WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION PENALTY ASSESSMENT TE-170713

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.

31		swoments,
[] 1.	Payme: in paym	nt of penalty. I admit that the violation occurred and enclose \$
[] 2.		t the violation. I believe that the alleged violation did not occur for the reasons! e below (if you do not include reasons supporting your contest here, your 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.
(A) 3.	your app	tion for mitigation. I admit the violation, but I believe that the penalty should ed for the reasons set out below (if you do not include reasons supporting plication here, your request will be denied): A PROLIGIZAL FOR NOT KNOW, NA THAT THESE I ASK for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to Business an administrative law judge for a decision
I declare u including i	nder pen nformati	I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above. alty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing, on I have presented on any attachments, is true and correct. [month/day/year], at

Service Date: June 20, 2017

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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

PENALTY ASSESSMENT: TE-170713 PENALTY AMOUNT: \$1,600

ALCLS, LLC 1918 South Markwell Court Spokane, WA 99223

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) believes that ALCLS, LLC (ALCLS) has committed violations of Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-30-221 Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements, which requires charter and excursion companies to comply with Title 49 CFR Part 382 – Controlled Substances and Alcohol Use and Testing, and Part 395 – Hours of Service of Drivers

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 81.04.530 allows a penalty of \$1,500 for failing to comply with the controlled substances and alcohol use and testing requirements of Title 49 CFR Part 382. RCW 81.04.405 allows penalties of \$100 for each violation of Part 395. In the case of an ongoing violation, every day's continuance is considered a separate and distinct violation.

In April 2017, Commission Motor Carrier Investigator Sandi Yeomans conducted a compliance review of ALCLS and documented the following violations:

One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 382.115(a) – Failing to implement an alcohol and/or controlled substances testing program on the date the employer begins and it was commercial motor vehicle operations. Because ALCLS operates a 20-passenger to a tyear – Twas Hummer, the company must have an alcohol and/or controlled substances testing going to refree program. ALCLS had no such program.

One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 382.115(a) – Failing to implement an alcohol and ways and ways

Eleven violations of Title 49 CFR Part 395.8(a) - Failing to require a driver to prepare a record of duty status using appropriate method. On eleven occasions T are the only and total hours per trip.

Commission considered the C. II.

The Commission considered the following factors in determining the appropriate penalties for $\frac{DOThiS-I}{IT}dO$

1. How serious or harmful the violation is to the public. The violations noted are serious and potentially harmful to the public. Companies that fail to provide an alcohol and/or controlled substances testing program when required, or who fail to require its drivers to record hours of service put the traveling public at risk. An impaired or fatigued driver presents serious safety concerns.

2. Whether the violation is intentional. Considerations include:

I corrected

- Whether the company ignored Commission staff's previous technical assistance; my mistakes and
- Whether there is clear evidence through documentation or other means that shows of the ve the company knew of and failed to correct the violation.

In its 2004 application for charter and excursion authority, ALCLS owner Rose Zaring affirmed that she had a copy of and understood the applicable motor carrier safety regulations. Commission staff provided new entrant technical assistance to the company. And since 2004, the company has had five compliance review investigations with no similar violations. Staff believes the company knew, or should have known, about these requirements.

- 3. Whether the company self-reported the violation. The company did not self-report these violations.
- 4. Whether the company was cooperative and responsive. During the compliance review I only question ALCLS was cooperative and responsive, and corrected many of the violations immediately. Ms. Zaring became angry and confrontational toward staff during the closing interv closing interview, but later submitted a responsive 15-day letter which outlined steps Be cause IT was taken to correct violations.
- > satisfactory @ 1st meeting onen 5. Whether the company promptly corrected the violations and remedied the impacts. 3 he had After the closing interview, ALCLS submitted its 15-day letter which indicated the company was now enrolled in a drug and alcohol testing consortium and has established procedures to correctly report hours of service. ALL violations were remedied The
- same Day as was my letter 6. The number of violations. For a company the size of ALCLS, the number of violations of explainations noted in the compliance review investigation is significant.
- 7. The number of customers affected. The company traveled 5,494 miles and reported \$39,400 in gross revenue for 2016. A small but not insignificant number of customers, as sume 2017 well as the traveling public, were likely affected by these safety violations.

 8. The likelihood of recurrence. The Commission does not know if the company is likely much 05 which
- to repeat these violations, but the company was cooperative and receptive of staff's assistance. We cannot afford This Penelty
- 9. The company's past performance regarding compliance, violations, and penalties. Staff has conducted five compliance review investigations since the company began operations in 2004 and this is the company's first penalty assessment. - Please Take this into
- 10. The company's existing compliance program. ALCLS has no formal compliance program. program.

11. The size of the company. ALCLS operates one commercial vehicle and has one driver. The company reported \$39,400 in gross revenue and 5,494 miles traveled in 2016.

These are first-time violations, but 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. The Commission generally will assess penalties per type of violation, rather than per occurrence, for other first-time violations of critical regulations that do not meet the criteria for mandatory penalties. The Commission will assess penalties for any repeat violations of critical regulations found in future compliance investigations, including for each occurrence of a repeat violation.

The Commission has considered these factors and determined that it should penalize ALCLS \$1,600 for violations of WAC 480-30-221 Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts CFR Parts • One violation of Title 49 CFR Part 382,115(a) - Failing to implement an alcohol and/or controlled substances testing program on the date the employer begins commercial motor vehicle operations. The Commission assesses the statutory penalty of \$1,500. We canceled this Because we going to Retire Eleven violations of Title 49 CFR Part 395.8(a) - Failing to require a driver to prepare a But could not record of duty status using appropriate method. As first-time violations, the Commission Grada Buyer This information, if proven at a hearing and not rebutted or explained, is sufficient to support the penalty assessment. Please occept my explantions assesses a penalty of \$100 for one violation of this type. I thought since 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 assessment 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 concerning the violation(s) require consideration of evidence and resolution in a hearing. Any contest of the penalty assessment must include a written statement of the reasons supporting that contest. Failure to provide such a statement will result in denial of I have written a statement concerning 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 this penalty through evidence presented at a + take into hearing or in writing. The Commission will great a reason for any or all of the violations that you believe should excuse you from the 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 for

mitigation must include a written statement of the reasons supporting that request. Failure to That This is

provide such a statement will result in denial of the request. See RCW 81.04.405. The only 30 pass.

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

law or fact require consideration of evidence and resolution in a hearing. Any request for

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

State:

State:



USDOT#:

Highway:

Washington State Patrol

Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Section

P.O. Box 42614

Olympia, WA 98504-2614

(360) 596-3815 safetynet@wsp.wa.gov

Report Number: WAU008000179 Inspection Date: 04/11/2017

Inspection Level: V - Terminal HM Inspection Type: None

ALCLS LLC 1918 SOUTH MARKWELL CT

SPOKANE, WA 99223

MC/MX#: 470199 State#:

Fax#:

Location: 1918 S MARKWELL CT, SPOKANE WA MilePost:

Phone#: (509)535-5524

Driver: License#: Date of Birth:

CoDriver: License#:

Date of Birth:

Shipper:

Origin: SPOKANE, WA Destination: SPOKANE, WA Bill of Lading: Cargo: EMPTY

VEHICLE IDENTIFICATION

County: SPOKANE, WA

Unit Type Make Year State

Plate #

Equipment ID

VIN

CVSA # CVSA Issued # OOS Sticker

LM HUMR 2003 WA

SUNAMI

5GRGN23U23H129534

6,400

18361453 24383878

BRAKE ADJUSTMENTS

Axle # Right

Left

1 N/A N/A N/A N/A

HYDR HYDR Chamber /

VIOLATIONS: No Violations Were Discovered.

HazMat: No HM-Transported.

Special Checks: No Data for Special Checks.

Placard: No

Cargo Tank:

was surprised that when sandi came Back That she wrote all Violations Down & held then

against me even

Sandi Yeomans

Special Investigator Motor Carrier Safety

Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW PO Box 47250

360/664-1237 Cell: 360/701-1602 FAX: 360/586-1150 syeomans@utc.wa.gov

Olympia, WA 98504-7250 http://www.utc.wa.gov

® @ 18

Report Prepared By:

YEOMANS, \$

Badge #: **WAU586** Copy Received By:

Page 1 of 1







Paula A. Lantsberger, MD, MPH, MRO, FACOEM Terrence D. Rempel, MD, MPH, MRO, FACOEM Royce F. Van Gerpen, MD, MPH, MRO

323 East Second Avenue, Suite 102 Spokane, WA 99202

509.455.5555 Toll Free 855-676-9482 509.455.4114 FAX www.omaspokane.org

DOT Result

Rosie Zaring A Little Class Limousine Service, LLC 1918 S Markwell Ct Spokane, WA 99223

Customer ID: 279

Loc Code: A LITTLE CLASS LIMO-D

Lab Account: 4102-8-D

Desc:

Donor Info:

SSN/ID:

Donor Name: Zaring, Rose

Test Info:

Specimen ID:

Collected: 5/5/2017

Reason: Pre-Employment

Industry: FMCSA

Lab: PAML

Coll Site Name: OMA

MRO Comments:

Lab Comments: QNS @ 0924

PAML Laboratories

Department of

Toxicology

Collector: KAJUANA DANIELS

5094555555

Overall Result:

Negative

Test Performed: DOT

Substance Tested	Result	Screen	Confirm	
Marijuana	Negative	50 ng/mL	50 ng/mL	
Cocaine	Negative	150 ng/mL	150 ng/mL	
Amphetamines	Negative	500 ng/mL	500 ng/mL	
Opiates	Negative	2000 ng/mL	2000 ng/mL	
PCP	Negative	25 ng/mL	25 ng/mL	

^{**}This panel includes tests for specimen validity.**

the same of the sa I have reviewed the laboratory results for the specimen identified by this form in accordance with DHHS guidelines and CFR Part 40.

Paula Lantsberger, MD, MPH, MRO

Dr Paula Lantsberger

Date Verified: 5/8/2017

Date MRO CCF Received: 5/5/2017

Report Sent By: CarrJ

Report Released: 5/8/2017

