

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

PROCEEDING NO. 20C-0346-INS

IN THE MATTER OF COMMISSION ACTION AGAINST THE CERTIFICATE(S) AND
PERMIT(S) OF MOTOR CARRIERS CONCERNING FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
PURSUANT TO § 40-10.1-112, C.R.S., AND RULE 4 CCR 723-6-6008 OF THE RULES
REGULATING TRANSPORTATION BY MOTOR VEHICLES.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION OF
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
MELODY MIRBABA
REVOKING AUTHORITIES AND PERMITS**

Mailed Date: September 15, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY.....	2
II. STATEMENT, FINDINGS, LAW, ANALYSIS, AND CONCLUSIONS	2
A. Background.....	2
B. Staff’s Evidence.....	3
C. Respondents’ Evidence.	5
D. Applicable Law.	7
1. Financial Responsibility Requirements and the Commission’s Authority to Revoke Permits and Authorities.	7
2. Notice and Service Requirements.	9
3. Burden of Proof.	10
E. Findings, Analysis, and Conclusions.....	10
III. ORDER.....	16
A. The Commission Orders That:	16

I. SUMMARY

1. This Recommended Decision grants the relief sought in the Public Utilities Commission Staff's (Staff or Commission Staff) Complaints against the motor-carrier Respondents listed in Appendix A to this Recommended Decision, revoking Respondents' authorities and permits based on the failure to keep currently effective proof of financial responsibility on file with the Commission. This Recommended Decision also provides avenues for Respondents listed in Appendix A to avoid revocation by taking action before this Recommended Decision becomes effective.

II. STATEMENT, FINDINGS, LAW, ANALYSIS, AND CONCLUSIONS**A. Background.**

2. Commission Staff instituted the cases in this proceeding by "Order of Summary Suspension and Complaint and Notice of Hearing" against the motor carrier-Respondents (Complaints) on August 24, 2020. Hearing Exhibit 2.

3. The Complaints against each of the Respondents¹ in this proceeding provide notice of the allegations against the Respondents. Hearing Exhibit 2. Specifically, the Complaints against each of the Respondents listed on Appendix A allege that the Commission received notice from the Respondents' insurance or surety carriers that the Respondents' insurance or surety coverage will be cancelled as specifically identified in each Complaint. *Id.* The Complaints further notify Respondents that their authorities or permits have been, or will be, summarily suspended on the date specified in each Complaint, and informs Respondents of the date, time, and location for a Commission hearing to determine whether their authorities or permits should

¹ This proceeding involves numerous Respondents against whom the Commission initiated Complaints by sending them each an "Order of Summary Suspension and Complaint and Notice of Hearing." Hearing Exhibit 2. Each of those Complaints is assigned a unique "Case No." which specifies the grounds unique to each Respondent. And, each of those case numbers are part of this single proceeding.

be permanently revoked for failing to maintain proper evidence of insurance or surety coverage with the Commission. *Id.*

4. On September 8, 2020, Staff served Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5 on Respondents by e-mail. *See* Notice Concerning the Service of Exhibits 1 through 5 for the September 9, 2020 Show Cause Hearing on Respondents (Notice) filed on September 8, 2020.

5. As noticed in the Complaints, on September 9, 2020, at approximately 12:00 p.m., the undersigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) held the hearing on the Complaints. Ms. Vanessa Condra appeared and testified on behalf of Commission Staff; counsel also appeared on behalf of Commission Staff. Representatives of Chauffeur Limousine Service LLC (Chauffeur), Premiere Limousine and Car Service LLC (Premiere), Hamilton Towing, Inc. (Hamilton), and Amazing Love Transportation LLC (Amazing Love) appeared and provided testimony on behalf of their companies. Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5 were admitted into evidence during the hearing.

B. Staff's Evidence.

6. Ms. Condra is responsible for reviewing Commission records and coordinating with other Commission Staff to commence proceedings against motor carriers to suspend and revoke their permits and authorities when they do not have currently effective proof of insurance or surety coverage on file with the Commission. Ms. Condra assisted with initiating this proceeding against Respondents because the Commission received notice from each of the Respondents' insurance or surety carriers of the imminent cancellation of their insurance or surety coverage. Hearing Exhibits 1 through 3.

7. Ms. Condra explained that the Commission served the Complaints and Attachment A to the Complaints (Hearing Exhibit 3) upon the Respondents by United States mail

on August 24, 2020, at the addresses, and upon the persons identified as designated agents for the Respondents, as provided in the Commission's files. Hearing Exhibits 1 through 4. Hearing Exhibit 1 is the list of Respondents, including their addresses and designated agents, who were out of compliance with their financial responsibility requirements as of August 24, 2020 when the Complaints were issued.

8. Ms. Condra explained that Respondents provided the Commission the addresses and identities of their designated agents that were used to serve the Complaints in this proceeding. The Complaints' Certificate of Service shows that the Commission served the Respondents by mailing the Complaints addressed as indicated in the "Hearing Cycle Listing." Hearing Exhibit 4. Ms. Condra explained that the Hearing Cycle Listing is Hearing Exhibit 1, the list of Respondents with their addresses and designated agents as on file with the Commission, who were out of compliance with their financial responsibility requirements as of August 24, 2020 when the Complaints were issued. Hearing Exhibits 1 and 4; *see also* Hearing Exhibit 2.

9. On September 8, 2020, Ms. Condra looked into whether any Respondents had initiated a Commission proceeding which may impact this proceeding (*e.g.*, application seeking to transfer or suspend Respondents' permits), and to determine if any of them came into compliance with the Commission's financial responsibility requirements since the Complaints were issued. While she did not learn of any pending proceeding that impacts this one, she did determine that many carriers came into compliance since the Complaints were issued on August 24, 2020. The Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 remain out of compliance with the

Commission's financial responsibility requirements.² By the time of the hearing on September 9, 2020, Ms. Condra was unaware of any other Respondents who came into compliance since the prior day. Based on the foregoing, Staff requested that the authorities and permits of the Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 be revoked.

10. Ms. Condra also explained that luxury limousine carriers whose permits are revoked may reapply at any time to obtain the same luxury limousine permit (including the same permit number). When asked, she was unable to provide information on how carriers may meet their financial responsibility obligations using a surety, but agreed to work with carriers who followed-up with her on that. She also agreed, when asked, to provide Premiere with a link to the Division of Insurance so that Premiere could follow-up on insurance issues (discussed below).

C. Respondents' Evidence.

11. Ms. Sherryl McGee is Hamilton's office manager. She explained that she has been working on renewing Hamilton's insurance since early July 2020. Hamilton changed insurance carriers, and received its proof of insurance on August 27, 2020. The insurance company informed Hamilton that it was unable to file proof of insurance with the Commission due to a problem with an address that was listed in the Commission's system. Ms. McGee explained that a personal address was listed for Hamilton as the company's mailing address, and that this caused the problem. She testified that this issue was corrected the morning of the hearing, so the insurance company should be able to file proof of insurance with the Commission that same day.

² In contrast, Hearing Exhibit 1 is the list of carriers who were non-compliant when the Commission issued the Complaints on August 24, 2020. As the difference in the numbers of carriers listed in Hearing Exhibits 1 and 5 make evident, many carriers came into compliance since the Commission issued the Complaints. All the carriers listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 are listed in Hearing Exhibit 1.

She agreed to follow-up with Hamilton's insurance company and work with Commission Staff as necessary to ensure that proof of insurance is filed as soon as possible.

12. Mr. Emilio Rizzuto owns and operates Chauffeur.³ Mr. Rizzuto explained that his company has been in business since 1981, and this proceeding is the first time it has faced revocation for failing to meet its financial responsibility requirements. Chauffeur caters to tourists visiting Colorado's mountain resorts. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Chauffeur's business has dropped off. Chauffeur's last trip to the mountain resorts was on February 29, 2020. Despite that, Chauffeur maintained insurance through the end of July 2020. Given Chauffeur's lack of income since the end of February, it was no longer able to afford insurance, so the company allowed its insurance to lapse. Mr. Rizzuto expressed interest in learning how to use a surety to meet financial responsibility requirements, and would like to have the same permit Chauffeur has operated under since 1981 reinstated should it be revoked in this proceeding.

13. Mr. Aziz Bahloul owns and operates Premiere. He explained that Premiere is in the same position as Chauffeur. Premiere maintained its insurance through August 20, 2020, in an effort to keep the business afloat during the pandemic. It became a big burden to continue to pay for insurance given the lack of business caused by COVID-19. He clarified that problems generating business started with Uber and Lyft taking a large chunk of his business (90 percent); he complained that the Commission failed to protect him and similar carriers from this. He would like the Commission to consider how Uber and Lyft have destroyed businesses like his, and to take action similar to other states to protect his business and others like it. Mr. Bahloul

³ During the hearing, the ALJ determined that Mr. Rizzuto, a non-attorney, may represent Chauffeur., based on the information that he provided and the record in this matter, consistent with Rule 1201(b), 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* 723-1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. As such, the ALJ allowed Mr. Rizzuto to represent Chauffeur.

explained that when COVID-19 hit, any remaining business he had disappeared because people are simply not travelling. He also testified that part of the problem is that his insurance rates increased dramatically, and he could see no reason for that based on his company's actions. For example, he testified that insurance rates jumped from approximately \$1,000 per vehicle to \$4,000 per vehicle. Mr. Bahloul believes Premiere's insurance company is engaging in predatory practices by dramatically increasing insurance rates for no reason, and without any limit. It has simply become unaffordable to maintain, though he has continued to work with his insurance company to try to lower the offered rates, including dropping off one vehicle. Mr. Bahloul testified that he is now facing closing Premiere and filing bankruptcy.

14. Ms. Asmait D. Ghebrehawariat owns and operates Amazing Love. She testified that Amazing Love has renewed its insurance, and that proof of insurance was not filed because her insurance agent was traveling and did not get to it in a timely manner. Ms. Ghebrehawariat testified that she reached the insurance company on the day of the hearing, and the insurance company promised to file proof of insurance with the Commission that same day. She agreed to follow-up with Amazing Love's insurance company and work with Commission Staff as necessary to ensure that proof of insurance is filed as soon as possible.

D. Applicable Law.

1. Financial Responsibility Requirements and the Commission's Authority to Revoke Permits and Authorities.

15. Generally, motor carriers holding a Commission permit, authority, or certificate must maintain and file evidence of financial responsibility with the Commission in such sum, for such protection, and in such form as the Commission deems necessary to adequately safeguard the public interest. § 40-10.1-107(1), C.R.S. (2019); Rule 6008 of the Rules Regulating Transportation by Motor Vehicle, 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* (CCR) 723-6. Motor carriers

must ensure their insurance or surety coverage is kept continuously effective during the life of a certificate or permit to operate. § 40-10.1-107(3), C.R.S. Commission Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6, identifies the amount, type of protection, and form for the insurance or surety coverage that motor carriers must maintain at all times in order to safeguard the public interest.

16. Specifically, motor carriers must obtain and keep motor vehicle liability insurance or surety bond coverage in force at all times. Rule 6008(a)(I), 4 CCR 723-6. In addition to motor vehicle liability coverage, towing carriers and household goods movers must maintain and keep cargo liability insurance or surety bond coverage in force at all times. Rule 6008(a)(I) and (III), 4 CCR 723-6. Towing carriers must obtain and keep worker's compensation insurance in force at all times; and towing carriers providing storage must obtain and keep garage keeper's liability insurance in force at all times. Rule 6008(a)(IV) and (V), 4 CCR 723-6. And, in addition to motor vehicle liability and cargo liability coverage, household good movers must obtain and keep general liability insurance or surety coverage in force at all times. Rule 6008(a)(VI), 4 CCR 723-6.

17. Motor carriers are responsible for maintaining and filing evidence of the required financial responsibility coverage with the Commission. § 40-10.1-107(1), C.R.S., and Rule 6008(a), 4 CCR 723-6. They must ensure their insurance or surety coverage is kept continuously effective during the life of a certificate or permit to operate. § 40-10.1-107(3), C.R.S. Insurers and sureties must notify the policy or bond holder *and* the Commission when terminating a policy or bond at least 30 days before the effective date of termination; failing that, termination is not valid. § 40-10.1-107(4), C.R.S. As a result, the Commission receives notice from insurance or surety carriers about imminent policy or bond terminations for motor carriers licensed by the Commission. *Id.*

18. Notice of cancellation from a motor carrier's insurance or surety carrier is evidence that the motor carrier no longer has proof of financial responsibility on file with the Commission. Rule 6008(e), 4 CCR 723-6. Failure to have proof of current and effective insurance or surety coverage on file with the Commission creates a rebuttable presumption that the carrier is in violation of the financial responsibility requirements. *Id.*

19. Section 40-10.1-112(1)(a) and (c), C.R.S., provide that a Commission issued authority or permit may be suspended, revoked, altered, or amended if it is established to the satisfaction of the Commission at a properly-noticed hearing that the holder of that authority or permit has violated Article 10.1, Title 40 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, or any applicable Commission rule. Rules 6009 and 6011, 4 CCR 723-6, also provide the Commission authority to revoke a permit or authority in the circumstances here.

2. Notice and Service Requirements.

20. The Commission must provide Respondents with notice of the Complaints against them, including sufficient facts to adequately advise Respondents of the relief sought and how they are alleged to have violated the law, as well as the time affixed for a hearing on the Complaints. §§ 40-10.1-112(1) and 40-6-108, C.R.S.; Rule 1302(h), 4 CCR 723-1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure; *see also* § 24-4-105(2), C.R.S. Such notice must be served upon the Respondents, which may be accomplished by mail. § 40-6-108(3), C.R.S.; Rule 1205(a) and (d), 4 CCR 723-1; *see also* § 24-4-104(10), C.R.S.

21. Regulated motor carriers must provide the Commission "its designation of the name, mailing address, and physical address of a Person upon whom service may be made of any lawful notice, order, process, or demand." Rule 6006(a), 4 CCR 723-6. That person is the motor carrier's designated agent upon whom the Commission may serve complaints and other notices.

Id.; Rule 1205(a) and (d), 4 CCR 723-1. And, regulated motor carriers are responsible for updating the Commission on changes to their designated agent, including the agent's mailing and email addresses, within two days of the change. Rule 6006(b), 4 CCR 723-6. Service on a motor carrier's designated agent on file with the Commission is service upon the carrier and is "prima facie evidence" that the carrier received notice. Rule 6006(c) and (d), 4 CCR 723-6. A certificate of service issued by the Commission's Director is *prima facie* evidence that service has been obtained. § 40-6-108(3), C.R.S.

22. In addition, Commission Rule 1205(a), 4 CCR 723-1, requires that a person filing any pleading or other document with the Commission must serve all other parties; the same rule allows parties to serve pleadings and documents by e-mail.

3. Burden of Proof.

23. Staff carries the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence to demonstrate that the allegations in the Complaints are true and that the Complaints were properly served on each of the Respondents. § 24-4-105(7), C.R.S.; Rule 1500, 4 CCR 723-1. The preponderance standard requires the fact finder to determine whether the existence of a contested fact is more probable than its non-existence. *Swain v. Colorado Dep't of Revenue*, 717 P.2d 507, 508 (Colo. App. 1985). A party has met this burden of proof when the evidence, on the whole, tips in favor of that party. *Schocke v. State, Dep't of Revenue*, 719 P.2d 361, 363 (Colo. App. 1986).

E. Findings, Analysis, and Conclusions.

24. The evidence was undisputed. The ALJ finds that the Complaints were served on the Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 in accordance with Commission rules. *See* Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5. The ALJ concludes that Staff demonstrated by a preponderance of the

evidence that it properly served the Complaints upon each of the Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5. § 40-6-108(3), C.R.S.; Rule 1205(a) and (d), and Rule 1302(g)(II)(e), 4 CCR 723-1; and Rule 6006(a) and (c), 4 CCR 723-6.

25. The ALJ finds that the Complaints comply with the relevant notice requirements because they: (a) inform Respondents that the Commission has received insurance or surety cancellation notices for each Respondent and the effective date of such cancellation; (b) advise Respondents that their authorities or permits are summarily suspended as of the coverage cancellation date; (c) notify Respondents that they may not conduct operations under their authorities or permits after the coverage cancellation and summary suspension date; (d) inform Respondents that the Commission has initiated a proceeding to permanently revoke their permits or authorities for failing to maintain and provide proof of effective insurance or surety coverage; (e) notify Respondents of the date, time, and means to attend the remote hearing on the Complaints at which Respondents have an opportunity to present data, views, and arguments; and (f) advise Respondents of the legal authority for the Complaints and relief sought. Hearing Exhibit 2. Rule 6009(e), 4 CCR 723-6; *see* §§ 40-6-108 and 24-4-105(2), C.R.S.

26. In addition, the ALJ concludes that Staff served Hearing Exhibits 1 to 5 on Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 by e-mail at the e-mail addresses which Respondents provided. As such, Respondents had the opportunity to review those exhibits before or during the hearing. *See* Rule 1205(a), 4 CCR 723-1; Notice and Exhibit A to Notice; Hearing Exhibit 5.

27. The ALJ concludes that Staff established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Commission received notice from the insurance or surety providers for the motor carriers identified in Hearing Exhibit 5 that their insurance or surety coverage was or will be cancelled or terminated. Hearing Exhibit 2. This creates the rebuttable presumption that the relevant

Respondent carriers are in violation of their respective financial responsibility requirements. Rule 6008(e), 4 CCR 723-6.

28. With the exception of Hamilton and Amazing Love, the evidence was undisputed that the Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 are out of compliance with their respective financial responsibility requirements set forth in § 40-10.1-107(3), C.R.S., and Commission Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6. While Hamilton and Amazing Love provided evidence that they have renewed their insurance, in compliance with their financial responsibility requirements, Staff established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Commission's records do not show proof of that as required by § 40-10.1-107, C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6.

29. Staff established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Commission's records do not show a currently effective level of financial responsibility, including but not limited to motor vehicle liability, general liability, garage keeper's liability coverage, worker's compensation coverage, and cargo liability coverage in such form and in such manner as required by § 40-10.1-107, C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6, for the Respondents identified in Hearing Exhibit 5. Staff met its burden of proof to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the allegations in the Complaints are true as to the Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5. Hearing Exhibit 5 is attached to this Recommended Decision as Appendix A.

30. The ALJ does not question Respondents' testimony as to the difficult circumstances that COVID-19 has placed on them; and the ALJ sympathizes with them. This, unfortunately, does not change the fact that the Commission remains legally obligated to fulfill its important and statutorily-mandated duty to the public to guarantee that motor carriers who hold an active authority or permit from the Commission have effective insurance as required by law. Indeed, the statute and rules creating both the Commission's and Respondents' legal

obligations relating to insurance requirements remain in full force and effect; none have been suspended or modified by executive order, or the legislature. § 40-10.1-107, C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6; *see* § 24-33.5-701, *et seq.* C.R.S. (authorizing the Governor to temporarily suspend statutes); *see e.g.*, Executive Order D 2020-011 (suspending certain regulatory statutes due to the presence of COVID-19 disease in Colorado).

31. The Commission's only means of performing its important duty to the public to ensure that persons who hold an active motor carrier authority meet their financial responsibility obligations is to require documentation of carriers' current and effective insurance or surety furnished in a uniform format to the Commission. The holder of the authority is responsible for ensuring that documentation is provided to the Commission. § 40-10.1-107, C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6. The Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 have failed to do so. For that reason, their authorities and permits should be revoked.

32. Because all Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 have failed to keep currently effective proof of financial responsibility on file with the Commission, their authorities and permits should be revoked.

33. However, Respondents may take action before the effective date of this Decision to avoid revocation. The Commission allows limited regulation carriers (including luxury limousine carriers),⁴ household goods movers, towing carriers, and hazardous materials carriers to submit a form to cancel their permits or authorities. Permit cancellation forms are available at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOQ2QWlrMFlvUDJoNjQ/view?.authuser=0. Given

⁴ Limited regulation carriers are defined as carriers who provide transportation service by charter bus, children's activity bus, fire crew transport, luxury limousine, Medicaid client transport, or off-road scenic charter. Rule 6001(qq), 4 CCR 723-6. Carriers may obtain a copy of the Rules Regulating Transportation by Motor Vehicle, 4 CCR 723-6 at the Commission's website at: <https://puc.colorado.gov/transportation-rules>.

the difficult circumstances that COVID-19 has created, this Decision allows such carriers to take advantage of that process if they wish to avoid having their permits or authorities revoked.

34. Fully regulated intrastate carriers, such as common carriers who operate a shuttle service, sightseeing service, charter service, taxicab service, and contract carriers may submit an application to suspend their authority under Rule 6205, 4 CCR 723-6 to avoid having their permits revoked. For the same reasons discussed above, the ALJ is recommending dismissal of Complaints against fully regulated intrastate carriers who file an application to suspend their authority before the effective date of this Recommended Decision.

35. The application form to suspend a common carrier authority is available at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOQ2dXZ0UTNIXzBvRIU/view.

36. The application form to suspend a contract carrier authority is available at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOQ2U2JQS2dvek5HWm8/view.

37. Applications to suspend may be submitted to the Commission by United States mail, and through the Commission's free E-Filing System. Interested carriers may register to use the Commission's free E-filing System at: <https://www.dora.state.co.us/pls/efi/EFI.register>.

38. Finally, as provided below, Complaints against carriers who come into compliance with their financial responsibility requirements before the effective date of this Decision will be dismissed, and their permits will not be revoked.

39. As several Respondents testified, the COVID-19 pandemic has strained many motor carriers' ability to generate income, thereby impacting their ability to maintain effective insurance or surety as required by law. But, limited regulation carriers who cancel their permits, or whose permits are revoked by this Decision need not face the permanent termination of their businesses. For the most part, such permits may be obtained by completing an application that

can be submitted to the Commission on-line, providing related supporting information, and proof of financial responsibility, and paying a fee.⁵ Rule 6302 (luxury limousine application and permit); Rule 6503 (towing carrier application and permit); Rule 6603 (household goods mover carrier application and permit). As Ms. Condra testified, when such carriers reapply for a permit, they may seek to have their current permit number reinstated.

40. Applications for a luxury limousine, towing, or household goods mover permits are available at the following link: <https://doraapps.state.co.us/puc/TransportationApplications/>.

41. As explained during the hearing and provided below, this Recommended Decision will not become effective for 20 days after the date the Decision is mailed, and only then, if no party appeals this Decision by filing exceptions. This allows ample time for Respondents to take action to avoid a final Commission decision revoking their permits or authorities.

42. For all the reasons discussed, Complaints against carriers who take one of the actions described in Ordering ¶ 2 (below) before the effective date of this Recommended Decision will be dismissed, and their permits will not be revoked.

43. Pursuant to § 40-6-109, C.R.S., the ALJ transmits the record of this proceeding, this recommended decision containing findings of fact and conclusions thereon, and a recommended order to the Commission.

⁵ Carriers concerned about their ability to comply with application requirements may request that the Commission waive an application requirement, per Rule 1003(a), 4 CCR 723-1. That rule allows parties to request a waiver of a Commission rule; in deciding whether to waive a rule, the Commission may consider hardship, equity, or more effective implementation of a rule on an individual basis. Rule 1003(a), 4 CCR 723-1. Such requests are decided on an individual and case-by-case basis and are outside the scope of this proceeding. *See id.*

III. ORDER

A. The Commission Orders That:

1. The authorities or permits listed in Appendix A, attached hereto, are revoked as of the effective date of this Recommended Decision.

2. Ordering Paragraph No. 1 will be void and the case dismissed as to any Respondent who takes one of the following actions before the effective date of this Recommended Decision:

- a. files the required Certificate of Insurance or surety with the Commission;
- b. files an Application to Suspend their permit or authority with the Commission, if permitted by Commission rule; or
- c. submits a permit cancellation form to the Commission, if permitted by Commission rule.

3. Proceeding No. 20C-0346-INS is closed.

4. This Recommended Decision shall be effective on the day it becomes the Decision of the Commission, if that is the case, and is entered as of the date above.

5. As provided by § 40-6-109, C.R.S., copies of this Recommended Decision will be served upon the parties, who may file exceptions to it.

a) If no exceptions are filed within 20 days after service or within any extended period of time authorized, or unless the decision is stayed by the Commission upon its own motion, the recommended decision will become the decision of the Commission and subject to the provisions of § 40-6-114, C.R.S.

b) If a party seeks to amend, modify, annul, or reverse basic findings of fact in its exceptions, that party must request and pay for a transcript to be filed, or the

parties may stipulate to portions of the transcript according to the procedure stated in § 40-6-113, C.R.S. If no transcript or stipulation is filed, the Commission is bound by the facts set out by the administrative law judge and the parties cannot challenge these facts. This will limit what the Commission can review if exceptions are filed.

6. If exceptions to this Recommended Decision are filed, they may not exceed 30 pages in length, unless the Commission finds good cause and permits this limit to be exceeded.

(S E A L)



ATTEST: A TRUE COPY

Doug Dean,
Director

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

MELODY MIRBABA

Administrative Law Judge