

Basic statement of the CR-101 was to provide a competitive environment for Airporters to address the TNC's, (i.e. Transportation Network Companies} such as (UBER).

This company's initial understanding of the reason for the CR-101 was that the UTC would step up to the plate where all other State agencies have failed and bring UBER under the regulatory control of the UTC. This is not the case and our question is why not? They meet the UTC's own definition under 480-30-036 of a common carrier and they haul passengers for compensation over the roads in Washington. "**Common carrier**" means any person who transports passengers by motor vehicle over the public highways for compensation.

Essentially all of the initial comments from stakeholders to the CR-101 were to bring TNCs into compliance and not dilute the regulations for Airporters regarding, safety, insurance, and training and driver certification. Under flexible fare structure there is no rate relief that the UTC can provide other than to get out of the rate regulation business entirely.

The current draft proposal of staff disregards every one of these comments. Contract vehicles and drivers are relieved of the same level of per seat insurance required of current carriers, there is no formal training required, safety is ignored as drug and alcohol testing is not required and any POV license including an out of state one is acceptable. To add insult to injury staff has inserted additional regulations to further burden the certificated Airporters adding a requirement that a full tariff be carried in each vehicle and posted on the carriers WEB Site. In addition, any required filing notices must be posted on the company's WEB Site. No thought was given to the cost or inconvenience of WEB Site postings or the additional paperwork to be required onboard the vehicles. Tariffs and Time Schedules are already posted on the UTC WEB Site and we already make the public aware of that posting in our printed brochure, so why then the redundancy and additional burden? Virtually everyone has access to the Internet via the various devices they now carry with them and can access the UTC site with all the information they need about any individual airporter.

The proposed language suggests that the UTC regulate "Express Freight", the Commission has no such authority under RCW 81.68. We do not understand how this section was entered into the draft and is an example of staff packing the WAC under the CR-101 which did not in any fashion call for increased regulation of certificated carriers and certainly regulation for which the commission has no authority. This must be removed.

We fail to see how any of this makes the Airporters more competitive with TNCs. Please explain this to us. If the door-to-door carriers see this as an end run on current regulation for them, why don't they just obtain a For Hire permit which allow them even more relief from regulation and keep the UTC from even beginning a new regulatory process.

In the absence of the UTC bringing the TNCs under their purview it is our opinion that this effort has been an exercise with no purpose and a waste of time and money. We further argue that any additional proposed regulations that do not in some demonstrative way contribute to the enhanced competitiveness of the Airporters is outside the scope of the CR-101. Staff may not just use this filing as a method to promulgate a large regulatory burden on the certificated Airporters.

We now have 5 times the required insurance for buses of 15 pax or less and 10 times the required amount for over 15 pax. How does the UTC justify the minimum for 7 or less. They should be at least the same rate as the 15 pax or 5 times the minimum.

Finally, Republic of King County is not a State agency and should not be a part of this workshop. If they want to regulate UBER then let them, but they should not dabble in State regulations. They have no say over airporters. They cannot impose their inspection procedures on any facet of airporter operations.