

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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

**PENALTY ASSESSMENT: TG-180635
PENALTY AMOUNT: \$800**

DB Hauling, LLC
612 N 20th Avenue
Yakima, WA 98902

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) believes that DB Hauling, LLC (DB Hauling or Company) has committed violations of Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-70-201 Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 391 – Qualifications of Drivers, Part 393 – Parts and Accessories Necessary for Safe Operation, and Part 396 – Inspection, Repair, and Maintenance.

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

In July 2018, Commission Motor Carrier Investigator Sandi Yeomans completed a routine safety investigation of DB Hauling and documented the following violations:

- **Two violations of Title 49 CFR Part 391.51(a) – General requirements for driver qualification files.** The Company failed to maintain a driver qualification file on either of its two drivers, Brian Chouinard or Donald York.
- **One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 393.40 – Required brake systems.** Upon inspection of vehicle 279, staff discovered brakes out of adjustment on two of six wheels and placed the vehicle out-of-service.
- **Two violations of Title 49 CFR Part 396.3(a)(1) – Brake system pressure loss.** Upon inspection of vehicles 319 and 248, staff discovered air pressure loss in the braking systems and placed the vehicles out-of-service.
- **Five violations of Title 49 CFR Part 396.3(b) – Required records.** The Company failed to keep the minimum required records of inspection and maintenance for the five vehicles examined.
- **Three violations of Title 49 CFR Part 396.5(b) – Lubrication.** Upon inspection of vehicles 100, 248, and 279, staff discovered oil and/or grease leaking from wheel hubs and placed the vehicles out-of-service.

The Commission considered the following factors in determining the appropriate penalty for the violation:

1. **How serious or harmful the violations is to the public.** The violations noted are serious and potentially harmful to the public. Companies that fail to maintain driver qualification records and critical vehicle safety components such as brakes and wheels put the traveling public at risk. A failure of a critical safety component or potentially unqualified driver present serious safety concerns.
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 violations.

DB hauling began operations in 2005 as a garbage and refuse collection company in Yakima, WA. The Commission granted operating authority to the Company on August 10, 2005. In its application for authority filed January 18, 2005, the Company acknowledged its responsibility to understand and comply with applicable state and federal safety requirements.

3. **Whether the company self-reported the violation.** The Company did not self-report the violations.
4. **Whether the company was cooperative and responsive.** The Company was cooperative throughout the entire investigation.
5. **Whether the company promptly corrected the violation and remedied the impacts.** The Company corrected violations throughout the investigation process.
6. **The number of violations.** Staff identified 15 violations types with 43 individual occurrences.
7. **The number of customers affected.** The Company reported 5,100 miles traveled in 2017. 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 DB Hauling is likely to repeat these safety violations, however the Company was cooperative with staff and made corrections to violations throughout the investigation process.
9. **The company's past performance regarding compliance, violations, and penalties.** Staff conducted safety investigations of the Company in 2006 and 2010 and noted similar violations. No penalties were issued. The commissioned penalized the Company for failing to submit a timely annual report seven times since 2005.
10. **The company's existing compliance program.** Brian Chouinard, Owner, is responsible for the carrier's safety and compliance program.

11. **The size of the company.** DB Hauling is a small company with two drivers and 13 vehicles. The Company reported a gross revenue of \$426,324 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.¹ The Commission will generally 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 found in future compliance investigations, including each occurrence of a repeat violation.

The Commission has considered these factors and determined that it should penalize DB Hauling \$800 for violations of WAC 480-70-201 Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 CFR Part 391, Part 393, and Part 396, calculated as follows:

- Five violations of Title 49 CFR Part 391.51(a) – General requirements for driver qualification files. These are first-time violations. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for a single occurrence of this critical-type violation.
- One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 393.40 – Required brake systems. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for this violation.
- Two violations of Title 49 CFR Part 396.3(a)(1) – Brake system pressure loss. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for each of these two violations, for a total of \$200.
- Five violations of Title 49 CFR Part 396.3(b) – Required records. These are first-time violations. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for a single occurrence of this critical-type violation.
- Three violations of Title 49 CFR Part 396.5(b) – Lubrication. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for each of these three violations, for a total of \$300.

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. Or, 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

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

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 violation(s).
- 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. If you are unable to submit the form electronically, you may send a paper copy to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, Post Office 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 August 24, 2018.

/s/ Dennis Moss for
RAYNE PEARSON
Director, Administrative Law Division

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
PENALTY ASSESSMENT TG-180635

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 \$_____ in payment of the penalty.

[] 2. **Contest the violations.** I believe that the alleged violations 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.”