



STATE OF WASHINGTON

UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W., P.O. Box 47250 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7250
(360) 664-1160 • www.utc.wa.gov

Investigation Report

Party Bus Regulation

April 2014

Investigation Report: Party Bus Regulation

Staff Report and Recommendations

Following news stories in other states about fatalities involving so-called “party buses,” many involving alcohol, the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) undertook a study of party bus operations in Washington. The UTC regulates safety for charter bus companies. A party bus may also be a charter bus, thus falling under UTC safety regulation. The purpose of this study is to determine to what extent party buses exist in Washington, to identify problems Washington or other states have seen specific to party buses and to explore options for increasing safety of party buses.

The study identifies the various types of passenger service licenses that can be used to provide party bus services and identifies the regulatory structure for each. The study describes the party bus industry as it operates in Washington state, jurisdictional challenges in regulating the industry, current safety and insurance rules and enforcement issues. The study also explains the California party bus law for passengers under the age of 21. Finally, it makes recommendations for increasing party bus passenger safety, including possible legislative changes.

Definitions

Charter party carrier. A “charter party carrier” is a person who uses a motor vehicle to transport a group of persons who, under a single contract, travel together as a group to a specified destination or for a particular itinerary. RCW 81.70.020(5). The motor vehicle must have capacity for seven or more persons, excluding the driver. RCW 81.70.020(4).

The UTC regulates charter bus carriers under RCW 81 (in particular, RCW 81.70) and WAC 480-30. However, the UTC does not regulate charter party carriers to the extent they provide service “wholly within the limits of incorporated cities.” RCW 81.70.030(1).

Limousine carrier. “Limousine” means a category of for-hire, chauffeur-driven, unmarked luxury motor vehicle. RCW 46.04.274. Limousine carriers are regulated by the Department of Licensing (DOL), the rules of which further define “limousine” to include, among other things, automobiles that seat no less than four, and no more than 14, passengers behind the driver. WAC 308-83-010(12)(a).

DOL regulates limousine carriers under RCW 46 (in particular, RCW 46.72A) and WAC 308-83. Limousine carriers regulated by DOL under RCW 46.72A are exempt from UTC regulation. RCW 81.70.030(4).

Note that although the DOL statute (RCW 46.04.274) does not limit limousines to any particular passenger capacity, DOL personnel have advised UTC staff that DOL does not license limousine carriers that operate motor vehicles with a capacity greater than 14 passengers behind the driver.

This is the largest capacity vehicle identified by DOL in its definition of “limousine” in WAC 308-83-010(12).¹

Party bus company. The term “party bus company” is not used in any statute in this state. For purposes of this report, “party bus” refers to a motor vehicle specially configured to accommodate a party on the motor vehicle itself. Amenities may include greater floor space, the addition of a bar to serve alcohol, flat-screen televisions, DVD players, enhanced audio system, karaoke equipment, DJ equipment, smoke machines, laser lights, disco lights, strobe lights or dance or “stripper” poles. The party bus company may provide transportation to a group of people known to each other, or only to individuals that have no relationship to one another.

It is important to understand the differences between a limousine and a charter bus, since each can be a party bus:

- A limousine is a for-hire, chauffeur-driven, unmetered, unmarked luxury motor vehicle that seats no more than 14 passengers behind the driver. Limousines are regulated by DOL under RCW 46 and WAC 308-83.
- A charter bus is any vehicle that transports a group of persons who, under a single contract, travel together as a group to a specified destination or for a particular itinerary. Charter buses are regulated by the UTC under RCW 81 and WAC 480-30.

If a company operates primarily limousines, but operates vehicles that carry more than 14 passengers, regardless of whether the vehicle is a limousine or some other vehicle, the company becomes a charter bus company as well as a limousine company. The limousines that carry 14 or fewer passengers remain under the regulatory authority of DOL, but the vehicles that carry more than 14 passengers fall under the regulatory authority of the UTC. The company must obtain both DOL and UTC registrations.

Not every limousine or charter bus company offers party bus services. There are a number of limousine companies that offer only limousine or luxury car service. Likewise, several charter bus companies offer only charter bus service. For the purposes of this study, which encompasses only buses under UTC regulation, a party bus company meets all of the following criteria:

- The company operates a vehicle that carries more than 14 passengers behind the driver.
- The company advertises itself as providing party bus services, or words to that effect.
- The vehicle’s interior is altered from its original condition by adding amenities such as the removal of seats to allow greater floor space, the addition of a bar designed to serve alcohol, flat-screen televisions, DVD players, enhanced audio system, karaoke equipment, DJ

¹ The DOL rule, WAC 308-83-010(12), uses the term “includes” to refer to the list of vehicles DOL considers to be limousines. “Includes” is not a term of limitation, which suggests that DOL would regulate limousines with a capacity greater than 14 passengers. Because that is not consistent with the information DOL has provided UTC staff, this report assumes that limousines with capacity greater than 14 passengers behind the driver are not regulated by DOL, and thus: 1) the exemption from Commission regulation in RCW 81.70.030(4) does not apply to carriers using these larger capacity vehicles; and 2) a carrier operating such a vehicle would be subject to UTC regulation, assuming it satisfied the other requirements of RCW 81.70.

equipment, smoke machines, laser lights, disco lights, strobe lights or dance or “stripper” poles.

Research

Staff conducted two Internet searches. The first search was designed to identify carriers in Washington that offered party bus service. The second search was designed to identify incidents that involved party buses. This search was not limited to incidents just in Washington. The results are discussed below.

Party Buses in Washington

The first Internet search revealed 33 companies operating in Washington that appear to fit the above definition of a party bus company. These companies are listed in Appendix B. While this list likely contains the large majority of such companies, there may be other companies that offer party bus service.

The search included Washington as a whole, plus individual named cities such as Bellingham, Seattle, Tacoma, Olympia, Vancouver, Pasco and Spokane. The search may have missed companies advertising services in smaller locations such as Aberdeen or Moses Lake, although it is unlikely those smaller cities have limousine or charter companies limited to those cities. It appears most smaller cities are actually served by a carrier located in, or serving, the closest larger city. That carrier would be found in the search that included the larger city.

Of the 33 companies identified, only 14 hold a UTC charter party certificate. Most of the remaining 19 companies advertise as a “limousine company”, and seven of the 19 are licensed as limousine carriers through DOL. These 19 companies may not be aware that if they operate a charter bus service using motor vehicles that hold more than 14 passengers, they must have a charter party carrier certificate from the UTC.

It is possible that some of these companies are exempt from UTC regulation because they operate wholly within the limits of incorporated cities, and thus are exempt from UTC regulation under RCW 81.70.030(4), or because they do not offer services to a group of persons, and thus do not meet the definition of “charter party carrier” in RCW 81.70.020(5). However, none of the companies advertised as operating only within city limits or indicated in the advertisement that it did not offer services to a group of persons. Staff was able to determine, either by reviewing advertisements or making direct contact with the companies, that none of the carriers identified as operating party buses limited their services to one city.

Party Bus Brokers

Procuring party bus services anywhere in Washington appears to be relatively simple. A potential customer can go online, enter “party bus” plus the city and the search will generate pages and pages of listings. The most common type of listing is a “party bus broker.” There are two types of brokers.

The first, less common type, is a “self-broker.” In this case, a potential customer enters information about what he or she wants (i.e., type of vehicle, purpose, date and time). The website gives the

customer a telephone number of party bus companies the customer can contact directly for more information, and to make reservations.

The second type of broker, and the most common, has the customer enter information online and then the broker contacts the party bus company and sets up the reservation for the customer.

Membership Party Buses

There is at least one membership party bus, located in Seattle. The company advertises as “a private club which plans events and as a member, you [the customer] can plan your own event or go on an existing event.” The company accepts membership forms and a \$10 membership fee before the trip begins. One possible motive for this business structure could be to avoid regulation, under the theory that the company transports only club members, and not the public generally. If this theory were sustained, the company would be considered a private carrier and not regulated by the UTC.

Party Buses Operating Within a City

As noted above, the law provides an exemption for charter party carriers operating “wholly within the limits of incorporated cities.” RCW 81.70.030(1). This means that as long as the bus does not leave the city limits while providing service, it is not regulated as a charter bus by UTC. UTC staff was able to determine, either through reviews of advertising or personal contact, that none of the carriers identified as operating party buses in Washington limited their services to one city.

Party Bus Incidents

The second Internet search showed that, since 2009, party buses were involved in 22 incidents in the United States and British Columbia, Canada. These resulted in 21 fatalities and an additional 48 personal injuries (see Appendix C). The following chart summarizes these incidents:

January 2009 through August 2013

Cause of Incident	No. of Incidents	No. of Fatalities	No. of Injuries
Passenger fell out of bus	10	10	4
An at-fault vehicle hit the bus	3	2	29
Passenger stuck head out top emergency hatch and hit highway overpass/abutment	2	2	
Passenger overdrank alcohol	2	2	
Bus collided with vehicle; fault is unknown	2	2	14
Passenger on open top deck of double-decker bus hit head on highway overpass	1	2	
Passenger running for bus was hit by bus	1		1
Bus spun-out; driver reportedly charged with manslaughter, hit-and-run, DUI	1	1	
Total	22	21	48

As the chart shows, in 10 of the 22 incidents, and 10 of the 21 fatalities (47 percent), a passenger fell from the party bus. In most cases, the passenger fell against, or otherwise accidentally hit, the emergency exit lever, the emergency exit opened and the passenger fell out while the bus was traveling down the road. In 10 instances, the passenger died.

The second most common cause of the 22 fatalities was on three occasions where a passenger on the top deck of a double-decker bus hit his head on an overpass. In two incidents, a passenger stuck his head through the top emergency opening of the double-decker bus and hit his head. In one other case, two passengers were killed when a double-decker party bus, with passengers partying on the open top deck, traveled under an overpass and two of the passengers hit the overpass simply because there was not enough clearance.

In two of the fatality cases, passengers consumed an excessive amount of alcohol – a 16-year old male in Canada who apparently died of alcohol poisoning and a 19-year old male in California who drove after drinking on the party bus, and hit a traffic wall and two other vehicles.

In another case, a passenger was running to catch the moving bus and the bus hit the passenger.

Three incidents, resulting in two fatalities and 29 injuries, occurred when a driver of another vehicle accidentally hit the party bus.

In two other incidents, resulting in two fatalities, the cause of the incident remains unknown.

In one case, the bus driver was apparently driving while over the legal alcohol limit, and spun out. A passenger was killed. The driver fled the scene, but was apprehended and reportedly charged with manslaughter, hit-and-run and DUI.

Discussion

Jurisdictional challenges

No state agency regulates all party bus companies. Party bus companies may fall within any of three categories: 1) limousine carriers subject to DOL jurisdiction (i.e., vehicles with capacity of 14 or fewer passengers behind the driver); 2) charter party carriers subject to UTC jurisdiction (i.e., vehicles with capacity of 15 or more passengers behind the driver); or 3) party bus companies in neither of these categories, and thus they are private carriers subject to jurisdiction of the Washington State Patrol (WSP), as to safety only.

The result is that no particular Washington statute addresses all party bus companies, or issues specific to this category of business. The UTC, DOL and WSP do not have regulations specifically addressing party bus companies or the unique safety challenges presented by such companies.

Current Safety and Insurance Rules

The UTC has regulatory jurisdiction over charter bus carriers. Within the scope of this regulation is the safety of the motor vehicles operated by these carriers. UTC safety rules parallel federal safety rules for all passenger bus companies, whether charter or auto transportation companies. For vehicles with a seating capacity of 15 or fewer, UTC rule WAC 480-30-191 requires the company to obtain and

maintain insurance levels of \$1.5 million and for vehicle with a seating capacity of more than 15 , the same rule requires the company to obtain and maintain insurance levels of \$5 million. In addition, the UTC has adopted federal safety rules in WAC 480-30-221. Each regulated company must meet those federal safety regulations for the following:

- Drug and alcohol testing programs;
- Commercial driver’s license standards;
- Preservation of records;
- Training requirements;
- Safety fitness procedures;
- Safety requirements for vehicles operated, including parts and accessories, inspections, repairs and maintenance; and
- Driving motor vehicles, including hours of service.

Party bus companies not under UTC regulation do not necessarily have these safety measures in place. For example, limousine operators regulated by DOL must have \$1.05 million in liability insurance. The UTC requires charter bus carriers (including party bus companies using vehicles with passenger capacity greater than 15) to have \$5 million in liability insurance.

Enforcement Issues

UTC staff has identified problems in enforcing charter bus requirements for party bus companies under the current statutory structure.

- *Membership party buses:* As described above, there is at least one company that operates as a “membership” party bus. A “members only” bus, if legitimately classified as such, could be exempt from regulation because the company does not hold itself out to the public and thus would be considered a private carrier. This particular company advertises as “a private club which plans events and as a member you [the customer] can plan your own event or go on an existing event.” The company accepts membership forms and a \$10 membership fee before each trip begins.

It is possible that a members-only company is not truly a private carrier, if, for example, the membership fee is nominal, the person becomes a member just before a trip begins, and only for purposes of that trip, and the point of joining is simply to take one bus ride to attend a party. In this scenario, there is no unifying activity or organization that binds the members together other than the one trip on the party bus. The members from different trips do not know each other, they do not belong to a single organization other than the one trip on the party bus and they do not socialize or plan activities together. To resolve this issue, the UTC would likely need to commence litigation with the individual company.

- *Intra-city exclusion:* The UTC staff study located one company that reports it operates only within the territorial limits of a city. If so, this company would fall under the exemption in RCW 81.70.030(1). When staff first became aware of this company, it was operating outside the limits of the city and did not have a charter party certificate from the UTC. The UTC held a classification proceeding in Docket TE-111232. The commission determined the carrier was

not exempt from UTC regulation, issued a cease and desist order, imposed a \$500 penalty and suspended an additional \$1,500 penalty. The company now reports that it operates only within the City of Seattle.

- *For compensation:* To prove a company is operating as a charter bus company in Washington without a required certificate, UTC staff must show, among other things, that the company operates “for compensation.” This can be difficult to do. Typically, UTC staff must find a passenger who has a written receipt or other confirmation of payment and who is willing to testify about the transaction. Not only is that difficult because it is hard to find a passenger, many times passengers are not willing to testify against a company. Either the passenger had a good experience and does not want to get the company into trouble, or the passenger had a bad experience and feels threatened by the company and so will not testify.

California Under-21 Safety Law

In 2011, the state of California passed bill AB 45. This bill contains laws specific to charter bus companies that operate party buses. Among other things, these laws regulate, as a safety measure, the consumption of alcohol by minors on a charter bus. Specifically, a charter bus company that will serve alcohol or allow alcohol to be served must, on a trip-by-trip basis, require the chartering party to provide a designated chaperone to any member of the charter party under 21.

The chaperone must:

- Sign a form that outlines the chaperone’s responsibilities.
- Check the identification of all passengers to determine if any are under 21.
- Read a statement that alcohol is prohibited for any person under 21.
- Notify the driver if at any time during the trip, a person under 21 consumes alcohol.

The law also holds the chaperone liable for “any reasonably foreseeable personal injury or property damage that is proximately caused by the consumption of alcoholic beverages by a person under 21 years of age.”

Moreover, if the party bus driver is informed that a passenger under 21 has consumed alcohol, he or she must immediately stop the trip and return to the point of origin. If the driver finds that passengers are consuming alcohol and did not make prior arrangements, including the appointment of a chaperone, he or she must stop the trip immediately and return to the point of origin. Failure by the driver to follow the law is a misdemeanor.

Survey of Other States

A survey of the 49 other states showed that besides California, only two states had any current laws/rules regarding party buses. See Appendix A. Nebraska passed legislation that makes it legal to drink on a party bus as long as the driver does not have access to the alcohol. New Jersey rules prohibit a party bus operator from providing alcohol to its passengers, but allows the passengers themselves to bring and consume alcohol on the bus.

One city, Royal Oak, Michigan, passed an ordinance designed to curb noise and disorderly activity on party buses.

Victoria, Australia, recently passed fairly comprehensive party bus legislation that puts responsibility on the party bus operator to promote responsible behavior of passengers, check passengers' identification for proof of age, remove alcohol once the bus has stopped at its first destination, ensure passengers do not remove alcohol from the bus and ensure the pick-up and drop-off points are near public restrooms and public transportation.

It is possible that other jurisdictions have laws or rules about alcohol consumption on a party bus. It appears that in some states, these laws are found in the state's liquor control laws and not motor carrier safety laws. This study looked only at motor carrier safety laws.

There are several entities considering revisions to party bus safety rules or greater enforcement of existing rules.

- The Oklahoma legislature sponsored a bill that calls for an interim study on party bus operations and identification of measures the legislature may take to improve safety. In particular, the study will consider holding vehicle owners and operators responsible for underage drinking if the driver "knowingly" allows it.
- The Iowa Department of Transportation is stepping up enforcement efforts for party buses. The party buses have the same requirements as other charter buses. The increased efforts simply ensure bus companies are registered, drivers have the appropriate licenses and they all comply with state and federal safety standards.
- The city of Bloomington, Illinois, is considering revisions to its regulations for party buses after one licensed by the city was put out of service by the Illinois State Police for safety violations.
- The Michigan Department of Transportation asked other states for any rules or regulations regarding party buses for consideration of new rules in its state. No state responded that it had rules specific to party buses.

* See appendix A for summary listing of other states laws/rules.

Conclusions and Recommendations

UTC staff makes the following recommendations for action.

Ensure that all companies identified in this report have the permit needed to provide service. UTC staff has already initiated investigations to determine the status of the 19 companies discovered in the course of this study that lack a charter party carrier certificate issued by the UTC. We will complete this investigation and, if UTC staff believes a certificate is required, we will initiate a classification proceeding if the company is unwilling to apply for a certificate.

The current categories of passenger carriers identified in statute and UTC rules may not be sufficient to address safety issues related to party bus operations. Rather, addressing all the safety issues in this report may require changes to statutes to increase safety and decrease the chances of fatal incidents related to party buses. Some changes that may be considered include:

Define a party bus company to include carriers who advertise, solicit, offer or enter into an agreement to provide party bus service. This makes it less difficult for the UTC to classify a carrier as a party bus company, because the emphasis is on what the carrier is holding itself out to do, rather than the details of particular transactions, which may lack documentation. This type of definition is used in RCW 81.80.010(5) to define “household goods carrier,” and this has proven very effective in UTC obtaining compliance by household goods carriers who have failed to obtain a permit from the UTC.

- a. *Remove the exclusion for buses operating within a single city (81.70.030(1)).*
This means that all persons meeting the definition of “charter party carrier” would be subject to UTC regulation, regardless of where they operate in this state. This will enable the UTC to require specific safety standards and levels of insurance for party bus companies that may not exist today. In any event, a charter bus operating within a city ought to be regulated for safety as strongly as a charter bus operating between cities.
- b. *Initiate laws similar to California for passengers under the age of 21.*
While it is illegal for anyone under the age of 21 to drink alcohol in Washington, it does not always stop the behavior. Laws similar to California require a chaperone if alcohol is served and if any passenger is under 21, and it holds responsible both the chaperone and the bus driver for implementing a zero-tolerance policy for underage drinking.
- c. *Prohibit the party bus company from providing alcohol to its passengers.*
This will limit the amount of alcohol a passenger can consume to the amount he or she brings on board. This prohibition should be enacted with the coordination of the Liquor Control Board. To address this issue, it may be advisable for the Legislature to amend statutes applicable to the Board.

- d. *Prohibit membership party bus companies.* The company that staff knows about that purports to operate as a “membership” bus may be doing so only to avoid regulation.

- e. *Prohibit the use of double-decker buses by private bus operators.*
UTC staff is unaware of any double-decker buses currently being operated by a private bus company in Washington. Consequently this prohibition should not disadvantage any existing company. It is clear from the experience of New Jersey, Michigan, and Illinois that these buses are inherently dangerous in the party bus context. Each of these states experienced one or more fatalities when passengers of a double-decker party bus hit their heads on an overpass or bridge abutment while on the upper deck.

Appendix A

Laws or rules in other states

	State	Rules Exist?	Content If Applicable
1	Alabama	No	
2	Alaska	No	
3	Arizona	No	
4	Arkansas	No	
5	California	Yes	Prohibits drinking under the age of 21 on a party bus
6	Colorado	No	
7	Connecticut	No	
8	Delaware	No	
9	Florida	No	
10	Georgia	No	
11	Hawaii	No	
12	Idaho	No	
13	Illinois	No	
14	Indiana	No	
15	Iowa	No	
16	Kansas	No	
17	Kentucky	No	
18	Louisiana	No	
19	Maine	No	
20	Maryland	No	
21	Massachusetts	No	
22	Michigan	No	
23	Minnesota	No	
24	Mississippi	No	
25	Missouri	No	
26	Montana	No	
27	Nebraska	No	May drink if the driver does not have access to alcohol
28	Nevada	No	
29	New Hampshire	No	
30	New Jersey	Yes	Party bus may not provide alcohol but passengers may bring their own
31	New Mexico	No	
32	New York	No	
33	North Carolina	No	
34	North Dakota	No	
35	Ohio	No	
36	Oklahoma	No	
37	Oregon	No	
38	Pennsylvania	No	
39	Rhode Island	No	
40	South Carolina	No	
41	South Dakota	No	
42	Tennessee	No	
43	Texas	No	
44	Utah	No	
45	Vermont	No	
46	Virginia	No	
47	West Virginia	No	
48	Wisconsin	No	
49	Wyoming	No	

APPENDIX B

**Party Buses
Washington State**

	Name	Address	Phone #	Web Reference(s)	Advertised Equipment	Permitted in WA/Agency
1.	Creative Bus	PO Box 4053, Renton, WA 98057 Email: reservations@creativebus.net	206-853-1892	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> creativebus.net gigmasters.com/Party-Bus/Creative-Bus/ 	Buses for 10, 15, 27 passengers	Yes/UTC CH-487
2.	Lady in a Limo LLL	Email: aladayinalimo@hotmail.com	206-423-9603	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> gigmasters.com/partybus/ladyinalimo 	Sedans, limos, party bus	Yes/UTC CH-64931
3.	A & A Limousine	PO Box 25589, Seattle, WA 98165 E-mail: info@a-alimo.com	206-367-5466	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a-alimo.com 	Limo buses for up to 38 passengers	Yes/UTC CH-063247 (DBA of JPH Int.)
4.	Dave's Party Bus	Email: davespartybus@hotmail.com	206-601-1800	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> davespartybus.com thumbtack.com/listing 	Bus for up to 14 passengers	No; Canceled 10/2011
5.	Super Stretch Limousine and Tyson Glawe LLC	Email: cblimo99@aol.com	360-887-3003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> superstretchlimousine.com Facebook 	Limos, Hummer, Escalade, buses for 18-26 passengers	Yes/UTC CH-63113
6.	Spokane Party Bus SwiftySwift LLC	1519 E Central Ave, Spokane WA 99218 Email: info@spokanepartybus.com	509-701-3392	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> thepartytransport.com 	Buses for 14 and 30 passengers	Yes/UTC CH-63856
7.	Seattle Party Bus Rentals	No address listed, but it appears to be based in Seattle	206-910-8858	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> seattlepartybusrentals.com 	Buses for up to 24 passengers	Yes/UTC CH-64010
8.	Cascadia Cruiser	No address listed, but it appears to be based in Portland, OR	971-277-3984	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cascadiacruiser.com 	Bus for 35 seated or more standing passengers	No
9.	Presidential Transportation	PO Box 28401, Seattle WA 98118	206-280-8488	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> presidentialpartybus.com 	Town car, buses for 9, 12,	No

	Name	Address	Phone #	Web Reference(s)	Advertised Equipment	Permitted in WA/Agency
		Email: reservations@presidentialtranspo.com			18, 24 passengers	
10.	Seattle Limo Bus	No address listed, but it appears to be based in Seattle	206-457-2600	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> seattle-limobus.com 	Hummer, SUV, executive car and van, stretch limo, party bus	No
11.	JJ Limousine Service	PO Box 40172 Bellevue, WA	888-604-LIMO/206-524-7211/425-454-5053	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> jlimo.com 	Limos, sedans, vans, limo bus, Navigator, Hummer, Escalade	Yes/UTC CH-64030
12.	Tacoma Party Bus	Email: sales@tacomapartybus.com	555-555-5555	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> tacomapartybus.com 	Multi-passenger bus	No
13.	Valet Town Car Svc	2910 49 th Ave NE, Tacoma WA 98422	866-840-7077	Unknown	Town cars and vans	Yes/DOL Limo
14.	HR Limousine	17854 38 th Ave S, Seatac WA 98188	206-335-8167	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hrlimousine.com 	20 pass Hummer disco floor	Yes/DOL Limo
15.	Tacoma Limo Svc (Elegant Limo, Inc.)	1201 Pacific Ave Ste 600, Tacoma WA 98402 Email: info@limoservicetacoma.com	253-777-3444	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> limoservicetacoma.com 	Town car, SUV, limos, 20 pass Hummer, 24 pass stretch Escalade, 35 pass bus	Yes/DOL Limo
16.	NSO Party Bus	10305 139 th St Ct E, Ste D8, Puyallup WA 98374 Email: infor@nsopartybus.com	253-435-9200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> nsopartybus.com 	Buses for 14 passengers	Yes/UTC CH-63760
17.	Xtreme Limousine (J&A Enterprise, LLC)	2213 4 th Ave, Seattle WA Email: xtremelinousine@gmail.com	206-979-2150 425-749-7318	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> xtremelimowa.com 	Hummers, limos, limo buses, luxury cars and SUVs	No

	Name	Address	Phone #	Web Reference(s)	Advertised Equipment	Permitted in WA/Agency
			888-607-3098			
18.	US Party Bus Seattle Party Bus	1027 Harbor Ave SW, Seattle WA 98116 Email: info@uspartybusseattle.com	206-219-5392/888-919-4895	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> uspartybusseattle.com 	Buses for up to 42 passengers	No
19.	Legend Limo	Email: info@legendlimo.com Reservation service	800-348-6985	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> legendlimo.com 	Buses for 20, 30, 40, 50 passengers	No
20.	Elegant Limo Service	2400 4 th Ave, Seattle 98121 Email: info@elegantlimous.com	800-209-1082/ 206-913-3260/425-643-2280	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> elegantlimous.com 	Luxury cars and SUVs, Limos, Hummer with 24 seats, 35 passenger bus	No
21.	Northwest Limousine Service	589 D Street Blaine, WA, 98230-5133	360-220-0207	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> limobellingham.com 	16 passenger bus	Yes/DOL Limo
22.	Jimmy's Limousine Service	4524 Pacific Ave SE, Lacey 98503 Email: info@jimmysautoservices.com	360-459-7113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> jimmysautoservices.com 	18 passenger Hummer	Yes/UTC CH-472(Note: Permit under other name)
23.	Fantasy Limousine	530 Ronlee Ln NW, Olympia 98502 Email: drowshe@comcast.net	360-402-2700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fantasylimos.net 	14-18 passenger Hummer	Yes/UTC CH-472 (dba of Jimmy's Limousine)
24.	A-Star Limousine	816 W Francis PMB #141, Spokane 99205 Email: sales@a-starlimousine.com	509-879-7948	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a-starlimousine.com 	Luxury cars, 14-passenger stretch limos	Yes/DOL Limo
25.	Spokane Legacy Limousine	120 E Mission Ave, Spokane 99202	509-216-6990	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> limoinspokane.com 	14 passenger stretch limos	Yes/DOL Limo
26.	Aspen Limos and Tours	16420 SE McGillivray Blvd, Vancouver 98683	503-274-9505	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> aspenlimotours.com 	30 passenger bus	Yes/DOL Limo

	Name	Address	Phone #	Web Reference(s)	Advertised Equipment	Permitted in WA/Agency
			360-260-0515 509-572-7494		20 passenger bus	
27.	Fiesta Limousine	2917 NE 65 th St #A, Vancouver 98663 Email: info@fiestalimos.com	503-641-8100 360-693-5758 866-533-5758	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fiestalimos.com 	22 and 32 passenger bus	No
28.	Portland Limousine/ Opex Limousine	9703 NE Covington Rd, Vancouver 98662 Email: info@portlandlimousine.net	877-763-0891 503-828-9884	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> portlandlimousine.net 	Buses for 20, 24, 30 passengers	No
29.	A Custom Limousine/West Coast Limousines	No address listed; appears to be based in Portland	360-567-8092 /503-661-1555	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> westcoastlimousines.net 	20 passenger Hummer, 20 passenger party bus	Yes/UTC CH-63215
30.	Limo Bus Seattle Dba of JPH International/A&A Limo	No address listed; appears to be based in Seattle Email: info@limobusseattle.net	206-365-1800	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> limobusseattle.net 	Buses for 20, 22, 30, 34, 36 passengers	Yes/UTC CH-63247
31.	SP+ Plus Transportation NW	1300 Dexter Ave N Ste155, Seattle 98109 Email: transportation-nw@spplus.com	206-282-6442	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> spplusnw.com 	18 and 21 passenger limos	Yes/UTC CH-443 (Note: Permit under other name)
32.	LX Limo	Email: info@seattlelxlimo.com	206-428-3087	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> seattlelxlimo.com 	Buses for up to 26 passengers	No
33.	Seattle Party Limo	Email: infor@seattlepartybus.net	206-914-3560	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seattlepartylimo.com 	Buses for up to 28 passengers	Yes/UTC CH-63859

APPENDIX C

Party Bus Incidents

	Date	City	Road	Victim(s)	Outcome	Circumstances
1.	08-11-2013	Portola Valley, CA	I-280	43-year old male	Fatality	Off-duty party bus with one passenger spun-out and slid down an embankment. Passenger died. Driver reportedly charged with manslaughter, hit-and-run, DUI.
2.	05-26-2013	Near San Francisco, CA	Highway 101	36-year old female 8 bus passengers	Fatality Injury	Car went out of control and the party bus hit the car. The fatality was in the car; the injuries in the bus.
3.	05-18-2013	Ellsworth, MN	Highway 10	23-year old male	Fatality	Passenger fell out of the back of the bus.
4.	05-10-2013	Kansas City, KS	I-35	26-year old female	Fatality	Passenger fell out bus emergency door.
5.	02-15-2013	Flores Island, BC	City street	16-year old male	Fatality	Unknown cause of death but alcohol suspected.
6.	09-29-2012	Portland, OR	City street	11-year old female	Fatality	Passenger fell out bus window.
7.	08-31-2012	Fort Lee, NJ	Geo Wash Bridge	16-year old male	Fatality	Passenger stuck his head out the top emergency hatch of the double-decker bus and hit highway overpass.
8.	07-27-2012	Los Gatos, CA	Highway 17	25-year old female 20-year old female	Fatality Injury	Allegedly drunken passengers began arguing on the bus and two passengers fell out of the emergency door.
9.	06-16-2012	Chicago, IL	Expressway	19 passengers	Injury	SUV sideswiped the party bus.
10.	05-05-2012	Cedar Falls, IA	City street	21-year old female	Injury	Passenger fell out bus door.
11.	03-04-2012	Tampa, FL	City street	20-something male	Fatality	Party bus with only driver aboard hit car at an intersection. Unclear which vehicle had the green light.
12.	10-29-2011	Erhard, MN	Unknown	24-year old male	Fatality	Passenger fell out of the back of the bus.
13.	06-24-2011	Detroit, MI	I-94	24-year old male	Fatality	Passenger stuck his head out the top emergency hatch of the bus and hit highway abutment.
14.	03-12-2011	Los Angeles, CA	City street	22-year old male	Injury	Passenger running to catch bus allegedly hit by bus in an intersection.
15.	06-05-2010	Langley, BC	Highway 10	17-year old female	Injury	Two passengers fell out bus door; one injury.
16.	06-05-2010	Indianapolis, IN	City street	29-year old male 14 passengers	Fatality Injury	Party bus hit car at an intersection. Unclear which vehicle had the green light.
17.	09-11-2010	Hazel Park, MI	I-75	23-year old male 26-year old male	Fatality Fatality	One passenger fell out of the bus. The second passenger got out to help and was hit by a car.

		City	Road	Victim(s)	Outcome	Circumstances
18.	02-05-2010	Burlingame, CA	Highway 101	19-year old male	Fatality	Passenger drank on the party bus to level of .26 on party bus, then drove, hitting a wall and two other cars.
19.	09-06-2009	Tukwila, WA	I-5	26-year old male 39-year old male 50-year old female	Fatality Injury Injury	Bus stopped at side of freeway for repairs was hit by an allegedly drunk driver.
20.	09-01-2009	Flint, MI	I-75	27-year old male 24-year old male	Fatality Fatality	Two passengers fell out bus door.
21.	01-10-2009	Detroit, MI	I-75	26-year old male 36-year old male	Fatality Injury	Two passengers fell out bus door.
22.	06-14-2009	Chicago, IL	I-57	22-year old male 22-year old male	Fatality Fatality	Two passengers on the top open deck of a double-decker bus hit their heads on a highway overpass.