## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ORIGINAL COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

TRANSPORTATION HIGHWAYS SUBCOMMITTEE

IN RE: OUT-OF-STATE CDL AND BACKHAULING

STROUD TOWNSHIP CONFERENCE ROOM 1211 NORTH 5TH STREET STROUDSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 2004, 10:03 A.M.

## BEFORE:

HON. RICHARD A. GEIST, CHAIRMAN

HON. RONALD S. MARSICO

HON. MARIO SCAVELLO

HON. KELLY LEWIS

HON. EUGENE F. McGILL

ALSO PRESENT:

HON. WILLIAM I. GABIG

HILLARY M. HAZLETT, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC



## ARCHIVE REPORTING SERVICE

2336 N. Second Street (717) 234-5922 Harrisburg, PA 17110 FAX (717) 234-6190

	**************************************		
1	INDEX		
2			
3	WITNESS	PAGE	
4	Michael Hoffman	6	
5	David Loucks	13	
6	R. Craig Reed	42	
7	Ray Delfing	60	
8	Cathy Tennis	76	
9	Paul Dudzinski	8 6	
10			
11			
12			
13			•
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

CHAIRMAN GEIST: I'll call the hearing to order at this time. I guess it's redundancy but I'll introduce myself again. I'm State Representative Rick Geist from Altoona, Pennsylvania. That's far, far away from here.

What a beautiful town driving through coming out here. You read about this place; and if anyone has ever read the book, The Life and Times of Jay Gold, it's one of the best books written in the last ten years. I got a different perspective driving in here today.

I would like to introduce at this time
Representative Marsico. He's the Subcommittee
Chairman who will run the hearing. He can introduce
the members at the panel here at the front and then
we will immediately get into this. I think that
he'll have another announcement to make.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, everyone. Again, thanks to
Representative Kelly Lewis, Mario Scavello for having
us here this morning. And to my far right is
Representative Will Gabig of Cumberland County. To
my far left is Representative Gene McGill from
Montgomery County and Paul Parcel, who is the

Executive Director of the House Transportation

Democratic Minority Committee. Thank you for being here.

We're going to begin right away, if we can. First on the agenda is Representative Lewis. Did you want to make further comments or did you want to --

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Again, on a formal basis, I'm Kelly Lewis for the hearing on the Safe 80 Task Force and Legislative District 189 covering Monroe and Pike County. We formed that along with Mario Scavello back in 2001, and really the leadership of Representative Geist and Representative Marsico helped us get out of the gate on that task force. And we modeled it directly after the Capitol Beltway Project and the great initiatives they had launched down there to try and reduce accidents.

We've been very successful on Safe 80 reducing accidents by almost 60 percent in the 3-year period. We're very pleased with that result.

As everyone knows, we still have a long way to go on that stretch of highway, a very dangerous stretch of highway that was designed in the 1950s.

We're looking for assistance as we move forward on engineering construction on some projects over the next several years.

We're pleased to host this hearing today in Monroe County. We're pleased that the House Transportation Committee is showing an interest in the topics that are very important to our taxpayers in Monroe County.

Mario and I know firsthand how difficult it is to address issues impacting Interstate 80, and so we're pleased to have them front and center.

Everyone had to get on Route 80 for the most part to get to this hearing today.

It was built to handle 13,000 vehicles per day. Now we're hitting 75 to 80,000 vehicles today. So just by the numbers, you can see the impact on the issues.

We're pleased to have everyone here today. We have a lot of folks from our Safe 80 Task Force. We're pleased to be the host.

Thank you, Representative Geist.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Okay. The first panel to testify is the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. That's Michael Hoffman, Director of the Bureau of Transportation and Safety; Gerald Clark, Supervisor of the Scranton District Office; and David Loucks, the Regional Enforcement Manager of the

Scranton District Office, Bureau of Transportation and Safety. Welcome.

If I could mention that if you have written testimony, we would ask that you submit it for the record; but somewhat, if you can, summarize that testimony if you're able to do that.

Thank you. You may begin.

MR. HOFFMAN: Good morning, Chairman Geist, Subcommittee Chairman Marsico and members of the Subcommittee.

My name is Michael Hoffman. I am the

Director of the Public Utility Commission, Bureau of

Transportation Safety. Accompanying me today are

David Loucks to my right, he's the Manager of the

Harrisburg and Scranton District Offices; and also

Gerald Clark, he's the Supervisor of the Scranton

District Office.

Following my testimony, David Loucks will be providing us with a presentation about the Commission's truck safety inspection enforcement efforts that are being carried out in conjunction with the Safe 80 Task Force.

I want to thank the members of the House Transportation Subcommittee on Highways for this opportunity to testify at today's hearing.

The Public Utility Commission regulates for-hire motor carriers that transport persons or property within the Commonwealth.

13.

These carriers include not only trucking companies but also motor coach operators, taxi companies, limousine businesses, providers of paratransit service, airport shuttle services, and scheduled route bus carriers.

Currently, the Commission regulates over 7,000 motor carriers that provide transportation services in Pennsylvania.

The Commission's truck safety efforts are overseen by the Bureau of Transportation and Safety's Motor Carrier Services and Enforcement Division.

The division carries out safety programs for intrastate, for-hire property carriers to whom the Division issues operating authority.

These programs include a roadside inspection program on nine interstate routes, safety fitness reviews for new operators, and a safety audit program.

The Division also participates in the Motor Carriers Safety Assistance Program, MCSAP, administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.

The Motor Carrier Safety Division is comprised of 53 enforcement personnel who are assigned to one of five district offices. Those offices are located in Pittsburgh, Altoona, Harrisburg, Philadelphia and nearby in Scranton.

Most enforcement officers have previous police experience and/or a degree in a criminal justice or a police science related field. Each of our enforcement personnel have successfully completed standard training courses in the inspection of trucks, motor coaches, and vehicles carrying hazardous materials, including cargo nets.

In addition, officers have received training regarding vehicle registration requirements, safety reviews, audits, and drug interdiction.

Each officer commits 40 percent of his or her enforcement time to the MCSAP. The majority of this time is focused on roadside truck safety inspections; however, officers also conductinspections of motor coaches at various bus destination points in the Commonwealth.

In June of this year, PUC enforcement officers began assisting the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration in its New Carrier Entrance Program, which evaluates the safety management

systems of the carrier to assure it can comply with the FMCSA regulations.

The MCSAP provides an 80 percent reimbursement to the Commission, monies that they spend on this program.

Over the past five years, Motor Carrier
Division enforcement officers completed 60,268
roadside inspections of trucks as part of its
commitment to the MCSAP. From these inspections,
14,390 vehicles were placed out of service for
serious safety violations while 5,771 drivers were
placed out of service. In addition, more than 8,492
summary citations were issued for drivers and
carriers for safety violations.

In addition to the truck enforcement responsibilities carried out as part of MCSAP, the Commission also has implemented inspection, investigation, and enforcement programs for the trucking carriers whom it has issued operating authority.

The Motor Carrier Division ensures that each carrier maintains insurance coverage and it has instituted several safety programs aimed at truck carriers.

Since 1995, the Division has conducted a

. 1

safety fitness review of each new carrier that the Commission has issued operating authority. A safety fitness review is an evaluation of the carrier's management system to determine whether the carrier is prepared to comply with the Commission's driver and vehicle safety requirements. The carriers must successfully complete the review or its operating authority will be revoked.

. 9

In 2003, a total of 508 safety reviews were completed with new, intrastate trucking companies.

The Division also conducts roadside truck safety inspections on non-interstate highways that attempt to focus on trucks making shorter intrastate movements.

Over the past five years, enforcement officers have conducted 8,528 driver/vehicle inspections on non-interstate routes. From these inspections, 1,168 vehicles were placed out of service for serious safety violations while 205 drivers were placed out of service. In addition, 290 citations were issued to drivers and carriers for safety violations.

Finally, the Division conducts investigations and audits of carriers that are subject of a public or internal Commission complaint

for a serious accident. Fines and certificate revocation may result from the violations found during the investigation and audit.

5`

In the course of their duties, Commission enforcement officers encounter non-English-speaking drivers. Though Federal and State safety regulations require truckdrivers to be able to read and speak English sufficiently to converse with the general public, to understand highway traffic signs and signals, to respond to official inquiries and to make entries on reports and records, PUC officers opine that an undetermined percentage of drivers are unable to meet this requirement.

When encountering a non-English-speaking driver, officers struggle to obtain the various shipping and driver documents needed to conduct the inspection.

In addition, officers may be unable to conduct a safety examination on the vehicle and undercarriage components because they fear that the driver is unable to understand their instructions when they are under the truck checking brakes, suspensions, frame, and other components.

Officers have few options to appropriately deal with the non-English-speaking driver. Since it

is not an out-of-service violation, they are unable to require the driver to cease operating the vehicle.

2.5

The most significant action that the officer has available is notification to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration via the inspection report, requesting the FMCSA do a follow-up investigation with that employing motor carrier.

In regard to violations of the Commonwealth backhauling laws, to the best of anyone's knowledge in the Bureau, Commission enforcement officers had only two encounters with vehicles that were transporting foodstuffs after recently transporting refuse or some other type of bulk hazardous material.

Both of those instances occurred on Route I-80 in western Pennsylvania. In each case, the officers was assisted by other law enforcement agencies and the Department of Environmental Protection to complete the prosecution.

That concludes my testimony. At this time,

I would like to have David Loucks provide a

presentation about the Bureau's efforts with the Safe

80 Task Force. At the conclusion of Mr. Loucks'

presentation, we will be glad to take your questions.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Go ahead.

MR. LOUCKS: If we are able to dim the lights a little bit to see this presentation. This is going to be a brief overview of the PUC's work at Safe 80 over the last three years.

There's going to be some pictures of our efforts at the Delaware Water Gap Bridge. We'll be taking a look at some of the figures and you're going to hear a lot of high out-of-service rates. We'll show you a bar graph here of what we have found over the past three years.

Also, you'll see pictures of the out-of-service items. We have some great systems. We have some pictures there of the actual brake components.

I want to start off with our involvement.

We got started back in the high profile accident of

January '01 was the trash truck coming into

Pennsylvania and colliding with the two vehicles and
ending up taking two lives.

Shortly thereafter, Representative Lewis did call a meeting, press conference at the Monroe County Commissioners' Office right down the road here. There was a large attendance there; State Police, PUC, and PennDOT attendances at that meeting.

Shortly thereafter, we got involved and

began our inspections at the Delaware Water Gap utilizing that Triple E Strategy of Enforcement, Education, and Engineering. We are involved in the enforcement end and also describe -- we're also involved somewhat in the education end of that.

PUC Motor Carrier Enforcement Division out of the Scranton District is responsible for 14 counties in the northeast. As Director Hoffman mentioned, regulating trucking companies and also motor coach bus companies, household movers, taxi cabs, limousines, paratransit vans and passenger brokers carried out by Supervisor Clark and six enforcement officers participate in the truck and bus program under MCSAP.

These are some facts to throw out. These come from the Federal Motor Carrier Safety

Administration of February of this year and looking at the number of trucks nationwide. 2002 numbers looking at 8 million trucks, large trucks, tractor-trailers. In 2000, they're looking at 3 million drivers. There's a lot of equipment out there to look at.

Down below, you'll see fiscal year 2003 roadside inspections. This is nationwide under the MCSAP and the out-of-service rates. So over 2

million inspections done in 2003 resulting in the driver out-of-service rate -- this is nationwide -- 6.9. The vehicle out-of-service rate is 23.2.

In Pennsylvania, that driver out-of-service rate is 7.8. The vehicle out-of-service rate is 33 percent. You'll see later on the higher percentages here we have in Safe 80, which is nearly double that out-of-service rate.

This is the picture of the Water Gap,

Interstate 80 coming west into the toll plaza. This
is where most of our inspections, again, right there
at the toll plaza. This is westbound. Trucks are
paying their toll. This is where the first contact
the officers will have.

Later on, I will show you the numbers coming across the bridge, a statement from the bridge website, 53,000 vehicles per day on that bridge.

There's a picture of the trash truck there. We're set up on the left side of that slide.

There's enforcement officers there with their vans and initial contact where the stop is made as the drivers come through that plaza is the first contact where they greet the driver and determine -- and get some documents and determine if they're going to conduct an inspection.

Again, the traffic count on that bridge, taking off their website, Delaware Water Gap Bridge website, indicating an increase in traffic is 50 percent since the '70s, average daily traffic 53,000 vehicles, approximate 10 percent is the truck traffic. We're looking at over 5300 tractor-trailers per day.

1.0

Enforcement staff set up on the side, their vans. One of the officers there is wearing a reflector vest. This is the numbers here that we took a look at over the three years, that this will be our fourth year involved in Safe 80, but we get started in April of '01. We took a comparison of April to November of prime inspection months.

This is based on an average of 1300 inspections per year over those three years, first 2001, 2002, 2003.

The first year out, you can see the high out of service in the blue. That's the vehicle out-of-service rate at 49 percent. Driver out-of-service rate that year was 17. We were somewhat surprised with that rate. We weren't expecting that.

We did have an officer that worked the bridge on a regular basis. He always had a high

rate, but it wasn't until we got involved in Safe 80 and we had all of the officers working in that area that we came to see the high numbers.

Those numbers were also experienced by

State Police and PennDOT. They had similar

out-of-service rates. We invited also the agents

from the Federal Motor Carrier and Safety

Administration out of their Scranton office. They

were also down that year and experienced the same

out-of-service rate.

The second year we thought we were doing a little better after our efforts. The vehicle out-of-service rate dropped to 35 percent. Then we see the driver out-of-service rate start to climb in 2002.

Then last year, the average vehicle out-of-service rate is back up in the high 40 percent range. We continue to see the driver out-of-service rate decline.

In talking with Supervisor Clark, one of the reasons we feel for the increase in driver out of service may be due to the fact that the officers have keyed in on a segment of commercial drivers, not full size tractor-trailer but more of the people involved in industry, small labors that are driving smaller, commercial motor vehicles and are outside the 100-mile radius of New Jersey coming into the state. We're finding they do not have the log book or are not familiar with the hours of service.

2.

3 \*

The officers have keyed in on that segment, although the commercial motor vehicle is not the full-size tractor-trailer, we felt that has boosted that out-of-service rate for the drivers.

Inspections and citations. Again, we are averaging about 1300 inspections per year at that site on Interstate 80 and average of 150,000 citations per year issued to the trucks and the owners and drivers.

Over that three-year period, we placed over 1600 trucks out of service and taken over 850 drivers out of service for serious violations that would be the out-of-service criteria.

Questions always came up, you know, we're in the prevention end, trying to prevent accidents, get the fatigued driver off, remove the unsafe truck. What is the end effect of that? How do you measure that? Have we prevented any fatalities?

There was a model created by FMCSA in 1998 that addressed that question. I have some information on that. This comes from the Volpe

National Transportation System Center analysis using data from 1998 to 2000.

The model they come up with takes into account Federal and State enforcement activities, in particular here the roadside inspection that we're involved with and also compliance reviews.

We talked about with Director Hoffman the safety reviews that we on all new carriers obtain a certificate, Pennsylvania PUC certificate. It's a review in their office of time records, drug and alcohol testing, a lot of books, vehicle maintenance.

The Feds in this module that they use, the analysis indicates that the roadside inspection nationwide -- and this is 2000 data -- saved 420 lives and avoided over 6400 injuries.

The compliance review and safety audit, we're looking at 64 lives saved and over 1,000 injuries avoided by using the compliance and safety review.

This information is available in a separate handout and is available on the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration website, more detailed information on that analysis.

Getting back to the inspection site there at 80, initial stop, the officer then greets the

driver and begins obtaining documentation.

.3

The officers are required to wear reflective vests while working the bridge as a large amount of traffic coming through that toll plaza.

Once they decide they're going to inspect the vehicle, it's taken down into the rest area and the officer then begins to enter in information on his laptop computer that generates a report for the driver.

Later on that day, the officer uploads that information to the PennDOT database and that information is later uploaded from PennDOT into the Federal database. They have a history of all of the carriers that have been inspected.

Beginning at Level 1 inspection, which is a full inspection including brake inspections underneath, the officer here is checking out brake hoses; the officer here conferring with the driver explaining some of the violations. These are all done at the Safe 80 site there at the Delaware Water Gap.

We're also taking a look at the log book to compare if the driver did comply with the out of service. As you're probably aware, it's the first change in 60 years of the Hours of Service

Regulations and the industry is dealing with those changes.

The Federal Motor Carrier Administration put out those changes in January of '04. The idea was to permit the driver to obtain that restorative sleep, previous eight hours off duty is now ten hours with the idea of getting that fatigued driver off the road.

With that final rule, it's estimated those new regulations will save up to 75 lives and prevent over 1300 fatigued related crashes annually.

It moves towards that 24-hour block again.

It allows that opportunity for that driver to get
that restorative sleep. There had to be a balance
between the industry and the enforcement.

I've seen a recent article where the Wal-Mart company and their drivers indicated that they thought they would have to hire more drivers and more cost involved and the latest report is adapting the schedules they found are more efficient. They didn't incur the cost they thought they would.

Taking a look at some of the items here are the brake defects and what places a truck, tractor-trailer out of service. This is a brake chamber that they took at the rest area, defective

brake chamber. Here is a defective brake shoe on one of the units.

This may be a little hard to see but it's a contaminated brake drum. There's oil and grease inside the brake drum rendering that unit inoperative. There's a little view of it there.

It's coded inside. And this is the common out of service of brakes.

Also common is safe loading, anything that is not secured, you can see a loose cylinder on the back of this truck. Going down the highway, you see a piece of four-by-four timber laying on the highway that has fallen off a truck. That is because the load was not secured. That's also an out-of-service item and ranks high in percentages. And this unit here did not have an end gate so it was also placed out of service.

You can see here once the out-of-service sign is written, the orange decal is applied to the windshield. The truck is placed out of service at that inspection site and not allowed to move until that repair is made.

Unlike like a speeding ticket, they're given a ticket that you're not allowed to go down the road. The out of service is built in fine with that

in addition to our citation. That unit can be sitting there whether it's full or empty, could be there three or four hours.

The cost of bringing out a repair facility to make that repair in the case of a driver out of service, he may be out until midnight. There's an embedded cost with that out-of-service order.

This is also a target enforcement area along 80. The State Police have done a terrific job slowing the cars down and issuing a lot of citations to aggressive drivers.

You might have came in and took notice to the dots that are up there on the roadway, educating the people about a safe following distance. It seemed to work out pretty well. Here we can see a trash truck actually slowing down to maintain two dots.

Also I believe these are still up, the billboards talking about the Safe 80 and zero tolerance. Also, with the cooperation of a roadway trucking company, they have a rolling billboard with the Safe 80 message that they've kept in the Pocono area. Again, getting the word out on Safe 80.

Education end, our officers and the supervisor also attend and whenever invited to

driver safety meetings in the area. So we will go out and explain the program and answer what questions they have on whether it be vehicle inspection or the new hours of service. We do that on a regular basis to get that word out to educate the carriers as to regulations and what is expected.

There's another picture of a billboard.

Then our ongoing commitment to making Safe 80 safer.

Six enforcement officers, all overtime committed to the Safe 80 project.

There's one more tool I want to show you that the officers have available. It's used as a screening tool that they can decide. There's so many trucks out there. We only have so much time and how they can use this tool to decide whether they want to perform an inspection or not.

It's called the ISS. It's part of the ASFMCE program. Inspection Selection System. On each truck you will see a DOT number and an NC number on the side of the door.

As that comes into the rest area, the officer can enter that information. He sees the DOT number on the side. He'll enter that information right in and hit the enter button. It will bring a whole history. This is a database of the carriers

across the country.

It will have all of their previous inspections. He gives them a rating and an assigned number with the green light indicating this is at a low out-of-service rate, low violation rate. The officer doing a quick walk around may want to pass on this truck and take another truck.

So as another truck may come in, he'll enter another number. This time it may come up with a different rating. The officer doesn't know until he enters that number.

Again, these are carriers based all over the United States. He hits the enter button. Now we're up into the yellow flashing light, a few more violations. It's optional for the officer whether he decides to do that inspection.

Again, that gives you a breakdown of your out-of-service rate compared to the national rate.

That's a lot of detailed information that the officer has ahead of time in deciding whether to perform that inspection.

And last the number put in here, it's going to generate a red light. The carrier has a high history. It's a carrier out of Hazleton, a history of brake violations, steering, suspension, medical

certificate. 1 This was a recent suspension that was 3 placed out of service here by one of the officers and ended up filling up the whole violation page as a 4 result of that inspection. Again, just another tool that the officers have available to make efficient 6 7. use of their time. That concludes my presentation at this 8 Director Hoffman and myself and Supervisor 9 Clark will be willing to entertain any questions you 10 11 may have. 12 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you very 13 I want to say that that was an excellent presentation, very informative. I know that 14 Representative Geist has a question. 15 16 CHAIRMAN GEIST: Is it Bureau Director Hoffman? 17 MR. HOFFMAN: It's Mike normally. 18 CHAIRMAN GEIST: What overlapping duties do 19 20 you have with DEP when it comes to the garbage 21 haulers? 22 MR. HOFFMAN: There really is not an

24 CHAIRMAN GEIST: That's the answer.

25 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay.

overlapping duty with them other than --

1 CHAIRMAN GEIST: Explain their duties 2 versus your duties. MR. HOFFMAN: Primarily what we're doing is 3 we're stopping the vehicles. We may identify the 4 vehicle as a participant in a backhauling violation. 5 If that were to occur, they have -- we're 6 7 immediately going to get a law enforcement agency involved. 8 On the two occasions in which we have 9 participated in that type of activity, both of those 10 11 occasions we received the assistance from the State 12 Police; but DEP has the seizure abilities for the 13 They're responsible for the contents in the 14 vehicle once we start that prosecution. 15 CHAIRMAN GEIST: A garbage truck coming 16 into Pennsylvania that's leaking, who is responsible? 17 MR. HOFFMAN: That will be DEP. 18 CHAIRMAN GEIST: A garbage truck coming 19 into Pennsylvania without the right licenses and 20 seals, whose responsibility is that? MR. HOFFMAN: To the best of my knowledge 21 it will be DEP. It would not be us. 22 23 CHAIRMAN GEIST: That wouldn't be the 24 Department of Revenue? 25 That could be. MR. HOFFMAN:

CHAIRMAN GEIST: If you were -- if you were to make a statement as to how we can improve the efficiency of this process so that we have one stop, one shop enforcement and one overall responsible vertical line of command, how would you see that happening?

MR. HOFFMAN: Well, certainly, I know that consolidation efforts have begun. We have begun to attend those meetings. We've attended two thus far.

I think there's been some discussions that have taken place between PennDOT and the State Police.

The bottom line for me, Mr. Chairman, is if it's the right thing to do for the citizens of this Commonwealth, then we shouldn't certainly be standing in that way to protect.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: The amount of people in the sandbox who want to keep the sandbox piece their own is great.

I know that this Chairman is really concerned about process and that we're missing too many that should be gotten and without the authority horizontally changed to a vertical authority, I don't think it ever works. Its time has come.

We've had way too many accidents. We've

. 9

1.5

```
had too many people slip through. The enforcement
powers that are needed out there need coordinated.
In the PUC, you are the highest ranking officer that
has any control over this; is that correct?
         MR. HOFFMAN: Over consolidation?
          CHAIRMAN GEIST: No. Over the enforcement.
         MR. HOFFMAN: Yes. That is correct.
         CHAIRMAN GEIST: And in the chain of
command of the PUC, where would your office be?
         MR. HOFFMAN: Above me is the Executive
Director of the Commission and then, of course, we
all answer to the five Commissioners.
         CHAIRMAN GEIST: Right. And they're
appointees by the Senate of Pennsylvania.
         MR. HOFFMAN: That's correct.
         CHAIRMAN GEIST: I'm not putting you on the
spot. I don't really want to do that. I am very,
very concerned. I have been for 15 years. It's
nothing new.
         About this whole process -- I know in rail,
it is the same way. We're not just talking about
trucking. We're talking about rail. I know that
with what we've been looking at in rail that it's
something that this Committee needs to address.
         I hope that within a year, we will have a
```

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

very high ranking cabinet official have absolute 1 responsibility for all of this with a chain of 2 command that reports that process. 3 I don't know whether that's going to be under PennDOT. I don't know whether it's going to be 5 6 under the State Police, but I know its time has 7 really come. It's one of the things that we need to do 8 to make roads much safer in Pennsylvania. I thank you for your testimony. I think it was very 10 excellent. 11 12 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you. 13 other questions? 14 Representative Gabig. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: I'll defer to 15 16 Representative Scavello. 17 REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Director Hoffman, Dave, you did a fabulous job. Thank you for coming 18 19 down. In the short term and just to pick up on 20 21 Representative Geist's question, what can we do on the entrance into our state here to reduce these 22 -23 vehicle out of services and the driver out of 2.4 services?

25 Is there any way that maybe coordinating an

effort with New Jersey because what I'm told, some of the vehicles on the other side of that bridge are parked and they're not coming through and the vehicles that are out of -- some of those vehicles that know they're out of service and what kind of penalties can we put on some of these? Can we increase -- I know the penalties have been increased but what more can we do?

MR. HOFFMAN: Certainly -- I think I'm going to let Dave address that question for the most part but certainly, I think there's the opportunity for that kind of cooperation, especially with contact with the Federal Motor Carrier and Safety Administration to coordinate some kind of joint effort.

Certainly, Dave and Jerry may know some specifics that have been going on or may be planned.

MR. LOUCKS: We have in the past in both Federal Motor Carriers agents from Scranton District Office and also Dave Yenson in New Jersey, they have special agents from the FMCSA and have attended Safe 80 meetings; they being out of the New Jersey office, the highway patrol that handles their programs.

As we took a look at the numbers, mixed up inspections of the surrounding states, Pennsylvania,

Ohio, New York, we're averaging 70,000 inspections.

New Jersey was a little bit behind in the number of MCSAP inspections in the area of 45, 46,000. They have improved their program.

We are working with Dave Yenson out of the New Jersey office. When I gave the high number of New Jersey based carriers out of service rather than go to three or four systems for those to filter to the Feds, I will take those, collate those and mail them to Dave Yenson so he can target some of these New Jersey-based carriers for safety audit. We are working with the state of New Jersey trying to improve that.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: When you get a carrier with that tremendous amount of out-of-service, what can we do to really come down hard on these carriers?

MR. LOUCKS: 'Again, this report goes into a database in Pennsylvania to the Feds. It develops a history for that carrier. The Motor Carrier and Safety Administration's primary responsibility in conducting a safety audit, they have what is called a hit list and what triggers that is that high out-of-service rate.

So there have been safety audits conducted

1 as a result of inspections done here on Safe 80, 2 whether it be a Jersey-based carrier or Pennsylvania. 3 All of those reports go into that database and they have the availability to get that 4 information to trigger that audit. 5 MR. HOFFMAN: Ultimately, they can lose 6 their operating authority. They are placed out of That out-of-service list is communicated to service. our office, our safety office, and all of our 10 officers receive that information. 11 So if we happen to spot that carrier 12 operating after that out-of-service directive has 13 been given by the FMCSA, certainly, we can respond to that but they take that action. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Dave, would this 16 be the right time to ask for help at the Delaware 17 Water Gap? 18 MR. LOUCKS: As you can see from the 19 numbers of the amount of traffic, more inspections, 20 and that's why it actually has worked out in that to 21 get as many inspections done. 22 PennDOT has trained certified local police 23 to work some of the secondary roads. We do have a 24 higher number of inspections compared to New Jersey. 25 Comparing, you know, looking at the number

of trucks that are out there and the number of 1 drivers, we're getting a drop in the bucket. So 2 certainly, more inspections, also better inspection 3 sites, similar to Grantville on 81 or on 80 where you have electric signs out in the interstate directing 5 traffic into the separate truck inspection areas. 6 Here shortly, we're going to be losing that 7 site to Safe 80 to conduct those inspections. 8 certainly, those two items would lead to increased 9 10 safety. REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Thank you very 11 much. 12 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Representative 13 14 Gabiq? REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you, Chairman 15 16 Marsico. 17 Thank you, gentlemen, for your presentation. I come from Carlisle in Cumberland 18 County. It's great to be up here in the Poconos 19 20 area. It was a good drive coming up with Chairman 21 Marsico. We read the local paper. The Patriot News, 22 23 in the capital, the headline, lead story was the issue on increased truck fatalities last year in 24

Pennsylvania, particularly in my area of Cumberland

County and the Capital Beltway. It's certainly a topical issue in my area.

I just wanted to make sure I understood the statistics before I ask my question, Director Hoffman, and I think it's on page 3 of your testimony where you give some pretty startling statistics about the vehicles being placed out of order due to serious safety violations and out of orders.

I want to thank Chairman Geist for permitting me to be here. I'm not a member of the Committee or Subcommittee. In my home area, this is a critical issue.

So maybe the members of the Transportation Committee are a little more familiar with these statistics. But when you say drivers placed out of order versus vehicles placed out of service, are those in overlap? I mean, could the vehicle be placed out of service and the driver out of service or can they be, you know, the driver is out, the vehicle is out?

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, sir. For example, you may have a truck that has defective brakes to the point where it is grounded. That driver of that vehicle may have an out-of-service violation that is severe enough to place him out of service for eight

hours, the rest of the day, or even so gross it may place him out of service for several days.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: And in the issue of non-English-speaking drivers, when the inspections are being conducted, they're not -- as I understood your testimony, they're not able to cooperate with the inspectors to the point where some inspections just aren't done because of safety concerns by the inspector. They don't want to get underneath trucks or whatever.

So I guess it's fair for me to conclude from that testimony that that number would be even greater if you were able to complete the inspections with these non-English-speaking drivers. Is that the gist of your testimony?

MR. HOFFMAN: I think it's possible that that could be -- I think the concern is we're unable to get underneath a vehicle for fear that for the lack of communication ability to be able to properly instruct the driver on the actions we want him to take.

The driver has to apply the brakes at different times. We're placed in a compromising position to begin with because all of the brakes, the parking brakes, emergency-type brakes are all

released on that vehicle.

We're underneath there, depending on the blocks that we have the vehicles blocked with in order to hold that vehicle in place, we really can't afford to have that driver hit the starter or do certain things while our officers are under the vehicle.

We've have some close calls where somebody laid their helmet down. The driver of the vehicle thought he was being asked to do something, he hit the starter and it jumped the blocks and smashed the helmet.

We've had some issues where people are misinterpreting. That happens even when English is not the barrier.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: If I understood your testimony, it is a Federal requirement that there be a proficiency in English by the driver.

Is it a violation here in Pennsylvania, a summary citation, or any other violation to your knowledge in Pennsylvania if they fail to have the minimum English proficiency that they're able to participate in these inspections and understand their training and their duties under the law?

MR. HOFFMAN: Certainly, for any violation,

and the Public Utility Commission, PennDOT as part of their chapter -- Title 67 PA Code has adopted the FMCSA safety regulations.

. 6

Our officers are able to write summary citations for non-out-of-service violations.

However, our bureau of policy is that generally we want the officers to write for the most critical violations, those being out-of-service violations.

And that's just --

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Let me put it to you straight. I mean, can you take someone who can't speak English, can't understand the rules, can't comply with your inspections, can you take him out of service under your guidelines out of Pennsylvania law today?

MR. HOFFMAN: We are unable to do that.

The Vehicle Code requires us to comply with the out-of-service criteria, which is uniform across the nation.

Currently, I know this is an issue, it is a large issue across the nation, but currently that out-of-service criteria is not contained in the provisions which allow officers to make judgments about English-speaking ability and then place them out of service.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you very much 1 for your answers. 2 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Any other 4 5 questions by the members? I have just a couple of questions, if I could. 6 First, I want to acknowledge that 7 Representative Baldwin is here from Lancaster County. 8 We welcome you, Mr. Baldwin. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE BALDWIN: Thank you. 11 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Following up on non-English-speaking drivers obtaining illegal CDLs, 12 13 do you have any idea how they're getting them in this 14 state or New Jersey? MR. HOFFMAN: I don't. I'll ask either of 15 my colleagues if they have any idea. Jerry? 16 17 MR. CLARK: We had an incident at the 18 Delaware Water Gap where we had a driver that came In checking the CDL, we found that it was an 19 20 address that was consistent with another driver that was driving behind him. 21 22 And as it turns out, the licenses are issued out of Florida. They're based in New Jersey. 23 24 We turned the information over to New Jersey. 25 seemed that these two drivers were issued licenses

where they gave their address as the actual testing center in Florida.

New Jersey State Police received that information, Lieutenant Harry Dunkley. They followed up on it and made action on that issue.

It is a problem nationally in some areas where drivers are able to obtain commercial driver licenses, but it's probably because of the testing and licensing procedures.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Do you think our rate of non-English-speaking drivers is higher than other states? Does the northeast have a higher rate do you think?

MR. CLARK: In this particular area or the Commonwealth?

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: In this particular area and the Commonwealth.

MR. CLARK: I would say higher in this particular area because it's a larger route where vehicles traverse. It's like a funnel. You have to go through Pennsylvania to get to New England. You have to go through Pennsylvania to get to the metropolitan. If you're going to travel points down south, because this is the transportation corridor and the majority of the people that employ drivers

and in the trash business utilize those people that have a certain amount of ethnicity. It's a broad spectrum.

There's some Slovak people that are involved in transportation. There's some Chinese people that we're unable to communicate with. It's a board spectrum that we have to deal with. Taking our officers and teaching them Spanish is not going to solve the issue.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Do you think that New Jersey and New York officials are looking into this and taking this as serious as this Committee is and our state is at this time? Are they taking a serious look into this?

MR. CLARK: I think all jurisdictions are.

I'm a member of the Commercial Vehicle Safety

Alliance Training Committee, which is an organization, international organization that represents all of the jurisdictions in the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

This issue has been on the table at CVSA.

The problem is that CVSA, other than the out-of-service criteria, is not a government agency.

They're working with partners that are trying to foster some legislation that may go nationally to a

1 iust issue. 2 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Any other questions? 3 I appreciate your time, your effort here, 4 your help, and your education on these issues. 5 very important issues. 6 Thanks very much. 7 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: The next to 8 9 testify is R. Craiq Reed, Director of the Bureau of 10 Highway Safety and Traffic Engineering, the 11 Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. 12 Good morning, Craig. You may begin. MR. REED: Good morning. On behalf of 13 14 PennDOT and the Bureau of Highway Safety and Traffic 15 Engineering, I want to thank you for the opportunity 16 to again interact with the Committee. 17 Our Bureau, we have a staff of roughly 89 18 persons. Our responsibility is summarized very 19 shortly as mobility safety and security of the 20 traveling public. The Bureau deals with everything from line 21 22 painting and signing that you see along the roadways 23 to intelligent transportation systems technologies, 24 to maintaining, supporting, and enhancing our crash

record system of storing annually anywhere from 130

to 140,000 crashes that occur in the Commonwealth.

We deal with Homeland Security and emergency incident response. We have a very broad charge in dealing with some very heavy issues. I certainly commend the Committee's work in this effort.

We try to look at it that when it comes to mobility safety and security, I've been using the slogan: Everyone, Everyday, Every Opportunity, because when you look at the Commonwealth and the 40,000 mile road systems and the 70,000 local road systems, over 1300 police departments, over 1200 municipalities, the challenge of dealing with mobility safety and security is certainly a huge one.

We think the only way we can be successful is through a combined effort of everyone who has a stake in this mission.

We talked a little bit -- others talked about engineering, education, and enforcement as a way we can deal with safety and mobility. The other thing I wanted to point out is that when you talk about that, the other three things to keep in mind when we talk about safety, there's only three things we can deal with; the driver, the vehicle, and the road.

You heard from the folks from the PUC taking about the vehicle side and the driver from the motor carrier area.

What I've been asked to talk about is our safety corridor policy that our Department is developing. Again, this is focusing more towards the driver and certainly towards the education and enforcement part of the puzzle to dealing with safety within the Commonwealth.

The safety corridor policy is a result of Act 229, which was passed in December of 2002. It authorizes the creation of highway safety corridors by the Department through traffic and engineering investigation.

The law establishes a doubling of fine for moving violations and also requires signing of the corridors to alert motorists.

In order to make the Act enforceable, there's two actions that need to occur. One, we need to develop and publish a policy. Then within two years, we need to convert that policy to a regulation.

What I would like to do is just share with the Committee and those present just briefly a little bit of what is the logic behind the corridor policy

as we developed it today and sort of where are we at with the enactment of that policy and ensuing legislation.

1.0

Currently, the criteria that we've looked at is looking at crash frequency, the geometrics of the roadway to make sure that anything we identify as a safety corridor, is it safe for enforcement and patrolling for both the officers and the traveling public? Is there space for the signing that is required by the Act?

The third thing that we've looked at and I think is one of the more critical parts of the policy is enforcement commitment. We think it will be of little value to put up signs of safety corridors without a commitment for a certain minimum level of enforcement to be associated with those corridors.

Part of the logic behind our criteria is looking at one of our larger goals that we have not only within the Commonwealth but a national goal as well. That goal is to achieve a rate of one fatality per 100 million vehicle miles traveled by 2008.

On the graph, what you see, the blue bars to the left represent the historical factors that we have achieved, again, looking at fatality rates.

To put this a little bit into perspective,

if you go back to the mid-1960s, Pennsylvania had a crash fatality rate of about 3.4. It took from the mid-'60s to the mid-'80s or about 20 years in order to achieve a one third reduction in that fatality rate.

Pennsylvania then experienced a second one third drop in the fatality rate from the mid-'80s to the mid-1990s. Roughly, in the '90s, we were pretty much flat in the 1.5 range for that period of time.

What it took historically the Commonwealth to achieve a 30 percent drop in the fatality rate of 20 years -- of 10 to 20 years, we now have a goal of trying to achieve a one third reduction in that fatality rate for a period of five years.

This is certainly a huge task that we have in front of us. Breaking the fatality rate into its two components is what you see on this next slide.

The bars represent the number of fatalities and the light blue line going from more or less to lower left to the upper right represents the number of vehicle miles traveled.

As we're all aware of, we're trying to reduce the number of fatalities and the number of vehicle miles traveled on our roadways continuously to increase at an alarming rate.

Our goal in terms of looking at fatalities, if we were to achieve it, would be to save an additional 500 lives annually if we can achieve our goal by 2008.

If we put that in the context of our safety corridor criteria, what we did is we took a look in saying that the Act is saying there's something enforceable. Okay. So we need to look at how can we identify areas where enforcement may be part of the solution and how can we target those areas such that we're able to affect driver behavior because that's what we're after.

We took a look at all types of crashes as a possible criteria. We looked at aggressive driving crashes and we also looked at speeding crashes.

Through our analysis, we determined that we would like to focus on speed-related crashes. We felt that that was the most likely to be successful in terms of enforcement. It's measurable. It's easy for the officers to be able to get a conviction as opposed to aggressive driving.

It's difficult. Many states have enacted an aggressive driving law being a combination of erratic maneuvers by a driver, but it's difficult to envision how close is too close.

When is an improper lane change and driving too fast, how do you identify that and how do you prove that to a Magistrate?

We felt that the speed-related crashes were the easiest to identify and most likely to get enforcement success.

In looking at the threshold criteria for identifying these sites, we came up with a combination of not only the rate of crashes due to speed as a primary cause but also the number of speed-related crashes in a particular location.

We did that because if you relied on just the rate itself, if you could take roadways, and an example would be Roosevelt Boulevard in the Philadelphia area, Roosevelt Boulevard because of the volume of traffic has a very low crash rate; yet, it has the highest number of speed-related crashes in the Commonwealth.

We felt it was fair to have a combination of both the rate of crashes per the volume of traffic as well as the absolute number of crashes in order to identify those corridors for the need for the greatest amount of enforcement.

We tie this in with another initiative that we have within the Bureau of Safety and Traffic

Engineering. We're using the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' plan to reduce fatalities as a guide.

This plan identifies 23 different categories for safety improvements. Category 4 deals with aggressive driving. We've identified for each one of these 23 categories, if we're to achieve one fatality per 100 million vehicle miles traveled by 2008 in each of those 23 categories, by how much do we have to reduce the crashes and fatalities in order to achieve that goal.

Related to aggressive driving, we identified the need to reduce aggressive driving related crashes by 70.

Speeding being one of the aggressive driving type behaviors, we say that we would like to achieve a savings of 14 lives annually due to speeding through the Highway Safety Corridor Program.

So using that target of 14 lives saved, we took a look at the history and information within the Department, looking at how many fatalities do we average per year, how many speed-related crashes do we get per year. We came up with there's generally 1.21 fatalities per 100 speed-related crashes within the Commonwealth.

Using that and the target to try to achieve a life savings of 14, we figured we needed to eliminate 1150 crashes. Assuming we could be 25 percent effective with our efforts, we can't have the police out on every corridor on every minute of every day, we figured if we were 25 percent effective, that means that we would need to try to treat 4600 crashes in order to get the life savings that we're after.

Looking at our historical information, that means for us to try to deal with 4600 crashes and have us prevent that number of crashes, we would have to be treating approximately 600 locations; in other words, 600 locations of highway safety corridors across the Commonwealth to statistically achieve our goal.

With these criteria in place, what we plan to do is pilot this effort. We have a vendor on board now. We want to identify a handful of pilot locations.

What we would like to have our vendor do is to help us take a look at these locations, looking at driver behavior before and after to make sure that we're doing this properly and that we're getting the desire and effect that we want out of the program.

We'll then use that information we gather

from the pilot to then finally develop the regulation that is required by the law. There have been a number of requests for highway safety corridors. You represent the Committees making those requests.

Based upon our criteria that we use, our facts and data to develop the logic behind it, we took a look at all of the requests that we're aware of right now and we're pleased to report that under the criteria of 23 or more crashes within a five-year period or one and a half times the normal expected crash rate, that all of the corridors that were requested would qualify under these criteria.

This slide lists the corridors with a lot of the information associated with them, looking at their location in PennDOT terms; the average daily traffic and other critical information.

I'll just show these quickly. This is the Harrisburg Beltway that Representative Marsico referred to. This is the area along Carlisle that Representative Gabig is interested in.

Here we have the 80 corridor up here in the Stroudsburg area. We also have the 81 corridor in the Scranton/Wilkes-Barre area.

With that, I will be happy to respond to any questions the Committee may have.

REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Representative 1 McGill, I believe you had a question. 2 3 REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: Thank you. Good morning. 4 MR. REED: Good morning. 5 REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: I never cease to be amazed at the statistics that you throw at us that 7 could drive these things down. I got two simple ones that I want to put back to you. We have a secondary violation in 10 Pennsylvania being not wearing seat belts. I have 11 spoken to the State Police Commissioner, that should 12 be -- that should be a primary reason to pull a 13 14 vehicle over. I believe it's time that we do something along that line. 15 Can you tell me if you've put the wearing 16 seat belts into the equation that would drive that 17 number down to around one? 18 MR. REED: That certainly would be helpful. 19 Statistically, every 1 percent increase in seat belt 20 usage is 8 to 10 lives saved. 21 REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: And where do we 22 stand now? 23 MR. REED: Right now, we're at about almost 24 25 80 percent, 79.some percent in terms of seat belt

usage. As far as secondary law states, that's doing very well.

Considering Pennsylvania has one of the weaker secondary laws, we think we're doing extremely well with our education campaigns.

REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: Could we get it to 90?

MR. REED: Statistics have shown that with enactment of a primary seat belt law, those states that have done that, they have gotten a 9 percent increase on the average in seat belt usage.

REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: So we can take that number and this Committee can evaluate what the impact of that would be right off the bat. We can get that and you can make those statistics, again, to drive that number down.

Secondarily, it takes three police officers in one of my boroughs to do any sort of speed enforcement. We have really in my opinion shirked their responsibility to get a radar bill through.

We should have radar for local police. If you're targeting over the next four to five years, our reduction, we simply need to give local police departments the ability to have radar to slow traffic down.

You used as an example the Roosevelt

Boulevard. If you give the Philadelphia Police

Department the opportunity to sit on Roosevelt

Boulevard, and I can give you the blocks along the

Roosevelt Boulevard to use that radar gun, I can

bring you 150 to 200 cars a day easily on that road.

So I believe that we keep beating around the bush on certain things in Harrisburg. It's about time that the Legislature move forward and be realistic.

One of the problems that you just addressed and get rid of fatalities is to control speed, and yet we bind police departments' hands. We say you're not allowed to do it. You're not capable of doing it. You might not be able to use it right.

We have had every excuse imaginable for not doing it. This Committee and the Senate Committee and the Governor needs to allow local police departments to have radar.

Secondly, if we go ahead and make a seat belt law that an officer can pull a car over when somebody is not wearing a seat belt, I believe we will resolve that problem.

I think we can get to your numbers sooner than 2008. You know, one of the things that we

learned very quickly when we increased or changed the 1 driving laws, that unbeknownst to them that one of 2 the absolutely astounding things that this Committee 3 can pat themselves on the back on for the rest of 4 their life are absolutely astounding is that there 5 are 100 more 16 year olds alive per year. They don't 6 know who they are, but they are alive every year that 7 that law stays in effect, the way that this Committee 8 ran it through. 9 We have 100 more kids that are alive. 10 think if we approach it aggressively with radar and 11 12

with seat belts as we did with young drivers, I think the sky is the limit on how many lives we can save, and we all benefit.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Those are my points. I hope you will take those back to PennDOT and say McGill was very aggressive again on these issues. I thank you for your time.

REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Representative Scavello?

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Thank you, Representative Marsico.

Thank you, Director Reed, for coming down to testify. I want to echo the words of Representative McGill. I do agree with the radar, if not for the small police departments but the larger police departments, 25 officers and up as a start. I think that would go a long way in help reducing the speeding in our Commonwealth.

I travel quite a bit, of course; and frequently, I do the 80, 81 or 22, 33, 322, 78, 81.

I see out there these speed -- the posted speed and then the right alongside what the vehicle is doing.

I don't know if you see them out there and those traffic -- I see people hitting their brakes when they hit those units. That's the posted speed. Then it tells you what this vehicle is doing.

I would love to see more of them on the highway. I think it's a great tool to help reduce speeding in the Commonwealth. What is your view on that?

MR. REED: We were required by Federal guidelines that on construction projects on interstates over a certain dollar threshold that we had to have those speed displays as part of that construction project. I support the use of those.

Our Bureau funded the purchase of one of those for each one of our engineering district offices statewide. So we are trying to do what we can to make those types of pieces of equipment more

available to our engineering district offices.

Our Bureau handles about \$10 million in safety grants annually. That \$10 million has not increased in probably the last ten years. So the needs are growing. The money that we have is limited.

In response to that, what we're trying to use and make the utmost use of are our facts and data to make sure that we're specifically targeting our efforts to the area and to the highest priority and to the regions of the state that are most important.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Representative

Lewis?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Chairman Marsico.

I thank you for your testimony.

I want to, again, thank the House

Transportation Committee. They helped me put the

Highway Safety Corridor language together that we had

developed through the Safe 80 Task Force and included

in the omnibus package that became 229. I believe

that was two years ago.

It's taken way too long to get this Highway
Safety Corridor language put out. I note from your

testimony that it will save ultimately 14 lives per year in 2008. We need to get that rolled out now.

We can't afford to keep waiting another year to roll this language out. We have volunteered our corridors to be pilots for test cases just so we can save constituent lives in our area. It's pretty simple.

We really want to encourage you to move this out faster and to let us help you roll this out faster.

I know we've had a number of meetings in Harrisburg on this. We've put together all of our task forces into a coalition to work with you so you're hearing one voice on it.

When can we expect this to be rolled out and have final language so we can get signs up on Interstate 80?

MR. REED: We sent the policy to the Governor's office several weeks ago. We haven't heard anything back negatively as far as the policy. We presented it to Senator Madigan earlier this week. We present it to you and now before this Committee.

Hearing no one saying that you're heading totally the wrong direction, we think we've gotten what we need in order to put the policy into effect.

I would hope that later this summer, we'll have the 1 pilot corridor designated and have the studies 2 3 rolling. REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: That's good news. Please use us to help roll this out. Please tell us -- that's the first time I've heard that the \$10 6 million figure has been frozen. 7 You're looking at some of the members of 8 the General Assembly that will lead efforts to 9 increase highway safety. We've done it with the 10 State Police, working with the members here to do it. 11 So please let us know your issues. We're interested 12 in highway safety. Thank you. 13 REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Good. Any other 14 15 questions? Thank you very much, Greg, for your time 16 1.7 and your testimony. We appreciate it. MR. REED: You're welcome. 18 REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Next to testify is 19 the panel of Tim Webb, the Senior Market Area Safety 20 Director for Waste Management; Ray Delfing, Senior 21 Market Area Safety Director for Waste Management. 22 23 believe that's it.

Good morning and welcome. You may begin at your pleasure.

24

MR. DELFING: Would you prefer that we 1 summarize the written testimony? 2 3 REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Yes, if you could, please. 4 MR. DELFING: Okay. Good morning. My name 5 is Ray Delfing, Senior Market Area Safety Manager for 6 Waste Management of Pennsylvania Incorporated, member . 7 of the Pennsylvania Waste Industry Association. 8 Next to me is Tim Webb, also a Senior 9 Market Area Safety Manager and Transportation Safety 10 and Compliance Manager for Waste Management Eastern 11 12 Group. On behalf of Waste Management, it is our 13 pleasure to testify before the panel. A large part 14 15 of my responsibility as Waste Management's Safety Manager is to manage our Transportation Safety and 16 1.7 Compliance Programs. Waste Management is one of the largest 18 truck fleets in the state of Pennsylvania. And in 19 light of the different State and Federal agencies and 20 regulations governing transportation and the solid 21 waste industry, we take our responsibility very 22 23 seriously. We have accordingly taken aggressive steps 24

to promote safety and compliance through our

comprehensive Transportation Safety Program.

Waste Management along with other PWIA members supported the Waste Transportation Safety Program. We applaud the Department's effort at integrating the Safety Program into existing regulations governing the transportation of waste in Pennsylvania.

Waste Management implemented its own comprehensive Transportation Safety Program that is centered on a computer-based system called Alive/Waste Master. We have provided each of you with a handout briefly explaining the Alive/Waste Master system.

To work as a transporter for Waste

Management, the transporter must enter into a

standard transportation contract. The transportation

contract requires the transporter to have a

satisfactory DOT rating, to maintain appropriate

insurance levels, and to agree to abide by Waste

Management's Alive/Waste Master system.

The contract also imposes exacting vehicle and driver standards and requires strict compliance with all applicable laws governing the transportation of waste on Pennsylvania's highways.

For example, in support of State and

Federal regulations, the contract specifically prohibits the backhauling of any foods to transfer trailers used to haul waste.

16.

Developed in 2000 to manage transportation safety and compliance, Alive/Waste Master is a computer-based tracking system that tracks a driver, vehicle, and operational compliance.

Once a transporter is under contract with Waste Management, each driver is issued with a smart card. The smart card contains an embedded computer chip that maintains all of the information that is necessary to physically operate a vehicle in Pennsylvania.

For example, the smart card records the driver's commercial driver's license information, the driver's last physical exam, and motor vehicle record.

The chip also stores the vehicle's identification number, current registration information, insurance information, a description of the vehicle, and capacity limits, and the DOT rating for the hauler.

Allow me to further explain how it works.

The transporter is loaded at one of Waste

Management's transfer stations and he crosses the

outbound scales.

The driver presents the smart card and the scale master swipes the smart card into the system.

Instantaneously, the driver's information and the vehicle information is produced and checked for validity.

If the information is valid and up to date, the truck is weighed to ensure that it meets the DOT's vehicle weight requirements. If the vehicle weight is legal, the time and date, destination, and vehicle weight is recorded on the smart card and the driver leaves for his or her designated landfill.

Once the driver reaches the designated landfill, the process is repeated. In addition to the Alive/Waste Master system and as part of the company's Transportation Safety Program, Waste Management has instituted a Vehicle Safety Inspection Program similar to the state's trashnet.

Teams of three Waste Management employees, a safety manager, a compliance manager, and a mechanic, periodically conduct announced and unannounced roadside inspections at Waste Management's Pennsylvania landfills and transfer stations.

The team randomly selects vehicles, whether

waste management owned or independently owned, and inspects the vehicle according to US DOT and the Pennsylvania DEP regulations and safety criteria.

2.0

For example, while the team's mechanic inspects the vehicle for mechanical compliance, the safety managers are inspecting the vehicle for working fire extinguishers, properly annotated logbooks, hours of service and proper paperwork.

If the team places a vehicle out of service, the vehicle is not permitted to leave the facility until the violation is corrected or the vehicle is towed. If the driver is placed out of service, the vehicle is not moved until a qualified driver arrives.

The Waste Management's Transportation

Safety Program has not been without significant

effort and cost, but we believe that the impact has been immediate and worthwhile.

In 2001 and, again, in 2002, Waste

Management received the Commercial Highway Safety

Award from the Bucks County Motor Carrier Traffic

Safety Task Force in recognition of outstanding

achievements in commercial highway safety.

Bucks County Motor Carrier Traffic Safety

Task Force recognizes commercial haulers to implement

1 changes and introduce programs that enhance highway 2 safety. 3 Thank you for allowing us to speak this 4 morning. Mr. Webb and I welcome any questions that 5 the panel may have. REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Any questions from 6 any of the members? 7 Representative McGill? 8 REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: Thank you for that 9 10 testimony. That's a remarkable system that you have 11 in place. 12 MR. DELFING: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: Have you noticed a 13 14 -- I guess as a side note, have you noticed a decrease in really expensive maintenance problems 15 16 because your drivers are obviously more aware of what is going on all of the time and looking for things? 17 I recognize the expense up front to do 18 this, but have you had any cost savings that might 19 20 have other companies think about doing something like this? 21 22 MR. DELFING: There are cost savings -- Tim 23 can speak to those in a second -- then, again, with our vehicle inspection program just being out there 24

day after day at our facilities.

We didn't record in our written testimony,
but those inspections -- at each one of those
inspections we invite local police, State Police, and
that region of the DEP as well.

Very often, those folks are willing to come out and support us. Sometimes they observe the process. Other times they get right in there with us and participate in the process.

REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Chairman Geist?

CHAIRMAN GEIST: I have a series of questions mainly because of some of the work that we're doing here.

If you have a contract hauler that works for Waste Management, what proof of insurance does Waste Management require from that company and how often do you check it?

MR. WEBB: Currently, the hauler is required to give us a certificate of insurance that comes into the office. Following that, we follow-up with the actual carrier, the policy, the company that is underwriting that policy to make sure that certificate is valid.

A lot of certificates are issued from the local insurance companies out of the local brokers'

offices. You have to make sure if, in fact -there's too many. We follow that. We put it into
the system.

If by chance it comes around for renewal
and we have not received the renewal certificate,
there's a 90-day, 60-day, and a 30-day notice. At

and we have not received the renewal certificate, there's a 90-day, 60-day, and a 30-day notice. At a ten-day interval, you get a phone call from the office. Your insurance certificate is about to run out. If we do not have it 24 hours prior to the deadline so we can make sure all of his trucks are off the road, we then shut them down, which in turn shuts down through the system.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: If a contract hauler is self-insured, what proof does Waste Management require from that hauler?

MR. WEBB: Currently, we do not have any haulers that are self-insured. To be self-insured takes a lot of money, a lot of investment. We do not have any that are self-insured. We have many haulers that have insurance lines of \$20 million.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Is catastrophic insurance required?

MR. WEBB: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: What limits?

MR. WEBB: Typically, million plus an

additional million on top.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Per incident?

MR. WEBB: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: One of the things that we have run into as the Committee is the false statements of self-insured, which some of these companies are carrying.

We're addressing that now with the insurance company. Our Committee will probably do something about it hopefully before the end of this term.

Let's talk for a moment about the problem of a truck and I'm just -- I'm going to make a simulation here. I don't want to throw a stone at any one person.

A hauler picks up 70,000 pounds in New Jersey and weighs out at Somerset at 80,000 pounds, how do you prevent that magic waste; and how do you control what that waste is in the industry if we are concerned about that and what they're hauling?

MR. DELFING: What we do with our system when you go outbound, they go through the scales and we track that weight. When they go inbound at our next facility, we track that weight as well.

We have a report that shows the difference

between the outbound and the inbound for weather, for sleet, snow, for fuel; but anything aside of that small percentage, we then go back and see if they had stopped and picked up anything else and if the load being represented is what it is.

20.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: If the driver leaves New Jersey and is scheduled for Pine Grove and shows up at Somerset, how does your company handle that?

MR. DELFING: What happens, and this is a problem we dealt with prior to the system, where you would have a driver that would take it to the landfill of choice by him.

It may be easier for him, may be closer to his house, he could make another turn; i.e., pick up another load, and get home sooner.

When we designate the landfill, that's the landfill they have to go to. If by chance we divert for whatever reason to go to another landfill, there's a series of checks and balances to make sure, in fact, it has been approved and somebody from our side is signing off on that.

If they show up once the card is swiped, they will identify that destination. That series of checks and balances are gone through that it has been approved or, two, you're going to turn around and go

to your destination as you were originally told.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: If a contractor for Waste

Management has an accident somewhere and is towed and
they don't pay their bills and don't get their
equipment and they don't do this, what does Waste

Management do to that hauler?

MR. DELFING: Obviously, we work very closely with the local agencies to the State agencies to make sure they have the information.

We have the certificates of insurance in our office. We provide the certificates of insurance, as well as the contact information for that particular carrier to those authorities so in turn they can make sure the bills are paid. If there's a problem with that, we work very close to alleviate the problem.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: And the final question is,

I know you guys have done this in the past; but would

you have your folks be able to sit in on the meetings

with us as we craft legislation?

MR. WEBB: Absolutely. We would be glad to work with you.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Because we think your smart card could end up being a requirement for anybody hauling in Pennsylvania. I know that you can

electronically share that with PSP and others. 1 MR. WEBB: Absolutely. 2 CHAIRMAN GEIST: I thank you very much. 3 That's all from me. 4 REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Any other 5 questions? 6 REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Just one quick 7 clarification from your testimony. Your smart card, 8 who uses that, just Waste Management trucks or any 9 hauler coming into your landfill? 10 MR. WEBBER: Currently, today any hauler 11 with us has a smart card. 12 REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: So that means anyone 13 dumping out of Waste Management landfill has to have 14 a smart card? 15 MR. WEBB: Anybody that is transporting 16 from us, from point A to Point B. If they pick up at 17 A, they will be under contract and they'll have a 18 smart card. We do have third party customers that 19 haul that have nothing to do with us. They will not 20 21 have a smart card. REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Definitely thank you 22 for developing that smart card. Sounds like a step 23 24 to the future. Thank you for your help on Safe 80

25

Task Force as well.

1 REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Representative 2 Gabig? 3 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I live in Cumberland County that has a 5 6 landfill. I think they own it now, actually in 7 Hopewell Township, NewBurg, right off the Turnpike and near 81. We heard some statistics. I think that you 10 were in here for the first testifier regarding how to 11 service rates for vehicles and drivers. Were you 12 able to hear that testimony overall from PUC, I think 13 it was? 14 MR. WEBB: Yes. 15 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Can you tell us, 16 your company, how did those numbers stack up against 17 It sounds like you're doing a better job. yours? Can you give us a feel for that? 18 19 MR. DELFING: I believe you said the State 20 average for driver out of service Waste Management of 21 Pennsylvania Incorporated vehicles, they all run 22 under the same DOT, same carrier, and driver 23 out-of-service rate is zero. 24 Our vehicle out-of-service rate right now 25 is slightly below the Pennsylvania average,

Pennsylvania being 33 percent I believe the testimony was.

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: It was a separate issue about drivers that don't have proficiency in English. Have you as a company taken any steps to address that issue?

MR. WEBB: What we have done is we track all of the pertinent information. We have an individual that comes to us that gets a license from a particular state. That state agency has found that that person has those proficiencies.

When they come to our system, we put them in the system. It is a Social Security number.

Typically, you heard testimony earlier about drivers that had similar licenses that are behind each other in line coming through the inspection.

In our system, as soon as you put that information in, the drivers come right to the top and immediately are not allowed to work for us.

At the same time, if there's a problem, we notify the local authorities. Typically, if somebody is going to sell an address or Social Security information, they're not going to sell it one time. It's going to pop up multiple times. We did catch that.

1 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Your smart card 2. system, I was in the DA's Office before I was elected and had handled a lot of cases involving vehicles and 3 collisions, fatalities, etc. 4 Obviously, they had black boxes in some of 5 the big long hauls. They had GPS capability to know 6 7 where and what and how fast they're going. Are you at that level yet or not? Do you have GPS. 8 9 capability? 10 MR. WEBB: On our long haul, we do not. 11 Some of our local hauling, we do use GPS. REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: And the issue on 12 speed then, does your smart card address that issue 13 14 at all? 15 MR. WEBB: What it does is obviously we 16 know the time and the travel distance from point A to 17 point B. It clocks the time and date you left. 18 Obviously, it's pretty easy for us to go back and do 19 the math. 20 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Do you routinely do 21 Do you have some kind of check that will give 22 average speed for a haul? In the transportation office for 23 MR. WEBB: 24 which I'm responsible, we have six individuals.

of their duties is they also run those reports and

make sure the system is getting uses. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: What do you call those individuals? 3 MR. WEBB: Transportation specialists. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Because I always 6 thought with this capability that is growing, obviously, that if we put more money into those kind of individuals that are sitting there tracking it on a computer versus having the on-site inspections, 10 that that would be pretty effective. What is your experience? 11 12 MR. DELFING: Well, they provide a wealth of information that could be instantaneous. 13 14 MR. WEBB: And the other thing is it adds 15 an even balance from the individuals; and the nice thing about the individuals in the office, it's black 16 17 and white. You're either in or out. It doesn't give a subjective. You cut those individuals. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you very much. 20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Any other 22 questions? 23 Thank you very much for your excellent 24 testimony and your time. I appreciate your being 25 here. Thank you.

Next to testify is Cathy Tennis who is the 1 President of the Pennsylvania Towing Association. 2 3 Cathy, if you could summarize your testimony. CHAIRMAN GEIST: Have you got 80 cleaned 5 up? MS. TENNIS: Mile marker 251, the gentleman 6 7 who brought that up, the State has prisoners out there now and so on. Good morning, gentlemen. My name is Cathy I am the President of the Pennsylvania 10 Tennis. 11 Towing Association and the owner of John Tennis 12 Towing in State College. 13 Out association represents the towing industry in the Commonwealth. Our members are the 14 15 people and the companies that help keep Pennsylvania 16 highways safe by removing wrecked and disabled 17 vehicles, tow them to storage and repair facilities 18 and clean up the highway after an accident. 19 Today I would like to present to you some 20 issues that the towers are faced with relating to 21 motor carrier accidents, frequently trash haulers. 22 You may not know this, but in many cases, 23 we, towers, are not paid for the services we provided since towers do not work under a contract with 24

PennDOT or the State Police. We respond without any

assistance of getting paid.

When there is an accident involving one of these trash haulers, we find more times than we like that they are not covered properly by their insurance to cover the cost of towing the recovery from this type of accident.

There are up to four entities that we could be dealing with, coverage of the power unit, coverage of the trailer, coverage of the shipper and coverage of the cargo. If there is coverage on any part of this accident, it is usually on the tractor or power unit. The trailers usually have little or no value, and the type of cargo we are talking about is referred to as valueless cargo.

The insurance company for the power unit comes in and does an evaluation of the unit and decides they are covering the cost of that repair, and then we are required by law to release that part of the wrecked motor carrier.

Once we have released that, we have lost the only thing that is of any value from the motor carrier accident. Most of the time nobody ever shows up or calls about the remaining parts. This creates a large debt for the tower to cover as well as some other problems.

If, indeed, nobody claims the trailer or the trash, we cannot even get rid of the trash because there is no paperwork showing the point of origin for where this trash came from.

When this happens, the landfills will not accept the trash. Insurance is required when a truck is registered through PA DOT or when applying for a waste transporter sticker at DEP.

In most cases, valueless cargo will not be insured, and the cost of cleanup is too often absorbed by the tow company.

In the event that there is adequate coverage to pay the tower, the towing recovery and disposal costs should be borne by the fund financed by carriers or taxpayers, and in the case of trash trucks funded by a cleanup bond.

Numerous times we find that after the accident has been cleaned up, an entire unit and get it back into your facility, an estimate is done for the damage. They say, yes, we're going to repair that and remove it from your facility into a repair place.

The insurance settles with you on that part of the accident. At that point, no one is responsible for the trailer or the cargo or the

\_ \_

cleanup at the scene.

5.

21.

Most of the time, we're dealing with a load that is either trash, junk tires, crushed cars.

Those are the items that nobody comes back then to claim.

They have a valuable part of the accident now at the repair facility. Nobody is interested in a trailer that is not worth anything or the trash that nobody wants to deal with.

The biggest problem with this is No. 1, it sits in your yard for a period of time, maybe months or years. You can imagine the smell that this causes.

Number 2, the part of getting rid of this is a lot of cases if there's a trash accident, there's no papers from the point of origin. If you do not have papers for the point of origin of the trash, you cannot take it to your landfill to get rid of it. You must be able to prove where this came from.

So towers are basically getting stuck with it and have no legal way to get rid of it. What you're finding out is when you are looking at their insurance, there are a couple of accidents involving trash, the coverage was \$2500. It's going to cost

somewhere around \$3200 to dispose of it.

So that's what our biggest problem is with these motor carrier accidents and the trash trucks going through Pennsylvania or coming into Pennsylvania to take care of the trash.

There's another proposed landfill up around the Snow Shoe area from what I understand. As we see it, that's only going to increase the trash trucks coming in or going through and that's going to put us at risk of more unclaimed bills.

There's got to be a way to make the people come into the state or going through the state with it to have the proper coverage, to have some kind of a sticker like some of them are required to have now that proves they have the insurance.

A major problem that we have run into in the past is they have false insurance cards. You do the accident and go back and try to contact the insurance company and that comes back to a PO Box in the Bronx. They do not exist.

As they're handing that insurance card to somebody stopping them, unless they're calling, they have a valid, quote, insurance card so they're not being questioned.

Some of the ideas we've had as far as the

association goes in helping with these cleanup costs, there are some pictures here of the one accident that Representative Geist brought up. This load laid along the riverbed for over a year.

Now the state has people out there and the state people doing the cleanup and taking care of it.

We ask that there be some type of a fund put together if possible by the carriers going through the state or coming in the state or taxpayers to help in this type of a cleanup or in the realm of the cost and some of the accidents.

If there could be some kind of a sticker or a proof that it can be checked on that says they have to have certain coverages in order to even come into Pennsylvania with a load of trash, authorize a cleanup bond in some way for the trash trucks and indemnify the trucks from hazardous materials cleanup expense.

When you get called out to some of these accidents, it's not picking up the trash on the road. We actually are required to refill the area with clean soil, reseeding, and that type of thing. You must have the equipment to do all of that.

One thing to keep in mind as a tower, when you are being called for this type of a job, if

indeed you refuse because you know you're running the risk of not being paid for it, the asking Department that is calling you is not going to continue to call you if you're not going to go out and do the job for them.

Nobody is really concerned whether you're getting paid once it's done. They want it cleaned up and taken care of. This could be a factor for clearance and so on.

If people keep getting hit with these losses due to this type of thing, you can't have updated paid good operators out there doing incident management the way the State would like it done and the way the towers would like it done in order for a private business owner to obtain those.

Some of the differences that people don't understand is there's a difference between a tow versus recovery. I put a list of definitions on the back of the paperwork.

Recovery is actually when a vehicle is not in a position to be towed and must be placed in such a position in order that it can be towed.

This would be on an embankment, on a roof, on the side or whatever. A tow is when it's hooked up to the disabled unit and moved from the scene.

The insurance companies don't understand there are two different things involved. Certainly, pulling up to a tractor-trailer and all of the wheels and tires are in effect, that's a normal thing.

embankment makes a bigger deal on what you're able to do. That's basically what we wanted to bring up as far as the trash haulers in the state of Pennsylvania and some of the problems we're running into with it and making it aware that it's a more often than needs to be refilled item and looking for more landfills could just create larger numbers in the problem.

REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Thank you very much.

Representative McGill has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: Well, just a couple comments so you know and maybe you've been in touch with them. We're putting together several pieces of legislation for quick clearing.

One of our meetings down at Montgomery

Community College about five months ago I guess it

was, there was the one piece of legislation that we

have that was introduced that Representative Harper

is going to have a press conference on Friday down in

Montgomery County for the moving of vehicles, the

minor accidents, getting them off of the road and doing that.

We are working on a fairly large piece of legislation that would allow you to pull those vehicles, whether they're still on their side, off the road and go through a lot of the quick clear like we've seen out of Washington state and in the western part of the United States.

As an integral part of that is towing, because obviously you have been on the short end of the stick as far as responsibility.

Police departments, local municipalities will call you and say, move it, and you go out and do it and very quickly; there is no payment.

We are aware as a Committee and again on our taking action on that now and I'm assuming looking down later, Eric, and he just nodded that you will be move involved in it, that we can come up with a plan to try and resolve this.

Because one, these are real people with real jobs who are out there stuck in traffic. These are real people with real jobs trying to move these vehicles after they've happened. They simply need to be reimbursed.

We are also looking at allowing for those

entrepreneurs that would get those rotating vehicles. 1 2 I'm sure you're aware. I'm not aware of --MS. TENNIS: They are called a rotator. 3 REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: They're massive and expensive, trying to get built into the legislation 5 some type of a premium to allow them to use you if 6 7 you want to invest to try to help us get the roadways cleared quickly. We are active on that. I'm glad 8 you brought these additional things to our attention. 9 MS. TENNIS: We very much appreciate being 10 11 a part of it. REPRESENTATIVE McGILL: I don't know when 12 we'll see it, hopefully in the very near future; but 13 when you present something like that, it seems to 14 grow in a lot of directions. We need to pull the 15 16 reigns back in. Thank you. 17 MS. TENNIS: Thank you. 18 REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Any other 19 questions? Thank you, Cathy. We appreciate your time, 20 21 your recommendations, and your testimony. 22 Next to testify is Paul Dudzinski. 23 welcome, professional driver with Roadway Express. 24 As I mentioned before, if you can summarize your 25 testimony, we would appreciate that.

MR. DUDZINSKI: Good morning. I'm Paul
Dudzinski, District 1 Road Team Coordinator for
Roadway Express. I'm very pleased to be here today
on behalf of Roadway Express.

I'm here to speak on the safety program at Roadway, primarily at our Tannersville terminal.

Currently, we have 82 one-million-mile drivers, 15 two-million-mile drivers, and 1 three-million-mile driver. That's 115 million miles of accident free driving. Those are individual accomplishments by quite a few drivers in an area that starts in Tannersville and ends at satellite terminals primarily in New York, New Jersey, and New England going through most congested areas in the northeast.

We have approximately dispatched 250 loads a day on a daily average of over 50,000 miles in a 24-hour period.

Our safety record programs are ongoing daily, weekly, monthly with continuous flow of information from internal sources as well as outside agencies such as PennDOT and PUC, who I want to thank for sending enforcement officers to our terminal for updating our drivers on hours of services and roadside inspections, what to look for primarily in pretrip inspections before we leave the terminals.

Also, on behalf of Roadway, we do outside safety awareness to the general motoring public such as no zone demonstrations. We're generally invited to high schools to do drivers ed classes, sharing the road with trucks.

We'll go to RV expos and get RV drivers in a no zone demo; or any other civic organization who requests a demo, we will be there.

We will be at the two Pocono races this year providing on-site firsthand awareness to the general public. We invite the general public to get in the driver's seat of a tractor-trailer and observe the no zone areas that we have designated around the truck.

To this day, Roadway Express Tannersville, PA has not had any driver or equipment placed out of service from a roadside inspection. This is what safety means to us at Roadway. Thank you for allowing me to speak to you today.

REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Thank you.

MR. DUDZINSKI: On that final sheet, you will notice driver eligibility requirements in order to drive for Roadway Express.

If you look under your No. 5, the driver must be able to read, write, and speak English

sufficiently to converse with the general public, to understand highway traffic signs and signals in English, respond to official inquiries, and to make entries on reports and records.

That's all I have. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Chairman Geist?

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Do you find that the carriers like your wonderful company and award trucking, the Barry Smith, Smith Trucking, that their companies go so far overboard on safety that the people that do the road inspections randomly very rarely ever pull those over?

MR. DUDZINSKI: We are pulled over. When I'm driving up the I-95 corridor through Connecticut and you see the sign flashing that the coop is open, you're going in. You're going across the scale.

We're scaled before we leave the terminal.

We have nothing to hide. Our hours of services are

updated everyday. Hazmat, our program for hazardous

materials, drivers are updated on that.

We have no fear of pulling into a weigh station or anything, you know, and should that officer deem the -- for us to pull over and do an inspection, we welcome it.

CHAIRMAN GEIST: Thank you. You've done a

\_\_\_

```
1
     wonderful job.
               MR. DUDZINSKI: Thank you.
              CHAIRMAN GEIST: Roadway should be proud of
 4
     you.
               REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Representative
 5
     Scavello?
 7
               REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Paul, thank you
     for coming in today. I also want to publicly thank
 8
 9
     your company for the much help you gave with
     Representative Lewis and I with Safe 80. Tom does
10
11
     outstanding.
12
               You can see by your record that the record
13
     your company has for safety, that is something that
14
     we would love to see other companies mirror.
15
               Again, thank you for coming down here and
16
     getting involved in the work in the program.
17
               MR. DUDZINSKI: Thank you.
18
               REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Representative
19
     Gabig?
20
               REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: Thank you,
21
     Mr. Chairman.
               I probably shouldn't ask this question, but
22
23
     I can't help myself. Are you one of the 1 million or
     2 million or 3 million safe mile drivers?
24
25
               MR. DUDZINSKI: Not yet, but --
```

REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: On your way? 1 MR. DUDZINSKI: From what I understand, I'm real close. 3 4 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: The issue that you 5 brought up on your eligibility requirements form, No. 5, the English language proficiency, you have a goal 6. 7 that is stated. 8 Do you have any idea how they implement 9 Do they have a test or how is that 10 administered? 11 That I don't have an answer MR. DUDZINSKI: 12 I could talk to our human resources and get an 13 answer for you. 14 REPRESENTATIVE GABIG: We're obviously 15 interested in that, this Committee and others are 16 interested in that issue. So whatever Roadway is 17 doing in that regard, I think is something we should take a look at and see how that might help us resolve 18 19 that issue. 20 REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Any other 21 questions? 22 REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, 23 Representative Marsico; and Paul, thanks. Again, 24 with Representative Scavello, I want to join in 25

thanking Roadway for their help on the Safe 80 Task

The mobile truck has been great, the demos Force. you provided. I know at Shawnee, you've always come down for the big events and West End Fair. appreciate that.

Anything you wanted to tell the Committee that we should be looking at that you in your personal opinion could help truck safety in Pennsylvania?

MR. DUDZINSKI: I would just consider more visibility of enforcement officers on the highway. That would be a deterrent. I also think it would be a great help. With more visibility, less things happen.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS:

REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time and your suggestions. Again, I want to also congratulate and thank Roadway for the hard work that you do on the Capital Beltway as well in Harrisburg and as your counterparts down in Harrisburg. You've done a tremendous job. certainly appreciate all of the help Roadway does in safety awareness with the general public. So thank you very much.

> MR. DUDZINSKI: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MARISCO: I believe this

24

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

concludes the hearing. 1 Did you want to make remarks, closing 2 remarks, Mr. Chairman? 3 CHAIRMAN GEIST: Yes, I do. I want to 4 thank Kelly and Mario for being wonderful hosts. 5 sure they're going to buy us a wonderful lunch when 6 we conclude here. I'm looking forward to that. 7 If anyone else is looking to follow the 8 trail of legislation that will be coming out of this 9 10 Committee, you can do that by logging onto the house website or call Eric in my office or call Paul. 11 12 It's better to call Paul because he loves to get lots 13 of calls. We'll try to keep you well informed, and 14 thanks to everybody for coming here today. This is a 15 big topic. We're going to try and fix it. Thank you 16 17 very much. 18 (The hearing concluded at 11:52 a.m.) 19 20 21 22 23 24

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Hillary Notary Pub/1c COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA . 9 Notarial Seal Hillary M. Hazlett, Notary Public City Of Harrisburg, Dauphin County My Commission Expires Sept. 29, 2007 Member, Pennsylvania Association Of Notaries