1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO				
2					
3	In the Matter of Robert :				
4	Williams, Notice of : Apparent Violation and : Case No. 10-235-TR-CVF				
5	Intent to Assess : Forfeiture. :				
6					
7	PROCEEDINGS				
8	before Mr. Scott E. Farkas, Attorney Examiner, at the				
9	Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad				
10	Street, Room 11-D, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10 a.m.				
11	on Thursday, August 19, 2010.				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21	ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC. 222 East Town Street, Second Floor				
22	Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201 (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481				
23	Fax - (614) 224-5724				
24					
25					
_ ~					

2 1 APPEARANCES: 2 Richard Cordray, Ohio Attorney General 3 By Mr. Werner L. Margard III and Ms. Sarah J. Parrot, 4 Assistant Attorneys General Public Utilities Section 5 180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 6 On behalf of the Staff of the PUCO. 7 Mr. Stephen A. Moyer 8 9 East Kossuth Street Columbus, Ohio 43206 9 On behalf of Respondent Robert Williams. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 2.1 22 23 24 25

		3
1	INDEX	
2		
3	Witness	Page
4	Phillip Haskins	7
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Margard Cross-Examination by Mr. Moyer Examination by The Examiner	7 27 41
6		
7	John Canty Direct Examination by Mr. Margard Cross-Examination by Mr. Moyer	43 58
8		
9	Robert Williams Direct Examination by Mr. Moyer Cross-Examination by Mr. Margard	60 67
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Margard	0 /
11	Courtney Webb Direct Examination by Mr. Moyer	74
12		
13	Staff Exhibit Identified	Admitted
14	1 Driver/Vehicle Examination Report 10	59
15 16	2 Photos of the railroad crossing from the PUCO website 22	
17	3 Forfeiture Assessment 46	59
18	4 Civil Forfeiture Violations Chart Nature & Gravity Points 48	59
19	5 Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture 56	59
20		
21		
22	Respondent Exhibit Identified	Admitted
23	A Multimodal Dangerous Goods Form 34	86
24	B Crown Dock Receipt 34	86
25	C Investigation Summary 39	

					4
1		INDEX (Continue	d)		
2					
3	Re	spondent Exhibit	Identified	Admitted	
4	D	Placards General Requirements	75	86	
5	E	Specification-Based Packaging	39	86	
6		Rules 172.504(c)(1)		00	
7	F	Material Safety Data Sheet	80		
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

Thursday Morning Session, August 19, 2010.

3

4

5

1

2

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 1.5

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

24

0025211.

23

25

THE EXAMINER: This is the -- the Commission has called for hearing at this time and place the Matter of Robert Williams, Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture, Case No. 10-293-TR-CVF.

My name is Scott Farkas. I am the Attorney Examiner assigned to hear this case. At this time I'll take appearances. First, on behalf of the Staff.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission, entering the appearance of Richard Cordray, Ohio Attorney General, by and through Assistant Attorneys General Werner L. Margard and Sarah J. Parrot, 180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor, Columbus, Ohio.

THE EXAMINER: On behalf of Mr. Williams. MR. MOYER: Yes, your Honor. On behalf of Robert Williams, Steve Moyer, 9 East Kossuth Street, Columbus, Ohio 43206, Supreme Court No.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you. At this time

is there anything that the parties want to raise as an issue at all?

MR. MOYER: Yes, your Honor, on behalf of the Respondent just as a technical matter pursuant to Ohio Administrative Code 409 -- excuse me, 4901:2-7-19 requiring that the evidentiary hearing be scheduled or held within 60 days, that has not occurred.

THE EXAMINER: Well, the rule is it shall be scheduled within 60 days of the prehearing being held.

MR. MOYER: Okay.

THE EXAMINER: And I believe it was scheduled within 60 days of the prehearing.

MR. MOYER: Just making it for the record, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Okay.

MR. MOYER: Thank you.

THE EXAMINER: I believe just for the record the prehearing was scheduled, let's see -Mr. Williams filed his request on February 25, 2010.
An entry scheduling a prehearing settlement conference was issued on March 18. That would fall within the rule of scheduling a prehearing conference within 30 days of the request for a hearing. And I

believe the initial entry scheduling the hearing was issued on June 11. I believe that falls within the goal also.

I'm sorry. I think the first one scheduling the hearing was on April 26. It was continued by both parties, both parties. Staff initially requested a hearing continuance and then, Mr. Moyer, you requested a continuance so.

MR. MOYER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Okay. Any other matters?

MR. MARGARD: No, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: So, Staff, you may call

your first witness.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. I would call Officer Phil Haskins to the stand, please.

THE EXAMINER: Okay.

17

## PHILLIP HASKINS

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

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Margard:

- Q. Please state your name for the record.
- A. Phillip Haskins.
  - Q. And what is your business address,

Mr. Haskins?

- A. My business address is 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215, Transportation Department, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.
- Q. And you are employed by the Commission; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And what is your job title and what are your duties and responsibilities?
- A. My job title is Hazardous Materials

  Investigative Specialist. My duties include the inspection of vehicles and motor carriers transporting hazardous materials for compliance with the federal and state safety regulations, transportation volumes of hazardous materials and regulations.
  - Q. And how long have you performed that job?
  - A. 23 years.
- Q. And do you have any certifications or special training of any sort?
- A. Yes. There's extensive training required and ongoing training through certification annually that the federal government requires us to meet to perform these jobs.
  - Q. And are all of your certifications

current?

- A. Yes.
  - Q. Mr. Haskins, were you on duty on October 22 of 2009?
    - A. I was.
  - Q. And do you recall what your job assignment was on that date?
  - A. I recall working in a specific area of the state. I cover approximately 25 counties, and the county I was working in was Union County that day.
  - Q. Do you recall inspecting a vehicle on that date that resulted in your preparation of an inspection report, specifically report No.
- 15 OH3202304873?
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. And as you testify today, do you have an independent recollection of that inspection?
      - A. I do.
        - MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor?
          THE EXAMINER: Yes.
    - MR. MOYER: Your Honor, might I object to the presentation of the document to the witness when he indicated he had an independent recollection of the stop? There has been no indication he needs a

document to refresh his recollection.

THE EXAMINER: Well, you can certainly raise an objection. I think at this point he's just asking him to identify -- he has just presented him -- actually he hasn't -- he's just taken the exhibit and presented me a copy of it.

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, if I am permitted to proceed, I will ask Officer Haskins to identify the document.

THE EXAMINER: I think that would be okay. I am going to overrule your objection.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you.

- Q. Mr. Haskins, I've handed you a document that I have marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit No. 1, a multi-page stapled document. Can you identify that for us, please?
- A. Yes. This is a photocopy of an inspection report that I completed on October 22, 2009.
- Q. And this report was prepared by you; is that correct?
  - A. It was.
- Q. And can you please tell us how this, the report, was prepared?
  - A. This report is prepared from a notebook

computer that I am issued by the State of Ohio to conduct my job duties, and it generates a document that once completed I provide this inspection report to the driver.

- Q. This is part of the regular course of your duties?
  - A. It is.

- Q. And this is done at the time of your inspection; is that correct?
  - A. At the completion of the inspection.
- Q. Mr. Haskins, I want to ask you some questions about this document. First of all, can you tell me what time this inspection occurred?
- A. I began the inspection at 11:35 in the morning and completed the inspection at 10 minutes after 12.
- Q. And that appears at the very top of this document; is that correct?
  - A. It does.
- Q. There's also a notation there of a certification date that is different than the inspection date. Do you know what that refers to?
- A. That's the date it was uploaded into the federal system.
  - Q. And do you know how that process occurs?

- A. It's done electronically through the Safety Net system.
- Q. And are you responsible for performing that function?
  - A. No, sir.

- Q. Below the time of the inspection there is a notation of Inspection Level: 1 Full Inspection. What's a full inspection entail?
- A. A full inspection involves a complete inspection of the commercial vehicle including the inspection of the under-components of the vehicle including brake inspections.
- Q. And that's the level of inspection that you performed on this vehicle on this date?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Below that there is an HM Inspection Type. HM refer to HazMat; is that correct?
- A. It does. It's the kind of hazardous materials. It indicates they were non-bulk products being shipped.
- Q. What does a non-bulk inspection type involve?
- A. It involves the type of imaging that the hazardous materials was packaged in at this time.
  - Q. So it doesn't refer to a specific type of

inspection; it refers to the materials that were inspected.

- A. That's correct, packaging.
- Q. Thank you. Now, you indicated that you use a computer to perform your inspection --
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- and the report that you print out, and you are able to print a copy of the report at the time of the inspection, correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - O. Does it look like this?
- A. It resembles this. It's a reflection of the -- all of the relevant information of the report that I complete upon the inspection, but it is a copy of the documents and the information that I've documented.
- Q. But as I understand it then, this is not an exact copy of the document you would have provided to the driver on that date; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. But is the information contained in this report the same as the information you would have provided to the driver at that time?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And was it accurate at the time that you

put the information into your computer?

A. Yes.

- Q. Tell us what you do with that information once you've inputted all the data into the computer.
- A. It's -- it's a Windows-based program that requires me to complete all of the necessary and required biographical information. Once the inspection report is completed I print a copy of that inspection document and present it to the driver for signature.
- Q. And the driver would have signed the document; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Are there occasions when drivers decline to sign the document?
  - A. Yes, there are.
  - Q. In your recollection did Mr. Williams sign the document?
    - A. I believe he did, yes.
- Q. Now, there are some -- some handwritten markings on this document. Are these your handwritten markings?
  - A. No.
- Q. Do you have any knowledge as to what they signify?

A. No, sir.

- Q. The rest of the information contained in this document is information that you created; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Let me ask you to take a look at the section that talks about the location. This is a roadside inspection. What does that mean?
- A. That means it was conducted alongside a public highway.
- Q. And this particular highway was U.S. Route 42 in Union County?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Do you know in which direction the driver was headed?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And what direction was he headed, please?
  - A. South.
- Q. And do you know what -- his destination here is indicated as Columbus?
- A. Yes. That was obtained from the shipping document that the driver presented me. The origination and destination was information that I derived from the driver's shipping documents.
  - Q. Below that is a section marked vehicle

identification. Can you briefly describe what's contained in the columns in this section, please?

- A. The column under vehicle identification identifies the commercial vehicle, both power unit and trailer in this case, the type, year of manufacture, biographical information of the vehicle, and VIN number of both the tractor and the trailer that the driver was operating at the time I inspected it.
- Q. There's a column that says GVWR. What does that indicate?
  - A. That's the gross vehicle weight rating.
  - Q. Now, there are zeros indicated here.
- A. That is normally determined to identify whether jurisdiction applies under the federal code. In this case it was a commercial vehicle tractor and trailer with an 80,000-pound gross vehicle weight rating and that field doesn't populate.
- Q. Very good. There is also an OOS Stkr. number.
  - A. Yes.

- Q. What does that refer to?
- A. That identifies the fact that there were defects on the vehicle identified that would require to be repaired and is considered to be out of

service.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Thank you. Let me ask you to direct your attention to the brake adjustments section.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. You did inspect the brakes on this vehicle; is that correct?
  - A. I did.
- Q. And do you know how many -- apparently there are five axles; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And do I read this correctly to indicate that the fifth brakes on the fifth axle were inoperable?
- A. Yes. Both left and right brakes on the rear most axle that would be on the semitrailer were inoperative.
- Q. And if we look at the violations section below that, that is the reason why this vehicle was placed out of service; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, in the course of your inspection did you cite the driver with any violation?
- A. The only violation that I identified with
  the driver was the fact that while transporting a
  hazardous load he failed to stop at the railroad

grade crossing in --

- Q. That's -- continue.
- A. Indicated with the letter D under unit. D stands for driver.
- Q. Very good. This is not an out of service violation in and of itself?
  - A. No, sir.
  - Q. What does the LVL 6 indicate?
- A. Level 6, that's another type of inspection that identifies a radioactive commodity. In this case there were no radioactive vehicles.
- Q. Okay. There is a column that says verify. What is this column for?
- A. That is a column where if a driver corrects a defect during the course of inspection, the verification would have been done in my presence, that the defect would have been repaired. In this case U stands for unknown.
- Q. Thank you. The violation description, is that something that you put in yourself or is that automatically generated?
- A. That's automatically generated by types of violations of the Federal Safety Code already present in the Windows-based inspection program.
  - Q. The next section says HazMat.

A. Yes.

- Q. And is this information that you input as well?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And what does this mean generally for the sake of the record, a corrosive material?
- A. That means at this time the vehicle was transporting a hazardous material as a class 8 hazardous material which is a corrosive material.
- Q. And this was placarded as hazardous material load?
  - A. It was.
  - Q. Properly so?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Mr. Haskins, can you describe for us what you recall about this inspection and why you stopped this vehicle?
- A. At this time I was traveling south on U.S. Route 42 approximately three vehicles behind the commercial vehicle in my state vehicle, an SUV, and as I watched the commercial vehicle approach the grade crossing, I did not see him stop as required as he approached the grade crossing. I then followed the vehicle to where I was in position to stop the vehicle and affect an inspection which I did.

- Q. Did you see the vehicle stop at all?
- A. Did not.

- Q. Did you see the vehicle slow at all?
- A. I saw traffic as it approaches the grade crossing, the vehicles in front of me slow, but not to where I remember observing any stopping or brake lights.
- Q. You don't recall any brake lights at all on this vehicle?
  - A. No.
  - Q. Did you inspect the brake lights?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Were the brake lights functioning?
- A. Yes.
- Q. In your inspection notes there is a reference that the driver stated he was not paying attention and forgot about the tracks. Did you have a conversation with Mr. Williams?
- A. Yes. Upon inspection I identified myself to the driver and my intentions of inspecting the vehicle and I inquired as to why he failed to stop at the grade crossing and his comment to me was stated in the record in my inspection notes that he stated he was not paying attention and forgot about the tracks.

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Yes.

MR. MARGARD: I would respectfully request the Bench take administrative notice of the Public Utilities Commission database regarding railroad crossing in the state of Ohio and specifically the database with respect to grade crossings maintained in conjunction with the Ohio Rail Development Commission, and I have a document that I would like to show to the witness from that database with respect to this particular crossing.

THE EXAMINER: Do you have any response to his request?

MR. MOYER: I haven't seen the document, what we are talking about so.

THE EXAMINER: Can you explain for the record what the database you are referring to is?

MR. MARGARD: Absolutely, your Honor.

The Public Utilities Commission does have jurisdiction over railroad crossings, maintains a database that includes photographs of all of the crossings, detailed information about the site, the owner of the rail, various location warning devices, grade, traffic information, and so forth. This is maintained for purposes of the Commission's ongoing

jurisdiction over those crossings.

1

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE EXAMINER: And it's maintained by the Commission?

MR. MARGARD: It is, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: I'll grant your request to take administrative notice.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, I had not premarked this as an exhibit having requested administrative notice but for convenience of the record it would be helpful to denominate this as Staff Exhibit No. 2.

THE EXAMINER: Okay. So marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. Mr. Haskins, are you familiar with the Commission's database with respect to railroad crossings?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. I've handed you a multi-page document that's been marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit No. 2. Have you seen this document before?
  - A. No.
  - Q. Have you seen this information before?
- A. Yes.
  - Q. Does this information depict the crossing

that was the site of the violation in this case?

A. It does.

- Q. And just so that I'm clear the direction of Route 42 at that location is a northeast to southwest direction; is that correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. And so the direction that you indicated as south in your testimony would be the direction depicted as west in the photograph; is that correct?
  - A. That's true.
- Q. Does this accurately depict the scene of the crossing?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is there a -- a particular grade of note with respect to this crossing?
- A. Yes, yes, there is. There is a slight grade as the U.S. 42 travels into that westerly direction. As it approaches the crossing, it does have a slight increase from being in a lower elevation as it approaches the crossing.
- Q. You would have been going slightly uphill then at the time?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. You indicated there were a couple of vehicles in front of you; is that correct?

- A. Yes. There were some non-commercial passenger-type vehicles between myself and the commercial vehicle.
- Q. Did you have a clear view of the commercial vehicle?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Were there any other obstructions?
- A. No, none, none that I recollect.
- Q. Was there any other reason why your visibility would have been impaired that day?
  - A. No.
- Q. Mr. Haskins, let me ask you to take a look at the area on Staff Exhibit No. 1 denominated locally defined fields. Do you see that area?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And the first line indicates by whom the shipment was loaded and this indicates it was loaded by the shipper, not the carrier, correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And that the shipping documents were prepared by the shipper, not the carrier, correct?
  - A. Also correct.
- Q. Then there is the hazardous class and 8 and that's the hazardous class materials previously identified; is that correct?

- A. That's the United States Department of Transportation classification for a corrosive material, class 8.
- Q. Thank you. There is to the right an ID number. Do you know what that ID number refers to?
- A. Yes. The hazardous materials being transported in this case was a corrosive with UN, uniform identification, number as UN2794. All hazardous materials have a UN identification number.
- Q. So this would specifically identify the materials involved?
  - A. Correct.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Do you recall what those materials were?
- A. Battery acid.
- Q. The hazardous materials were otherwise properly stored and loaded?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you. The next line down indicates a packaging group and has a Roman Numeral III. Is that a Roman Numeral III?
  - A. It is.
  - Q. And what does that refer to?
- A. There are three classifications of the
  packaging for hazardous materials in the United

  States Code and a packing group III designates a mild

hazard packaging. It's the least severe as far as packaging of hazardous materials.

- Q. Thank you. To the right there's an indication of gross weight.
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And is this pounds?
- A. Yes.
- Q. 2,330 pounds?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And to what portion of the load does that weight refer?
- A. That refers to the hazardous materials declaration on the shipping document that the driver presented me showing that there were 2,330 pounds of corrosive material in that shipment.
- Q. Did you visually inspect the load to ensure that it was as indicated on the shipping papers?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is there any other information that you recall about this inspection that is not contained in your report?
- A. No. I believe this contains all of my -- all of the facts I obtained from the inspection and including my notes that I prepare after the

inspection that was a part of this interaction that I had that day.

- Q. Do you recognize the driver? Is he sitting in the room?
  - A. Yes, he is.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. I have no further questions for Officer Haskins.

- - -

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Moyer:

- Q. Good morning, Officer Haskins. My name is Steve Moyer, and I represent Mr. Williams in this case. How are you this morning?
  - A. Good, thank you.
- Q. Fine. You indicated that you were three vehicles back from Mr. Williams' semi tractor and trailer, correct?
- A. Yes. I believe two to three vehicles separated us.
- Q. Okay. And vehicles, the whole line of vehicles slowed down for the crossing, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And is it your testimony that through those two or three vehicles you could see the brake lights on that semitrailer at all times?

A. I operate an SUV, so I am somewhat elevated from the other vehicles. And I believe I testified that I don't recall seeing stop lamps as he approached the crossing.

- Q. Okay. Did you see -- could you see the taillights -- my question is could you see the taillights or could you not see -- could you see the taillights? Let me ask you that.
- A. I believe I could see them from -- from independent memory of the --
- Q. Are you certain as you sit here that you could see his taillights the entire time as he approached it?
- A. I couldn't see any taillights activated as I approached the crossing.
- Q. That's not my question. Could you see the taillights on the trailer the entire time?
- A. From my position, yes, I believe I could see the taillights.
- Q. So there is no SUVs behind you or in front of you?
  - A. No. They were passenger vehicles.
- Q. They were passenger vehicles and none of those passenger vehicles' hoods or roofs obscured the view of the taillights of the semi tractor-trailer?

A. I don't believe so.

1.5

- Q. You don't believe so, okay. And although the vehicles slowed down and you're two or three cars back, your testimony is that the truck did not come to a stop?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And that's based upon the fact you couldn't see stop lights, correct?
- A. I saw the whole line of traffic as it approached the intersection, and none of the vehicles stopped.
- Q. Okay. But you're following a vehicle two or three back so whether that one stopped doesn't necessarily determine whether the semi tractor stopped, correct?
- A. Correct, but the relationship between the commercial vehicle and all passenger vehicles did not change through the intersection.
- Q. Okay. And after you followed the commercial vehicle over the tracks, you signaled, flashed your lights at him to pull over, correct?
- A. It was approximately 3 miles where I could get in the position to stop the vehicle. The other passenger vehicles either turned off or got into a different lane, and when the vehicle was

directly -- immediately in front of me, I activated my lights to inspect the vehicle.

- Q. Okay. You flashed your headlights at him?
- A. My headlights were flashed and my lights on top of my vehicle.
  - Q. And he immediately pulled over, correct?
  - A. Correct.

- Q. Okay. And did you then -- did he advise you that it wasn't safe there and you should go -- and you guys went to the bowling alley to perform the inspection?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And at the time that you pulled in behind him at the bowling alley, you made mention to him about whether he stopped for the railroad tracks; is that your testimony?
- A. My testimony says during the initial interaction with the driver I identified myself and my purpose and I asked him about the railroad grade crossings and the requirements for transporting hazardous materials, and his comment to me was what I documented in the notes of my inspection report.
- Q. Okay. And did you tell him at that time that you weren't going to write him up for the

railroad violation?

- A. I didn't say that.
- Q. Okay. Now, you indicated that you did a brake inspection and that axle five was inoperable, correct?
- A. Yes, both brakes on the rear most trailer axle.
  - Q. That is a safety issue?
  - A. That is.
  - Q. That's an out of service safety issue?
  - A. It is.
- Q. Why is it that with hazardous materials on you then sent him on to Columbus with that vehicle without taking it out of service?
- A. I believe the driver at this time was destined to London, Ohio, for fuel. In that case I followed him to London, Ohio, because the driver had no tools to correct the defect so I escorted the vehicle to a safe haven so he could affect repairs.
- Q. In fact, didn't you tell him to go to the CSX yard to affect the repairs?
  - A. I don't recall that.
- Q. If Mr. Williams was to testify to that, would you disagree with that testimony that you directed him to drive to the CSX yard to affect

repairs?

- A. I don't recall that dialogue.
- Q. Okay. You then indicated that this is the least severe packaging group hazard; is that what your testimony was?
- A. Yes. Packaging group III which this shipment was was the least severe of packaging designated by USDOT regulations.
- Q. Okay. And this had a placard, HazMat placard, on it and you indicated it was a class 8 hazard, correct?
  - A. Correct, yes.
- Q. And you said it was properly placarded, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. How did you determine that it was properly placarded?
- A. From information derived from the shipping document and inspection of the cargo transport vehicle, that it was placarded on all four sides with the appropriate corresponding hazard class.
- Q. You didn't cut the seam and open the container?
  - A. If I did, I would have identified that.

1 Okay. So you didn't inspect the load, Ο. 2 correct? 3 I inspected the shipment. Α. Q. You inspected the shipment. 5 Shipping documents and container. Α. 6 Okay. But you did not inspect the 0. 7 contents of the container, correct? 8 Α. I can't recall if I did. If I inspected 9 the cargo, I would have identified that the -- if 10 there were a seal, I would have identified that the 11 seal was removed and replaced with a State of Ohio 12 seal to inspect the contents of the shipment. 13 Right. And that's not noted on your Q. notes so it's fair to say if it's not noted on your 14 15 notes, you did not do it? 16 Α. It's fair to say I did not change the 17 cargo seal. 18 Q. Okay. 19 MR. MOYER: May I approach the witness, 20 your Honor? 21 THE EXAMINER: Yes. 22 MR. MOYER: I am going to hand him RW10 23 and 11 which we previously provided to you.

THE EXAMINER: Could you provide one to

Officer Haskins --

24

25

Ο.

34 1 the Bench, please. 2 MR. MOYER: Yeah. I have got extras for 3 the Court, your Honor. THE EXAMINER: Thank you. 5 MR. MARGARD: Mr. Moyer, would you 6 specifically identify what pages. 7 MR. MOYER: I will just give you a copy 8 with stickers on them. 9 MR. MARGARD: Thank you very much. 10 MR. MOYER: And for the record we've 11 provided these to opposing counsel in advance of 12 today's hearing. 13 But directing your attention, if I could, Ο. 14 to what we've marked as Exhibit A, is that one of the 15 documents that you would have inspected on the date 16 of this stop? 17 Α. It appears --18 THE EXAMINER: Just for the record 19 marking Exhibit A is the Multimodal Dangerous Goods 20

Form, and Exhibit B is a dock receipt. (EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) MR. MOYER: That's correct, your Honor, correct.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you. You may proceed.

21

22

23

24

- Q. Officer Haskins, would Exhibit A or Exhibit B be documents that you would have reviewed on October 22, 2009, after your stop of Mr. Williams?
- A. It does resemble a shipping document that is associated with this inspection, yes.
- Q. Okay. And on both of those documents it indicates the cargo that was contained in the container, correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And of concern to us as we're looking at Exhibit B, there's an indication of a couple of skids with four batteries on it, two forklifts, two chargers, with a total weight of 4,274 pounds, but the only thing we're really concerned about here is the two skids with the four batteries, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And that's the basis -- that's what brings us here today.
- A. Yes, hazardous materials shipment requirements, yes.
- Q. You've just told us you did not open the container, correct?
- A. I don't recall physically opening the container or the inspection of the cargo.

- Q. Okay. You would agree with me, would you not, that the only hazardous material in the battery is the sulfuric acid, correct?
- A. Yes, that's -- that is the component that designates batteries as hazardous.
- Q. That's the sulfuric acid, that's the corrosive portion of the battery.
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. You have no idea of the 2,330 pounds how much of that is the sulfuric acid, do you?
  - A. No.

1.5

- Q. Okay. Did you inquire of anyone at that time or since how much of that 2,330 would be HazMat corrosive?
- A. Only from the shipping document did I derive the weight.
- Q. Okay. And that 2,330 is, in fact, what you put on your report too, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And so when you testified on direct that there was 2,330 pounds of hazardous materials, that's not technically correct, is it? There's 2,330 pounds of batteries of which some portion is sulfuric acid and hazardous materials,

correct?

1.5

- A. Well, the battery which includes the actual battery acid and the packaging is deemed to be the hazardous materials under USDOT definition of a hazardous material but there would be no way I could determine how much sulfuric acid comprises the packaging.
- Q. Under what authority is it -- what statute do you believe states that the entire weight of the battery constitutes the weight of the hazardous materials as opposed to simply the corrosive portion of it or the battery acid?

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I'll object to calling for a legal conclusion other than to the extent the witness may know a specific section.

THE EXAMINER: I'll sustain unless you're aware of the specific section.

MR. MOYER: Can I respond to that? He's just testified to a legal conclusion. He's just testified that it's the gross weight of the battery that's the HazMat, not the sulfuric acid. Certainly I ought to be able to inquire whether there is a basis for that testimony. He said it, not me.

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I believe he indicated there was a basis, that he understood it

was in the rules so what Mr. Moyer is asking for now is a specific code section.

MR. MOYER: That's right. If he is going to testify as an expert on it, I'm allowed to inquire what the basis of his purported testimony in that regard is.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I can answer the question.

THE EXAMINER: Okay.

- A. 49 CFR, the volume of transportation regulations hazardous materials, and the definition sections in Chapter 171 paragraph 8 there's a definition of packaging and the packaging indicates that the hazardous materials including the packaging designates the entire hazardous materials.

  Therefore, the weight of the hazardous materials and the packaging as declared by the shipper determines
- Q. So even if the -- even if the product then would be a -- something that weighed 8,000 pounds and had a teaspoon of corrosive material in it, it would be a hazardous material weighing 8,000 pounds?

the hazardous materials description.

A. Not necessarily true. It has to meet the definition of a corrosive material found in that same

section under 171 to be classified as a hazardous material by the shipper of the product.

Q. Okay.

1.5

MR. MOYER: May I approach again, your Honor?

THE EXAMINER: Yes.

Q. Officer, would you agree -
THE EXAMINER: You're marking this E?

MR. MOYER: Yes. This is Respondent's

Exhibit E, Section -- copy of Code Section 172.504,

general placarding requirements.

(EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. Officer Haskins, would you agree with me that Table 2 is a -- or, excuse me, corrosive materials are a Table 2 material?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And would you agree with me that this code section says that if a transport vehicle or freight container contains less than 1,000 pounds aggregate gross weight of hazardous materials, it is exempt from placarding requirements?

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I am going to object to this line of questioning. First of all, the document says what it says. The law says what it says. I don't see any point in asking Mr. Haskins if

the document says what it says but, furthermore, there is no placarding violation being alleged here. This simply isn't relevant.

THE EXAMINER: Response?

MR. MOYER: My response is if it wasn't needed to be placarded, then he hasn't violated the railroad crossing. If there's — if it was a vehicle that didn't need a placard, then he didn't need to stop and it's our position he didn't need a placard because it had less than 1,000 pounds of hazardous material on it.

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, the vehicle was, in fact, placarded. That's the relevant consideration here. Mr. Haskins has already testified that the packaging constitutes part of the weight. Mr. Moyer is free to argue the law in brief. I don't know what this adds factually.

THE EXAMINER: I'll sustain the objection. The law speaks for itself.

MR. MOYER: I don't have anything further for this witness. Thank you.

THE EXAMINER: I do have a couple of questions for you just before we get to if there is any redirect.

\_ \_ \_

### EXAMINATION

By The Examiner:

- Q. When you are approaching the grade crossing, your testimony was there was the Mr. Williams' vehicle, his truck, and then there were two two vehicles in front of you. You're in an SUV and you could to your recollection you could see his brake lights, but you never saw them activated.
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Is that correct? And also is there anything that would lead you to believe that he didn't stop other than his brake lights?
- A. Yes. The fact that we were all of the vehicles on that particular intersection were traveling in the same direction and the relationship between myself and any of the other vehicles including the commercial vehicles did not change so there was no possible way that he could have stopped because I had a visual observation of the vehicle at all times and, of course, the passenger vehicles are not required to stop, therefore, all four vehicles proceeded through the crossing.
  - Q. And what was the speed limit of the road?
  - A. I believe the speed limit in that area is

42

1 45.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Q. Okay. And what were the weather conditions at the time, if you recall?

A. I believe it to be clear and dry. Had it been anything else I would have noted that in my remarks.

THE EXAMINER: All right. Any redirect?

MR. MARGARD: No, your Honor, no

redirect.

THE EXAMINER: Then you are excused.

MR. MOYER: Could I have some recross?

THE EXAMINER: He has no redirect.

MR. MOYER: Not based on your questions?

MR. MARGARD: Can we go off the record

for just a second?

(Discussion off the record.)

THE EXAMINER: Back on the record.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. The staff would like to call Mr. John Canty to the stand, please.

**–** – ·

22

23

24

# JOHN J. CANTY

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

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Margard:

- Q. Will you please state your name for the record.
  - A. Yes. John J. Canty, C-A-N-T-Y.
- Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity, please?
- A. I am employed by the Public Utilities

  Commission of Ohio. I am the Assistant Chief of the

  Compliance Division in the Transportation Department.
  - Q. And your business address, please, sir?
- A. 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
- Q. Can you please describe your job duties and responsibilities for us?
- A. Yes. As the Assistant Chief of the Compliance Division, I am responsible for among other things supervising the compliance officers and the support staff in the Compliance Division. The compliance officers are the ones who are responsible for reviewing the inspection reports that come in from the field, assessing those violations on the

computer record, sending out the letters and notifications that are required to the responsible parties as well as conducting a conference if a conference is requested by the Respondent.

- Q. Prior to your testimony today did you have any personal involvement with this particular inspection?
  - A. No.

- Q. Were you responsible for supervising individuals who did have responsibilities with respect to this inspection?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Let me ask you first and foremost,
  Mr. Canty, if you had an opportunity to review Staff
  Exhibit 1, the inspection reports offered this
  morning?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. And can you describe for us how this inspection came to be in this form.
- A. Generally, yes. The inspector in the field in this case, Inspector Phil Haskins, would have conducted the inspection. He would have entered the information into his laptop computer using software that's provided by the Commission. He would have printed out a copy of the inspection report and

given that to the driver. The data elements then would have been transferred to us electronically most probably through his telephone line or his cable to the Commission here and into our database here at the Commission.

We then have several databases here at the Commission we maintain that retains all of the data elements that he has input into his computer.

- Q. This particular document then is a record that is maybe obtained by the Commission both in electronic and in paper form; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, it is.

1.5

- Q. And this to the best of your knowledge and information is a true and accurate copy of that information?
- A. It is a copy. It is not an original, yes.
- Q. Mr. Canty, are you incidentally familiar with the document that's been identified as Staff Exhibit No. 2?
- A. Yes. I am aware of that database. I have reviewed it on occasion but not in this particular case.
- Q. But this is another database that is maintained and a record that is maintained in the

ordinary course of business by the Commission?

A. Yes, it is.

- Q. Mr. Canty, you indicated one of your job responsibilities had to do with forfeiture assessments, supervising individuals who determine forfeiture assessments; is that correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Have you reviewed the forfeiture assessment in this case?
  - A. Yes, I have.

    MR. MOYER: May I approach, your Honor?

    THE EXAMINER: Yes.
- Q. Mr. Canty, I have handed you a single-page document that's been marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit No. 3. Can you identify that document for me, please?
- A. Yes. This is the forfeiture assessment matrix that was completed regarding this case. It was completed by Mr. Forbes, one of the compliance officers employed here at the PUCO. It lists the inspection report which was generated in the field by Officer Haskins. It lists the Respondent's name, in this case Robert A. Williams, and the violation that was cited against him, the grade crossing violation.
  - Q. And this is the document that you earlier

testified you had reviewed with respect to this case?

A. Yes.

2.

1.5

- Q. This is, in fact, the actual forfeiture assessment to assess a forfeiture to Mr. Williams in this case; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. There are a number of different categories here with a number of different values in them. How are those values used or determined in reaching an assessment?
- A. We have a nature -- what we call a nature and gravity chart that we use in the HazMat -- in the Compliance Division for HazMat inspections. It lists the general categories of the HazMat violations as well as the Federal Motor Carrier violations. It divides them into various groups depending upon the nature and gravity of the violation as well as who would be responsible, the carrier or the shipper or the driver.

We also have a document which assigns point values based on the type of material being transported as well as the weight. We take all of those numeric factors into consideration. We plug them into this which is essentially an Excel spreadsheet to compute the value — the monetary

value of the violation. In this case it came up to \$400.

MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor?

THE EXAMINER: Yes.

- Q. Mr. Canty, I have handed you a multi-page document that I have marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit No. 4. Can you please identify this document?
- A. Yes. This is exactly the document I was referring to, the violation chart, the nature and gravity points for the various violations that can be completed during an inspection.
- Q. Can you tell me how this chart was -- was developed or where this information comes from?
- A. It's original development predates my employment in the Division. I cannot testify as to its exact origin, but we have been using this chart or versions of this chart since my employment in the Division for the past 20 odd years.
- Q. And the specific violations relate to and refer to violations of the hazardous materials regulations?
- A. As well as Federal Motor Carrier violations, yes.
  - Q. And are the weightings given to these

different factors based on any standard that you are aware of?

- A. Yes. We comply with the requirements of the CVSA guidelines for assessing violations that are discovered during inspections, Commercial -- V -- Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance.
- Q. Thank you. So these particular values are consistent with the CVSA standards?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Would you please walk us through the assessment -- and I suppose before I begin that you indicated that Mr. Forbes completed this particular assessment; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Is he someone under your supervision or direction?
  - A. Yes, he is.
- Q. And did you have an opportunity in reviewing this document to determine whether the assessment was properly done?
- A. Yes. I reviewed and discussed it with him.
  - Q. And in your opinion was it properly done?
  - A. It was properly assessed, yes.
  - Q. And in your opinion is the dollar amount

being assessed here correct and accurate?

A. Yes, it is.

1.5

- Q. Will you please walk us through then the determination of that amount.
- A. Yes. Starting in the -- well, the only column that has any data in it, 392.10(A)(3), the violation failing to stop at a railroad grade crossing, the first row there it says nature gravity 0 through 10 points. If you turn to the fourth page -- fourth page of the violation, the chart, under Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations Driver Violations, it is the first paragraph under that heading that says 1 through 4 points, it started with 4 point violations there, the fourth violation under that heading is failure to stop at railroad grade crossing so that is where the first point value would come from so that the point value initially for this violation is 4 points.

Moving down that column there are a few more rows, extent of violation, actual harm, and other circumstances, these are elements that we are required to consider in our assessment of each violation. Actual harm might be -- well, in this case the value of zero is given for all three of those but if there had been say an accident, some

property damage or environmental -- environmental damage or evacuation required, any other circumstances that might have applied, none of that applied in this case so those values are all zero.

1.5

- Q. Mr. Canty, if I can stop you briefly before you go on, there is an indication under both the extent of the violation and other circumstances that a negative value could have been assigned.

  Under what circumstances would a negative value have been appropriate?
- A. A negative value could possibly be applied if there had been some mitigation of the violation at the time. In this case I don't know that there can possibly be any, either you crossed the railroad tracks or you did not. I don't think there could be any mitigation of that violation.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. If you would continue with your description.
- A. So the row -- it says the row A subtotal points, at that point what you're doing is adding up the values in the column above which obviously still adds up to 4. Row B, material hazard, as I indicated, we take the type of material and the weight into consideration.

On the next page it says Material Hazard

Chart. On the left side is the point value and the right side is the hazard class or division. In this case as we have already heard in the testimony, this was a corrosive material which is a class 8. That has a point value of 0.9. However, a point modifier listed on the bottom left of that page if it's a PG, packaging group, III which is the least severe of the packaging groups that could be used, then if it's a packaging group III, and it was in this case, you would subtract .3 from the .9. That is what Mr. Forbes did and so the value entered in row B hazardous material -- I'm sorry, material hazard would be .6.

The next column down is amount of material. You turn to the last page, the amount of material on this inspection was 2,300 pounds approximately. That weight in the column on the right-hand side of the page would be between 1,000 and 9,999 pounds for a point value of .4. So the value of .4 was entered into row C. Row D, subtotal of points is B plus C times A so in this case B plus C, .6 plus .4, is -- equals 1, 1 times 4 is 4 so the subtotal of points here is 4 so the value of 4 is in that -- that row there, row D.

The next couple of rows down, E and F,

Respondent culpability and Respondent history, the Respondent culpability is a point value which can also be increased depending on the nature of the violation. If it was something other than a simple violation, if it was something done that was a egregious violation, I would say, as opposed to a simple not egregious violation, that could be increased in value. But in this case it is 1 and Respondent history can be 1, 2, or 4. That only applies to carriers. We don't have a Respondent history for shippers or drivers. That is always 1 for a driver. So those two values are both 1.

Obviously 1 times 1 times 4 equals 4 which is in row G, total points, and then you multiply 4 times the base value of -- the base value which is 100 and you come up with a forfeiture value of a total of \$400 for this violation.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Canty. Were you present during --

THE EXAMINER: Just for the record before you get to that can you just explain there are other columns here that do have some numbers? Do those have any significance, or is that just clerical error?

THE WITNESS: As in the column -- second

column over, second, third, and fourth?

1.5

THE EXAMINER: Has the same numbers and  ${\tt E}$  and  ${\tt F}$  have numbers all the way across.

THE WITNESS: I am not sure why those values carried over. This was the only violation cited against the driver. So this is the only violation that had an assessment.

THE EXAMINER: So the fact there are numbers in these columns has no bearing on the assessment of forfeiture?

THE WITNESS: No, none whatsoever. I am not sure whether the compliance officer inadvertently put those values in there. I see there are two values that shouldn't be there, the .6 and the .4 in row B and C, in the second column row B and C, but I'm not sure if he inadvertently tabbed over into that column and then didn't erase it. That would be my best guest, your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Margard) Mr. Canty, were you present during the cross-examination of Officer Haskins by Mr. Moyer?
  - A. Yes, I was.
- Q. And you heard the conversation and discussion regarding weight of the material.

A. Yes, I did.

- Q. And are you familiar with the hazardous materials regulations?
- A. Yes, I'm familiar with them. I have not had training as recently as Officer Haskins, so in that sense I would defer to his answer as opposed to offering my own.
- Q. Well, with respect to the amount of material that is included on the forfeiture assessment, is it your understanding that that's how the amount of material is determined is the amount reported on the inspection report based on shipping documents
  - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. -- without respect to containers or packaging of any sort?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Mr. Canty, you also indicated you were responsible for the letters, notices, and so forth that are sent out to indicate possible assessments to drivers, carriers --
  - A. Yes.
  - O. -- the like?
- A. Yes, I am.
  - Q. Did you have an opportunity to review the

notices that were provided in this case?

A. Yes, I did.

1.5

- MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor?
  THE EXAMINER: Yes.
- Q. Mr. Canty, I have handed you a multi-page document that's been marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit No. 5. Have you seen this document before?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Can you describe what this document is, please?
- A. Yes. This would be the first notification that's required to be sent to the responsible party. This is what is known as a Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture regarding the case in question here against Mr. Williams. The letter is dated November 13, 2009. It instructs Mr. Williams that we intend to make a civil forfeiture assessment of \$400 against him for the grade crossing violation. It directs him to either pay the forfeiture or request a conference within 30 days.
- Q. Would you turn to the second page of that document, please. And what is contained in this portion of the document?

- 1 This is the notice that is referred to as Α. 2 the Notice of Preliminary Determination regarding the 3 same case. This is dated February 12, 2010. This is 4 addressed to -- apparently to Mr. Williams' attorney, Steve Moyer, at 9 East Kossuth Street here in 6 Columbus. This notice is sent after a conference has 7 been conducted, informs the Respondent or in this 8 case Respondent's attorney that a conference was conducted, and we the Commission still intend to hold 10 Mr. Williams responsible for the violation at the 11 \$400 amount.
  - Q. These are documents that are regularly maintained in the ordinary course of business here at the Commission?
    - A. Yes, they are.
    - Q. Both in electronic and in paper form?
    - A. Yes, they are.
  - Q. And are documents that were sent to Mr. Williams or to his attorney regarding his rights in this matter?
    - A. Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And in your opinion was Mr. Williams and/or his counsel properly served with all appropriate notices in this case?
  - A. Yes, they were.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. I have no further questions for Mr. Canty.

# CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 By Mr. Moyer:

- Q. Morning, Mr. Canty. How are you?
- A. Good morning. Fine, thank you.
- Q. If I could direct you to Staff Exhibit 3, the forfeiture assessment section, if the amount of material was less than 1,000 pounds, what would the resulting change in that row C be?
- A. Less than 1,000 pounds, let me refer to Staff Exhibit 4, the hazardous amount chart. Less than 1,000 pounds would be a value of .2 instead of .4. The result would be essentially to reduce that violation from \$400 to \$200.
- Q. And this was not a violation that your office considered to be an egregious violation?
- A. Not in the sense that it was done maliciously or -- I'll just leave it at that, with malice.
  - MR. MOYER: Nothing further.
  - THE EXAMINER: Any redirect?
- MR. MARGARD: I have no redirect, your
- Honor.

```
1
                 THE EXAMINER: Okay. You're excused,
2
    thank you.
3
                MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I would
4
    respectfully move the admission of Staff Exhibits 1,
5
    3, 4, and 5 noting that Staff Exhibit No. 2 had
6
    already been recognized by the Bench, administrative
7
    notice taken of that document.
8
                 THE EXAMINER: Okay. Any objection to
9
    the admission of Staff Exhibits 1, 3, 4, and 5?
10
                 MR. MOYER: None.
11
                 THE EXAMINER: They will be admitted.
12
                 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
13
                 THE EXAMINER: Any other witnesses does
14
    the Staff have?
15
                 MR. MARGARD: I have none, thank you.
16
                 THE EXAMINER: All right. Why don't we
    take a short recess, 10 minutes, and then we will go
17
18
    back on.
19
                 (Recess taken.)
20
                 THE EXAMINER: Let's go back on the
21
    record.
22
                 MR. MOYER: Respondent would call Robert
23
    Williams to the stand.
24
25
```

### ROBERT WILLIAMS

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

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Moyer:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Robert, would you please state your full name for the record.
- A. Robert Allen Williams, 573 Frebis, F-R-E-B-I-S, Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43206.
- Q. And do you own or rent that house on Frebis?
  - A. I own.
  - Q. Okay. And what effect would losing your license for 60 days have on you?
    - A. Pretty devastating.
- 16 O. How?
  - A. Our health insurance, we would lose our health insurance. I have got a son and his two daughters and wife living with us at this time. He needs back surgery. 60 days would devastate me.
  - Q. Directing your attention to October 22, 2009, do you remember that day?
    - A. Yes, I do.
    - Q. Where were you driving that day?
    - A. I was coming from Celina, picked up a

load, heading back to the CSX yard in Columbus.

- Q. Okay. And did that route take you on Route 42?
  - A. That day it did, yes.
- Q. Okay. And before you started your trip that day, did you do a pretrip checklist?
  - A. Yes, I did.

- Q. Tell the Court what you did in that pretrip checklist.
- A. As far as I checked the vehicle's lights, I checked the tires, I checked the brakes as far as I can check the brakes. I don't actually crawl under the vehicle and measure the brakes when I pick up a container but just checked my fluid levels and.
- Q. Did the vehicle and the -- your load pass the checklist?
  - A. As far as I -- yes, yes.
  - Q. Okay. And what was your load that day?
- A. I was picking up a load at Crown Battery, and I don't know -- I didn't know what it was. I mean, I just go to pick up a load. I didn't realize what -- it was a HazMat load. They did say it was HazMat.
- Q. Okay. And did -- can you look at Exhibits A and B that are in front of you.

A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Okay. And are those -- do you recognize those two documents?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Are those documents that were given to you for this load?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And was this a domestic load or an international load?
  - A. International.
- Q. Okay. Do you have an understanding as to whether that changes any placarding requirements?
- A. Yes. The requirements on international regardless of the amount of the actual HazMat when a container is being railed, aired, or flown out of the country, they have to placard it regardless of the amount of the actual HazMat or the chemical or whatever is on it.
- Q. Okay. All right. If I could direct your attention, Robert, to Exhibit B, would you look at that document.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And in looking at the middle

  section of that document, can you tell the Court what

  you were hauling in this container that day?

- A. There was two lift trucks which were like pallet jacks, electric work equipment, two -- well, it was two attachments that go to the equipment, add-on attachments, and then there was four batteries, one on one pallet and three on the other pallet strapped.
  - Q. Okay. What did the total weight of the two pallets and four batteries weigh?
  - A. 2,330, 2,330 pounds including the strapping and the pallet.
- Q. Okay. And as you're driving down 42, do you recall approaching the railroad tracks?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And tell the Court what you recall about that.
- A. As far as I recall, there was two vehicles behind me. I did slow down, and I thought I came to a stop.
- Q. Okay. After you crossed the tracks, did you see Officer Haskins?
- A. Probably not -- probably could -- I was probably a mile and a half, 2 miles across the tracks before I realized he was back there. I seen a vehicle with lights on. There was two vehicles actually behind me and they did turn off and he

approached and I didn't realize it was an officer at the time, still approached up closer to me with his headlights on. He was flashing his lights and at the time I thought it was a construction vehicle and then I realized it was an officer.

- Q. Okay. And you pulled over?
- A. When I realized it was an officer, I did, yes.
- Q. Okay. And then did you guys then go on to the bowling alley for him to do his inspection?
- A. Right, yeah. It was a two-lane road. There's not much room there.
  - Q. Okay.

- A. He said proceed up to the bowling alley; he was going to do a DOT inspection on me.
- Q. Okay. When you got out of your truck up at the bowling alley, what did Officer Haskins say to you?
- A. He mentioned -- he said you realize I didn't -- you realize you didn't stop for the railroad track back there. And I said, you know, oh, I didn't? And I said I think I was preoccupied because I was having an issue with my oil -- I had my oil changed at the TA up there and I was going to stop at the TA and I was kind of losing a little

pressure there and I might have been preoccupied, maybe didn't come to a complete stop so I wasn't, you know.

- Q. What did Officer Haskins say to you?
- A. He is doing a DOT -- he was going to do a DOT, that's a level 1 inspection. And he said he wasn't going to give me a ticket, you know, for the --
  - Q. Railroad?

1.5

- A. Railroad crossing, yes.
- Q. And he did the inspection, correct?
- A. I let it slide. I didn't even think about it after that.
  - Q. Okay. He did the inspection, correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Did he -- and he found that the brakes weren't working on axle 5, correct?
- A. Yes. That's on the actual container itself. My tractor, he checked everything out on my tracker; it was fine. Proceeded to check the container and found that the fifth axle brakes were out of adjustment, completely out, put me out of service completely; yes, that's what he said.
- Q. Okay. And where did he tell you to -- did he tell you to park the rig and get a tow truck?

A. No.

- Q. What did he tell you to do?
- A. He said he was going to allow me to proceed on to the CSX rail yard and to have them put it out of service and hand them the paper when I got there.
  - Q. Is that what you did?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Okay. Now, did the -- that was axle 5 that wasn't working. Does that mean -- how many axles were on the container?
- A. There's two axles on the container, got three -- three axles on the actual tractor.
  - Q. They were all working.
- A. Right. Everything was fine there. Then that's the last axle, 5, on the rear of the container or the chassis. The container sets on the chassis but.
- Q. So one of the two sets of brakes weren't working on the trailer but the other one was.
- A. Right. The fourth axle, I believe he didn't mark it out. The fourth axle was fine, and Officer Haskins said that the axle was, you know, completely out which they say would put you out of service.

1 Okay. And, again, you indicated that Ο. 2 Officer Haskins indicated he was not going to cite 3 you for the railroad violation, right? He said he wasn't going to give me a 4 Α. 5 ticket, yeah. 6 All right. Did Officer Haskins open --7 crack the seal and open the container? 8 Α. No. And about how tall are your taillights on 9 the back of that chassis? Waist high? Below waist? 10 11 Α. They are -- about 3-1/2 feet. 12 Q. Okay. 13 Maybe 4 feet depending on. Α. 14 Okay. Q. 15 I would say 3-1/2. Α. 16 MR. MOYER: All right. I don't have anything further for Mr. Williams. 17 18 THE EXAMINER: Okay. 19 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION 21 By Mr. Margard: 22 Q. Mr. Williams, thinking back to 23 October 22, 2009, how did you start your day? 24 I start my day get up, shower, and dress Α.

and coffee, and go to where my load assignment takes

me.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And were you at home here in Columbus when you did that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Was your first assignment then to drive to Celina?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you drove empty to Celina, or did you take cargo?
  - A. I drove empty.
  - Q. Just your tractor.
- A. No, drove empty with the trailer and the tractor up there to be, you know, live loaded.
- Q. Is that the same trailer you were driving at the time of the inspection?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And where did you pick up the trailer or where did you pick up the load for the trailer, I should say?
  - A. Well, I picked up the load in Celina, I guess that's how you pronounce it, Celina, Ohio.
  - Q. And specifically where in Celina did you pick it up?
- A. Celina, if that's how it's pronounced, at
  the Crown -- I don't know if it's Crown Industry or

Crown Battery, but it's the Crown facility up there.

- Q. At the shipper's facility.
- A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

- Q. And this is an intermodal load; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And Crown had already loaded the container before you arrived; is that correct?
  - A. No. I sat there and live loaded.
  - Q. You loaded it yourself.
- A. No. They loaded it while I sat there. I mean, I brought the empty there and waited for them to load it.
- Q. I want to make sure I'm clear on what we're loading. You waited as they loaded the container, or you waited as they loaded the container onto the trailer?
- A. No. I waited as they loaded  $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$  I took the empty there.
  - Q. You took the empty container.
  - A. Right.
- Q. Not just the trailer, the empty container.
- A. Right. The container sits on the
  chassis, yeah. I took the chassis and the container

70

to the facility to be loaded.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

12

13

- Q. Okay. And watched as they loaded the container?
  - A. No. They don't allow you to watch.
- Q. But they loaded the trailer container while you were in the chassis of the truck.
  - A. Yeah. I'm in my tractor.
- Q. The cab of the truck. And they then closed and sealed it.
- A. Yes. I pull away. They come out and close the doors and seal it up.
  - Q. Okay. Thank you. Is this a route you've driven before?
- A. Yes, yes.
  - Q. And you indicated --
- A. Many times, yes.
- Q. On that day your course took you on Route
- 18 42. Does it usually?
- A. If I wasn't -- I was going to the TA on 42 and 70.
- THE EXAMINER: What's the TA?
- THE WITNESS: Truck --
- MR. MOYER: Truck America.
- THE WITNESS: Fuel and --
- THE EXAMINER: Fuel stop.

THE WITNESS: Service.

- Q. Specifically because of the oil problem that you were noting?
- A. Right. I had my actual PT -- my tractor there on Sunday. This was like a Tuesday. And I was losing a little bit of oil pressure. I would have stayed on 33 to 270. That's what would have been my normal route. There's no railroad crossing or nothing, you know.
  - Q. That seems logical, of course.
- A. Right, right. But I have been across 42 many times, probably 60 at least.
  - Q. So you were familiar with that route.
- A. I used to come out of Bucyrus and go that way all the time. I know the railroad track. I'm real familiar with it. That's what you are getting at, yes, I do.
- Q. That helps but I was trying to figure out exactly where you were headed and I assume any other times that you would need service on that route, that's probably the way you would have gone --
  - A. Right.
- Q. -- to get to that truck stop. Okay.

  Now, in response to Mr. Moyer's questions you were

  describing the load that you were carrying. When you

arrived at the CSX yard, the container or the trailer was unloaded?

- A. No. They take the whole -- I drop the container chassis and all off there. The container is lifted off and put on a -- on the train.
  - Q. After you had already left.
- A. Right, yeah. I don't have nothing to do with that. I just park it, you know.
- Q. And so you would have gone to the yard, unhooked the trailer, and gone on about your business.
  - A. Yes.

- Q. So at any point did you ever see what was inside the container?
- A. Never, never. Less -- now, there's times this is -- there's times when they will open them, you know, they spot check them to make sure nothing spilled, you know, and then they'll reseal it, you know, change the document.
- Q. But just to be clear though that didn't happen this time?
  - A. Right, nothing.
- Q. So you -- other than the description on the documents Mr. Moyer showed you, you have no idea what was in the container.

A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

Q. Okay. I guess the final question I have for you is you were indicating the height of your brake lights. When you apply the brakes, are there any other lights that come on on the trailer?

A. No.

Q. Okay.

A. That was in the day so it would have been just the brake lights. There wasn't no other lights on.

MR. MARGARD: Okay. I don't think I have anything further for Mr. Williams. Thank you, sir.

THE EXAMINER: Any redirect?

MR. MOYER: None.

THE EXAMINER: Okay. You're excused.

Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE EXAMINER: Do you have any other

19 witnesses?

MR. MOYER: Yes. We would call --

Respondent would call Courtney Webb to the stand.

(Witness sworn.)

THE EXAMINER: You can proceed.

\_ \_

25

## COURTNEY WEBB

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

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Moyer:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Ms. Webb, would you please state your full name for the record.
  - A. Courtney Renee Webb.
- Q. You are going to need to keep your voice up because of the air conditioning.
  - A. Courtney Renee Webb.
- Q. And this young lady is taking down everything you said so use a big voice, okay? All right. Where did you work this summer?
- A. I interned at Steve Moyer's law office in Columbus, Ohio.
  - Q. Are you currently what?
  - A. I am currently an intern under Mr. Moyer.
- Q. Okay. Are you going to college? Are you going to law school?
- A. Yes. I am a senior at Wittenberg
  University this year and hope to go to law school
  next year after graduation.
- Q. Okay. And were you asked to do anything as it relates to the Robert Williams case?

- A. Yes, I was. Mr. Moyer asked me to investigate the alleged charges against Mr. Williams and specifically the placarding laws and whether or not they were required.
- Q. And did you prepare a summary of what you found?
  - A. Yes, I did.

MR. MOYER: May I approach the witness, your Honor?

THE EXAMINER: Yes.

- Q. And, first of all, Courtney, can you identify what Exhibit C is?
- A. It is my investigation summary that I prepared.
- Q. Okay. And Exhibit -- what is the exhibit to your right right there?
  - A. D.
  - Q. D, what is that exhibit?
- A. This is a copy of pages 36 through 39 of the general requirements for the Hazardous Materials Compliance Pocketbook.
  - Q. That's this little handbook?
- A. Yes.
  - Q. All right. First of all, what sources -THE EXAMINER: Just for the record can

you -- that when you said "that," this little pocketbook, could you identify that for the record.

1.5

MR. MOYER: This is the Hazardous

Materials Compliance Pocketbook with a copyright date
of 2008, I believe. I believe it's copyright 2008,
your Honor.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you.

- Q. Courtney, what documents or resources did you use to investigate the issue as it relates to this compliance issue with Mr. Williams?
- A. I used the Hazardous Materials Compliance Pocketbook which would be Exhibit D, and I also used certified copies of documents provided by Crown Equipment Corporation in response to a subpoena Mr. Moyer's office served, and I also used information provided to me over the phone from the technical support personnel at the Ohio GNB warehouse.
- Q. Okay. And, first of all, as it relates to the Hazardous Materials Compliance Pocketbook, we've marked as Respondent's Exhibit D the materials that relate to corrosive materials, correct?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And corrosive materials such as this are a -- are on Table 2, correct?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

- Q. Okay. And the page 37 then also refers to when Table 2 materials are required to be placarded, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. There's also an Exhibit E in front of you.
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And is that the federal statute that summarizes the same thing that's on Exhibit D?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. All right. And so the issue then became whether or not the hazardous materials were over 1,000 pounds or 554 kilograms, right?
- 17 A. Yes.
  - Q. And what did you do next to investigate that issue?
  - A. With in accordance with the pocketbook or other sources?
    - Q. Other sources.
- A. Then I used documents that were provided by a subpoena from Mr. Moyer's office, and they were from Crown Equipment Battery.

Q. Okay.

- A. Or just Crown Equipment. And they showed that the batteries that were transported by Mr. Williams were GNB batteries and also that they gave me the model number and things such as that I could use for reference.
- Q. Can you state for the record what GNB batteries are?

THE WITNESS: They are just a type of battery that Crown Equipment purchases. They don't make their batteries; they purchase them from other companies.

THE EXAMINER: That's some designation of Crown Batteries?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. MOYER: Actually I believe GNB is a brand of battery.

OFFICER HASKINS: It's a manufacturer.

MR. MOYER: It's a manufacturer, yes.

THE EXAMINER: Thank you.

- Q. And were you able to identify out of the weight of the battery how much was -- how much of it was sulfuric acid and how much of it was other materials?
- A. Yes. They -- when I spoke to the

personnel of Crown Battery --

1.5

MR. MARGARD: Well, your Honor, I am going to object at this point. This is clearly hearsay.

MR. MOYER: My response is that the Commission is — that the strict Rules of Evidence are not necessarily followed as it relates to these hearings. And this is certainly an investigation that was done as it relates to what the true nature of the hazardous material was. It's not offered for the truth of the matter asserted. It's just background material for this argument.

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, first of all, while the rules of hearsay do not strictly apply, and I certainly agree with that, I would dispute that this isn't being offered for the truth of the matter contained in it. Clearly, she's being asked to testify as to the weight of hazardous materials, the amount of hazardous materials which is information that she gained no other way than through her discussion with some unidentified employee, an employee that they easily could have produced here.

Very clearly Mr. Moyer's office subpoenaed records from this company. They very easily could have subpoenaed a witness to testify as

to what these batteries contained. Instead they have chosen not to do so and using an intern whose investigative abilities seem to be very capable. It is none the less not testified in this manner.

MR. MOYER: Well, the truth of the matter asserted in this case is not what the weight of the sulfuric acid is in this case. The truth of the matter asserted is whether or not Robert Williams violated a statute related to stopping at a railroad crossing. This is clearly not the determinative issue for this Court. There has been a complete lack of any testimony from the Staff's standpoint as to what the actual weight of the sulfuric acid which is the hazardous material was.

We are offering this as the only evidence so far to be presented as to what the actual weight of the -- of the hazardous material is and this should be admitted for that purpose.

THE EXAMINER: Can the court reporter read the question that Mr. Moyer -- the last question that he asked.

(Record read.)

THE EXAMINER: I'm sustaining the objection.

MR. MOYER: Your Honor, for the record we

would proffer evidence that the actual weight of the sulfuric acid was 1.6 kilograms times 4, the actual weight being 206 kilograms of actual hazardous material, 206 kilograms being less than one-half of the \$1,000 threshold -- excuse me, the 1,000 -- excuse me, the 454 kilograms threshold for Table 2 materials. And we would proffer that for the record.

- Q. (By Mr. Moyer) Courtney, can you identify what Exhibit F is?
- A. Exhibit F is a copy of the Material
  Safety Data Sheet for lead acid battery which is what
  was filled with acid.
- Q. Was this document also received pursuant to a subpoena?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Directing your attention to page 2 of the MSDS sheet.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Under composition/information on ingredients where it says sulfuric acid, can you tell me what the average percentage by weight of sulfuric acid is according to this MSDS sheet for wet batteries?
  - A. The average is 25 percent.
    - Q. Okay. And the total weight of the

1 pallets and four batteries was 2,330 pounds. What 2 would 25 percent of that be? 3 Α. That would be 582, around .5 percent. Pounds. Ο. 5 Uh-huh. Α. 6 And, again, less than the 1,000-pound Ο. 7 threshold amount? 8 Α. Yes. MR. MOYER: Nothing further. 10 THE EXAMINER: Okay. Cross? 11 MR. MARGARD: I have no cross for the 12 witness. Thank you, your Honor. 13 THE EXAMINER: Okay. You're excused. 14 Thank you. 15 MR. MOYER: Your Honor, on behalf of the 16 Respondent we would move to admit Respondent's 17 Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, and F. 18 THE EXAMINER: Any objection? 19 MR. MARGARD: Yes, your Honor. I am 20 going to be objecting to Exhibits C, D, and F. I'll 21 object to Exhibit C on the basis of my previous 22 objection, that it contains hearsay information from 23 a source that easily could have been called to 24 testify, containing matter that is apparently

extremely important to the determination of whether

or not a violation occurred here, that is, the amount of hazardous materials. It is offered by, again, perhaps a capable witness but certainly not an expert and certainly not expert enough to be able to testify to this information.

1.5

I'll object to Exhibit No. D because while this comes from a handbook this is not the federal regulations. The same information essentially is contained in Exhibit E to which I have no objection, but I see no purpose served by the inclusion of summary information contained in Exhibit No. D.

With respect to Exhibit No. F while this is apparently what it purports to be the indication is this was produced pursuant to a subpoena but there's been no indication in this record who produced this information or in response to what subpoena or, in fact, whether or not this had anything to do with the batteries that were contained in the shipment. It just doesn't have any relevance at all.

THE EXAMINER: Okay. You want to respond?

MR. MOYER: Yes, your Honor. First as to Exhibit C, this investigative summary is no different

than the officer's note from which he testified to.

It summarizes what was done. It summarizes the course of those materials. And we believe that it should be admitted for that purpose. Do you want me to go through each one of them?

THE EXAMINER: Yes.

MR. MOYER: All right. The next one that I believe he objected to was Exhibit D. Exhibit D was identified as pages from the Hazardous Materials Compliance Pocketbook which drivers carry with them. I see no reason why printed materials that drivers carry with them shouldn't be admitted before this Commission. We would offer it for that purpose.

And Exhibit F is an MSDS sheet. These are prepared pursuant to federal statute. These are, I believe, self-authenticating documents in that they are prepared pursuant to federal requirements. They are required to be carried with loads that have hazardous chemicals. And when a -- when a document is prepared as a result of a requirement of the federal government, I believe that it should -- it is self-authenticating on its own, but even if it's not authenticating on its own, Ms. Webb testified as to the source of that document.

Again, this Commission is not required to

strictly construe the Rules of Evidence as -- as his Honor made clear at our pretrial conferences on this matter. I did not object to many of the technical evidentiary arguments that could have been based upon both what the Ohio Administrative Code says and what has been represented.

This is clearly evidentiary material,

Exhibit F, prepared in compliance with federal law

that was received pursuant to subpoena related to

this -- these batteries, this load, and it should be
admitted.

MR. MARGARD: May I respond, your Honor?
THE EXAMINER: Yes.

MR. MARGARD: With respect to the investigative summary, Exhibit C, completely unlike the investigator's report which was written based on at the moment impressions, based on his observations, based on discussions with the Respondent, completely unlike that.

With respect to Exhibit D while this is something that may be carried by drivers there's no evidence in this record it was carried by this driver or that this driver relied on this in any extent at all. Once again, it's not the law. It's merely a summary. The law is adequately contained in

Exhibit E.

1.5

With respect to Exhibit F, yes, Ms. Webb did indicate it was provided in response to a subpoena but nowhere in this record is there any indication to whom that subpoena was directed or other than the statements of counsel that it was issued in this case or with respect to these batteries, in fact, there is an indication here this came from East Penn Manufacturing. We have no idea if they had anything to do with these batteries. I have no idea why they produced this.

And the mere fact it was produced purportedly in response to some federal regulation certainly doesn't make it self-authenticating. There are plenty of things that are produced in response to federal regulations that are full of untruths and inaccuracies. There is simply no basis to include it in the evidentiary hearing in this case.

MR. MOYER: May I respond just to that last argument?

THE EXAMINER: Yes.

MR. MOYER: I would offer for the Court the fact that in many, many courts of law MSDS sheets are routinely admitted without any testimony, without any further documentation for the reasons that I have

```
1
    previously set forth. I've introduced them in
2
    previous cases; opposing counsel has introduced them
3
    in previous cases. These MSDS sheets are routinely
    used and produced and relied upon by experts
5
    throughout this country in the course of law so
6
    especially as to that one, that document should be
7
    beyond argument.
8
                THE EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. All
9
    right. I am going to admit Respondent's A, B, D, and
10
    E, but I am not going to admit C and F.
11
                 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
12
                THE EXAMINER: Is there anything further?
13
                MR. MOYER: What was the basis for not
14
    admitting Exhibit F?
15
                THE EXAMINER: Well, you established no
16
    foundation to the witness for this document.
17
    there's no information as to East Penn Manufacturing
18
    Company. She didn't indicate her familiarity with
19
    the document.
20
                 Is there anything further on behalf of
21
    either party?
22
                MR. MARGARD: Nothing, your Honor, thank
23
    you.
24
                THE EXAMINER: Okay. Do you want the
25
    opportunity to file a brief?
```

1 MR. MOYER: Sure. 2 THE EXAMINER: Okay. Let's go off the 3 record. (Discussion off the record.) 5 THE EXAMINER: The parties have requested 6 the ability -- the opportunity to file a brief, so 7 we've established a briefing schedule. Initial 8 briefs will be due by September 20 and the reply briefs due by September 27. I would request that the 10 parties serve each other electronically with the 11 briefs. They can provide me a copy electronically 12 also but file a copy in the docket of the case. 13 Anything further in the case by either 14 side? 15 MR. MOYER: Nothing on behalf of the 16 Respondent, your Honor. 17 MR. MARGARD: Nothing, your Honor, thank 18 you. 19 THE EXAMINER: Okay. This matter will be 20 closed or adjourned. 21 (Thereupon, the hearing was concluded at 22 11:51 a.m.) 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 Thursday, August 19, 2010, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Karen Sue Gibson, Registered

Merit Reporter.

10 (KSG-5240)

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

9/2/2010 1:19:57 PM

in

Case No(s). 10-0235-TR-CVF

Summary: Transcript Transcript of Robert Williams hearing held on 08/19/10. electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.