1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO				
2					
3					
4	In the Matter of: : Gregory Artemenkov :				
5	Re: Notice of Apparent :Case No. 10-474-TR-CVF Violation and Intent to :				
6	Assess Forfeiture. :				
7					
8					
9	PROCEEDINGS				
10	before Mr. Jim M. Lynn, Hearing Examiner, at the				
11	Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad				
12	Street, Room 11-D, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:00				
13	a.m. on Tuesday, November 30, 2010.				
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22	ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.				
23	222 East Town Street, 2nd Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215				
24	(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481 Fax - (614) 224-5724				
25					

```
2
1
    APPEARANCES:
2
            Richard Cordray
            Ohio Attorney General
3
            By Mr. Stephen A. Reilly
            Mr. John Jones
            Public Utilities Section
            180 East Broad Street, Floor 9
5
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
6
                  On behalf of the Staff.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

•				3
1	INDEX			
2				
3	WITNESSES	PAGE		
4	ALAN T. OGDEN			
5	Direct examination by Mr Reilly Examination by Hearing Examiner	6 13		
6	Further direct exam by Mr. Reilly	15		
7	JOHN CANDY Direct examination by Mr. Reilly	17		
8		Ι,		
9	STAFF EXHIBITS	ID'D	REC'D	
10	1 - Driver/Vehicle Examination Report		23	
11	2 - Notice of Apparent Violation and	18	23	
12	Intent to Assess Forfeiture			
13	3 - Notice of Preliminary Determination	20	23	
	4 - Fine Schedule	22	23	
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Tuesday Morning Session, November 30, 2010.

_ _

1.5

HEARING EXAMINER: Let's go on the record at this time.

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio has assigned for hearing at this time and place Case No. 10-474-TR-CVF, In the Matter of Gregory Artemenkov Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture.

I'm Jim Lynn, the Attorney Examiner assigned to hear this case.

At this time we'll have the appearances of the parties, beginning with the Ohio Attorney General's Office.

MR. REILLY: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of the Ohio Public Utilities Commission,
Richard Cordray, Ohio Attorney General, William
Wright, Section Chief, Steve Reilly and John Jones,
Assistant Attorneys General, 180 East Broad Street,
Columbus, Ohio 43215.

HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you.

And for the record I'd like to note that Mr. Artemenkov is not here. When we had convened at an earlier time a month or so ago for this hearing

```
1
    Mr. Artemenkov also was not present, so, Mr. Reilly,
2
    I believe you were telling me that there had been
3
    attempts to contact Mr. Artemenkov and remind him of
4
    the hearing today; am I correct?
                MR. REILLY: Yes, your Honor.
                                                Last
6
    Wednesday, November 24th, our office called Mr.
7
    Artemenkov, was not able to reach him but left a
8
    voicemail message for him on the telephone number we
    had, telling him, reminding him of the hearing this
10
    morning.
11
                HEARING EXAMINER: And the message was
12
    left and nothing's been heard.
13
                MR. REILLY: We've heard nothing in
14
    response.
15
                                                Well,
                HEARING EXAMINER:
                                   Thank you.
16
    having said that, if you'd like to call your first
17
    witness please, we'll get underway.
18
                MR. REILLY: Thank you, your Honor.
                                                       We
    would call Sergeant Ogden.
20
                HEARING EXAMINER: If you'd like to come
21
    up here to the witness stand, Sergeant.
22
                 (Witness sworn.)
23
                HEARING EXAMINER: Please take a seat.
24
                Mr. Reilly, please continue.
25
                MR. REILLY: Thank you, your Honor.
```

6 1 2 ALAN T. OGDEN 3 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows: 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 By Mr. Reilly: 7 Q. Morning, Sergeant Ogden. 8 Α. Morning. Would you introduce yourself to the Bench Q. 10 and give your name and your employer? 11 My name is Sergeant Alan T. Ogden. 12 work for the Ohio State Highway Patrol. 13 You're a sergeant with the Ohio Highway Ο. 14 Patrol? 15 That's correct. Α. 16 How long have you been with the Patrol? 0. 17 Α. Eighteen years. 18 What's your current position with the Q. 19 Patrol? 20 Supervisor of the licensed commercial Α. 21 standards section, Warren District Headquarters. 22 Q. What does that -- just generally what 23 does that involve? 24 Α. A lot. We oversee the Motor Carrier 25 Enforcement Section. We also oversee school bus

inspection, platform scales, and the driver exam stations and driving schools.

- Q. Now, Sergeant Ogden, in the 18 years you've been with the Patrol, I take it you have had occasion to enforce the motor carrier safety regulation?
- A. I've been with the commercial enforcement section for ten years.
- Q. And have you taken any classes on the commercial motor vehicle safety regulations?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And there's some sort of certifications with those?
- A. Originally we have to attend a two-week course and receive just a general part A/B driver/vehicle. Once we're done with that we have to obtain 32 level 1s.

In addition to that there's our general hazmat courses, our cargo tank courses, and our bulk under-package courses, which we have to be certified annually to do inspections on those to maintain our certifications.

Q. Sergeant, I'd like to draw your attention at this point to August 13 of 2009. Did you have an occasion to meet a Gregory Artemenkov --

1.5

A. Yes, I did.

Q. -- on that date?

Could you describe the circumstances of that meeting?

A. That particular day I was working in Columbiana County on U.S. 30 around the Westpoint exit of the four-lane highway. I observed Mr. Artemenkov drive past my vehicle. I believe he was headed northbound at the time.

And as he passed I looked over at his truck, he was wearing a light colored shirt, later was discovered it's a light tan shirt, and as he went by no seat belt was visible as he went past my vehicle.

- Q. Now, you mentioned he was driving a truck. Was it a commercial motor vehicle?
- A. Yes, it was. It was a truck-trailer combination.
 - Q. And this was on U.S. 30.
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. What happened after he drove by you?
- A. I proceeded to stop him, activated the overhead light, stopped him alongside the berm, and approached the driver's side -- correction, passenger's side.

When I approached the passenger's side, as I normally do, I will knock on the door, announce my presence, explain to the driver why I stopped him, and also that I will be conducting a vehicle inspection on his truck at that time.

- Q. And the reason you stopped him was you didn't see him wearing his seat belt.
 - A. That's correct.

1

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And that would have been a violation of the commercial motor vehicle safety rules?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, we're here on a failure to wear the seat belt today.
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Could you describe the seat belt in the truck for us?
- A. It was a lap/shoulder combination, it was dark in color.
 - Q. Did it appear to be operational?
 - A. Appeared to be, yes.
- Q. You said you conducted an inspection. At the end of the inspection what happened?
- A. I carry a pad and paper around noting the violations as I see them. Also recording information as far as the vehicle, plates, VIN numbers, and so

forth.

At the conclusion of the walk-around inspection I'll immediately go to the patrol car and begin entering this information into our Aspen program we have preloaded on all of our laptops.

- Q. The Aspen program is a computer database?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. What happens to the information after you load it onto your laptop?
- A. After it's entered into the computer a report is generated much like the one I have here today, much like the one you have as well. The driver is given a copy of the report. I go over the violations discovered and explain to the driver how to take care of the report from here.

I will sign the bottom, the driver will sign the bottom, and he's given the report to take to the company.

- Q. Do you recall -- did you do this in this case?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. When you presented the report to Mr. Ogden did he say anything with regard to the seat belt violation -- strike that.

HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Artemenkov?

A. What was the question?

- Q. Was there any interaction between you and Mr. Artemenkov with regard to the seat belt violation?
- A. No. As our discussion earlier on this case, I'll note in the section under the "Inspection Notes" of a driver who will say I had it tucked under my arm or I had it behind my back. If they're adamant they had it on, that will be noted on my inspection report. There's nothing noted on here.
- Q. Now, you mentioned that you went -- at the end of the inspection you went to your laptop, you entered the information into the Aspen database and then what happened with the inspection, do you know?
- A. At the end of that day all the reports are tagged and uploaded to the server.
- Q. And the server, have you ever heard of the Safety Net program?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Could you tell me what that is?
- A. I believe that's where they store all the reports and where the reports are pulled from.
- Q. And is the accuracy of the information in that database important?

A. Yes, it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

19

- Q. Why is that?
- A. If it wasn't, what's the sense of recording the information into that?
- Q. Is that information used in the enforcement of the motor carrier safety program?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. You mentioned a couple of times that printout from that database, have you seen those printouts before? From the Safety Net database?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. In your 18 years you've probably seen many of them.
- A. This is just one that I have. I pulled it off of my laptop.
- Q. I'd like you to take a look there on the witness stand I have a document marked Staff
- Exhibit 1. Can you find that for us?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Can you tell me what that is?
- A. This is the copy that you're referring to here.
- Q. Of the report from the Safety Net database?
- A. Yes, sir.

- Q. If you would take a look at it, does it accurately reflect your observations --
 - A. Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. -- on August 13, 2009?
- A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Does it reflect the violations for a seat belt anywhere?
 - A. Yes, it does.
 - Q. And where is that?
 - A. Under the "Violations" section.

MR. REILLY: I have nothing further.

HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Reilly.

- - -

EXAMINATION

By Hearing Examiner:

- Q. Sergeant, you're indicating then you were along U.S. 30 and you observed Mr. Artemenkov as he drove by?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Can you tell me what the weather conditions were like that day? Was it a sunny day, did you have good visibility?
- A. I had good enough visibility to see he didn't have a seat belt on.
 - Q. And you were looking up into the cab?

A. Absolutely.

- Q. You were not parked at a location where you happened to be higher than the cab and looking down into it.
- A. No. I drive a 2007 Chevy Tahoe so it sits up a little bit higher than a patrol car.
- Q. And you indicated then when Mr. Artemenkov was -- when you stopped him at the beginning of the inspection there was a useable lap and shoulder belt combination there but he had not had it buckled.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And when you gave him a copy of the inspection which indicated the violation, did you mention the violation to him?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. And then he had no response?
 - A. No response.

HEARING EXAMINER: Let's go off the record for a minute please.

(Off the record.)

HEARING EXAMINER: We'll go back on the record.

Q. One more question, Sergeant, what was the speed of the driver at this time that you estimate?

```
1
                  I can't even guess. I don't even know.
            Α.
2
     I mean I would say he was going at least 55 miles an
3
     hour. At least that. I mean I can't say he was
4
     speeding.
5
                  HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. I have no
6
     further questions for you. Thank you.
7
                  MR. REILLY: Just a couple more if I
8
     could.
9
10
                    FUTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION
11
    By Mr. Reilly:
                  Sergeant, did you have a clear view of
12
            Q.
13
     the driver Mr. Artemenkov as he drove by you?
14
                  Yes, I did.
            Α.
15
                  Were you able to see inside the cab
            Q.
16
     plainly?
17
            Α.
                  Yes, I was.
18
                  MR. REILLY:
                               Thank you.
19
                  HEARING EXAMINER: And, Sergeant, was
20
     there anything like tinted glass on the windows?
21
                  THE WITNESS: No. I could clearly see he
22
     didn't have his seat belt on.
23
                  MR. REILLY: Thank you.
24
                  HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, you can
25
     take your seat.
```

Before we go on, I wanted to mention for the record that the prior hearing date which Mr. Artemenkov was not present was October 14. Shortly afterwards I determined that a notice that had been sent of that hearing date sent certified mail was returned unsigned by Mr. Artemenkov.

So for today's hearing, which is

November 30th, I directed that notice be sent to

Mr. Artemenkov both certified mail and non-certified
as well. The certified mail card Mr. Artemenkov was
to sign was returned unsigned, however, presumably
the non-certified letter got through to his address.

And in addition, Mr. Reilly had noted that the Attorney General's Office attempted to contact Mr. Artemenkov as well and left a phone message too. So I'm assuming that adequate notice was given to Mr. Artemenkov through ordinary mail and through phone call as well.

Mr. Reilly?

MR. REILLY: Yes, your Honor. This will come as no surprise to your Honor, we will be moving for default at the end of this hearing. And I think from the explanation your Honor's just given, all reasonable means were taken in which to notify Mr. Artemenkov of this hearing.

1 We don't have any reason to believe that 2 he was not aware of the hearing given -- particularly 3 given the means that were taken to notify him of it. HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. 5 Mr. Reilly, do you have another witness? 6 MR. REILLY: We do, your Honor, we would 7 call Mr. John Candy. 8 (Witness sworn.) 9 HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Reilly, please 10 continue. 11 12 JOHN CANDY 13 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 14 examined and testified as follows: 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 By Mr. Reilly: 17 Q. Mr. Candy, would you tell us by whom 18 you're employed and in what position? 19 The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Α. 20 I'm the assistant chief of the Compliance Division. 21 And what are your responsibilities 22 generally as assistant chief of the Compliance 23 Division? 24

the Division who are responsible for sending out

Generally supervising the employees in

Α.

notices of violations that are discovered during commercial motor vehicle inspections.

Q. Is it a fair statement that the proceedings for the assessment for the -- strike that.

Is it a fair statement that the proceedings for the enforcement of the federal motor carrier safety rules and the Ohio motor carrier safety rules come under your general supervision?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. The inspection report from this case against Mr. Artemenkov comes under your general supervision, does it not?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Mr. Candy, I would like to first of all talk to you about the procedures involved in this case. And did Mr. Artemenkov receive notice of the violation asserted in this case?
 - A. Yes, he did.
- Q. I'd like you to take a look at what has been marked for identification purposes as Staff Exhibit No. 2. Do you find that up there on the witness stand?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Could you tell me what that is?

A. Yes; this is referred to as a notice of apparent violation and intent to assess forfeiture.

It is dated August 26, 2009. Case No. OH0499007420D.

It's addressed to a Gregory Artemenkov, it informs him of the violation of failing to wear a seat belt while operating a commercial motor vehicle, and that we intend to assess him \$100 for that. In addition he is directed to either pay that fine or request a conference.

- Q. And is that sent out pursuant to the Commission's rules?
 - A. Yes, it is.

- Q. Do you know if Mr. Artemenkov requested a conference?
 - A. Yes, he did.
- Q. Do you know if Mr. Artemenkov participated in that conference?
 - A. Yes, he did.
- Q. Did that conference result -- what was the result of that conference?
- A. As a result of that conference we notified him that we still intended to assess him the \$100 for the forfeiture and again gave him directions for paying that amount or for requesting administrative hearing.

- Q. And that was done through what document?
- A. That's referred to as notice of preliminary determination.
- Q. And is a notice of preliminary determination also provided for in the Commission's rules?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. I would like to take a look at what has been marked for identification purposes as Staff Exhibit No. 3. Can you find that for me there?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Can you tell me what that is?
- A. Yes; that is the notice I just referred to as dated August 8, 2010, the same case number that I've referenced before, written to Mr. Artemenkov and again telling him that following the conference we still intend to assess him a \$100 forfeiture, with the directions there to either pay that or request an administrative hearing.
 - Q. And what did Mr. Artemenkov do?
 - A. He requested the administrative hearing.
- Q. And all of this is pursuant to the Commission's procedures in civil forfeiture cases; is that not correct?
 - A. Yes, it is.

Q. Can you tell me, are the Commission's -- strike that.

Are you familiar with the procedural guidelines of the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Alliance?

A. Yes.

- Q. Are the procedures that are outlined in the Commission's rules consistent with the guidelines from the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Alliance?
 - A. Yes, they are.
- Q. Were the procedures followed in this case consistent with the guidelines followed by the -- consistent with the guidelines suggested by the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Alliance?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. I would like to talk to you about the fine itself. The fine imposed in this case by the staff was \$100; is that not correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell me how this fine amount was determined?
- A. We have a fine schedule that we use. It breaks down the various violations into four groups. It lists those violations generally into those four groups or categories, and depending on the number of

violations that you have in each one of those groups, that determines your fine.

There's also attached to that fine schedule a list of all the various violations and what the dollar amount is for each violation.

- Q. I'd like you to look and see if you can find what has been marked for identification as Staff Exhibit No. 4. Can you find that?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Can you tell me what that is?
- A. Yes; that is the fine schedule that I referred to. This has an effective date of October 1, 2008.
- Q. Calling your attention to page 2 of that fine schedule, group 4, is failure to wear a seat belt identified anywhere on there?
 - A. Yes, it is.
 - O. Where is that?
- A. It is in, as you mentioned, group 4, it is approximately halfway down that list of violations, and not using a seat belt is a \$100 fine.
- Q. Is this fine consistent with the recommended fine or penalties schedule adopted by the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Alliance?
 - A. Yes, it is.

- Q. Was the respondent in this case treated any differently than anyone else would have been treated in similar circumstances?
 - A. No; this is a very standard case.
 - Q. Thank you, Mr. Candy.

1.5

MR. REILLY: We have nothing further, your Honor.

HEARING EXAMINER: I have no questions for Mr. Candy. You may step down.

I want to thank --

MR. REILLY: If I could, your Honor, I would like to move Staff Exhibits 1 through 4 into evidence.

HEARING EXAMINER: Yes, and they will be admitted.

(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

MR. REILLY: And I would also like to move for default in this case, your Honor. As the Bench is aware, Mr. Artemenkov has not attended this hearing. Under the Commission's rules specifically 4901:2-7-14, the failure to attend a hearing an individual has requested constitutes default and default constitutes admission of all the violations contained in the hearing — asserted in the hearing.

The Commission has enforced this rule in

at least two cases, and they are In the Matter of James P. Matheny, Jr., Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture, Case No.

08-596-TR-CVH, and In the Matter of Michael Waller

for Administrative Hearing, Case No. 09-1859-TR-CVF.

Those cases are factually identical to this one in that the respondent requested a hearing and did not appear. As in those cases, in this case staff has presented evidence demonstrating the occurrence of the violation and supporting the civil forfeiture.

For that reason on the precedent of those cases and on the basis of the Commission's rules, we would move for default.

HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, I'll take that into consideration. And thank you for moving the exhibits into evidence.

On that note, I believe we can wrap up the proceedings for today, and again, thanks for everyone for your attendance.

MR. REILLY: Thank you.

(Hearing adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)

_ _ _

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Tuesday, November 30, 2010, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

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

My commission expires February 19, 2013.

(JUL-1664)

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

12/14/2010 9:05:33 AM

in

Case No(s). 10-0474-TR-CVF

Summary: Transcript Transcript of Gregory Artemenkov hearing held on 11/30//10. electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Anderson, Rosemary Foster Mrs.