BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of Baker : Equipment and Materials,

Ltd. Notice of Apparent : Case No. 20-805-TR-CVF Violation and Intent to :

Assess Forfeiture.

PROCEEDINGS

Before Michael L. Williams, Attorney Examiner, for the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, via Webex, called at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 29, 2021.

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC. 222 East Town Street, Second Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-4620 (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481

```
2
 1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
               Michael DeWine, Ohio Attorney General
               By Steve Beeler, Esq.
 3
               Assistant Attorney General
               180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
 4
               Columbus, Ohio 43215
 5
                    On behalf of the Staff of the PUCO.
 6
               Rob Woods, Pro se
               Baker Equipment & Materials, Ltd.
 7
               990 North Main Street
               Monroe, Ohio 45050
 8
                    On behalf of Baker Equipment &
 9
               Materials, Ltd.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		3
1	INDEX	
2		
3	STAFF'S CASE	
	WITNESSES:	PAGE
4	Aaron Lockhart	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Beeler Examination by the Attorney Examiner	9 25
6	Examination by the Attorney Examiner (cont'd)	41
7	Further Direct Examination by Mr. Beeler Examination by the Attorney Examiner	76 81
8	Rob Moser	
	Direct Examination by Mr. Beeler	43
9	Rod Woods	
10	Direct Testimony	37
11	Cross-Examination by Mr. Beeler Examination by the Attorney Examiner	58 68
12		
13	STAFF EXHIBITS IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
14	<pre>1 - Driver/Vehicle Examination 12 Report 1/27/2020</pre>	42
1 -	2 - Notice of Preliminary 46	49
15	Determination 3 - Driver/Vehicle Examination 65	75
16	Report 08/25/2020	
17	COMPANY EXHIBITS IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
18	<pre>1 - Driver/Vehicle Examination 57 Report 01/27/2020</pre>	72
19	2 - Doran Manufacturing invoices 50 3 - Baker Equipment & Materials 50	73 73
	Work Order Invoices	
20	4 - Inspection Bulletin 2014-02 52 Identification of Long Stroke	72
21	Brake Chambers or Brake	
22	Adjustment Limit Markings 5 - Code 393.47E (2 citations) 29	74
23	<pre>"Clamp or Roto type brake out-of-adjustment"</pre>	
24	out of adjustment	
25		

			1
			4
1	INDEX		
2			
3	COMPANY EXHIBITS	IDENTIFIED	$\lambda DM T mm E D$
4			
5	<pre>6 - Code 393.53B (2 citations) "CMV manufactured after 10/19/94 has an automatic</pre>	28	74
6	adjustment system that fails to compensate for wear"		
7	7 - Code 396.3(a)(1)BOS - "Brakes Out Of Service.	56	74
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Friday Afternoon Session,
June 29, 2021.

- -

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's go on the record. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio has assigned for hearing at this time and place Case No. 20-805-TR-CVF, In the matter of Baker Equipment & Materials, Ltd, Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture.

My name is Mike Williams, and I am the Attorney-Examiner assigned by the Commission to hear this case. We'll begin today with appearances by the parties. I'll begin with Staff.

MR. BEELER: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio, Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost,

I'm Assistant Attorney General Steve Beeler, located
at 30 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you want to introduce the rest of your appearing parties, or you want them to do themselves?

MR. BEELER: Testifying on behalf of Staff will be inspector Aaron Lockhart and Rod Moser of the Compliance Department of the Commission.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Mr. Woods,

you are appearing on behalf of Baker Equipment, correct, sir?

MR. WOODS: Yes, sir.

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Anybody else appearing on behalf of you or the company?

MR. WOODS: No, it is just me.

begin today's hearing I would like to take a moment to note that consistent with COVID-19 response measures as described in Amended Substitute House Bill 197 as replaced by House Bill 404, this hearing is being held via Webex, which enables parties to participate via video conference, and for members of the public to access the hearing by telephone or by video over the internet.

In light of the virtual nature of today's hearing, I will add some preliminary remarks for the record.

First, if counsel or witnesses experience any technical difficulties during the hearing they should please immediately contact me. My direct phone is 614-466-0106, or they can email me, and we have emails as described in regard to prehearing circulation, or they can use the Webex chat function. Please note that the chats are

recorded. They are not private, but they are not part of the official record in the case.

2.1

For those of you who may be watching or listening as an attendee, including witnesses who are waiting to testify, while you are observing your microphone will be muted and your videos will be turned off.

Now, in most respects, this virtual hearing will proceed in much the same fashion as if we were in person before the Commission.

I would ask that to the extent you have camera capacity, that you keep your cameras on so that we have a better idea of what's going on and make sure that we're not losing any connection or any pivotal moments in testimony.

I'll ask that everyone please be mindful of our Court Reporter. Please speak clearly, at a reasonable pace, so that she can accurately transcribe the record.

Please do your best to avoid speaking over each other, or taking corrective steps, that would be taking an intentional pause at the end of questions, slowing down, in order to account for connectivity lags or any possible objections.

During testimony witnesses should only

have access to those documents that they would have if they were physically sitting in the witness stand, such as exhibits previously identified and exchanged by counsel or by the parties.

There should be no attempts to communicate through any other means with anyone privately during their testimony, nor to access technology while they are on the hearing stand.

Exhibits that are ultimately admitted into the record that were not previously docketed, which would be all the exhibits we talked about earlier, will need to be sent to the Court Reporter. And we'll discuss the mechanism for that at the close of today's hearing.

Are there any questions before -preliminary matters before we begin with our
presentation on behalf of Staff?

MR. BEELER: No questions, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Woods?

MR. WOODS: No questions, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. With that, I will invite Staff to call their first

23 witness.

2.1

MR. BEELER: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of the Staff, the Staff would call Inspector

- 1 | Aaron Lockhart to the stand.
- 2 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Good afternoon,
- 3 Mr. Lockhart. I'm going to swear you in as you begin
- 4 | your testimony. Would you raise your right-hand,
- 5 | please? Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
- 6 | you're about to give is the truth?
- 7 MR. LOCKHART: I do.
- 8 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.
- 9 Mr. Beeler.
- MR. BEELER: Thank you, your Honor.
- 11 Aaron Lockhart,
- 12 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
- 13 | examined and testified as follows:
- 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 15 By Mr. Beeler:
- 16 Q. Mr. Lockhart, go ahead and please state
- 17 your full name for the record, please.
- 18 A. It's Aaron Lockhart.
- 19 Q. Okay. And where are you employed?
- 20 A. I am employed by the Public Utilities
- 21 | Commission of Ohio out of District 4.
- 22 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Lockhart, could
- 23 | we maybe increase the level of your microphone
- 24 | volume or talk a little louder? I'm sorry.
- 25 THE WITNESS: Okay.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.

By Mr. Beeler:

2.1

2.2

- Q. And you mentioned you work for the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. What is your position within the Commission?
 - A. I am a Hazardous Materials Specialist 2.
- Q. Okay. How long have you been with the Commission?
- A. I've been with the Public Utilities
 Commission for approximately seven years.
- Q. Okay. What are your duties in your capacity as a hazardous material expert -- or Hazardous Material Specialist 2?
- A. My duties are to perform compliance reviews, shipper reviews, hazardous material inspections, regular roadside inspections. I'm required to complete 25 roadside inspections a month, 320 inspections a year.
- Q. Okay. What sort of training do you have for your job, continuing education and certifications?
- A. I have -- for the PUCO, I have specific training within CVSA, Level 1 inspection, Level 2 inspection, 3, all the way up through radiation Level 6 inspections. We have continued in-service

training, extensive certification training for hazardous materials.

And before that, before I got on with the Public Utilities Commission, I was an over-the-road truck driver for ten years, so I have a lot of experience within the trucking industry, and the operation of semis as well.

- Q. Just on average, how many inspections do you do in a year?
 - A. In a year I do, at a minimum, 320.
- Q. Okay. In most years do you do more than that?
 - A. Most years it equals out to being a little more when you factor in Level 5 inspections, which is terminal inspections that are required for compliance reviews, determining a carrier's out of service rate.
- Q. You used an acronym in your previous answer, CVSA. Does that stand for the commercial -- the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance?
 - A. Yes.

2.

2.1

- Q. Okay. Would you say, just generally, that your motor carrier inspections are conducted to protect the safety of Ohio's traveling public?
 - A. Absolutely, 100 percent.

12 1 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 2 MR. BEELER: I'm going to turn to --3 your Honor, to Staff Exhibit 1. I believe I have it previously marked as Staff Exhibit 1. And Mr. Woods 4 5 should have a copy of that as well. 6 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Woods, do you 7 have that? MR. WOODS: I do. 8 9 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. 10 By Mr. Beeler: Q. Do you have that document in front of 11 12 you, Mr. Lockhart? 13 A. I do not. 14 Q. Can you -- can you access that document 15 in any way? 16 A. Maybe if you tell me how or where. 17 MR. BEELER: Can you -- can we go off the record, your Honor? 18 19 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We're off the 20 record. (Discussion off the record.) 2.1 22 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's go ahead and 23 go back on the record. 24 We went off the record to allow 25 Mr. Lockhart to access, via email, the proposed

exhibits on behalf of both the Company as well as on behalf of Staff, and he's advised off the record that that's the only information that he has available to him electronically as he proceeds on the stand.

Go ahead, Mr. Beeler.

By Mr. Beeler:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. So Staff Exhibit 1, do you recognize that document?
- 9 A. Yes, that's the Driver/Vehicle 10 Examination Report.
- Q. And can you tell me the dates that are on that report?
- A. Yeah, the inspection was completed on January 27th of 2020, started at 12:10 p.m. and finished at 1:32 p.m.
- Q. Okay. Is that document -- is that a Commission record?
 - A. That is a Commission record, yes.
- Q. And it's kept in the ordinary course of your business?
- 21 A. It is, yes.
- Q. It's the practice with each inspection for the Commission to make these reports, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And it's your duty to make the report

for the violations you observed; is that correct?

- A. That is correct, yes.
- Q. Is this document in a similar condition as you prepared it?
- A. Yes, it is. I'm not for sure if that is the one that was actually printed off and handed to the driver, but that is the same report, yes.
- Q. Yeah, in other words, the report that is handed to the driver is very similar to this?
 - A. Correct.
- 11 Q. But this looks a little different?
- 12 A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

16

17

18

- Q. But the information is the same, correct?
- 15 A. That is correct, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Was the reason for you producing this report, Staff Exhibit 1, an inspection of the motor carrier vehicle owned by Baker Equipment & Materials, Ltd.?
- 20 A. Yes, it was.
- 21 Q. Do you remember the inspection?
- 22 A. I do.
- Q. Okay. So in the report, I just want to talk briefly for the record, in the violations section there's information in the violation

description, and there's a colon there, so there's some information before the colon, and there's some information after the colon. Do you see that?

A. I do.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- Q. So the information before the colon is automatically generated by your computer system, right?
 - A. That is correct, yes.
- Q. And the information after the colon is -- when there is a colon, is you input that information?
- A. That is correct also. That is my -- my small notes on the -- the description of the violation, correct.
 - Q. Okay. And then you don't -- those are your notes, you don't have any notes down in the inspection notes area, right?
 - A. I don't believe I did on this inspection.
- Q. I mean, you can see it down there in Staff Exhibit 1 that it's a blank field?
- A. Right, because the notes were entered into the violation section.
- Q. Okay. Who was the driver listed on the report?

- A. The driver is James Little, John James Little.
- Q. How about James A. Littlejohn, does that sound --
 - A. That works, too.
- Q. Okay. Are there any violations listed on this report?
- A. There are six violations listed on this report.
 - Q. Okay.

2.1

- A. And I'm going to start on the flat tire violation, which is 49 CFR 393.75A3.
 - Q. Okay. Please describe how you observed that the tire was flat.
 - A. When I do the inspection -- I do a walk around inspection to start with. This was a Level 1 inspection where I eventually crawl under and check brakes, but I'll check the front of the truck, I'll check lights, all that, then I will go around and kick tires.

And when I say kick tires, tires -- semi tires give a distinct thump if -- if they are not inflated to the proper level. So as I'm working my way around the trailer I'm kicking tires to ensure all the tires are inflated properly.

When I get to that tire, it thumps, it does not -- it is flat -- it appears to be flat. So at that point in time I continue my inspection. I speak with the driver, and we get the tire pressure gauge and check the actual pressure in the tire.

- Q. Okay. So you -- you used the tire pressure gauge to determine that axle 2 right inside measured at 40 percent?
- A. Yeah, the way I do it is I don't get down with the tire and the valve stems of the tire without the driver present.
 - Q. Okay.

2.1

A. I do not want a driver looking in the mirror and interpreting something -- that I'm letting air out of a tire or doing anything inappropriate to a tire.

So generally what I do is have the driver come around, check the tire pressure themselves with the truck tire pressure gauge, so the driver can't say that it wasn't flat, it's verified by the driver.

The driver finishes checking it, and in this case he checked it three times. We got the same reading three times, and then I put the pressure gauge on and got the same reading myself. At that

point in time we write the tire flat.

Q. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

2.1

- A. Below 50 percent is what that violation was.
- Q. And your notes -- I mean, you say axle 2 right inside measured at 40 percent, so that's below the 50 percent?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. There's another CFR section that deals with under inflated tires. Why did you write this violation versus the under inflated tire section?
- A. Because it was less than 50 percent, which is the out of service criteria for a flat tire.
- Q. So under 50 percent then it fits under the violation that you wrote up?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 Q. Correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
 - Q. So again, it's your testimony here that you observed the tire was flat and measured at 40 percent, in violation of the section, correct?
- 23 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Turning now to the next -- I'm going to lump them all together, so the next five

violations.

2.1

2.2

- A. Okay.
- Q. It looks like there's an -- you know, it's brakes out of service and adjustment, there's 49 CFR 396.3A1, which is just breaks out of service, there's two 393.47Es, and then there's two 393.53Bs, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So I'll ask you why you write that many here first, but you observed the brakes in this situation out of service and adjustment, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So how did you observe that? Please explain your process.
- A. Okay. At that point in time in the inspection we make sure the tires brakes are all released. We have the wheels chalked.

We explain to the driver that we're going to get underneath the truck. We're looking at everything under the truck from brake pads to frame, to brake chambers, everything, and we use a soapstone, and I will mark the brake chambers for the slack adjustor, I'll mark the location that they are in, all the way through all of the brakes.

And then after I am done marking all the

brakes we'll have the driver apply their brakes and then we come back through and measure them.

2.1

And then we have the measurements. We have measurements within the out of service criteria that we can look at and mark -- the program, Aspen that we use, when you enter the size of the brake chamber and you enter the brake measurements, it will automatically tell you if those brakes are out of adjustment.

So when I went through, I measured all the brakes. I found axle 2 and axle 5 had brakes out of adjustment, so the violations were written.

- Q. Okay. And I believe this is going to be the issue in this case, but you observed at the time that -- what type of brakes did you observe?
- A. Yes, we are extensively trained in those, and I also have, like I said, ten years over the road driving experience where I've adjusted brakes, so yeah, we're very familiar with them.

If it's a questionable brake chamber we have a device called a Chamber Mate that we can put on the brake chambers to verify what we're seeing is accurate.

With this inspection I do remember I did not have to use the Chamber Mate because I was fully

confident that they were short stroke brake chambers.

- Q. So you didn't -- you just mentioned that they were, in your observation, short stroke brakes?
 - A. Absolutely, yes.

2.1

- Q. And please describe how you know that for sure.
- A. You tell the -- you can tell the difference by the -- a lot of times there's a tag on it by the inlet air hoses, whether or not they are square or round. A lot of times you can tell by the distance between the clamps. You know, a long stroke has a wider distance between those clamps.

But when I am -- when I am under there checking brakes and I come to one that's out of adjustment, if it measures out of adjustment for either short stroke or long stroke, I'm double checking, triple checking those brake chambers to ensure that they are what I think they are.

It's not something that's done haphazardly, we make sure those brake chambers are what we are saying they are.

- Q. So there is a tool or some sort of device that you can check to see what type of brakes there are?
 - A. There is, it's a Chamber Mate. And I am

not sure if that is -- someone within the PUCO that invented that or if that's a nationwide tool, I honestly don't know, but they have passed it out to all the inspectors in Ohio.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- Q. And why again did you not use it here?
- A. Because I was confident in the fact that they were short stroke.
- Q. Okay. And you're aware just from the exhibits and the information that was submitted by Mr. Woods, that his claim is that the -- the brakes were -- were long stroke, while you observed that they were short stroke, correct?
 - A. Yeah, I understand that.
 - Q. Okay. Did you take any photos here?
- A. I did not. That is not something we do unless the brake pads have cracks or spaces within those.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall if the driver,
 Mr. Littlejohn, stated that -- at the stop that he
 could adjust the brakes, that he was certified or
 capable of doing that?
 - A. He did not.
- Q. He affirmatively said that he could not do that?
- A. No, he did not state either way.

Q. Okay. And again, I mentioned -- and I want to just go through it one more time so the record is clear.

2.1

So there's five total violations for the brake -- the brake issue. Explain why you wrote it up five -- you know, five violations rather than just one?

A. Okay. So when you have a set of brakes or brake chamber that's out of adjustment on Unit 1, which this vehicle did, when you write that violation it automatically gives you a second violation of the automatic slack adjustor being inoperative or not working correctly.

If the automatic slack adjustor was working correctly, then the brakes would not be out of adjustment. So it automatically populates that for vehicles newer than 1994.

The second unit, Unit No. 2, the trailer, is a separate unit, so when you write a brake violation on that separate unit, then that automatic slack adjustor automatically populates again for that other unit.

So if there was multiple on one unit, there would only be one violation, but since it was the truck and the trailer, there were two slack

adjustor violations, two brakes out of adjustment violations, and then that equaled up to being more than 20 percent, which is an out of service violation for brakes out of adjustment. So that is the -- the fifth violation that is added.

- Q. Okay. So overall, it's your testimony here today that for all five of the violations, that the brakes were out of service and adjustment, correct?
 - A. That is correct.

2.1

2.2

- Q. Anything else that -- important to note for the Judge or for the Commission, anything else you would think would be important for the record in this case?
- A. I can't think of anything other than the fact that every inspector in the State of Ohio, I know, is fully trained on brake adjustments, and it's something that every inspector in the State of Ohio doesn't take lightly, either.
- Q. And it was clear to you that these were short stroke and not long stroke, correct?
 - A. It was clear to me, yes.

MR. BEELER: Okay. No further
questions, your Honor. Again, I would reserve
Mr. Lockhart for rebuttal, and also at this time I

would move for the admission of Staff Exhibit 1 into the record.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. We'll deal with the admission of the exhibit at the close of any cross-examination or clarified testimony. I just have one or maybe a couple questions,

Mr. Lockhart.

7 Mr. Lockhart

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

EXAMINATION

By the Attorney Examiner:

Q. And part of this is educating me, so I'm looking at Staff Exhibit 1 under the brake adjustments section there.

And you described the five different brake components, and brakes 2 and 5 are the ones — that are found to be on the right side, are the ones that are found to be in violation, and they measure two-and-a-quarter?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Would that measurement have been within normal tolerance if they were long stroke brakes?
 - A. They would be, yes.
- Q. Okay. Was there discussion during the course of your investigation about whether they were or were not long stroke brakes?

- A. There was not discussion, no. You mean with the driver?
 - Q. Right.

2.1

2.2

- A. No, there was not -- not discussion.

 Pretty much the -- you know, other than me explaining the brakes were out of adjustment, which he understood, you know, what the out of adjustment brakes were -- and then as you can see on that report, you know, the axle 2, axle 5, is highlighted, so I'm able to point out what ones are out of adjustment to him, and there was no -- we discussed the flat tire, which he was fully aware of because he measured that himself.
- Q. Okay. And you described this tool, this Chamber Mate that you're not sure, you know, how it came to be in existence?
 - A. Right.
- Q. But it would be something that would have conclusively determined whether the brakes were or were not within tolerance, or would that have confirmed that they were long or short stroke? What would that have done for us?
- A. It would have just reconfirmed for the inspector what they were looking at as far as long or short stroke. It's a tool in our tool kit that we

can use if needed.

2.1

- Q. And how much time does that add to an inspection? So if you decide you need to use the Chamber Mate, is that 30 seconds per brake review, or how does that work?
- A. It would just be a matter of getting out from under the truck and going and getting that piece of equipment and getting back under there. I mean, it's not going to -- in the whole scheme of the inspection it's not going to take an extraordinary amount of time.
 - Q. It's some sort of a handheld device?
- A. It is.
 - Q. Okay. And how often do you use the Chamber Mate?
 - A. Actually, it's pretty rare, because most of the time it's very obvious as to what those brakes are, what those chambers are, unless you're getting into a situation where it's like a truck out of the fracking fields or there's a lot of grease and oil and issues within the -- within areas around that brake chamber. But most of the time it's pretty straightforward as to what those brake chambers are.
 - Q. Now, have you had a chance to review the exhibits that Mr. Woods has provided or proffered on

behalf of Respondent?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

A. I have, yes.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

By the Attorney Examiner:

- Q. So I believe it's proposed Exhibit 6.
- 6 Do you have that -- can you access that for me?
 - A. I do. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And that's the one that begins across the left, code 393.53B2, two citations, correct?
- 11 A. Correct. Yes.
- Q. And then if you continue, there's some
 pictures, talks about the paint marks on the slack
 adjustor, and then the photo taken after six cranks.

 Do you see those, sir?
- 16 A. I do.
 - Q. Does that give you any insight as to -Let's back up a little bit there. Let's assume that
 the pictures are taken without any repairs or changes
 in the level of the brakes from what you -- from what
 you inspected, okay?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Does that -- do those pictures add any clarification or give you any pause as to your testimony regarding the failures that you diagnosed

and recorded?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- A. No, because it was written per CVSA inspection policies. So if the brakes are out of adjustment, then at that time that the brakes were out of adjustment, that slack adjustor was not working properly.
- Q. So in the state that they are in, they are obviously -- they have been opened up in some capacity for purposes of evaluating presumably whether they need to be repaired or not, and you're not able to say whether they are, as depicted there, the same as what you saw, you can just tell us what you saw and what you recorded, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Do those pictures give any indication as to whether they are short or long stroke brakes?
- A. On the ---that exhibit that you are looking at right now?
 - Q. Correct.
- A. No, it does not. There is two pictures on that exhibit, correct?
 - Q. That is correct.
- A. Yes, that gives me no indication of long or short stroke.
- 25 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

By the Attorney Examiner:

2.1

- Q. And unfortunately -- there it is. So I want to go back to the exhibit just prior to that, which would be, I believe, Respondent's proposed Exhibit 5, and there are some pictures there at page 2. Do you have that in front of you?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Does that give you any indication as to whether these would be short or long stroke brakes?
- A. In these pictures, yes, it would be long stroke, and the top picture would be long stroke.
 - Q. And then the two pictures below that?
 - A. They are long stroke as well.
- Q. Now, do you know if these pictures are just pulled as an example, or -- these are not pictures of the brakes you actually inspected, correct?
- A. As far as -- I'm not sure where the pictures come from, but those are not the brake chambers I looked at.
- Q. Okay. And you would not normally take pictures of the brake chambers in the course of your investigation?
- A. No, that is not something that is PUCO policy as far as an out of adjustment brake. It

would be if there was a brake chamber that was caged or had a crack in it. Something in that nature we would take photos of, but a -- just to show proof of the size of the brake chamber, no, that is not PUCO policy.

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Mr. Lockhart, thank you so much.

Mr. Woods, again, we have some limitations regarding your ability to cross-examine witnesses, but I certainly want to give you an opportunity to coordinate with me to make sure that Mr. Lockhart has clarified and testified in a fashion that gives the Bench as much information as it needs to make a recommendation to the Commission.

Do you want to make any comments regarding Mr. Lockhart's testimony and/or work through me on any clarification you need in order to make any comments, sir?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor. The first one is referring back to the tire. And back on the tire, the report from our driver, who is very safety conscious, he's a 20-year veteran driver of both the industry as well as this company, very familiar with what he's doing in regard to road safety.

The measurement taken at the inspection

station, my driver confirmed to me that the inspector didn't take any measurement, he handed the gauge to him to take the measurement.

My driver wasn't so familiar with that gauge, we use a little different style gauge here than what we use in the shop.

2.1

That axle 2 inside tire is very difficult to get at, so my driver was not confident with the measurement that he took on the tire.

But that being said, he is a very respectful individual, so he is not going to push back in any sort of response to law enforcement, which is exactly what we ask him to do.

So that is the contention I would make, or the differentiation I would make based on the report I have from my driver, Mr. Littlejohn. He said that he was the one who took the measurement and not the inspector himself.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Littlejohn does not appear to be here and testify today, correct?

MR. WOODS: That is correct.

22 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Anything else 23 relative to the tire?

MR. WOODS: No, sir.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Do you want

to make any comments or clarifications regarding the brakes?

2.

2.1

MR. WOODS: Is this my time to kind of go over the exhibits that I had and submitted, or is that later?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: It will be later.

Although I don't want to let procedure get in the way of making sure that you get the utmost in a fair hearing here, so I don't want you to feel as though you're stifled in regard to comments you have regarding your exhibits, and how they relate to Mr. Lockhart's testimony.

Mr. Lockhart may or may not be called to rebut your case when you've made that, so if he's not called again I don't want you to lose your opportunity to make comments. I would encourage you not to keep things in reserve if you want to talk about them now.

MR. WOODS: Back to the tire then. What I would say is our driver was given a gauge that he wasn't familiar with, that he didn't know the calibration history, the accuracy of, and he took a measure of the single hardest tire on the truck to take a measurement of that he didn't feel good about. So that is what I'll speak on on the tire.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Anything else on the tire?

MR. WOODS: No, sir.

2.1

2.2

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Turning now to the brakes. We had Mr. Lockhart who testified that based on his experience, that these were, I believe, short stroke brakes, and with that as the assumption, that they were out of compliance as noted in his inspection report. Do you have points you would like to clarify in that realm?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor. The trucks that we have -- so if I could go back to the truck that the driver was driving this day. He was driving a truck No. 0382, which is our internal equipment ID number for the truck.

We have -- in our company, we have two CDL truck drivers. We are a concrete construction company. We deliver materials and equipment to job sites all throughout the midwest for large concrete construction projects that we do as our course of business. So we have got two drivers, we have three semi trucks.

We have three semi trucks so that when one is down we can still keep both drivers moving.

And on the day of this event, the driver was actually

driving the backup truck, and he was driving the backup truck because in his daily inspection of his primary truck, he discovered a low tire.

2.1

So immediately he followed our protocol, which is, you know, if your daily inspection doesn't go to lead that the truck is safe for use, we don't drive it, of course we don't run.

So he stopped, he went to get the backup truck and proceeded with his daily inspections. So our guys are doing their daily inspections, daily kicks and tire checks to make sure trucks are safe.

And in the course of events, he chose that the backup truck was indeed safe for carriage, so he proceeded.

Subsequent to that -- can we talk brake chambers, or is it the right time to talk brake chambers.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Again, some of this may come out again when it turns to you to present your case, but I don't want to see you lose your opportunity to add anything that would help me understand or clarify your position relative to at least the short versus long brake chambers.

So please tell me everything you want to tell me relative to the brake chambers, even though you may have to repeat some of this in your case in

chief if you choose to.

2.1

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor. So it took
Mr. Littlejohn about ten minutes being back at the
shop, so the Guernsey job site that we were going to
is about three-and-a-half hours from our shop here in
Monroe, so it took later in the day before he got
back, and we immediately brought his truck in the
shop.

Obviously he came and reported to me the violations that he talked to me about on the phone earlier in the day, and we brought the truck into the shop.

We have 15 mechanics within our shop who average about 16 years of service with our company of working on this type of equipment. So --

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Woods, I'm going to interrupt you ever so briefly here. And it's difficult. I mean, you're representing the company in your capacity and you're also providing some testimony, so to the extent you're providing testimony, I'm going to go ahead and swear you in.

Would you raise your right hand, please?

Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth?

MR. WOODS: I do.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Please proceed.

Rob Woods,

2.1

being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT TESTIMONY

MR. WOODS: Okay. So within about five minutes of him getting into the shop we had his truck pulled in, looking at the report -- and our guys are very familiar with the trucks here.

The trucks and the trailers that we have are the heaviest duty of units. So we are a concrete construction company, we're hauling laser screens, we're hauling trawls, we're hauling batch plant components, you know, very large, very heavy, very awkward objects, so when we buy a truck we buy the heaviest duty of trucks.

And in this case, this was a Peterbilt that is made specifically for hauling heavy loads, and it too was equipped with long stroke brake chambers.

As our rule, we believe in the extra durability, extra strength, extra durability of the long stroke chambers, so that is what we outfit our trucks with, as well as our trailers, so that is what we used here.

The pictures that I took were taken that very day. So I'm sorry, let me correct that. The first picture on Exhibit 5 was taken that day on the truck.

2.1

I really have no way of taking a photo that shows the truck in question, as well as the long stroke brake chamber to identify that paired together, but that picture was taken the same day of the violation.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Bear with me one second. So I have proposed Exhibit 5, which is three -- two pages, and that has at the beginning Code 393.47E, (2 citations), and on page 2 there, there's three pictures, and then I have proposed Exhibit 6, which has two pictures. It's a one-page document, two pictures, showing what appears to be a slack adjustor. That's what you're describing, correct, sir?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor. The picture that I'm talking about is the first picture on Exhibit 5. So this is the one where the hoses are still connected.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So you're telling me that the first picture on Exhibit 5, it says, "Photo of Chamber in Installed View," that's an

actual photo of the brake chamber on the truck in question?

2.1

THE WITNESS: On that day, yes, sir.

The two pictures below it were taken the following day.

So we're a one-shift operation. Our guys leave the shop about 4:00. I had them stay later that day to look at the truck, so that's where we saw the violations, saw that the tolerance that was allowed for the long stroke brake chamber.

Our resident DOT expert mechanic was the one who stayed and went over that with me. So we got pictures of that. And then the following day are when the remaining two pictures of Exhibit 5, as well as the two pictures on Exhibit 6 were taken.

We went ahead -- again, we are not going to question any sort of safety violation. We removed these parts. We believe they were functioning well, but we replaced them the next day, and that's when we were able to get a much better view of those parts to show the three-inch stroke as well as the square embossment that indicates the long stroke chambers. So those second, third, fourth, fifth pictures there, those were taken a day after the violation.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. The second,

third, fourth, fifth, you're combining the pictures 1 2 from the two proposed exhibits, correct? 3 MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor. ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So just so I'm 4 5 clear, the testimony is that all five proposed 6 exhibits across both exhibits are actually from the 7 truck in question? 8 MR. WOODS: That is correct, your Honor. 9 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And were you there 10 when the pictures were taken? 11 MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor, I took the 12 pictures myself. 13 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. 14 Anything else you want to clarify regarding 15 Mr. Lockhart's testimony? MR. WOODS: No, your Honor, I didn't --16 I think we're -- very simply, whether we're talking 17 18 about whether these are identified as long stroke or 19 short stroke as it relates to violations 2 through 7. 20 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. 2.1 Actually, Mr. Lockhart, I just want to make sure I 22 understand your testimony, sir. 23 24 Aaron Lockhart,

being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was

examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

By the Attorney Examiner:

2.1

2.2

- Q. So the testimony, I believe, is that the pictures in proposed Exhibit 5 are not representative of the brake chambers that you saw the date of your inspection, is that your testimony, sir?
- A. I would have to say yes, because I mean, we look at so many brake chambers, I can't -- you know, I can't picture exactly in my mind, all I can do is look back, I wrote short stroke violations, so short stroke brake chambers is what I saw on the vehicle.
- Q. Okay. And I understand that you do a lot of inspections per year. I know this was some time ago, so I'm not trying to have a gotcha moment. You're not sure if these pictures are what was on the truck because you don't remember, you didn't take pictures, is that your testimony?
- A. No, I'm sure what I looked at was short stroke, so those cannot be the brake chambers that was on the truck I inspected.
- Q. So in looking at these pictures here today, you're confident that you would always recognize those as long stroke brake chambers?

A. I am confident, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Beeler, anything else from your witness, sir?

MR. BEELER: No, but again, just reserving him for rebuttal.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. And I believe we did mark -- or we implicitly marked Staff
Exhibit 1, which is the inspection report, and you've moved to admit that.

Mr. Woods, I'll offer you the opportunity to say anything regarding the possible admissibility of that proposed exhibit before I bring it into the record. Sir, anything you want to say regarding whether that should or should not be made part of the record?

MR. WOODS: No, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All right. That exhibit will be deemed admitted as Staff Exhibit 1.

(EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Beeler, I assume you want to call your next witness?

MR. BEELER: I do. The Staff would call Rod Moser to the stand.

24 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Moser, would you 25 raise your right hand? Do you swear or affirm the

43

1 | testimony you're about to give is the truth?

MR. MOSER: Yes, sir, do.

3 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you,

4 Mr. Beeler, please proceed.

5 Rod Moser,

being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 By Mr. Beeler:

8

13

14

15

16

- 10 Q. Please state your full name for the Commission.
- 12 A. My name is Rod Allen Moser.
 - Q. Where are you employed?
 - A. I am the Chief of Compliance within the Transportation Department for the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.
- Q. Okay. How long have you been in that position?
 - A. A little over four years.
- Q. Okay. What are your job duties?
- A. Relating to this particular case, my job duties are the administration of the Transportation Department civil forfeiture process.
- Q. Okay. What are your expert
 qualifications for violations, certifications,

continuing education?

2.1

2.2

A. I was -- prior to this job, I was a

State Trooper for nearly three years. I've had heavy
focus on commercial enforcement in that capacity, and
ended my career there as the District 6 Commercial
Enforcement Coordinator Sergeant.

That afforded me the opportunity to look at inspections, and I'm very familiar with commercial vehicles. Since joining the Commission I am certified in North American Standards Parts A and B, motor coach, general haz-mat, cargo tanks, and bulk and nonbulk hazardous materials.

- Q. And you're here today to testify on the amount of the forfeiture, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Just before we get into the specific violations here, explain just in your -- in your department how you determine forfeitures in general?
- A. Well, any time there's a violation on an inspection, a letter would go out to the company or to the driver. That letter would state whether or not there is a fine.

In order -- the way we determine whether there's a fine is we look at the violation. The violations are divided into six distinct categories.

Five of the categories are nonhazardous materials and the sixth is hazardous materials.

2.1

The nonhazardous materials are divided into groups known as Group 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Group 0 never has a fine. They are never things that are marked as out of service, they are generally things like having a marker light out or something like that.

Group 1, Group 2, and Group 3 are things -- equipment related violations that the CVSA has determined are likely to cause a crash or can play a role in causing a crash. Group 1 is the most likely of those three, Group 2 next, and then Group 3.

Group 4 violations always generate a fine, and those are things like driver behaviors, authority and insurance, those kind of violations.

Groups 1, 2, and 3, if a violation is marked as out of service, and the inspection is marked in such a way that there's no indication that the violation was caused by a crash, and the inspector did not write a written warning or a ticket for that violation, then we would issue a fine in that -- on that violation.

Q. So does the Commission apply this

process to everyone that you regulate?

A. We do. All inspections conducted within the State of Ohio by certified inspectors come through our office, and they are all treated in the same manner.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. BEELER: Okay. Your Honor, I have marked as Staff Exhibit 2 the Notice of Preliminary Determination.

By Mr. Beeler:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

- 11 Q. Mr. Moser, do you have that document in 12 front of you?
- 13 | A. I do.
 - O. What is it?
 - A. Notice of Preliminary Determination. We generally just call it an NPD, with a statement from the Commission that we had had a conference with the respondent and were unable to come to a resolution as part of that conference, so we send a letter that says these are the violations and the civil forfeiture amounts prior to the conference, and since we couldn't agree, here is the violation and civil forfeiture amount after the conference.

Then the respondent has the opportunity to either pay the forfeiture or request a formal

administrative hearing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

20

2.1

23

24

- Q. And I think you said that this is sent to the respondent, correct?
 - Respondent or the respondent's representative.
 - Okay. Did you review this document in preparation for this hearing?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Is it a Commission record?
- 10 A. It is.
- 11 Q. And it's kept in the ordinary course of 12 business?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
 - Explain how you derived the civil forfeiture in this case.
- A. All right. In this case there are, like 16 17 I said, Group O violations, there are four of those. 18 Group O never engenders a violation, so for those
- four violations there was no fine. 19

There's one Group 1 violation, which is the brakes out of service. So in any -- any time at 22 least 20 percent of the brakes are deemed out of service, or they are defective, that triggers this violation, and if it's marked yes, out of service on the inspection, then it generates a fine. 25

In this case there was only one Group 1 violation, and that is \$100. And then there's also one Group 2 violation, flat tire was also marked as yes for out of service. There was only one Group 2, and that is \$50. So the total was \$150.

- Q. So the Group 1 violation is the brakes out of service, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

2.1

- Q. And then the Group 2 violation is the flat tire, correct?
- A. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. Okay. Is the penalty here, is it consistent with the recommended fine schedule and recommended civil penalty procedure adopted by the Commercial Motor Vehicle Alliance?
- 16 A. Yes, it is.
 - Q. And the fine that's derived here is also in compliance with the Commission rules?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. I think you already said it, but the correct -- the amount here is \$150 total, correct?
- 22 A. \$150 total, correct.
- Q. Okay. Would you recommend that amount to the Commission then?
- 25 A. Yes, I would.

O. Okay. Anything else important to note for the Examiner or the Commission in this case for the record?

A. No, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

MR. BEELER: Thank you. No further questions, your Honor. I would move for the admission of Staff Exhibit 2, subject to any other comments.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Beeler. Mr. Woods, I don't have any comments or questions myself of Mr. Moser, and if you have anything you would like to state at this juncture that might lead to my asking a question or two, or if you see Staff Exhibit 2 as being relatively straightforward, what are your thoughts, sir?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. We will admit Staff Exhibit 2 at this juncture.

(EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

MR. WOODS: No questions, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Beeler, anything else on behalf of Staff at this stage?

MR. BEELER: No, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Woods, I'd say now is your turn to present your case, and certainly we have the information already on the record that's

not going away.

2.1

And as I said before, I have the utmost of patience relative to the potential for, you know, information coming in twice. I'd rather have it come in twice or multiple times as opposed to not at all, so now is the time to make your case.

And I don't know if you want to begin by going through your exhibits or clarifying information you presented already, but the floor is yours now, sir.

(EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. WOODS: Thank you, your Honor. I'd just like to look at Exhibit 2 and 3, and quite honestly, these exhibits are really just to show, you know, background or character background about what we do here.

If you think about how this flat tire violation occurred, I am one hundred percent confident in our driver's daily inspection again. The first truck he inspected he found a low tire, so he didn't drive that truck. Wasn't able to solve that issue, so he moved to another truck, did an inspection and that passed.

At that point I am assuming that that tire is in good condition pressure wise, as well as

the structural integrity of that tire, and he went on his way.

2.1

So let's say that the tire pressure reading at the inspection station was accurate, which I believe we are doubting, but let's say it's accurate.

At that point I'm going to say something happened on the road, whether he got something in the tire on the way -- and nothing in his training steers him to do a check or anything that would find that, so what we have done to prevent this from ever happening again -- so again, safety is our number one priority here.

We have spent over \$15,000 after this violation to outfit each of our trucks, each of our trailers, with onboard tire pressure monitoring systems so that in that same scenario, he leaves here with a tire with good pressure and something happens along the way, it's going to trigger him and give him a notice that he needs to stop and figure that out.

So this is really just background to show we are very safety conscious. We have invested a lot of money to be sure that we keep our drivers and the other passengers on the road safe.

That's Exhibit 2 and 3.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So I'm going to go ahead and let you go through your exhibits and then we'll invite Attorney Beeler to ask questions that he has on behalf of the Staff. So that's all you have to add on Exhibits 2 and 3 at this juncture?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Please proceed.

2.1

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. WOODS: Exhibit 4 is the CVSA

Inspection Bulletin for the identification of long
stroke brake chambers.

So you can see within here, this is the instruction as prepared by the CVSA for how to identify a long stroke brake chamber, and it goes through a series of methods.

So as the inspector mentioned, you know, tagging is an option on some of them, but the most common or most readily available that we have seen, because again, all of our trucks we outfit with long stroke brake chambers, are the square bossed ports.

So on page 3 of the CVSA bulletin, you can see where it shows the square shaped air fitting ports, the same that were on the units -- on our truck that are shown in photos on Exhibit 5.

So that is their document that indicates the identification of a long stroke brake chamber, and we are one hundred percent confident that is what our trucks are outfitted with.

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: So again, I don't want to take away Mr. Beeler's cross-examination, but let me go ahead and understand in realtime here.

So the first picture on page 3 of
Exhibit 4 shows square shaped air fitting ports,
that's what that is labeled. Do you see that, sir?
Mr. Woods?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And then if I go to Exhibit 5, you're telling me that the top left picture there, that would be the square shaped air fitting ports, is that what you're telling me?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Please proceed.

MR. WOODS: So -- and then with the long stroke brake chamber, if you proceed to page 6 of Exhibit 4, in Section F.

So our brake chambers, as you saw in the casting, are three inches. The brake adjustment limit for those is two-and-a-half inches.

So again, we're not contesting the brake adjustment measurement at the inspection station, what we are contesting is that the brake -- that the incorrect brake adjustment limit was used, because with the three-inch brake chambers we would have a two-and-a-half inch allowance. I believe the measurements were two-and-a-quarter on axles 2 and 5, so it would be within the limit.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.

2.1

MR. WOODS: So that's what I'd like to cover on document 4.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. You want to proceed?

MR. WOODS: In record No. 5, that is simply describing what we just talked about.

So in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety
Regulations Handbook, you'll see on page 1 of
document 5, the two-inch adjustment limit is circled
for standard stroke chambers, and the two-and-a-half
inch allowance is for long stroke.

So again, we are just coming down to are these long stroke, or are these short stroke, and we believe that they were identified incorrectly as short stroke, where we had long stroke brake chambers.

Armstrong & Okey, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Anything else on Exhibit 5?

2.1

MR. WOODS: The photos on page 2, as I mentioned again, I'm going to be redundant in what I said before, the first picture was taken the day of the violation once that truck was back here in our shop.

Picture -- the bottom half pictures were taken after we replaced the parts. So we replaced the slack adjustors, we replaced the brake chambers.

So those bottom two pictures were taken after we cleaned up to where you could see the casting identification markers that note type 30LP3 spring brakes, so we just took a wire brush to clean that up a little bit so you could clearly see what that chamber was displaying.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: All three of those pictures are the same brake chamber?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. WOODS: And then on document 6, we talked about this, this is the slack adjustor. So really the whole reason to this picture is just to show that the slack adjustors were functioning.

So as the inspector described, if you

have an out of spec condition, you're automatically going to get -- the CMV manufactured after 1994 has an automatic air brake adjustment system that fails to compensation for wear.

2.1

So that is an automatic violation based on an out of spec condition. This picture was simply to show that the adjustors were functioning. We went ahead and replaced those, but they were functioning at the time and were within limits.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And those were taken the day -- as I recall -- go ahead.

MR. WOODS: These were taken the day after. So the first picture in the installed state, which is in document 5, was taken the day of. All the four other pictures were taken the next day once we took that truck apart in the morning in our shop.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And you took all those pictures.

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Go ahead.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. WOODS: And then document 7 -- and I think that's pretty straightforward. If the brakes weren't out of service -- or weren't out of tolerance, they weren't out of service and then we

wouldn't have more than 20 percent of the service brakes out of service, if we were measured with a long stroke brake chamber.

2.1

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. And then your Exhibit 1 is the same Driver/Vehicle exam report that we have already talked about as Staff Exhibit 1; is that correct?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So I have an understanding of all your proposed exhibits. What else do you want to tell me about the circumstances.

MR. WOODS: I have nothing more to share.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay, sir, I appreciate that. I'm going to go ahead and assume that you want to admit the exhibits that you discussed.

We did discuss all the exhibits although
1 would be duplicative of Staff 1, so I assume you
want to admit Exhibits 2 through 7, Respondent's
Exhibit 2 through 7 which we'll mark accordingly; is
that correct?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor.

MR. BEELER: Your Honor, I would like

the -- the Exhibit 1 of the driver examination, it has a little different information. It's very similar, but it has some other information on there that I'm going to ask Mr. Woods about.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Well, we will take under advisement admissibility of all the exhibits as proposed by Respondent. That will be 1 through 7. And with that I'll turn to you for any cross-examination.

MR. BEELER: Great.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Beeler:

2.1

- Q. Hello, Mr. Woods. I think you mentioned this before, but Mr. Littlejohn was the driver for your company at this inspection, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir, is that correct.
- Q. And Mr. Littlejohn is not here today, correct?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. On the tire violation, I mean, you mentioned that you just -- that the driver told you that he was the only one to check the pressure, correct?
- 25 A. That is correct.

- Q. I mean -- but did you have any reason to believe that Inspector Lockhart didn't check the tire as well?
- A. The only firsthand information I have is from my driver who said that the inspector asked him to check the tire, handed him the gauge, he took the measurement, and then handed that back to the inspector.
- Q. Okay. On both Baker Exhibit 1 -- or Company Exhibit 1 and on Staff Exhibit 1, they both -- and I think you mentioned this -- they both say verified by driver. That's what you're talking about, correct?
 - A. Is that a question for me, sir?
 - Q. Yes.

2.1

- A. Yes, the driver -- where it says driver verified the measurement, I would say based on my understanding from discussion with the driver and his recollection of the event, that it wasn't necessarily just verified by the driver, it was actually measured by the driver.
- Q. Okay. Maybe I'll just ask it generally. When the truck was put out of service, how did you get it back to your shop? How did you do it?
 - A. There were two elements to that.

Because we didn't have air available, we called a tire shop to come and put air in the tire. They pressure tested it to see if there was any leak. They didn't find evidence of a leak. He said he put about ten pounds of air pressure in it. He was surprised that we had to stop and put air in it, but he did that.

The second part of it was we had to get at least one more brake in adjustment, and our driver is capable of doing a manual adjustment on the brakes, so he adjusted the brake to get closer to two inches of play with some FaceTime with some technology with our mechanics here to get those adjusted back — to get under the two-inch limit.

Q. So --

2.1

- A. And he drove the truck.
- Q. Okay. So on your Company Exhibit 1, on page 2 of that, there's some information on -- this is a signature of the repairer. Can you just explain what -- who that is, and what that's about?
- A. Yes. That signature is confirming that the truck is now -- it was the tire pressure that we were working on here for one of the signatures.

So that first signature is the gentleman from Buckeye Tire, who was the company who put air

back into the tire that was reported as low, and then the second signature is our driver. It's hard to read, but that is James Littlejohn. He is our driver. He did the brake adjustment to get the brake adjustment closer it two inches.

- Q. And again, Mr. Littlejohn is not here today, and then the mechanic from Buckeye Tire is not here today to testify as well, correct?
 - A. That's correct.

2.1

- Q. Do you remember if Buckeye Tire gave you any sort of invoice or bill at the time of the inspection?
- A. I don't remember if he handed us a paper copy or if we got an emailed copy from his office, but certainly there was a -- there was a billing received. I don't know that it was received when he did the service or if it was received afterward.
- Q. So he billed you for putting air back in the tire, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And you did not present that, whether it was electronic or a paper, copy of any bills or invoices, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - O. So the -- Let's turn to Baker Exhibits 2

- and 3. So -- and I think you already stated this, but all of the invoices and the work orders are dated well after the inspection, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. And Baker Exhibit 5, I think you mentioned this, but did you take those pictures?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. And you took the same pictures -- you also took the pictures in Exhibit 6?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Did you use a digital camera or a phone, or something else?
 - A. It would have been a digital camera.
- Q. Okay. I think you mentioned this, but how many trucks does Baker Equipment own?
- A. Company-wide, we own probably 50, but I'm going to speak to the Monroe office, which is where I am based out of, we own two -- I'm sorry, we own three for two CDL drivers.
- Q. Do all those trucks have the same brake, or is there a variety of the type of brakes, or does that change, vary?
- A. The trucks that we use all have long stroke brake chambers, the three. We have some small straight trucks and things that are not fifth wheel

or trucks that are designed to pull heavy trailers. So I'm speaking exclusively to the semi road tractors that we're familiar with on the highway.

- Q. And you have your own shop there in Monroe, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.1

- Q. And you can replace brakes at the shop?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Do you have on hand replacement brakes and replacement brake chambers at the shop?
- A. No, sir. We order those kind of on a work order basis when we have a truck that needs repair. We will call the truck parts source and have those parts shipped in.
- Q. I think you mentioned this, but I want to ask it again. Did you provide any photos that show that the photos from your Exhibit 5 and your Exhibit 6 come from the truck subject to the inspection?
- A. I did not. I have about 50 photos taken that day of the units, but I did not submit those. I submitted only the ones that were in the document.
- Q. Is there any way to tell from looking at those pictures in your Exhibit 5 and Exhibit 6 that they come from the truck at the inspection?

A. No, there's not.

2.1

- Q. You mentioned a serial number or some sort of identification number for the truck. Can you -- is that anywhere in Exhibit 5 or Exhibit 6?
- A. The serial number for the truck is not because there's no view -- because of the location of the brake chamber and where it's positioned on the truck, there is no way to get a picture of the VIN number from the truck in the same picture that you do of the brake chamber.
- Q. Okay. And I think we talked about this, but you agree that if -- if these were indeed short stroke brakes, that the inspector wrote a good violation, you just disagree that they were long stroke brakes and therefore you were still within the acceptable measurements, correct?
- A. Yes, sir. The measurements that the inspector took, we are not contesting.

 Two-and-a-quarter inches -- we measured them when they were here.

The one that the driver didn't readjust, we got the same measurement that the inspector had, so we are not contesting the measurement taken, we got the same measurement back here at our shop.

MR. BEELER: Okay. Your Honor, can I

```
65
     ask for just a brief recess to talk with -- to see if
 1
 2
     I have any more questions, and I can chat with my
     folks?
 3
               ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yeah, you want five
 4
 5
     minutes, or --
 6
               MR. BEELER: Yeah.
 7
               ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. We'll go
     ahead and go off the record for a five minutes.
 8
     We'll come back at 2:55.
9
10
               (Recess taken.)
               ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We were off the
11
     record for about ten minutes, and before we came back
12
13
     on the record Attorney Beeler, on behalf of Staff,
14
     has circulated another proposed exhibit.
15
               We have had the opportunity to look at
16
     it, Mr. Woods has looked at it also. With that,
17
    Mr. Beeler, I'll invite you to continue with your
18
     cross-examination.
19
               MR. BEELER: Sure.
20
               (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
2.1
     By Mr. Beeler:
22
           Q. Mr. Woods, do you recognize this
     document?
23
24
           A. This is the first time I've seen the
25
     document, so...
```

- Q. Do you know what it is?
- A. It looks like a similar vehicle examination report.
 - Q. All right. Is that an examination report of Baker Equipment & Materials Ltd.?
 - A. It is.
 - Q. With the driver Jesus Garraro?
 - A. That's what it says.
 - Q. Do you know Mr. Garraro?
- 10 A. I do not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

22

23

24

- 11 Q. Do you see that the -- you see that the
 12 address on there is P.O. Box 526, Monroe, Ohio,
 13 correct?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And is that the address, or the mailing address of your shop?
- A. That is the mailing address for all of
 the Baker Equipment & Materials locations throughout
 the U.S. There are about 12 locations where we are
 based out of. It appears that this is one of our
 Florida locations.
 - Q. Okay. Do you know if this truck with the VIN number there and the plate number, do you know if you've ever used that truck at the Monroe, Ohio shop?

- A. We have never used that truck at the Monroe, Ohio shop. That truck has never been to the Monroe, Ohio shop.
 - Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- A. It is licensed out of Ohio because that is where our headquarters are.
- Q. Okay. But you do agree on that report that the -- the chamber under the brake adjustments is at least partially short stroke?
- A. I believe that's what it says for axles 1 and 2.
 - Q. Okay. Getting away from this exhibit,
 you -- you stated that the driver did the -- did his
 own brake adjustments so he could move the truck on
 the road, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. And -- and how much -- you said the driver had some significant experience in doing that, correct?
- A. Significant experience driving, significant experience doing truck inspections.

 Mechanic work, not significant experience.

We had him on FaceTime and had the

consultants of our Monroe shop helping lead him to

how to adjust the brakes to get it legal so that he

could drive back to our home location.

- Q. Okay. So did you submit any of that -- any of those videos or photos on the side of the road from Mr. Littlejohn?
 - A. Did not.
- Q. Okay. And he was sophisticated to know enough about brakes to make the adjustments with the assistance of your mechanics on the side of the road, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- 11 Q. But you also -- so -- never mind.
- MR. BEELER: That's all the questions I
- 13 | have, your Honor.
- 14 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you,
- 15 Mr. Beeler.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- 16
- 17 EXAMINATION
- 18 By the Attorney Examiner:
- 19 Q. Mr. Woods, to clarify, this Staff
- 20 Exhibit that's labeled Staff Exhibit 3 doesn't impact
- 21 any of your prior statements regarding the fact that
- 22 | you have -- is it two trucks for three drivers as you
- 23 | testified earlier, correct, out of your Monroe
- 24 location?
- A. With a slight adjustment to what you

just said. We have three trucks for two drivers.

Q. I knew I was getting it wrong.

2.1

2.2

A. That's okay. By I don't know how this is relevant. Baker is the largest concrete construction company in the United States, so we operate in a variety of areas. We don't necessarily talk to one another.

Our home addresses happen to be the same. We're a big company within corporate America. So I've never met Mr. Garraro, or that truck has never been in our shop. So I can't speak to much of what was submitted.

- Q. I appreciate that. And candidly, I think the line of questioning by the State was certainly within reason to get clarification on the heels of your testimony as to the number of trucks you have, and how the are equipped, and so your testimony I think adds some clarity regarding the fact that P.O. Box 526 Monroe, Ohio receives mail corporate wide in regard to essentially all of your trucks, correct?
 - A. Yes, your Honor.

23 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Mr. Beeler, 24 anything else on cross-examination?

MR. BEELER: No more cross-examination,

your Honor.

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Woods, anything you want to clarify? And again, we're kind of in that awkward place at this point in a proceeding.

You would be open for redirect regarding any clarification that would flow from the cross-examination. I think we have been very attentive and detail focused on making sure that you're able to tell the story freely. So I don't know that you have anything you want to clarify, but I'll invite you to do that now.

MR. WOODS: I appreciate your patience throughout this. I have nothing further.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you.

Anything further in regard to your case before we would then turn to the State and the potential either for calling -- recalling a witness and/or closing the case? Anything else you want to add for the record for my understanding?

MR. WOODS: No, your Honor.

MR. BEELER: I do have one thing, your
Honor. And sorry, I just wasn't familiar with the
process that you wanted to follow, but I do have, you
know -- usually we work to move exhibits in and -mark them and move them in, so I was waiting for that

to happen because I do have some objections.

2.1

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We were headed there next, Mr. Beeler. Thank you so much. Mr. Woods, I assume you want to -- and I think we have marked them both ways.

We'll go ahead and mark them Baker
Exhibits 1 through 7, and that would substitute and
essentially be deemed the same as Respondent's 1
through 7. So they will be Baker 1 through 7. I
assume you want to move to admit all seven of those,
sir?

MR. WOODS: Yes, your Honor.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Beeler, do you want to take them one at a time?

MR. BEELER: Yes. Well, I can say I don't have any objection to Baker Exhibits 1 and 4. And just to clarify, 4 is kind of the summary just from the FMCSA or from somebody on how you look at brakes.

is the driver's examination report, which is different than the one you admitted in that it has clarification regarding some of the put in service and some of the remediative measures, there's no objection there, that will be admitted. Exhibit 4 is

the CVSA inspection bulletin. There is no objection, that will be admitted.

(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Now, as to Exhibit 2, sir.

2.

2.1

2.2

MR. BEELER: So Exhibit 2 and 3, Staff would object just on the basis of relevance. These are all invoices and bills that are dated well after this inspection.

The tire violation happened on a certain date. The fact that, you know, these -- the tire pressure system that was billed -- that was in the bills and invoices there, it happened at a later date and is not relevant to this case.

admit Exhibits 2 and 3. While they are remote in time from the inspection that occurred here, they do go to credibility of Mr. Woods regarding the manner in which the trucks are maintained, as well as the --frankly, the expense that the company has gone through in order to add credibility or to frankly feel better insulated relative to the manner in which those are maintained.

So I believe Exhibits 2 and 3 are ordinary business records that are normally kept, and

I think they are relevant to this proceeding in regard to how trucks are operated and maintained, so those are deemed admitted over the State's objection.

2.1

(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

MR. BEELER: Okay. And then for Exhibits 5, 6, and 7, I would object based on failure to authenticate and lack of a foundation.

There's nothing in these pictures that show that the photos of the brakes and of the slack adjustors came from the truck on the day of the inspection.

There's nothing to say that Mr. Woods couldn't have taken pictures of different brakes from a different truck, or taken pictures of other brakes, you know, that he potentially had around the shop. So the objection is failure to authenticate and lack of a foundation.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you. And I will admit Exhibits -- Let's go through them individually.

So Exhibits 5 and 6 are admitted.

Mr. Woods has testified regarding the fact that he did take the pictures, so they are authenticated. If there's some issue relative to his credibility, that can be determined in regard to the admitted exhibits,

```
but I believe there has been sufficient
1
2
     authentication provided, and so those exhibits are
     admitted over the State's and Staff's objection.
 3
               (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
 4
 5
               ATTORNEY EXAMINER: In regard to
 6
     Exhibit 7, I don't see any authentication issues
7
     there. It's basically a recap regarding Code 396.3.
     Do you still object to the admission of that?
8
9
               MR. BEELER: I just objected to it
10
    because it followed from the authentication.
11
     know, it's basically just kind of a followup to
12
     Exhibit 5 and 6.
13
               ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. I'll admit
14
     that under the same reasoning then.
15
               (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
16
               ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Anything else in
17
     terms of the exhibits?
18
               MR. BEELER: No, your Honor.
19
               ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Mr. Woods,
20
     it's a little unorthodox here, but I will give you a
2.1
     chance to tell me anything else you want to tell me
2.2
     relative to the case.
23
               I'll give the State the opportunity to
24
     add anything clarifying as well. And certainly don't
25
     feel compelled to. If you feel as though you've
```

presented and I've understood, then you're welcome to pass on this, sir.

MR. WOODS: Your Honor, I would just like to say that I have nothing further and I appreciate your patience and time.

6 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.

Mr. Beeler, anything else on behalf of Staff?

8 MR. BEELER: Yes, your Honor. First,

9 | did we admit Staff Exhibit 3?

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We did not. And I
know we bounced back and forth a little bit here,

Mr. Beeler, so we have marked and you want to move to

13 | admit that, sir?

MR. BEELER: I do.

15 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Woods, any

16 objection?

3

4

5

7

MR. WOODS: No, your Honor.

18 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Staff Exhibit 3 is

19 admitted.

20 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

21 MR. BEELER: At this time, your Honor,

22 Staff would like to recall as a rebuttal witness

23 | Aaron Lockhart.

24 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Mr. Lockhart,

25 | would you -- you're still under oath, sir. Go ahead,

Mr. Beeler.

1

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

2 Aaron Lockhart,

3 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was

4 examined and testified as follows:

FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION

6 By Mr. Beeler:

- Q. Mr. Lockhart, do you have Baker -- or Company Exhibits 1 through 7 --
 - A. I do.
- Q. -- in front of you. Can you go through, you know, I guess each one -- I mean, you don't have to go through Staff Exhibit -- but yeah, just go through each exhibit and explain -- and explain your thoughts basically on the -- on those cases.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Or on those exhibits, sorry.
- 17 A. Sorry, I'm bringing them back up.
- 18 | Sorry, everything went down, Mr. Beeler. Okay.
- 19 Exhibit 1 is the inspection report. I mean, that is
- 20 pretty self-explanatory.
- 21 The inspection report is what I
- 22 | completed on the roadside as to what I seen on those
- 23 | trucks -- or on the truck that I inspected that day.
- 24 | So it was pretty self-explanatory.
- Exhibits 2 and 3, the work orders for

the tire pressure, that's good, because the type of industry that he has described that they do, there's going to be a lot of tire issues. There's going to be actually a lot of brake issues.

2.1

And if you look at CVSA, there's tire and brake issues. So Exhibit 4, the inspection bulletin, that -- the inspection bulletin is what we are trained on. So he's 100 percent accurate and correct with that inspection bulletin.

It comes from CVSA. It's what every inspector is trained on to be able to do Part A, Part B, to be able to do Level 1 inspections, Level 2 inspections, so yes, Exhibit 4 is accurate.

Exhibit 5, as he stated, there's no way to determine that these pictures came from the brake chambers on the vehicle.

- Q. What is your concern with that?
- A. My concern is -- I mean, there's probably a maintenance record, you know, with serial numbers on something that was installed, but my concern is you can take a picture of any brake chamber and present it as evidence and argue any case on brakes that's out of adjustment.

It's just -- my concern on those brake chambers is that's not the chambers I looked at

during the inspection.

2.1

Exhibit 6, the slack adjustors, that's the inner working of the slack adjustor, that's not something that we're viewed -- we view or look at roadside, unless the slack adjustor is busted open. All I can testify to is if they were out of adjustment at the time, then the slack adjustor was not working at that time.

As far as the Exhibit 7, brakes out of service, it's above 20 percent when you add the two, so the brakes were out of service.

I would like to touch base, just if I can real quick, on what you presented and was entered as Exhibit. Was it State Exhibit 3?

O. Yes.

A. Okay. That shows to the fact that Baker uses multiple different types of brake chambers on their vehicles. There's multiple inspections on that, that you entered.

Some have short stroke, some have long stroke. They have them on these same vehicles on that -- on the one that you were pointing out had short stroke on axle 1, 2, long stroke on axle 3.

The next one down is a tractor-trailer combination. They are short stroke. So that kind of

goes to the fact that the company does use both types of brake chambers. They are hauling heavy equipment, so any heavy -- heavy, heavy loads is going to wear those brakes out sooner.

I would like to touch base if I could as far as the tire pressure gauge. Accurate to a point. I did hand the tire pressure gauge to the driver. He did check it, but I did verify it after he checked it. So --

Q. Did you check it first before the driver?

2.1

A. I did not. I kicked the tire determining it was flat, handed him the inspection tool, he checked it, but I verified it after he checked it. So it was at 40 pounds.

And if the driver is able to adjust brakes -- air brakes and get them back into adjustment, I think a simple tire pressure gauge is not out of the question for that driver.

But also, it was stated that they used FaceTime and different technology like that to get the brakes back in adjustment. Nobody stated when that driver was adjusting those brakes that those were long stroke and did not need adjustment.

We're looking at those brakes at the

time the driver was adjusting those brakes. They should have said they were long stroke brakes.

- Q. Okay. On the flat tire violations, you heard Mr. Woods say that the driver completed a pretrip inspection.
- A. I did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Would that matter with a flat tire? A flat tire can happen --
 - A. It would not.
- Q. -- on the trip, right?
- 11 A. Yes, things break on the highway.

 12 That's part of trucking and that's part of our

 13 inspections. You know, a good pretrip is great, but
- 14 | tires go flat all the time.
- Q. And then finally on the brakes, it is
 your testimony that the brakes pictured in Company
 Exhibits 5 and 6 are not the brakes you inspected on
 the day of the report, correct?
- 19 A. Correct, that is my testimony.
- MR. BEELER: No further questions, your
- 21 Honor.
- 22 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you,
- 23 Mr. Beeler. Just a couple clarifications,
- 24 Mr. Lockhart.
- 25 | -

EXAMINATION

By the Attorney Examiner:

2.1

- Q. You indicate that you do at least 320 inspections a year -- I'm not trying to trick you here, so feel free to clarify -- 320 or more inspections a year. Of those, approximately how many end up in out of service findings relative to brake failure?
- A. I would say probably five percent or less. That would probably be a -- a better question for Mr. Moser statewide, but as far as mine, it's probably less than five percent.
- Q. Okay. And so that would be what, roughly 15 a year?
 - A. Roughly, yes.
 - Q. But you don't have a protocol where if you write out of service for brakes where you would necessarily take pictures and/or employ the Chamber Mate before you would make that finding, correct?
 - A. We do not.
 - Q. And you don't personally?
- 22 A. I do not, no.
 - Q. Okay. If we had pictures of the brake chambers and/or the Chamber Mate had been employed, that would certainly help clarify this issue,

correct?

2.1

A. I believe it would, yes.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. That's all I needed in terms of clarification.

Mr. Woods, again, I'm not going to let you cross-examine witnesses, but if there's anything you'd like to state for the Bench in response to the additional testimony that's been provided here today, I'll invite you to talk to me about that, sir.

Anything else you want to add?

MR. WOODS: Yes, very quickly, your

Honor. As for the reference that the driver -- or
that the mechanic should have identified the long
stroke via the FaceTime video, at that point the
violation had been written.

The driver was directed to go off to the side, fix the truck before he left. There was no chance for him to counter that argument, there was no reinspection requirement from the officer. Our driver simply made the adjustments and moved out.

So the fact that that wasn't brought up then, the violation had been written, we didn't have the experts as part of the violation verification process, so I'm not sure the logic of that argument.

Secondly, it seems really in question

that we are all making the judgment of are these long stroke or short stroke, and then it's ultimately coming back to my credibility on that in taking the pictures.

2.1

I've got over 50 pictures that I took of this. Did I do a poor job? Am I a lawyer to be able to put a good argument together and know that I should have submitted, you know, 20 pictures instead of the condensed summary that I did? That may be true.

But I've got over 50 pictures of different views of the truck, none of which you can see the truck VIN number and the truck brake chamber installed at the same time, but I assure that those pictures were taken by me with the truck before any work had been done to the truck here.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay.

MR. WOODS: And then on the tire pressure gauge, let me say the gentleman who drives this truck is five-foot-three and about 340 pounds, so he struggles to get in some tight areas, and to measure the inside tire of a tractor on that axle with the pressure of -- he's a nervous guy as well, so to get a good measurement on that would have been very tough for him. So that is all I have.

1 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Beeler, as I indicated, I'm going to let you 2 close with anything else you have. Anything else you 3 have of this witness? 4 5 MR. BEELER: No. ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Anything else you 6 7 want the Bench to know, sir? 8 MR. BEELER: No, your Honor. 9 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Well, I think 10 we have developed a very thorough record. I appreciate the attention of all the parties, and the 11 12 patience. 13 I think these virtual hearings -- I 14 quess it doesn't really matter what I think, they are 15 coming to an end, but when the parties cooperate and take their time and are patient, they certainly work 16 well, and I appreciate everyone's time and attention 17 18 and approach here today. 19 I do want to ask the parties to email 20 your exhibits to our Court Reporter so they can be 2.1 affixed, made a part of the transcript. 2.2 Valerie, can you provide your email 23 address for them to document.

ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And then if we get

(Discussion off the record.)

24

near the time of issuing the transcript, if the Court Reporter doesn't have them it will be easy to follow the trail as to where they might have broken down.

With that then, I think there's nothing else for us to attend to here today. Again, I thank all the parties, and we are closed.

> (Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 3:27 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Tuesday, June 29, 2021, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Valerie J. Grubaugh,
Court Reporter and Notary
Public in and for the State
of Ohio.

My commission expires August 11, 2026.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/14/2021 10:02:42 AM

in

Case No(s). 20-0805-TR-CVF

Summary: Transcript in the matter of the Baker Equipment and Materials, Ltd hearing held on 06/29/21 electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Grubaugh, Valerie