

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD**

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	Docket Number: 2025-0120
vs.	)	
	)	MISLE Activity ID: 8085143
JORDAN METIS JEFFRIES,	)	
Respondent.	)	

ORDER MEMORIALIZING PRE HEARING CONFERENCE AND CONSENT ORDER

Issued: July 11, 2025

By Order of Administrative Law Judge: Hon. Jennifer A. Mehaffey

Appearances:

For the Coast Guard

Daniel B. Schaefer, Esq.
USCG Suspension and Revocation National Center of Expertise

Paul R. Schachtner
USCG Sector Columbia River

For the Respondent

Jordan Metis Jeffries, *Pro se*

On March 24, 2025, the Coast Guard filed a Complaint dated March 11, 2025, against Jordan Metis Jeffries (Respondent) seeking a twelve (12) month outright suspension of his Merchant Mariner Credential (MMC) for an alleged refusal of a reasonable cause chemical test.¹ On June 4, 2025, the Coast Guard filed a Motion for Approval of a Settlement Agreement and Entry of Consent Order (Motion), containing the Settlement Agreement to be approved as a settlement of this case under 33 C.F.R. § 20.502.

After reviewing the Settlement Agreement, I note the terms of the parties' agreement allowed that the suspension of Respondent's MMC could exceed the 12-month suspension proposed in the Complaint. Specifically, the Settlement Agreement states Respondent's MMC would be suspended outright for a minimum of six months, but if he does not complete the requirements of the Settlement Agreement within the six months, his MMC "will not be returned until completed." Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 2, 6. Pursuant to Coast Guard policy, the sanction for failure to complete the terms of the Settlement Agreement "should match the proposed order from the complaint." Marine Safety Manual Vol. V Investigations and Enforcement, Part C, Ch. 4, Sec. E.4.d., COMDTINST M16000.10A (April 24, 2008).

Considering the above, on July 1, 2025, I convened a telephone conference with the parties to discuss their understanding of the agreed-upon sanction set forth in the Settlement Agreement. Daniel B. Schaefer, Esq. of the USCG Suspension and Revocation National Center of Expertise and Paul R. Schachtner of USCG Sector Columbia River appeared on behalf of the Coast Guard. Respondent appeared on his own behalf. During the conference, the Coast Guard

¹ Although the Coast Guard dated the Certificate of Service for the Complaint as March 11, 2025, the Coast Guard did not file the Complaint with the Coast Guard Docketing Center until March 24, 2025. Additionally, the Coast Guard Return of Service for the Complaint included a FedEx proof of delivery form showing the Complaint package was sent to Respondent on March 12, 2025. However, because the parties reached an agreement and did not raise an issue regarding proper service, the discrepancy in dates of service does not affect my approval of this Settlement Agreement.

stated the period of deposit of Respondent's MMC was agreed to by the parties because Respondent would often be in remote locations due to his work as a wildland firefighter. The parties had agreed to these terms to allow Respondent sufficient time to complete the settlement requirements prior to returning his MMC, specifically as they relate to obtaining an evaluation from a Substance Abuse Professional (SAP) and completing any rehabilitation education and/or treatment program recommended by the SAP. Respondent affirmatively stated he understood the terms of the Settlement Agreement to be that his MMC could potentially be suspended for longer than 12 months. Although settlements with such open-ended terms should not be employed regularly, based on the specific consideration of Respondent's work requirements and the parties stated understanding and agreement of the sanction, I will approve the agreed-upon sanction. See 46 C.F.R. § 5.569(a); See also Appeal Decision 2487 (THOMAS), 1989 WL 1126144 at *3 (the imposition of a sanction is the sole responsibility of the ALJ).

As evidenced by their respective signature, the parties assert that settlement is in the public interest and appropriate based on Respondent's cooperation and good faith efforts towards remediation. The parties also agree the entry of a Consent Order approving this settlement without further litigation is the proper means of resolution in this matter. Accordingly, the parties have expressly waived their right to a hearing and appeal in this matter and I have not conducted a hearing on the merits of this case. I have carefully reviewed the terms of the Settlement Agreement and find that it is fair, reasonable, and in substantial compliance with the requirements of 33 C.F.R. § 20.502.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, the Motion for Approval of Settlement Agreement and Entry of Consent Order is **GRANTED**, and the Settlement Agreement is **APPROVED** in full and incorporated herein by reference. This Consent Order shall constitute full, final, and complete adjudication of this proceeding.

Done and dated July 11, 2025
New York, NY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "MehaFFEY", is written over a horizontal line.

HON. JENNIFER A. MEHAFFEY
Administrative Law Judge
United States Coast Guard