Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Commercial Vehicle Operations (CVO)

2008 Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Deployment Workshop: Collaborating to Advance CVISN

Meeting Minutes

Baseline Issue

Department of Transportation Contract Number DTMC75-07-D-00009, Task No. PQJ14

NSTD-09-0039 V1.0

January 2009

Prepared by:



Prepared for:



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

Baseline Version

Internal and external reviews of this document, previously published drafts, and preliminary versions have been completed. All comments received to date have been incorporated or addressed.

This document and other CVISN-related documentation are available for review and downloading by the ITS/CVO community from the FMCSA CVISN site on the World Wide Web. All updates to this document will be maintained and published on that site. The URL for the CVISN site is: http://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/facts-research/cvisn.

Please note:

This document is disseminated in the interest of information exchange. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

Additional review and comments to this document are welcome. Please send comments to:

Julie Lane Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E., Room W66-406, Technology Division (MC-RRT) Washington, DC 20590 Phone: 202-385-2391 E-Mail: Julie.Lane@dot.gov

> Sandra B. Boys The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory 11100 Johns Hopkins Road Laurel, MD 20723-6099 Phone: 240-228-7610 E-Mail: Sandra.Boys@jhuapl.edu

2008 Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Deployment Workshop: Collaborating to Advance CVISN Meeting Minutes

Table of Contents

Ex	ecutive S	ummaryv	
1.	. Introduction		
	1.1	Purpose of the Workshop1	
	1.2	Purpose of this Document1	
	1.3	Organization of this Document1	
2.	Tutorial	Introduction to CVISN1	
3.	Achievin	ng CVISN Core Compliance: Lessons Learned Discussions	
	3.1	E-Screening2	
	3.2	E-Credentialing	
	3.3	CVIEW	
	3.4	Procurement Process	
4.	Advanci	ng Your CVISN Program9	
	4.1	Executive Kick-Off	
	4.2	State of CVISN	
	4.3	Funding CVISN10	
	4.4	Making the Case for CVISN; Keeping It Going10	
5.	Data Qu	ality and Performance Monitoring11	
	5.1	Early Deployment	
	5.2	Core and Expanded Deployment12	
6.	Emergin	g Technologies and CVISN13	
	6.1	Roadside Operations	
	6.2	Roadside Data Access14	
	6.3	Permitting15	

7.	. Developing an Integrated Commercial Vehicle Safety Program		
	7.1	The Relationship of CVISN to Other Federal Programs16	
	7.2	Future of CVISN Operations – Mainstreaming	
8.	Focus G	roup Meetings19	
	8.1	CVISN-PRISM Coordination Focus Group19	
	8.2	Universal Identification Focus Group	
9.	Summar	y and Analysis	
	9.1	Participant Evaluations	
	9.2	Observations and Recommendations	
	9.3	Next Steps	
10.	Acronyr	ns24	
AP	APPENDIX A. CVISN DEPLOYMENT WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS		
AP	APPENDIX B. WORKSHOP AGENDAB–1		

2008 Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Deployment Workshop: Collaborating to Advance CVISN Meeting Minutes

Executive Summary

The 2008 Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Deployment Workshop: Collaborating to Advance CVISN brought stakeholders together to improve the future of the CVISN Deployment Program. The workshop provided an opportunity for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) and states to discuss common experiences and explore how best to deploy and augment CVISN both now and in the future. Twenty-nine jurisdictions were represented in person (additional states attended via webcast), and 14 federal staff participated in at least part of the 3-day workshop held 2–4 December in Baltimore, Maryland. Participants included representatives from state credentialing and enforcement agencies, system architects, and CVISN program managers, as well as FMCSA field staff and information technology development and support teams.

The workshop objectives are described below.

Present high-level introductory material for states/personnel that are new to CVISN.

The workshop opened with a tutorial on CVISN that highlighted best practices in all CVISN program areas and disseminated the latest information regarding CVISN. This presentation was also attended by multiple states via webcast.

Give the states an opportunity to share lessons learned during CVISN deployment.

Stakeholders at various stages of deployment delivered presentations and participated in panel discussions on topics including electronic screening, electronic credentialing, safety information exchange, and the procurement process. The panel format allowed for a peer-to-peer exchange focused on sharing best practices and lessons learned.

Provide the states a forum for peer exchange and networking to advance their own programs.

Panel discussions also included sessions on completing and maintaining CVISN Core compliance, data quality and performance monitoring, implementing emerging technologies, and mainstreaming CVISN. During the workshop, representatives from more than 18 states participated on panels, providing an excellent opportunity for peer exchange and networking. States also had ample opportunities for informal networking during breaks, meals, and outside workshop hours.

Inform the states about current status of federal programs and projects related to CVISN.

The executive welcome provided an overview of the role of CVISN in achieving the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT)/FMCSA goals. The State of CVISN address highlighted the FY 2008 successes of the CVISN program and identified the program goals for FY 2009. Presentations by Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM);

Creating Opportunities, Methods, and Processes to Secure Safety (COMPASS); and Comprehensive Safety Analysis (CSA) 2010 program representatives afforded states insight into how those programs will impact their state CVISN programs.

Encourage the states to explore specific topics of interest in focus group discussions. States attended focus group sessions on CVISN-PRISM coordination and universal identification.

Provide the opportunity for the States to work with FMCSA representatives for one-on-one assistance.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Workshop

The 2008 Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Deployment Workshop: Collaborating to Advance CVISN brought stakeholders together to improve the future of the CVISN Deployment Program. The workshop provided an opportunity for FMCSA and states to discuss common experiences and explore how best to deploy and augment CVISN both now and in the future. Twenty-nine jurisdictions were represented in person (additional states attended via webcast), and 14 federal staff participated in at least part of the 3-day workshop held 2–4 December in Baltimore, Maryland. Participants included representatives from state credentialing and enforcement agencies, system architects, and CVISN program managers (PMs), as well as FMCSA field staff and information technology (IT) development and support teams.

1.2 Purpose of this Document

This summary document captures the discussion highlights of the 3-day workshop.

1.3 Organization of this Document

Sections 2 through 8 include discussion summaries. Section 9 consists of general observations and recommendations resulting from the workshop. Acronyms are listed in Section 10. Appendix A lists everyone who attended at least part of the workshop. Appendix B shows the workshop agenda.

2. TUTORIAL: INTRODUCTION TO CVISN

The tutorial provided an overview of the CVISN Program and included a summary of the typical Commercial Vehicle Operations (CVO) environment before and after CVISN deployment, an overview of Core CVISN functionality, and examples of best practices in the areas of electronic credentialing and safety information exchange. The tutorial defined the concept of Expanded CVISN and identified the functional areas. It also enumerated the benefits of the CVISN Program to motor carriers and states.

• The second half of the presentation addressed issues that arise when implementing CVISN, including planning, obtaining federal funding through the FY 2009 CVISN Deployment Grant Program, and best practices for reaching out to industry.

The tutorial concluded with a reminder of the technical assistance available from FMCSA to states to support CVISN planning and deployment.

3. ACHIEVING CVISN CORE COMPLIANCE: LESSONS LEARNED DISCUSSIONS

Core CVISN-compliant states shared lessons learned in the areas of e-screening, e-credentialing, Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window (CVIEW), and CVISN procurement.

3.1 E-Screening

States learned about different approaches to e-screening and the factors to consider when making their selections. Speakers covered what is involved with e-screening in their states, how it looks from the state's perspective (e.g., how much it costs, what bypass criteria are used), and how it looks from the carrier's perspective (e.g., how much it costs, who can participate).

Presentations:

- Utah E-Screening Shirleen Hancock, UT
- E-Screening in South Dakota: Lessons Learned Anselem Rumpca, SD
- North Carolina Pre-clearance System Eric Hooks, International Road Dynamics

Highlights:

- Without interoperability, e-screening is not cost-effective. All states need to share data.
- Participants would like to see agreement across states for some basic minimum common criteria.
- Some data in the Safety and Fitness Electronic Records (SAFER) system are stale. States need to maintain fresh information.
- To get intrastate operators involved in e-screening, states should consider putting sites on rural/non-interstate routes.

Questions to the Panel:

• Why did your state decide on this approach?

NC: To have control of the program and access to the data for uses such as planning. SD: To have control of the criteria. Officers want access to data for credentials, not speeding enforcement. SD would like to see agreement across states for some basic minimum common criteria.

UT: For partnership, cost savings, and more vehicles participating.

• What are the next steps for your deployment?

NC started with 11 sites and has five additional sites that do not have readers. They are also adding mainline weigh-in-motion (WIM) to other sites and virtual weigh stations off interstate routes.

SD is looking at three other sites, but is concerned about lack of interoperability (receiving transponder data from other jurisdictions). They are not likely to expand until that problem is solved.

UT is addressing intrastate carrier involvement, deployment of virtual weigh stations, and implementation of permitting.

• What lessons learned would you like to pass on to the audience?

NC: Think about the intrastate carrier base when deciding where to deploy sites. SD: Do a cost-benefit analysis before you jump in. Share the data. CVISN is about safety, so we should give our enforcement staff the tools they need to focus on unsafe operators. Think about enrolling bad carriers so they can be identified. UT: There are different sources of help; UT welcomes calls from other states.

Questions from Participants:

• UT is a PrePass state. How do they use variable message signs (VMS)?

UT uses VMS to provide additional messages to the driver.

• How often do you check credentials after enrollment?

NC: Daily based on updates from SAFER; semi-annually or annually for manual checks. SD: Daily based on updates from SAFER. KY and WA are uploading data on behalf of other states, which has increased the number of vehicles SD can identify. SD is interested in the possibility of an International Justice and Public Safety Information Sharing Network (Nlets) query capability for screening. UT: Quarterly.

• What are the administrative costs (staffing, database, servers, etc.)?

NC: Varies based on number of sites; \$300–400K per site over 8 years. SD: Two part-time people; please refer to what SD has reported in its CVISN evaluation inputs for details. • Sharing data has been controversial. How does enforcement use the data?

NC: Data is shared among state agencies. They can track for distance tax, speed, etc. The data is not used to hit enrolled carriers harder.

SD: If the carrier does not have the proper credentials to run in SD, they will be pulled over.

3.2 E-Credentialing

States learned about different approaches to e-credentialing and the factors to consider when making their selections. Speakers covered what is involved with e-credentialing in their states [International Registration Plan (IRP), International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA), permitting, and state portal, as applicable], what credentialing services are offered to their customers electronically, what services are still manual and why, and what the impact of e-credentialing has been on their legacy systems, i.e., just building interfaces with carriers or redoing their systems entirely.

Presentations:

- New York State's OSCAR (One-Stop Credentialing and Registration) Electronic Credentialing System Rick McDonough and Ken Reksc, NY
- Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles Electronic Credentialing System Judy Johnson, FL
- Kansas E-credentialing Deann Williams, KS
- Alabama DOR (Division of Revenue) Motor Carrier Overview of E-credentialing Joe McCormick, Celtic Systems for AL

Highlights:

• Involve customers and credentialing staff in the development process. Take small steps; roll out end-to-end, well-tested functionality incrementally.

Questions to the Panel:

• How did your state decide on its approach to e-credentialing?

NY: Used a team of different agencies that met weekly; decided on business rules. Focus was on support to the motor carriers.

FL: Used a phased approach because of resource availability and funding. A study pointed out what to do first, based on priorities.

KS: Established a CVISN team, involving industry, which drove the priorities. AL: Had a vision about verifying information before handing out credentials. Several iterations were needed to clean internal and SAFER data. • What are the next steps for your deployment?

NY: Divisible load permits; pay through OSCAR for different permits; expand IRP functionality; and Highway Use Tax (HUT) renewal for 2009. FL: Enhancements to IFTA (based on lessons learned since originally implementing). KS: Rewrite intrastate system; provide oversize/overweight (OS/OW) permitting with routing; rewrite IFTA; look at license plate readers. AL: Currently use Regional Processing Center (RPC) for quarterly tax returns; working on an internal version. Deliver more data to roadside.

• What lessons learned would you like to pass on to the audience?

NY: Start small; don't tackle the whole thing at once. Make the system functional from beginning to end for each piece at a time. Listen to the customers and learn from their experiences. E-credentialing is where NY started because it yielded benefits to both the carriers and the state. When a new function is added, participation increases in the other capabilities, more than expected.

FL: Involve industry during the design phase. FL did not have carrier services involved in the design; interfaces work for small operators but not as well for service providers.

KS: Include key staff in the design. Ensure that they can walk through the entire process when you ask them to evaluate the implementation.

AL: Make sure the application works internally before rolling out to the customers. Take small steps; turn on one piece at a time.

Questions from Participants:

• What forms of e-payment have been implemented?

Credit cards, debit, Automated Clearinghouse (ACH), escrow account. Depending on the state or agency, fees are paid by the carriers or the state.

• Is it legal to charge the carrier for the credit card transaction?

In some states, it is.

• What steps still need to be done manually?

FL: Heavy Vehicle Use Tax (HVUT) needs to be verified manually. KS: For OS/OW permits, routing needs to be checked in the office.

3.3 CVIEW

States learned what CVIEW is, different approaches to deploying CVIEW, and the factors to consider when making their selections. States also learned what is required to exchange data with SAFER. State speakers covered what the CVIEW/CVIEW-equivalent does in their states, how they use the data that are downloaded from SAFER into their CVIEWs (e.g., at the roadside, to check during credentialing operations, permitting, etc.), and what technologies are used. Volpe discussed the rules of CVISN participation, such as uploading, certification, re-baselining, and de-certification.

Presentations:

- Oklahoma CVIEW Bob Hale, OK
- Florida's CVIEW Equivalent Sharon Easley, E-Squared Engineering for FL
- Maryland PreVIEW Manoj Pansare, MD
- Volpe re CVISN Participation Jingfei Wu, Volpe Center

- Teamwork and regular communications are keys to success.
- A "CVIEW equivalent" is an option that meets CVISN program requirements. Each state CVISN team should determine what method satisfies the state's needs. For example, making queries from the roadside to SAFER via Web services and using other existing state applications may suffice.
- CVIEW enables checking one credential before issuing another, but not all agencies/states perform that check.
- CVIEW provides data that helps states leverage technology to maximize enforcement effectiveness.
- States must certify their CVIEWs when first ready to upload data to or download data from SAFER. States re-baseline (purge and replace) their own data in SAFER periodically, such as on request from another jurisdiction and following major software upgrades. A state may be decertified if it stops maintaining data in SAFER.

Questions to the Panel:

• Why did you choose your approach to CVIEW?

OK: Cost effective and logical.FL: Cost.MD: The incremental approach made sense. The state wanted to make data available for law enforcement in a way that would be useful to them.

• What are the next steps for your deployment?

OK: Update the CVISN plan to add weigh station changes. Incorporate additional functions into CVIEW and integrate into the Web page. FL: Add more query functions – Nlets and OS/OW permit data. MD: Expand to virtual weigh stations (VWS) and additional PrePass sites.

• What lessons learned would you like to pass on to the audience?

OK and FL: Preparation, communication, and follow-up are essential. MD: It is difficult to get all the agencies involved to talk to each other. Training, regular communications, and testing are important.

3.4 **Procurement Process**

In this panel discussion, states garnered suggestions for handling the procurement process from others who have mastered it. The panel addressed such issues as challenges faced in the state's CVISN procurement process, how they were resolved, and resources for obtaining help on developing requests for proposals (RFPs). States shared funding innovations and lessons learned.

Panelists:

- Kalyna Nedilsky, MD
- Punita Choxi and Greg Oliver, DE
- Laura Edwards, AK
- Dick Hayworth, IN

- Challenges include dealing with different cultures across agencies, communications, understanding requirements, learning the technology, working the system.
- Take advantage of those who came before you (e.g., get copies of other states' RFPs, successful procurement methods for different kinds of procurements).
- The process often takes much longer than expected/planned.
- Use all available resources to get started, such as CVISN Program Manager (PM) calls, direct contact with other states, library/Internet, CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site, and vendors. Engage lawyers early. Think outside the box when deciding on the procurement approach. Investigate whether the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) has RFPs, requests for information (RFIs), etc., that would be useful.
- Be innovative and resourceful. Consider alternatives. Check on past histories of potential vendors. Learn from one procurement to the next.
- AR and LA are working on issuing USDOT numbers to intrastate operators. They are seeking implementation lessons learned, legislative language, outreach packages, etc., from states that have gone through the process.
- Strike a happy medium in the RFP specify enough details to clarify requirements, but not so many that no one can meet them. Be as flexible as you can. Make sure testing is part of the process to ensure that the end product meets the users' needs.
- Look outside your agency (including non-government) for related projects, funding, match, services, and infrastructure.
- Document resources, vendors, successes, problems.
- Be sure the vendor is responsible for testing and validation.
- Choose and educate the evaluation team carefully. Make sure they understand perspectives of all users. Consider involving the evaluation team in defining the user requirements.
- For IT systems, ensure that needs that surfaced during demonstrations from vendors translate into documented requirements that are implemented in the delivered system.

4. ADVANCING YOUR CVISN PROGRAM

States explored how to fund, sustain, and mature their CVISN programs.

4.1 Executive Kick-Off

Mike Griffith, Office Director for Research and Analysis, FMCSA, delivered the executive kickoff. He emphasized that recent analysis shows how CVISN improves safety. FMCSA supports CVISN through grants, technical assistance, regular stakeholder calls, CVISN architecture and information technology (IT) infrastructure, and workshops like this.

4.2 State of CVISN

Julie Lane, CVISN Program Manager, Technology Division, FMCSA, delivered the State of CVISN address. She noted these FY 2008 accomplishments:

- Awarded \$21.8M in CVISN grants,
- Deployed CVISN functionality,
- Completed national evaluation of CVISN,
- Implemented Webinar series, and
- Assessed SAFER operations.

The FY 2009 goals include:

- Complete Core CVISN planning in all states,
- Complete Core CVISN in three additional states,
- Distribute CVISN deployment grants, and
- Update CVISN Web site.

States may submit FY 2009 CVISN Deployment Grant applications between January and July 2009.

4.3 Funding CVISN

This session was a prelude to the FY 2009 CVISN Deployment Program Grants webinar on 29 December 2008. States learned what types of projects have been funded via CVISN grants, what funding could be used for match, and what additional sources have been used for funding CVISN.

Highlights:

- New this year: grants funds may be used to pay Volpe/vendors for support related to Unified Carrier Registration (UCR) certification, pay an association for services, or fund a multi-state project. A state may submit a simple (e.g., for fees or operations and maintenance) grant application early and may submit a more complex (e.g., for deployment) application later.
- Think broadly when looking for matching funds. Coordinate among state agencies and across grants from FMCSA. Apply for funds this year, because FMCSA does not know whether there will be any CVISN grant funds next year. Make CVISN a priority.

4.4 Making the Case for CVISN; Keeping It Going

States explored how to deploy, sustain, and help their CVISN programs grow.

Champions:

- Greg Oliver, DE
- Joe Crabtree, KY

- Keys to success include: support from a strong state champion, industry support, dedicated staff, timing, continuity. Data about specific safety and cost benefits is useful.
- Handling personnel changes is crucial to sustaining the CVISN program. Many states use non-government staff (including consultants) to maintain continuity. Provide training for new staff. FMCSA will provide material such as the CVISN 101 tutorial.
- Make the program a priority. Clarify responsibilities across state agencies. Market, use, evaluate, and maintain the components. Keep the team active. Know your audience when selling the program. Listen to your customers and meet their needs. Let FMCSA headquarters know if they can help.

Question to the Panel and Participants:

• What are some keys to maintaining the core capabilities and deploying enhanced capabilities?

IN: Active motor carrier association. Try to keep them involved.ID: Need laws passed in a timely way. Need someone at the state level to keep the momentum going so you don't have to start over from scratch.FL: Document memorandum of understanding (MOU) with state agencies and clarify who is responsible for what. Build on what you have.SD: Get the trucking associations on board. Carriers may agree to raising fees if you can show how they will save money. Most states are receiving CVISN funding, but credentials data are not being sent to SAFER by some. Most transponder IDs are not in SAFER. Addressing these issues requires FMCSA assistance.

5. DATA QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING

5.1 Early Deployment

Participants in this session were introduced to data quality and performance monitoring. The tutorial addressed what is meant by data quality, why data quality is important, what current data quality issues are related to CVISN, and how these issues are being addressed. The functional, management, and operational levels of performance monitoring were presented.

Highlights:

- Data quality must be built into the system. One bad data experience can discourage a group of stakeholders from using CVISN capabilities. States should monitor quality and performance using tools, procedures, and staff.
- Quarterly reports on CVISN grants are one aspect of performance monitoring. State teams could gather information needed during regular monthly meetings. Division Offices submit the quarterly report received from the state to FMCSA's Electronic Data Management System (EDMS). FMCSA headquarters (HQ) should be able to access the quarterly reports from EDMS. Some states expressed interest in submitting quarterly reports via a Web interface.

Open Item:

• Find out how quickly carrier out-of-service (OOS) status is recorded in Motor Carrier Management Information System (MCMIS) and pushed to SAFER subscribers. Is it within the timeframe stated in the CVISN Operational and Architectural Compatibility Handbook (COACH), Part 1 (30 minutes)?

5.2 Core and Expanded Deployment

This session addressed data quality and performance monitoring issues at a detailed technical level. It included discussions of outstanding data quality issues and review of the FY 2009 SAFER Development Plan.

Champions:

- Bill Goforth, WA
- Chris Campbell, Iteris for ID
- Jingfei Wu, Volpe Center

- States are interested in limiting IRP status codes sent to SAFER/used at the roadside to three: active, inactive, and federal OOS.
- Several states are currently not sharing safety carrier USDOT numbers. The problem will go away eventually, when all states are PRISM compliant; workarounds were discussed.
- Volpe reviewed SAFER releases in FY 2008 and current work. Many of the SAFER Change Requests (SCRs) being addressed originated in the IT office and are not CVISN architecture change requests (CRs). Based on responses to the stakeholder survey, the current three highest priority SCRs are:
 - SCR 147: Data integrity between T0020, T0021, T0022 on IRP account number
 - SCR 2461: Modify Inspection Selection System (ISS) score calculation in DOT 423 schema
 - SCR 2575: Modify SAFER to receive all intrastate carrier Safety Status/Motor Carrier Safety Status Measurement System (SafeStat) data
- Volpe described SAFER system monitoring. Stakeholders with a User Authentication System (UAS) account can access a Web service on the SAFER Web site for information on uploaded data.
- WA and Iteris discussed performance monitoring on the state side. The weekly *T0031* and *PRISM Timeliness and Data Quality Report*, developed and distributed by WA, shows that SAFER downloads are now meeting the 24-hour rule. Adhering to the 30-minute rule for changes to OOS status is not currently possible.
- The champions recommended that states participate in the CVISN Architecture Configuration Control Board (ACCB).
- The possibility of using CVISN grant funds to pay for Volpe support was reiterated.

Open Items:

- Users request that Volpe send out a report listing the record count of IFTA account, IRP account, Fleet, and Vehicle records, and transponder number by state. This report would show how many records SAFER has for each state by five input transactions: T0019, 20, 21, 22, and 24.
- DE would like the COMPASS Portal to show the Username as well as the Userid. Currently, the portal only displays an obscure COMPASS ID (e.g., COMPASS 12345555) or none at all. It also does not allow the Operations Team to see which users are modifying application data via the portal [e.g., MCMIS and Enforcement Management Information System (EMIS)]. This issue has been submitted as a System Change Request and is being addressed.

6. EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND CVISN

States learned from each other via presentations and discussions about current concepts, technologies, costs, and issues related to deployment of roadside operations.

6.1 Roadside Operations

Speakers presented roadside projects that they are planning, prototyping, and/or deploying. The topics covered included goals and description of the project, the concept of operations (ConOps), technologies employed, project budget, and open issues.

Presentations:

- Truck Size and Weight Enforcement Technology Project Virtual Weigh Station Concept of Operations – Tom Kearney, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Smart Roadside Monitoring Systems Jim Csencsits, ID
- Universal Identification: Getting an Electronic Identifier on Every Truck Joe Crabtree, KY

- The FHWA intends that the Virtual Weigh Station ConOps being developed under their Truck Size and Weight Program be the basis for a shared understanding of a virtual weigh station.
- ID's Smart Roadside Monitoring System includes automated facilities to capture images, size, weight, and speed, thus increasing inspection capabilities. The system has far surpassed the goal of increasing international inspections by 50% and is expected to also attain the goal of increasing international hazardous materials (HazMat) inspections by 200% in CY 2008.
- Is it time to update the federal regulations to require an electronic identifier (ID) on every truck? This question has been asked in multiple forums over the past 2 years, and the

response has been consistently positive. The Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) passed a resolution to petition FMCSA to require an electronic ID; the CVSA ITS Committee is currently working on the petition letter.

Questions from Participants:

• What technology was selected for the WIMs in ID?

The need for a high-speed WIM drove the selection of quartz piezo. Cameras are used to capture the USDOT number.

• In ID, is the WIM data used for citations?

No, the data is used to alert staff to watch for a vehicle.

• What is the cost to the carrier for universal identification?

The cost of the device should be low, approximately \$1–2 per truck. Administrative costs related to assignment of the devices will be more significant.

• Has a tamperproof, windshield-mounted device been considered?

We have recommended that the device be unusable after removal. Procedures will need to be put in place to audit.

• Rather than having states issue the radio frequency identification (RFID) devices, has the team considered having FMCSA issue the devices?

Yes. However, states already have licensing processes in place to issue identifiers for every vehicle.

• How would the new RFID mesh with existing transponders?

A new device would be required. The new device would be extremely simple, and the reader would be inexpensive as well.

6.2 Roadside Data Access

Speakers presented projects that they are planning, prototyping, and/or deploying that involve providing roadside enforcement personnel with access to safety information. The topics covered included goals and description of the project, ConOps, technologies employed, project budget, and open issues.

Presentations:

- Expanded CVISN Driver Information Sharing and Enhanced Safety Information Sharing Projects: Idaho, Illinois, and Oklahoma – Chris Campbell, Iteris for ID, IL, and OK
- Roadside Data Access Connecticut and Arkansas Bill Guiffre, Cambridge Systematics for CT and AR
- An Information Sharing Initiative for Alabama Law Enforcement Allen Parrish, AL

Highlights:

- For ID, IL, and OK, Iteris has integrated access to carrier, vehicle, and driver data from federal and state systems for roadside use. The Web-based solutions described issue permits and prepare citations.
- For CT and AR, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., merges carrier, vehicle, permit (CT only), and IFTA (CT only) data onto a single screen.
- The University of Alabama has developed mobile law enforcement tools in a single integrated "Mobile Officer Virtual Environment (MOVE)" to provide access to citation, crash, vehicle, driver, and carrier data. One tool is the Law Enforcement Tactical System (LETS), which is a law enforcement information portal. LETS-GO is a mobile Windows-client version of this application that reads query results out-loud to the officer. LETS accesses state systems, including driver licensing, CVIEW, registration system, citation database, etc.
- Common issues include data quality, timeliness, bandwidth, and a clear understanding of the data elements.

6.3 Permitting

The speaker and panelists discussed permitting projects that they are planning, prototyping, and/or deploying. The topics covered included goals and description of the project, ConOps, technologies employed, project budget, and open issues.

Panelists:

- Presentation: Delaware Hauling (Oversize/Overweight) Permitting System Punita Choxi, DE
- Anselem Rumpca, SD
- Richard Hayworth, IN

Highlights:

• DE has implemented an OS/OW permitting system that allows on-line application and approval; it plans to include automatic routing and e-payment options as enhancements.

- SD issues 30 different kinds of permits. The SD permit system includes automated routing, supported by an operational Geographic Information System (GIS).
- IN has seen a tremendous improvement in the turnaround time to issue a permit. Police are tied into the system for awareness regarding need for support, such as escort of 'super loads'. Envelope routes have been developed to handle the gap caused by not having GIS for all roads.

Question from Participants:

• Is anyone looking at regional permitting or sharing permit data via SAFER?

MT uses regional permits through the Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (WASHTO). The Southern Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (SASHTO) has consolidated (not regional) permits. Some New England states can issue permits for their neighbors

7. DEVELOPING AN INTEGRATED COMMERCIAL VEHICLE SAFETY PROGRAM

7.1 The Relationship of CVISN to Other Federal Programs

Managers of FMCSA PRISM, CSA 2010, and COMPASS programs summarized program status and plans and discussed how these programs might impact CVISN.

Presentations:

- PRISM Tom Lawler, FMCSA
- COMPASS Bill Coleman, FMCSA
- CSA 2010 Bryan Price, FMCSA

Highlights:

• PRISM is a 100% federally-funded program for improving safety and data quality. Currently, 30 states are involved at some level. Key aspects include verifying MCS-150 data, identifying the carrier responsible for the safety of each vehicle, bar-coding to streamline data collection, linking vehicle registration and safety performance, and supporting the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Process (MCSIP). PRISM is funding a pilot study in KY on the use of license plate readers. Model legislation for states to use to thwart chameleon carriers has been developed. The PRISM team is working with GA and WA to implement PRISM for intrastate and non-IRP interstate carriers. Also on the horizon is elimination of the issuance of "Registrant Only" USDOT numbers. States can obtain PRISM grants to modify their IRP systems to support this.

- The COMPASS program is an FMCSA-wide initiative that is leveraging new technology to transform the way that FMCSA does business. The IT modernization effort will improve existing functionality, add new functionality, and migrate legacy systems to the FMCSA portal. The new functionality will include single-sign-on (SSO), account management, and carrier portal; data quality improvements; safety fitness determination; data warehouse; and business intelligence. The FMCSA portal currently provides SSO for more than 3000 users to MCMIS, EMIS, Licensing & Insurance (L&I), and DataQs; additional systems will be added in FY 2009. The focus areas for FY 2009–2010 will be:
 - Mobile client: Roll ASPEN and other field systems into one application, resident on the laptop in the field, synched every day. What the officer sees will be a mirror image of what is on the network. Eventually, connectivity will be provided to the field;
 - Prioritization to support CSA 2010: Identify CSA 2010's needs, take what they have done and, with Volpe, add it to the FMCSA portal;
 - Enterprise database: Include data from MCMIS;
 - New entrant and compliance monitoring;
 - Registration: Rewrite the L&I system. The requirements process has been difficult.
- CSA 2010 is a major FMCSA safety initiative. Major elements of the new operational model include progressive interventions, safety fitness determination, safety measurement, and IT. CSA 2010's Safety Measurement System, which will replace SafeStat, will be organized by seven Behavior Analysis & Safety Improvement Categories (BASICs). The BASICs will replace the four Safety Evaluation Area (SEA) values. A National Roll-Out Plan has been developed for CSA 2010 deployment. Impacts to CVISN include:
 - PRISM targeted carrier criteria will change. The seven BASICs values may not be aggregated into an overall score;
 - Motor carrier performance in the seven BASICs will play a role in inspection recommendation, replacing ISS-D;
 - The SAFER eXtensible Markup Language (XML) transactions will need to change to reflect the changes in data elements.

Participants expressed an interest in a nationwide standard for bypass criteria. Participants noted that states will need time to react to the changes and asked that CSA 2010 explain upcoming changes to the CVISN ACCB at least 9 months before the rollout. Julie Lane mentioned that CSA 2010 will be invited to the COMPASS-CVISN Coordination ad hoc team teleconferences. She noted that a request has been made for CVISN to co-lead the CSA 2010 working group. CVISN grant funding can be used for implementing changes required by CSA 2010.

7.2 Future of CVISN Operations – Mainstreaming

The workshop concluded with a panel discussion of completing, mainstreaming, and maintaining CVISN operations. "Mainstreaming CVISN" was defined as "integrating CVISN into the standard day-to-day operations of the state's agencies". Topics included what mainstreaming CVISN means to each state, the primary barriers and the greatest benefits to mainstreaming CVISN, and each state's plans to fund the ongoing maintenance and operation of its CVISN programs.

Panelists:

- Punita Choxi, DE
- Sharon Easley, E-Squared Engineering for FL
- Tammy Duncan, Southwest Research Institute (SwRI) for TX

- From a Division Administrator (DA) perspective, communication is key. DAs understand the good of the program, but are not technical; they depend on state engineers. They need the information so that they can communicate with FMCSA HQ and ensure funds are funneled down to states.
- States that are successful typically have an Executive Steering Committee and a CVISN task team or working group. Motor carriers are included.
- The CVISN PM needs to be part cheerleader, part salesperson.
- "In-Reach" (termed coined by Richard Easley) is essential. Marketing within your own state.
- States have unique problems. For example, VWS may not work in a state with limited connectivity, but mobile inspections may be the answer.
- If a state has received all CVISN grant funds for which it is eligible, it needs to be innovative in uncovering other funding sources, such as border enforcement grants.
- Mainstreaming CVISN means that it is no longer a research project e-credentialing, e-screening, etc., are the normal way of doing business.
- When a state's CVISN projects are in the ongoing maintenance phase, they have to be mainstreamed and part of the regular budgeting process.
- A federal mandate motivates state decision-makers. If CVISN were mandated, state funding might be easier to come by.
- Participants expressed interest in reviewing CVISN cost-benefit analyses that have been done by other states. One suggestion was to share the analyses on the CVISN Collaboration Site. Julie Lane noted this as a good topic for a webinar.

Advice from panelists and participants:

- Sell CVISN to agency heads.
- Clarify ongoing responsibilities. It is not enough to deploy cool technologies.
- Put CVISN in the state budget.
- Give briefings about the history, projects, capabilities, and benefits (safety, costs, and efficiencies).
- Need institutional knowledge, technical knowledge, how to work with legislature.
- Technology changes; needs change. Adjustments are part of reality.
- Assess whether things are working and whether changes are needed.
- Keep communicating and coordinating across agencies.

8. FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS

8.1 CVISN-PRISM Coordination Focus Group

Interested participants met to discuss issues regarding deployment of both the CVISN and PRISM programs in a state.

- States expressed interest in having the T0041P PRISM Targeted Vehicle Output Transaction available on the FTP (file transfer protocol) site where CVISN states get all their other transactions, rather than only on the PRISM FTP site. This issue will be brought before the CVISN ACCB.
- PRISM Team representatives noted the importance of having a CVISN technical representative at the PRISM implementation planning meetings. There has been a proposal to combine all the FMCSA grant programs and make the match requirement 80/20 across the board. The PRISM Team noted that PRISM grant money has no expiration date; if needed, the state can ask for an extension to spend it.
- Attendees discussed how states can divide PRISM and CVISN funds to offset CVIEW or IRP system costs.
- PRISM Team representatives mentioned that at the next PrePass board meeting there will be a discussion of adding the target file to the e-screening process.

8.2 Universal Identification Focus Group

Interested participants walked through and discussed the draft *Concept of Operations for* Universal Identification: Identify Every Commercial Vehicle on the Road.

Presentation:

• DRAFT Concept of Operations for Universal Identification: Identify Every Commercial Vehicle on the Road – Joe Crabtree, KY

Highlights:

- The focus of the ConOps is on identifying vehicles and carriers. The goal is to implement a simple interim solution as quickly as possible to identify every vehicle (and its associated carrier).
- A passive RFID (e.g., on windshield, license plate, or door-mounted placard) method is preferred due to low cost.
- The ConOps proposes an initial solution. The ultimate goal is Wireless Roadside Inspection (WRI), which will include onboard sensors and sophisticated technology. However, deployment of WRI may take 15 years.
- The identifier from the RFID device will have no inherent meaning. The correlation between the unique ID captured from the RFID device on the vehicle with the standard identifiers for the vehicle and the carrier responsible for that vehicle's safety will happen in SAFER. Thus it is critical to have timely data in SAFER.
- The identifiers determined electronically could be used in the same ways as those collected manually are used today.

9. SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

9.1 Participant Evaluations

Twenty-five workshop evaluation forms were returned by participants. Of these, all participants rated the workshop value as "excellent" or "good". Networking opportunities and information exchange were most often noted as being high points of the event.

Some comments regarding next steps participants are planning to take to advance CVISN in their states include:

Networking

- Contact other states for follow-up meetings and details regarding costs, issues of deployment
- Utilize PM telecons and ACCB for discussion and problem-solving

- Share workshop information with rest of team members. See that other team members access the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site
- Become more involved in specialized discussions (i.e., CSA 2010)

Grants

- Meet with FMCSA regarding grants
- Tailor our grant application to address issues that were resolved

CVISN Deployment

- Prepare an Expanded CVISN Top-Level Design and a 2009 CVISN Grant application
- Use all of the experience and information from the workshop in our deployment
- Continue monitoring of our program but with renewed enlightenment
- Make a concerted effort to get our IRP and PRISM systems completed so that we can advance our CVISN program
- Take all of this information back to my Division and start to really get into CVISN

9.2 Observations and Recommendations

This section presents observations and recommendations concerning the CVISN Deployment Workshop.

9.2.1 PRISM/CVISN Coordination

The CVISN and PRISM programs share the goal of improving motor carrier safety through information exchange. They also share the same stakeholders, the same source for carrier census data (MCMIS), the same source for vehicle registration data (state IRP systems), and the same data repository (SAFER-PRISM Central Site). FMCSA encourages states to deploy both programs in a mutually supportive and synergistic manner.

The spontaneous interest in holding a CVISN-PRISM focus group meeting on the last afternoon of the workshop underlined states' interest in coordinating deployment of both programs and the need for training and collaboration. Several specific next steps that could be taken include:

- On an upcoming PM telecon, discuss how states can coordinate their plans and grant requests
- Hold joint PRISM/CVISN planning sessions with states; coordinate on grant reviews
- Make the T0041P "PRISM Targeted Vehicle Output Transaction" available on the CVISN FTP site (it is currently posted on the PRISM FTP site)

9.2.2 Performance Monitoring

Different levels of performance monitoring were addressed by the two breakout groups. The Early Deployment group focused on the functional and management levels. In the next year, FMCSA and the states need to consider what are the typical questions that they must answer and what metrics are needed to answer those questions. They must also consider what are the best evaluation tools to collect the information.

The Core and Expanded Deployment group focused on the operational level, with an emphasis on how well federal and state systems meet performance and data quality goals. States are taking a proactive approach by developing procedures, tools, and reports. Often these solutions can be shared with other states. Volpe may also develop reports to support state activities. At the operational level, the CVISN ACCB Proactive Data Quality/Operational Issues Focus Group will continue to discuss and track data quality and performance monitoring.

9.2.3 Future CVISN Deployment Workshops

It is difficult to balance the agenda between newcomers and experienced CVISN stakeholders. Newcomers are interested in lessons learned and more "basic" information. More experienced stakeholders want to address specific technical issues. Since workshop attendees will always come with varying levels of CVISN experience, the next workshop should manage expectations. The workshop should include different sessions/days for various levels of expertise and promote it as such beforehand. For example,

- Day 1 for the newcomers (CVISN 101, funding options)
- Day 2 for all (status of program, state-led advancing CVISN sessions for each area of Core or Expanded, cutting-edge projects, related FMCSA activities)
- Day 3 for specific networking activities and working on issues (technical focus groups, lessons learned on topics of interest, PM discussions, FMCSA division staff, etc.)

Webcasting all or part of the workshop may be an alternative to reach those with travel restrictions.

9.3 Next Steps

A number of ongoing actions and next steps were identified. While not assigned as specific action items, these efforts will be followed up and reported on periodically to CVISN stakeholders.

Primary responsibility: FMCSA

- 1. Follow up with states that are not sending data to SAFER. Determine whether there are any issues FMCSA can help resolve.
- 2. Conduct webinar on FY 2009 CVISN Grant Program.
- 3. Strengthen ties/communication/coordination with CSA 2010.
- 4. Strengthen ties/communication/coordination with PRISM.
- 5. Conduct webinar on CVISN benefits that states have documented.
- 6. Deliver CVISN 101 to western states.

Primary responsibility: CVISN stakeholders

- 1. Submit grant applications.
- 2. Continue to share lessons learned and ideas to help CVISN succeed.

10. ACRONYMS

AAMVA ACCB	American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators Architecture Configuration Control Board
ACH	Automated Clearinghouse
ACS	Affiliated Computer Services, Inc.
AK	Alaska
AL	Alabama
AR ASPEN	Arkansas
ASPEN	not an acronym
BASICs	Behavior Analysis & Safety Improvement Categories
COACH	CVISN Operational and Architectural Compatibility Handbook
COMPASS	Creating Opportunities, Methods, and Processes to Secure Safety
ConOps	Concept of Operations
CR	Change Request
CSA	Comprehensive Safety Analysis
CSI	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
СТ	Connecticut
CVIEW	Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window
CVISN	Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks
CVO	Commercial Vehicle Operations
CVSA	Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
CY	Calendar Year
DA	Division Administrator
DC	District of Columbia
DE	Delaware
DHSMV	Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (FL)
DMV	Department of Motor Vehicles
DOR	Department of Revenue
DOT	Department of Transportation
	1 1
EDMS	Electronic Data Management System
EMIS	Enforcement Management Information System
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FL	Florida
FMCSA	Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
FTP	File Transfer Protocol

FY	Fiscal Year
GA	Georgia
GIS	Geographic Information System
HazMat	Hazardous Materials
HOFM	Office of Freight Management and Operations (FHWA)
HQ	Headquarters
HUT	Highway Use Tax
HVUT	Heavy Vehicle Use Tax
ID	Idaho
ID	Identifier/Identifications
IFTA	International Fuel Tax Agreement
IL	Illinois
IN	Indiana
IRD	International Road Dynamics, Inc.
IRP	International Registration Plan
ISS	Inspection Selection System
IT	Information Technology
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
JHU/APL	The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
KS	Kansas
KY	Kentucky
L&I	Licensing & Insurance
LA	Louisiana
LETS	Law Enforcement Tactical System
MCMIS	Motor Carrier Management Information System
MCS	Motor Carrier Services (IN)
MCSIP	Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Process
MD	Maryland
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOVE	Mobile Officer Virtual Environment
MSCVE	Measurement Standards and Commercial Vehicle Enforcement (AK)
MT	Montana
NC	North Carolina
Nlets	International Justice and Public Safety Information Sharing Network
NY	New York
NYS	New York State

OK	Oklahoma
OOS	Out of Service
OS/OW	Oversize/Overweight
OSCAR	One-Stop Credentialing and Registration (NY)
PM	Program Manager
PRISM	Performance and Registration Information Systems Management
RFI	Request for Information
RFID	Radio Frequency Identification
RFP	Request for Proposal
RPC	Regional Processing Center
SAFER	Safety and Fitness Electronic Records
SafeStat	Safety Status/Motor Carrier Safety Status Measurement System
SASHTO	Southern Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
SCR	SAFER Change Request
SD	South Dakota
SEA	Safety Evaluation Area
SHA	State Highway Administration (MD)
SSO	Single-Sign-On
SwRI	Southwest Research Institute
TOA	Traffic Operations Administration (DC)
TX	Texas
UAS	User Authentication System
UCR	Unified Carrier Registration
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
UT	Utah
VMS	Variable Message Sign
VWS	Virtual Weigh Station
WA	Washington
WASHTO	Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
WBDA	Warren B. Dunham Associates
WIM	Weigh-in-Motion
WRI	Wireless Roadside Initiative/Inspection
XML	eXtensible Markup Language

APPENDIX A. CVISN DEPLOYMENT WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

This appendix lists those who participated in the 2008 CVISN Deployment Workshop in person or by webcast.

Name	Organization	E-mail
Tim Adams	IRP, Inc.	tadams@irpinc.org
Delaine Adkins	Kansas Highway Patrol	dadkins@khp.ks.gov
Randy Allemeier	Iteris, Inc.	rta@iteris.com
Trish Aragon	Colorado Department of Revenue -	taragon@spike.dor.state.co.us
5	MCS	
Valerie Barnes	JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory	valerie.barnes@jhuapl.edu
Paul Battenfield	Tennessee Department of Safety	paul.battenfield@state.tn.us
Brian Beaven	Kentucky Transportation Cabinet	brian.beaven@ky.gov
Tim Bolton	Maine DOT	tim.bolton@maine.gov
Sandra Boys	JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory	sandra.boys@jhuapl.edu
Randy Braden	Alabama Department of Transportation	bradenr@dot.state.al.us
Kevin Breedlove	FMCSA – North Carolina Division	kevin.breedlove@dot.gov
Chris Campbell	Iteris, Inc.	clc@iteris.com
Steve Capecci	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.	scapecci@camsys.com
Ron Char	JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory	ronald.char@jhuapl.edu
Punita Choxi	Delaware DOT	punita.choxi@state.de.us
Dan Cline	Tennessee Department of Safety	Daniel.Cline@state.tn.us
Bill Coleman	COMPASS Change Management –	bill.coleman@dot.gov
	FMCSA	······································
Joe Crabtree	Kentucky Transportation Center	crabtree@engr.uky.edu
Jim Csencsits	Idaho Transportation Department	jim.csencsits@itd.idaho.gov
Mickey Davis	FMCSA – Florida Division	michael.davis@dot.gov
Ken Demers	Oklahoma Department of Public Safety	demers.ken@gmail.com
Doug Donscheski	Nebraska State Patrol	doug.donscheski@nebraska.gov
Brandon Douglas	Tennessee Department of Safety	brandon.douglas@state.tn.us
Tammy Duncan	Southwest Research Institute	tduncan@swri.org
Warren Dunham	Warren B. Dunham Associates (WBDA)	wbda@aol.com
Sharon Easley	E-Squared Engineering	seasley@e-squared.org
Richard Easley	E-Squared Engineering	reasley@e-squared.org
Laura Edwards	State of Alaska – MSCVE	laura.edwards@alaska.gov
Shelley Feese	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.	sfeese@camsys.com
Art Fleener	FMCSA – Iowa Division	Arthur.Fleener@dot.gov
Chris Flynn	The Volpe Center	chris.flynn@dot.gov
William Giuffre	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.	wgiuffre@camsys.com
Bill Goforth	Washington Department of	gofortb@wsdot.wa.gov
	Transportation	
Valinda Gorder	Parker Young	vpgimi@aol.com
Mickael Gouweloos	FMCSA	mickael.gouweloos@dot.gov
Michael Griffith	FMCSA	mike.griffith@dot.gov
Bob Hale	Oklahoma Department of	bhale@odot.org
	Transportation	
Shirleen Hancock	Utah DOT/Motor Carrier Division	shirleenhancock@utah.gov
Laura Haney	Utah Department of Transportation	ljhaney@utah.gov
Dick Hayworth	Indiana Motor Carrier Services	dhayworth@dor.in.gov
Mike Hoeme	Kansas Corporation Commission	b.reid@kcc.ks.gov

Name	Organization	E-mail
Thad Hoffman	Iteris, Inc.	tth@iteris.com
Eric Hooks	International Road Dynamics, Inc.	eric.hooks@irdinc.com
Matthew Hudnall	CARE Research & Development Lab,	mhudnall@cs.ua.edu
	The University of Alabama	
Tonya Hunt	Tennessee Department of Safety	tonya.hunt@state.tn.us
Paul Hurd	Tennessee Department of Safety	Paul.Hurd@state.tn.us
LeeAnn Jangula	FMCSA – North Dakota Division	leeann.jangula@dot.gov
Judy Johnson	Florida DHSMV	judyjohnson@flhsmv.gov
Jonathan Kasper	New Jersey State Police	lpp4629@gw.njsp.org
Tom Kearney	FHWA–HOFM	tom.kearney@fhwa.dot.gov
Veron Kirkendoll, Sr.	FMCSA	veron.kirkendoll@dot.gov
Charles Kleber	FMCSA – PRISM Team	ckleber@att.net
John Kratzer	New Jersey State Police	lpp4193@gw.njsp.org
Cathy Krupa	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.	ckrupa@camsys.com
Quon Kwan	FMCSA	Quon.Kwan@dot.gov
Julie Lane	USDOT/FMCSA	julie.lane@dot.gov
Tom Lawler	FMCSA – PRISM Team	tom.lawler@dot.gov
Nancy Magnusson	JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory	nancy.magnusson@jhuapl.edu
Susan Martin	ACS	susan.martin@acs-inc.com
Robert McCain	Celtic Systems	csa@celtic.bz
Joe McCormick	Celtic Systems	jmccormick@celtic.bz
Richard McDonough	New York State Department of Transportation	rmcdonough@dot.state.ny.us
Shirley McCuire	FMCSA – Iowa Division	obirlow maguira @dat.gov
Shirley McGuire Paul Melander		shirley.mcguire@dot.gov
	FMCSA – Tennessee Division	paul.melander@dot.gov
Renee Morrison	E-Squared Engineering	rmorrison@e-squared.org
Samir Nayak	Celtic Systems	snayak@celtic.bz
Kalyna Nedilsky	Maryland Motor Carrier Division	knedilsky@sha.state.md.us
Kevin Needham	Jacobs Engineering	kevin.needham@jacobs.com
Kirstie Nixon	Colorado Department of Revenue –	knixon@spike.dor.state.co.us
	Motor Carrier Division	
Clem Novenario	Florida DHSMV	clemnovenario@flhsmv.gov
Linley Oberman	PRISM Team	oberman1345@aol.com
Greg Oliver	Delaware DOT	gregory.oliver@state.de.us
Michael Pannone	State of Alaska – MSCVE	michael.pannone@alaska.gov
Manoj Pansare	SHA Motor Carrier Division	mpansare@sha.state.md.us
Darin Parish	Southwest Research Institute	dparish@swri.org
Allen Parrish	CARE Research & Development Lab,	parrish@cs.ua.edu
	The University of Alabama	
Scott Petrilla	Colorado Department of Revenue	spetrilla@spike.dor.state.co.us
Bryan Price	USDOT/FMCSA	bryan.price@dot.gov
Mike Junkin Price	Alabama Department of Public Safety,	mike.junkin@dps.alabama.gov
	Motor Carrier Safety Unit	
Larry Ramsey	FMCSA	larry.ramsey@dot.gov
Forest Rawls	USDOT/FMCSA	forest.rawls@dot.gov
Kenneth Reksc	New York State Tax & Finance	Kenneth_Reksc@tax.state.ny.us
Craig Root	California Highway Patrol	croot@chp.ca.gov
Anselem Rumpca	South Dakota DOT	hal.rumpca@state.sd.us
Kajaz Safarian	District of Columbia DOT/TOA	kajaz.safarian@dc.gov
Bob Sardo	CT DMV	Bob.Sardo@ct.gov
Denny Silvio	Louisiana Department of	dsilvio@dotd.la.gov
	Transportation and Development	

Name	Organization	E-mail
Bonnie Simmons	FMCSA – Virginia Division	bonnie.simmons@dot.gov
Renee Smith	FMCSA	renee.smith@dot.gov
Ken Sowers	Missouri DOT – Motor Carrier Services	kenneth.sowers@modot.mo.gov
Mary Stuart	JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory	mary.stuart@jhuapl.edu
Carolyn Temperine	FMCSA	carolyn.temperine@dot.gov
Ron Thompson	FMCSA – Illinois Division	ron.thompson@dot.gov
Paul Truban	New Jersey DOT	paul.truban@dot.state.nj.us
Karen Ward	NC State Highway Patrol	kmward@ncshp.org
Kris Weaver	ACS	kris.weaver@acs-inc.com
Barbara Webb-Edwards	USDOT/FMCSA	barbara.webb-edwards@dot.gov
Deann Williams	Kansas Department of Revenue/Motor	deann_williams@kdor.state.ks.us
	Carriers Services Bureau	
Mike Wilson	Indiana State Police	mwilson@isp.in.gov
Jingfei Wu	The Volpe Center	jingfei.wu@dot.gov
Lee Zimmerman	USDOT/FMCSA	lee.zimmerman@dot.gov

APPENDIX B. WORKSHOP AGENDA

2008 CVISN Deployment Workshop: "Collaborating to Advance CVISN" Baltimore, Maryland 3-Day Agenda

Day 1 – Tuesday, December 2, 2008

Time	Agenda Item	Speaker(s)/Moderator(s)
7:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast and Registration	
8:15 a.m.	Welcome	Julie Lane, FMCSA
8:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	Tutorial: Introduction to CVISN	Steve Capecci, CSI
9:45 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	Break	
11:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	ACHIEVING CVISN CORE COMPLIANCE: LESSONS LEARNED DISCUSSIONS	
11:00 a.m.	E-screening	Mary Stuart, JHU/APL Shirleen Hancock, UT DOT Hal Rumpca, SD DOT Eric Hooks, IRD for NC
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	E-credentialing	Sandra Boys, JHU/APL Richard McDonough, NYSDOT Ken Reksc, NYS Tax & Finance Judy Johnson, FL DHSMV Deann Williams, KS DOR Joe McCormick, Celtic Systems for AL
2:30 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.	Break	
2:45 p.m.	CVIEW	Mary Stuart, JHU/APL Bob Hale , OK DOT Sharon Easley, E-Squared Engineering for FL Manoj Pansare, MD SHA Jingfei Wu, Volpe
4:00 p.m.	Procurement Process – Panel	Warren Dunham, WBDA Kalyna Nedilsky, MD SHA Punita Choxi, DE DOT Laura Edwards, AK MSCVE Dick Hayworth, IN MCS
4:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Day 1 Wrap-up	Warren Dunham, WBDA

Time	Agenda Item	Speaker(s)/Moderator(s)
7:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast and Registration	
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	WELCOME AND STATE OF THE PROGRAM	
8:30 a.m.	Welcome	Julie Lane, FMCSA
8:45 a.m.	Executive Kick-off	Mike Griffith, FMCSA
9:00 a.m.	State of CVISN Address	Julie Lane, FMCSA
9:45 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	Break	
10:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.	ADVANCING YOUR CVISN PROGRAM	
10:00 a.m.	Funding CVISN	Sandra Boys, JHU/APL
10:45 a.m.	Making the Case for CVISN and Keeping It Going	Valerie Barnes, JHU/APL Joe Crabtree, KY Transportation Center Greg Oliver, DE DOT
11:55 a.m.	Session Wrap-up	Valerie Barnes, JHU/APL
12:15 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.	Lunch	
1:15 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	DATA QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING	
1:15 p.m.	Data Quality and Performance Measures	Early Deployment Group: Valerie Barnes, JHU/APL <u>Core and Expanded Group:</u> Sandra Boys, JHU/APL Bill Goforth, WA DOT Chris Campbell, Iteris for ID Jingfei Wu, Volpe
3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.	Break	
3:15 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND CVISN	
3:15 p.m.	Roadside Operations	Warren Dunham, WBDA
	Smart Roadside Monitoring Systems	Jim Csencsits, ID Transportation Dept.
	Universal ID: Getting an Electronic Identifier on Every Truck	Joe Crabtree, KY Transportation Center
	Virtual Weigh Station Concept of Operations	Tom Kearney, FHWA-HOFM Cathy Krupa, CSI
4:15 p.m.	Roadside Data Access	Warren Dunham, WBDA
	RAPID Roadside Portal	Allen Parrish, University of Alabama, CARE Research & Development Lab, for AL
	Driver Information Sharing and Enhanced Safety Information Sharing Projects	Chris Campbell, Iteris for ID
	Roadside Data Access Comparison of Two CVISN Deployments	William Giuffre, CSI for AR and CT

Day 2 – Wednesday, December 3, 2008

Time	Agenda Item	Speaker(s)/Moderator(s)
5:00 p.m.	Permitting	Warren Dunham, WBDA
	Delaware Hauling OS/OW Permit System Upgrade	Punita Choxi, DE DOT
		Hal Rumpca, SD DOT, panelist Dick Hayworth, IN MCS, panelist
5:30 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.	Wrap-up	Warren Dunham, WBDA

Time	Agenda Item	Speaker(s)/Moderator(s)
7:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast	
8:15 a.m.	Welcome	Julie Lane, FMCSA
8:30 a.m.	Developing an Integrated Commercial Vehicle Safety Program: The Relationship of CVISN to Other Federal Programs	Julie Lane, FMCSA
	PRISM	Tom Lawler, PRISM Team
	COMPASS	Bill Coleman, COMPASS Change Management
	• CSA 2010	Bryan Price, FMCSA
10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.	Break	
10:15 a.m.	Future of CVISN Operations – panel	Warren Dunham, WBDA
	Mainstreaming and maintaining CVISN operations at the state level	Punita Choxi, DE DOT Sharon Easley, E-Squared Engineering for FL Tammy Duncan, SwRI for TX
11:15 a.m.	Workshop Wrap-up	Julie Lane, FMCSA
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Lunch (buffet, optional carry-out)	
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	OPTIONAL FOCUS GROUPS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SESSIONS	
	Optional Focus Group Sessions	
	Driver Information Sharing	Valerie Barnes, JHU/APL
	Roadside Identification – Universal ID	Cathy Krupa, CSI Joe Crabtree, KY Transportation Center
	Optional One-on-One Technical Assistance	
	Grant Preparation/Questions	
	Core CVISN Compliance Questions	
	CVISN/PRISM Integration	
	Technical Assistance Requests	

Day 3 – Thursday, December 4, 2008