

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

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

PENALTY ASSESSMENT: TH-260167

PENALTY AMOUNT: \$2,800

Renzenberger, Inc.  
d/b/a Hallcon  
711 Capital Way S., Suite 204  
Olympia, WA 98501  
[cmier@hallcon.com](mailto:cmier@hallcon.com)

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) believes Renzenberger, Inc. d/b/a Hallcon (Hallcon or Company) violated Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-62-278, Contract Crew Transportation Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements which adopts Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (49 C.F.R.) Part 391 Qualifications 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 March 5, 2026, Commission Motor Carrier Safety Investigator Jacob Brunton completed a routine safety investigation of Hallcon and documented the following violations:

- **One violation of WAC 480-62-278(11)(a) – Failing to ensure a negative pre-employment controlled substance and alcohol test was verified prior to a driver performing a safety sensitive function.** The Company allowed driver Aaron Hunter to drive a contract crew transportation vehicle prior to receiving a negative pre-employment controlled substance and alcohol test result.
- **Twenty violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.21(a) – Using a driver who has not completed and furnished an employment application.** Hallcon used drivers who had not completed and furnished an employment application.
- **Nine violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.23(a)(1) – Failing to investigate driver's background within 30 days of employment.** The Company failed to obtain an initial motor vehicle record within 30 days of hire for drivers Mark Bradley, Looche Brown, Fernando Castro, Cheri Dehart, John Gillikin, Scott Green, Erica Griffin, Douglas Heitz, and Felicia Rush.
- **Twenty-four violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.45(a) - Using a driver not medically examined and certified.** The Company allowed drivers Fernando Castro, John Gillikin, Erica Griffin and Felicia Rush to operate contract crew transportation vehicle without a valid medical examiners certificate on 24 occasions between September 27, 2025, and December 24, 2025.

- **Twenty-eight violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.51(b)(8)(i) - Failing to place a note relating to verification of medical examiner listing on the National Registry of Certified Medical Examiners required by 49 C.F.R. § 391.23(m)(1) in driver qualification file.** Hallcon failed to document the verification of the medical examiner listed in the National Registry of Certified Medical Examiners.

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 serious and potentially harmful to the public. Contract crew transportation companies that: (1) use drivers before verifying negative pre-employment controlled substance and alcohol test results, (2) use drivers who have not completed and furnished an employment application, (3) fail to investigate driver's background within 30 days of employment, (4) use drivers not medically examined or certified, and (5) fail to place notes verifying medical examiner listings for drivers put their customers and the traveling public at risk. These violations present significant safety concerns.
2. **Whether the violations were intentional.** Considerations include:
  - Whether the Company ignored Commission staff's (Staff) 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 violations.

On July 18, 2018, the Commission received the Company's application for railroad contract crew carrier authority. In the application, Drew Jones, Vice President of Hallcon, acknowledged the Company's responsibility to understand and comply with applicable motor carrier safety laws and regulations.

On August 8, 2018, Staff provided new entrant safety regulation training to Hallcon, where the Company acknowledged receiving training pertaining to 49 C.F.R. § 391.45(a). The Company knew or should have known about these requirements.

On February 15, 2022, Commission Motor Carrier Investigation staff completed a routine safety investigation of Hallcon and provided the Company technical assistance.

The Company knew or should have known about these requirements.

3. **Whether the Company self-reported the violations.** Hallcon did not self-report these violations.
4. **Whether the Company was cooperative and responsive.** The Company was cooperative throughout the safety investigation and expressed a desire to come into compliance with state regulations.
5. **Whether the Company promptly corrected the violations and remedied the impacts.** Hallcon has provided Staff with evidence that some of the violations were corrected.

6. **The number of violations.** Staff identified 11 violation types with a total of 177 occurrences during the safety investigation. Of those violations, Staff identified five violation types with 82 individual occurrences that warrant a penalty in accordance with the Commission's Enforcement Policy.
7. **The number of customers affected.** Hallcon traveled 5,421,092 miles in 2025. These safety violations present a public safety risk.
8. **The likelihood of recurrence.** The Company incurred repeat violations and additional new violations, despite prior technical assistance and suspended penalties. Absent a significant commitment to prioritize safe operations, the violations are likely to reoccur.
9. **The Company's past performance regarding compliance, violations, and penalties.** On March 13, 2019, The Commission assessed a \$200 penalty against Hallcon for 47 safety violations related to 49 C.F.R. § 395.8(a) and 49 C.F.R. § 395.5(b)(2) in Docket TH-190073.  
  
On March 8, 2022, The Commission assessed a \$26,800 penalty against Hallcon for 268 safety violations related to 49 C.F.R. § 391.45(a) in Docket TH-220108.
10. **The Company's existing compliance program.** Carol Mier is responsible for the Company's safety compliance program.
11. **The size of the Company.** The Company currently employs 208 drivers and operates 13 commercial motor vehicles. The Company reported \$1,584,111.00 in gross revenue in 2025.

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 by violation category, 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 Hallcon \$2,800 (Penalty Assessment), calculated as follows:

- One violation of WAC 480-62-278(11)(a) – Failure to ensure a negative pre-employment controlled substance and alcohol test was verified prior to a driver performing a safety sensitive function. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for this violation.

---

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

- Twenty violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.21(a) – Using a driver who has not completed and furnished an employment application. The Commission assesses a \$100 penalty for these repeat violations.
- Nine violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.23(a)(1) – Failing to investigate driver’s background within 30 days of employment. The Commission assesses a \$100 penalty for these repeat violations.
- Twenty-four violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.45(a) - Using a driver not medically examined and certified. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for each occurrence of these repeat critical violations, for a total of \$2,400.
- Twenty-eight violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.51(b)(8)(i) - Failing to place a note relating to verification of medical examiner listing on the National Registry of Certified Medical Examiners required by 49 C.F.R. § 391.23(m)(1) in driver qualification file. The Commission assesses a \$100 penalty for these repeat violations.

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 the violation(s) 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 the violation(s) 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 their 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 violation.
- Admit the violation but request mitigation of the penalty amount.

Please indicate your selection on the enclosed form and submit it electronically through the Commission’s web portal at <https://efiling.utc.wa.gov/Form> **within FIFTEEN (15) days** after you receive this Penalty Assessment.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://efiling.utc.wa.gov/Form>.

send a paper copy to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, PO Box 47250, Olympia, Washington 98504-7250.

If you wish to make a payment online, please use this link: [Make a Payment Now \(wa.gov\)](#).<sup>3</sup>

**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 Lacey, Washington, and effective March 31, 2025.

*/s/ Connor Thompson*  
CONNOR THOMPSON  
Director, Administrative Law Division

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.utc.wa.gov/documents-and-proceedings/online-payments/make-payment-now>

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**  
PENALTY ASSESSMENT TH-260167

**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, 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 violation(s) occurred.  
 Enclose \$2,800 in payment of the penalty.  
 OR  Attest that I have paid the penalty in full through the Commission's payment portal.
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 they make a materially false statement which they know 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 their 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.