```
1
        BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO
2
3
    In the Matter of NW
    Logistics LLC, Notice of :
    Apparent Violation and : Case No. 10-827-TR-CVF
    Intent to Assess
    Forfeiture.
 6
7
                          PROCEEDINGS
8
    before Jim Lynn, Attorney Examiner, at the Public
    Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street,
10
    Room 11-D, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10 a.m. on
11
    Wednesday, December 1, 2010.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
                     ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
               222 East Town Street, Second Floor
21
                   Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
                (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
22
                      Fax - (614) 224-5724
23
24
25
```

```
2
1
    APPEARANCES:
2
            Richard Cordray,
            Ohio Attorney General
3
            By Mr. William L. Wright,
            Section Chief
            Mr. Werner L. Margard, III
            and Mr. Stephen A. Reilly,
5
            Assistant Attorneys General
            180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
6
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
7
                  On behalf of the Staff of the PUCO.
8
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Ţ					3
1	INDEX				
2					
3	Wit	ness		Page	
4		Michael J. Byrne			
5		Direct Examination by Mr. Margard Examination by Examiner Lynn		5 22	
6	F	Further Direct Examination by Mr. Margard Further Examination by Examiner Lynn		28 29	
7		n J. Canty	1	2.1	
8	Direct Examination by Mr. Margard Examination by Examiner Lynn		31 40		
9					
10	Sta	ff Exhibit I	dentified	Admitted	
11	1	Driver/Vehicle Examination Repo	ort 7	41	
12	2	NW Logistics markings	15	41	
13	3	NW Logistics insurance			
14		information	16	41	
15	4	Driver's Daily Log	16	41	
16	5	Query Central Carrier Summary	19	41	
	6	FMCSA Motor Carrier Details	19	41	
17	7	Zelenka Nursery Delivery Receip	ot 23	41	
18	8	Michigan Apportioned Registrati	on		
19	0	Cab Card	24	41	
20	9	Fine Schedule Out of Service	2.2	4.1	
21		Violations	33	41	
22	10	3-23-10 Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture	39	41	
23	11	5-18-10 Notice of Preliminary Determination	39	41	
25					

Wednesday Morning Session,
December 1, 2010.

\_ \_

Mr. Margard.

EXAMINER LYNN: 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. 10-827-TR-CVF, in the Matter of NW Logistics LLC, Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Forfeiture.

I am Jim Lynn. I am the Attorney

Examiner assigned to hear this case. At this time we will have the appearances of the parties. Actually there is only one party present currently and that's somebody from the Ohio Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Margard.

MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of the transportation staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio by Richard Cordray, Ohio Attorney General, William L. Wright, Section Chief, Public Utilities Section by Assistant Attorneys General Warner L. Margard and Stephen A. Reilly, 180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor, Columbus, Ohio.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right. Thank you,

I'll note for the record at this time

1 there is no one present representing the carrier NW 2 Logistics. NW logistics was served with notice of 3 when this hearing time would be and we will continue then with proceedings with Mr. Margard's witness and 5 hopefully somebody from NW Logistics will show up in 6 the meantime. 7 So having said that, Mr. Margard, if you 8 would like to call your witness, please. MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. Ι 10 would call Inspector Byrne. 11 Mr. Byrne, if you would come up to the 12 witness stand, please. Thank you. 13 (Witness sworn.) 14 EXAMINER LYNN: Take your seat and, 15 Mr. Margard, you can go on with your questions. 16 Thank you, your Honor. MR. MARGARD: 17 18 MICHAEL J. BYRNE 19 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 20 examined and testified as follows: 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION 22 By Mr. Margard: 23 Please state your name for the record. Q. 24 Α. Michael J. Byrne. 25 Q. And by whom are you employed?

- A. With the Ohio State Highway Patrol.
- Q. And in what capacity?

1.5

- A. The official title is Motor Carrier Enforcement Inspector.
  - Q. And where are you stationed out of?
- A. The district headquarters in Bucyrus, Ohio.
- Q. Can you briefly describe your duties and responsibilities?
- A. Duties and responsibilities include inspection of commercial motor vehicles, making sure basically they are safe, lights, tires, brakes, combing through the truck, load securement, in addition to that qualifications of the drivers including CDL, medical card, logbooks, and also checking carrier credentials.
- Q. Thank you. How long have you been employed as an inspector?
  - A. Since November of 2004.
- Q. Do you have any specialized training or certification to perform this job?
- A. To perform this job you must be certified in the North American Standard Level 1 inspection, and to be recertified you must have a minimum of 32 level 1 inspections which are a full and complete

- inspection plus to be Hazmat certified which is irrelevant in this case. You have to have that, but each year we have to do so many, and our main requirement they want from us is a thousand inspections per fiscal year.
  - Q. Thank you. Were you on duty on March 16 of this year?
    - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. And do you recall what your job assignment was that day?
  - A. Commercial vehicle enforcement.
- Q. Okay. No different than -- nothing unusual?
  - A. No.
- Q. Okay. And in the course of your duties on that date did you have an opportunity to inspect a vehicle driven by a Derek Loveland?
  - A. That is correct, yes, sir.

    MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor?

    EXAMINER LYNN: Yes.
- Q. Inspector Byrne, I've handed you what I have marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit 1. Is this a copy of the inspection report that you generated as a result of an inspection conducted on that date?

A. Yes, it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

- Q. By the way before we start looking at the report do you -- do you have an independent recollection of this inspection? Do you remember this inspection?
  - A. I do have some recollection, yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. Very good. Thank you. Let's briefly take a look at -- at this report. First of all, this was prepared by you; is that correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And can you tell me how you prepared this report?
- A. This report was prepared using the computer program called ASPA.
- Q. Something you carry with you in your vehicle?
  - A. Yes, it is, yes.
    - Q. And this happened at 7:47 in the morning?
- 19 A. Yes.
  - Q. And it's noted here that this is a level
    II walk-around inspection.
    - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you briefly explain what a level II inspection is?
  - A. A level II inspection incorporates two

things, the driver inspection and then the actual walk around of the truck. The driver inspection, of course, is checking the driver's CDL, making sure he's not fatigued, ill, intoxicated, anything that would render him out of service according to the out-of-service criteria, CDL, medical card, logbook. Speaking of the walk around, the walk-around inspection consists of checking lights, tires, low air warning, emergency equipment, load securement, things of that nature.

- Q. Okay. Thank you very much. I take it in your discussion with the driver and in the review of the documents he is carrying with him, you were able to complete much of the information that's contained in this report?
  - A. Yes.

1.5

- Q. I want to begin by taking a look at the vehicle identification section. Do you see that on the report?
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. And you have two units here, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you have a type TT and ST. What are those designations?
  - A. The TT means truck tractor which is the

power unit, and the ST means semitrailer, the towing vehicle.

- Q. And then you have the make, year, and the state. I assume this is the state of registration and a license number on the vehicle.
  - A. Uh-huh.

- Q. You then have a company number here. What does that company number refer to?
- A. The company number refers to the vehicle number.
- Q. That's the number of the vehicle, not necessarily of the company that owns the vehicle?
- A. No. That's strictly just the vehicle number that the company would put on the -- like a decal.
  - Q. An identifying number.
- A. An identifying number just for that truck.
  - Q. Very good.
    - A. Or vehicle.
- Q. Thank you. Then, of course, is the vehicle identification number.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And the gross vehicle weight? GVWR, is that relevant for purposes of your inspection here?

- A. With our -- the combination vehicles we have been told it's not necessary for the gross vehicle weight rating.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And then there is a note for issued decal and existing decal. What are these and what's the difference?
- A. Issued decal, those apply to only whether you are doing a level I inspection and if the vehicle meets certain criteria, then it's issued to -- one of our decals showing the vehicle passed with some excellent qualification, if you will. The existing decal means the vehicle has had a prior commercial inspection and was issued a prior decal, one of the things they want us to list on the document.
- Q. In the last column it says OOS sticker.

  I assume that's an abbreviation, OOS stands for out of service.
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And there is an indication yes here. Can you please tell me why that is?
- A. Yes. If the vehicle is to be placed out of service, we either enter a yes for was placed out of service and a sticker was issued or, no, that a sticker was not issued.
  - Q. So this yes is because you issued an out

of service?

1.5

- A. Yes. A sticker was applied, yes.
- Q. Very good. Thank you. Before I get to the violations I do want to briefly go up to the top box where the driver's name appears. You also have NW Logistics there which is the party of interest here today. Can you tell me why that name appears in this box?
- A. That name appears in the box because that is the carrier that was determined to be operating on the roadway, the carrier determined to be transporting the cargo.
- Q. Okay. Very good. Thank you. Now, let's head down to the violations section. And there are a number of violations but only two of them are noted as out-of-service violations, correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Those are the only violations I want to pay attention to today. The first out-of-service violation is for operating a CMV, commercial motor vehicle, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. After the effective date of an unsatisfactory rating. Now, first of all, in terms of putting this information into your report, what do

you actually put into your computer to generate this information?

- A. Well, the computer has a generic violation, if you will, and I could use that generic violation. I don't recall exactly what it says but it's very -- a very vague so what you see there is what I typed in which is what applies to the section code there, the Code of Federal Regulations 49 CFR 385.82 and that's typed into and what I cannot finish typing goes into my notes.
- Q. Very good. Okay. So let's -- earlier in your testimony you talked about company credentials --
  - A. Yes.

- Q. -- I believe is the phrase you used and that is also part of your inspection. In addition to your actual walk around the vehicle and your driver qualifications and so forth, you also do what you call the company credentials. Can you tell me how you conduct that part of your inspection?
- A. We have access to the internet through an air card and for purposes of our inspection they want us checking carrier credentials. What does that mean? We connect to the internet, and we go to some of the different Federal Motor Carrier Safety

Administration websites, and we check, No. 1, to see that the carrier has the proper operating authority.

And if not, we verify with the out-of-service criteria whether it is an out of service.

Then we also check through the fed's website to see if there is an out-of-service order, a Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration out-of-service order, against the carrier. That's what we are doing when we are checking credentials of that carrier.

- Q. When you say again the carrier, this is different than a sticker that you place on a vehicle. This is an out-of-service order against the carrier as a whole.
  - A. As the whole entity, yes.
- Q. And that's where the unsatisfactory rating comes from here, that the company is rated as unsatisfactory and, therefore, may not conduct business?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Very good. Thank you. How did you determine that NW Logistics was the carrier in this case?
- A. Several -- several different ways. No. 1, the markings on the side of the vehicle and I do

have pictures that indicate -- that show NW Logistics the carrier, some insurance paperwork also showing NW Logistics, driver interview, and the logbook entry for the 16th which if I may add was not current at the time of that inspection.

- Q. And that was one of the other violations that you found, wasn't it, that the logbook was not current?
  - A. Yes, yes.

MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor? EXAMINER LYNN: Yes.

- Q. Inspector Byrne, I've handed you a document I have marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit 2. Is this a copy of one of the photographs that you took indicating the markings on the vehicle?
  - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Just to be clear this is, in fact, a -- a photograph that you took using equipment issued to you at the time of the inspection?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Thank you.

MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor?

EXAMINER LYNN: Yes, you may.

Q. Inspector Byrne, I have now handed you a

document marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit 3. Can you identify this document for me, please?

- A. This is the insurance paperwork that was onboard the commercial vehicle showing, for example, liability.
- Q. And this document demonstrates that the vehicle was insured by NW Logistics?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. And just to be clear this is again a copy of the photograph that you took off this particular document; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Thank you.
  - MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor? EXAMINER LYNN: Yes, you may.
- Q. Inspector Byrne, I have now handed you a multi-page document marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit No. 4. These all appear to be pages of a driver's log. Can you please identify what these photographs demonstrate, please?
- A. These photographs demonstrate pictures of the logs, the driver's records of the duty status, in other words, logbook for the 14th, 15th, and 16th.

  If I may continue, I could elaborate a little more?

Q. Please do.

1.5

A. Okay. You'll see the log entry dated 3-14 of 2010 shows that the driver was off duty from 3-6 to 3-14. Continuing onto the next page you will see the date of 3-15-10 that the logbook is incomplete meaning that the carrier is missing and as well as the grid graph is incomplete.

During this inspection I had Mr. Loveland update this logbook, logbook entry I should say, to show what he had been doing since that time.

The third page shows the updated logbook filled out minus the mileage up to the 16th at the time he was stopped. Mr. Loveland was advised to make his logbook current up to the time of the inspection, and as you can see there the notation DOT Sandusky, Ohio, so we had him update it and make sure that he fills out the logbook completely up to that time showing the proper identification of who he is operating for and what he has been doing since up to the time of the inspection.

Q. Very good. Thank you. So there is an indication of some sort that he was -- he was off duty -- some notation of Ridge Apple Growers but was off duty during that period. That as of the 15th, he indicates the name of his carrier as NW Logistics?

A. Yes.

1.5

- Q. As he does on the 16th, the day of the inspection, NW Express Log, assuming Logistics.

  Thank you. Now, after having determined that NW Logistics was the carrier, you indicated you checked some -- some federal sites to determine the company's authority as you will.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What -- what did you determine as a result of that inquiry?
- A. Well, after checking a couple of the different federal websites, namely, one of them was Query Central. Query Central was checked, indicated the carrier was under a federal out-of-service order. And this was also verified with a phone call to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. And as well, the carrier has no operating authority per the check with the what they call SAFER website as well as Query Central. I lost my train of thought.
- Q. You mentioned that you placed a call. Did you place that call at the time of your inspection?
- A. Yes. The call was placed because I want to be absolutely sure that this carrier was under an out of service.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

- MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor? EXAMINER LYNN: Yes, you may.
- Q. Inspector Byrne, I've handed you two documents separately marked, one as Staff Exhibit No. 5 and one as Staff Exhibit No. 6. Are these documents that you generated as a result of your inquiries that day at the time of the inspection?
- A. Yes. These are documents that were presented directly from the -- those particular websites, Query Central.
- Q. And can you very briefly summarize what these documents show?
- A. If you'll look at Staff Exhibit No. 5, you will see on there top left corner shows Query Central and there is a -- this was printed out on the 16th, the date of the inspection. I took a photograph of this on the 16th. You will see there OOS 3-15-2010. That means the out of service was issued on 3-15-2010, the reason being unsatisfactory, unfit and per further down you will see the carrier name, USDOT number, physical address, so on.

Exhibit No. 6 is also for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration website showing the same carrier, same USDOT number, address. You

will notice towards the middle of the page authority type there is two types of authority he can use -- or all three, common, contract, and broker. And the status shows inactive, none, none, so the carrier has no authority whatsoever there. And then, of course, towards the bottom it shows what kind of insurance they would need to carry on file and what is required.

- Q. So -- so that I'm clear when it says inactive, that means they have no active authority to engage in common carrier.
  - A. That is correct.

EXAMINER LYNN: Inspector Byrne, is that because of the safety issue?

THE WITNESS: That may -- I don't know how to answer that. That could be possibly independent or could be in conjunction with.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right. Thank you.

- Q. And just to be clear and to follow-up on the judge's question, if the carrier is out of service, its authority would effectively be suspended during that out-of-service period; is that your understanding?
  - A. Honestly I do not know.
  - Q. That's fine. But for purposes of this

case in addition to the carrier being out of service, you were able to determine that the carrier did not have authority to be operating as a common carrier in this state.

A. That is correct.

1.5

- Q. You indicated you also conducted and interviewed the driver. Was there anything significant of note in that interview that you would like to add to the record at this time?
- A. I do recall the interview with the driver, and he was somewhat confused because I want to be absolutely sure of who the carrier is. I don't want to be writing up the wrong carrier for purposes of the inspection. And he was confused somewhat as to who the carrier was. He said Ridge Apple Growers owns the truck, but he was driving for NW Logistics.

So to be firm in this I want to be sure with him who the actual carrier's operating for that day, carrier NW Logistics or Ridge Apple Growers.

And after the interview, it was determined by talking with him NW Logistics was the carrier.

- Q. And just again to be clear, it is not unusual, is it, for a carrier to be using a vehicle that is owned by a different entity?
  - A. Sure, that is correct.

1 MR. MARGARD: That's all the questions I 2 have for Inspector Byrne. Thank you, your Honor. 3 EXAMINER LYNN: Thank you. Thank you, 4 Mr. Margard. 5 6 EXAMINATION 7 By Examiner Lynn: 8 Ο. Actually I had a few questions for you. Α. Sure. 10 Let's see, were there any shipping papers Q. 11 that indicated NW Logistics was the carrier? 12 Α. The shipping papers did not -- according 13 to my photographs, the only thing I was determining 14 with the shipping papers -- there are photos of the 1.5 shipping papers showing where his next delivery was 16 going to and where the cargo had originated, but 17 unfortunately the shipping papers did not determine. 18 Your inspection report indicates it was Q.

- Q. Your inspection report indicates it was shrubbery being hauled.
  - A. Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. But, again, the source of the shrubbery did not indicate on shipping papers who the carrier was for that particular load.
  - A. (Witness nods head.)

    EXAMINER LYNN: I have a few other

questions of Mr. Margard. Do you have a question related to this?

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I do. If it would benefit, your Honor, I do have a copy of the shipping document Inspector Byrne alluded to, and I would be happy to mark that.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. We can do that as well. Is that Staff Exhibit 7, I guess?

MR. MARGARD: Yes, thank you, your Honor.

- Q. (By Examiner Lynn) And you indicated that after some discussion with the driver, you determined NW Logistics was the carrier. But you indicated the driver also had made some reference to Ridge Apple Growers.
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Did he -- did he make any connection between Ridge Apple Growers and the load he was hauling on the day you did the inspection?
- A. Just other than talking with him, he said Ridge Apple Growers owned the truck.
- Q. Owned the truck, I see. So Ridge Apple Growers according to the driver owned the truck, but on the vehicle itself the name of the company and apparently the USDOT number and so forth on the door on Staff Exhibit 2, those are all NW Logistics.

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay.
- A. And if need be, sir, I do have some additional photographs that show the vehicle, vehicle information showing Ridge Apple Growers with the matching of the unit VIN number.
  - Q. I'm sorry. You kind of lost me.
- A. Okay. As we discussed, Ridge Apple Growers owns the truck.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. And the Michigan registration shows Ridge Apple Growers.
- Q. The registration for the license plate or something?
- A. The registration with the license plate, yes. However, the company markings on the side of the vehicle show NW Logistics.
  - Q. I see.
- MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I also have a copy of that registration card which I'll mark as Staff Exhibit 8 and offer.
- EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. That would be helpful. Thank you.
- Q. Let's see, I had a few other questions.

  And the -- on Staff Exhibit 5 is the Query Central

printout. Query Central then is a federal website?

A. Yes, it is.

1.5

- Q. Okay. And you had made -- I think in response to one of Mr. Margard's questions, you had made a comment about the vehicle -- or the carrier, I should say, not only being out of service but also having no operating authority.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Was I correct about that? Okay. The out-of-service determination was apparently made when you went to, say, Query Central, it says OOS date, out-of-service date, 3-15-2010. The Staff Exhibit 6 exhibit indicates carrier out of service also but the part about, again, no operating authority, how is that determined?
- A. The -- through the Query Central and then there's also a section of Query Central called licensing and insurance. You click on that, and it brings up this page here. You will see where it says this carrier is out of service. That is referring to the federal out-of-service order.
  - Q. All right.
- A. But as you go down then, it also shows where the authority -- they have no authority to --
  - Q. Is that on Staff Exhibit 6 where it

indicates authority status inactive?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Has no authority, okay. So that's indicated on Staff Exhibit 6 and you are saying you weren't really sure if there was a connection between the out of service because of I guess safety violations and no authority. You didn't really know if there was any connection between the two.
- A. That I'm not 100 percent about because I have -- I know of cases where vehicles have been stopped and they have a federal out-of-service order but yet still have authority. Yeah. So I'm not sure how that could be --
- Q. Just to make sure I have the details straight then, so the out of service would apply to -- actually to this entire carrier, whatever vehicles it would have, not just this one in particular.
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. And then no operating authority means that -- I guess help me with what that means or if you don't know, you don't know.
- A. Well, to briefly summarize up this carrier is a for hire carrier. They are hauling someone else's goods.

- Q. All right, sure.
- A. To be able to haul those goods, they can just go out and say, John Q. Dough, I'm going to haul your cargo here. We're going to operate between these dates.
  - Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. They have got to have permission.
- Q. Okay.
- A. Okay? If they don't have permission, in other words, the authority, then they can't be hauling goods.
- Q. Okay. So NW apparently if they had authority would be a common carrier based on --
  - A. It could be any one of those three.
  - Q. Any of the three?
  - A. Any one of the three or all.
- Q. Okay. At any rate we know at the time of the inspection they had no authority at all via common, contract, or broker according to Staff Exhibit 6.
  - A. That's correct.
- EXAMINER LYNN: We'll go off the record for a minute.
- (Recess taken.)
- EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. We will go back on

the record at this time. Mr. Margard has marked as
he indicated he would Staff Exhibits 7 and 8, Staff
Exhibit 7 being a shipping paper that accompanied the
driver on this load, Staff Exhibit 8 being the
registration card for the vehicle itself. I guess it
was for licensing purposes, vehicle licensing
purposes.

Mr. Margard, I believe you had some comments about these exhibits?

MR. MARGARD: If I may only briefly, your Honor, ask the witness to authenticate these two documents.

EXAMINER LYNN: Okay. Sure.

14

## FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Margard:

8

10

11

12

13

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Inspector Byrne, you have before you what has been marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibits 7 and 8. As the Examiner indicated, No. 7 purports to be a copy of the shipping paper in this case; is that correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. And Exhibit No. 8 purports to be a copy of the registration for this vehicle to Ridge Apple Growers; is that correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. And just so that the record is clear, these are both copies of the photographs that you took at the time of your inspection; is that correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. And all of the photographs that we have made copies of, these are -- except for the fact they are in black and white instead of color, these are true and accurate copies of photographs that you took at the time?
  - A. Correct.

MR. MARGARD: That's all I have.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right. Thank you,

Mr. Margard.

## FURTHER EXAMINATION

By Examiner Lynn:

Q. Let's see, Inspector Byrne, looking at Staff Exhibits 7 and 8 then, I had a question about Staff Exhibit 8. That indicates then the owner of the vehicle, Ridge Apple Growers, or at least for purposes of licensing the vehicle is -- I'll start over.

The owner for purpose of licensing is Ridge Apple Growers; am I correct?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Is it -- is this something you have encountered on other occasions where the owner of the vehicle might be different from the carrier that's operating the vehicle?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. That does happen.
- A. Yes.
- Q. And, again, you indicated in your questions with the driver and apparently the driver, if I remember correctly, had mentioned Ridge Apple Growers to you.
  - A. Yes, he did.
- Q. But you indicated based on your discussions with him on that day, that he -- after talking to him, you concluded that he was hauling for NW Logistics on that particular day with that particular load.
- A. Yes. I want to be 100 percent sure who the actual carrier is.
- Q. All right. Now, let's see, and you -- also on Staff Exhibit 1 you had indicated aside from the operating a commercial motor vehicle after there being an unsatisfactory rating, that's one of the violations, you also indicated operating without

```
1
    required operating authority. I see. So those are
2
    both -- those are two operating violations. One is
3
    the operating authority issue and the other is the
4
    out of service based on prior I guess safety
5
    violations of the company; is that correct?
6
           Α.
                 Uh-huh.
7
                 EXAMINER LYNN: That's fine. All right.
8
    Okay. I have no other questions at this time. I may
    have further questions later, but you can take your
10
    seat for now. Thank you very much.
11
                Mr. Margard.
12
                MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor.
13
    Staff would call Mr. John Canty.
14
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Mr. Canty.
15
                 (Witness sworn.)
16
                 EXAMINER LYNN: Please take your seat.
17
                Mr. Margard, you may continue.
18
                MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor.
19
20
                         JOHN J. CANTY
21
    being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
22
    examined and testified as follows:
23
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION
    By Mr. Margard:
25
           Q.
                Please state your name.
```

A. John J. Canty, C-A-N-T-Y.

- Q. And by whom are you employed and in what capacity?
- A. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio,
  I am the assistant chief of the compliance division.
  - Q. And your business address, please?
- A. 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
- Q. Thank you. How long have you been the assistant chief of compliance?
  - A. Approximately 19, 20 years.
- Q. And what are your duties and responsibilities very briefly?
- A. Among other things I supervise the employees who are responsible for sending out the notices for violations that are discovered on commercial motor vehicle inspections.
- Q. You then are knowledgeable about how civil forfeitures are calculated?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you please describe how a civil forfeiture is calculated for violation to the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations.
- A. Yes. We have a chart, violations chart, that we have in the office which breaks down all the

violations into four categories and then assesses the violations according to how many violations fall into each category. We also have -- well, actually the fourth category of violations lists violations that are assessed independently of other violations. We also have an addendum to that several pages long which lists every violation and with the dollar amount as per each violation.

MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor? EXAMINER LYNN: Yes.

- Q. Mr. Canty, I have handed you a multi-page document that's been marked for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibit No. 9. Can you identify this document for me, please.
- A. Yes. That is the fine schedule for violations discovered during a commercial motor vehicle inspection that I was referring to that we use in the compliance division.
- Q. Now, this particular document indicates it became effective October 4, 2007. Is this the most recent version?
- A. It is the version that would have been in effect when this -- this was assessed, yes.
- Q. Excellent. Thank you. Are the dollar amounts contained in this schedule consistent with --

in your opinion with the recommended fines or penalty schedule adopted by the Commercial Vehicle Safety

A. Yes.

- Q. And is the procedure that you've described consistent with the recommended civil penalty procedure adopted by the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And this procedure is the same for all carriers and individuals?
  - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Thank you. Let's take a look at the specific violations in this case if we can. In the course and scope of your duties, have you had an opportunity to review the Commission's file in this case?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. And have you seen what's been marked as Staff Exhibit No. 1, the Vehicle Examination Report?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And this document is part of the file that you reviewed in preparing your testimony?
  - A. Yes, it is.
  - Q. In fact, are all of the documents marked

so far today as part of this hearing part of the Commission's file in this case?

- A. Yes, they are.
- Q. Thank you. There are two violations noted on this report as out-of-service violations; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Am I correct in understanding that only out-of-service violations are assessed forfeitures?
- A. Not entirely. There are some violations that fall into group 4 which are not out of service such as not using the seatbelt would be an example. That would have an independent forfeiture amount for them regardless of whether or not they are out of service.
- Q. None of the other violations found in this case, however, fall in that category, do they?
  - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Let's talk about these specific violations here. And can you tell me how the civil for -- civil forfeiture assessment was made for the two violations found here.
- A. Yes. We have a computer program that runs against the data that we have stored in the database. It identifies which violations are to be

assessed and the dollar amount they are to be assessed based on the fine schedule that we have established. The computer assesses that dollar amount on the record, and we mail out the forfeiture notice to the party.

- Q. And specifically what was the amount of the forfeiture assessed in this case?
  - A. The total amount was \$1,000.
- Q. And is there an apportionment of that amount between the two violations?
- A. There is an apportionment of violation amounts. In this case there's two violations that could have been assessed, the first being the out-of-service violation, the second one being the no authority violation. The out-of-service violation is \$1,000, and the no operating authority is 500 which would normally add up to \$1,500. However, we are prohibited by statutory requirements that we may not assess more than \$1,000 per inspection. So that's why the total amount on this was \$1,000, not \$1,500.
- Q. In your opinion were the forfeitures properly determined and assessed in this case?
  - A. Yes.

1.5

Q. And in your opinion are those amounts reasonable?

A. Yes.

- Q. Mr. Canty, I do want to ask you one other question about the circumstances in this case and that's the situation where the carrier was placed out of service. Inspector Byrne testified that he was aware of that because he checked a federal site that indicated when the out of service became effective. Were you present for that portion of his testimony?
  - A. Yes, I was.
- Q. And do you have any additional information about how that information came to be recorded in the federal databases or when, in fact, the out-of-service violation occurred for this carrier?
- A. Yes. According to the research that I have done on this case, there was a compliance review done at the location of the company in I believe it was Caledonia, Michigan. As a result of that compliance review, violations were discovered which were severe enough to take the carrier out of service. The carrier was notified on January 13 of 2010 that they would be out of service effective March 15, 2010, unless they appealed that decision. I did not see anything on the record that would show that they did appeal that decision.

- 1 It is -- is it your understanding of this Ο. 2 violation that a carrier is permitted to operate for 3 a period of time after receiving that initial notice? Α. After receiving the notice, yes.
  - The January 13, 2010, notice? Q.
  - Α. Correct.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And they are permitted to operate for 60 days; is that correct?
- Approximately 60 days, in this case the Α. notice was sent on January 13. The out-of-service date would have been March 15. That's approximately 60 days.
- Very good. So in your opinion based on Ο. your review of this case, this carrier was, in fact, operating more than 60 days after it was given an unsatisfactory safety rating?
- Α. Yes, I believe the inspection was the day after the effective date. The effective date was March 15; the inspection date was March 16.
  - Very good. Thank you. Q. MR. MARGARD: May I approach, your Honor? EXAMINER LYNN: Yes, you may.
- Mr. Canty, I have handed you two Q. documents marked respectively for purposes of identification as Staff Exhibits 10 and 11. Can you

identify these documents for me, please.

A. Yes. Staff Exhibit 10 is a -- what we refer to as a Notice of Apparent Violation and Intent to Assess Civil Forfeiture. It is dated March 23, 2010. It is addressed to NW Logistics in Caledonia, Michigan. This is the notice that we are required to send to any party who is going to be assessed a civil forfeiture.

In this case it lists the two violations that we have been discussing, the out-of-service violation and the no operating authority violation. It advises the company that the amount of the forfeiture will be \$1,000. Within 30 days they must either pay that forfeiture or ask for a conference.

- Q. And I will note in addition in Exhibit 10 the violations are noted as being part of violation group 4. That's group 4 as identified on Staff Exhibit 9, the out-of-service violation chart?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Thank you. And Staff Exhibit No. 11, please.
- A. No. 11 is what we refer to as a Notice of Preliminary Determination. It is dated May 18, 2010, addressed to NW Logistics in Caledonia, Michigan.

  This is the notice that we send out following the

completion of a conference with the company. This advises them that as a result of the conference, we still intend to maintain the forfeiture of \$1,000. They are directed to either pay that amount or request an administrative hearing.

- Q. Now, are both of these documents part of the file that you reviewed in preparing for your testimony today?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And both of these documents are items that are typically and regularly maintained by the Commission as part of its files?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And in your opinion and based on your review of the file in this case, did the respondent receive all notices that they were required to be served with as required by the Ohio Administrative Code?
  - A. Yes.

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

- - -

## EXAMINATION

- By Examiner Lynn:
  - Q. Mr. Canty, you had mentioned that based

```
on your research, you learned the carrier received in January of this year that it would be placed out of service and that it had I guess 60 days approximately until it actually had to shut down operations. You also indicated there is no indication that the carrier had appealed that decision; am I right on that?
```

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And this was indicated on one of the U.S. Department of Transportation websites?
  - A. Yes, it is.

EXAMINER LYNN: All right. I have no further questions either. Thank you for your comments. Can we go off the record for a minute?

(Recess taken.)

EXAMINER LYNN: Before we continue,

Mr. Margard, do you want to move these be admitted

into evidence?

MR. MARGARD: I would, your Honor. I would respectfully move for the admission of Staff Exhibits 1 through 11.

EXAMINER LYNN: That motion will be granted. They will be admitted into evidence.

(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

EXAMINER LYNN: I also want to mention

for the record several things. It's now 11 o'clock. This hearing began at 10 a.m. There is no one present representing NW Logistics. The request for a hearing was made by a Mr. Mirsad Bektas, M-I-R-S-A-D B-E-K-T-A-S. And he had been the contact person for NW Logistics since that request for hearing was made.

1.5

The hearing was originally scheduled for October 21. Because of unforeseen circumstances I, the Attorney Examiner, had to cancel that date, October 21, and change the date to December 1.

I did get in touch with Mr. Bektas who was still at NW Logistics at that time and explained to him the hearing date would have to be moved. The date was then rescheduled to December 1, and the carrier was served with notice of the new date, December 1 of this year at 10 a.m.

In addition, I earlier this week on

Monday of this week which would have been November 29

made a call to Mr. Bektas reminding him of the

hearing date. He contacted me yesterday by telephone

late in the day and explained that he was no longer

employed by NW Logistics. And I then asked him is

the owner of the company aware of the violation. And

he said, oh, yes, he is aware of the violation.

Having said that then I'll note for the

record that presumably based on Mr. Bektas' prior connection with NW Logistics, the company is aware of the violation, and in addition service was made to NW Logistics of the date of today's hearing, the date and the time. However, no one has been present to show up for the company.

Finally, I'll add that during this past hour while the hearing was going on I went off the record twice to check for telephone messages of my office to see if anyone from the company had called and perhaps was on the way here and there have been no messages.

So having said that I believe we've concluded everything that's necessary for the hearing today. I want to thank everyone for their attendance, and we will adjourn.

(Thereupon, the hearing was concluded 11:05 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 Wednesday, December 1, 2010, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes. Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter. (KSG-5294) 

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

12/15/2010 12:55:01 PM

in

Case No(s). 10-0827-TR-CVF

Summary: Transcript Transcript of NW Logistics LLC hearing held on 12/01/10. electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.