1	
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
3	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
4	
5	IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING ROOM G-50
6	HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
7	
8	MONDAY, MARCH 15, 2010
9	10:03 A.M.
10	PUBLIC HEARING ON
11	LICENSING OF SCHOOL BUS DRIVERS
12	
13	BEFORE:
14	HONORABLE JOSEPH F. MARKOSEK, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN
15	HONORABLE MIKE CARROLL HONORABLE PAUL COSTA HONORABLE TED HARHAI
16	HONORABLE TED HARHAT HONORABLE MARK LONGIETTI HONORABLE JOHN J. SIPTROTH
17	HONORABLE TIM SOLOBAY HONORABLE RICHARD A. GEIST,
18	MINORITY CHAIRMAN
19	HONORABLE JOHN EVANS HONORABLE DICK HESS
20	HONORABLE DAVID HICKERNELL HONORABLE MARK KELLER
0.1	HONORABLE RON MILLER
21	HONORABLE TINA PICKETT HONORABLE JEFFREY PYLE
22	
23	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR
24	P. O. BOX 278 MAYTOWN, PA 17550
25	717-426-1596 PHONE/FAX

		_
1	ALSO PRESENT:	
2	REPRESENTATIVE JOSH SHAPIRO DAN HEALY, REPRESENTATIVE BRYAN LENTZ'S OFFICE	
3		
4	STACIA RITTER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (D) ANNE BALOGA, RESEARCH ANALYST (D) AMANDA WOLFE, COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE	
5	AMANDA WOLFE, COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT (D) ERIC BUGAILE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (R)	
6	VICKI TROSTLE, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT (R) ADAM GINGRICH, RESEARCH ANALYST (R)	
7		
8		
9	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR	
10	REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX		
2	NAME	PAGE	
3	PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND OPENING REMARKS	4	
4	KURT MYERS	5	
5	DEPUTY SECRETARY SAFETY ADMINISTRATION	J	
6	PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTA	ATION	
7 8	SELINA PITTENGER EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL BUS ASSOCIATION	19	
0	PENNSILVANIA SCHOOL BUS ASSOCIATION		
9	TIMOTHY COTTER DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR	4 0	
10	PENNSYLVANIA DIVISION FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY		
11	ADMINISTRATION U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
12	CLOSING REMARKS	71	
13	CHODING KHIMKKO	, 1	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

\sim	
/.	

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Good morning, everybody.

While Representative Siptroth is still standing, we'll have him lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you.

And welcome to the Transportation Committing hearing this morning relative to school bus safety and school bus regulation and driver regulation. And I think there's perhaps nothing more important that we do with this committee than ensure the safety of all motorists out there, particularly our young people who use those school buses.

Representative Chairman Geist, do you have any comments?

Okay. We'll get started then. First person to testify is -- relative to school bus driver licensing requirements and processes, is, of course, our old friend, Mr. Kurt Myers, who is Deputy Secretary for Safety

Administration, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.

Kurt, like to introduce the folks who are with you here this morning?

MR. MYERS: Good morning
Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. Yes,
thank you. Pleasure to be here this morning.

I brought with me Chris Miller, and Chris oversees driver qualifications for the Bureau of Driver Licensing, and also with me, to the far right, is Diana Henning, and Diana oversees driver control issues within the Bureau of Driver Licensing as well. And those individuals are both experts in their area, so specific questions we'll be happy to be able to answer those for you.

I've already supplied testimony to you, and I won't read it verbatim, but I would like to just point out a few highlights here.

First, the school bus driver, school bus industry is probably one of the more regulated industries that we have.

Specifically, they have oversight not only from PennDOT, but also the U.S. Department of Transportation as well as the Pennsylvania

PUC.

And in addition to that, there's also obviously important input and oversight by the Department of Education, the Department of Welfare, and the Department of Health.

school bus driver, there are a number of steps that an individual must take, and first and foremost, they must be a commercial -- have a commercial drivers license. And in doing that, they must take a test for that as well as the skills test to become the commercial driver. But then beyond that, the expectation is, for them to become a school bus driver, they must go and take a physical.

Now, this is a more extensive

physical, if you will, than what you might

remember when you were sixteen and a half and

getting your drivers license. We're obviously

looking at things in relationship to

cardiovascular issues. We're looking at

issues associated with diabetes and other

things that may impact that driver's ability

while he is or she is moving people from point

A to point B.

Assuming the driver passes the physical, the form is forwarded on to PennDOT, and we send them a -- for the application for the endorsement, we then send them an authorization letter. It's a learner's permit application. And these two documents allow the driver to begin the training process of becoming a school bus driver.

New school bus drivers must complete a minimum of twenty hours of instruction, including fourteen hours of classroom instruction and six hours on one-on-one vehicle familiarity and driving instruction.

And the PennDOT school bus driver training course is administered by local school districts, contractors or intermediate units, under the supervision of PennDOT.

Before a driver becomes a fully credentialed school bus driver, they are required to complete the school bus specific knowledge test, administered by the department, and pass the school bus skills test, administered by a licensing examiner.

In addition to the requirements to become a school bus driver, a driver also has

the requirement to maintain their school bus endorsement, and annually, they are required to submit to a school bus physical.

Also every four years, they are required to recertify by completing a minimum of ten hours of instruction consisting of at least seven hours of classroom training and three hours of one-on-one, in-bus training. They will also be required to complete the school bus specific knowledge and skills examination.

So, as you can see, there's an extensive amount of training that goes into qualifications for becoming a school bus driver. And I think it's important to point out here that there are approximately forty thousand school bus drivers in Pennsylvania today.

Last year, based upon the figures from the Department of Education, I believe it is actually 2008, they drove a little over four hundred million miles, and they did it quite effectively, quite frankly. When we look at the statistics going back at least ten years, there has not been a fatality in a

school bus in the last ten years, in over ten years. And I think that is a credit to the individuals who drive those buses every day, and the significant importance obviously they give to the passengers that they have on their bus, which are our children.

check drivers' records, I do want to point out that there is a requirement that the driver's record be checked on a yearly basis. For school districts, there is no charge. For an independent contractor who is contracted to a school district, they can either pay five dollars a record or we have a blanket fee of two hundred dollars a year, they can check the record as often as they want.

When an employer receives a driver's record, it will include reportable crashes that the driver was involved in. This will include the date and location of the crash as well as the type of vehicle they were driving.

And, finally, it's important to note that with the Fair Credit Reporting Act, drivers must give their consent for their

1	employer to access their driving record. The
2	employer is bound to use a driver record
3	solely for the purpose for which the driver
4	gave consent, and, therefore, the employer,
5	like PennDOT, cannot release the information
6	on the driving record unless authorized to do
7	so.
8	With that, Mr. Chairman, I'll be more
9	than happy to take any questions that the
10	committee may have.
11	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank
12	you.
13	I see questions by Representative
14	Siptroth.
15	REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you
16	Mr. Chairman.
17	Very quickly, Kurt, the driving
18	record, is that only while they're operating
19	under the privileges of commercial drivers
20	license and school bus drivers license, or is
21	that all accidents that they may be involved
22	in?
23	MR. MYERS: It's all accidents they
24	may be involved in, going back, assuming that
25	the school has requested a ten-year record,

1 going back ten years. 2 REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 4 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative 5 Mark Longietti. REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank 6 7 you. Just want to comment, my district's 8 9 right on the border with Ohio. Do you know, 10 when they do the background check or the 11 driving record check, does it pick up out-of-12 state incidents as well? 13 MR. MYERS: Chris or Diana? 14 MS. HENNING: Since school bus 15 drivers are commercial drivers in 16 Pennsylvania, any violation or violations 17 that occurred out of state are reported to 18 And, you know, with a CDL driver transfer 19 into Pennsylvania, that history follows them 20 and is made part of the Pennsylvania driving 21 record. 22 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: I know --I was a school solicitor for a number of 23 24 years, and we actually had an incident where a 25 driver was picked up for DUI in Ohio over the

weekend and delayed reporting it to -- not for a long period of time, but for a couple of days. And I remember looking at the various statutes and requirements, it wasn't quite -- if I recall correctly, at that time, it wasn't quite crystal clear what their obligations are when -- you know, they weren't operating a school bus at the time but they were out of state with their private vehicle and got pulled over for DUI.

Do you have any comment on that?

MS. HENNING: Since the

implementation of MCSIA in September 30th,

2005, violations that happen in the personal

vehicle count towards disqualification as

well. So I would think they would be

obligated to report those violations to their

employer.

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Even though it -- in this case, if I recall correctly, what happened was, it was an arrest, obviously takes some time before the arrest moves along to either diversionary program or conviction, but that's what occurred. Do you know how that shakes out?

1 MS. HENNING: I'd have to look at the 2 law to see at what point in time they are supposed to report that to the employer, 3 4 whether it's upon arrest or upon conviction, 5 so I'm not real sure about that. MR. MYERS: We'll be happy to look 6 into that and get back to you. 7 8 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Okay. 9 Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Kurt, I had a question relative to the size of school 11 12 buses. If you have a smaller bus -- and I 13 can't recall the number of seats -- is there a 14 threshold that, you know, if you have a bus 15 that's less than X number of seats that a lot 16 of these procedures do not apply to the hiring 17 and training of the drivers? 18 MR. MYERS: I'll defer to the expert 19 in that area. 20 Chris, do you want --21 MS. MILLER: As school bus is --22 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: You need to 23 speak -- you're going to have to really --24 MS. MILLER: A school bus is designed 25 to seat or designed to seat eleven or more,

including the driver. That vehicle is

considered a school bus and the same rules and

regulations apply whether you're driving a

smaller size school bus or larger size school

bus, the training is identical for all

drivers.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. So if you have a bus, a van, you know, some private carriers or whatever, are -- they have vans that seat, I don't know, five or six perhaps, do they not -- they don't have the same requirements then, a CDL or some of the other things?

MS. MILLER: You're correct. They do not require a CDL, if the vehicle is designed to seat ten or fewer passengers, including the driver, so they would not have to do the licensing and the training.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Have we had any history of situations where, you know, that's occurred and perhaps PennDOT has, you know, been questioned about that, or, you know, has been -- had some action taken against them, you know, because of that? Or is that something that, you know, the

legislature needs to look at?

I mean, I guess I'm just trying to get a feel for, you know, that particular issue that's -- I know there's been one or two folks that have approached me about it, and so I'll just throw it out there now, and I'll just hear what you have to say.

MS. CLARK: I have not had any questions related to school vehicle crashes.

MR. MYERS: No, I haven't either,
Mr. Chairman, but I'll be happy to look into
that. To the best of my knowledge, though,
I'm not aware of any issues related to ten or
less passenger seats.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. The other thing, too, you had mentioned there hasn't been a fatality relative to a school bus -
MR. MYERS: In bus, for a passenger

MR. MYERS: In bus, for a passenger in a bus.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: In a bus.

MR. MYERS: In a school bus. There have been some fatalities outside of the buses, but within the bus itself, those passengers, there has not been a fatality within the last ten years.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: A number of years ago, we had passed some legislation that required the stop arms and the arm in the front of the bus that extends. Do we have data showing, you know, kind of before and after statistics on that? Is that -- how that's increased the safety?

MR. MYERS: We certainly have the data. I don't know -- at this point in time, if we've ever looked at it from the standpoint of when that law went into effect and the requirement to have the arm and whether or not there's been a difference since that point in time, but we can certainly go back and take a look.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Yeah. I'd be curious, if you'd provide that to the committee. For another reason, I know some of us here we're here when we passed those laws, and, you know, it would be good to know if we actually saved some lives by passing -- by passing those laws.

I think Representative Ron Miller has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Just to

1	follow up to yours, Mr. Chairman, as far as
2	the fatalities, it's great to hear that we've
3	not had any in the past ten years, but when
4	you say regarding school buses, and then we
5	hear the definition of a school bus as
6	compared to the vans that are used for
7	transport, are we talking the total student
8	transportation system? I guess my question
9	comes down to the vans that are used to
10	transport ten or less students, have we had
11	any fatalities or serious accidents related to
12	those?
13	MR. MYERS: I don't have the
14	specifics on that. Do you, Chris?
15	MS. CLARK: I don't have the
16	statistics with me. No, sorry.
17	REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: As a follow-
18	up, maybe you can get to the committee,
19	because it'd be interesting to know if we're
20	seeing a problem with that type transportation
21	as compared to the school buses.
22	MR. MYERS: Very good.
23	REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Thank you.
24	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Deputy

Secretary Myers and your staff, thank you very 1 2 much. Appreciate that. Before we introduce the next speaker, 4 I'd like to, for the record, indicate to the 5 stenographer the members who are here. Representative Dave Hickernell, Representative 6 Tina Pickett, Representative Jeff Pyle, 7 8 Representative Paul Costa, Representative John 9 Siptroth, Representative Mark Longietti, 10 Representative Mike Carroll, Representative Tim Solobay, Representative John Evans, 11 12 Representative Ron Miller, Representative Mark 13 Keller, and Representative Dick Hess. And, of 14 course, the aforementioned Chairman Rick Geist 15 and Chairman Joe Markosek. 16 Did I miss anybody? And, I'm sorry, 17 Representative Lentz will not be here, but Dan 18 Healy is here in his -- in his stead. 19 Dan, welcome. 20 MR. HEALY: Thank you very much. 21 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: You're welcome to 22 come up here, if you'd like. 23 Okay. Our next area of interest is 24 hiring practices concerning school bus

25

drivers.

19 1 Miss Selina Pittenger, executive 2 director, Pennsylvania School Bus Association. Welcome. 3 4 MS. PITTENGER: Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: You may proceed when you're ready. 6 MS. PITTENGER: Okay. Good morning, 7 Chairman Markosek, Chairman Geist, and members 8 9 of the House Transportation Committee. Again, 10 my name is Selina Pittenger. I'm the executive director with the Pennsylvania 11 12 School Bus Association. 13 The Pennsylvania School Bus 14 Association is made up of three hundred fifty 15 private school bus contractors who provide 16 transportation services to school districts. 17 Approximately 85 percent of the five hundred 18 school districts in Pennsylvania use 19 contractors to provide student transportation 20 services. A majority of those contractors are 21 members of our association. 22 Our primary focus is to foster the 23 highest degree of safety in the transportation

25 I thank you for allowing me to

of school children.

24

testify today about the school transportation industry and the hiring practices for school bus drivers. We would like to talk to you today about the safety aspects of riding in school buses, as we feel it's important for us to share our statistics with you as you move forward with the legislative process.

Deputy Secretary Myers did mention about the number of school students and miles traveled in our commonwealth. To reiterate that, on a daily basis, over 1.5 million school students are transported daily without incident. This includes the public, private, charter, and parochial school students in grades K through 12.

There are over thirty thousand registered school buses and more than four hundred million miles traveled annually. And, again, more importantly is we have not had a student fatality, according to our records, in a school bus since 1993.

These statistics are a true testament of school buses operated in Pennsylvania and the highly skilled drivers.

The PSBA has been actively involved

with PennDOT, reviewing school bus -- school vehicle and school driver qualification and regulations for nearly three decades. Our partnership with the department ensures that students are transported in the safest vehicles on a daily basis.

Over the last three decades, school buses have vastly improved and Pennsylvania was at the forefront, mandating safety equipment on school buses and extensive school bus driver training before any other state in the nation.

Pennsylvania was one of the first states to require the side stop arm. And the crossing gates in the front is also another safety feature that is in protecting the children outside the bus, is where more of the fatalities and accidents occur.

Pennsylvania school bus driver

training is one of the most extensive in the

nation. And we are one of the few states that

mandates recertification. Our school bus

drivers are some of the highest skilled

drivers in the nation.

In the last four years, Pennsylvania

school bus driver -- eight Pennsylvania school bus drivers have either placed first or second at the International School Bus Driver Safety Competition, competing with drivers all across the nation and Canada.

This -- Pennsylvania school bus

transportation is by no mistake. State

requirements require mandate -- requirements

mandate through background checks, medical,

physical, and training be obtained before a

driver can be certified to be behind the wheel

of a school bus and transporting school

students.

There are over forty thousand licensed school bus drivers in Pennsylvania.

A school bus driver is required to obtain a CDL with a passenger and school bus endorsement, and minimum of twenty hours of training by a certified school bus driver instructor must be completed before a new school bus driver can obtain the school bus endorsement.

When a new applicant applies for a school bus position, the employer is mandated to perform several background checks on

prospective employees. These checks include the Pennsylvania State Police criminal background check, the FBI fingerprint background check, the child abuse clearance, and a motor vehicle record check.

These four background checks must be performed even if the prospective employee is already a licensed school bus driver.

The Pennsylvania Department of

Education and the Pennsylvania Department of

Transportation outline offenses that would

prohibit an employer from hiring a new

applicant if convicted of these offenses

occurred within the last five years.

Employers are to obtain a five-year driving history from the Department of Transportation. The department only issues driving histories of three years or ten years. If driving violations occurred more than ten years ago, it is not on the motor vehicle record.

If report includes a -- if the report includes a report of an accident, it does not indicate the fault for the accident, only that the individual or the individual's vehicle

involved in the accident on the date listed.

Employers must rely on the honest -their applicants to be honest and forthright
when questioned about any background check
information. By law, drivers with a CDL must
notify their employer in writing if convicted
of a violation within thirty days of the
conviction.

In addition to the training,
background checks, and physical screenings,
all applicants must also submit to
preemployment drug tests, and, once hired, be
placed in a random drug and alcohol testing
pool.

It initially costs school district and contractors approximately five hundred dollars per applicant for training, background checks, preemployment drug test, and a medical physical. On average, two of ten applicants will qualify to be hired.

Once a new drivers has been approved, to be hired by the school district, in order to maintain their school bus driver certification, a driver must complete and submit to the department an annual physical,

be included in a random drug and alcohol testing program, and complete ten hours of recertification every four years.

Pennsylvania laws and regulations describe the minimum requirements that all school districts and contractors must follow, however school districts and contractors have more stringent policies and are above and beyond the state's minimum requirements.

For example, states require all background checks be done prior to employment only. Majority of the school districts and contractors perform background checks on their employees on a regular basis throughout their employment.

Contractors request MVRs on their drivers at least once a year. Some school districts and contractors review these reports semi annually or quarterly.

A challenge for our industry is -within the hiring process is obtaining the
four background checks in a timely fashion.
One of the required background checks runs
through -- each one of these required
background checks runs through four different

departments, and turn-around time varies from instantly for the state police background check and the motor vehicle record check is via online. It can be up to thirty days for the child abuse clearance.

And one suggestion we would like to make at this time is to streamline and consolidate all the required background checks into one submission. This would help streamline the hiring process and ensure that all the necessary background checks have been requested.

As you know, each legislative session numerous bills are introduced that would affect student transportation, whether it's improving vehicle safety, penalizing passing motorists, eliminating school bus driver distractions, or improving school bus driver qualifications. Legislators must be aware, when considering legislation that would increase unfunded costs while not providing a significant increase to safety, these unexpected and unfunded mandates put a burden on school districts whose budgets have been established calculating what the anticipated

costs for transportation will be for the next vear.

The PSBA recognizes that school bus drivers have the duty to direct a hundred percent of their attention to the safe operation of the school bus and the safety of their passengers and that talking on a cell phone or using other personal portable electronic device, whether it's hands-on or hands-free, is a distraction from their professional duties.

The PSBA recommends all school bus companies adopt the following policies -- or policy: Drivers may not use a cell phone or other personal portable electronic device while operating a school bus or any other vehicle transporting students, including loading and unloading students, except in an emergency.

For the purpose of this policy, an emergency exists if the driver requires immediate assistance to ensure the safety of his or her passengers or to report a dangerous or life-threatening situation.

Because of our belief that driver

1 distraction is a leading cause for many 2 accidents, we support legislation that would prohibit texting and limit cell phone use. 3 would further recommend that additional 4 5 penalties be added to a motorist who passes a stopped school bus while loading or unloading 6 while using a cell phone or other electronic 7 8 device. 9 Thank you for giving me the 10 opportunity to testify before you today. I'd 11 be happy to answer any questions. 12 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you 13 very much. 14 The chair would like to note that 15 Representative Ted Harhai has joined us. 16 Representative Jeff Pyle.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for testifying today.

Just curious, are there any laws or governance requiring school bus stops? And the question I ask is, many of my small boroughs are very condensed in river valleys, will have school buses stopping on every corner along the state highway. Are there any

rules of conduct or whatever or policies
within your association that advises your
drivers to at least space them out a couple of
blocks apart or whatever distance?

MS. PITTENGER: That is dependent on the school districts. The Department of Education, the education code mandates that the school districts develop the routes and the school bus stops.

There is issue where the stops -- or not issue but there is guidance as to where school bus stops are located with sight distance and recommendations on where those stops should be established.

If there's a hazardous walking route, they can petition the Department of

Transportation to come out and do a study on the hazardous walking route, and that's more for those that have bus stops that are spread further apart.

In the past few years, though, we've seen a reduction in school bus stops, where they have started spacing them out a little bit further, but it's mostly contingent on the parents and the students within the district

of how those stops are established. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 4 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative 5 Ron Miller. REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: I guess, on 6 your prohibition of the cell phone and things, 7 I appreciate the indent. 8 9 Do you have a definition of what's 10 considered an emergency? And I guess, reason for asking is, I know, in my school district, 11 12 often the driver is called because a parent 13 reports that their child did not get off the 14 school bus, and the question is: Did they 15 just fail to get off or did they fail to get 16 on? Where is that child? 17 Would that be considered an 18 emergency? 19 MS. PITTENGER: That would be 20 considered an emergency. Those school buses 21 are equipped either with two-way radio systems 22 with dispatchers, so that's how they get --

most of the time they're being contacted through a dispatcher and an authority within the district and the company. Though, some of

23

24

25

1 them, some companies have a policy they won't 2 even allow their drivers to carry their 3 personal cell phone along with them; that 4 their means of communication can only be 5 through what's been dictated by the district and the company. 6 REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Okay. 7 8 you. 9 Thank you Mr. Chairman. 10 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative 11 Mark Longietti. 12 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank 13 you. 14 I notice from your testimony that 85 15 percent of the school districts use 16 independent contractors for their school bus 17 services. Are you aware, are there 18 contractors that have more stringent 19 requirements for their bus drivers than what 20 the law prescribes? 21 For example, if I see from your 22 testimony, within thirty days of a traffic 23 violation conviction, the employee is supposed 24 to provide notice. Are there contractors that

even on, like, a DUI arrest or refusal to

25

submit to chemical test, that would require notification and possibly even suspend that driver from driving? Are you aware of that?

MS. PITTENGER: I am aware of many companies and districts that, you know, in their employee handbooks and their employee policies that are more stringent, that even though they haven't been convicted over a violation, that they are to report, you know, as soon as possible; in some cases, they may say within forty-eight hours of, you know, of being cited for a violation, I guess, is the proper term, that they notify the employer and make them aware of their -- you know, what happened and that sort of thing.

If it comes out that they have not, then, again, the policies they have, you know, for termination and, you know, those types of outlines within their employee policies, so they are -- you know, I guess they are above and beyond what the state does require as far as reporting that they have had a violation, been cited for a violation.

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Do you know if it goes beyond even reporting to --

1 okay, you have an obligation to report, but 2 that independent contractor would also say that you cannot drive a bus, you know, unless 3 4 you're acquitted. 5 MS. PITTENGER: Oftentimes, they will -- you know, might not be terminated 6 immediately, but they will be put, you know, 7 8 on suspended notice. They might be doing some 9 light duties at the garage or, you know, in 10 order to maintain a flow of income, but they are removed -- most often removed from the 11 12 vehicle until, you know, everything's been 13 cleared up. 14 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Okay. 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative 17 John Siptroth. 18 REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 19 20 Thank you for your testimony. 21 Do you represent companies that 22 operate vehicles to transport students of ten or less that are not considered school buses? 23 24 MS. PITTENGER: Yes. Many -- I would 25 say a lot of our members have, you know, not

only school buses in their fleet but they do also operate school vehicles which are ten passengers or less to transport school students. Often the smaller vehicles are used for special needs transportation or in districts where some of the new developments have — it's not as easy for a large school bus to get in to some of the new developments, and they will, you know, use the school vehicles to pick up the students closer to their residence instead of having them walk out to a major roadway.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: In regards to that, do you operate that vehicle when you're loading or unloading the school children's completely out of the right-of-way?

MS. PITTENGER: School vehicles are mandated to follow all passenger motorist laws, which motorist is prohibited from coming to a stop on a roadway without being fully -- they can stop if they're completely off the roadway and that other cars can get by them. They are -- school vehicles cannot do student pick-up like a school bus does; they're not equipped with the light system. So those do

have to be totally off-road pick-ups and discharged. Often they're done either, you know, loading and unloading in a driveway or they're curbside, off of the roadway, to -- for students access that vehicle.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: I've

noticed and I have had some reports of those

types of vehicles that are not out of the

cartway completely and -- when they are

loading and unloading students, and that's why

I question that, because I have a safety

concern with that.

MS. PITTENGER: Right. And that's a violation of the law that they would be cited by the police, local law enforcement or state police, if noticed.

School vehicles also have the same requirements identification wise as school buses do, with having either the school district or the contractor name on the side of the vehicle, so that should make it somewhat easier to identify who the vehicle works -- is belonging to and transporting for.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Okay.
Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you.

I have one question, too. You had mentioned in your testimony, it sort of jumped out at me when you said it, that only two out of ten folks that apply to be school bus drivers actually become school bus drivers or become licensed. I'm just curious. I would have guessed it would have been a little higher than that. That's 20 percent of all the applicants.

Can you just give us a little background as what are the common causes of the eight that don't make it, you know, the reasons, common reasons?

MS. PITTENGER: That's pretty, you know, a broad -- the reasons are pretty broad. Sometimes it's, you know, after just a couple of days of the initial training, the applicant realizes this isn't really going to be a good fit for me, you know, I don't know if I'll have the patience to deal with seventy-two children.

Some of them wash out due to, you

know, their background checks aren't up to par and that they're not qualified.

A number of school districts and contractors, again, go above and beyond with the statute of limitations and the -- if they've been convicted of one of the crimes, that they would not be eligible.

Also, another factor is the physical requirements. They go through a pretty stringent physical, so they may wash out because of they just don't qualify physically.

And sometimes they don't -- you know, even though they're told right up front that this is a job of a split shift, you know, two hours in the morning, two hours in the afternoon, they think that will work out, and often, you know, something else comes up and they need to have their time more condensed into a period.

So those are some of the reasons why they're not qualifying and staying on.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: What percentage of those that don't make it, if you know this, would be turned down because of they can't

pass the drug or alcohol?

MS. PITTENGER: That -- I don't have figures on that, to those that don't pass the preemployment drug test.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. If there's a question of -- if a question of qualification is raised in a background check, what happens? Whose decision is it to employ the driver?

MS. PITTENGER: It is ultimately the decision of the school district to approve the driver. The qualification process, often the district, working with their contractor, you know, mandates that they follow all the laws and the policies of the district in the hiring process. But, ultimately, that driver cannot be put behind the wheel of a school bus or school vehicle until the district, at a board meeting or, you know, such meeting that would allow them to begin transporting school students.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. If the background check indicated somebody had a previous DUI, for example, that would not necessarily preclude them from being hired, if

the school district decided that, in spite of 1 2 that, they were going to hire this person, they could still do that. 3 4 MS. PITTENGER: They could. I mean, 5 often those types of -- you know, anything that's showing up on a background check, 6 whether it's the criminal check or the MVR, is 7 8 going to be, you know, scrutinized more 9 closely and that driver is going to be 10 scrutinized more closely to see, you know -again, if it's been twenty years since that --11 12 a DUI or anything showed up on their 13 background check, they might look at it as, 14 hey, he's grown up or she's grown up and 15 learned the errors of their ways. 16 But a lot of assessment, because of 17 the lengthy training process, you know, 18 characters are assessed and it kind of is a 19 longer interview process for a school bus 20 driver. 21 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. I don't 22 see any other questions by the committee, so, 23 Miss Pittenger, thank you very much. 24 MS. PITTENGER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Very good

25

1 testimony. Appreciate it. 2 Next we have an overview of compliance safety accountability. And is 3 4 Mr. Timothy Cotter, who's division 5 administrator for the Pennsylvania division of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety 6 Administration of the U.S. Department of 7 8 Transportation. And he has a slide show 9 available. 10 Mr. Cotter, do you want your --- to 11 have your staff person come forward, too, if 12 you wish. 13 MR. COTTER: I think we're okay. 14 Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Might want to 16 move the microphone a little bit. 17 MR. COTTER: Good morning. 18 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Good morning. 19 MR. COTTER: Appreciate the 20 opportunity to come here today to talk about a 21 new program that we have at the Federal Motor 22 Carrier Safety Administration. Hopefully you 23 have copies of the slides as well with you that were handed out earlier. 24 25 The program is called CSA2010, and

it's comprehensive safety analysis, and it's a program that we're going to use to monitor and have oversight of the motor carrier industry across the country and in Pennsylvania.

I want to first talk to you about what we are changing and why we are making this change at the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

And CSA2010 has three main components to it. First off is how we're going to measure a carrier's safety performance using roadside and crash data.

And the second part is what we're terming interventions, or how we're going to make contact with the industry once they're identified as having some safety issues.

The third part of CSA2010 is our safety fitness determination. And this is part of our long-term plan, to be able to use the data to make a safety fitness determination for each carrier.

Just a little background first, I
thought it might be helpful, from the Federal
Motor Carrier Safety Administration. It is
our mission to reduce crashes, injuries, and

fatalities involving trucks and buses. We are established as a separate agency in January 1st of 2000.

We were originally part of federal highway, and we were separated to our own mode in 2000. We have over about a thousand employees, and we have an office in each state, usually located in the capital of each state.

Some of the key programs that we have at FMCSA, this is just a few of them. We're talking about commercial drivers license, that's one of our programs at FMCSA. We also have responsibility for the moving of household goods and oversight of that industry.

A key program that we have is called the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program.

I'll talk about that in a minute. That's a grant program that we have in each state to fund commercial motor vehicle activities in each state.

And a relatively new program we have is called the New Entrant Safety Program, and that involves every carrier, once they obtain

a U.S. DOT number, and they're an interstate carrier, they're required to go through a safety review within the first eighteen months of operation. And that's a program that was started about four years ago.

The Motor Carrier Safety Assistance

Program is a federal grant program that

provides states with financial assistance to

hire staff and implement strategies to enforce

safety regulations. The program helps

encourage a state to hire individuals,

officers, and also to do crash data analysis

relevant to our grant program.

Here in Pennsylvania, our lead agency for the grant program is the state police, and we have a subgrantee as well, that's the Public Utilities Commission. And in fiscal '09, we have a grant of over six million dollars that is given to the state of Pennsylvania to implement CMV programs, and it helps the uniformity of our programs as well, that vehicles operating in our state are under the same regulations and compliance as they operate in other states as well.

I'm going to talk on CSA2010. It's a

new program that we're very excited about at FMCSA. It's going to introduce a new enforcement and compliance model that's going to allow FMCSA interstate partners, like the state police and PUC, to come in contact with a larger number of carriers than we have in the past. And that was one of the things that we found, is we don't make as many contacts with the industry as we want to.

So why do we want to change? Well, this graph shows the rate of fatalities over time per a hundred million miles being travelled. The chart illustrates that the introduction of some of our different programs has had a positive impact on safety. And the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program, you can see back in 1984 it was implemented, and other programs as well have shown a decrease in fatalities involving commercial motor vehicles.

But if you look at the last couple years on that graph, you can kind of see where the numbers are somewhat of a flat line on fatalities going down. And that's where we want to make that improvement as to be able to

bring fatalities down across our country.

And this slide kind of represents the fatalities in Pennsylvania, and we're pretty much in line with the national perspective when it comes to the flat line in fatalities. The last three years, you can see we've averaged around a hundred ninety-three fatalities involving commercial motor vehicle.

So as the country has gone from a flat line perspective, so has Pennsylvania for the last couple years, although I am very hopeful that 2009 is going to see a reduction in that. We've had a reduction on overall fatalities on our highways, which is obviously very great to see, and hopefully we'll be able to see those numbers in our CMVs once the numbers are finalized.

So why are we making this change?

Well, one of the things we found is we don't touch enough of the carriers out there in a given year. We have over seven hundred thousand interstate carriers, about thirty thousand here in Pennsylvania. And we only touch less than 2 percent of the actual

carriers when we have an investigation or a compliance review, as we term it, completed.

And from a compliance review, a carrier's given a safety rating. And it can be satisfactory, conditional, or unsatisfactory.

One of the limitations with the safety rating is a carrier can have a review ten years ago and they can be rated conditional, and it's not really indicative of their operation today because that rating was so long ago. They could make a lot of improvements over time to be a satisfactory company. Or they could have let things slide and could even have a less-than-conditional rating. But we don't know because we haven't been back to that company in ten years.

And one of the things with CSA2010 is to have the opportunity to go visit more carriers over time than we are right now.

The three components of CSA2010, the first one is the safety measurements. I'll spend most of my time talking about how we're going to identify or measure carriers from a safety performance. The second part are the

interventions or the different types of contacts that we're going to implement. And the third one is what I mentioned before, safety fitness determination, where it's -- our hope, down the road, is to be able to use the data to determine that fitness rating for a carrier.

There are seven categories, or basics that we are calling, that a carrier is going to be evaluated in. These are the seven different categories where we're going to take crash and inspection data that is conducted each day by roadside officers and law enforcement, we're going to pull that data in and score carriers under these seven categories.

The first one is called unsafe driving. And just to give you examples of some of these different categories, unsafe driving are your speeding violations, think of moving violations, improper lane change, aggressive driving, violations that would be documented by an officer. Those are the examples of violations in that first category, unsafe driving.

Fatigued driving is those related to hours of service where a driver is cited for a false record of duty status or being over the limitations for the hours of service, for example.

Driver fitness is the third component. And those are your CDL-related violations and medical requirements, where a driver maybe is not driving with the proper CDL or endorsement, or they're being cited for not having a medical card or not being physically qualified. Those violations are captured and a carrier scored under driver fitness.

The fourth one, controlled substance and alcohol, those are violations related to a driver being in possession of alcohol or drugs during a roadside inspection or they're stopped and they're under the influence of drugs or alcohol as well. That would score a carrier under controlled substance and alcohol.

The fifth one, vehicle maintenance, are your maintenance violations. A carrier has an inspection. Roadside violations are

documented for brakes being out of service, maybe lights not working, problems with the frame of the vehicle. Maintenance-related violations are captured under number five.

cargo related would be those cargo securement or any type of hazardous material violations a carrier might be cited for. So if they don't have proper cargo securement, they're hauling coils of steel down the road and it's not properly secured, those type of violations are captured under number six.

And the final one is the crash indicator or crash score, where we have thousands of crashes being reported on a monthly basis to us from all the different states. And it's captured under a carrier's DOT number. And for number seven, the crash indicator, they would get a crash score based on how many crashes they've had in the last two years.

For these seven categories, the data that we are using goes back twenty-four months. So when we run the numbers for CSA2010, if we ran it this month, we would go back twenty-four months, and this just gives

you an example how much data we are pulling in to score carriers under these seven categories.

Nationwide, we have over six million inspections being completed of which over a hundred seventy-six thousand are being completed by Pennsylvania officers.

We have two hundred ninety thousand crashes being reported during that twenty-four month time period of which over ten thousand are here in Pennsylvania.

And we have about six hundred ninetyseven hundred thousand carriers out there, and
as I indicated, around thirty, thirty-one
thousand carriers based here in Pennsylvania.

One of the differences with our program with CSA2010 is we're going to use all violations from a roadside inspection.

Currently, when we monitor a carrier's performance, we are only using out-of-service violations, those that deem the vehicle or driver being placed out of service. But what we are trying to do at FMCSA is raise the bar in the sense that any violations that are found during a roadside inspection are going

to contribute to the scoring of a carrier under CSA2010.

Two other aspects that we're going to use under our measurements is the time weighted and severity weighting.

In time weighted, we want to put more emphasis on the current data that we have. I talked about going back twenty-four months to look at the data, but we put more weight and emphasis on the data that we pull in within the first six months. So if the carrier had a crash or inspection within the last six months, that's going to have a greater impact on their scoring under this program than an inspection or crash that happened twenty months ago. We want to put more weight, more emphasis on the current data that we have available, and as it gets older, it has less of an impact on the carrier's scoring.

And severity weighting is the same way, and in the sense that those serious violations are going to have a greater impact. I'll show you a couple examples, but basically we're looking at out-of-service violations would have a greater impact on

their scoring than some of our non-out-ofservice violations.

There are seven different areas that we are scoring a carrier, and I just want to show you two to kind of give you a sense of the data that we are pulling in.

The unsafe driving measure, this is the operation of a motor vehicle in a dangerous or careless manner by a driver and carrier. And some of the examples of those violations that would be scored under this category would be speeding, reckless driving, improper lane change, failing to use a seat belt.

And then the time weighted, as you can see from the slide, is weighted from a three, two, and one standpoint. So an inspection that happened within the first three months or six months is given three points and so on from there.

Under the examples, you can see
there's a number next to that score, the
speeding and reckless driving, it's a five and
a ten. Well, all violations under this factor
are scored from a one to ten, so speeding is

given a score of five where a reckless driving is more likely to cause or contribute to a crash, so that's given a score of ten. Seat belts, while still very important, doesn't necessarily cause or contribute to a crash, and it's given a score of one, under this particular factor.

The other example is under vehicle
maintenance, inadequate or improper
maintenance procedures by a carrier, and some
of the examples are insufficient brake lining,
a horn not working, improper rear end
protection, and improper tire depth on that
vehicle. Those are the points that are given,
anywhere from a one to ten score is the
severity weight.

And, again, the time-weighted aspect is looked at as well. And that's an important point from the industry standpoint, that, well, if this inspection or this crash is on my record for the next two years, I can't do anything about it. In truth, that is on their record under this scoring, but as that data gets older, it has less of an impact on their scoring.

The second part of CSA2010 is the new interventions. And I've highlighted in blue the more typical intervention tools we use here today. The on-site investigation comprehensive is what we use here in our program today. And by comprehensive, what I mean on that is, we have a carrier who's been identified as having maintenance problems, we do a full review on that carrier, where we look at drug and alcohol, CDL compliance, hours of service along with that maintenance.

And what we want to do is move to the on-site investigations and off-site investigations that are highlighted there.

The on-site investigation focus will allow us to go into that same company that was identified as only having maintenance issues and just look at that one problem. We want to get away from looking at everything at that carrier that the data is not telling us that they're having a problem in hours of service.

Let's open up our time for the carrier and also for our investigator to just look at where the problem is. And that's where our focused on-site investigation would come into

play there.

The off-site investigation would be an example where the carrier would provide us documentation and we would do that review back at our office. And an example of that would be a carrier, let's say they have a high crash rate. We would ask them to provide us with the documentation related to those crashes, and we can do our assessment off site. And it helps the carrier and also our staff as well, where we don't have to send somebody out to the carrier to look at that one part for a couple of hours or a day. And it also frees up the carrier's time as well by providing that information and letting us do our work from an off-site perspective.

So those are some of the new intervention tools that we're looking to utilize under CSA2010.

These are the test states right now that are involved in the CSA2010. It's been going on for about three years now, our pilot program. And here in the northeast, we have states like New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland that are involved in CSA2010.

The last part of our discussion is

the safety fitness rating. And this is a

proposal that we're looking to implement. And

we want to get away from what we term our

"seal of approval" for our ratings. Right now

a carrier gets a rating, as I indicated, and

it stays on their record for ten, twenty

years, until a new rating is generated.

And what we are doing is proposing a safety fitness determination, where based on the data alone on a monthly basis, the carrier would be classified as either unfit, marginal, or continue to operate. And this would be changing on a monthly basis because we would be running our data once a month, and a carrier would be determined to be unfit, marginal, or continue to operate based upon their safety performance.

So it really puts the carrier in control of their safety fitness determination, based on their crashes and based on their roadside activity.

The data itself we're going to make available to the industry later this summer. It's going to be an opportunity for them to

log on with a pin number. They can access their own information; no one else would have access to it. And they can start to look at the data and see how they are scoring, and it will provide them with the opportunity to see what type of changes or program improvements need to be made by the carrier for when we do roll out the program later this year.

And kind of a subset of CSA2010 is a program called preemployment screening program. And that is going to be a new opportunity for the carriers to be able to have access to our crash and inspection data. And what will happen is, as a carrier goes to hire a driver, the driver will sign a release form, and at that point, the carrier's going to be able to contact FMCSA through a third-party vendor, and they're going to get access to all the inspections and crashes related to that driver.

So that's going to be information available to the carrier to help them make a more informed decision of when they go to hire a driver. It is not a mandatory program; it is optional. But it's going to be a program

that we expect the carriers to jump on very quickly, based on the benefits that it will provide to them.

When we talk to carriers, one of the big things that we try and stress is educating their drivers about this. A driver's going to be on the front line, based on the roadside inspection and the crashes, so it's important that drivers have an understanding of this program as well.

In our office, we have been doing a lot of education presentations and seminars to the industry to get this word out. We have websites available. I, myself, have been talking on this program to the industry, to make them aware, to get them up to speed so they're ready to go once we do fully implement CSA2010.

So those are the three aspects of the CSA2010. We have our safety measurement, our new intervention process. And we're really hoping with a greater number of interventions, it's going to result in the agency reaching more carriers, and it's going to lead to increased safety while decreasing the amount

of disruption to our carriers who are 1 2 investigated. 3 This program is also good for 4 carriers. These compliance are going to help 5 to establish a more equal playing field for the industry once we roll out the program 6 later this year. 7 8 At this point, I'd be happy to take 9 any questions you may have. 10 Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative 12 Mike Carroll. 13 REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you 14 very much. 15 Thanks for your testimony. 16 Exactly how does this affect the 17 carriers in Pennsylvania? What's the penalty 18 here for newly discovered violations? 19 MR. COTTER: The program is going to 20 be a monitoring program for us, for every 21 carrier that has a U.S. DOT number. Once they 22 have their inspections and crashes, that 23 information is uploaded. So we're going to be

able to monitor a carrier's performance over a

period of time, two years under CSA2010.

24

25

So it's not really so much of a penalty, but it's an opportunity for us to better assess a carrier at an earlier point.

Right now, we kind of wait until they have serious problems. Under CSA2010, what we want to be able to do is, once those problems start to be filtered up, they're at a point where we want address them, we can tackle them a lot earlier and a lot sooner.

So instead of waiting for a carrier to have maintenance and hours-of-service and driver problems, if maintenance is their only problem, let's get to it right then and there and address and work with that carrier to make those safety improvements.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Exactly how do you do that?

MR. COTTER: We have investigators in my office and also with the PUC where we'll send them out to the carrier and work with them and look at their programs and see what type of policy or program changes need to be made at their operation. And it's based on our experience, what our officers and their experience with other carriers, that they can

help implement new programs to those carriers that need assistance there.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Seems like you're going to really be busy. I mean, the statistics that I've learned -- I was at a recent meeting with the group that -- involved with I-81 corridor in northeastern

Pennsylvania, and the information related to truck inspections indicated an astoundingly high number of trucks were put out of service when they did these inspections. And it just seems to me that you're going to inherit all sorts of work here with respect to inspections, I guess, in advance of them actually going out to the road.

Do you have that kind of staff to be able do something like this?

MR. COTTER: Well, I think we have
the resources. I think what is being created
here are more opportunities for how we're
going to handle those carriers that have been
identified. I mean, some of the other
examples that we would have as tools would be
sending out warning letters to those carriers,
increasing those carriers that have been

identified as having problems with more roadside inspection, but also for sending officers out to do reviews, instead of spending a whole week at a carrier where they have look at everything, they're going to be able to maybe do two or three reviews in a week and look at those carriers, because they're going to focus in on where the problem is.

So I think we have the resources, just better looking at the problems and using our time more efficiently under this new program.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Just one last questions, Mr. Chair, if I may.

The driver fitness component that you touched on earlier, will that change the ability for Pennsylvania CDL drivers -- I mean, for example, as I understand it, certain medical conditions now warrant the issuance of a CDL and others prevent the issuances.

Do these new driver fitness requirements change our existing medical requirements for a CDL?

MR. COTTER: It does not change

anything. What it does is allows us to better capture all those violations under a single category. So we're not looking to change the physical requirements or standards that are out there. It's just being able to identify those drivers and carriers that have been cited for those violations and more directly look at those problems.

So we're not looking to change any of the regulatory physical requirements.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: I'm not sure how you'd qualify a violation as a medical condition -- I don't -- you're not equating a medical condition with a violation, are you?

MR. COTTER: Well, there can be drivers that maybe they don't have a medical roadside, and that would be something that we might want to look at a little bit closer after the fact. If a driver doesn't have a medical card or he's been cited three or four times during different roadside inspections, that would be something we would want to look at a little bit more closely to see why does that driver not have a physical. Is there some type of physical limitation out there or

has the driver just been having a disregard 1 for that rule in particular? 2 REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you, 4 Mr. Chairman. 5 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative John Siptroth. 6 REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you. 7 8 Just a little follow-up with 9 Representative Carroll. Is there any amnesty 10 program afforded to the drivers in this 11 program? In other words, if they blow a 12 whistle on a carrier for repeated violations, 13 that they're forced to drive a truck or a bus 14 or whatever, is there any amnesty offered to 15 those particular drivers? 16 MR. COTTER: We take it very serious 17 when a driver comes in with any type of 18 complaint involving a carrier. And as we do 19 today and will down the road, we don't 20 acknowledge to the carrier that we got a 21 complaint from a certain individual; we never 22 identify that individual. 23 Some of the more serious complaints that we have found on a carrier have come from 24

drivers, so that's a very important kind of

25

resource that we see out there. So we never go back to the driver or hold the driver accountable for violations under the whistler-blower requirements, if they have identified any problems out there.

So we -- we look for drivers to notify us of those violations, however we never tell the carrier or acknowledge to anybody else where those violations were -- came from or how we were notified.

mean, there are tracking devices that -- you know, scenarios that would lead back to a particular driver of a particular rig and that type of thing, if they're being cited or inspected more frequently than the average vehicle in the fleet. That's my only concern, that they could be tracked back to that particular whistler blower.

MR. COTTER: I know when we have our investigators go in, it's a standard expectation not to reveal where the complaint came from. And when we look at a carrier's operation, we don't go and just look at that one vehicle, one driver. We usually take a

1 sampling of drivers that a carrier is 2 utilizing, whether drivers or vehicles, so I 3 think, through that process, we're able to 4 kind of mask where we are looking at or where 5 the problem even originated from, to help kind of prevent the complaint being indicated or 6 who was involved with the original complaint 7 8 there. 9 REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Okay. 10 Thank you. 11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. You're 13 welcome. 14 Representative Ted Harhai. 15 REPRESENTATIVE HARHAI: Thank you, 16 Mr. Chairman. 17 Thank you, Mr. Cotter, for your 18 testimony. 19 Feeding off of Representative 20 Siptroth, you might get a disgruntled driver, 21 as you well know, and turn somebody in for 22 something that isn't -- isn't bad or very 23 marginal. That's not my question, but I'm sure that's what you have to deal with on a 24 25 daily basis. I'm angry with my carrier so

I tell them that the braking is bad; let them figure out. Just the fact that they're getting inspected and upsetting the apple cart, so to speak, makes them happy.

My question is, do you utilize the black box at all? And are you familiar with -- I have legislation that's been pending and languishing for about five years. And it just came to light again with this Toyota issue about the sticking gas pedal.

Do you have anything that is similar? Although you were very comprehensive, and I think it seems to be a good program, do you utilize something where you would find out by the accident they ignored them, and are they always — obviously they're not always trucking issues — or not issues, but default. Do you have anything of that sort on the tractor that would indicate braking, air bag deployment, distance in braking, things of that nature?

MR. COTTER: Currently, we don't use that in the field or in the divisions right now, but I can look in to see how our agency is going to be considering looking at those

opportunities.

REPRESENTATIVE HARHAI: I'm just curious, because, as I said, there's language, because the insurance industry has fought very hard and long to stop that from being a part of it or allowing themselves to access the information but not the actual company, or in the case that I would be doing with an individual constituent, they can't get ahold of their own information and they paid for a vehicle. Sounds pretty bad.

I'm just curious if you utilize that or just that type of system in addition to what you already have, which I said, and agree with, is very comprehensive.

MR. COTTER: Not in today's environment, but I can see where our agency is looking to go on that, if that would help.

REPRESENTATIVE HARHAI: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. I had a couple of questions, Mr. Cotter.

One -- you had mentioned that there are roughly thirty thousand carriers in Pennsylvania?

1 MR. COTTER: Correct, interstate 2 carriers, yes. 3 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Interstate 4 carriers. And school buses would not be part 5 of that. MR. COTTER: For the most part, no. 6 I mean, occasionally, you might have a school 7 bus operation that would go across state lines 8 9 on a "for hire," but that's a very limited 10 occurrences. CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Would there be --11 12 some of those carriers out of that thirty 13 thousand be just a person that has one truck? MR. COTTER: Yes. 14 15 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: So it can be all 16 sizes? 17 MR. COTTER: Um-hum. 18 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: On one of your 19 slides, or actually a couple of them, you were 20 talking relative to the SMS basics, that 21 slide, where the focus on behaviors linked to 22 crash risks. Distracted driving wasn't 23 mentioned. 24 We've obviously been dealing very 25 heavily with that here in the legislature

recently. Is there data to be shown there or 1 2 is it part of some other data that you have? MR. COTTER: I know distracted 3 4 driving is a priority for the office of the 5 secretary. And I know our agency is working on some rule makings related to that, but I'm 6 not privy to those discussions or know kind of 7 8 where they stand here today. 9 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Let me 10 just say that Mr. Cotter sits on the 11 Pennsylvania Motor Carrier Advisory Committee, 12 which Chairman Geist and I and Miss Pittenger 13 also are members of that. 14 And I want to thank you for your 15 efforts relative to that and for also coming 16 to our hearing today and providing some very 17 good information. 18 Any other questions by the members? 19 Representative Costa, you didn't have 20 any questions? 21 REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: No, sir. 22 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thought I saw a 23 hand up over there. 24 REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Just trying to

25

get comfortable.

1 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Mr. Cotter, thank 2 you very much. Very good testimony. And I want to thank all of the people 3 4 that spoke today. 5 And I also want to mention that Representative Josh Shapiro has joined us as a 6 visitor. 7 8 And, Josh, just so you know, I 9 consider all the visitors to this committee as 10 wannabes. So --11 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I certainly 12 am, Mr. Chairman. 13 CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Welcome to the 14 committee meeting today. I know you have a 15 great interest in distracted driving. 16 Just a point of order for the 17 committee and some information. April 12th 18 and 13th, we will be in the Lehigh Valley and 19 in Philadelphia. We have a tour in the Lehigh 20 Valley of a cement plant -- or a concrete 21 plant. And, also, the committee is invited to 22 attend a conference in Philadelphia relative 23 to distracted driving. And that's for the

information of the members.

Seeing no further business, the

24

25

```
1
        meeting is adjourned. Thank you.
                  (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
2
3
        11:15 a.m.)
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I HEREBY CERTIFY that I was present upon the hearing of the above-entitled matter and there reported stenographically the proceedings had and the testimony produced; and I further certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my said stenographic notes. BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR Court Reporter Notary Public