20150130164453 Filed Date: 01/30/2015 State Corporation Commission of Kansas

THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

In the Matter of the Investigation of BMS)
Transportation Company, Inc. of Platte)
City, Missouri, Pursuant to the Kansas)
Highway Patrol Issuance of a Notice of	Docket No. 15-GIMM-212-KHP
Violation(s) and Invoice for the Violations of)
the Kansas Motor Carrier Safety Statutes,)
Rules and Regulations	E.

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

KANSAS HIGHWAY PATROL

TROOPER JASON MILLS

ON BEHALF OF

THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

- 1 Q. Please state your full name.
- 2 A. Jason Mills.
- 3 Q. By whom and in what capacity are you employed?
- 4 A. I am a Technical Trooper employed by the Kansas Highway Patrol (KHP).
- 5 Q. Where is your employer located?
- A. The Troop headquarters that I report to (Troop I) is located at 700 SW Jackson, Suite
 704, Topeka, KS 66603.
- 8 Q. How long have you been with the Kansas Highway Patrol?
- 9 A. I have been with the KHP for almost 14 years, since July of 2001.
- 10 Q. Please summarize your educational and professional background.
- After being hired by the Patrol, I attended a 22-week training at the Highway Patrol 11 A. 12 Training Academy in Salina, KS. That training included a certification through Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) to complete level III driver inspections. 13 Level III inspections are inspections of the driver and paperwork only. Since graduating 14 from the academy I have become certified as a Level I inspector. Level I inspections 15 cover the driver, paperwork and the entire vehicle, including crawling underneath the 16 truck and checking the chassis and the drive train and everything underneath the truck. I 17 have also gained certifications to complete inspections in hazardous materials, cargo 18 tanks, other bulk packaging and radioactive materials. Since 2010, I have been instructing 19 general hazardous materials transportation, receiving my instructor certification through 20

the National Training Center in 2013. I completed Level III inspections until 2002, when
I obtained my Level II certification. Level II inspections are essentially Level I
inspections without checking all the brakes. From 2002 until 2010, I completed the
required minimum 50 Level II CVSA inspections per year. Beginning in 2010, I achieved
my Level I certification, at which time I was required 720 truck inspections per year. In
2013, I attended training in Commercial Motor Vehicle Post-Crash Investigation from the
Nebraska State Patrol.

- 8 Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?
- 9 A. No.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Please explain the circumstances giving rise to the roadside inspection of the vehicle of BMS Transportation Company, Inc. on June 23, 2014.
 - A. On that evening I was riding with Technical Trooper Shawn Hines. As we were pulling from a parking lot onto US-59 highway, in Garnett, Central Dispatch broadcast an attempt to locate for a truck tractor, semi-trailer that was spilling its load. At the same time, this BMS combination passed by us northbound on US-59. Based on the description a red in color truck pulling a trailer leaking product, given by the reporting party, location, and direction of travel we were able to locate and determine that this BMS truck was the vehicle involved in the attempt to locate. We pursued the truck and stopped it for inspection on US-59, at approximately milepost 111. The stop occurred at approximately 2020 hours, i.e., 8:20 p.m.

- Q. What was your role in the stop and inspection?
- 2 A. I completed the walk around, hazardous materials inspection, cargo tank inspection, and inspection report.
- 4 Q. Are you familiar with the challenge raised by BMS Transportation Company, Inc.
- 5 in this matter?
- 6 A. Yes. They are challenging the fine for the out-of-service violation for brakes.
- 7 Q. Did you formally document the June 23, 2014 stop and inspection?
- 8 A. Yes. I documented the inspection in Inspection Report Number KS00PR000571
- 9 Q. Please describe the vehicle or vehicles involved in this stop.
- 10 A. The tractor was a red in color 2007 Kenworth truck, marked with USDOT number 1074225. It was pulling a 1977 Fruehauf MC-306 cargo tank that was displaying class 3 placards, with ID number UN1999.
- 13 Q. Did this vehicle meet the definition of a commercial motor vehicle? Please explain?
- 14 A. Yes. It did meet the definition of a commercial motor vehicle in two ways. In the
 15 definition under 49 C.F.R. 390.5, the combination was in interstate commerce, over
 16 10,001 lbs. gross vehicle weight rating and gross vehicle weight. It was also transporting
 17 an amount of hazardous materials that required placards to be displayed.
- Q. Please explain the Kansas Highway Patrol's authority as it relates to the stop and inspection of commercial motor vehicles.

- A. Several Kansas statutes and administrative regulations, as well as case law, give us the authority to stop and complete inspections on commercial motor vehicles and the drivers of such vehicles. KSA 74-2108 authorizes and directs members of the Highway Patrol to stop and inspect private and public motor carriers to ensure that they are in compliance with the rules and regulations.
- Q. At the time of the stop, how did you determine that the vehicle and its driver were subject to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's (FMCSA's) rules and regulations?
- 9 A. Using the definition, and speaking with the driver we were able to determine that it was in commerce and subject to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs).
- 11 Q. What type of inspection did you conduct on the vehicle-in-question? Please explain.
- 12 A. We completed a CVSA Level I, hazardous materials, and cargo tank inspection. The
 13 Level I inspection included a 37-step process, including the driver and vehicles. The
 14 hazardous materials and cargo tank inspections included ensuring compliance with the
 15 Hazardous Material Regulations (HMRs).
- 16 Q. Did you identify any violations during the June 23, 2014, stop and inspection?
- 17 A. We identified 26 violations of the FMCSRs and HMRs.
- Q. The issue in contention in this matter is the out-of-service determination for defective brakes. Describe in detail how you determined that three of the vehicle-in-question's brakes were out of adjustment beyond acceptable limits?

4

that the combination was out of service.

- 1 A. Technical Trooper Hines completed the inspection of the brakes that evening. I did not
 2 look at the brakes. During Trooper Hines' inspection of the brakes, I wrote down the
 3 measurements that he was taking. After his inspection of the brakes, we simply discussed
- Q. Please explain the rule relevant to putting a vehicle out-of-service for defective
 brakes.
- The North American Standard Out-of-Service Criteria, as printed by CVSA, determines A. 7 which violations apply to the number of defective brakes that would place the vehicle(s) 8 out-of-service based on the number of required brakes on the vehicle(s). If twenty 9 percent (20%) or more of the brakes are defective, the vehicle(s) meet the out-of-service 10 condition. Brakes that are out of adjustment count toward a defective brake. This 11 combination, having ten brakes, would meet the out-of-service condition with two 12 defective brakes. It was determined to have three out of adjustment, therefore, exceeding 13 the twenty percent (20%) threshold. 14
- 15 Q. Regarding other violations, how did you determine that there was oil leaking on the vehicle's outer wheel on the driver's side?
- From the presence of oil/grease on the axle end hub assembly and on the inside of wheel rim.
- 19 Q. Were there other oil and/or grease leaks that you found on the vehicle?
- 20 A. Yes, there was oil leaking from the engine onto the ground during the inspection.
- 21 Q. Please explain the rule that applies to oil and grease leaks.

- 1 A. 49 C.F.R. 396.5 states, "Every motor carrier shall ensure that each motor vehicle subject
- to its control is—(a) Properly lubricated; and (b) Free of oil and grease leaks."
- 3 Q. How did you determine that the vehicle-in-question had placarding violations?
- 4 A. I observed that the required placards were damaged, faded, folded over, torn and obscured.
- 6 Q. Please explain the rules relevant to these placarding violations.
- 7 A. 49 C.F.R. 172.516 states that all placards must be visible from the direction that they face. They may not be damaged, deteriorated, or obscured.
- 9 Q. Was the vehicle-in-question hauling hazardous materials? Please explain.
- 10 A. It was hauling an elevated temperature material as defined in 49 C.F.R. 171.8, "(1) Is in a
 11 liquid phase and at a temperature at or above 100° C (212° F)." A check of the
 12 temperature gauge on the side of the cargo tank showed that it was at a temperature of
 13 approximately 280° F.
- 14 Q. How did you determine that the vehicle-in-question had a violation for leaking these 15 hazardous materials?
- 16 A. From the reporting party in the initial attempt to locate, and from observing that there
 17 were materials leaking from around a valve on the rear of the cargo tank.
- 18 Q. Please explain the rule that applies to the leaking of hazardous materials.
- A. 49 C.F.R. 173.24 states, "b) Each package used for the shipment of hazardous materials under this subchapter shall be designed, constructed, maintained, filled, its contents so

- limited, and closed, so that under conditions normally incident to transportation. (1)
 Except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, there will be no identifiable (without the
 use of instruments) release of hazardous materials to the environment."
- Q. During your inspection, did you discover any other hazardous materials related violations?
- We discovered several other hazardous material violations, including no Pipeline and 6 A. Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) copy of PHMSA registration as 7 required by 49 C.F.R. 107.601, the drain holes in the overturn protection on the cargo 8 tank plugged, in violation of 49 C.F.R. 178.340-8C; the cargo tank was not marked with 9 test date markings, as required by 49 C.F.R. 180.415; no piping protection for piping on 10 the MC-306, as required by 49 C.F.R. 178.340-8; piping failing to be 6 inches inboard of 11 rear end protect, as required by 49 C.F.R. 178.340-8; marking on left side of cargo tank 12 not square on point, as required in 49 C.F.R. 172.325; and the basic description of 13 hazardous materials listed on shipping paper were not in the proper sequence, as required 14 in 49 C.F.R. 172.202. 15
- 16 Q. Please explain the rules that apply to these violations.
- 17 A. See above.
- 18 Q. Is there anything further you wish to add to aid the Commission in its decision?
- I do have pictures and video of several of the violations, including the leaking hazardous materials. Also, I found that the overall condition of the tractor trailer combination was very poor. It appeared that maintenance was not being kept up or even completed. The

driver didn't seem to care about the condition of the vehicle either. When asked if he had completed the required pre-trip inspection, he stated that he did do the inspection, knew that the materials were leaking, and still chose to drive. I only received this statement because I caught him in a lie.

5 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

6 A. Yes it does.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

15-GIMM-212-KHP

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing docket was placed in the United States mail, postage prepaid, or hand-delivered this 30th day of January, 2015, to the following:

KEN PRATT BMS TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, INC. PO BOX 2326 PLATTE CITY, MO 64079 Fax: 816-431-2573 MICHAEL DUENES, LITIGATION COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027 Fax: 785-271-3354 m.duenes@kcc.ks.gov

BRIAN G. FEDOTIN, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027 Fax: 785-271-3314 b.fedotin@kcc.ks.gov

Victi Jacobsen