

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday & Thursday, November 12-13, 1997

Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia Pennsylvania

The focus of the first Technical Review Committee (TRC) meetings, held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on November 12 and 13, was the review and approval of the field operation test (FOT) work plans. On the first day, two TRCs, Carrier Operations and Credentialing, presented, while the second day was dedicated solely to the Safety TRC presentations. Each state awarded funding for a FOT gave a presentation to provide additional information about the projects' scope, goals, objectives, budget and schedule. The FOT work plan presentations accomplished two goals: they provided the TRCs a more detailed understanding of the FOTs, and provided a forum for all states to understand how each jurisdiction will implement their FOT.

The following sections summarize the presentations and issues discussed at the meeting. The minutes have four sections, one for each TRC committee, Carrier Operations, Electronic Credentialing and Safety, and a section on the meeting evaluation. The summaries include the presenter and the agency they represented, along with the issues brought up in the discussion following each presentation. Based on requests from the meeting attendees, we have enclosed a variety of attachments. They include:

1. New York's Memorandum of Understanding between agencies participating in FOT 8
2. New York's Commercial Vehicle Credentialing System, Design Overview (FOT 8)
3. Connecticut's legislation and policy guidance documents
4. Fee Automation Process presentation, David Lewis— CVO Working Group Co-chair
5. Safety TRC Overview presentation, Bill Yodice— Safety TRC Chair
6. Virginia FOT 9 presentation on Electronic Screening, Ken Jennings— VDOT

Carrier Operations TRC Meeting

The objective of this first meeting was to provide members with information regarding FleetForward, develop and discuss the TRC's direction and goals, and discuss possible performance and evaluation measures for FleetForward. In addition, current TRC members were asked to identify key people who should be regular members of the TRC.

Presentations

Robert Pritchard, ATA Foundation, presented an overview of the FleetForward FOT.

Mark Hornung, ALK & Associates, followed with a demonstration of the technology that will be part of FleetForward.

Marygrace Parker, TRC Chair, presented the draft mission, vision, barrier and goal statements for Carrier Operations TRC.

General Discussion & Comments

Comments have been consolidated into four areas: (1) FleetForward project and participants, (2) information issues, (3) benefits and evaluation of FleetForward, and (4) barriers. At the meeting, the project evaluators who attended introduced. The project evaluators will work with the TRC to establish baseline information, including the outline of data to be collected and the expected benefits to the public and private sectors. Castle Rock will distribute information on future meetings to address the project evaluation. The discussion at the meeting was fairly involved; highlights are presented below:

FleetForward Project and Participants

*Mission for FleetForward*¾By design the mission of FleetForward focuses on operational efficiency with safety as a secondary goal.

*Participating companies*¾The motor carriers participating in FleetForward will be screened for good safety records and selected for how they will best estimate market potential of the FleetForward product. In Phase One, the participating carriers are those already using fleet management software. In selecting motor carriers for Phase Two, TRC members requested that ATA consider geographic representation and buses in the test pool.

*Independent operators*¾The TRC noted the limited participation of independent operators and discussed including state and national motor carrier associations to increase owner/operator representation.

*Recruit UPS*¾FleetForward hopes to recruit UPS drivers into participating in the project. UPS has the most current information on road conditions considering the number of vehicles in the fleet and the exchange of information between drivers on road conditions.

*Project skepticism*¾Both public and private sectors have expressed skepticism. Some skepticism may be addressed by encouraging the participation of both private and public sectors in the operational test; specifically, encourage the participation of small and large motor carriers. Some private sector skepticism is based on the fact that, to date, no government agencies have backed a product that gives routing information.

Information Issues

Information Exchange Network (IEN) ¾Many questions and issues were raised about the IEN. In general, the TRC thought FleetForward would test the boundaries of the IEN in terms of the data exchanged, frequency of exchange, inputs of information, time sensitivity of the data, and the packaging of the information.

*Data access*¾The private sector expressed concerns about who would have access to the data, how the information

would be communicated, and whether or not the information could be used for any enforcement measures or to affect competition.

Benefits & Evaluation

Performance criteria ¾ Anticipated performance criteria includes costs and total amount of software purchased. Secondary measures that are difficult to quantify include: time (not as relevant to the market because most motor carriers are paid by the mile) and penalties (avoidance of fees).

Secondary effects ¾ Success of FleetForward could cause an increased exchange of information between drivers. For example, an incident is reported to the dispatcher, who notifies his drivers, who in turn notify other drivers on the road.

Benefits to owner/operators ¾ Owner/operators will only purchase the product if it is of direct value to their operations.

Measured benefits ¾ Other projects designed to improve efficiency and safety could alter the base condition, making it difficult for benefits to be measured.

Barriers

Carrier investment choices ¾ A private carrier could invest in another capital item, such as a truck, rather than purchasing FleetForward. Need to quantify the benefits of FleetForward in terms of cost savings that can be compared to other capital expenditures.

Long-term costs ¾ The TRC expressed concerns about the reliability of the software, and potential costs of any upgrades and maintenance.

Electronic Credentialing TRC Meeting

The Credentialing TRC kicked off its first meeting with an overview of the TRC's direction and presentations of the FOT 8 work plans. In addition, the TRC discussed a proposed project, Fee Automation Process, to centralize fee calculations for each state. The following section presents the comments on the work plan presentations and the Fee Automation Process concept. During the meeting, the TRC discussed aspects of new regulation, legislation, and memorandums of understanding between agencies that have been required by these new programs and changing environment. Please see page 1 of the minutes for a complete list of the relevant attachments.

Work Plan Presentations

Massachusetts ¾ Linda Kelly, Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles

Massachusetts' work plan presentation included an overview of their existing programs using

advanced technology, the Internet and electronic transactions. For FOT 8, Massachusetts plans to automate registrations for renewals and amendments, IFTA and IRP trip permits, and oversized/overweight, and conduct the electronic collection of roadside citations and accident reports. The use of the internet will be their key medium used to connect to motor carriers. To do so, Massachusetts will develop their own carrier automated transaction (CAT) system. Currently, the project does not plan to connect to the clearinghouses. General comments and discussion included:

Credit card and electronic fund transactions (EFTs) ¾ Massachusetts has negotiated a 1.8% and 1.9% transaction cost with the credit card companies. Massachusetts also indicated that the state is currently paying the credit card charges. So that Massachusetts does not lose expected revenue, they place a \$200 cap on all credit card transactions. Amounts above \$200 are processed electronically, which has a \$0.25 per transaction cost.

Internet ¾ Massachusetts encourages motor carriers to renew and register on-line and even charges a penalty if the carrier decides to register in person.

Information access ¾ Massachusetts plans to make their information available to carriers.

Automated transactions ¾ Massachusetts batch processes the automatic transactions with a turnaround time of two days.

Delaware ¾ Tricia Faust, Delaware DOT and Cheryl Roe, Delaware Department of Motor Vehicles

Delaware provided a brief synopsis of their existing programs and then went on to describe their plans for FOT 8. Delaware will provide on-line end-to-end processing for intrastate carriers. As part of the project, Delaware plans to connect to the IRP clearinghouses. General comments and discussion included:

Credit card and electronic fund transactions ¾ Delaware is considering the use of credit cards, but can't afford to pass the cost onto the customer or electronic funds transfers.

Internet ¾ Delaware will encourage motor carriers to renew and register on-line. Delaware has decided to have two (2) major carriers, two (2) middle size carriers and one (1) small carrier in their demonstration project. A meeting with the carriers will be held in early December.

Information Access ¾ Delaware plans to make all their information available to carriers (i.e. Driver's License, Vehicle Registrations, Insurance, and IRP).

Participation ¾ Delaware is customer-oriented, consequently they plan to coordinate owner/operator participation in an interactive operation.

*Technology*¾ Delaware is presently working on a 2D bar code and electronic signature

New Jersey¾ Lee Feldman, New Jersey Division of Motor Vehicles

New Jersey plans to investigate successful web-based credentialing systems and then implement those systems with minor modifications for New Jersey requirements. The program's focus will be on interstate carriers, but ideally will have the flexibility to add intrastate carriers at a later date. From this FOT, New Jersey will produce guidelines and checklists for other states implementing credentialing projects.

*Credit Card and Electronic Funds Transactions*¾ New Jersey is considering the use of credit cards.

*Internet*¾ New Jersey is planning with use of the internet to encourage motor carrier participation.

*Information Access*¾ New Jersey plans to make their IRP and IFTA information available to carriers.

New York¾ Guido Quattrocchi, New York Department of Taxation and Finance

New York plans to automate all of their credentialing activities from beginning to end, which will change the way business is conducted. Hazardous Materials is not included in the credentialing consolidation as they only issue five permits a day. New York's process will involve issuing a memorandum of understanding between agencies (attachment 1). Also, as part of the project, New York has developed a conceptual design (attachment 2). During the meeting, the TRC discussed aspects of new regulations and legislation required by these new programs. General comments and discussion included:

*Electronic fund transactions*¾ To address the issue of a signature, New York plans to use a PIN to accept or reject EFTs.

*Information access*¾ Under New York's current plan, two participating agencies will not be able to access the same information. Individuals, however, will be able to access their own information.

*Intra-/interstate carriers*¾ New York plans to develop a migration plan to include intrastate carriers later on.

Pennsylvania¾ Ann Marie Kessler, Pennsylvania DOT

Pennsylvania has a preliminary work plan developed for automating the credentialing process for IRP. One of their first steps will be to better define the project scope and tasks. To do so, Pennsylvania suggested sending a survey to the other jurisdictions and holding a meeting to help define the scope of the project. In addition, Pennsylvania will be upgrading their computer terminal environment (mainframe) to a PC-based environment. Pennsylvania also requested that a meeting with the participating FOT 8 jurisdictions be established. This meeting would enable all participants to exchange additional information which will assist Pennsylvania with their ability to develop the demonstration project as well as enable all FOT members to share in the development of the electronic credentialing process.

Safety TRC Meeting

Captain Bill Yodice, Safety TRC Chair, began the meeting with a welcome and overview of the Safety TRC. During the issues/barriers portion of the presentation, a number of issues were discussed. Highlights include:

*Interstate & intrastate compatibility with data, computers and information*¾ Questions included what type of data should/could be shared among states and trucking companies, and the issue of laptop computer compatibility. Also, the possibility of developing a resolution between northern and southern states that will standardize electronic clearance (presentation will be made at the AASHTO Annual Meeting).

*Outreach programs*¾ Questions and comments included which states currently have an outreach program, who should be conducting the outreach programs (i.e., state associations), and what relevant ITS information should be included. Also, the possibility of developing a brochure to hand out explaining current projects and benefits was discussed.

*SAFER*¾ Concerns were expressed about SAFER not meeting officers' needs and not being able to provide real-time information at the roads.

*Diesel emissions project*¾ Connecticut plans to issue a sticker that indicates reciprocity between New Jersey and other states. For example, if a carrier is stopped in Connecticut, that carrier will be waved through a New Jersey stop.

Work Plan Presentations

The work plan presentations began with FOT 10 (Safety Management) and FOT 9 (Electronic Screening) in the morning. The afternoon session consisted of FOT 7 (Roadside Safety). The following section presents a brief summary of the presentations, presenters and issues developed as a result of the presentations.

FOT 10¾ Safety Management

Maine¾ Tim Bolton, Maine DOT

Maine's FOT will provide real-time CVO data to enforcement officials, thereby improving highway safety. The Maine FOT will utilize USDOT numbers, as a common motor carrier identifier, to pull information from the MCMIS database. Maurice Dionne, Maine Bureau of Motor Vehicles, discussed the state's public motivators that have driven the project. One motivator was the group Parents Against Tired Truckers which initiated a Maine Motor Carrier Task Force. Another issue discussed was whether or not Maine will require that USDOT numbers be visible on the trucks operating in Maine. Presently, Maine does not require USDOT numbers on trucks.

ATA Foundation¾ Robert Pritchard

The ATA Foundation is looking to improve safety compliance through a proactive approach to organizational structures and systems. The FOT will investigate effective safety management practices in both the enforcement and motor carrier community. Once identified, these practices will be shared through outreach and education programs.

FOT 9¾ Electronic Screening

Delaware¾ Howard Giddens, Delaware

Delaware gave an overview of their FOT. A number of discussions arose from the presentation. Some of the broader issues that were addressed include:

- Transponders and SmartCards
- Coordination with CIVSN
- Technology push and pull
- Assessing the deployment
- Setting up a deployment or standards conference on transponders
 - IAG
 - ITS
 - AASHTO
 - ASTM
- How to interact with different FOTs and other projects
 - Conference calls
 - Quarterly reports
 - Are these enough?

Virginia¾ Ken Jennings, VDOT

Virginia gave an interactive presentation on utilizing License Plate Readers for electronic screening. Virginia indicated that this will be a real test and not a staged one. No issues were discussed, concluding the presentation.

FOT 7¾ Roadside Safety

All of the FOT 7 projects will utilize laptop computers for roadside safety inspections. At the meeting, there was some discussion of the type of laptop computers each FOT 7 project will purchase. Some states will be purchasing off-the-shelf hardware and software while others will be purchasing made-to-order hardware and software. Since there is such a broad selection of hardware and software available in the area of laptop computers, it was determined that it would be helpful to develop a laptop computer matrix. The matrix would show the states' hardware and software along with the pros and cons of each. Following is a summary of the issues discussed:

- Training
- Pros and cons of different computers
- Communication systems (wireless, landline)
- Getting data for the evaluators

The following is summary of the states and the presenters for each state:

- Connecticut— Rudy Supina, Connecticut State Police
- Massachusetts— Gary Burns, Massachusetts State Police
- Maryland— Ray Walker, Maryland State Police
- New York— Norm Schneider, New York Department of Transportation
- Pennsylvania— Vincent Babich, Pennsylvania State Police

- Rhode Island— Matt Giardina, Rhode Island State Police

Meeting Evaluation Summary

We received a number of responses to the evaluation form that was included in the meeting materials. Everyone who returned an evaluation form thought the meeting met or exceeded their expectations. Some of the comments about the meeting included:

- Allowed states to articulate their FOTs
- Provided a mechanism to share information about other states' activities
- Requested detailed and concise information on reports

Everyone also agreed that the section of the meeting discussing mission, vision, and TRC direction was sufficient. However, one respondent thought that a single session for all TRCs would have been sufficient. All of the respondents thought that the consistency of the presentations among all the states met expectations and allowed easy comparisons among the state work plans.

Additional information requested for future TRC meetings and peer reviews of the FOTs includes:

- Detailed evaluation criteria/standards
- Standardization and the cost benefits for all parties
- Evaluation process
- CVISN updates from MD and VA

States would like to see the following updates from current programs at the next TRC meeting:

- FOT status reports— Featuring in-depth status reports from among the FOTs
- Evaluation plans
- I-95 Steering Committee meeting reports— PRISM and other related electronic project status reports
- CVO Enforcement Tour
- Screening interoperability
- DSRC standards
- Presentations from other Coalitions (i.e., southeast region (Southern I-95), HELP, AASHTO)

Additional topics people would like to see covered include:

- FOT evaluation updates
- How we can link with the southeast and take I-95 beyond Virginia
- SAFER updates
- Standards