

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**NOTICE OF PENALTIES INCURRED AND DUE  
FOR VIOLATIONS OF LAWS AND RULES**

**PENALTY ASSESSMENT: TV-190082**

**PENALTY AMOUNT: \$9,800**

InMove LLC  
8009 NE 152<sup>nd</sup> CT  
Kenmore, WA 98028

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) believes that InMove LLC (InMove or Company) violated Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-15-555, Criminal Background Checks for Prospective Employees; WAC 480-15-560, Equipment Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 CFR Part 396 – Inspection, Repair, and Maintenance; and WAC-480-15-570, Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 CFR Part 391 – Qualifications of Drivers, and Title 49 CFR Part 395 – Hours of Service of Drivers.

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 81.04.405 allows penalties of \$100 for each violation. In the case of an ongoing violation, every day's continuance is considered a separate and distinct violation.

On February 4, 2019, Commission Motor Carrier Investigator Sandi Yeomans completed a routine safety investigation of InMove and documented the following violations:

- **Five violations of WAC 480-15-555 – Failing to acquire criminal background checks of prospective employees.** The Company failed to acquire criminal background checks on five prospective employees: Michael Floyd, Josh Fry, Linard Feaster, Marcus Smith, and Melanie Morris.
- **89 violations of Title 49 CFR Part 391.45(a) – Using a driver not medically examined and certified.** The Company allowed its drivers Marcus Smith and Michael Floyd to drive without having been medically examined and certified on 89 occasions during the six months preceding the safety investigation.
- **One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 391.51(b)(9) – General requirements for driver qualification files.** The Company failed to note the medical examiner verification in driver Marcus Smith's driver qualification file.
- **Three violations of Title 49 CFR Part 395.8(e) – False record of duty status.** On three occasions, the Company allowed its driver, Marcus Smith, to make false records of duty status.
- **One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 396.3(a)(1) – Brake system pressure loss.** Staff discovered a severe air leak in the right rear wheel of fleet vehicle 004 that caused a brake system pressure loss. Staff placed this vehicle out-of-service.

- **Two violations of Title 49 CFR Part 396.11(a) – Driver vehicle inspection reports.**  
The Company failed to require drivers Marcus Smith and Michael Floyd to prepare driver vehicle inspection reports.

The Commission considered the following factors in determining the appropriate penalties for these violations:

1. **How serious or harmful the violations are to the public.** The violations noted are very serious and potentially harmful to the public. Moving companies that fail to conduct criminal background checks on their employees, ensure their drivers are medically examined and certified, monitor drivers' hours of service, and properly maintain vehicles, put their customers as well as the traveling public at risk.
2. **Whether the violations were intentional.** Considerations include:
  - Whether the company ignored Commission staff's previous technical assistance;  
and
  - Whether there is clear evidence through documentation or other means that shows the company knew of and failed to correct the violation.

The Company applied for a household goods moving authority in April of 2015. In its application for authority, the Company owner, Melanie Morris, acknowledged its responsibility to comply with applicable safety laws and regulations. On July 29, 2015, company representative Matt Hanna attended household goods training provided by Commission staff. In its 2017 Annual report, the Company listed Ms. Morris as the safety director. The Company knew or should have known about these requirements.

3. **Whether the company self-reported the violations.** The Company did not self-report these violations.
4. **Whether the company was cooperative and responsive.** InMove was cooperative throughout the investigation.
5. **Whether the company promptly corrected the violations and remedied the impacts.** The Company did background checks during the investigation and submitted a 15-day letter in response to the investigation. The 15-day letter addressed how each violation was corrected.
6. **The number of violations.** Commission staff identified 13 violation types with a total of 108 individual occurrences.
7. **The number of customers affected.** The Company employs one full time driver and operates two motor vehicles. In 2017, the Company traveled 9,380 miles and conducted 323 household goods moves. A significant number of customers, as well as members of the traveling public, were potentially affected by these safety violations.

8. **The likelihood of recurrence.** The Commission does not know if InMove is likely to repeat these safety violations. However, the Company was very cooperative with Staff, willingly accepted technical assistance, and took immediate steps to correct some violations and submitted a 15-day letter. In the 15-day letter, the Company described what it did to prevent a recurrence of each violation.
9. **The company's past performance regarding compliance, violations, and penalties.** This is the Company's second routine safety investigation. In 2016, the Company received a satisfactory safety rating following a comprehensive compliance review. The Company received two violations when it failed to note the verification of the medical examiner in the driver qualification file of drivers Marcus Smith and Sidney Morris. The Company has no previous penalties.
10. **The company's existing compliance program.** Ms. Morris is responsible for the Company's safety compliance program.
11. **The size of the company.** InMove is a small company with one driver and two vehicles. The Company reported \$410,352 in gross revenue for 2017.

The Commission's Enforcement Policy provides that some Commission requirements are so fundamental to safe operations that the Commission will issue mandatory penalties for each occurrence of a first-time violation.<sup>1</sup> The Commission generally will assess penalties per type of violation, rather than per occurrence, for first-time violations of those critical regulations that do not meet the requirements for mandatory penalties. The Commission will assess penalties for any equipment violation meeting the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's "out-of-service" criteria and also for repeat violations of critical regulations, including each occurrence of a repeat violation.

The Commission has considered these factors and determined that it should penalize InMove \$9,800 for violations of WAC 480-15-555, Criminal Background Check on Prospective Employees; WAC 480-15-560, Equipment Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 CFR Part 396 – Inspection, Repair, and Maintenance; and WAC-480-15-570, Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 CFR Part 391 – Qualifications of Drivers, and Title 49 CFR Part 395 – Hours of Service of Drivers, calculated as follows:

- Five violations of WAC 480-15-555 – failing to acquire criminal background checks on prospective employees. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for each occurrence of this critical violation, for a total of \$500.
- Eighty nine violations of Title 49 CFR Part 391.45(a) – using a driver not medically examined and certified. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for each occurrence of this critical violation, for a total of \$8,900.

---

<sup>1</sup> Docket A-120061 – Enforcement Policy of the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission – Section V.

- One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 391.51(b)(9) – failing to keep medical examiner verification in driver’s qualification file. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for this repeat violation.
- Three violations of Title 49 CFR Part 395.8(e) – false record of duty status. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for three occurrences of this first-time critical violation.
- Two violations of Title 49 CFR Part 396.11(a) – failing to require drivers to prepare vehicle inspection reports. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for one occurrence of this first-time critical violation.
- One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 396.3(a)(1) – having a vehicle with brake system pressure loss. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for this out-of-service violation.

This information, if proven at a hearing and not rebutted or explained, is sufficient to support the penalty assessment.

Your penalty is due and payable now. If you believe any or all of the violations did not occur, you may deny committing the violation(s) and contest the penalty through evidence presented at a hearing or in writing. Alternatively, if there is a reason for any or all of the violations that you believe should excuse you from the penalty, you may ask for mitigation (reduction) of the penalty through evidence presented at a hearing or in writing. The Commission will grant a request for hearing only if material issues of law or fact require consideration of evidence and resolution in a hearing. Any request to contest the violation(s) or for mitigation of the penalty must include a written statement of the reasons supporting that request. Failure to provide such a statement will result in denial of the request. *See* RCW 81.04.405.

If you properly present your request for a hearing and the Commission grants that request, the Commission will review the evidence supporting your dispute of the violation(s) or application for mitigation in a Brief Adjudicative Proceeding before an administrative law judge. The administrative law judge will consider the evidence and will notify you of his or her decision.

**You must act within 15 days after receiving this notice** to do one of the following:

- Pay the amount due.
- Contest the occurrence of the violations.
- Request mitigation to contest the amount of the penalty.

Please indicate your selection on the enclosed form and submit it electronically through the Commission’s web portal **within FIFTEEN (15) days** after you receive this notice. If you are unable to use the web portal, you may submit it via email to [records@utc.wa.gov](mailto:records@utc.wa.gov). If you are unable to submit the form electronically, you may send a paper copy to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, PO Box 47250, Olympia, Washington 98504-7250.

**If you do not act within 15 days**, the Commission may take additional enforcement action, including but not necessarily limited to suspending or revoking your certificate to provide

regulated service, assessing additional penalties, or referring this matter to the Office of the Attorney General for collection.

DATED at Olympia, Washington, and effective March 21, 2019.

*/s/ Rayne Pearson*  
RAYNE PEARSON  
Director, Administrative Law Division

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
PENALTY ASSESSMENT TV-190082

**PLEASE NOTE:** You must complete and sign this document, and send it to the Commission within 15 days after you receive the penalty assessment. Use additional paper if needed. I have read and understand RCW 9A.72.020 (printed below), which states that making false statements under oath is a class B felony. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify to the matters set forth below and I have personal knowledge of those matters. I hereby make, under oath, the following statements.

- 1. **Payment of penalty.** I admit that the violations occurred and enclose \$8,900 in payment of the penalty.
- 2. **Contest the violation(s).** I believe that the alleged violation(s) did not occur for the reasons I describe below (**if you do not include reasons supporting your contest here, your request will be denied**):
  - a) I ask for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to an administrative law judge for a decision.
  - OR  b) I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above.
- 3. **Application for mitigation.** I admit the violations, but I believe that the penalty should be reduced for the reasons set out below (**if you do not include reasons supporting your application here, your request will be denied**):
  - a) I ask for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to an administrative law judge for a decision.
  - OR  b) I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing, including information I have presented on any attachments, is true and correct.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_ [month/day/year], at \_\_\_\_\_ [city, state]

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Respondent (company) – please print

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Applicant

RCW 9A.72.020:

“Perjury in the first degree. (1) A person is guilty of perjury in the first degree if in any official proceeding he makes a materially false statement which he knows to be false under an oath required or authorized by law. (2) Knowledge of the materiality of the statement is not an element of this crime, and the actor’s mistaken belief that his statement was not material is not a defense to a prosecution under this section. (3) Perjury in the first degree is a class B felony.”