

Motor Carrier Alternative Compliance Subcommittee

Mid-Year Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 15, 2017: 3:00-4:30 PM ET

****Note that the full attendee list is on the last page of this document.**

Discussion

1. Welcome and introductions
 - a. Brenda welcomed everyone and introduced the new Chair for this Subcommittee, Sharon Newnam, who gave a brief background of her work and interests.
 - b. There were roundtable introductions of everyone else in attendance (see last page).
 - c. Brenda gave a brief background of the subcommittee, referencing:
 - i. A Subcommittee Report (white paper), originally created in 2011-2012, and then updated in 2013. This is available at:
<http://www.ugpti.org/trb/truckandbus/meetings/2013/downloads/2013AlternativeCompliance.pdf>
 1. The report references TRB's Commercial Truck and Bus Safety Synthesis Program (CTBSSP) Synthesis 12: Commercial Motor Vehicle Carrier Safety Management Certification; and this is available from TRB at:
<http://www.trb.org/Publications/ProductsCTBSSPSynthesisReports.aspx>
 - ii. A briefing to the full committee at the 2016 annual meeting, available at:
<http://www.ugpti.org/trb/truckandbus/meetings/2016/downloads/2016AlternativeCompliance.pdf>
2. Overview of the research project to support the FMCSA implementation of the Beyond Compliance process - Gene Bergoffen (see presentation)
 - a. Dan mentioned that a lot of prior research has been conducted by ATRI, UMTRI, Virginia Tech, and others analyzing the implementation of various technologies and the improvements in safety; but what is the incentive for carriers to participate in a "Beyond Compliance" program?
 - i. Gene stated that the project will not duplicate work already completed, but will synthesize the existing work. A framework of possible incentives will be developed as part of this project.
 - ii. Don agreed, stating that they will be interviewing carriers to help create this framework.
 - iii. Joe concurred, adding that they will be looking to what will apply to both smaller and large carriers; and as part of the FAST Act requirement for "credit" for companies participating in the program, the metrics for receiving this credit need to be established.
 - b. Dan questioned the possible Return on Investment for companies that have already implemented many of the technologies, but now may have to set-up a way of "tracking" this?

- i. Joe responded that Dan is a half-step ahead of the project, but FMCSA plans to make the implementation as streamlined as possible, taking into account carriers that have already implemented programs/technologies.
 - ii. Don added to this that the trucking industry is a commodity service market that is always looking for ways to create differentiation. If shippers recognize carriers that receive some sort of third-party recognition, this may be a benefit to the carriers.
 - c. Roger discussed the Partners in Compliance (PIC) program in Alberta that has identified a set of carrier incentives, best practices and safety standards, and a carrier risk factor measurement algorithm. In addition, it has recognition and third-party audit and support (<http://picalberta.ca/>). He stated that there are 79 carriers, with 14,000 power units and that the program has been operating in Alberta for nearly 20 years (since 1998). He offered that a Canadian carrier could likely be available participate in this research project if there is interest.
 - i. Gene asked Roger to please contact him to discuss this in more detail; and Roger said that he will do so.
 - d. Joe added a final comment that FMCSA did not receive the information they needed from the public notices for comments; and this is why they decided to move forward with this research project to really understand how to monitor the program and apply the credit. And, also to understand what volunteer practices carriers are doing today and why.
 - e. Roger, Dan, and Joe discussed the “meaning” of the terms “Alternative Compliance” and “Beyond Compliance” in terms of conveying the scope of the committee.
 - i. Alternative Compliance could mean that you don’t have to meet regulatory requirements provided that you can achieve better safety results through implementation of a different process, that you can do “this instead of that”.
 - ii. Beyond compliance could mean doing something “outside” of or “in addition to” the existing regulations (beyond the regulations).
 - f. Roger discussed the North American Fatigue Management Program, and believes this would be a good example of a preferred alternative to Hours-of-Service regulatory requirements (<http://www.nafmp.com>).
 - i. Gene agreed stating that fatigue management is a critical, vital component.
 - ii. Don said he is very familiar with this program, and will examine as part of this project.
- 3. Expanding the scope of the committee
 - a. Ron Knipping had suggested at the Annual Meeting to broaden the scope of committee to “carrier safety management”; and reiterated that this subcommittee shouldn’t necessarily be tied to the FMCSA program name or initiatives. This would invite more varied discussion of other carrier practices, such as driver selection, etc.
 - b. Roger suggested that the term “carrier safety management” may infer that the government is stepping aside from the safety role.
 - i. Ron clarified that we are discussing the scope / name of this subcommittee.
 - c. Sharon agreed with expanding the scope, and that the discussions should not just be about compliance, but a whole safety culture.

- d. Mike also agreed, stating that it is good to have representation from both Canada and Australia in regards to self-directed safety management.
 - e. Bernardo reminded the group that as a TRB subcommittee, we should focus on discussing research, supporting practice, and engaging in evidence-based discussions. Who is doing what?
 - f. Mike suggested the possible committee name of “Carrier Safety Performance”.
 - i. Ron agreed as the name would represent an outcome, the primary interest of the committee.
 - g. Brenda and Sharon will work off-line to determine a new committee name based on the discussion, and change the defined scope as needed.
 - h. Discussed the idea of expanding the program through partnering with existing agencies/initiatives at the Annual Meeting. Brian Taylor mentioned a compliance program in Alberta, Jeff Burns mentioned broker groups.
 - i. Brian and Jeff were not on the call, but Brenda suggested that we may want to invite representatives to present information at an upcoming conference call or meeting.
4. Data to evaluate the effectiveness of accreditation programs
- a. Mike Fox mentioned at the Annual Meeting the examples of the International Motorcoach Group (IMG), which is a monitoring group (<http://imgcoach.com/about-img>); and the Transportation Safety Exchange (TSX), which is an auditing group -- <https://www.transportationsafetyexchange.com/>.
 - i. Mike wasn't on the call, but we will follow-up off-line for any updates or additional information.
 - b. Sharon was following up on TruckSafe system in Australia.
 - i. Sharon mentioned that there are minimum standards, but there has not been an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program.
 - c. No one on the call knew of any evaluations of effectiveness of the various programs in existence.
 - i. Ron stated that this is a great topic to continue to research.
 - ii. Mike said that we need to remind ourselves that this is a business and very competitive. Need to keep considering the economic competition and its influence on safety outcomes.
5. Follow-up discussions from TRB:
- a. One key theme emerging from the discussion in the last meeting was ‘best practice’ frameworks. Some points for discussion:
 - i. What is best practice and how can we define it? What is the role of technology in best practice? Gene mentioned a white paper to set-up the concept of a pilot test for evaluating the effectiveness of technology.
 - 1. Gene added that the pilot test is needed, given the lack of evaluations in existence.
 - ii. Sharon mentioned an example of an initiative in Australia that has attempted to establish ‘best practice’: <http://www.nrspp.org.au/Pool/Resources/NRSPP-National-Fleet-Benchmarking-Project-Discussion-Paper.pdf>
 - iii. Other examples of best practice frameworks?

1. Mike mentioned he had developed a benchmarking program years ago, and has a spreadsheet of the variables included. He will share this with the group.
 - iv. Ron stated that he is not as much concerned with the “culture” but more the “practices”.
 1. Gene agreed, stating that they will be looking at the “attributes” that people define as “culture”.
 2. Sharon also agreed that we need to determine the actual meaning (i.e., what practices contribute to a positive safety culture) in order to provide tangible guidance to carriers.
 3. Roger added that with any change, there is a need for CEO buy-in, as it can be hard to keep it going.
 - v. Sharon will distribute some reports that may be of interest.
6. Other business
 - a. There was no other business reported. Brenda and Sharon will compile and distribute the meeting minutes, and follow-up on the action items identified.

Motor Carrier Alternative Compliance Subcommittee: Mid-Year Attendee List

Name	Organisation	Email
In Attendance		
Brenda Lantz	North Dakota State University, Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute	brenda.lantz@ndsu.edu
Sharon Newnam	Monash University, Australia (MUARC)	sharon.newnam@monash.edu
Bernardo Kleiner	TRB Staff Representative	BKleiner@nas.edu
Gene Bergoffen	Maineway Services	bergoffen@roadrunner.com
Don Osterberg	Transportation safety and security expert	Don.Osterberg@gmail.com
Dan Murray	American Transportation Research Institute	dmurray@trucking.org
Ron Knipling	Independent safety researcher and consultant	rknipling@verizon.net
Roger Clarke	Motor Carrier Safety Associates	roger.clarke@shaw.ca
Mike Belzer	Wayne State University	michael.h.belzer@wayne.edu
Joe Delorenzo	Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	joseph.delorenzo@dot.gov
Gian Marshall	Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	Gian.Marshall@dot.gov
Steve Vaughn	Help, Inc.	steve@helpinc.us
Stacey Tisdale	Texas A&M Transportation Institute	s-tisdale@tti.tamu.edu
Tom Weakley	Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association	tom_weakley@ooida.com
Andrew King	Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association	Andrew_King@ooida.com
Joyce Pressley	Columbia University	jp376@cumc.columbia.edu
Nicholas Kehoe	toXcel (safety engineer)	Nicholas.Kehoe@toxcel.com
Sarah May	Volpe National Transportation Systems Center	Sarah.May@dot.gov
Olivia Gillham	Volpe National Transportation Systems Center	Olivia.Gillham@dot.gov
Invited, but not in Attendance		
Eric Miller	Transport Topics	emiller@ttnews.com
Dan Blower	University of Michigan (UMTRI)	dfblower@umich.edu
Jeff Burns	Dollar, Burns and Becker, Trial Attorneys	jeffb@dollar-law.com
Brian Taylor	Drivewyze transportation services	btaylor@drivewyze.com
Deborah Quackenbush	Virtual Excellence	daquack@aol.com
Mike Fox	National Transportation Safety Board	michael.fox@ntsb.gov
Dave Madsen	Volpe National Transportation Systems Center	dave.madsen@dot.gov
Theresa Rowlett	Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	theresa.rowlett@dot.gov
Martin Lavallière	Université du Québec à Chicoutimi	Martin_Lavalliere@uqac.ca