BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO In the Matter of Lester R. Diehl. : Case No. 09-1929-TR-CVF PROCEEDINGS before Mr. Kerry Sheets, Hearing Examiner, at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-D, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 20, 2010. ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC. 222 East Town Street, 2nd Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481Fax - (614) 224-5724

		2
1	APPEARANCES:	
2	Richard Cordray	
3	Ohio Attorney General Duane W. Lucky, Section Chief	
4	By Ms. Sarah J.Parrot Mr. Thomas G. Lindgren	
5	Assistant Attorneys General Public Utilities Section 180 East Broad Street, Floor 6	
6	Columbus, Ohio 43215	
7	On behalf of the Staff.	
8	Mar I a a hara D. Di a h l	
9	Mr. Lester R. Diehl 9623 Snapp Road	
10	DeGraff, Ohio 43318 On behalf of the Respondent, Pro Se.	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		111 100	. 1100000	.11190
				3
1	INDEX			
2				
3	WITNESSES	PAGE		
4	ROBERT J. BARRETT, JR. Direct examination by Ms. Parrot		5	
5	TOM FORBES Direct examination by Ms.Parrot	36 50 54		
7	LESTER R. DIEHL Direct testimony by Mr. Diehl Cross-examination by Ms. Parrot			
9				
10				
11	STAFF EXHIBITS	ID'D	REC'D	
12	1 - Compliance Review	15	49	
13	2 - CR Assessment Sheet	39	49	
14	3 - Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture	46	49	
15 16	4 - Notice of Preliminary Determination	48	49	
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

In Re: Proceedings 4 1 Tuesday Morning Session, 2 April 20, 2010. 3 HEARING EXAMINER: Public Utilities 5 Commission of Ohio has set for hearing at this time 6 and place Case No. 09-1929-TR-CVF, being in the 7 Matter of Lester Ray Diehl, d/b/a Ray's Trucking. 8 My name is Kerry Sheets, I'm an attorney 9 examiner assigned to hear this case. 10 May we now have the appearances of the 11 parties please. 12 MS. PARROT: Good morning, your Honor. 13 On behalf of the staff of the Public Utilities 14 Commission of Ohio, Richard Cordray, Ohio Attorney 15 General, Duane W. Lucky, Section Chief, by Thomas G. 16 Lindgren and Sarah J. Parrot, Assistant Attorneys 17 General, 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215. 18 HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. 19 Mr. Diehl, go ahead and state your name 20 and address. 21 MR. DIEHL: Lester Ray Diehl, 9623 Snapp 22 Road, DeGraff, Ohio 43318. 23 HEARING EXAMINER: Very good.

Do you have any witnesses to call this

24

25

morning?

5 1 MS. PARROT: Yes, your Honor. The staff 2 would begin by calling Inspector Robert Barrett to 3 the witness stand. (Witness sworn.) HEARING EXAMINER: Please be seated. 6 7 ROBERT J. BARRETT, JR. 8 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 9 examined and testified as follows: 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 By Ms. Parrot: 12 Good morning, Mr. Barrett. Could you 0. 13 please state your full name for the record? 14 Robert James Barrett, Jr. Α. 15 Q. How do you spell your last name please? 16 Α. B-a-r-r-e-t-t. 17 Thank you. Q. 18 What is your business address? 19 Α. I work out of the Columbus office, 180 20 East Broad Street. I am a field staff member 21 assigned to Wapakoneta, Ohio. 22 And who is your employer? 0. 23 Α. The State of Ohio, the Public Utilities 24 Commission of Ohio.

And what is your role with the Public

25

Q.

Utilities Commission of Ohio?

- A. I'm a hazardous materials investigator.
- Q. What are your duties or responsibilities in that position?
- A. We ensure compliance with Federal Motor
  Carrier safety regulations and the hazmat regulations
  and the Ohio Administrative Code upon motor carriers
  and commercial motor vehicle drivers, conduct safety
  audits on uniform carriers, and we do roadside
  inspections and incident follow-up if there's a
  hazmat spill relating to transportation.
- Q. And what equipment has been issued to you so that you may perform your job?
- A. I'm assigned a marked State of Ohio enforcement vehicle, uniforms, electronical equipment, laptop, scanner, administrative supplies.
- Q. How long have you worked for the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio?
- A. Just about eight and a half years. I started mid-December of '01.
- Q. And over the course of those eight and a half years, approximately, have you been employed in your current position or have you had other roles with the Commission?
  - A. No, entirely hazmat specialist.

- Q. Where were you employed prior to your employment with the Commission?
- A. Department of Public Safety with the State Highway Patrol.
  - Q. And what was your role there?
  - A. I was a state trooper.
- Q. How many years were you employed as a state trooper?
  - A. About 16 and a half.
  - Q. Thank you.

1

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Do you hold any certifications or have you received training that helps you to perform your job as an investigator?

A. Yes. I went through the FMCSR and NTC provided training to provide roadside inspections, vehicle inspections. I've been through the hazmat training, general hazmat, bulk package, cargo tank level, radioactive.

I've had compliance review training, safety audit training. Quite thorough training, as a matter of fact.

O. Sounds like it.

Are you familiar with the business that operates under the legal name of Lester R. Diehl and does business under the name of Ray's Trucking?

A. Yes.

2.3

- Q. Did you conduct a compliance review of that company in August of 2009?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. What prompted you to conduct that compliance review?
- A. Federal Motor Carrier Safety

  Administration Columbus office provided a list of

  what we call priority carriers, carriers that have

  been deemed to be deficient in various aspects of the

  regulations either through accidents, roadside

  inspections, or possible complaints. And they were

  provided to me on an assignment list as a priority

  assignment to do an audit.
  - Q. Where did the compliance review occur?
- A. It was done at the place of business for Ray's Trucking, and that was at the residence at 9623 Snapp Road, Mr. Diehl's residence.
  - Q. Thank you.

Was the compliance review that you conducted in August of 2009, was that your first encounter with this particular company?

- A. As I recall, yeah, it was.
- Q. Are you aware whether or not this company had been subject to a prior compliance review?

A. I'm required to do various background preparation for the audit, and there was nothing to indicate they'd been through it. And in conversation with Mr. Diehl this was his first regulatory contact as far as an on-site review or assessment of their compliance.

- Q. You mentioned that you performed some preliminary work to prepare, I guess, for the review. Would you please elaborate on that?
- A. We go into some of the federal websites and obtain their previous performance records. We go through and check they're a for-hire carrier and we go through the federal licensing and insurance website, verify they do have the appropriate insurance on file.

We run a motor carrier profile through the motor carrier management inspection, which is basically a database that captures all of their performance.

If they're a limited liability company or a corporation, we go on file through the Secretary of State to verify the legal name, that type of thing.

That was all done ahead of time.

Q. And then once you've done that how do you inform the company that you're going to be conducting

this compliance review?

- A. My personal protocol is that if it's a complaint, we normally or I normally go in unannounced. Meaning I just show up at their place of business. If it's a priority list assignment, I found that it's more beneficial to both parties if you call and make advanced notice and give them some form of a detailed list as far as what records you're going to need to see, give them a chance to get things in place.
- Q. So did you give some advance notice to the company in this particular case that you would be --
- A. I made a note in my review that I did. I don't recall, having been so long ago to an extent, but, yes, I did.
- Q. But you documented that fact that you'd given them some advance notice?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What equipment did you use to actually complete the compliance review? How do you go about making the review?
- A. We do everything electronically. So I have a laptop, we utilize a federal software program and we actually plug in the data from the motor

carrier.

I have a portable scanner and printer that I take so if there are records that I need to copy or maintain on file for my own, we scan things directly right into the lop.

- Q. So you mentioned that you used the commuter to plug in information. Does that process then generate some type of report?
- A. Yes. The present program generates a written version of the audit, captures the violations and logistical information of the motor carrier.
- Q. And at what point in the process do you prepare that audit report?
- A. Well, when you first go in obviously you're going to complete part A which is your logistic names, addresses, phone numbers, how many trucks, how many drivers, the extent of their operation, tax ID number, that type of information. That's what we call part A.

And then that's done within the first several hours to initiate the review. Then we get into the gathering of information. And that's considered part B of the review that we find enough evidence that substantiates violation of the either the FMCSR or the HMR and that's captured in part B

violations.

- Q. And those acronyms you just used --
- A. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations and the Hazmat Regulations.
  - Q. Thank you for clarifying that.

So would you say that the information that you compiled and input into this report, would you say it's accurate?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Because you're doing this at the time of the compliance review itself?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And so once you've completed the report, what do you do with it at that point?
- A. Once the review is completed and copy is printed out and provided to the motor carrier, or in this case Mr. Diehl, we go over the violations in part B -- verify personal part A is correct. Then we go over the violations in part B, make sure he understands what violations pertain to.

We have a section called recommendations which anytime we have a violation in part B, we tailor our recommendation and counteract or corrective action of violation.

That's done at what we call the closing

or exit interview, and then motor carrier or in this case Mr. Diehl would sign for the review. At that point the review is electronically uploaded through the laptop in to the Commission.

- Q. So the report is sent then to the Commission at that point?
  - A. To Columbus, yes.

- Q. What types of records are reviewed during the course of the compliance review?
- A. My method is upon completing the initial interview and trying to ascertain the scope of the company's operation, I go into their insurance, make sure that they have proper insurance on file, which is in part 387 of the Federal Safety Carrier Regulations.

Upon verifying that they have the appropriate insurance on file we then crosscheck that against the Federal Motor Carrier Safety

Administration licensing and insurance website to ensure that what they're showing us is what's actually on file with the feds, I guess.

We then go into accident review. We look at the company's loss run report, we look at their motor carrier management information system database to ensure are there any accidents that I'm aware of

in the database that either the carrier is not declaring or vise-versa, sometimes we'll find an accident that they've had that's not on file with us. That goes both ways. We make sure that the proper records are maintained, that's part 390 of the FMCSR.

We go into the driver qualification. We want to make sure that the proper records -- that the drivers are properly qualified for the carrier allowing them to operate a commercial vehicle.

We go into drug and alcohol testing. If the company operates a CDL vehicle, we want to ensure that they're in compliance with part 40 and 382, which is the requirement for drug and alcohol testing.

Go into driving violations in 392. We go into parts and accessories of their trucks in part 393. Hours of service, which is what most people would call a logbook, to ensure that the carriers are operating within the hours of service rules.

And finally if they're a non-hazmat carrier I finish up with part 396 which deals with the maintenance records and maintaining of their equipment.

Q. Thank you.

So those types of records that you just

gave us an overview of, are those the records that you were reviewing in this particular case as well?

- A. Pretty much in that order, yes. That's how I go about my review.
  - Q. Thank you.

MS. PARROT: May I approach, your Honor?
HEARING EXAMINER: You may.

MS. PARROT: Your Honor, at this time I would ask that Staff Exhibit 1 be marked for identification purposes.

HEARING EXAMINER: It will be so marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. Mr. Barrett, do you have a copy of what's been marked as Staff Exhibit 1?
  - A. I do.
  - Q. Do you recognize this document?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Would you please identify it for us?
- A. It's a recreation or electronically prepared copy of the compliance review through the Capri software that I completed when I did
  Mr. Diehl's audit.
  - Q. So this report was prepared by you?
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. And a copy of this report was sent to the

Commission; is that correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. Did you prepare this report as part of your official job duties?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And at this time if you would please direct your attention to the first part of the report which I believe is the first two pages. Would you please give us an overview of the information that's provided in this section?
- A. That's part A, it consists of page 1 and page 2. And as I previously stated, that is the logistical information for the carrier or subject of the audit.

In this case it was Mr. Diehl operating as a sole proprietor. The legal name is Lester R. Diehl, which is his legal name, as a d/b/a of Ray's Trucking, and then the information operation type, all the logistical information that was given to me at the time of the review opening.

- Q. Would you say that Staff Exhibit No. 1 is an accurate representation of the actual report that you prepared?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And is this report compiled in a standard

format that's used in each compliance review case?

A. Yes.

2.3

Q. If you'd please turn now to part B of the report. I believe that's the starts on the third page.

This appears to contain a summary of the violations that you noted during the course of the compliance review; is that correct?

- A. Yes. Part B is the violation section.
- Q. And if you would please take us through the first violation that you've indicated there and let's go through in some level of detail here and start where it indicates in that first box to the left it says "Federal" and then "acute." Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Would you please explain that to us what that field represents?
- A. Ray's Trucking operates combination commercial motor vehicle semi tractor/semi trailer. Those vehicles are subject to the CDL required in part 383 in the FMCSR.

Any commercial motor carrier who operates or drivers who operate vehicles subject to the CDL requirement, the motor carrier is required to

implement a drug and alcohol testing program.

Upon initiating my review, I discovered that Mr. Diehl had not initiated a drug and alcohol testing program at that point. The CDL section as with drug and alcohol testing is actually a federal violation. So those rules are going to be the same no matter what state a commercial vehicle requirement the CDL operates.

And since Mr. Diehl operates vehicles within Ohio and beyond, he's an interstate carrier and violation was written as a federal violation. He had no drug and alcohol testing program whatever, so upon initiating review.

- Q. And the designation "acute," what does that refer to?
- A. An acute is the most serious type of a violation as far as severity that we can discover on a compliance review. I would relate it to a felony in the criminal system.
- Q. And then I see there it indicates the section 382.115, subsection (a), does that refer to the Federal Motor Carrier safety regulations, is that what that represents?
- A. Yeah, right, it says they shall implement a drug and alcohol program.

Q. And moving over to the right I see there's a field there "Discovered" and also "Checked"? You see those? What do those represent?

A. If we are required to check a variety of records under one particular statute, if we're required to look at 30 days of records, that would be under number checked, "discovered" would be the amount of violations or days of violations discovered.

Since they don't have or didn't have a drug and alcohol testing program to satisfy FMCSA, we simply recorded as 1 of 1. They had no program, one discovery out of one check.

## Q. Thank you.

And then below that I think you already mentioned there's a description there of the particular violation which I think you've already explained to us. What is the "Example" section? What does that represent?

- A. For jurisdiction we're required to document a driver's name, a particular date in which the driver would have operated a commercial vehicle in interstate commerce subject to this rule.
- Q. So it's called an "example." So is it truly an example in the sense that it's just one

example of a particular violation?

A. Right.

- Q. It's not a comprehensive list of all violations that you noted?
- A. No. It's just one day in which I discovered that a commercial vehicle driver subject to 393 subject to 40 and 382 operated a commercial vehicle from Ohio or beyond back to Ohio. And this example was from Illinois back to Ohio without the carrier having implemented a drug and alcohol testing program.
  - Q. Thank you.

All right, let's go through the other violations that you indicated in the report. The second one, what did you find there?

A. The second one is under part 391 which is in the driver qualification section. The carrier only employed two drivers at the time of the review. So obviously I only have two driver files in which I was required to check.

If you look under the violations discovered to check, you'll see checked as two. They only had two which I was required to review.

The violation example in No. 2 is actually for a violation of failing to obtain what we

call a preemployment MVR on a driver. Which is an abstract printout of the driver's license history through in this case the Bureau of Motor Vehicles for each driver employed.

That is required to be made in 30 days of the driver's date of hire. And that's part of the driver's qualification file forever.

So in this case I was required to look at two driver qualification files, which I did. I discovered that neither file contained a preemployment MVR that was obtained within 30 days of the driver's reported date of hire.

- O. And "MVR" stands for?
- A. Motor vehicle report.
- Q. Thank you.

And again, there you've noted a particular example --

- A. That's correct.
- Q. -- of the trip there.

And the third violation please?

A. Third violation is continuing under the driver qualification section for using a driver not medically examined and certified during the preceding 24 months.

Again for the records checked and

reviewed there were two driver files required to be checked. I found one driver failed to have a medical certificate as required.

2.3

All commercial vehicle drivers are required to have a DOT physical or examination done to certain protocol in order to operate a commercial motor vehicle. Those certificates can be issued from 30 days up to two years maximum depending on the driver's medical state.

If you're in good health, can be granted up to two years total. If you have one of any ailments, maybe high blood pressure as an example, they could issue it for 30 days and require a follow-up.

In this case Christopher Diehl, who was Mr. Diehl's son, had a medical looks like 1/21/08 and expired on 1/21/09 and the review was done in August of '09. So he did not renew the certificate after it expired.

- Q. Continuing on, move on down, the fourth violation there indicates that this is a state violation; is that correct?
- A. Yes. The first, the first violation as I stated was this drug and alcohol testing. The second and third violations in 391 were in the driver

qualifications. So the remainder of the driver qualification was found to be in compliance to where I did not cite a violation.

No. 4 goes into part 395 which is actually the hours of service portion of the review. All drivers who operate a commercial vehicle are subject to the hours of service requirements either need to have a timecard if they drive locally within a hundred air miles of their driver's reporting location, or if they exceed a hundred air miles they're subject to actually preparing a logbook for each day in which they operate.

They're subject to 11 hours of maximum drive time, which is actually behind the wheel.

They're not permitted to drive after 14 hours, which is driving and on-duty time combined.

If the motor carrier operates seven days a week, they're governed by what's called the 70-hour rule, meaning in any floating eight-day period, they can't dive after a driver accumulates 70 hours on duty. If a motor carrier operates less than seven days, they're bound by the 60-hour rule.

And back to your question, violation No. 4 was to indicate, and actually that's what we call a "ghost" violation. May be a little bit confusing.

There were actually no violations discovered there if you look under the discovery checked. Thirteen days of records were checked for hours of service but there were no violations discovered.

For each time we go in to do a compliance review there's a sample size, we're required to look at sample size of records. In this case the carrier employed two drivers. So as an investigator I'm required to review 30 days of records for hours of service per each driver for a total in this case of 60, maybe 62 depending on the months reviewed.

If a driver operates within the state of Ohio solely, it can fall under what we call a state code or state violation. It's where the State of Ohio has adopted the federal regulation dealing with the hours of service.

Again not to try to confuse you, the way the feds have us report if the driver operates interstate on any given day, the following seven days no matter how they operate, if it's intrastate, within the state of Ohio, or interstate, those seven days are always recorded as an interstate federal day.

So out of the record I was required to check, I found 13 days that fell under the state

code, there were no violations discovered. So again that indicates zero out of 13.

- Q. Okay, so you've documented what you did there and what you found but there wasn't a violation.
- A. You basically have to manipulate the software to let it realize you met the sample size of the records. You're accounting for that 13 days. No violation discovered.
- Q. Okay. So then the fifth violation there appears to be a federal violation.
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And that appears to be the same hours of service regulation there that's at issue. It does appear you found some violations what respect to the federal regulation.
- A. That is correct. The two, violation 4 and violation 5 actually go together to indicate how many total records did I review for compliance with the 11-hour rule which is the maximum drive time.

So actually I would have checked 33 plus
13 which would have been 46 hours or records for
hours of service in compliance with the 11-hour rule.
And there were three discovered out of the 33 in
violation No. 5.

The example was 6/2 of '09 Mr. Diehl, Ray Diehl drove for 19 hours since his previous ten hours off. And that was an interstate trip he drove from Saint Marys, Ohio to Sauk Rapids, Minnesota.

But again, you're combining 4 and 5 together and you're probably asking yourself, well, that's not the required 60 records for hours of service compliance, and I don't mean to jump ahead, but in order to tell you that I met the sample size, if you go ahead to violation 8, you'll see there were additional violations cited for failing to have a record of duty status prepared. When you add the numbers together, you meet the numbers.

Q. Thank you for explaining that.

Let's move to the next page of part B, that's page 2 of 3. And actually, I'm sorry, I'm getting ahead of myself.

6 and 7, violation sections 6 and 7 appear to relate again with we've got the state component there and the federal as well; is that correct for the 14-hour rule?

A. Yes. Basically I'm verifying the compliance on the same records of duty status for the 14-hour rule as I did the state. So the counts are going to be identical in 4, 5, 6, and 7. Which

violation 6 being the ghost violation, zero violations discovered, and No. 7 being the amount of records that were found to be in violation.

- Q. With respect to section 8 there, violation 8.
- A. Violation 8 were days in which there were no records of duty status prepared which they should have.
- Q. Then No. 10 looks like we're moving to part 396 of the Federal Motor Carrier safety regulations.
  - A. Right.

- Q. What's part 10? I'm sorry, violation 10.
- A. Violation No. 10, correct, it is in part 396 which is maintenance and 396.11 is the DVIR requirement. It is a written report of what we call the driver vehicle inspection report which is where the "DVIR" comes from obviously.

It's a record of a post-trip inspection.

On any given day when a commercial vehicle was operated either intrastate commerce, within the state of Ohio, or beyond, interstate commerce, at the completion of that driver's tour of duty on any given day they're required to give a post-trip inspection and give a written record of that inspection for each

unit, for the truck and the trailer.

And the record retention on the DVIR is 90 days from the date of completion. So violation No. 10 and violation No. 11 actually go together. The carrier failed to require the drivers or their drivers to do a DVIR, so there were essentially no records to look at.

What I had to do was then go through and document each day in which a vehicle was driven, a commercial vehicle was driven in intrastate commerce, each day they were driven in interstate commerce.

It's a combination vehicle which his were a tractor and a trailer would be considered two missing records. So there were 32 out of 32 under federal and 32 out of 32 under the state section.

- Q. So 10 pertains to the state section and 11 pertains to the federal section for the interstate trips.
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Several of these violations I notice indicate that they're critical violations as opposed to we talked about the acute violation earlier and what that meant. What does "critical" indicate?
- A. "Critical" indicates a pattern of non-compliance. As an example, on hours of duty

status, if the required sample size would be 60, if you meet or exceed 10 percent of your sample size, it can trigger a critical violation. It just indicates that the non-compliance is more widespread where an acute violation it simply has to occur one time.

Thank you very much for explaining that.

- And then on the last page of part B, that's page 3 of 3 of part B, it indicates that the proposed safety rating is "conditional." Would you please tell us what that means? How that's determined?
- A. As the investigator I go in and I review the records and if I can substantiate a violation, it's cited in part B as we just went through. The software program will decipher and calculate that safety rating by itself based on the violations that have been input into the program.
  - Q. Okay.

Q.

- A. So there's really no way for me to take a compliance review and give somebody a better rating in which they would have normally received. It's all done electronic, I really don't have any role over that.
- Q. And what is the significance of receiving a conditional rating for the carrier?

A. Currently under the program that we operate, a motor carrier, once they go through an enforcement audit such as this, they can either be one of three ways: They can either be a satisfactory, which is as good as can you get, you may be low end on the satisfactory, you may be high end.

Conditional is middle of the road.

You're not perfect but yet in an unsatisfactory would be the bottom of the spectrum. If somebody flat out is not in compliance, they're going to receive an unsatisfactory rating.

So in this instance the carrier came back conditional. Which in my experience having never been through an audit really is not unrealistic or uncharacteristic for a carrier to receive a conditional rating first time around.

## Q. Thank you.

Let's turn the page to part C of your report please. And would you please tell us what this part, the purpose of this part is?

A. Part 3 is something -- part C is something that I complete once the review is completed at the motor carrier. It's basically a synopsis of what I encountered from first contact

through the completion of the review.

I put a little bit more detail in my part C probably than some investigators do, but really part C, the intention of that is to be available for subsequent investigators when they go in what did the investigator previously encounter within this company. And like I said, it's a recap really of what I discovered at the time I walked in the door.

- Q. So that would be the "Remarks" section that you're referring to there specifically?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Kind of a narrative summary of what you found during the course of the compliance review? Is that a fair statement of what that represents?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And then at the top of the part C I see there it indicates that the reason for the review again was that this company was on the priority list that you explained to us earlier.
- A. Yes, that's correct. I apologize, I skipped right down to "remarks."
  - Q. Quite okay.

And then it also indicates -- actually I should jump back there. Indicates "Safestat," category "E." What does that refer to?

- A. It's an alpha character that's provided by FMCSA with an alpha character A being someone who's on the higher non-compliance, where an H or an I which would be the highest or the best of the Safestat priority which you can be. That's really about the best way I can explain it.
  - Q. So it's a classification basically?
- A. Right. If I have six carriers to audit on my list, they prefer that we knock out -- start with your A carriers, B carriers, and work your way down your list.
- Q. Okay. And it indicates there that the planned action was "compliance monitoring"? Does that indicate that in the future that the company is subject to continued monitoring or what does that refer to?
  - A. Yes. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And then below that you've already given us a very good overview of the various parts of the Federal Motor Carrier safety regulations that you conducted your review based upon those sections, this part, and I can that's all summarized there as well; is that right?
  - A. Yes.

Q. And then the "Remarks" section, you

already kind of mentioned that for us. Is there anything you would like to change or correct in your remarks section?

A. No.

- Q. It's a fair characterization of what you found during the course of the compliance review?
- A. Yes. As I said, it was prepared right at that time.
  - Q. Thank you.

Did you interview anyone at the company during the course of the compliance review?

A. I just worked with Mr. Diehl himself. He was the person that retrieved records upon request and if there were areas of non-compliance, like as an example in the DVIR, tried to go over what he needed to do in the future.

I don't recall, I think his son may have stopped in or out at one point, but I don't know if I actually interviewed him as far as official interview other than just an introductory.

- Q. So you primarily were working with Mr. Lester Ray Diehl?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you did it sounds like have a discussion about what you found and what's required

under the regulations; is that correct?

A. Yes. He wasn't subject to the safety audit program. The safety audit program was an educational outreach program designed by FMCSA but he was established prior to and was not applicable to following the safety audit program.

As I said, it's not uncommon or uncharacteristic for somebody the first time around, especially somebody who's a small scale motor carrier sole proprietor to not be aware of the regulations and to not be in compliance.

- Q. I think you mentioned several times the FMCSA? Just for the record.
- A. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.
  - Q. Thank you.

Is there anything else regarding your compliance review that you've not yet mentioned today that you think is important for the Commission to know?

A. No. Just one thing that I would like to state, that it's obvious that Mr. Diehl's a small time in the big scheme of motor carriers. He employs himself and his son. He operates out of his home. He did not have an office or anything set up there.

He did not have a maintenance facility.

If it's bit cold and snowing, he's not doing -- he's either not doing the maintenance on his truck or he has to take it someplace else. Because he was doing it in his driveway.

As far as the conditions during the

audit, you know, we're sitting at his kitchen table. It's not the most professional setting by any means. I'm not going to say it's the worst, but it wasn't a good environment to actually conduct a compliance review. But we got through it and obviously was not very organized. And hopefully that's changed since August of '08.

- Q. '08 or '09, I'm sorry?
- A. '09, yes, I'm sorry. Thank you. I apologize.
- MS. PARROT: Your Honor, I have no further questions.
  - HEARING EXAMINER: Do you have any questions?
- MR. DIEHL: No, sir.
- HEARING EXAMINER: No questions. You're excused.
- MS. PARROT: Your Honor, at this time the staff would call Mr. Tom Forbes.

36 1 (Witness sworn.) 2 TOM FORBES being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows: 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 By Ms. Parrot: 8 Good morning, Mr. Forbes. Would you Q. 9 please state your full name for the record? 10 Tom Forbes, F-o-r-b-e-s. Α. 11 Ο. And your business address please? 12 180 East Broad Street, Fourth Floor, Α. 13 Columbus, Ohio 43215. 14 By whom are you employed? Q. 15 The Public Utilities Commission Α. 16 Transportation Department, Compliance Division. 17 What is your specific position within the 0. 18 Compliance Division? 19 Α. I'm a compliance officer. 20 What are your duties and responsibilities Q. 21 as a compliance officer? 22 I answer technical calls from the 23 regulated community, I review roadside inspections

and compliance reviews and assess forfeitures based

on the information provided in those documents.

24

25

I attend training, I testify at hearings, and I conduct enough roadside inspections to maintain my certifications.

- Q. How long have you worked for the Public Utilities Commission?
  - A. Five years.

2.3

- Q. And how long have you been employed in your current position?
  - A. Five years.
- Q. Do you hold any certifications or have you received any special training?
- A. Yes, ma'am. I attended the North

  American driver vehicle inspection report training to
  inspect commercial motor vehicles, hazardous

  materials inspections, cargo tank inspections, other
  bulk package inspections, radioactive inspections and
  compliance review.
- Q. In the course of your job duties have you had the opportunity to review the Compliance
  Division's file on this particular case?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
    - MS. PARROT: May I approach, your Honor?
      HEARING EXAMINER: You may.
- Q. Mr. Forbes, I've handed you what's been marked as Staff Exhibit 1. Do you recognize this

document?

2.3

- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Please identify it for us.
- A. This was a compliance review that was conducted by Specialist Barrett on Lester R. Diehl, operating as Ray's Trucking.
- Q. Is this document part of the file that you reviewed for this case?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Is Staff Exhibit 1 a document that's regularly maintained by the Compliance Division staff in the course of its business?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Would you please tell us how the compliance review report reaches the Public Utilities Commission?
- A. It is electronically transmitted by the specialist to the Enforcement Division, a copy of it is made and is hand-delivered to the Compliance Division.
- Q. And then what happens at that point once it's received?
- A. It is assigned to a compliance officer.

  They enter the data in the computer based on what is in the compliance review and then they fill out an

assessment worksheet and mail any letters of fines or violations as are appropriate.

Q. You mentioned that they fill out an assessment worksheet. Would you please tell us generally how that process works?

2.3

A. Typically as a violation code cite, the federal violation cite is listed in the assessment worksheet. It is reviewed against the list in the federal regulations to determine if it is a critical or an acute violation. It may also be neither.

For critical and acute violations fines are generated if they exceed -- if critical violations exceed the 10 percent threshold. And all that data is plugged into the assessment chart and the dollar amount is determined for the appropriate forfeiture.

MS. PARROT: May I approach, your Honor?
HEARING EXAMINER: You may.

MS. PARROT: Your Honor, at this time I ask that Staff Exhibit 2 be marked for identification purposes.

HEARING EXAMINER: So marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

Q. Mr. Forbes, do you recognize what's been marked as Staff Exhibit 2?

A. Yes, ma'am.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. What is this document please?
- A. This is the assessment chart I was referencing earlier on the case for Ray's Trucking with the compliance review number CR09C344.
- Q. So this is the assessment worksheet that was completed for the compliance review done on Ray's Trucking?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And it looks like the assessment was done on September 18, 2009; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And appears that it was done by Christina Ross who is the compliance officer.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So you yourself did not complete this worksheet.
  - A. I did not.
- Q. Did you have the opportunity though to go through it and review it before your testimony today?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
  - Q. Thank you.

And is this document regularly maintained by the Compliance Division staff in the ordinary course of business?

A. Yes.

- Q. Let's go through the assessment for the first violation in particular. I'm not sure that we need to go through each one, but we'll start with the first one and if you could please walk us through it.
- A. The first violation is for 382.115(a). That was the drug and alcohol program, failing to have a drug and alcohol testing program. That is an acute violation.

Acute violations have a base forfeiture of \$1,000. And it goes down this table and it gets to the number of violations down under "sum" and this was one violation because it's a program violation since missing the whole program, so 1 is multiplied by 1,000 to come up with \$1,000 forfeiture.

- Q. You mentioned that the amount of the acute violation is \$1,000, and I see that it also indicates a critical violation would be assessed the amount of 400. How are those determined?
- A. Those are determined by the Commission.

  Those are the amounts for all compliance reviews.

  Those are the base amounts for all compliance reviews assessed by the Commission.
- Q. And then it looks like you also consider other factors, such as the extent of the violation,

culpability and so forth. Would you please expand on that for us?

2.3

A. The extent of the violation for acute violations is always 1. For critical violations if there is less than 10 percent it would be a zero.

And it's a multiplication factor so that would mean there would be no fine if it's less than 10 percent.

Culpability is -- there's standard culpability and there is willful conduct where somebody was trying to deceive or fraudulently hide a document. None of these violations were for willful conduct. These were all for standard actions.

As Mr. Barrett stated, there were no previous compliance reviews so this carrier has no history with the Public Utilities Commission previously violating these same sections of rules. So the standard history of 1 is used.

Then comes to the sum of violations, and that is how many violations did Mr. Barrett discover based on the number checked.

- Q. And then the repeated violations portion of the assessment, when is that relevant?
- A. When there is more than one violation the repeated violations are at 25 percent of the original assessment. So for thousand dollar violations,

repeated violations would go for 250 and for \$400 violations, repeated violations would go at \$100.

There is a caveat to that that for 396 violations repeated violations are only \$25. But for all other sections.

- Q. And then finally the ability to pay factor, how is that used?
- A. It's based on the gross income that was provided by the specialist and the PUCO caps their forfeitures at 1 percent of the gross income per violation.
- Q. And then finally you reach a total for that particular violation, that particular code section then at the bottom of the assessment worksheet it looks like.
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And so then would you take those totals for each violation and add those together to reach a grand total for the amount of the forfeiture?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. You mentioned you've had the chance to review this worksheet. Are there any corrections or additions that you need to make to it at this time?
- A. Yes. I discovered two errors in the worksheet when I was reviewing it. The first error

is for what's listed as violation No. 4 on page 1 of the worksheet. It shows three violations discovered of 33.

That does not meet the 10 percent requirement, so the extent should have been listed as a zero rather than a 1 and it would change that \$600 to zero dollars.

The second violation with an error is violation No. 7. The 395.8(a) section and in the math for repeated violations each repeated violation should have been at \$100. 11 times 100 would have been 1,100 and it's listed as 775. So that violation would have been increased by \$325.

The first violation mentioned, violation No. 4 would have been reduced by 600 showing a net difference of \$275 that this case is overassessed. It was originally assessed at \$7,025. Deducting the \$275 it was overassessed, the correct forfeiture would have been \$6,750.

- Q. So is the new figure that you've just mentioned, \$6,750, is that the grand total that you -- of the forfeiture that you would recommend to the Commission?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
  - Q. Do you feel that that amount is a

reasonable recommendation to make to the Commission?

A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. Are the dollar amounts and the process you've just described for us, is that consistent with the federal government's uniform fine assessment program?
- A. We follow the same pattern of critical and acute violations that they do. The dollar amounts are less.
- Q. So actually less harsh, is that what you're saying?
  - A. Financially less harsh, yes.
  - Q. Than the federal program.

And is this process, is it used consistently by the PUCO staff for compliance review assessments that are done?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And I think you mentioned also that part of your job is to issue notices to carriers about how this process operates; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Would you please tell us what the nature of the notices that are sent; what's described to the carrier?
  - A. For compliance review the carrier

receives what's called a notice of apparent violation and intent to assess forfeiture. That's the first document the carrier receives. It lists the violations that are listed in either the compliance review or the assessment chart and the monetary amount the Commission is proposing to assess for that violation.

With that document is an explanation sheet to tell the carrier -- an instruction sheet to tell the carrier how to pay the forfeiture or request a telephone conference if they wish to provide mitigating circumstances or corrective measures.

Q. Thank you.

2.1

2.3

MS. PARROT: May I approach, your Honor?
HEARING EXAMINER: You may.

MS. PARROT: Your Honor, I would like to mark Staff Exhibit No. 3 for identification purposes.

HEARING EXAMINER: So marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. Mr. Forbes, do you recognize what's been marked as Staff Exhibit No. 3?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
  - Q. Could you please tell us what it is?
- A. This is the notice of apparent violation and intent to assess forfeiture I was previously

discussing as what was sent to the carrier.

- Q. And is this an accurate representation of the notice that was sent to Mr. Diehl?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. Once this notice is received what happens at that point?
- A. Mr. Diehl had the option to either pay the forfeiture or request a telephone conference. In this particular case Mr. Diehl requested a telephone conference.
- Q. And then what was the outcome of that conference?
- A. No settlement was reached or resolution was reached at the telephone conference.
- Q. And was any further notice then sent to Mr. Diehl at that point?
- A. Yes. Then Mr. Deal was sent what's called a notice of preliminary determination. In essence says we had a telephone conference and was unable to resolve this case.
- With it comes an instruction sheet that either instructs Mr. Diehl how to pay the forfeiture or request an administrative hearing and the timelines to do such.

MS. PARROT: May I approach, your Honor?

1 HEARING EXAMINER: You may. 2 MS. PARROT: Your Honor, at this time I 3 would like to mark Staff Exhibit 4. HEARING EXAMINER: So marked. 5 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 6 Mr. Forbes, do you recognize Staff Q. 7 Exhibit 4? 8 Α. Yes, ma'am. 9 Would you identify it for us please? Q. 10 This is the notice of preliminary Α. 11 determination that was provided to Mr. Diehl after 12 conclusion of the telephone conference. 13 Is this Staff Exhibit 4, is it an 14 accurate representation of the letter of the notice 15 that was sent to Mr. Diehl? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Mr. Forbes, are Staff Exhibits 3 and 4 Ο. 18 maintained by the Compliance Division staff in the 19 ordinary course of business? 20 Α. Yes, ma'am. 21 MS. PARROT: Your Honor, I have no 22 further questions. 2.3 HEARING EXAMINER: Very well. 24 Mr. Diehl, do you have questions?

MR. DIEHL: No, sir.

1	HEARING EXAMINER: You're excused.
2	MS. PARROT: Your Honor, at this time I
3	would move for the admission of Staff Exhibits 1
4	through 4.
5	HEARING EXAMINER: I will admit those
6	exhibits into evidence at this time.
7	(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
8	MS. PARROT: The staff has no further
9	witnesses.
10	HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Diehl, do you wish
11	to provide testimony?
12	MR. DIEHL: I don't know how to do it.
13	I'm just discussing the amount of fine, that's all
14	I'm really here for. I don't disagree with what
15	Mr. Barrett found.
16	HEARING EXAMINER: You need to state that
17	on the stand if you want to.
18	MR. DIEHL: Okay, not a problem.
19	(Witness sworn.)
20	HEARING EXAMINER: Please be seated.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## LESTER R. DIEHL

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

## DIRECT TESTIMONY

HEARING EXAMINER: You can go ahead and provide your historical narrative of events.

THE WITNESS: I got notified by the Commission that Mr. Barrett was going to come out and give me an audit. I made one phone call to him so we could roughly set up a time and he sent me a letter out saying what he was going to need to go over so I could help provide.

So when the day come, he showed up, I had very little because I started this company as myself and then I grew and got bigger and my son just started driving for me. And I had no way of knowing what all I needed because it -- as a small guy, that's not published for me to just get ahold of.

And things he found wrong with me, I'm human, I did make a mistake and not be able to do all this. I feel the fine is just way out of hand. I was brought up to use common sense and to me this isn't common sense to fine somebody like me this kind of money.

And I admit to making the mistakes. I

didn't have the proper knowledge. Like he said, I operate out of my house. I drive all the time because I drive one of the trucks. My son's gone all the time. We do our own mechanic work. And some of the violations nobody has discussed this till today how we done anything.

Other than what Mr. Barrett found out when he was out there, and of course he can only do so much in his line of work. And I just feel like other than tabling half this fine back for another audit, I just feel the fine is just way too much for a small person like me.

\$7,000, I'm going to have to sell trucks and do something else. Because I can't afford \$7,000 fine and still make my truck payments and try to survive.

Because I never considered myself an employee, I just always drove the trucks. We paid the bills out of what money come home. We needed parts for the truck, we went down and paid it.

So as far as my drug and alcohol, I guess since I don't consider myself an employee, because I never dealt with employees before, I just never done none of this stuff because when I looked into some of it, at that time starting this the only program I

could get into was going to cost me like 5 or \$600 upfront to get a drug program.

Mr. Barrett did straighten me out on that and we have started a drug program on both me and my son driving records. He helped me get that straightened out so we have started this stuff now.

At that point I didn't -- I couldn't find no information out. What little bit I was home was afterhours because I usually get up and leave at 2:00, 3:00 o'clock in the morning, don't get home till 7:00 or 8:00 o'clock at night. There was nobody I could call at them hours to find out all this information what I did need to do.

My wife's gone, she baby-sits the grandbabies at my daughter's house all the time so she's not at home. You can call the house, all you get is an answering machine all day long till I get home to see what's on my answering machine.

So I'm just, I understand we need safety and I'm for safety on the trucks. I'm not trying to get out of that part of it. I just feel this needed to be discussed a little more before they put this kind of fine on me to see if I did understand why it is and I just don't know how I'm going to pay it, to be honest with you.

I know, and I've discussed some of it with Mr. Barrett, there's a lot of carriers out there around my area that to me are doing worse than this running around with farm tags on doing commercial work. They're getting away with it.

Now's telling me I can only operate 11 hours a day. When we haul grain in the fall we can run up to 15 hours a days. Some places stay open for us.

I'm going to have to cut my hours and other places are going to come in and take my business away and I don't feel that's right. Some places we run whole mile radius. To make a complete circle is only a mile. How do we log that when we're on the road maybe three/quarters of a mile?

That's where my log violations come in because I didn't know how to log that when I stayed at home, then I got on the road out of state is when they caught me with my log violations. So I paid my log violations of \$200 to that state and now they're fining me here another \$100 for something that I already paid.

But that's all coming out of my pocket since I'm not a corporation. I feel like the log violation not being fined three times now for the

very same thing. I just don't -- I made a mistake and I'm not trying to deny that, I just don't feel the way the fine was set up is right.

I don't know how else to explain it so everybody can understand what I'm saying. But that's my -- I'm not, like I said, I'm not discussing what he found wrong is wrong. It was wrong. I wasn't right. I'm -- I guess what I'm saying, protesting the fine that's involved in it. The money factor on it.

HEARING EXAMINER: Does that conclude your testimony?

THE WITNESS: I guess the best I can do, yes.

HEARING EXAMINER: Do you have any questions?

MS. PARROT: Just a couple, your Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Ms. Parrot:

- Q. Good morning, Mr. Diehl. Do you have a copy of what's been marked as Staff Exhibit 1 in front of you?
  - A. I think right here's one of them.
  - Q. That's Investigator Barrett's compliance

review report that he completed.

So I just want to be sure I understand your testimony. You're not disputing his findings that are summarized in this document.

- A. Right. That's what the law states. I understand that now.
- Q. On the first page of this report it indicates that for the year 2008 I believe that the gross revenue for your company was approximately \$195,000; is that correct?
- A. Yeah. Of the paperwork that I showed him.
- Q. And it looks like your company has been issued both the USDOT number as well as an MCMX number; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. At the point that you obtained those numbers did you do any -- take any efforts to familiarize yourself with the Federal Motor Carrier safety regulations?
- A. No. With the DOT number what caused me to get it, I was running out of Indiana hauling grain and had to have a DOT number on the side of the truck. The State of Ohio itself doesn't of course ask if you're a farmer, commercialized hauler or

what, every truck out there will be a DOT number.

The officer stopped me to give me an indication what I needed. So I went home, we printed it off, we filled it out and sent it in. However long it takes to give me the DOT number.

And on the general freight, you know, they told me how to fill out for the MC number so I basically just filled it all out and it was all sent back to me. They didn't question me, I didn't question them, if you understand what I'm trying to say --

Q. Okay.

- A. -- on that.
- Q. So when you started your business, when you began your own business did you at that time take any steps to try to familiarize yourself with the regulations and what's required to operate a business like this in Ohio?
- A. Only thing I done, of course, I've been driving for 36 years and when I first started I leased my truck to carriers. And I just picked up over all them years of what I thought we were doing things right. Which probably was a bad thing to do at this point.

And I just done it from there and

In Re: Proceedings

everybody I talked to since deregulation come in effect they said get your own numbers. Go out and get your own business. You have to go through this company, you don't have to go through this company, and give them 25 to 30 percent of the total revenue.

I've always hauled grain. So they -basically that's all I did. When I was with the
carriers, they said something about drug testing, but
when I got my own authority, well, I ain't
considering myself an employee, we're just driving
the trucks.

Like I say, it pays the electric bill, everything at home, brings groceries home. I never paid myself at the end of the week \$300 or whatever the case may be. As long as the money was in the checkbook whatever we needed, we just went out and got.

- Q. So when you were working for these other carriers you were aware that there were things such as drug and alcohol testing programs?
- A. Yeah. That was just going into effect as I was starting to quit those.
- Q. And as a driver did you have to maintain a logbook or some sort of record of your hours.
  - A. See, when I haul grain being I stayed in

Ohio or under a hundred air miles, they never said anything about keeping track of your time either. So I didn't have to log it under a hundred air miles. So I never did that.

When I was going through the road I just showed off duty seven days prior to that. So when I come my own company, I just didn't show running my grain and then when I get my loads of freight going to these other states, I just picked the logbook number that day.

So when I got stopped on them two occasions what did you do prior to this? I just hauled grain locally. Most of mine's under a hundred miles grain hauling. So that's where we need to know what you done the last seven days. Say you hauled grain.

I understand guys will turn the truth and try to benefit themselves. But I always tried to be honest when I got stopped by any officer what happened prior to that. Of course I was wrong. I got fined for it, so.

- Q. Were you required to keep a medical certificate that was up to date --
  - A. Yes.

Q. -- as a driver with these other carriers?

A. One here where I -- my son got caught, he was hauling grain locally. There again, I assumed he was doing that part for me instead of me having to question him on it and that's where I was wrong.

I should have been questioning him because he was also working at a regular garage at the time. When he started with me he only worked part time four hours in the morning. Then he got laid off here two years ago and decided he'd go full time. And they made him take physicals at work so I just assumed he had an up-to-date one. Like I say, my fault. I should have checked better than that.

- Q. And then finally the vehicle inspection reports, is that something you were required to do when you were working for other carriers prior to --
- A. My own truck, most carriers left that responsibility up to me because it's my truck to be kept care of. Until he explained to me. When we me and my son find something wrong with it, we just run down and buy the part and put it on. Because we do all our own work. I go home today and find something wrong, we'll buy the part, so when the truck comes in, we put it on.

I got a book that we keep for the trucks and when we do the repairs, but not how we found the

repairs. Everything that's listed per truck there's a book in each one of the trucks when we do we write the date, what we done, and the miles down as far as when the repair was done. Not how we found it.

Because we just see it, broken spring, we need a spring on the truck. So we just back it in the drive and replace the spring, you know.

- Q. So have you taken steps after this compliance review --
- A. We show it on the log like Mr. Barrett told us to do. We still don't always when we find the problem down, haven't got myself still in the routine make that form, "broken spring, truck out of commission." We just run down, buy the spring, couple hours the truck is back on the road because we fixed the spring.
- Q. And in terms of hours of service, have you made any changes with respect to that?
- A. We've got -- I've got them -- now we've got logs for every day since Mr. Barrett's been out at the house. And he explained to me as far as my grain we just need to show on the logbook say we worked eight hours today.

Instead of running 40 miles, you have more lines where you load and unload that nobody

would be able to load. We just show eight hours hauling grain locally, we put in remarks and start of each day we show what we done the pre-trip inspection on the logbook.

And then however long we did and back home at DeGraff, Ohio and started the next day whatever time. It varies day to day.

- Q. Is your company participating in a drug and alcohol testing program?
- A. Yes. He got me set up over at Wilson. I called the lady and we went over there. Of course, my physical right here a few months ago, I went and got a new physical at the hospital. Got all that because we started with his help we started a driver's file like we needed to be.
- Q. So you're not disputing any of the violations that Investigator Barrett found, it's just the amount of the forfeiture that's been recommended to the Commission.
  - A. Right.

- Q. And are you disputing the process that was used now that you've kind of heard about how that works or is it just the total amount?
- A. Just the total amount to me just seems to be a little bit high for being my first time even

being audited, let alone being fined.

I mean I feel like first time you get a speeding ticket you go to court and the judge stands up and say if you behave, we'll reduce it down half of what it could be and you pay it. But they don't say we're going to carry this other \$35 over from a year from now and see if you get caught or not and get added to it.

I hope I'm explaining it so you can understand.

- Q. So the staff has recommended a forfeiture and I think they revised it today, the recommendation was a little lower. I believe it's roughly \$6,700. So you still feel that that amount is unreasonable?
- A. I still feel it's high due to the fact, like I say, in my logbook violations I already had to pay the state I got stopped in. Now I got to pay the State of Ohio and the feds some more. And when I paid the state I realized the mistake.

Like I say, the only reason they caught me, I had been hauling grain prior to that time locally at home and then I left out the dog food and one was state of Wisconsin and one was state of Kentucky they caught me in because I didn't have enough prior seven days knowing what I was doing so

	63
1	they wrote it up being over hours.
2	MS. PARROT: Your Honor, I have no
3	further questions.
4	HEARING EXAMINER: Very good.
5	Do you have anything more to add?
6	THE WITNESS: No, sir. Best I can do.
7	HEARING EXAMINER: You're excused.
8	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
9	HEARING EXAMINER: Anything more to bring
10	before the Commission?
11	Then I consider this matter submitted on
12	the record. Thank you for coming.
13	MS. PARROT: Thank you.
14	(Hearing adjourned at 11:20 a.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## 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, April 20, 2010, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

13 (JUL-1547)

Julieanna Hennebert, Registered Professional Reporter and RMR and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires February 19, 2013.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

5/4/2010 9:53:58 AM

in

Case No(s). 09-1929-TR-CVF

Summary: Transcript Transcript of Lester R. Diehl hearing held on 04/20/10. electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Hennebert, Julieanna Mrs.