customer, but  
 20 just simply on its face legally a different service for  
 21 which an application should be granted without  
 22 objection.  
 23       Should the Commission decide it needs to  
 24 consider additional factors such as whether or not the  
 25 incumbent is providing satisfaction -- service to the

Page 112

1 satisfaction of the Commission, we believe the price is  
 2 a major point of issue. For the incumbent to provide  
 3 service at a price more than 100 percent of the proposed  
 4 price is significant. It doesn't allow a service like  
 5 Capital Aeroporter to compete with more direct and  
 6 express services.  
 7       Although we don't have pricing for you here  
 8 today, I will tell you that generally speaking, taxis  
 9 and Uber and Lyft are more money than an airporter, but  
 10 they do not offer service anywhere near the low price  
 11 being offered by Bremerton Kitsap Airporter, which  
 12 should allow it to be significantly more competitive.  
 13       We also believe that due to the complaints  
 14 made by customers to Teresa Simplot, there is adequate  
 15 support for the fact that that price point is  
 16 significant to the customers and not just a theoretical  
 17 issue.  
 18       I'll review my notes and make sure I've made  
 19 all the comments we intended to make. I think -- I  
 20 think that covers the primary legal points. I wanted to  
 21 point out that the exhibits that we have submitted speak  
 22 for themselves. We believe they more than adequately  
 23 support that there is a convenience to customers to  
 24 receive this additional service, and that because  
 25 customers simply do not always use Capital Aeroporter

Page 113

1 due to its price, there is going to be sufficient  
 2 gravity of ridership in that territory to support the  
 3 additional service, notwithstanding the fact that the  
 4 fitness to run the new proposed service is not a factor  
 5 to be considered here today. Thank you.  
 6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.  
 7 Mr. Callaghan, do -- does Staff normally  
 8 make a closing statement in these?  
 9 MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, this is actually  
 10 my first brief adjudicative proceeding. I was going to  
 11 just make a brief comment that unfortunately, because  
 12 the assigned Commission Staff member is not with me  
 13 today and this is a highly fact-based inquiry, I  
 14 couldn't give the Commission Staff's opinion on this  
 15 matter based on the fact that a lot of evidence and  
 16 testimony has been presented today that simply wasn't  
 17 available to the Staff member. Thank you.  
 18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.  
 19 You -- you can proceed when you're ready.  
 20 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, the main purpose  
 21 of the proceeding today, again, is to establish the fact  
 22 whether or not -- and using all the evidence and facts  
 23 that Capital Aeroporter has provided today, in objection  
 24 to this application, that Capital Aeroporter certainly  
 25 does provide service to the satisfaction to the

Page 114

1 Commission upon many factors.  
 2 Capital Aeroporter does hold the authority  
 3 to provide the same scheduled service proposed by the  
 4 applicant along the route of Interstate 5 between  
 5 Holiday Inn Express Lakewood and Seattle-Tacoma  
 6 International Airport.  
 7 Over the years, Capital Aeroporter has made  
 8 more than a reasonable effort to expand and improve its  
 9 service to the customers, as heard in Mr. Jim Fricke's  
 10 testimony, starting back with eight scheduled trips to  
 11 the current 23 trips offered by Capital Aeroporter to  
 12 and from the airport in which our scheduled service  
 13 operates from the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood earlier  
 14 in the day than proposed by the applicant and continues  
 15 later in the day with more frequency and more  
 16 convenience to the traveling public.  
 17 Capital Aeroporter has shown that we -- we  
 18 continue to make efforts to provide convenient and safe  
 19 service. We provide timely frequent service in the fact  
 20 that we constantly monitor our -- our passenger loads,  
 21 add additional vehicles, and provide our customers with  
 22 the most efficient route and -- and transportation  
 23 possible, while also operating a business that -- that  
 24 doesn't lose money as referred to by the owner of  
 25 Bremerton Kitsap in his first statement, first exhibit

Page 115

1 in this case. We are currently operating the JBLM route  
 2 at a monetary loss for several reasons.  
 3 So that's a true indication of the real  
 4 purpose of Bremerton Kitsap's application to add this  
 5 point. It is not for the public convenience and  
 6 necessity, and it has not been proven to provide it --  
 7 to provide it for the public convenience and necessity,  
 8 and it is not required by the public.  
 9 Bremerton Kitsap simply wants to add an  
 10 additional stop because they're losing money operating a  
 11 route that is no longer profitable or sustainable. So  
 12 they'd like to just jump on the next spot available and  
 13 try and add -- grab a few more customers to create a bit  
 14 of financial gain for the company.  
 15 Capital Aeroporter has continued to meet all  
 16 advertised schedules, which is also a consideration in  
 17 WAC 480-30-140. It's not just focusing on the time  
 18 schedule that's posted with the Utilities and  
 19 Transportation Commission. As we all know, no -- nobody  
 20 goes to the UTC to check the time schedule operated by a  
 21 carrier. People go online, they check Google, they ask  
 22 their friends, they get references, personal references  
 23 from hotel managers, especially for -- for service. And  
 24 Capital Aeroporter provides the scheduled pick-up and  
 25 drop-off times for customers to the airport and from the

Page 116

1 airport.  
 2 When customers make requests for service  
 3 changes, we respond, and they -- when they inform us  
 4 about any sort -- type of a service difficulty on our  
 5 Rate My Ride app, we instantly know the information and  
 6 make -- if -- we respond to it accordingly, either  
 7 providing additional service or looking how we can  
 8 better serve the general public.  
 9 Capital Aeroporter has provided scheduled  
 10 service the same as that proposed by the applicant and  
 11 will continue to provide that service in a manner which  
 12 is safe, courteous, and respectful.  
 13 Capital Aeroporter, again, operates 23 trips  
 14 to SeaTac as opposed to Bremerton Kitsap, the  
 15 applicant's, 13 trips. In our schedule, we allow for  
 16 traffic delays and other situations that happen on a  
 17 daily basis on Interstate 5.  
 18 I want to point out in the application of  
 19 Bremerton Kitsap on their schedule, their proposed  
 20 schedule. So opening -- opening statements of Bremerton  
 21 Kitsap in -- in their supporting comments from the owner  
 22 state that, (as read) Well, the Holiday Inn Express  
 23 Lakewood operates as an overflow facility for the  
 24 Rainier Lodge and the Evergreen Lodge on base. So we  
 25 thought we'd -- we'd go there to help, you know, get

Page 117

1 those -- those people.  
 2 Well, if you look at the proposed time  
 3 schedule No. 24 on the application, you'll notice that  
 4 the Rainier Lodge and the Evergreen Lodge are no longer  
 5 stops proposed by the applicant. If you also look at  
 6 time schedule 23, the current schedule operated by  
 7 Bremerton Kitsap, they currently offer pick-ups and  
 8 drop-offs at Madigan as well as Waller Hall, the McChord  
 9 passenger air terminal. All of those stops are being  
 10 eliminated from this proposed schedule. So there's  
 11 obviously something else at play here and something that  
 12 is for, again, financial gain for the company and the  
 13 best interest of the company.  
 14 Furthermore, on the time schedule proposed,  
 15 as very detailed illustrated by -- by counsel of the  
 16 applicant, they have a wonderful time schedule that  
 17 shows all these times and runs at intermediate stops to  
 18 the airport. However, adding the Holiday Inn Express  
 19 Lakewood on each run thir-- 25 minutes before arriving  
 20 at SeaTac Airport.  
 21 Well, the distance between the Holiday Inn  
 22 Express Lakewood is 32.2 miles on the road driving to  
 23 the airport. I would find that nearly impossible to  
 24 legally and safely get to SeaTac Airport when 25 minutes  
 25 for a distance of 32.2 miles is about 80 miles per hour.

Page 118

1 Furthermore, on the time schedule, there are  
 2 departure times listed from the airport. So in 25  
 3 minutes, the applicant proposes to get to the airport,  
 4 drop off everyone upstairs, go back around, pick up and  
 5 depart within ten minutes of that time.  
 6 There -- there were not -- there were some  
 7 exhibits that were objected to today, but there have  
 8 been some service issues noted in the public about  
 9 staying on --  
 10 MR. FASSBURG: I'm going to object -- I'm  
 11 going to object to this. Not only were they already --  
 12 well, I objected to them and that objection was  
 13 sustained. If we were going there, there's certainly  
 14 plenty of potential material establishing the same for  
 15 Capital Aeroporter that we didn't attempt to introduce  
 16 for the very reason that it's irrelevant to this  
 17 proceeding.  
 18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, you -- you can't talk  
 19 about exhibits that were not admitted into the record.  
 20 JOHN FRICKE: Okay. No problem. I'll just  
 21 simply refer back again to the -- the application at  
 22 this point, then, because this is also a determining  
 23 factor in this -- in this proceeding.  
 24 The letter, initial letter by Ms. Simplot  
 25 states that they'd like to have more additional

Page 119

1 transportation service to stop at the hotel for guests  
 2 that would be convenient and efficient. Referring to  
 3 apparently an inefficient two-and-a-half-hour interval  
 4 between runs for a current operator. That obviously  
 5 with Bremerton Kitsap's schedule is the only operator  
 6 that operates at a two-and-a-half-hour interval at this  
 7 time.  
 8 The manager also goes on to -- to state that  
 9 there -- would be appreciative that any company would go  
 10 out to try to expand, work on a more efficient  
 11 cost-effective means of transportation.  
 12 The original support statement filed with  
 13 the application made no mention of Capital Aeroporter or  
 14 our scheduled service available. It simply refers to  
 15 prices compared to taking a taxi, and that to have  
 16 additional times would be extremely beneficial. We need  
 17 to have other options, more convenient, more times, more  
 18 runs and, again, Capital Aeroporter, 23 trips to the  
 19 proposed 13 trips is more than that proposed by the  
 20 applicant.  
 21 During the last six months, Capital  
 22 Aeroporter has continued to explore different options  
 23 how to improve our scheduled service, not only with the  
 24 Holiday Inn Express Lakewood, but with the TownePlace  
 25 Suites Lakewood, hotels in DuPont and Olympia because we

Page 120

1 feel it is very important to consider -- to continually  
 2 try to expand scheduled service offering to the general  
 3 public. However, operating more than one company from  
 4 the Holiday Inn Express Lakewood is not economically  
 5 feasible or sustainable. There simply is not the  
 6 population density available for guests of the Holiday  
 7 Inn Express.  
 8 As stated in -- in -- previously in my  
 9 testimony, my -- my conversation with Ms. Simplot, she  
 10 was not pleased with having someone from Lakewood area  
 11 dropped off at her hotel that was not a guest.  
 12 As you will see, as the Commission will see  
 13 in the support statement from Ms. Simplot and the  
 14 supplemental support statement, Applicant's only witness  
 15 to this case for support is not really someone  
 16 independent from the public. It's someone that they  
 17 contacted to try to persuade to help them achieve the  
 18 goal of adding a stop outside of JBLM so that they could  
 19 make more money. And the witness only requests service  
 20 for hotel guests from the Holiday Inn Express or to the  
 21 Holiday Inn Express.  
 22 There is no public support or need or  
 23 necessity or requirement stated anywhere in their  
 24 application or exhibits from the public that shows the  
 25 need for any type of passenger other than a hotel guest

Page 121	Page 123
<p>1 to or from the Holiday Inn Express.</p> <p>2 In September 2018, Bremerton Kitsap</p> <p>3 attempted to circumvent UTC rules and laws set forth --</p> <p>4 MR. FASSBURG: Objection. This is</p> <p>5 irrelevant to the application proceeding.</p> <p>6 JOHN FRICKE: It is relevant. It shows fact</p> <p>7 and matter leading up to the application.</p> <p>8 MR. FASSBURG: This isn't relevant to</p> <p>9 whether it's the same service, whether the incumbent is</p> <p>10 actually providing the service for which it has</p> <p>11 certificate authority, or whether the incumbent provides</p> <p>12 service to the satisfaction of the Commission --</p> <p>13 JOHN FRICKE: I am providing a statement and</p> <p>14 foundation to illustrate the comparison of same service</p> <p>15 and what is proposed by the applicant for what is</p> <p>16 already existing at the location.</p> <p>17 JUDGE CHARTOFF: I'm going to sustain the</p> <p>18 objection.</p> <p>19 JOHN FRICKE: Capital Aeroporter continues</p> <p>20 to operate efficient routes to and from the Holiday Inn</p> <p>21 Express Lakewood. We do not operate zigzag all over the</p> <p>22 county. We establish the number of customers, we make</p> <p>23 adjustments within minutes of the passenger loads with</p> <p>24 our airport coordinator and vehicles and drivers that</p> <p>25 are on -- that are ready to make schedule adjustments at</p>	<p>1 opportunity for cross.</p> <p>2 JUDGE CHARTOFF: I understand. I am giving</p> <p>3 him some leeway because he is unrepresented, and I will</p> <p>4 not use any facts in -- if there are new facts in his</p> <p>5 closing, I will not rely on those if they're not -- they</p> <p>6 aren't in evidence.</p> <p>7 MR. FASSBURG: I appreciate that.</p> <p>8 JOHN FRICKE: Thank you, Your Honor. You</p> <p>9 can refer to the testimony of Mr. Jim Fricke, in fact,</p> <p>10 where he says we would respond within five minutes to --</p> <p>11 for a request for service from the Holiday Inn Express</p> <p>12 Lakewood.</p> <p>13 I would like to also for the Commission to</p> <p>14 take notice of a situation with the application as well</p> <p>15 as required for application of a -- of an extension of</p> <p>16 authority or new authority. It is necessary to provide</p> <p>17 and it is required, in fact, by WAC R -- to provide</p> <p>18 ridership and revenue forecast for the first 12 months</p> <p>19 of operation and a pro forma balance sheet and income</p> <p>20 statement for the first 12 months of operation. All of</p> <p>21 those are absent with just a general statement of --</p> <p>22 of --</p> <p>23 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.</p> <p>24 JOHN FRICKE: -- an owner.</p> <p>25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yeah, we -- I think we</p>
Page 122	Page 124
<p>1 SeaTac Airport.</p> <p>2 In fact, when our shuttles are traveling to</p> <p>3 the airport, a customer could call from the Holiday Inn</p> <p>4 Express Lakewood minutes before needing scheduled</p> <p>5 service to the airport, and our next available scheduled</p> <p>6 shuttle would be able to pick them up.</p> <p>7 MR. FASSBURG: Your Honor, I'm going to</p> <p>8 object to the extent that Mr. Fricke is now arguing</p> <p>9 outside the scope of the record. I don't have an</p> <p>10 opportunity to cross-examine him on new facts that he</p> <p>11 has been inserting throughout his closing. I've</p> <p>12 obviously given him broad leeway without objecting too</p> <p>13 much because I think that's appropriate, but I'd ask you</p> <p>14 to instruct him to stick to the record as been presented</p> <p>15 in his argument.</p> <p>16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Right. What -- I --</p> <p>17 JOHN FRICKE: I already testified to the</p> <p>18 fact of -- of the service that we are and will continue</p> <p>19 to provide for customers for Holiday Inn.</p> <p>20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. I am giving you --</p> <p>21 JOHN FRICKE: How -- I mean, this is -- this</p> <p>22 is a statement to further confirm the facts of -- of my</p> <p>23 testimony.</p> <p>24 MR. FASSBURG: And -- and, Your Honor, he's</p> <p>25 elaborating in ways on which I didn't have an</p>	<p>1 talked about the scope of this proceeding, we've talked</p> <p>2 about that a lot. It's limited to whether the objecting</p> <p>3 company holds a certificate, whether it's the same</p> <p>4 service, and whether the service is provided to the</p> <p>5 satisfaction of the Commission. The Commission will be</p> <p>6 considering those other things you're looking at, but</p> <p>7 not in this proceeding. Those other factors that you're</p> <p>8 talking about.</p> <p>9 JOHN FRICKE: Okay. Okay. I understand.</p> <p>10 Well, just to finish up, then. As Capital has</p> <p>11 illustrated and presented evidence throughout the</p> <p>12 proceeding, both from testimony and exhibits, we provide</p> <p>13 and continue to provide scheduled service to the</p> <p>14 satisfaction of the Commission. Applicant's counsel</p> <p>15 clearly showed differences in time schedules; however,</p> <p>16 our time schedule that we operate our scheduled service</p> <p>17 on was approved by the UTC on January 31, 2013, and we</p> <p>18 received no counsel or recommendations to make any</p> <p>19 changes to such schedule.</p> <p>20 We are very -- very careful in making sure</p> <p>21 we abide by our scheduled times, because that is one of</p> <p>22 the very important factors of scheduled service. We --</p> <p>23 we pick up customers when we say we're picking them up,</p> <p>24 we arrive, plan to arrive, on time unless any unforeseen</p> <p>25 circumstances with traffic or weather that are out of</p>



Page 125	Page 127
<p>1 our control. We operate all available trips out of the                  2 airport and, in fact, provide service to anyone who's --                  3 who's not able to get on any service that doesn't take                  4 reservations. We will do our best to accommodate them                  5 to provide the best scheduled service to and from the                  6 Holiday Inn Express.                  7 And in -- in my final comment, again,                  8 referring back to the witness, Ms. Teresa Simplot, the                  9 supplemental statement provided on -- on March 8th                  10 obviously was changed from the initial on -- on November                  11 15th. And I made every attempt at providing better                  12 service from before the -- the statement that was made                  13 that there were any complaints about fares or -- or                  14 Capital Aeroporter. We never -- in my two                  15 communications with Ms. Simplot, I specifically asked                  16 her if there were any issues or difficulties or -- or                  17 complaints and nothing was provided to me at that time.                  18 Thank you.                  19 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.                  20 Okay. Is there anything further?                  21 MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, I would like to                  22 make a brief final note.                  23 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.                  24 MR. CALLAGHAN: If I may.                  25 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Mm-hmm.</p>	<p>1 of the fact that they call it scheduled service. And I                  2 think I have been clear in pointing out that the law                  3 describes scheduled service and door-to-door                  4 differently.                  5 But one of the things I think just really                  6 needs to be made as clear as possible is that it's not                  7 just enough that you have authority to provide a                  8 service. You have to actually provide that service.                  9 What Mr. Fricke has described isn't a scheduled service.                  10 It's a service that you can schedule. You can schedule                  11 door-to-door service by making a reservation to be                  12 picked up at a particular location or be dropped off at                  13 a particular location. That's the same as the so-called                  14 scheduled service they have provided.                  15 And so despite the label being applied by                  16 the protestant, the -- the reality is what matters here.                  17 Capital Aeroporter doesn't provide scheduled service                  18 wherein there is a schedule of stops and times, period,                  19 as a matter of fact, as they have admitted repeatedly.                  20 And so when the Commission decides whether to grant an                  21 application if the incumbent isn't actually providing                  22 the service, even if they have authority, the incumbent                  23 doesn't, in fact, by rule have a right to protest.                  24 They have protested and we've had this                  25 proceeding here today, but if you re-review the</p>
Page 126	Page 128
<p>1 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you.                  2 I would just like to note on the record that                  3 based on the figures provided by Capital in Exhibits 11                  4 through 16, it's entirely possible that this proceeding                  5 has cost the parties the equivalent of the annual                  6 revenue generated by this stop. And so Commission                  7 Staff, as always, strongly encourages parties to try to                  8 settle these matters before a hearing. It's not always                  9 possible, but -- and I -- I know that both parties                  10 understand this, but I think it bears repeating, that                  11 taking matters like this to a hearing, while it's always                  12 the party's right to do so, it seems like this --                  13 regardless of the outcome today is probably is                  14 suboptimal outcome for everyone involved. Thank you.                  15 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you. Okay.                  16 MR. FASSBURG: I would -- if you -- if you                  17 would permit a brief response for the comments made by                  18 Mr. Fricke specifically.                  19 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Can --                  20 MR. FASSBURG: It'll be very brief, Your                  21 Honor.                  22 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay.                  23 MR. FASSBURG: Sure. So one of the things                  24 that I think is worth noting and articulating is that                  25 Mr. Fricke states they provide scheduled service because</p>	<p>1 standards in WAC 480-30-116, you'll find that unless                  2 they are providing the service, they can't object. I                  3 think it can't be more clear that the Commission                  4 intended to allow a new application under the                  5 circumstances here. Thank you.                  6 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.                  7 JOHN FRICKE: Your Honor, may I just make                  8 one brief two-sentence response?                  9 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Two sentences.                  10 JOHN FRICKE: Okay.                  11 JUDGE CHARTOFF: But it has to be related to                  12 what he just said.                  13 JOHN FRICKE: Yes, definitely. The                  14 applicant is attempting to cloud or change the fact that                  15 we provide scheduled service, and even according to WAC                  16 480-30-036, the specific definitions in which auto                  17 transportation companies operate by a specific                  18 definition of scheduled service means an auto                  19 transportation company providing passenger service at                  20 specified arrival and/or departure times at points on a                  21 route. We have specified departure times, we have                  22 specified arrival times. Thank you.                  23 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Thank you.                  24 So before we adjourn, I do find good cause                  25 to extend the deadline. I think I may need to consult</p>

1 the transcript. So I will issue a decision within ten  
2 days of receiving the transcript, which should probably  
3 be about 20 days from now. Anything else?

4 MR. FASSBURG: That's it from us. Thank  
5 you.

6 MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor.

7 JOHN FRICKE: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. We are adjourned.

9 Thank you.

10 (Adjourned at 12:55 p.m.)

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 CERTIFICATE

2  
3 STATE OF WASHINGTON  
4 COUNTY OF THURSTON

5  
6 I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand  
7 Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby  
8 certify that the foregoing transcript is true and  
9 accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358