

Decision No. R22-0110

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO**

PROCEEDING NO. 22C-0045-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: February 28, 2022

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| I. STATEMENT AND SUMMARY.....  | 2  |
| II. BACKGROUND, FINDINGS, LAW, ANALYSIS, AND CONCLUSIONS.....  | 2  |
| A. Background.....   | 2  |
| B. Factual Findings .....  | 4  |
| C. Applicable Law. ....  | 9  |
| 1. Financial Responsibility Requirements and the Commission’s<br>Authority to Revoke Permits and Authorities. .... | 9  |
| 2. Notice and Service Requirements .....   | 11 |
| 3. Burden of Proof.....  | 12 |
| D. Findings, Analysis, and Conclusions.....  | 12 |
| III. ORDER.....  | 17 |
| A. The Commission Orders That: .....   | 17 |

---

## **I. STATEMENT AND SUMMARY**

1. Except for one Respondent, this Recommended Decision grants the relief sought in the Public Utilities Commission Staff's (Staff) Complaints against the motor-carrier Respondents listed in Appendix A to this Recommended Decision, revoking Respondents' authorities and permits based on their failure to keep currently effective proof of financial responsibility on file with the Public Utilities Commission (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. BACKGROUND, 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" (Complaints) against the motor carrier-Respondents<sup>1</sup> in this proceeding on January 24, 2022.<sup>2</sup>

3. The Complaints against each of the Respondents 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 that a hearing will be held by video-conference on February 9, 2022, at 12:00 p.m. to determine whether their authorities

---

<sup>1</sup> 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, which is assigned a unique "Case No.," specifies the grounds unique to each Respondent. And, each of those case numbers are part of this single proceeding.

<sup>2</sup> Hearing Exhibit 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

or permits should be permanently revoked for failing to maintain proper evidence of insurance or surety coverage with the Commission.<sup>4</sup>

4. On February 8, 2022, Staff made a filing stating that Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5 were served on Respondents by e-mail that same day.<sup>5</sup>

5. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) held the hearing as noticed in the Complaints, on February 9, 2022, at approximately 12:00 p.m. Staff appeared with counsel. The following Respondents appeared: Mr. Lance Morris with Double XL Logistics, LLC (Double XL); Mr. Eric Skjerseth with Biodiesel for Bands, doing business as Planetary Transport Company (Biodiesel); Ms. Karina Zuniga with Cordero's Towing & Services, LLC (Cordero's Towing); Mr. Brian Houtz with Mountain Movers and Storage, LLC (Mountain Movers); and Ms. Tia Rolison and Mr. Samson Bynes with Fat's Towing LLC (Fat's Towing).<sup>6</sup> No other Respondent appeared. Before beginning the evidentiary portion of the hearing, the ALJ asked Staff if it still seeks to revoke the permits of the Respondents who appeared at the hearing. Staff stated that it seeks to dismiss the Complaint against Biodiesel, and that it seeks to revoke the permits of the remaining Respondents who appeared.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Hearing Exhibits 2-3.

<sup>5</sup> See Notice Concerning the Service of Exhibits 1 through 5 for the February 9, 2022 Show Cause Hearing on Respondents (Notice), filed on February 8, 2022.

<sup>6</sup> Based on the record and the information each Respondent provided, except for Biodiesel, the ALJ determined that the above-named individuals appearing on behalf of the above-named Respondents (all non-attorneys), may represent their respective companies consistent with Rule 1201(b)(II), 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* (CCR) 723-1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. As such, the ALJ allowed them to do so. Biodiesel did not respond to the ALJ's attempts to gather information necessary to make this determination, and as noted below, did not participate further in the proceeding.

<sup>7</sup> After Staff made this statement, Biodiesel did not participate in the hearing any further, and eventually dropped off the hearing entirely. In fact, shortly after Staff announced that it would seek to dismiss the Complaint against Biodiesel, Mr. Skjerseth failed to respond to the ALJ's numerous attempts to ask him questions relating to whether his company qualified to be represented by a non-attorney under Rule 1201(b)(II), 4 CCR 723-1.

6. During the hearing, the following witnesses testified: Mses. Marquita Riley and Karina Zuniga and Messrs. Morris, Houtz, and Bynes. Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5 were admitted into evidence during the hearing.

**B. Factual Findings**

7. Ms. Riley 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. Riley 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.<sup>8</sup>

8. Ms. Riley explained that the Commission served the Complaints and Attachment A to the Complaints upon the Respondents by United States mail on January 24, 2022, at the addresses, and upon the persons identified as designated agents for the Respondents, as provided in the Commission's files.<sup>9</sup>

9. Respondents provided the Commission the addresses and identities of their designated agents that were used to serve the Complaints in this proceeding. The Certificate of Service for the Complaints demonstrates that the Commission served the Respondents by mailing the Complaints addressed as indicated in the "Hearing Cycle Listing."<sup>10</sup> The referenced Hearing Cycle Listing is Hearing Exhibit 1.<sup>11</sup> Hearing Exhibit 1 includes those carriers listed in Hearing

---

<sup>8</sup> Hearing Exhibits 1-3.

<sup>9</sup> Hearing Exhibits 1-4.

<sup>10</sup> Hearing Exhibit 4.

<sup>11</sup> See Hearing Exhibits 1 and 4.

Exhibit 5, their designated agents and addresses as on file with the Commission as of January 24, 2022, and whose insurance or surety faced imminent termination as of that same date.<sup>12</sup>

10. Ms. Riley testified that on February 8, 2022, Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5 were served on Respondents who remained out of compliance as of that date at their e-mail addresses on file with the Commission.<sup>13</sup> She also explained that the Respondents provided those e-mail addresses to the Commission.

11. Also on February 8, 2022, Ms. Riley searched Commission records to determine whether any Respondents took other action rendering it unnecessary to revoke their permits, such as coming into compliance with their financial responsibility obligations, cancelling their permits, or initiating a Commission proceeding which may impact this one (*e.g.*, application seeking to suspend a permit). She identified Respondents who came into compliance with their financial responsibility obligations or took other action rendering it unnecessary to revoke their permits after the Complaints were mailed. She created an updated list of Respondents who remained out of compliance with the Commission's financial responsibility requirements as of February 8, 2022. That list is Hearing Exhibit 5.<sup>14</sup>

12. On the day of the hearing, February 9, 2022, Ms. Riley again reviewed Commission records to determine if any Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 took action to eliminate the need to revoke their permits.

---

<sup>12</sup> See also Hearing Exhibit 2.

<sup>13</sup> See Notice.

<sup>14</sup> In contrast, Hearing Exhibit 1 is the list of carriers who were non-compliant when the Commission issued the Complaints on January 24, 2022. As the difference in the number of carriers listed in Hearing Exhibits 1 and 5 makes 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.

13. She discovered that the Durango Transfer, Moving, and Storage, Inc., (Durango Transfer) (Case No. 12562-INS, Permit No. HHG-00104) submitted a form cancelling its permit. Because its permit was cancelled, Ms. Riley requested that the Complaint against Durango Transfer be dismissed. Ms. Riley asked that the permits and authorities of the remaining Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 be revoked for failing to meet their financial responsibility obligations.

14. Ms. Riley also clarified that Biodiesel submitted an application to suspend its permit, which the Commission approved. For that reason, Biodiesel was removed from the list of Respondents whose permits or authorities the Commission seeks to revoke (Hearing Exhibit 5), and the Complaint against it was dismissed.

15. Cordero's Towing owns PUC Permit No. T-04666.<sup>15</sup> The Complaint against Cordero's Towing alleges that it failed to maintain proof of active liability and cargo insurance on file with the Commission.<sup>16</sup> Ms. Zuniga owns Cordero's Towing with her spouse. She testified that Cordero's Towing had two vehicles that were not functioning, causing it to cease operations. Her company allowed vehicle insurance to lapse because it was insuring two vehicles, which particularly costly given that neither were operational. Ms. Zuniga anticipates that at least one of the vehicles will be operational soon. Ms. Zuniga anticipates having insurance in place soon, and plans to ensure that proof of financial responsibility is provided to the Commission within 20 days.

16. Fat's Towing owns PUC Permit No. T-05236.<sup>17</sup> The Complaint against Fat's Towing alleges that it failed to maintain proof of active liability and cargo insurance on file with

---

<sup>15</sup> Hearing Exhibit 2 at 2.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 7.

the Commission.<sup>18</sup> Mr. Bynes owns Fat's Towing with Ms. Tia Rolison, his spouse (who also appeared at the hearing). He testified that similar to Cordero's Towing, his company ran into some difficulties, and essentially shut down operations in late November 2021. He testified that he submitted a form to cancel Fat's Towing's permit, but that he never heard back about that. He hopes to still be able to cancel his Company's permit, then have it reinstated when he is ready to get Fat's Towing back in business.

17. Double XL owns PUC Permit No. HHG-00575.<sup>19</sup> It is alleged to have failed to keep proof of active cargo, general liability, and liability insurance on file with the Commission.<sup>20</sup> Mr. Morris owns Double XL. He testified that he takes his company's financial responsibility obligations very seriously, and explained that his company's insurance policy lapsed because his insurance broker failed to renew the policy despite assurances that the policy would be renewed, and failed to communicate with him about this, despite numerous attempts on his part to reach someone. Ultimately, he ended up dropping his insurance broker, and getting insurance in place through a different insurance broker. Mr. Morris had several documents that he initially wished to present as evidence. However, before taking a recess to ensure that such documents could be properly presented, the ALJ noted that Double XL does not appear on Hearing Exhibit 5. Since Staff only seeks to revoke the permits of those carriers listed in Hearing Exhibit 5, this absence is significant. Given this, and that the ALJ asked Staff at the beginning of the hearing whether it seeks to revoke the permits of any of the Respondents who appeared, and Staff did not identify Double XL as a carrier whose permit it no longer seeks to revoke, the ALJ again asked Staff whether it seeks to revoke Double XL's permit. Staff's counsel stated that it does not seek to

---

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> Hearing Exhibit 1 at 4.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

revoke Double XL's permit, and that the Complaint against Double XL had already been dismissed because Double XL's permit expired and became inactive on January 25, 2022.<sup>21</sup> Based on this, Mr. Morris declined to present the documents that he initially wished to offer into evidence.

18. Mountain Movers owns PUC Permit No. HHG-00600.<sup>22</sup> The Complaint against Mountain Movers alleges that it failed to maintain proof of active cargo insurance on file with the Commission.<sup>23</sup> Mr. Houtz owns Mountain Movers. He testified that his company's insurance lapsed due to communication issues with his insurance companies. Specifically, he explained that the insurance agent for the company who provides cargo insurance told him it would be automatically renewed, but just before the policy was set to expire, the agent said that the cargo policy would not be renewed unless Mountain Movers added liability insurance. Mr. Houtz attempted to get cargo insurance through his insurance company that provides liability insurance, but after some back and forth, that company told him it was unable to offer cargo insurance. Mr. Houtz then went back to cargo insurance company's agent and started to work with him to change the policy as the agent requested, so that he could get cargo insurance. He expressed frustration at the difficulties he faced with both insurance companies, but testified that he fully expects to have all the insurance issues resolved within the next week.

---

<sup>21</sup> The ALJ advises Staff that in the future, it must be prepared to state at the beginning of the hearing whether it seeks to revoke the permit of *any* Respondent who appears, including those who do not appear on Hearing Exhibit 5 because the Complaints against them have been dismissed. Such preparation saves all parties time and resources, and serves administrative efficiency.

<sup>22</sup> Hearing Exhibit 2 at 12.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

**C. Applicable Law.****1. Financial Responsibility Requirements and the Commission's Authority to Revoke Permits and Authorities.**

19. 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.<sup>24</sup> Motor carriers must ensure their insurance or surety coverage is kept continuously effective during the life of a certificate or permit to operate.<sup>25</sup> 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.

20. Specifically, motor carriers must obtain and keep motor vehicle liability insurance or surety bond coverage in force at all times.<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> And, in addition to motor vehicle liability and cargo liability coverage, household goods movers must obtain and keep general liability insurance or surety coverage in force at all times.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> § 40-10.1-107(1), C.R.S. (2021); Rule 6008 of the Rules Regulating Transportation by Motor Vehicle, 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>25</sup> § 40-10.1-107(3), C.R.S.

<sup>26</sup> Rule 6008(a)(I), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>27</sup> Rule 6008(a)(I) and (III), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>28</sup> Rule 6008(a)(IV) and (V), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>29</sup> Rule 6008(a)(VI), 4 CCR 723-6.

21. Motor carriers are responsible for maintaining and filing evidence of the required financial responsibility coverage with the Commission.<sup>30</sup> They must ensure their insurance or surety coverage is kept continuously effective during the life of a certificate or permit to operate.<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> As a result, the Commission regularly receives notice from insurance or surety carriers about imminent policy or bond terminations for motor carriers licensed by the Commission.<sup>33</sup>

22. 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.<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup>

23. Section 40-10.1-112(1)(a) and (c), C.R.S., provides 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.

---

<sup>30</sup> § 40-10.1-107(1), C.R.S., and Rule 6008(a), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>31</sup> § 40-10.1-107(3), C.R.S.

<sup>32</sup> § 40-10.1-107(4), C.R.S.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

<sup>34</sup> Rule 6008(e), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*

## 2. Notice and Service Requirements

24. 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.<sup>36</sup> Such notice must be served upon the Respondents, which may be accomplished by mail.<sup>37</sup>

25. 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.”<sup>38</sup> That person is the motor carrier’s designated agent upon whom the Commission may serve complaints and other notices.<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup> A certificate of service issued by the Commission’s Director is *prima facie* evidence that service has been obtained.<sup>42</sup>

26. 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.

---

<sup>36</sup> §§ 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.

<sup>37</sup> § 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.

<sup>38</sup> Rule 6006(a), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>39</sup> *Id.*; Rule 1205(a) and (d), 4 CCR 723-1.

<sup>40</sup> Rule 6006(b), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>41</sup> Rule 6006(c) and (d), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>42</sup> § 40-6-108(3), C.R.S.

### 3. Burden of Proof

27. 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.<sup>43</sup> The preponderance standard requires the fact finder to determine whether the existence of a contested fact is more probable than its non-existence.<sup>44</sup> A party has met this burden of proof when the evidence, on the whole, tips in favor of that party.<sup>45</sup>

#### D. Findings, Analysis, and Conclusions

28. The ALJ concludes that Staff demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that it properly served the Complaints and Attachment A thereto upon each of the Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 by mailing them to the designated agents and addresses on file with the Commission for each of the Respondents.<sup>46</sup>

29. The ALJ finds that the Complaints and Attachment A thereto 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

---

<sup>43</sup> § 24-4-105(7), C.R.S.; Rule 1500, 4 CCR 723-1.

<sup>44</sup> *Swain v. Colorado Dep't of Revenue*, 717 P.2d 507, 508 (Colo. App. 1985).

<sup>45</sup> *Schocke v. State Dep't of Revenue*, 719 P.2d 361, 363 (Colo. App. 1986).

<sup>46</sup> Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5; § 40-6-108(3), C.R.S.; Rules 1205(a) and (d) and 1302(g)(II)(e), 4 CCR 723-1; and Rule 6006(a) and (c), 4 CCR 723-6.

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.<sup>47</sup>

30. In addition, the ALJ concludes that on February 8, 2022, Staff served Hearing Exhibits 1 to 5 on Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 at the e-mail addresses which Respondents provided. As such, Respondents had the opportunity to review those exhibits before and during the hearing.<sup>48</sup>

31. Because the Complaints against Double XL and Biodiesel have already been effectively dismissed, their permits and authorities will not be revoked. Indeed, by February 8, 2022, Staff had already removed Double XL and Biodiesel from the list of Respondents whose permits and authorities it seeks to revoke in this proceeding.<sup>49</sup> As such, their permits are not at issue in this proceeding.

32. Durango Transfer appears on the list of Respondents whose permits Staff seeks to revoke as of February 8, 2022 (Hearing Exhibit 5).<sup>50</sup> Because Durango Transfer cancelled its permit, the Complaint against it is moot. As such, the Complaint against Durango Transfer will be dismissed, and its permit or authority will not be revoked.

---

<sup>47</sup> Hearing Exhibits 1, 2, and 4; Rule 6009(e), 4 CCR 723-6; *see* §§ 40-6-108 and 24-4-105(2), C.R.S.

<sup>48</sup> *See* Rule 1205(a), 4 CCR 723-1; *see* Notice and Exhibit A to Notice; Hearing Exhibit 5. Exhibits were displayed on the video-conference screen during the hearing and were available to download during the hearing.

<sup>49</sup> *See* Hearing Exhibit 5.

<sup>50</sup> Hearing Exhibit 5 at 1.

33. Except as noted above, the ALJ finds 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.<sup>51</sup> This creates the rebuttable presumption that the relevant Respondent carriers are in violation of their respective financial responsibility requirements.<sup>52</sup>

34. Except as noted, the preponderance of the evidence established 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 Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6, as of the time of the hearing. Except as noted, the ALJ finds that Staff established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Commission's records do not show a currently effective level of financial responsibility in such form and in such manner as required by § 40-10.1-107, C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6, as noted in the Complaints against each Respondent listed in Hearing Exhibit 5. Except as noted, the ALJ concludes that Staff met its burden of proof to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the allegations in the Complaints against Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5<sup>53</sup> are true.

35. 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 the 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.<sup>54</sup> Except as noted, the

---

<sup>51</sup> Hearing Exhibit 2.

<sup>52</sup> Rule 6008(e), 4 CCR 7236.

<sup>53</sup> Hearing Exhibit 5 is attached to this Recommended Decision as Appendix A.

<sup>54</sup> § 40-10.1-107, C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6.

Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 have failed to do so. This failure warrants revocation of their permits or authorities.

36. However, Respondents may take action before the effective date of this Decision to avoid revocation. First, carriers may avoid revocation by: (a) obtaining insurance or surety coverage as required by Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6; and (b) causing proof of that insurance to be filed with the Commission in the form and manner required by Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6. The Complaints against carriers who take this action before the effective date of this Decision will be dismissed, and their permits will not be revoked.

37. In addition, limited regulation carriers,<sup>55</sup> luxury limousine carriers, household goods movers, towing carriers, and hazardous materials carriers who submit a form to cancel their permits or authorities before the effective date of this Decision may avoid revocation of their permits. The Complaints against carriers who take this action before the effective date of this Decision will be dismissed, and their permits will not be revoked. Permit cancellation forms are available on the Commission's website at:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb\\_duOO2QWlrMFlvUDJoNjQ/view?.authuser=0](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOO2QWlrMFlvUDJoNjQ/view?.authuser=0).

38. Fully regulated intrastate carriers, including common carriers operating a shuttle service, sightseeing service, charter service, taxicab service, and contract carriers who submit an application to suspend their authority under Rule 6205, 4 CCR 723-6, before the effective date of this Recommended Decision may also avoid revocation of their permits. The Complaints against carriers who take this action before the effective date of this Decision will be dismissed, and their permits will not be revoked.

---

<sup>55</sup> 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.

39. Applications to suspend a common carrier authority are available at:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb\\_duOQ2dXZ0UTNIXzBvRIU/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOQ2dXZ0UTNIXzBvRIU/view).

40. Applications to suspend a contract carrier authority are available at:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb\\_duOQ2U2JQS2dvek5HWm8/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOQ2U2JQS2dvek5HWm8/view).

41. Having a permit revoked or cancelled does not always mean that a carrier's business is permanently terminated. Generally, Commission rules allow many types of motor carriers, including luxury limousine, household goods movers, and towing carriers, to obtain new permits without difficulty by filing an application.<sup>56</sup> For the most part, such permits may be obtained by completing an application that can be submitted to the Commission online, providing related supporting information and proof of financial responsibility, and paying a fee.<sup>57</sup> Rule 6302 (luxury limousine application and permit); Rule 6503 (towing carrier application and permit); and Rule 6603 (household goods mover carrier application and permit).<sup>58</sup> Referenced carrier types who voluntarily cancel their permits or whose permits are revoked for failing to comply with financial responsibility obligations may reapply for a permit.

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

43. As provided below, this Recommended Decision will not become effective for 20 days after the date the Decision is mailed, and only then if this Decision is not appealed. This

---

<sup>56</sup> While the ALJ does not warrant or otherwise guarantee this outcome, it is her understanding that carriers may request that a prior permit number be reinstated as part of the carrier's application for a permit.

<sup>57</sup> 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. 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* Rule 1003(a), 4 CCR 723-1.

<sup>58</sup> 4 CCR 623-6.

allows ample time for Respondents to take action to avoid a final Commission decision revoking their permits or authorities.

44. 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.

### **III. ORDER**

#### **A. The Commission Orders That:**

1. The Complaint against Durango Transfer, Moving and Storage, Inc., (Case No. 12562-INS, Permit No. HHG-00104) is dismissed.

2. Consistent with the above discussion, except for the above-named Respondent, the authorities and permits listed in Appendix A, attached hereto, are revoked as of the effective date of this Recommended Decision.

3. Ordering Paragraph No. 2 will be void and the Complaint 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 allowed by Commission rules; or
- c. submits a permit cancellation form to the Commission, if allowed by Commission rules.

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. Proceeding No. 22C-0045-INS is closed.

6. 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, this 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.

7. 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.

(SEAL)  
(S E A L)



THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

MELODY MIRBABA

---

Administrative Law Judge

ATTEST: A TRUE COPY

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Doug Dean".

Doug Dean,  
Director