COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE TRANSPORTATION: COMMITTEE

* * * *

In re: Senate Bill 1057 and House Bill 1722

* * * *

Stenographic report of hearing taken in Room 8-E, East Wing, Main Capitol. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Wednesday September 6, 1989 9:00 a.m.

HON. J. DOYLE CORMAN, CHAIRMAN HON. JOSEPH A. PETRARCA, CHAIRMAN

MEMBERS OF SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEE

Hon. Victor J. Lescovitz Hon. Clarence D. Bell Hon. Edward J. Lucyk Hon. Mario J. Civera, Jr. Hon. Joseph F. Markosek Hon. Peter J. Daley, II Hon. Charles F. Nahill, Jr. Hon. Scott Dietterick Hon. Russ Fairchild Hon. Joesph A. Steighner Hon. Donald W. Snyder Hon. Richard A. Giest Hon. Thomas M. Tigue Hon. Edwin G. Holl Hon. Michael R. Veon Hon. Dick L. Hess

Also Present:

Paul Parsells, Executive Director Greg Warner Sheryl Simpson Paul Landis

Reported by: Dorothy M. Malone, RPR

Dorothy M Malone Registered Professional Reporter 135 S Landis Street Hummelstown, Pennsylvania 17036

1	INDEX TO WITNESSES	PAGE
2	John J. Zogby, Deputy Secretary for Safety Administration, PennDOT	5
4	Doug Tobin, Director of Driver Licensing, PennDOT	
5	Robert J. Rhodes, President, Pennsylvania School Bus Association	31
6	Elaine Farrell, Executive Director, Pennsylvania School Bus Association	
7 8	John J. Bell, Pennsylvania Farmers' Association	40
9	Dorsey Musselman, Central Pennsylvania Truckers' Association	44
10	Henry E. Beaver, State Legislative Director, United Transportation Union	49
11	-	
12	Donald W. Dunlevy, Secretary of Pennsylvania State Legislative Board, United Transportation Union	
13	William Yocum, Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association	69
14 15	Robert P. Wooten, Assistant General Manager for Public Affairs, SEPTA	74
16	James Moore, Executive Vice President, Pennsylvania Recreational Vehicle and Camping Association	80
17	Richard Bloomingdale, Legislative Director, AFSCME, Council 13	97
18		
19	Larry Klos, President, Business Agents, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 85	102
20	Norton Brainard, Pennsylvania Conference of Teamsters	106
21		-
22	Harry Lombardo, President, Transport Workers' Union	115
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Good morning. The Senate and House Transportation Committee are holding this joint public hearing today to receive testimony about Senate Bill 1057 and House Bill 1722, identical legislation enacting the Uniform Commercial Driver's License Act.

This legislation will ensure Pennsylvania's compliance with federal law that requires a national standard for testing and licensing commercial truck and bus drivers. By April 1992 an estimated 320,000 licensed drivers will have to take a written test and about 18,000 drivers will have to take an additional driving skills portion examination.

Failure of Pennsylvania to comply with the federal law will mean a loss of federal highway funds. So while we have options, they are somewhat limited, we must comply with the federal law.

Representative Petrarca and I thought the Committee should have a joint hearing to receive testimony not only on the contents of legislation but also how our Committees can help make the transition to the new licensing system go smoothly.

At this time it is my pleasure to introduce the other senators, some of which have not yet arrived, so the other senator is Senator Bell and I. Representative Petrarca will introduce the House members or call the roll, whichever.

1	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA. We will have roll call.
2	
3	Paul.
4	MR. PARSELLS: Representative Petrarca.
_	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Present.
5	MR. PARSELLS: Representative Clark;
6	Representative Daley; Representative Gruitza;
7	Representative Lescovitz, Representative Lloyd, Representa-
8	tive Lucyk; Representative Markosek; Representative Murphy,
9	Representative Preston, Representative Steighner.
10	REPRESENTATIVE STEIGHNER: Here.
11	MR. PARSELLS: Representative Tigue.
12	REPRESENTATIVE TIQUE: Here.
13	MR. PARSELLS. Representative Veon.
14	REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Here.
15	
16	MR. PARSELLS: Representative Wozniak;
	Representative Dininni; Representative Civera, Representative
17	Dietterick.
18	REPRESENTATIVE DIETTERICK: Here.
19	MR. PARSELLS. Representative Fairchild.
20	REPRESENTATIVE FAIRCHILD: Here.
21	MR. PARSELLS. Representative Giest,
22	Representative Hess, Representative Nahill, Representative
23	O'Brien, Representative Snyder, Representative Telek.
24	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Thank you. Representa-
25	tive Veon on the House side, the prime sponsor of the

identical legislation that Senator Corman introduced in the Senate, so we felt it more appropros to get together and since the mandated legislation of the Federal Government, we are here to expedite this legislation.

Senator.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you. Our first person to give testimony today will be John J. Zogby, Deputy Secretary for Safety Administration, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. Jack, did you want to come up and take the mike? He has already passed out copies of his testimony. I think you should have those.

MR. ZOGBY: Thank you, Senator, and good morning. I have with me Doug Tobin, who is the Director of Driver Licensing in the Commonwealth.

I think it would be appropriate to begin with a review of the background and history of this activity that culminated in the form of Senate Bill 1057 and House Bill 1722.

Over the past ten years, in fact, over the past several decades, we have seen significant safety improvements in the nation's transportation system.

However, an area where desired improvements have not reached the level that those of us in the state and Federal Government felt they should is in the area of truck and bus safety. Both the social and economic losses

associated with traffic crashes involving commercial motor vehicles has been a focus of public concern for these past two decades. This concern has come from Pennsylvania citizens, your constituents, from this body, that is, the General Assembly, from the industry itself and from the U.S. Congress.

More than 6,000 commercial motor vehiclerelated fatalities have occurred nationwide every year
since 1984. In 1988 alone, commercial vehicles were
involved in 5469 fatal accidents resulting in 6372 highway
deaths; 355 of those occurred here in Pennsylvania. In
fact, in Pennsylvania we have had over 300 deaths each
year since 1984. It is estimated that these costs, the
accident costs associated with these deaths nationwide,
are \$6 billion each year.

When considering the issue of unsafe commercial drivers by those who have been studying it, and particularly the United States Congress, two major problems were consistently identified: (1) state licensing procedures were not uniform and may not adequately evaluate an applicant's qualifications to drive a commercial vehicle and (2) drivers could easily obtain licenses from more than one state and thereby avoid possible license sanctions by spreading out traffic convictions among these various licenses.

The Congress took action to enhance commercial vehicle safety and reduce highway fatalities, and that was the passage of the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986. The Act regulates drivers of heavy trucks and buses more strictly. It requires licensing agencies to implement new knowledge and skill tests, to retest and relicense all existing commercial drivers, and to participate in a national information system called (CDLIS). The Act will lead to improved driver quality. Commercial drivers will better understand the rules of the road and possess the special skills necessary to operate their vehicles safely. Additionally, the possibilities to obtain or use multiple licenses will be virtually eliminated.

Only 31 states utilized any form of classified driver licensing system at the time the Act was passed, and those systems varied from state to state. Only 12 of these states, including Pennsylvania, required behind the wheel road testing in trucks or buses. Even though Pennsylvania was one of the 12 states requiring behind the wheel testing, you may recall, there was a period in the mid-70s when drivers could obtain a Pennsylvania heavy truck or bus license simply by declaring that qualification on their renewal notice. In fact, in our experience many drivers qualified themselves for

Class 1 through 6. Many of these drivers completed their licensing test in an automobile, but they are now authorized to drive a three-axle or inter-city bus or a tractor-trailer combination throughout Pennsylvania or the nation without ever demonstrating a proficiency to drive these heavy type vehicles.

The Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act addresses these discrepancies. The states have many new driver licensing requirements with which to comply. States will continue to license commercial drivers, establish fees, renew licenses, and determine the age and fitness requirements of intrastate drivers. States will also need to comply with federal testing and licensing criteria, blood alcohol level provisions, and with other sanctions. Failure to comply with the minimum federal requirements could lead to the loss of up to ten percent of federal-aid highway funds, as Senator Corman pointed out. For Pennsylvania that could mean a loss of over \$19 million in 1993 which would be the first year of these sanctions enactment and in excess of \$38 million each year thereafter.

When Congress deliberated on this issue they identified five items that they felt should be addressed. They were

- 1) a uniform licensing system
- 2) a single driver's license

1	3) a standard driver knowledge and skill
2	examination
3	4) a positive driver identification
4	method, and
5	5) a licensing information system - that
6	is CIDLS, the one I mentioned previously.
7	The Congress set April 1, 1992 as the
8	implementation date for states to conform with federal
9	requirements, to convert their licensing system, and to
10	retest and relicense all commercial drivers. Thirty-seven
11	states have passed Commercial Driver Licensing legislation
12	thus far.
13	State commercial driver licensing compliance
14	requirements include:
15	- implementing a minimum standards testing
16	program
17	- adopting federal suspension, revocation,
18	and disqualification criteria and penalties
19	- accepting reciprocity with other states
20	to allow their commercial drivers with approved licenses
21	to operate a commercial motor vehicle in Pennsylvania
22	- notifying the national information system
23	of information on licensing and updates when issuing or
24	disqualifying a commercial driver
25	- obtaining the driver's record from the

1	out-of-state licensing agency prior to the issuance of a
2	Pennsylvania CDL.
3	- notifying the licensing state of any
4	conviction for commercial driver moving traffic convictions
5	- adopting blood alcohol concentration
6	levels at which a person is deemed to be operating a
7	commercial motor vehicle under the influence of alcohol,
8	and
9	- adopting of single license and domicile
10	requirements
11	The legislative proposals before you meet
12	those requirements. The proposals follow the model uniform
13	legislative package developed by the Federal Highway
14	Administration and the American Association of Motor
15	Vehicle Administrators. This was a means of ensuring
16	uniformity of legislation between states and compliance
17	with federal standards.
18	The proposals reflect the permissible
19	exemptions for firefighters, farmers within a radius of
20	25 miles of the farm, and for military personnel. They
21	exceed the federal standard by raising the minimum
22	commercial driver licensing age to 21, by including
23	recreation vehicles, and retaining our current, stricter
24	definition of a school bus.
25	In a study sponsored by the Federal Highway

Administration, they found that commercial drivers under the age of 21 are up to six times as likely to become involved in fatal crashes as older drivers. This is supported by our own Pennsylvania accident data. The data further suggests that judgment might be a factor, noting that drivers under the age of 21 had a higher incidence of citations for reckless driving, moving violations, speeding, and failure to yield, which suggests a lack of maturity in younger drivers. It's also been a requirement, under Federal Highway rules, that commercial drivers involved in interstate commerce be at least 21 years of age.

Since our licensing system currently requires drivers of recreation vehicles to obtain a heavy truck license, we've continued that requirement in the proposals. That requirement will further ensure that drivers of large recreation vehicles demonstrate an ability to control and safely operate their vehicles. And I have information that some of the vehicles manufactured today are as much as 45,000 pounds gross weight. The legislation proposed lowers the weight threshold from our existing 30,001 pounds to the nationwide uniform 26,001 pounds.

Regarding our existing school bus definition, the federal act requires that all bus drivers comply with the federal minimum standards. School bus drivers are

1 included in the program by that mandate. Pennsylvania has 2 had a successful school bus program for many years. 3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We've retained the current capacity definition of a school bus, which is 11 or more passengers, including the driver, to enable those who are involved in programs, the parents, students, administrators, employers to continue those benefits that are established by our pupil transportation program which includes an annual medical exam, training requirements and periodic road testing of driver

9 10 qualifications. Timely enactment of the legislation will

ensure that a Pennsylvania commercial driver can continue to drive in other states, and that is also a time restricted activity. It will also provide each commercial driver the opportunity to complete the test requirements by the mandatory date of April 1, 1992, while enabling the Commonwealth to avoid the loss of federal funding.

Of the approximately 1.1 million drivers we have on file, and remember those are the ones who qualified themselves back in the '70s, we had estimated, based on national models and on the commercial driver populations in other like states, that we have about 320,000 legitimate commercial drivers who will need to be retested and relicensed. We also have approximately 20,000 new commercial drivers who want to be tested each year.

With the more comprehensive testing requirements of the commercial driver license program, a phased implementation approach is necessary. The legislative proposals also do that. The content of the driver's examination will be amended to bring the testing program into compliance with the federal standard. That enables us to begin to retest drivers and new applicants early next year.

Mandatory compliance with the commercial driver testing program for currently licensed commercial drivers would begin in November, 1990, as authorized in the legislation. All drivers would be required to complete appropriate knowledge exams. The federal act does not allow the knowledge exams to be waived. The skill test can be waived for drivers, who over a specified period of time, who do not have:

- any majorasuspensions for technicitions for their record,
- do not have a record of an accident
 where they were at fault, any drunk driving accident,
 leaving the scene of an accident, any felony, misdemeanor
 of the first degree or misdemeanor of the second degree,
 in other words, any major offense,
 - one other requirement for not waiving the

1 skill test is the person has to be regularly employed 2 in a job requiring the operation of a commercial motor 3 vehicle. The requirements there are two years, 4 - have driven a representative vehicle 5 for the past two years preceding the application or have 6 previously passed a skills test given by a state with a 7 classified licensing and testing system, provided that 8 the testing was completed in a representative vehicle 9 for that classification. 10 With timely enactment of the legislation. 11 all testing of currently licensed commercial drivers must 12 be completed by March 31, 1992. Our programs call for 13 that. 14 The sanction and penalty provisions contained 15 in these proposals follow the federal requirements and have 16 an effective date of April 1, 1992. At that time, we 17 would have a program which complies with federal criteria. 18 The changes proposed to the licensing 19 system will be extensive, and include. 20 - retraining of driver license examiners 21 - identifying testing sites 22 - administering test and processing exam 23 results 24 - changing the content of the driver 25 licenses

1	- identifying and implementing changes to
2	the data processing systems
3	- developing scheduling systems
4	- printing and distributing new commercial
5	drivers manuals
6	- having drivers adequately prepare for and
7	pass knowledge exams
8	- having employers ensure drivers are
9	prepared for testing. Many of these activities are already
10	underway.
11	The cost to the Commonwealth to implement
12	this program will be approximately \$16 million, which
13	includes the cost to both the Department and the State
14	Police thru March 1992. The proposals call for an
15	additional \$10 per year commercial driver licensing fee
16	and an additional \$50 restoration fee following any
17	commercial driver suspension, revocation, recall, or
18	disqualification. These fees are comparable to fees
19	being established by other states. And I believe that
20	information was also passed out to you.
21	One other issue I felt should be brought
22	to your attention is the concern with those that have
23	difficulty reading. To address that concern, we are
24	working on a literacy program which could be used by
25	interested drivers, employers, labor groups and associations

A new commercial drivers manual is available for use by groups who wish to help their drivers prepare for the test. A video training aid to be used with the manual is also available. We will have an alternative testing format to the written test available prior to April 1992 for those with literacy problems. The alternative format will likely include oral or automated testing, although such an alternative will not exist for the hazardous material endorsement test.

I hope this information provides the necessary background to help you understand the importance and necessity of these legislative proposals. For the safety benefit gained by the public, the drivers, and employers, this legislation will be good for the Commonwealth.

Thank you and at this time I will answer any questions, Senator.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much.

That certainly is a good review of where we are and

possibly why we are here.

BY CHAIRMAN CORMAN:

Q I have a question about the school bus portion of it. I am led to believe that Pennsylvania has been looked upon as a model state with our school bus rules and regulations and many other states have patterned

1 themselves after Pennsylvania. Is that true? 2 That is true, sir. We have been into this A 3 some ten years and we have been looked at as a model. 4 Q And we have a pretty good safety record? 5 And we have a pretty good safety record. 6 Is it possible that the testing that we 7 now require could be adopted as the same tests that we 8 would require in this or why are we changing it? 9 Well, the test that was developed for Α 10 national uniformity was developed under the federal act 11 with the guidance of the Federal Highway Administration 12 and an association of states involved in motor vehicle 13 administration. The tests that we have developed in 14 the past with regard to school bus operations, although 15 many of it would be unique to that operation, many of 16 the issues there are in the new testing procedure. Ι 17 can ask Doug to respond further to that. 18 Many are in it but it is a much more 19 comprehensive testing that will be required now of school 20 bus drivers. Is that not correct? 21 MR. TOBIN: That is correct, Senator. The new national test has been validated and has been 22 statistically proven to be a reliable test. I can't 23 say the same for our current test for school bus drivers. 24 That is one of the criteria for judging whether or not 25

1 we are in substantial compliance with the federal law 2 and regulation. 3 BY CHAIRMAN CORMAN: (To Mr. Tobin) 4 Q So is the answer we must use their 5 questions? 6 We have two options. We can use their 7 questions or we can spend a lot of money to develop a 8 new test that would be essentially the same test. 9 Q My question was not must we spend a lot 10 of money. My question was --11 Α I understand, Senator. 12 Q Must we use their exact questions or do 13 we have the ability to ask the questions we believe are 14 correct? 15 Α We must ask the questions. We also have 16 the ability to ask questions and we will ask for school 17 bus operators some additional questions which pertain 18 to school bus operations such as maintaining order and 19 discipline on a school bus and so forth, emergency 20 evacuation procedures. 21 MR. ZOGBY: Well, to relate directly to 22 your question, Senator, we can design our own test but 23 then it must be approved for, at least the reciprocity 24 part, by the Federal Highway Administration regulation. 25 That is what Doug was alluding to when he said it would

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cost us a lot more money. I don't think our school bus operators, those who are trained in this, would have any difficulty passing the commercial drivers test.

BY CHAIRMAN CORMAN. (To Mr. Zogby)

I don't know how to judge that as yet. Q Ι met with a group yesterday and they felt they had a pretty good program in place now and showed me some evidence that maybe if we spent more time concerning ourselves about the safety boarding the buses and departing from the bus and educating the people who ride the buses, the school children, safety practices getting on and getting off, we might be spending money far more wisely than the additional testing of drivers, who seemingly are proving themselves to be pretty safe. That is all I am trying to get at before we put a whole bunch more difficulties on some people who seemingly are demonstrating they are pretty good drivers. Maybe we ought to consider whether we want to do that or do some other things.

Things that we have to do to make the system work you identified them as identify testing sites, administering tests and processing exam results. Where are we going to do that so that this will not cause major confusion to all the drivers of trucks and buses?

A We have a couple of options that we are pursuing and showing some positive reaction to. One is

1 what we call third-party testing which is an acceptable 2 form of testing under the federal criteria, and that 3 would be those who are in the industry could set up testing 4 under an acceptable criteria to the Commonwealth and 5 have their instructors trained under the federal criteria. 6 Administer the tests to their own drivers or even to 7 other drivers. We have had a reaction I believe from 8 88 parties that would be considered third-party testing. 9 That would be for the skill test, sir. Our own State 10 Police have been identifying many of the locations they 11 have used previously. They will need a few additional, 12 at least in this first couple years before the implementa-13 tion date. I think after that they will be able to handle 14 the novice driver as they have in the past. It will be the same. But yet that is a concern that there are enough 15 testing sites, there are enough people to test, and that 16 17 is why we opted for the third-party testing criteria. 18 So trucking companies could administer the test themselves if they chose to do that under proper 19 20 supervision? Α That is correct. 21

Q How many other states have already passed this legislation?

A I believe I said 38. As of the last reading, we had 38 states passing.

22

23

24

1	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much.
2	Representative Petrarca, do you have questions?
3	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Yes.
4	BY CHAIRMAN PETRARCA:
5	Q John, I was approached by operating
6	engineer 66 and they said there was two states out of the
7	38 that passed this legislation. That they exempted
8	grade all cranes and construction equipment. Do you
9	know what two states these were?
10	A I have no idea.
11	Q That is the language the Senator and I
12	are looking for.
13	A We will look for that. We'll make a note
14	of that. We'll follow up.
15	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Any members
16	Representative Veon.
17	REPRESENTATIVE VEON. Thank you, Mr.
18	Chairman.
19	BY REPRESENTATIVE VEON.
20	Q Jack, some concerns have been expressed by
21	the recreation vehicle industry. Specifically they have
22	some documents that said of the 38 states that have passed
23	it, no other states are requiring the commercial drivers
4	license, but that in our legislation we do. I was
5	wondering if you could comment on that.

A Well, I know California requires it. I am not sure how many states do require it. I do know that the federal law was perhaps not silent but they certainly weren't specific on it. Most states' reactions to the recreation vehicle is that when they get to the weight limits defined by the federal criteria, that the driver of that vehicle probably, because of, perhaps in so many cases, his infrequent use, probably needs the training more than even a commercial driver.

The federal law was silent on it in the sense because the federal law really has no jurisdiction over private ownership of these type of vehicles. While they do in interstate commerce traditionally. And so they were silent on it.

Pennsylvania that at some level the recreation vehicle owner should be tested. Now according to our records, and these may be wrong, we looked in our motor vehicle registration record, we have 60 some vehicles registered in that class weight. Maybe what we can do is if we look at it, we might find more that are up above the 26,000 pound level anyway. Those people, we found that a good percentage of them in fact had a Class II or III license. Now how they obtained it I am not sure. It may have been through the recertification program.

1 0 They have some interesting points here. 2 Instead of taking the full Committee's time at this time. 3 what I would like to do is I would like to have the 4 Department respond in writing to the various points and circul-5 late that to the member for their information. I think they have 6 some good questions that for the members' information I 7 am sure we are going to get a lot of these questions. 8 If you could respond in writing, that would be helpful? 9 Α Okay. 10 Also concern has been raised, how many times 0 11 can an individual take the test? 12 Α Three times. 13 Three times? Q 14 You mean take it with a failure? 15 Yes. Q 16 Up to three times. 17 Up to three times; some folks raise a good 18 point where we are asking that they voluntarily come in 19 and take the test now. And if they would take it and 20 fail three times now, they would be without a license even prior to April 1 of 1992. Has some thought been given 21

for them to come in now, if they come in now and three times

fail it, they are done automatically even if they do that

to give some grace period at least up until the federal

deadline of 1992? In other words, to add to the incentive

22

1 prior to 1992.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

What Doug was pointing out to me, the voluntary stage which starts sometime in January through November of 1990 will be by the third-party testing mechanism except for the novice driver. The novice driver will have to start through the State Police. Those people who would come in through that system, of course, it is going to be through the third-party tester, they will have an opportunity for applying, getting the education. They already are classified as Class II or III operators. The point at which they apply to us for the commercial driver license under the new criteria is the point at which we will start the clock on when they can pass that test. Now if the company chooses, as we in PennDOT choose, to train the drivers by giving them the opportunity to review the manual, get briefed on that through some type of training mechanism, we have videos prepared for our own employees that we will make available to corporations or associations or unions that they can go through that mechanism and I think then, Representative Veon, that they will have a good opportunity to pass that within three times.

23

I think the other question on the other side would be with all that preparation, if they don't pass, and I am really concerned about the skills portion

25

if that is going to be the crux of it, I think at that point we have to question whether in fact they should retain a commercial driver's license.

My concern is really on the written portion and a lot of these folks obviously have not been to school for a long time. I think we need to pay close attention if you are asking them to come in voluntarily early, it seems to me you are taking away some of the incentive for them to do that if in fact they take it X amount of times and they lose their license prior to the federal deadline even being here of '92. I just want to throw that out. Maybe perhaps we ought to consider giving them some additional opportunities at least up to the federal deadline. That would be my suggestion. I can follow up on that at a later time, but I did want to bring that up.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Could we caution all members of the panel that we have a full day.

REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Sure, one more question.

BY REPRESENTATIVE VEON.

Q The other question regarding the drunk driving issue, and I wanted to be clear as to how the .04 may or may not affect a driver with his driving his own vehicle and where it is .10 and then also on page 35

1 of the legislation, Section 1612, we say commercial 2 drivers prohibited from operating with any alcohol in 3 system. I was wondering how that might relate to 4 the .04? 5 Α The .04 in fact is the federal regulation. 6 And if you are operating a commercial vehicle and you are 7 tested out at .04 blood alcohol concentration, you are 8 in fact driving drunk and you get the full provisions of 9 the federal law which calls for an initial one-year 10 suspension. The second time you get caught in that or 11 within. I believe it is five years, it is a lifetime 12 disqualification. 13 Now, with respect to the zero level, that 14 is your further reference, that refers to anybody who 15 has any evidence of alcohol in their system will be put 16 out of service for 24 hours. Will not be allowed to drive. 17 That carries that. 18 A person who loses their commercial driver's 19 license under .04 will still be able to retain his 20 passenger car license. Of course, if it is .1 then he 21 loses both. But if he is between .04 and .1 he will still 22 have the ability to retain his passenger car license. 23 REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Thank you, Jack. 24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 25 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Senator Bell.

1	SENATOR BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2	BY SENATOR BELL:
3	Q Jack, how does this affect the volunteer
4	fireman driving a fire truck?
5	A It does not. They are exempted from this
6	act.
7	Q What is this Class D license?
8	A What we did is we put in a provision of
9	Class D which is similar to our current Class 1 that
10	you can operate any vehicle up to 26,000 pounds or if
11	you are not trailing a vehicle over 10,000 pounds. So
12	it is a passenger car, van, that type.
13	Q And that is a new class of license?
14	A Yes. We changed the classes, Senator,
15	to conform with the federal law.
16	Q Does that mean if I drive a pick-up truck
17	I need a Class D?
18	A A pick-up truck would be a Class D.
19	Q I would take a new license?
20	A Yes.
21	Q It means every person in Pennsylvania
22	driving a pick-up truck has to take a new license exam?
23	A No, sir. No, sir. They would be automatical-
24	ly classified into the new class.
25	Q I thought they can waive the skills test

1 but they have to take the knowledge test. 2 That is for anybody who is classified 3 into the commercial driver's license classes which will 4 be class --5 0 Which includes Class D? 6 A, B and C. Α 7 Why do you define it Class D then in this? Q 8 I am confused. 9 Α Well the Class D will be the current --10 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Excuse me. Is that 11 class, which? I can't determine you're saying E or C. 12 MR. ZOGBY: D, I am sorry, sir. 13 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: A, B, C, D. 14 SENATOR BELL: D as in dog. 15 MR. ZOGBY. Pennsylvania's classification 16 system was always Classes 1 through 6 and they progressed 17 through the numbers in something like a hierarchy of 18 weight. However, Class 4 was school bus, Class 5 was 19 motorcycle and Class 6 was the mopeds. So our 1, 2, and 20 3 was passenger car, pick-up trucks, vehicles less than 21 26.000 pounds. Class B were those vehicles that were 22 26,000 pounds or rather were trailering something over 23 10,000 pounds. Class 3 was the combination vehicle over 26,000 pounds. 24 The new federal law just reversed the order. 25

```
1
      They said Class A is the highest level vehicle. So if
 2
      you got a Class A license, you can drive anything, a B,
 3
      C or D, that is, without the endorsements. Then Class B
 4
      relates to our old Class 2 Class C was put in as a
 5
      provision for including our school bus operators and
 6
     hazardous materials. And then Class D will be our current
 7
      Class 1 and those people will be automatically put into
 8
      that class. They won't have to be tested.
 9
     BY SENATOR BELL:
10
                     How about taxicabs?
                0
11
                     Taxicabs will be Class D.
                A
12
                     D?
               Q
13
               Α
                     Yes.
14
                     SENATOR BELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15
                     CHAIRMAN CORMAN:
                                       Thank you very much.
16
     We have been joined now by Representative Lucyk,
17
     Representative Hess and Senator Holl. Have any of you
18
     any questions before we continue?
19
                     (No response.)
20
                     Thank you very much. Thank you very much
21
     for coming, John. I am sure we will have more questions.
                                 Thank you.
22
                    MR. ZOGBY:
23
                     CHAIRMAN CORMAN: I'm sorry, Representative
24
     Tigue.
25
     BY REPRESENTATIVE TIGUE:
```

1	Q Just a quick question, two really. Jack,
2	is the Federal Government providing any funds to implement
3	this?
4	A They have, Representative Tigue, they have
5	provided over the last several years, we have taken
6	advantage of \$100,000 a year for the last three years.
7	Q A hundred thousand a year and that is
8	going to continue for implementation of this?
9	A It will continue, at least as we see it
10	for the foreseeable future, with regard to things like
11	redesigning our data processing system. We had to do
12	some extensive redesigns of that to include this new
13	class system, the new sanctions. As far as implementing
14	the law, that is, test sites and putting in new examiners,
15	I don't think they are going to provide any money for
16	that.
17	Q One other question, how many other states
18	require that a commercial driver licensee be at least
19	21 years of age?
20	A Right now I think we are the only state.
21	Do you know of any other?
22	MR. TOBIN: I don't know of any others.
23	BY REPRESENTATIVE TIGUE: (To Mr. Zogby)
24	Q Then why are we doing it?
25	A The obvious reasons were, as I tried to

1 point out, the accident data suggests, both on a national 2 level and our own data, suggests that the operation of a 3 commercial vehicle by those who are still in the process 4 of learning or maturing shows that their involvement rate in fatal accidents is six to one. 6 But under the proposal, if I am 18 today 7 and I have a Class 3 license, you are going to give me 8 a commercial driver's license, you are not going to allow 9 him to do it because he doesn't have it today? 10 Yes, you are right. The law suggests that 11 those who currently have the license would be grandfathered 12 Those who would be applying would have to wait till in. 13 21. 14 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: And I'm sorry, we also 15 have Representative Geist who has joined us. Any other 16 questions? 17 (No response.) 18 Thank you very much, Jack. 19 MR. ZOGBY: Thank you, sir. 20 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: The next person will be 21 Mr. Robert J. Rhodes, President of the Pennsylvania School 22 Bus Association and Elaine Farrell, Executive Director 23 of Pennsylvania School Bus Association. Thank you for giving us the 24 MR. RHODES: 25 opportunity to appear before the House and Senate

Transportation Committees today to present the views of the Pennsylvania School Bus Association on the issue of the commercial driver's license.

My name is Bob Rhodes and I am President of R. J. Rhodes Transit, Inc., located in Freedom,
Pennsylvania and I am the current President of the
Pennsylvania School Bus Association. R. J. Rhodes Transit has been transporting children to and from school for over 50 years and we employ 150 school bus drivers who will be affected by the Commercial Drivers License law. Elaine Farrell is the Executive Director of the Pennsylvania School Bus Association and is here with me today to answer any questions you may have after the testimony.

The Association represents approximately
50 percent of the Commonwealth's yellow school bus fleet
with members from all areas of the state. There are 36,000
plus school bus drivers in Pennsylvania who will be
affected by the legislation passed to implement the
federally mandated Commercial Drivers License Program.
Our interest in testifying is two fold. First, how the
Commercial Drivers License legislation, as written, will
impact school bus drivers and, secondly, how the school
vehicle definition in the proposed legislation will impact
districts and private school bus fleet owners.

Areas Affecting Drivers Directly

1. AGE REQUIREMENT

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Current law allows a person age 18 to drive a school bus in Pennsylvania. School bus statistics in Pennsylvania indicate that there are only 95 school bus drivers age 18-20 out of a total 36,200 and that they only had five out of 1,277 accidents that occurred, or .4 percent.

The Senate and House bills increase the age upon which a person can drive a school bus to 21. Over 75 percent of Pennsylvania's pupil transportation services are provided by school bus contractors, many of them family-owned businesses. This means that children of fleet owners are heavily involved in the family bus business, initially cleaning or repairing buses when they are young, inspecting buses when certified by PennDOT as they become older, and, on occasion, driving the bus. In addition, college students ages 18-20 are frequently employed to drive a school bus and depend on the wages to help them through college. If properly trained, we find the age group of 18-20 to have excellent reflexes and learn to control the vehicle very well. Finally, school buses traveling within the state are not subject to the Intrastate Motor Carrier Safety Regulations of which the age limit begins at 21.

The Pennsylvania School Bus Association

would request the Committee reconsider this requirement and lower the age to 19. Nationwide, including Pennsylvania, the school bus industry is having a difficult time recruiting individuals to drive a school bus. We anticipate that the new Commercial Drivers License law will make our job even more difficult and, therefore, request some leniency with the age requirement.

2. LEARNER'S PERMITS

Current law requires a person to obtain a \$5.00 learner's permit to learn to drive a school bus.

The final license obtained is FREE.

The proposed legislation requires a separate learner's permit for each endorsement a person applies for. In the case of an average school bus driver, the following endorsements would be required:

"P" - Passenger endorsement

"S" - School Bus endorsement

"K" - No Air Brakes

This will cost \$15.00.

The school bus industry requests your consideration of reviewing the learner's permit procedure so that a person who wishes to drive a school bus is not subject to a potential 200 percent increase for the privilege.

3. FEES

Currently, school bus drivers, as mentioned, pay a \$5.00 school bus learner's permit fee and then the usual \$24.00 fee to renew a Class 1 license which includes the Class 4 School Bus endorsement. School bus Class 4 licenses are renewed every four (4) years without additional fees.

The fees included in the proposed legislation require the endorsement permit fees as well as a \$10.00 annual Commercial Drivers License fee. In the case of school bus drivers who are not accustomed to incurring license fees, this will require an initial outlay of as much as \$79.00; \$15.00 for three (3) endorsement permits, \$40.00 for a four (4) year Commercial Drivers License. and \$24.00 to renew their Class 1 license.

School bus drivers work part time, are very highly regulated by federal and state safety laws, and must adhere to \$10.00 criminal history checks as well as \$25.00 annual physicals.

The Pennsylvania School Bus Association requests consideration of a \$6.00 yearly Commercial Drivers License fee which will at least, at a minimum, match the current \$24.00 Class 1 license renewal fee.

School Vehicle Definition

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Current regulation defines a "school vehicle" as "any passenger car or truck with a passenger

seating capacity of not more than ten passengers, including the driver..." PennDOT and the State Police have permitted vans, such as 12 or 15 passenger vans, to transport children to and from school or on field trips if only ten passengers are on board to comply with the regulations.

As a result, there are probably hundreds of 12 or 15 passenger vans owned and operated by school districts, Intermediate Units, and school bus contractors. They are convenient to use on narrow dirt roads where a school bus cannot travel, or when a small group of students go on a field trip that does not require the use of a large school bus.

The proposed legislation defines a "school vehicle" as "a motor vehicle <u>designed for carrying</u> no more than ten passengers, including the driver..." This implies that 12 or 15 passenger vans, currently in use with ten passengers aboard would be prohibited.

The concern the school bus industry has is the tremendous financial burden placed on districts, Intermediate Units and contractors to replace these vehicles. The second concern is the lack of communication that would not be provided to the van owners, as to the new definition, and the ultimate confusion as to the proper enforcement of the use of school vehicles.

PSBA supports several sections of the

proposed bills including:

1. THIRD PARTY TESTING

Currently State Police barracks are overburdened with 16 year-olds obtaining licenses, individuals testing for new classes of licenses and school bus drivers trying to renew their Class 4 school bus drivers' licenses. Appointments can run into weeks and months, discouraging many individuals from renewing much-needed licenses to be employed.

The third party testing concept will alleviate the back-up that exists at State Police barracks by permitting individuals to become third party examiners for the road test portion of the required exams. We would hope that the intent of the proposed legislation is to also permit third party testers to continue to road test new drivers and those requiring retesting every four (4) years after the transition period for the commercial drivers license. School bus drivers will continue to be the only class of drivers who will require retesting, aside from drivers of hazardous materials.

2. "S" SCHOOL BUS ENDORSEMENT

Pennsylvania has one of the best 20 hour school bus driver training programs in the nation. Several states do not even have a school bus driver required training course. Pennsylvania has the fourth largest

fleet of school buses in the nation with a very low accident rate.

The "S" endorsement is not required by
the federal Commercial Drivers License regulations or law.
We support both the Senate and House bills' requirement
for the "S" endorsement which will mean the continuation
of the 20 hour and 10 hour mandated courses of instruction
and annual physicals for all school bus drivers.

3. SUSPENSIONS

Although school bus drivers are already prohibited from consuming alcohol eight hours before driving a school bus, we support the bills' strict drug and alcohol policies and resulting suspension or loss of license. This provision will clearly make for a safer commercial vehicle and safer roadways for everyone to travel on.

Conclusion

The school bus is the safest form of transportion on a roadway in the United States. Stringent driver and equipment regulations contribute to this, resulting in a safe ride for children to and from school each day. The federal Commercial Drivers License requirements did not specifically target school bus drivers as a group of individuals who needed to improve their driving skills, but were included because of the precious cargo

1 they transport. 2 Our concerns shared with you today are 3 intended to assist the Transportation Committees in 4 enacting legislation that is fair to school bus drivers 5 as well as other groups of individuals affected while 6 keeping within the constraints of the federal requirements. 7 Thank you. Elaine and I will be happy to 8 answer any questions you may have. 9 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much. You 10 have given me some new questions to ask the people from 11 PennDOT which have agreed to stick around until the end 12 of our hearing today and we will get questions at the 13 end. Senator Bell. 14 SENATOR BELL: No questions. 15 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Senator Holl. 16 SENATOR HOLL: No questions. 17 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Representative Petrarca. 18 CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Any questions on our 19 side? 20 (No response.) 21 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much. 22 We will let you off easy. 23 Thank you. MR. RHODES: CHAIRMAN CORMAN: John J. Bell, Pennsylvania 24 25 Farmers' Association. Before you slip out, I guess I would

like to congratulate the school bus people for the good record you have in safety and interest in the subject. Thank you.

Proceed.

MR. BELL: Senator Corman, Representative Petrarca, members of the Senate and House Transportation Committees. Good morning. My name is John Bell. I am Legislative Counsel for the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association. My testimony today is being offered on behalf of our Association and the over 22,600 farm families who comprise our Association's membership. We would like to thank the members of both the Senate and the House Transportation Committees for the opportunity to present our views, relative to the proposed legislation to implement the federal commercial driver's license standards.

The Pennsylvania Farmers' Association and our national affiliate, the American Farm Bureau Federation, were active participants in the process leading to the adoption of minimum federal standards to be met in state commercial driver's licensing. While we were generally supportive of Farm Bureau's efforts to exclude from standard requirements farm vehicle operators, we were aware that many of the licensing standards to be imposed on states were similar to the requirements already imposed on Pennsylvania drivers under the state's Classified Driver's Licensing law.

We continue to believe that a primary

purpose for driver's licensing is to ensure that a person

has adequately demonstrated the actual ability to demonstrate

a class of vehicle he or she wishes to operate, whether

the vehicle is a farm truck, commercial truck or passenger

vehicle. We support the attempt in the legislation you

are considering to maintain the relative testing and

licensing standards currently implemented under Pennsylvania's

A serious concern that we had with the federal licensing requirements was in the area of transportation of hazardous materials. Specifically, we were fearful that all farmers and farm employees would be required to obtain commercial licenses to operate implements of husbandry and exempt farm trucks on the sporadic chance that they may be operating a vehicle meeting the threshold quantities as to require placarding of the vehicle.

current classified driver's licensing system.

The Federal Motor Carrier Regulations already impose requirements upon drivers in intrastate transportation of hazardous materials, regardless of the distance to be transported. To impose additional requirements of "commercial" driver's testing and licensing on these operators would cause substantial practical problems for both farm vehicle operators and those commissioned to administer the requirements without having

any additional positive impact on safety.

We appreciate that the proposed legislation recognizes the needlessness of these requirements and support the provisions currently contained in the bills to exempt from commercial driver's license requirements operators of implements of husbandry and operators of farm vehicles operated within a 25-mile radius of the farm.

There is one amendment we would recommend to the proposed legislation. As currently drafted, the bills would prohibit any person under 21 years of age from obtaining a commercial driver's license in Pennsylvania. Our current law permits a person 18 years of age to obtain a Class 2 or Class 3 driver's license. And the current Federal Motor Carrier Regulations permit persons under 21 years to operate restricted farm use trucks without distance limitation and to operate restricted farm use combinations within a 150-mile radius of the farm.

As neighboring states adopt and implement the farm vehicle operator waiver from federal commercial driver's license standards, a blanket imposition of an age minimum of 21 in Pennsylvania would create an inequity between Pennsylvania drivers and those of other states in the operation of larger farm registered trucks and combinations on Pennsylvania roads. Pennsylvania farmers, family members and employees under 21 would be prohibited

1 from operating larger farm trucks and combinations on 2 roads in their home state, but similarly situated persons 3 residing outside Pennsylvania would not. 4 We believe such inequity has no logical 5 purpose and would recommend that you amend the proposed 6 legislation to permit persons at least 18 years of age 7 and operating solely farm registered vehicles to obtain 8 a commercial driver's license. 9 Again, we would like to thank you for the 10 opportunity to share with you our views. I will take 11 any questions you may have at this time. 12 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much. 13 Senator Bell. 14 SENATOR BELL: Mr. Chairman, the witness, 15 Mr. Bell, just raised a point that I think is very, very 16 In other words, if you are driving down 181 important. 17 and if you are from Pennsylvania, you have to be 21. If 18 you are from Virginia, only 18. That is a lot of BS. 19 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Senator Holl. 20 SENATOR HOLL: No questions. 21 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Representative Petrarca. 22 CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: No questions. 23 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much. 24 We appreciate your taking time to come in and sharing 25 this information with us.

1 MR. BELL: I appreciate this opportunity. 2 sir. Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Dorsey Musselman. 4 Central Pennsylvania Truckers Association. 5 MR. MUSSELMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the panel. 7 I would like to take the opportunity to thank all involved 8 for the opportunity to be here today. 9 My name is Dorsey Musselman. I am an 10 owner-operator truck driver and have been for the past 11 29 years. 12 Today I am here representing the Central 13 Pennsylvania Truckers Association of Bedford, Pennsylvania 14 of which I am President, and also United Truckers News, 15 which my wife. Ethel, who is accompanying me, is the 16 Executive Secretary. This United Truckers News consists 17 of five independent trucking associations with a combined 18 total membership of well over 2.000 truckers of which most 19 are leased to various PUC and ICC carriers. 20 The majority of our members are in favor of 21 the Commercial Driver License Program, however, we have some reservations, so far the few states that have started 22 23 to administer the written and driving tests, the results have been disastrous. And when you ask yourself why? 24 We feel without a doubt anytime anyone takes 25

on a project of any kind, where neither side is prepared properly you can usually count on a failure.

For this program to be a success and have any meaning whatsoever and be able to contribute to better highway safety for everyone involved, which should be the goal of everyone here today, then certain steps must be taken.

Number 1. Who will administer the written test?

The person who administers the written test should have some knowledge of what is involved with driving a heavy vehicle especially an 80,000 pound rig. Also be familiar with the questions and answers.

One concern all drivers I have talked to and including myself, is where do I actually go to take the test? If this is my responsibility to schedule the time to take the test, it could become a major problem when you consider the large amount of drivers involved here. Also we feel the main reason the drivers have failed the test in states where the test has already been given is no instructor ever reviewed the questions and answers with them or explained why. Therefore, we feel we should have access to some instructions prior to taking the test.

Number 2. Driving Skill Test.

This test to be given by anyone other than someone who is fully qualified to drive the vehicle that the test applies to makes the test meaningless and will have no impact on safety whatsoever. In other words, what we are saying, if you are not qualified to drive my truck, your opinion as to my ability to drive a truck is worthless.

Number 3. Driver's obligation and opportunity to properly take the above two tests.

What we need as a driver is a copy of the tests, ample time to study and prepare, and the tests to be administered under proper conditions so we are able to pass the tests, but more important if the driver learns something good from this whole experience, then we will become more safety conscience and better drivers.

As a matter of fact, when you check all reputable national statistics of highway accidents, commercial drivers already are almost twice as good as other drivers. There is a reason for this. We may have some bad drivers in our industry, but doesn't every other industry or group of people in this country have their problems. A very high percentage of truck drivers that I have been involved with over the years are hard working, honest and decent family-oriented people. Most owner-operators like myself mortgaged their homes, family farms and whatever else in order to purchase their trucks,

therefore have a very good built-in reason to succeed.

We realize one accident can destroy a life's time of hard labor for more than one person or family. Not to mention the pain or suffering it may cause innocent people.

It is our understanding that certain groups may be exempt, such as farmers, and firemen. We feel this is absolutely wrong. We feel if Pennsylvania establishes a fair and decent program of testing, responsible drivers should be willing to participate and exemptions of any type have no valid argument.

One other concern we have, we have been told the tests have been based on a sixth grade reading level. This may sound easy, but let me assure you a large number of drivers who have a safe driving record at the present have been out of high school from 30 to 50 years. Many of these drivers like myself being out of school for 36 years, when I look at the homework the children in my immediate family bring home, I soon discover by today's standards of sixth grade work, I am practically illiterate.

So this is one of the big reasons I support better education for me and my fellow drivers, we need to catch up. So that is why I am asking for a fair shake and a chance for improvement. And the goal of this whole program should be highway safety instead of revenue raising.

_ .

And I would like to say that we support Mr. Jack Zogby on the fee schedule that they put in. Ten dollars a year, we feel, is very fair.

Once again I would like to thank

Representative Hess and Senator Corman for the opportunity

and everybody else who made it possible for me to be here

today.

We would be glad to answer any questions you would have and in the future we will be available to assist you in any way we possibly can to establish an excellent commercial driver license program in Pennsylvania. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much,
Mr. Musselman. I agree with you. If we are going to
pass this legislation and make it meaningful, we must
make certain that test sites and the people giving the
tests and all that sort of thing fits together very well.
Otherwise there is going to be great havoc. All you have
to do is drive down the road and see how many trucks are
out there and how many drivers we are talking about to
know the system better and work smoothly or we are going
to have havoc.

MR. MUSSELMAN: That is right.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: It is our desire to work with PennDOT to see that they do provide adequate test sites.

1	And as you have heard, they will allow certain qualified
2	people to test our drivers.
3	MR. MUSSELMAN: We like that.
4	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Any questions?
5	(No response.)
6	That's a fire alarm that goes off regularly.
7	We'll ask the people out in the hall if we should leave.
8	Otherwise we'll call on Henry E. Beaver, State Legislative
9	Director, United Transportation Union; Donald W. Dunlevy,
10	Secretary of Pennsylvania State Legislative Board, United
11	Transportation Union.
12	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: I would like to take
13	this opportunity to introduce Vic Lescovitz.
14	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much. I
15	hope that we have the noise under control in a minute.
16	To allay the fears of everyone, this happens about every
17	hour in this part of the building.
18	Good morning. You may proceed.
19	MR. BEAVER: Good morning, Chairman Corman
20	and Chairman Petrarca, distinguished members of the panel.
21	I have with me today Donald Dunlevy, who is the Secretary
22	of the Pennsylvania State Legislative Board and Dick
23	Lechette, who is a bus driver for SEPTA.
24	My name is Henry E. Beaver and I am the
25	Director for the Pennsylvania State Legislative Board of

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the United Transportation Union. The United Transportation
Union represents bus drivers on the Suburban Division of
the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority.
These members are currently required to possess a Class 2
driver's license and, as a result of the federal legislation,
will be required to obtain a Class B Commercial Driver's
License (CDL) with a passenger endorsement.

The federal mandate for the individual states to enact legislation providing for a commercial driver's license stems from the fact that many states gave little or no regard to the need for demonstrating or possessing any skills or qualifications to operate such vehicles. Pennsylvania, with its requirements for obtaining a Class 2 or 3 license, was not one of the states which brought to focus the need for such a requirement. Therefore, I would initially like to stress the fact that we believe Pennsylvania has in no way been deficient or lacking in its requirements for obtaining such a license, particularly with regard to Class 2 licenses. Consequently, we believe no need exists to substantially depart from Pennsylvania's current qualifying requirements other than to satisfy the new federal standards and to protect, without undue hardship, the status of our experienced, qualified, professional drivers.

First of all, the United Transportation Union

25

23

24

25

recommends retention of the current ten passenger capacity (including driver) definition of a bus as a threshold for requiring a commercial driver's license with a passenger endorsement rather than raising it to the 16 passenger threshold as established by the new federal regulations. I remind you that this threshold only became effective in Pennsylvania on July 1, 1986, as the result of relatively recent legislation with concern for the safety of the traveling public and the United Transportation Union believes it should continue to be maintained at that level. Such action, taken prior to the establishment of the federal regulations, is illustrative of the fact that, in the interest of safety, Pennsylvania has seen fit to act on its own initiative well before the Federal Government established its licensing requirements, as well as most other states. Additionally, an increase in the current threshold from 10 to 16 could conceivably encourage the use of "gypsy vans" or unregulated "jitneys" in certain areas, which would be contrary to the intent of the federal law. We agree that the exemption for van pools or ride-sharing programs should continue to remain in effect, and all of this is permissible under the Federal Highway Administration's final rule.

We must all recognize the fact that many of those required to take the test have been long-term

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

career drivers with little formal education and who are functionally illiterate or deficient in reading comprehen-To many of these individuals a written test is a potentially job-threatening situation, even though they possess the skills and knowledge necessary to safely operate a commercial vehicle. Recognizing this fact, the Federal Highway Administration's final rule requires a knowledge test which can either be oral, written, or given with automatic equipment. From an administrative standpoint, a written test may be preferable but in fairness to those with such reading and comprehension deficiencies, provisions should be made for oral testing for these individuals. One way to mitigate this problem may be to provide an immediate oral retest for anyone failing to first pass a written knowledge test. I stress the word immediate for two reasons:

- (1) to eliminate any unnecessary anxiety or stress caused by a prolonged waiting period on those who initially fail a written knowledge test, and
- (2) to avoid the necessity of making a return visit to the testing location and the resultant loss of time to those individuals.

This provision should be optional at the request of the applicant but, of course, could not apply to the hazardous material endorsement, which is required

to be written and for which reading comprehension is an absolute necessity.

1

2

25

Next, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) or any other administrator of the tests should be required to provide a list of all the questions and answers which will appear on the test as is currently done with all standard PennDOT license applications. In this way, those who are deficient in reading comprehension will have an opportunity to seek out clarification and eliminate some of the anxieties associated with testing such as this. This is especially true of those individuals who have not been subjected to such testing for 20 to 30 years or more and whose income is dependent on passing the test. In anticipation of any objections to this proposal on the basis that it is like cheating, I emphasize that the purpose here is not to challenge these individuals but to assure that they know certain principle aspects of their jobs. I reiterate the fact that these individuals are skilled and knowledgeable professionals who truly do know their job functions thoroughly but many of which are not proficient in their ability to adequately determine, through written language, the particular question being asked of them. It is in the Commonwealth's best interest from the standpoint of commerce and employment to assure an orderly transition in

3

4 5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this matter and such questions and answers would be a great asset in doing so.

The Federal Highway Administration's final rule permits states to waive the skills test for those who meet certain conditions, which are listed in the Federal Register, Volume 53, Number 140, for July 21, 1988, on page 27651, and which are appended to my written testimony. The United Transportation Union recommends adoption of such a waiver in the interest of reduced costs and unnecessary inconvenience to both individual drivers and the Commonwealth. We see no justification or benefit in requiring experienced, veteran drivers to take a test to prove they possess the skills to do what they have been doing safely for years. Those who do not fall within the above guidelines and all new applicants would, of course, have to perform the skills test.

The United Transportation Union further recommends changing the proposed legislation to provide that failure to pass either portion of the test or the endorsement tests for a CDL (Class A, B or C) will automatically renew an existing Class 2 or 3 license until April 1, 1992, which is the effective date for implementation of the CDL provisions. The United Transportation Union recognizes the necessity of beginning to certify commercial motor vehicle operators as the normal renewal

dates arise in order to effectuate an orderly transition to the new CDL program, however, inasmuch as the deadline for compliance isn't until April 1, 1992, certain individuals should not be selectively penalized or forced to comply with its provisions prior to that time. Certainly there would be no objection to qualifying prior to the compliance date inasmuch as that has no adverse effect on any individual, however, no single individual should be subject to disqualification and resultant loss of employment prior to that time or in a non-uniform manner. Thus, the United Transportation Union believes that it is proper to renew an existing Class 2 or 3 license through April 1992, for those who may initially fail the CDL test.

In the area of third-party testing, both of the major transportation authorities in the Commonwealth -- Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) and the Port Authority of Allegheny County (PAT) -- have extensive training and qualification programs for passenger certification, both of which have excellent track records. It is the United Transportation Union's belief that they should each be certified as third-party testers for passenger drivers as we know of no one in the Commonwealth more qualified or equipped to do so.

Inasmuch as certain traffic violations

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

could result in the permanent loss of an individual's CDL, the United Transportation Union believes that it is imperative that commercial drivers have the absolute right without reproach to refuse to move vehicles which they determine to be unsafe, noncomplying, or having any inoperative or malfunctioning equipment. For example, an inoperative speedometer could cause a commercial driver to inadvertently exceed the speed limit and, therefore, be subject to a "serious traffic violation" resulting in the ultimate loss of the CDL and resultant loss of employment. Any employer requiring or coercing an individual to operate a commercial vehicle in violation of this provision should be made subject to appropriate fines or other penalties as deemed necessary. consequences for the commercial driver are far too severe and therefore certain protections must be afforded to those individuals.

With regard to those who are presently employed as commercial drivers, or as a condition of continuing employment are required to perform the skills portion of the test, the United Transportation Union believes that the legislation should require such employer to provide the vehicle necessary to perform the test at no cost to the employee. Absent this provision a serious problem could arise insofar as a person's ability to

acquire a vehicle in which to perform the test. Undoubtedly, most employers would voluntarily provide such a vehicle but this protection should be included as protection against those who for various reasons would otherwise deny their employees the use of a vehicle or charge the employee for its use.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Finally, the United Transportation Union believes that the CDL validation and the non-CDL (or private auto) violation of the license should be mutually exclusive due to the varying criteria, standards, and circumstances which apply to each of these. For instance, an individual, alone in their automobile and finding themselves late for a wedding, ball game, or some other commitment important to them, would be most likely to exceed the speed limit or take some other unauthorized shortcut, as I'm sure we all have done at one time or another. However, given the circumstances surrounding such an incident, I do not believe it should impact on that individual's certification to drive a commercial vehicle. In the converse, a suspension or denial of the right to operate a commercial vehicle, due to a violation in that type of vehicle and considering the skills and knowledge necessary to do so, should not impact on a person's authorization to drive an automobile particularly in light of the comparative minimal skills required to do

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Commercial drivers should thus not be held to a SO. higher standard than any other Class D driver. I further point out that a person about to drive a commercial vehicle does not approach this task as casually as they would approach the driving of their personal automobile. On the other hand, the driver of a private automobile, as a matter of routine, does not approach that task with the seriousness of a person about to drive a commercial vehicle, starting with the pre-trip inspection. Additionally, a person who loses their CDL with its higher standards should not be further penalized in their attempt to find further employment by having their Class D license suspended as well. Therefore, the United Transportation Union believes that any sanctions taken against the operator of one type of vehicle should not apply to their opportunity to operate the other type.

The United Transportation Union believes that these changes would be beneficial to all concerned and facilitate implementation with the least amount of adversity. I would also like to point out the potential impact on such items as the state's unemployment compensation fund if the same situation occurring in California was repeated here. In the initial testing period in that state, 38 percent of the applicants failed to pass the CDL test. Certainly no one believes that 38 percent of

those applicants were unqualified but the resultant impact of such a catastrophe on the various state agencies caused by massive unemployment claims, excessive costs and man hours related to further retesting and negative impact on commerce would all be detrimental to the Commonwealth, its citizens, and its industry. It behooves us all to facilitate a smooth, orderly and complete transition to the new system for as many of our professional commercial drivers as is possible and I hope you find our suggestions helpful.

Thank you. We would certainly address any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much.

In part, in answer to some of your questions, and your testimony was all very good, we agree on the skills portion and professional drivers who don't have violations recorded against them will be grandfathered into the program. As well as I have forgotten what the other note was I had. Any questions? Senator Bell.

SENATOR BELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BY SENATOR BELL:

Q Mr. Beaver, Mr. Zogby when he discussed
42 pages of law, which I don't think anybody can understand,
didn't see fit to tell us that some of the state requirements are far greater than the federal requirements.

1 You have told us that it could be a written or an 2 oral test or an automated test. Would you be so kind as 3 to furnish the joint chairmen what you have picked up as 4 where the state has exceeded the federal requirements? 5 We certainly can do that, Senator. Α 6 Send it later to him in writing. Q 7 Yes, sir. 8 Now you talked about a written test. Q 9 Zogby didn't tell us who prepared the written test. Who 10 does prepare the written test? 11 Well, as far as we can understand it, Α 12 it will be a third party. From my understanding, I think 13 that the State Educational Board, I think it is Indiana 14 University is going to set up the testing procedures. 15 Would there be different written tests Q 16 for every state? 17 Α No. I think it is a standard test. 18 Is that a federal requirement? Q 19 Yes, it is a federal requirement and I think 20 it is on an eighth grade level. 21 Now, I am going to give you a hypothetical Q 22 situation. Your SEPTA buses run very close to the borders 23 of New Jersey and Delaware. If a person lives in New 24 Jersey will he be able to drive a SEPTA bus with a New 25 Jersey license?

A We have discussed this, Senator, very much so. We do have a lot of people who work on SEPTA in the southeast quarter and they do live in New Jersey. We understand that a person who lives in this Commonwealth must have a CDL once this program is initiated. If those people live in New Jersey and New Jersey seeks to do nothing, and from what I understand right now, New Jersey is in chaos when it comes to the CDL program. If they would say it is all right we are going to take the penalties set down by the federal mandate and do nothing on the CDL course, I think then that SEPTA in its right would certainly test those people according to the grades, the skills test of the CDL.

As far as the Commonwealth goes, I don't believe they would have any control over those people living in Jersey providing Jersey does not do anything with that federal mandate.

Q You outguessed my question. Let's say
Delaware adopts the CDL and they are 18 years old and
they have an oral test. But Pennsylvania says you live
in Pennsylvania, you cannot work for SEPTA unless you are
21. But if you lived in Delaware, you could work for
SEPTA if you are 18. Am I correct?

A Yes, we are at a disadvantage in that. That is true.

1 SENATOR BELL: Thank you. Thank you. 2 Mr. Chairman. 3 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Senator Holl. 4 BY SENATOR HOLL: 5 Q Mr. Beaver, you do not refer to the section 6 of the law, proposed law, that deals with blood alcohol 7 Do you have any comments? 8 Α Well, the only comments I have, Senator, 9 It seems like we're going to live in two 10 different worlds. If we have a CDL license in regards 11 to alcohol, the federal mandate says 0.04. At the same 12 time our people who are driving on D licenses or the 13 No. 1 license as it is today, their alcohol content, 14 of course, would be required to be below 0.10. 15 discrepancy there I don't think is really fair. I think 16 that somewhere along the line we have to address this 17 as we go down in this program. 18 I also heard testimony today about zero 19 level testing. This is impossible. There is no testing 20 laboratory in the United States that can give you a zero level testing for alcohol. It is impossible. And yet 21 some of the carriers are going to come up with the idea 22 23 that it has to be a zero level testing for alcohol. way you can do that. 24

Mr. Beaver, do you have any idea why the

25

Q

levels have been changed? Has your organization experienced any problems with blood alcohol level?

A Not that I could really address to you,

Senator. I don't believe that we have had any problem with

it. Except that I know that SEPTA has in their working

conditions zero level of testing for alcohol. We can

give you some more information on it. My secretary says

we did have some problem with it, but as I stated before,

there is no way that we can test for zero alcohol. I mean,

each one of us would come up with some kind of a sample.

BY CHAIRMAN CORMAN:

Q The other point I wanted to raise to you, you talked about if we can put the law into effect prior to the federal mandated time of April 1, 1992. The only reason we are starting early is that we would allow the drivers to start earlier to try to qualify so that there isn't a stampede at the end. Our law would not require that everyone have a CDL prior to April 1, 1992 either. We are just going to get the process started early enough so that we could have an orderly transition.

A We appreciate that. Except those people that are going to fail these written tests or such tests that the Department sets up as criteria, if the person is still knowledgeable in their skills and he doesn't really have to have that CDL until April 1st, 1992, we don't

1 think he should be deprived of working for his livelihood. 2 Oh, I see. Your point was if the person Q 3 fails, he ought not to be dismissed. 4 Α That is correct, sir. 5 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: I am not sure how that 6 works but we will certainly look at that. Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Representative Lescovitz. 8 REPRESENTATIVE LESCOVITZ: Thank you. 9 Mr. Chairman. 10 BY REPRESENTATIVE LESCOVITZ: 11 Q The only question I had was on page 5 12 I believe of your testimony you talk about third-party 13 testing and you mentioned SEPTA and the Port Authority of 14 Allegheny County in the legislation, billed to third party. 15 Do you want to elaborate on that or do you just believe --16 Mr. Dunlevy or yourself can mention something about that. 17 Do you believe that SEPTA does have the necessary personnel 18 to handle the third party? 19 Well, I have a bus driver from SEPTA with 20 me. He is one of my people and I am certain he can address 21 any questions you have as far as their certification for 22 testing drivers. I think SEPTA, in its outline, Dick, you could comment on that and maybe tell the representative 23 what SEPTA does on their testing. 24

MR. LECHETTE: SEPTA has a very thorough and

25

comprehensive training program for bus drivers when they are hired. And I have with me an outline that the instructor goes through with a new student to qualify him as a bus driver. All the safety features he must know, the rules of the road. In here are four manuals. Two of them are Pennsylvania Driver Code manuals, the regular one for license 1, and the yellow for 2 and 3 which they are given, and also the owner's manuals for the neoplane buses. There are two types of neoplanes and both of those manuals are given. The operators, during their training, study these and all the testing, written testing, is taken out of these four manuals.

They also have a comprehensive training program on the rails and they do requalify each rail operator every year. I happen to be a rail operator right now and I qualify every year with a written test. I must go out and perform a driving test on the rails, go through all the signal operations, the switching operations, and I must qualify every year or I am withheld from work until I do. Maybe a day or two and I study and I go back and take the test again.

REPRESENTATIVE LESCOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to make sure that was noted here for the record so the Department and the Committee would know that, SEPTA's program.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. DUNLEVY: To go a little bit farther on that, I believe SEPTA requires a written exam every year, too, for these operators which I think it is imperative that they do become a third-party testing, certified.

CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Representative Steighner.
REPRESENTATIVE STEIGHNER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

BY REPRESENTATIVE STEIGHNER:

Very briefly, I am well aware of SEPTA's Q in-depth training and safety program as well as many of the trucking firms throughout Pennsylvania not only adhering; to the federal and state guidelines, but many of them have their own in-house safety and training programs as well and some of them are even of a higher standard. It is for that reason that on page 6 of your testimony I am a little confused where I think you are suggesting to the two Committees that a person's driving record not have an impact on whether they receive certification. I am somewhat puzzled. Are you telling us that a person who has a personal driving record of their own automobile, their personal vehicle that they transport their husband or wife and/or family members and have a track record of speeding, stop sign violations, red light violations, that that history not be considered as far as the

certification is concerned? If I am understanding your testimony in the second paragraph of page 6 --

A No, sir, we are not going on that side of the coin at all. It is on the other side of the coin where you would be operating a commercial vehicle and you may be stopped for possibly an overload or some criteria that would be a minor infraction where you would lose your commercial driver's license and we don't want them to lose their Class D or their personal, private automobile license so that they would still be able to earn a livelihood.

Q On the converse that is what you are saying?

A Yes.

Q But in the sentence preceding that is where you talk about the examples of a person going to a wedding, a ball game, etc., etc. However, given the circumstances surrounding such an incident, I do not believe it should impact on that individual's certification to drive a commercial vehicle.

What exactly are you saying there?

A We are saying the guy in his automobile is liable to do a lot of things that he wouldn't do with his commercial vehicle either.

Q With his family members in a vehicle?

1 A Well, not necessarily, not necessarily. 2 0 I'm having a difficult time separating 3 It is the same individual at least behind the the two. 4 operating vehicle. 5 MR. DUNLEVY: Representative, let me 6 answer that. This came out of some of our discussions. 7 In cases of individuals, yourself maybe at a fundraiser or 8 alone, not necessarily with his family. I think with his 9 family he would take the same approach as he would with 10 a bus full of people. We are talking about people that 11 in a situation where they are alone, they are late, 12 in a different context and they would get on that bus 13 recognizing they are hauling passengers, take that approach 14 to that vehicle differently than they take that approach 15 to a commercial vehicle. I think the whole mindset is 16 different as you get into the vehicle, one or the other. 17 I don't think the impact on the private and personal use 18 should impact on the operation of a commercial vehicle 19 given the differentiation between the two and the different 20 standards, the two classes. 21 REPRESENTATIVE STEIGHNER: With all due 22 respect, I think you are totally incorrect. That is all, 23 Mr. Chairman. 24 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much. Thank you for taking time to come and tell us your ideas. 25

1 MR'. BEAVER: Thank you. 2 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Mr. William Yocum. 3 Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association. Good morning, 4 Bill. 5 Good morning, Senator. MR. YOCUM: 6 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Identify yourself for 7 the record and proceed. 8 MR. YOCUM: Senator, Representative 9 Petrarca, gentlemen and ladies: My name is Bill Yocum. 10 I am President of the Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, 11 a trade association representing 2300 members who operate 12 trucks on the highways of Pennsylvania. Our members 13 include both for-hire carriers, commonly referred to as 14 trucking companies and private carriers, those who use 15 trucks in furtherance of some other primary business. 16 PMTA supports the enactment of legislation 17 necessary for Pennsylvania to adopt the federally mandated 18 Commercial Driver License Program. We have worked closely 19 with the Department of Transportation in planning for the 20 adoption of the Commercial Driver License Program and we 21 pledge our support to the Department in implementing the 22 plan. Before accepting questions, I would like 23 to respond to a couple questions that Senator Bell asked 24 other witnesses. I think I can clarify. First, with regard 25

1 to the age, you used the illustration of the Pennsylvania 2 driver and the Virginia driver on Interstate 81 or 83. 3 The Virginia driver would have to be 21 years of age. 4 A minimum commercial driving age of 21 has been in force 5 for interstate carriers since 1937. So he would be in 6 violation and subject to fine. 7 Now, with regard to who prepared the test, 8 the Federal Highway Administration contracted with the 9 Essex Corporation to prepare the written test. We are 10 giving seminars for the benefit of our members to help 11 them learn how to prepare for the written test and we are 12 offering to them audio tapes with the idea that the truck 13 driver can play that audio tape as he goes down the road 14 rather than listen to country music. 15 (Laughter.) 16 I will be happy to respond to any questions. 17 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much. 18 Your comments are certainly right to the point. Any 19 questions of Mr. Yocum? 20 REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Thank you, Mr. 21 Chairman. 22 BY REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Mr. Yocum, the previous people that testified 23 Q from the UTU had two points and if you would care to 24 comment on them. Number one was they are asking us to put 25

1 in the legislation that would require an employer to 2 provide the vehicle necessary to take the test and to not 3 allow the employer to charge for the use of using that 4 vehicle to take the test. I wonder if you had any comments 5 on that? 6 In our industry that does not appear to 7 We have a severe driver shortage that is be a problem. 8 going to get much worse before it gets better. Anyone 9 that I am aware of wanting to hire a driver will provide 10 the vehicle in order to have that driver qualify for the 11 necessary tests. 12 0 At first glance you would not oppose 13 mandating that in this legislation? 14 I oppose mandating most anything. I would 15 prefer to let the free marketplace work it out. 16 Q Thank you. And my last question is regarding, 17 they also mention here perhaps we ought to look at 18 legislation where employers may require employees to take 19 out unsafe vehicles and they end up being fined for some 20 violations on the road for that. They are asking us to provide some kind of job protection or protecting that 21 license for an individual who is sent out by an employer 22 with an unsafe vehicle, forced out basically. 23

A There are present remedies for that problem.

The Federal Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety always responds

24

25

1 to a complaint from a driver. The driver faced with 2 those circumstances should simply refuse to take the 3 vehicle out, an unsafe vehicle. And if he is discharged 4 for that, he has recourse with the Bureau of Motor Carrier 5 Safety and let me tell you his employer will be in big 6 trouble. 7 REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Thank you, Mr. Yocum. 8 I would like to follow up at a later time on this issue. 9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Senator Bell. 11 BY SENATOR BELL: 12 Mr. Yocum, does this proposed bill presented Q 13 by the House and Senate, which are Mr. Zogby's bills, 14 do they exceed the federal requirements? 15 Α It is my belief that they adhere to the 16 federal requirements. I don't see that they exceed them 17 in any aspect. 18 Of course, the age limit of 21. Q 19 A No, in fact the federal requirement is 21. 20 For intrastate? Q 21 No, not for intra. Α 22 Q This requires intra. 23 Not for intrastate driver carrier. 24 intrastate for-hire carrier has had the 21 age limit. 25 Would you get your staff to carefully Q

1 analyze if there are excessive requirements in these bills 2 over what the federal requirements are and then furnish 3 it to the Chairman? 4 Α I will do that. A preliminary perusal 5 and study indicates that they are not in excess of the 6 federal requirements. 7 How about the requirement of a written test? Q 8 Is that a federal requirement? 9 Yes. 10 0 In other words, you can't give oral tests? 11 There is a provision for giving an oral 12 test in extenuating circumstance. 13 How about intrastate, within the state, 14 can an oral test be given for that? 15 This -- yes, it could be. That is right. 16 These are points I think our Chairman ought Q 17 to, because I have tried on occasion to read federal law 18 and federal regulations and you have to be a wizard from 19 Oz to understand those things and I know you people have 20 the legal assistance that would help. 21 A Right. 22 SENATOR BELL: Thank you, sir. 23 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: No other questions. Thank you very much, Bill. 24 25 MR. YOCUM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN. Mr. Robert T. Wooten,
Assistant General Manager for Public Affairs for SEPTA.
Please identify yourself for the record and proceed.

MR. WOOTEN. Good morning. I am Robert T. Wooten, Assistant General Manager for Public Affairs for the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority. With me this morning is Mr. Phillip LeBurto (phonetic), who is a safety officer at SEPTAL

I am not going to read my testimony. I am just going to make a few comments, most of which are follow ups to what I have heard from other people this morning. SEPTA, obviously, supports the intent of the legislation and recognizes that the Commonwealth must comply with the federal statute. We share the concern that has been expressed this morning regarding the timing and the logistics and do urge as expeditious an implementation of the CDL program as possible. We have approximately 4,000 employees who will be required to obtain a commercial driver's license. A breakdown on that is approximately 3,000 of them are bus operators and the other thousand made up of street supervisors and maintenance personnel who do, in the performance of their duty, have to operate a bus on occasion.

Secondly, I would like to follow up on the testimony of Mr. Beaver and reiterate and urge that SEPTA

be strongly considered as a third-party tester. Again, on the uniqueness of, I suppose, of our operation and our willingness even to work with our fellow HAMTA members and PennDOT so that we could even provide that opportunity to other agencies across Pennsylvania if they so desire to utilize our services.

Thirdly, in terms of the age situation,
SEPTA's practice on qualifying people as an operator
requires five years of a clean driving record. So that
the effect of the 21 age stipulation for operators is moot
to us because of our present practice. However, it is a
potential impediment to maintenance personnel. We do
hire maintenance mechanics below the age of 21, and if
the age 21 limit is imposed, that is a potential problem
for our hiring practices.

And finally, Senator Bell had earlier raised the issue of operators in other states and indeed we do have bus drivers who are residents of Delaware and New Jersey and we would urge as much consideration so that Commonwealth residents are not put at a disadvantage.

And I would entertain any questions.

BY CHAIRMAN CORMAN:

Q But the age requirement, regardless of whether they are in New Jersey, Delaware or Pennsylvania still requires five years clean record. So they would have

1	to be 21 to be hired as a driver.	
2	A That is right.	
3	Q Regardless of what state they are from?	
4	A That is right, but the maintenance problem	
5	Q The maintenance, your reason they would	
6		
7	need a CDL is because of road testing the vehicle possibly?	
8	A That is right. It is simply the transporting	
9	of vehicles from a depot to a heavy shop or some incidental b	ut
	important parts of their function do require them to	
10	operate a vehicle on the streets.	
11	Q Maybe there could be an exemption made	
12	for incidental driving for maintenance purposes.	
13	A Yes, yes.	
14	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you. Any questions?	
15	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Representative Nahill.	
16	BY REPRESENTATIVE NAHILL:	
17	Q I infer from your last statement when you	
18	talk about five years of a clean driving record, that you	
19	would not be heartily in favor of the other proposal which	
20	is you have two separate lives, one in a car and one in	
21	a commercial vehicle?	
22	A No, and our practice now is we have a	
23	cooperative effort with the Commonwealth where we get	
24	information about the status of someone's driving record.	
25	Q Do you have any information or background	

for instance on somebody who has accumulated a lot of personal car violations? What happens with them when they get behind the wheel of a bus?

A I'm going to defer to Mr. LeBurto.

MR. LeBURTO: Representative, an annual check is made of the driving record. We get the abstract from Harrisburg and we review that. If that record shows any suspensions that may have occurred in the last seven years, any traffic accidents they have had in the last two years and any physical impairments that they may have picked up on, when we find someone who has had a problem with suspension, revocation, we will then have them straighten it out with the authorities. If it is a matter of just paying some fines and costs, take care of that. We will put them back to work, but we do hold them off if they are suspended.

BY REPRESENTATIVE NAHILL: (To Mr. LeBurto)

Q Have you ever studied the effect of somebody who has a bad personal driving record versus what they do behind the wheel in a bus?

A What we found, the real extreme individual, the one who has had five or six suspensions over a seven-year period, someone who is habitually a problem, they generally turn up in our accident records. The tendency is to be a less careful driver than someone that is a clean

driver.

2

3

1

CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Representative Snyder. BY REPRESENTATIVE SNYDER. (To Mr. Wooten)

4

5

Could you give me a thumbnail sketch of Q how you think this third-party testing is going to work?

6

7

be worked out is for us to enter into discussions with

8

PennDOT and to describe to them our current training

9

program, how we qualify drivers outside of the license

10

program but to the satisfaction of putting people out

11

on the street carrying passengers. And I suspect that

12

that dialogue would reveal a considerable amount of

13

compatibility and it would serve the purpose.

14

Let me make sure I understand that. concept of third-party testing is that you would qualify

15

16

your own commercial drivers as opposed to PennDOT

17

qualifying them?

18

MR. LeBURTO: Sir, the conversation I

19

have had with the Bureau has been that PennDOT officials

20

the requirements of being an examiner. They would then 21

will run a class to teach SEPTA chief instructors on

22

be certified by the state after they passed whatever

23

24

25

to see that we are training correctly in accordance with the state requirements. Maintaining a record file on each

requirements the state would impose. Subject to audits

Well, I think the first thing that has to

1	individual. Making sure that our instructors or the
2	tester is also driving safely.
3	BY REPRESENTATIVE SNYDER: (To Mr. LeBurto)
4	Q They then would test only SEPTA employees
5	or others as well?
6	A Our intention is just to take care of our
7	employees only. We have no interest in training truck
8	
9	drivers or whatever other than SEPTA of course.
10	REPRESENTATIVE SNYDER: Thank you.
	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Senator Bell.
11	BY SENATOR BELL: (To Mr. Wooten)
12	Q Are you familiar with the reason why
13	in Pennsylvania the State Police instead of PennDOT tests
14	drivers for licenses? Do you know the history of it?
15	A No, I do not, sir.
16	SENATOR BELL: Before they put the State
17	Police in, the testing was pretty corrupt.
18	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much.
19	We appreciate your taking the time to be at this hearing
20	and sharing with us.
21	MR. WOOTEN: Thank you.
22	MR. LeBURTO: Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Mr. Chairman, two
24	legislators just came in late, Representative Civera and
25	
£3	Representative Joe Markosek

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: At this time we will call Mr. James Moore, Executive Vice President of Pennsylvania Recreational Vehicle and Camping Association. Mr. Moore.

Good morning, please identify yourself and proceed.

MR. MOORE: Good morning. I am Jim Moore of the Pennsylvania Recreational Vehicle and Camping Association. Senator Corman, Representative Petrarca and members of the Joint House/Senate Transportation Committee:

The Pennsylvania Recreational Vehicle and Camping Association consists of RV dealers, RV manufacturers and private campgrounds. We ask your consideration to exempt owners of motor homes over 26,000 pounds gross vehicle weight rating from the parameters of this CDL program.

I have attached a letter that I sent to PennDOT regarding my views on this.

The bills as written, I might add, I would challenge anyone, lawyer or not, to read these bills and make your determination that they did in fact decide to cover motor homes. The only way this is really determined is PennDOT's interpretation. Then you say, well, how did you figure out it was covering motor homes? The way I did is that PennDOT for three years has been beating the drum with the American Association of Motor

Vehihome

Vehicle Administrators that Pennsylvania wanted motor homes to be covered under the Commercial Driver's License Program. To this day I don't know why.

As has previously been mentioned, 38 states have already passed the Commercial Driver's License.

Not one of them covers the motor homes. Pennsylvania is truly going to be an island on this. I presented a lot of this information to the PennDOT officials and I even point out the Federal Register of April 14, 1988, one paragraph in it and I will read Outload.

"The Congress intended that the provisions of the Act apply both to interstate and intrastate drivers involved in trade, traffic and transportation in all sectors of the economy. Drivers of foreign vehicles, fire fighting equipment, military vehicles and transit buses are subject to the commercial driver's license requirements. However, the requirements do not apply to a driver of a vehicle for personal use such as a recreational vehicle that would otherwise meet the definition of a commercial motor vehicle."

Now this is from the Federal Highway

Administration. So what I am telling you is that both

the Federal Highway Administration and the AAMVA have both
said that their intention was never to include motor homes.

Jack Zogby has testified, put in the record that they only

have about 60 of these. We don't understand why PennDOT wants to make Pennsylvania an island with the number one manufacturing state of RVs in the eastern United States. Tourism is the number two industry of Pennsylvania. We are certainly a part of the tourism. I just truly don't understand it.

If the Committee would so desire, we could produce parameters of the motor home driver. But I think one of the important things is the motor home driver averages 3500 miles a year. Furthermore, when those miles are driven, what time of day those miles are driven and where they are driven, I think is very important. Most people that own these big motor homes spend their winters in Arizona, Florida, someplace else, not Pennsylvania highways. They are usually lifetime Pennsylvania residents and I think they do in fact have pride in keeping a Pennsylvania license plate on their motor home.

Now clearly if Pennsylvania becomes an island strictly for motor homes and no one else is doing it, it is no real large task to set up a legal residency, say, in Florida where you spend six months and you set up a mailbox and get your regular driver's license from the State of Florida or wherever else you want and not have to be subjected to the commercial driver's license just because you own a motor home. I think that would be

sad though. It makes no sense to force Pennsylvania residents to do this. I might say it is foolish for our tourism industry also to have Pennsylvania in the tourist industry create a myth, and it will be a myth. there will be no truth to it. That Pennsylvania, if you drive through Pennsylvania and you have a big motor home, they are liable to require you to have a commercial driver's license. So you better drive around Pennsylvania. I understand that legally out-of-state drivers won't necessarily fall under it, but those rumors will get around. I am not going to read all the written testimony I have presented to the members of the Committee. We just ask your consideration. We don't think these motor homes are in the same league for safety problems. fact, opinion is cheap. Everyone has one. Let us fall on strictly the traffic record, the statistics. They are available. We just do not think that the owners of motor homes, and remember, this isn't all motor homes, granted. It is motor homes over 26,000 GVWR. Quite frankly, there aren't a whole lot of those made but there are some. Usually the reason that they are increasing in gross vehicle weight rating, our future development is to make a heavier chassis, to come up with a system that the motor home will handle better. I refer to a lot of these ones that are over this as always on a greyhound bus chassis

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

because most people understand what that is. Those motor homes, their cheap version starts at 275,000. Most of them run about 450,000. So that is why you don't have that many of them.

The use of a motor home, most of the people have them, they live in them a large part of the year. Number two, they are used for sporting events. If you go to the races, Pocono 500, if you go to the Penn State football games, you will see the tailgate parties. The fact is if you are a football fan, you know those motor home drivers, they wait until that traffic subsides. They are not prone to get out in rush traffic. That is part of the beauty of them.

All I am saying, gentlemen, no other state has included motor homes in this legislation. I have even contended, I don't know, it is just contended that a couple of people at PennDOT have a personal vendetta. Why, I don't know. I have asked them. Doug Tobin and I have dealt with each other for years. I can't understand it. But he has been on it for three years now, and the only possible reason that I even knew these bills were going to cover motor homes is because he has been beating the drum for three years with the AAMVA.

Senator, I remain available for any questions your Committee may have.

just been handed a letter that was written by R. P. Landis, Associate Administrator for Motor Carriers, U.S. Department of Transportation. And he writes a letter to a David J. Humphreys, President of Recreational Vehicle Association in Virginia. He cites the vehicles that are to be included. The definition of Congress includes all trade, traffic and transportation conducted both intrastate and interstate commerce and then he states, "A recreational vehicle however, which is not used in commerce and is operated

So I don't know who this Mr. Landis is.

The letter certainly indicates to me it was not their intention to talk at least about motor homes.

BY CHAIRMAN CORMAN:

solely as a family personal conveyance for recreational

purposes is not covered under the Act."

Q What would be your thoughts about what is commonly called a fifth wheeler trailer that seems to me looks just about like a regular tractor trailer? Might we have a need for requirement of a license there? I have never been in one.

A The fifth wheel trailer is engineered like the large tractor trailers. As far as the same type of connection, they connect to the bed of a pick-up truck.

Quite frankly, they tow superbly, much better than our

1	regular travel trailers as far as roadability. I don't
2	think they are a traffic hazard. I think their traffic
3	record speaks for them. Senator Bell referred to earlier
4	those pick-up trucks. A lot of people don't realize,
5	even the little, tiny Datsun pick-up trucks are commercial
6	vehicles in that they must in fact pay for a license fee
7	based on really the gross combination weight rating. That
8	is the GVWR plus whatever they are going to be hauling.
9	So frankly, the present law without CDL
10	being in existence already covers it.
11	Q Do you have any statistics from a reliable
12	source of motor homes and travel trailers, accidents?
13	A Sir, the most reliable statistics we go
14	by are the insurance industry's statistics.
15	Q Do you have some of those statistics
16	A I don't have them with me.
17	Q that you could forward to me?
18	A Yes, sir, I can.
19	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: I would appreciate if
20	you would do that and I will distribute that information
21	to the Committee. Okay, thank you very much. We appreciate
22	you being with us today, Mr. Moore, and bringing us this
23	important information.
24	MR. MOORE: Thank you, sir.
25	(Complete prepared testimony of Jim Moore,

Executive Vice President, Pennsylvania Recreational Vehicle and Camping Association was as follows:)

"On behalf of the PRVCA membership...RV dealers, RV manufacturers, and private campgrounds, I ask your consideration to exempt owners of motor homes over 26,000 pounds GVWR from the parameters of the CDL program.

"Attached is my letter to PennDOT explaining my view of PennDOT's wording to include motor homes in the new CDL program.

"The CDL program will affect all RV
manufacturers who have their own commercial
trucks to haul their RVs to dealers' lots or
out of state. Pennsylvania ranks fourth in RV
manufacturing and fifth in RV ownership in the
country. The parameters for commercial truck
safety of the CDL is something the PRVCA supports.

"However, I am totally perplexed at the PennDOT managers who worded the CDL bills with the intent that owners of motor homes over 26,000 pounds GVWR would have to obtain a commercial driver's license.

"Why?...Their own association, AAMVA, who helped foster this national CDL program clearly says that it is not their intent to include RVs

1 under the CDL program. 2 "I also address your attention to the 3 attached copy of the Federal Register with my letter to PennDOT, specifically the paragraph 5 I have boxed. 6 "According to our national association, 7 RVIA, that as of September 1, 1989 exactly 38 8 states have passed a Commercial Driver's License 9 program...not one of those states' programs 10 includes motor homes...not one. 11 "Pennsylvania is the number one RV manufac-12 turing state in the eastern United States... 13 tourism is the number two industry of 14 Pennsylvania...and the RV industry is unquestion-15 ably a part of that tourism industry. 16 "Doug Tobin of PennDOT has told our 17 national association, RVIA, that "the Senate 18 wants RVs under the commercial driver's license." 19 If this is true, I ask... "Why?" 20 "Does someone really feel that large motor 21 homes are in the same league as commercial 22 trucks? 23 "Motor home owners average 3,500 miles traveled. .per year and usually that isn't all 24 in Pennsylvania. That isn't even a rough week 25

for a cross country truck.

"Motorrhome owners normally do not travel during topic rush traffic...they normally embark on trips on days less likely to be heavily traveled...and when they're traveling if they get tired, they pull off the road and take a nap...in a comfortable bed or couch.

"I will grant you that some motor home owners do detract from the normal patterns I have described...when Penn State and Pitt football teams play home football games...but, even then, if you would note, they usually let the main traffic subside, before they leave the stadium.

"If some legislators have had a bad experience with a motor home as PennDOT claims, I'm truly sorry. But I still don't believe that should cause Pennsylvania owners of large motor homes to all be penalized...yes penalized.

"Most people who buy those large motor homes worked all their lives to enjoy the life-style that motor homes gives them...in their declining years...visiting the USA, visiting relatives, and grandchildren, escaping to Florida and Arizona in the wintertime, and

sometimes using them for tailgate parties at football games...but normally using that motor home as their home to return to Pennsylvania's spring through fall seasons and visit family.

"Pennsylvania passing CDL to include motor homes will make Pennsylvania an embarrassment to our RV industry, to motor home owners who license in Pennsylvania, and non-Pennsylvania motor homes who will be fearful to visit Pennsylvania...because the other states don't require a commercial driver's license for large motor homes.

"Understand, those motor home owners whose motor homes carry Pennsylvania plates and there is also a Pennsylvania driver's license in their wallet...because they're Pennsylvanians can... if forced to...get their license plates and driver's license in other states like Florida and Arizona...it really isn't that big a deal... just a lot of troublesome forms to fill out caused by their native state...but at least these other states don't require a commercial driver's license...perhaps only Pennsylvania will require it.

"How sad to force some native Pennsylvanians

1 to give up their Pennsylvania residency! 2 "How foolish to post "not welcome" signs 3 to large motor home owners from everywhere who 4 thought tourism was important to Pennsylvania. 'Why are Pennsylvania's Transportation 6 officials waving a red safety flag for large motor homes...when none of their counterparts 8 are? "Are Pennsylvania transportation safety 10 experts really smarter than their peers 11 throughout the country in discovering and 12 defining a safety problem that seems to concern 13 no one else...or are PennDOT officials saying 14 that Pennsylvania motor home owners don't drive 15 as safely as all other motor home owners. 16 "Members of both the House and Senate 17 Transportation Committees, please support an 18 amendment to exempt motor homes from the 19 Commercial Driver's License." 20 (Letter from Jim Moore to Jack Zogby was as 21 follows:) 22 September 1, 1989 23 Jack Zogby Deputy Secretary for Safety Administration 24 Pennsylvania Department of Transportation 1200 Transportation and Safety Building 25 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Dear Jack:

"On behalf of the Pennsylvania Recreational Vehicle and Camping Association I express total disappointment in your allowing the wording of the proposed legislative bills, Senate Bill #1057 and House Bill #1722 to include certain camping recreational vehicles to be affected by the Commercial Driver's License (CDL) proposal.

"I believe that the unique PennDOT position to include motor homes over 26,000 pounds GVWR and travel trailers over 10,000 pounds GVWR in the CDL program is not truly a PennDOT position, but is the personal vendetta of your CDL point man, Doug Tobin.

"I have met with Doug personally and the following is why I say that Doug has for some reason put his personal stamp on placing large RVs into the CDL program...even though federal guidelines clearly say the CDL program is not meant to cover recreational vehicles (see attachment from the Federal Register).

"1. Two and a half years ago Doug Tobin announced to AAMVA (American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators) that he personally felt that RVs should be placed under a Commercial

1 Driver's License program. 2 "2. Almost two years ago at the joint 3 New York/Pennsylvania Highway Users conference meeting in New York State, I expressed to you my 5 surprise and concern that Doub Tobin was telling 6 AAMVA people that he was going to include RVs 7 in the Commercial Driver's License program. You told me then that you thought I was mistaken. 9 "3. Doug Tobin was a guest speaker at an 10 executive committee meeting of the Pennsylvania 11 Highway Users Federation meeting in 1989 on 12 the topic of Commercial Driver's License. 13 front of approximately 15 executives Doug clearly 14 said that the Commercial Driver's License would not affect recreational vehicles and handed out 15 written guidelines on CDL (none of which 16 intimated and had intention of covering RVs 17 under the CDL program). 18 In June of 1989, House Bill #1722 19 and Senate Bill #1057 were printed. 20 "5. A careful reading of these bills 21 caused me to go meet with Doug Tobin. (Frankly, 22 you could read these bills over and over and 23 never get the idea that there was anything in 24 them which would cause drivers of motor homes 25

1	over 26,000 pounds and travel trailers over
2	10,000 pounds to be affected).
3	"6. Doug told me the following:
4	"A. Yes, drivers of motor homes over 26,000
5	pounds GVWR and travel trailers over 10,000
6	pounds GVWR would have to obtain a commercial
7	driver's license. (PennDOT interpretation, not
8	legislative intent, would mandate this.)
9	"B. When I pointed out to Doug that it
10	was clearly printed in the Federal Register
11	the RVs were not intended to be part of the CDL,
12	he said that he wasn't aware that an individual
13	state couldn't have more stringent parameters
14	than what AAMVA recommended.
15	"C. When I pointed out that he had
16	recently told the executive committee of the
17	Pennsylvania Highway Users Federation that it
18	would not affect RVs, Doug said he didn't
19	remember saying thatbut he didn't deny he
20	said it.
21	"D. Then Doug proceeded to tell me that he
22	believed that owners of larger RVs should have
23	to obtain a commercial driver's license.
24	"E. He then told me he had a relative who
25	owned two motor homes over 26,000 pounds GVWR

and he felt that his relative should have to obtain a commercial driver's license.

"Jack, I have no idea if that relative of Doug's is his "unfavorite" relative or even if he is a Pennsylvania resident. But I believe it to quite possibly be a factor in Doug Tobin's personal vendetta to have Pennsylvania be perhaps the only state which requires certain RV owners to obtain a commercial driver's license.

"Jack, I believe there is no way you could read those bills and know that there was an intent to require certain RV owners to obtain commercial driver's licenses.

"I also believe that perhaps very few of the legislators who are sponsoring the bills are aware that PennDOT's point man, who worded the bill, clearly intends to require commercial driver's license for owners of motor homes over 26,000 pounds GVWR and travel trailers over 10,000 pounds GVWR.

"Inasmuch as PennDOT is obviously the enforcer of the commercial driver's license, if PennDOT interprets the definition of "commercial motor vehicle" on page 18, lines 18-30 and page 19, line 1-5 of both bills to say

1 it includes certain RVs, it does. 2 "Therefore, I ask your support to amend 3 the wording of page 19, line 5 to read as follows: 5 "The term does not include an implement 6 of husbandry, a motor home or a house trailer. 7 "Jack, I have worked with both you and 8 Doug Tobin for many years and I respect both 9 of you as professionals. But in this instance 10 Doug is going overboard against the grain of 11 the Federal Government and other states. I 12 understand from our national association, RVIA, 13 that Doug is telling them, "our Senate wants 14 RVs to be commercial." 15 "I am sending a copy of this letter to 16 Doug and also the legislators. 17 "Jack, in closing let me point out that if Pennsylvania mandates CDL for RVs, Pennsylvania 18 19 will become an island and cause people to 20 register the affected RVs in other states, and even obtain driver's license from that state if 21 22 necessary. "It's embarrassing, and it's not needed. 23 "Sincerely, 24 Jim Moore 25

1 Executive Vice President Pennsylvania Recreational Vehicle and Camping 2 Association" 3 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: We have decided here 4 that we are going to proceed with all the rest of the 5 witnesses instead of taking a lunch break and then coming 6 back. So at this time we'll call Mr. Edward Keller, 7 Mr. Richard Bloomingdale from AFSCME, Council 13 and 8 hopefully Mr. Larry Klos, Mr. John Morris and Mr. Harry 9 Lombardo. Are they present? They may not be here. Are 10 they here? Marvelous. Thank you very much. We will proceed without a luncheon break if all the people are 11 12 here. 13 Please identify yourself. Good morning. 14 Identify yourself for the record and proceed. MR. BLOOMINGDALE: Good morning. My name 15 is Rick Bloomingdale. Ed Keller could not be here today. 16 So I will be offering AFSCME's testimony. I am the 17 18 Legislative Director of AFSCME Council 13, which represents 19 80,000 members across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. With me is Barry Bogart also of our 20 21 legislative department. I want to thank the Chairmen for the 22 opportunity to testify concerning the issue of the 23 Commercial Driver's License found in Senate Bill 1057 24 and House Bill 1722. 25

Because the number of commercial vehicle accidents was on the rise, it was the intention of Congress in 1986 to pass a law which would guarantee a qualified, safe driver behind the wheel of every 18-wheeler on our highways, in buses that we ride to work and those that transport our children to and from our schools, by April 1st, 1992. We feel that the federal legislation missed the point entirely. We at AFSCME feel that because of deregulation, companies have not been able to keep their vehicles in safe working condition, and drivers push themselves to their limits to keep their companies profitable. Rather than deal with the above-mentioned pressures, Congress put the responsibility on the drivers.

However, since we cannot change federal law here and because AFSCME represents thousands of public workers in both state and local governments that are affected by these new federal requirements to obtain a commercial driver's license, we are taking steps to comply. In fact, AFSCME has initiated and cooperated fully with the Department of Transportation and Penn State University in the development of a program called "ROAD to Success" (Real Opportunity for Advancement and Development). This is a pilot program in operation in four counties of the Commonwealth: Allegheny, Philadelphia, Centre and Dauphin. And it will be expanded to the remaining 63 counties.

The ROAD program is designed to determine

what kind of training and help employees need in order to

prepare for and pass the new knowledge test required by

the Federal Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986.

Federal law leaves you with the responsibility of implementing their legislative intent by mandating that the state pass legislation adopting the federal standards for obtaining a commercial driver's license, but at the same time giving the state some flexibility in the test procedure and time constraints prior to April 1, 1992.

The two pieces of legislation, House Bill 1722 and Senate Bill 1057, go a long way towards satisfying the federal mandate. But we feel there are some changes that need to be made. The two tests, knowledge and skills, should be overseen by state government. Testing of Pennsylvania's drivers must continue to be performed by the driver license examiners of the State Police as it is today. We must not allow the integrity of the tests or the safety on our highways to be sacrificed to corporate profits.

There is also a need to provide within this legislation driver protections, protections that will allow a driver all the time he or she needs to get ready for the federal test.

1 For instance, if a driver's current 2 Class 3 license expires between November 1, 1990 and 3 April 1, 1992, in order to keep driving, that person must 4 take the federal test right then whether they are ready 5 or not. We feel that is an unfair burden on those drivers 6 who by sheer bad luck have a license that expires in that 7 time frame. One solution would be to extend those Class 8 3 licenses until April 1, 1992. With that option the 9 driver would have the same amount of time to prepare 10 as everyone else. 11 Another driver protection would be the 12 flexibility the feds have allowed in the knowledge test. 13 The state can give it written, orally or by machine. 14 We feel that the drivers should have those options. We 15 hope you will consider our comments and add them to the 16 state legislation. 17 AFSCME urges swift passage of this legisla-18 tion. I will answer any questions from the members of 19 the Joint Committee at this time. 20 Thank you. I will be glad to answer any 21 questions at this time. 22 BY CHAIRMAN CORMAN: 23 Currently the commercial operators inspect 0 their own vehicles. If they prove they can do that 24 25 successfully are you opposed to that as well?

1	A No, whatever they do now is fine.
2	Q Then why can't they be properly instructed
3	to test their drivers so that we have more availability
4	of the tests to the various drivers to qualify?
5	A Well, inspecting the vehicles, there are
6	obviously unsafe vehicles on the roads as I think a couple
7	of weeks ago the State Police did a major pull over and
8	inspection of trucks and pulled a number of them off the
9	roads and sent a lot of them back to their docks to be
10	fixed. So I think the private sector has not done a very
11	adequate job of making the vehicles totally safe. Adding
12	the testing procedure on top of that I think would lead
13	to some possibilities of expediency to get the drivers
14	back on the road to protect their profits, which is a
15	reasonable, I mean; it is not reasonable but it is some-
16	thing that they have to deal with.
17	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Senator Bell.
18	BY SENATOR BELL:
19	Q You represent all the PennDOT drivers?
20	A Yes, sir.
21	Q And you don't want PennDOT checking their
22	own drivers?
23	A Well, I think it would be the same as a
24	company. A company checking its own drivers there is room
25	for, let's say, some unfair pressures on the supervisors.

1	Q The word is corruptness.
2	A Well, okay. Currently I think
3	Q I just want to point that out. Everybody
4	doesn't trust everybody in PennDOT.
5	(Laughter.)
6	A So, we would urge that the testing
7	procedure be left with the State Police and the driver's
8	license examiners who currently do that testing.
9	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: I don't see any other
10	questions. Thank you very much for taking time and coming
11	to share with us today.
12	Mr. Larry Klos, President, Business Agents
13	Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 85. Please identify
14	yourself and then proceed.
15	MR. KLOS: I would like to thank this
16	Committee for the opportunity to be here today to testify.
17	My name is Larry L. Klos, and I am the President of
18	the Pennsylvania Joint Conference Board of the Amalgamated
19	Transit Union. With me today are Mr. Warren George,
20	International Vice President of Amalgamated Transit Union
21	and Mr. John Remark, Financial Secretary of Local 85.
22	I represent over 5,000 transit workers in
23	the State of Pennsylvania. I am also the President of
24	Local 85 of the Amalgamated Transit Union in Pittsburgh.
25	Our international office is located in Washington, D.C.

which represents over 176,000 transit workers throughout the United States and Canada.

Our main concern here today is to testify to this Committee on the problems and unanswered questions on House Bill 1722 and Senate Bill 1057 which will comply with the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986.

At present, 34 states have already passed legislation to comply with the federal regulations and we are here today to bring some of the problems that may arise in this state in reference to the new commercial driver's license.

- 1. If available should there be thirdparty testing? The Port Authority of Allegheny County
 does have a Safety and Training Department that could
 accommodate the skill testing. Will they be required?
- 2. Will there be a grandfathering clause on skill tests? What are the requirements?
- 3. Written tests of multiple choice and will there also be verbal testing for individuals with literacy?
- 4. Types of license, CDL and private operating license are they one in the same?
- 5. Age restrictions of under 21 years of age before eligible to apply for a CDL under the present federal regulation would restrict individuals on job selection by seniority.

1	6. Number of times a person would have to
2	be tested to receive CDL? Number of times permitted
3	to take test with permit of a CDL?
4	7. Number of passengers per vehicle
5	to require the operator to have a CDL. The federal
6	regulation states 16 passengers plus operator should be
7	reduced to ten including operator so there would be a more
8	professional driver to transport the public.
9	8. The act requires that by April 1992
10	operators and maintainers must have a CDL. Prior to
11	April 1992 operators and maintenance should be permitted
12	to work in their classifications without a CDL.
13	9. Civil Service standards should apply
14	to test scores for passing grade for the CDL or their
15	past driving record.
16	10. Safety standards of the amount of
17	passengers permitted in the vehicle, sitting and standing
18	while in operation.
19	11. The inspection of the equipment prior
20	to operation and the right of refusal.
21	12. The act requires strict standards for
22	all individuals to maintain the CDL, but does not require
23	the employer to put a safer piece of equipment on the
24	highway. This must be addressed.
25	Failure of the individual who is required

1 to be tested for a CDL and also to maintain his/her CDL 2 could be devastating to the livelihood of that lindividual. 3 We ask that this Committee take into consideration our 4 comments, and amend the present House Bill 1722 and 5 Senate Bill 1057. 6 I am available for questions. Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much. 8 Do we have questions? 9 CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Representative Hess. 10 BY REPRESENTATIVE HESS: 11 Mr. Klos, only one question. Number nine 0 12 of your statement here you are saying the Civil Service 13 standard. What standard are you referring to? 14 Right now I believe if you apply for a job at the post office, if you had military service there is 15 16 a percentage that can be adapted to that testing. 17 As I understand, you are saying then that in this testing procedure if you have to score a score of 18 19 hypothetical 70 or 65, because of the Civil Service 20 standard, you are asking them to automatically give you five or ten points and give you a passing grade? 21 Some type of percentage or the individual 22 23 who may have 30 years of a driving record with no accidents, no problems, yet he is required to take a 24 test on Monday. If he can't pass that test does that mean 25

1	Tuesday he is not a good operator.
2	Q I understand what you are saying there
3	about the safe driving for over 20 or 30 years. But I
4	think you are defeating your purpose by giving points
5	by not passing the test, the Civil Service test, you
6	are comparing apples and oranges.
7	A Well, sir, it is only a suggestion because
8	of the fact that we believe, we have a lot of senior
9	people operating coaches today who do have perfect driving
10	records, but again
11	Q I am not questioning that portion.
12	A Well, it is a comment one way or another,
13	sir.
14	REPRESENTATIVE HESS: Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much for
16	coming and sharing with us today. Mr. John P. Morris,
17	President of Pennsylvania Conference of Teamsters.
18	MR. BRAINARD: Good morning.
19	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Good morning. Identify
20	yourself and proceed.
21	MR. BRAINARD: My name is Norton Brainard
22	and seated with me today are Gary Sheehan and Ken Stocker.
23	We are here representing Mr. Morris for the Pennsylvania
24	Conference of Teamsters. We share the Committees' interest
25	in the impending Commercial Driver Licensing legislation

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(S. 1057, H.B. 1722), primarily because it will affect a large percentage of our 140,000 Pennsylvania Conference members.

We have several areas of concern which the proposed legislation does not cover, and which we would like to see addressed in some fashion. These areas are:

1) Literacy Funding -- Many of our members who will be required to take the written CDL tests have a literacy problem. In addition, most of these persons have not taken any type of a written test for years -- and are thus inadequately prepared for the stresses involved. PennDOT has instituted a pilot literacy program for its affected workers who will need help in this area, receiving almost \$500,000 in state and federal funding.

Laudable as PennDOT's pilot program is, it does nothing to help those literally thousands of non-PennDOT drivers who need this kind of assistance, or face losing their jobs. We want some form of state funding for a literacy program to benefit Teamster members included in the legislation. Although the amount needed to fund such a program may be in excess of \$500,000 range, in comparison the cost becomes minimal -- \$500,000 would provide unemployment benefits for less than 95 displaced Teamster drivers -- better to help these productive workers retain their jobs through literacy training.

2) Insurance Company Safeguards -- Under the current system, it is possible that a driver holding a CDL could be penalized by his insurance company if he has an accident or incurs a traffic violation while driving his personal automobile, and vice-versa. Some kind of safeguard against this kind of cross-referencing of information, perhaps a statutory law or rule promulgation, must be incorporated into the CDL legislation to protect Pennsylvania's drivers from hidden surcharges and sudden cancellations by their insurance companies.

- federal guidelines, a driver who incurs a serious traffic violation while operating a commercial vehicle could lose not only his CDL, but also his personal operator's license. While the loss of a CDL would prohibit a driver from only one form of employment, the loss of a personal driving license could bar a worker from many jobs. Some provision allowing for a special type of license, restricted to on-the-job use and other specific periods, should be incorporated into the legislation.
- 4) <u>Written CDL Testing</u> -- We have four areas of concern with the written testing:
- a) Oral Tests -- PennDOT proposed to limit the availability of oral testing to those CDL applicants who have flunked the written CDL test once. In our opinion,

this places an unnecessary stress on functionally illiterate and reading comprehension deficient applicants; the oral examination should be available upon demand. PennDOT is currently allowing applicants for personal driving licenses to request oral examination; this practice should be extended to CDL applicants as well.

 Also, for those drivers who have a fluency problem in English, the oral tests should be available in Spanish and other languages.

b) <u>Written Test Locations</u> -- the tests should be offered in major cities around the state, possibly through the community college system.

c) <u>Earned Experience Credit</u> -- Under the federal guidelines, CDL applicants must correctly answer 80 percent of the questions on the basic knowledge and on each of the written endorsement tests the applicants would need to pass. While this percentage proves how well an applicant studied, it does not provide an adequate measure of the applicant's actual driving experience.

We propose that a credit for experience be included in the written testing procedure, similar to the credit given to veterans in the civil service system. In New York, a credit percentage system that accounts for a driver's actual years of hands-on driving is being considered. Under this "earned experience credit" system,

1 a driver would receive the following amount of credit 2 towards his written test score for each year of driving 3 experience: 4 Hired date to one year -- 5 percent 5 One to two years -- 10 percent 6 Two to five years -- 15 percent 7 Five to ten years -- 20 percent 8 Ten years or more -- 25 percent 9 The use of such a credit system would allow 10 for a more equitable scoring process by factoring in 11 the invaluable years of experience accumulated by career 12 drivers. 13 d) Availability of Written Test Questions --14 Given the serious consequences of flunking the CDL exam 15 for many drivers (namely, the loss of their livelihood), 16 PennDOT should be required to provide in advance a list of 17 all questions which will be used on the written knowledge 18 and endorsement tests. This information will allow 19 drivers to maximize their studying and test preparation 20 while minimizing the associated anxiety and stress. 5) Skills Testing -- The skills test portion 21 22 of the CDL testing process should be grandfathered for those drivers with good driving records for the previous 23 two years. 24

6)

25

Blood Alcohol Content/DUI Determination

Currently, a driver may be detained by a police officer for DUI if the officer has reasonable grounds to suspect the driver of having alcohol in his system. This method is imprecise, impractical, and highly arbitrary, at best.

Given the serious nature of a DUI violation (and the serious penalties involved for the convicted CDL holder), it is imperative that a more elaborate and reliable method of detection than just an officer's suspicions be required.

- 7) Mechanics of the CDL Changeover Process -Because of the complexities of the ongoing CDL changeover
 process, some minor adjustments are needed, such as:
- a) A limit should be established on the cost of the CDL license, the CDL test itself should be given free of charge to all applicants, and the state should be required to pick up any excess retesting charges or costs for all currently licensed (Class 2, 3 and 4) drivers who wish to be tested.
- b) Section 12(e) of the proposed CDL legislation should be changed to provide that failure to pass either portion of the test or the endorsements for a CDL (Class A, B, or C) will automatically renew an existing Class 3 license which will be valid until April 1, 1992 and will expire on that date.
 - 8) Protection for Drivers Against Unsafe

Equipment Violations and Mislabelling of Hazardous

Materials Cargoes -- Under the federal guidelines, drivers are held responsible for driving unsafe equipment and for the proper labelling of their hazardous materials cargo. In many instances, drivers are forced to drive inadequately equipped or unsafe vehicles. Unscrupulous shippers have also been known to mislabel hazardous materials cargoes in order to circumvent the current stringent federal regulations.

Individuals need the right to refuse to handle unsafe or noncomplying equipment and mislabeled hazardous cargo, since any violations in these areas would affect the status of their CDL license.

Also, any violation charged to a driver due to the condition of a vehicle, or to the registration/inspection stickers, or any similar condition, should be charged to the company which owns the vehicle, not to the driver.

With these modifications, the proposed CDL legislation would provide for a smooth changeover to the CDL system, and would allow all affected drivers the opportunity to obtain a CDL with a minimum of inconvenience and discomfort. The Pennsylvania Conference of Teamsters stands ready to offer any further assistance necessary.

We thank you for your attention today.

1	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much.
2	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Representative Markosek.
3	REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: Thank you, Mr.
4	Chairman.
5	BY REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK:
6	Q Just a quick question regarding illiteracy.
7	I understand it is a problem. Do you have any idea of
8	the percentage of the drivers that would have a problem
9	with that?
10	A We have had meetings with the Department
11	of Education and their figure is, the test is geared
12	to approximately a sixth grade level. Hazardous materials
13	is upwards to almost an eighth grade level. The Department
14	of Education estimates that approximately 30 percent of
15	Pennsylvania's population fails to read at a sixth grade
16	education level startling as it may seem.
17	REPRESENTATIVE MARKOSEK: Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN PETRARCA: Representative Veon.
19	REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Thank you, Mr.
20	Chairman.
21	BY REPRESENTATIVE VEON:
22	Q The same questions that I asked Mr. Yocum,
23	number one, do you think it is necessary as the UTU
24	suggested to require the employer to provide a vehicle
25	to take the test at no charge? Do you think it is

1 necessary to put that in the legislation? 2 Two, my other question was regarding the 3 current safeguards. If there are any an employee has 4 when he is required to take out an unsafe vehicle, if 5 any. 6 I will address those to the best of my 7 knowledge, Representative Veon. As far as mandating the 8 requirement that a driver has some protection in the 9 legislation, we feel very strongly that it should be there. 10 The issue as to whether or not there are other bodies 11 being the Federal Highway Safety Commission that will take 12 reports of unsafe vehicles. In all practicality that 13 may work, for instance, with a vehicle without brakes. 14 But if you get down to the nit-picky stuff that the CDL 15 legislation requires, it is not going to be safeguarded 16 and drivers are going to be taking vehicles possibly with 17 defective speedometers and they are going to be forced 18 into that situation. And then if they are caught for 19 speeding, they are going to have to pay the consequences. 20 REPRESENTATIVE VEON: Thank you. Thank 21 you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Thank you very much for 22 23 coming. BY CHAIRMAN CORMAN: 24 25 Yes, I do have one question. Q

Α Sure.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q You indicated on the testing for alcohol that currently, if I can find it, that the State Police only require the person be detained if they suspect there may be some abuse of alcohol. You seriously don't want a breath-o-lyzer test or some other test performed on every driver on every truck inspection test, do you?

Α Well, may I address that? What I meant specifically or what the Pennsylvania Conference means specifically, Senator, is the fact that there is a provision for a law enforcement official to take a driver out of service for 24 hours and the wording is the text. Now, we don't anticipate the problem too much in Philadelphia and the major counties. But as you drive through smaller townships and there are fines that are going to be imposed and there is going to be costs, you know, there is going to be revenue generated here, there is potential for abuse by local law enforcement authorities that we do not want to see come on to our members.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: Okay, thank you very much. And the final person is Mr. Harry Lombardo, President of the Transport Workers' Union. Mr. Lombardo, is he present? Your timing is excellent.

MR. LOMBARDO: Well, your timing is not.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN CORMAN: I apologize. Since all the witnesses are present, we decided to proceed straight through instead of taking a lunch break and I hope that doesn't inconvenience you.

MR. LOMBARDO: Well, it does but it is my fault, not yours. I am not really prepared to testify at this time, but I would at least raise some questions. In my attempt to prepare for these hearings today, yesterday when I had most of this data available to me the first time, some questions have arisen that would be of concern to our membership that at some point need to be answered for us.

CHAIRMAN CORMAN. Certainly please do this.

Besides the oral statement you wish to make today please send us a written document of the various concerns that you have and I will see that it is distributed to all members of the two Committees.

MR. LOMBARDO: Thank you. Okay, for the record, my name is Harry Lombardo. I am the President of the Transport Workers' Union Local 234 in Philadelphia. We represent about 5600 operators and vehicle maintainers in the Philadelphia region who work for SEPTA.

Some of the concerns that we have deal with the issue of grandfathering operators who have presently

held Class 2 operator's licenses for a number of years already. Would they be required to take skills and knowledge tests or is there some method people are considering that would just grandfather those folks in and deal specifically with new employees?

We are concerned with regards to the literacy of our membership in their ability to take the battery of tests that are suggested to be required. Is there some provision that the state will provide for training, some grant money that maybe unions could tap into or the transit agencies that we work for in conjunction with the unions could tap into to provide some type of training for our members.

We would be curious to know the number of times a person would be eligible to take the test before being considered washed out and unable to acquire a CDL license in the event they have difficulty passing the test.

The other area of concern that we have is in regards to the area of pre-trip inspections. There are a number of items that suggest that a vehicle should not go in service if they are defective. How would those regulations be enforced? For example, if an operator inspects a vehicle and determines that some turn signals are inoperable, marker lights inoperable, does he have the

right to refuse to take that vehicle out? If the vehicle does go out, what mechanism is there to resolve any disputes between the employer and the employee in regards to who made the determination for the vehicle to go on the street? How would these grievances be resolved? Typically through the grievance and arbitration procedure or what kind of protections does the state intend to provide the employees who are obligated to fulfill the requirements that you would set.

In regards to maintenance employees who repair vehicles that would be required to be tested, many of our members are hired under the age 21. The standard as I understand is that people of 21 years of age be required to get a commercial driver's license.

That would wipe out a significant number of our maintenance employees who are hired at the age of 18. Would limit their promotional opportunities and certainly maybe disqualify some people who are presently in positions simply because of their age. You have to consider how you are going to handle those people.

I guess at this point, since I am not very well prepared then, that is all the comments I would like to make. But I certainly would like an opportunity to prepare a formal statement and submit it to you at a later date. Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN CORMAN: We certainly would. I
2	apologize to you for not waiting until 1:15 when you were
3	regularly scheduled. However, if you submit it in writing,
4	we will certainly see that it is distributed. Questions?
5	(No response.)
6	No questions. I thank you very much and
7	I thank all others who were here today. This concludes
8	our hearing on the subject for today.
9	(Whereupon at 12:40 p.m. the hearing was
10	adjourned.)
11	(Prepared statement of Diane Farrell,
12	Recreation Vehicle Industry Association was as follows:)
13	DATE: September 5, 1989
14	TO: Representative Joseph A. Petrarca
15	State of Pennsylvania
16	COMPANY: House of Representatives
17	FROM: Dianne Farrell Recreation Vehicle Industry Association
18	(800) 336-0154
19	COMMENTS/INSTRUCTIONS:
20	"Attached are comments submitted by the
21	Recreation Vehicle Industry Association, the
22	trade association representing 300 manufacturers
23	of motor homes, travel trailers and van conver-
24	sions. Together, our manufacturers produce over
25	95 percent of all these products sold in the

1 United States. 2 "RVIA is very concerned over the provisions 3 in H 1722 and S 1057 which require operators of 4 motor homes (personal vehicles driven for less 5 than 30 days a year) to obtain commercial 6 driver's licenses in order to drive their motor 7 home over 26,000 GVWR. "To date, 38 states have passed commercial 9 driver license legislation and no state has seen 10 fit to require operators of motor homes to 11 obtain a commercial driver's license. 12 "For your information, attached is a notice 13 from the Federal Register and a letter from the 14 FHWA clarifying that motor homes operated for 15 personal use are not considered commercial 16 vehicles. 17 "RVIA welcomes the opportunity to discuss 18 this matter with you and we can share with you 19 how other states have chosen to treat motor homes. 20 We can be reached at 1-800-336-0154. 21 "IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE THE NUMBER OF PAGES 22 INDICATED, PLEASE CALL THE TELEPHONE NUMBER 23 LISTED ABOVE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. The Honorable Ray A. Barnhart 24 Federal Highway Administrator 25 U.S. Department of Transportation

400 Seventh Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590

2

1

3 Dear Mr. Barnhart:

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"The Recreation Vehicle Industry Association (RVIA), the national trade association representing the manufacturers of recreation vehicles (including motor homes and travel trailers) and their related suppliers, urgently requests the Federal Highway Administration to confirm our firm conviction that the provisions of the Commercial Motor Vehicle Act of 1986 (the 1986 Act) do not apply to recreation vehicles because neither the language of that Act nor its legislative history indicate any such intent. However, several states mistakenly believe that recreation vehicles (motor homes and travel trailers) are 'commercial motor vehicles' as defined in the 1986 Act. Consequently, those states believe they are required by federal law to apply the licensing and other provisions of the 1986 Act and FHWA regulations issued thereunder, to recreation vehicles (motor homes and travel trailers), in order to be eligible for federal grants under that Act.

"Concerns about the unsafe operation of

of trucks and buses on our nation's highways and the resulting alarming increase in the number of serious truck accidents, fatalities, injuries and property damage are what motivated Congress to pass the 1986 Act.

Among the major factors contributing to the increase in truck accidents since deregulation are overweight and poorly-maintained trucks, drivers who continued to drive trucks under other state licenses after their licenses had been revoked by one or more states because of poor driving records, and overly fatigued truck drivers who had driven with little or no rest for long periods of time over great distances.

"In contrast, the drivers of recreation vehicles are not subject to any of the competitive economic pressures to cut safety corners that truckers experience. Recreation vehicles are family vehicles that are driven solely for pleasure during family leisure periods and vacations. Since recreation vehicle drivers are not part of the 'truck driver' problem that Congress addressed in the 1986 Act, they were not

intended to be included in its solution.

"The term 'commercial motor vehicle'
in the 1986 Act should be construed in the
same manner as in similar previously enacted
laws administered by FHWA and regulations
issued thereunder, which do not classify
recreation vehicles as 'commercial motor
vehicles.'

"FHWA regulations governing vehicle size and weight limitations and route designations (issued under the authority of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) as amended) define a commercial motor vehicle as a 'motor vehicle designed or regularly used for carrying freight, merchandise, or more than ten passengers, but not including vehicles used for van pools.' Moreover, FHWA has interpreted the 102 inch vehicle width limitation imposed by the STAA as applying only to commercial vehicles and that the states are free to regulate the width of recreation vehicles and other vehicles as they see proper.

"The Motor Carrier Safety Act of 1984 was enacted to provide uniform commercial motor vehicle safety measures and strengthened

enforcement to reduce the number of fatalities and injuries and the level of property damage related to truck operations. This Act defines a commercial motor vehicle as 'any self-propelled or towed vehicle used on highways in interstate commerce to transport passengers or property... if such vehicle has a gross vehicle weight rating of 10,001 or more pounds,...is designed to transport more than 15 passengers; or...is used in the transportation of materials found by the Secretary of Transportation to be hazardous...' Recreation vehicles are not subject to this Act or regulations issued thereunder by FHWA.

"The Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986 mandates minimum standards for states to follow in the licensing of persons to operate commercial motor vehicles. The definition of a commercial vehicle in this Act closely follows the 1984 Act definition. However, the definition in the 1986 Act refers to motor vehicles used 'in commerce' to transport passengers or property, whereas the 1984 Act refers to motor vehicles used 'in interstate commerce' to transport passengers or property.

"The purpose of substituting 'in commerce'

1 for 'in interstate commerce' in the definition 2 of commercial motor vehicle was to make the 1986 3 Act apply to all operations of commercial motor 4 vehicles that Congress can regulate under the 5 commerce clause of the Constitution (Article I. 6 Section 8, Clause 3). The same purpose was 7 expressed by the words 'in commerce' in the 8 definition of commercial motor vehicle in the 9 Tandem Truck Safety Act of 1984. The words 10 'in commerce' did not make additional types of 11 vehicles such as 'family' recreation vehicles, 12 subject to either of these Acts. 13 "Accordingly, the term 'commercial motor 14 vehicle' in the 1986 Act does not include 15 recreation vehicles and the licensing and other 16 provisions of the 1986 Act do not apply to 17 operators of recreation vehicles. 18 "In conclusion, RVIA respectfully requests 19 that you: 20 "1. Promptly confirm in writing that 'family'recreation vehicles are not 'commercial 21 motor vehicles' under the 1986 Act; 22 "2. Place a copy of that confirmation in 23 Docket No. MC-125, and 24 Include a statement to that effect in 25 "3.

1 the preambles of Federal Register notices and 2 the text of proposed and final regulations 3 issued in Docket No. MC-125 and other dockets 4 under the authority of the 1986 Act. 5 Sincerely, 6 David J. Humphreys, President 7 David J. Humphreys, President Recreation Vehicle Industry Association P.O. Box 2999 1896 Preston White Drive 9 Reston, Virginia 22090 10 Dear Mr. Humphreys: 11 "This is in response to your letter of 12 March 19 to Federal Highway Administrator R. A. 13 Barnhart requesting a determination of the 14 applicability of the Commercial Motor Vehicle 15 Safety Act of 1986 (the Act) to drivers of 16 recreational vehicles. Your letter has been 17 forwarded to the Federal Highway Administration's Office of Motor Carrier Standards for reply. 18 19 "The Act defines a commercial motor vehicle 20 as one which is used in commerce to transport passengers or property. The vehicle must have 21 a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 22 26,000 pounds; or be designed to transport more 23 than 15 passengers including the driver, or be 24

used in the transportation of hazardous materials,

25

1 with some exceptions for certain classes and 2 quantities of hazardous materials. The definition 3 of commerce includes all trade, traffic and transportation conducted both in intrastate 5 and interstate commerce. A recreational vehicle. 6 however, which is not used in commerce and is 7 operated solely as a family/personal conveyance 8 for recreational purposes is not covered under 9 the Act. 10 'We will place a copy of your letter in 11 the public docket, and will fully address this 12 issue in the preamble of our next regulatory 13 document published on this subject, as you 14 have requested. 15 "Thank you for your interest in motor 16 carrier safety. 17 Sincerely yours, 18 R. P. Landis Associate Administrator for Motor Carriers" 19 20 I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence taken by me in the within matter are fully and 21 accurately indicated in my notes and that this is a true 22 and correct transcript of the same. 23 24 135 S. Landis Street 25 Hummelstown, PA 17036

1	The foregoing certification of this
2	transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same
3	by any means unless under the direct control and/or
4	supervision of the certifying reporter.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	