

# Motor Vehicle Review Committee



March 10, 2008

## MINUTES

### Motor Vehicle Review Committee Members in attendance:

Kim Hood, Chair  
Doug Richins  
Greg Sheehan representing Dennis Carver  
Roxie Huntsman  
Robin Erickson  
Scott Harding  
Kevin Walthers  
Doug McCleve

### Fleet Operations and Guests in attendance:

Margaret Chambers	Division of Fleet and Surplus Services
Sam Lee	Division of Fleet and Surplus Services
Amanda Ronan	Division of Fleet and Surplus Services
Cerena Crosby	Division of Fleet and Surplus Services
Shawn Hess	Division of Fleet and Surplus Services
Scott Bingham	Division of Fleet and Surplus Services
Brian Fay	Division of Fleet and Surplus Services
Sal Petilos	Department of Administrative Services
Kimberlee Willette	Governors Office of Planning and Budget
Kristin Phillips	University of Utah
Dave Rees	University of Utah
Bret Burgon	Division of Risk Management
Greg Husband	Department of Public Safety
Charlene Whitehead	Mountainland Applied Technology Center
Marlene Seedall	Department of Workforce Services
William Shiflett	Department of Technology Services

On Monday, March 10, the Motor Vehicle Review Committee held their regularly scheduled meeting in W140 State Capitol Complex, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chair Kim Hood called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

## **1. Approval of Minutes for December 10, 2007**

Chair Hood asked if there were any corrections that needed to be made to the minutes.

**MOTION:** Doug Richins moved to approve the minutes from December 10, 2007.

The motion passed unanimously.

## **2. Accident Review Committee Change Proposal.**

Sam Lee stated that this is a repeat from the December 10, 2007 meeting. We are now coming back with a new recommendation. We are asking for a centralized Accident Review Committee which would meet if the individual agency Accident Review Committee is not meeting. There is a time line set and if the Agencies do not meet then the centralized Accident Review Committee would meet to determine preventable, non-preventable status and make recommendations to the Agency of potential disciplinary action. We have noted in paragraph two that we would notify the agencies Human Resource Department and make sure the agencies management is aware of any recommendations and disciplinary action.

Robin Erickson asked who would be on the centralized Review Committee. Sam Lee stated it would be in rule but we would recommend Administrative Services, Risk Management, Fleet Operations, and Human Resource Management.

Sal Petilos asked if he expected participation from the Agency who is not meeting. Sam Lee stated he didn't think they would participate in the centralized since the reason the centralized committee is looking at the accident is because the Agency did not hold their meeting and missed the deadline. If the individual driver wanted to come to the meeting we could be open to that. But if the agency accident review committee is not functioning we do not anticipate the agencies participating since they are functional.

Doug Richins asked if the agency committee or agency director be notified if the agency does not take action and the accidents are routed to the central accident committee. Sam Lee stated the accidents needed to be reviewed in a timely manner and that is what is driving this issue. We will definitely notify the agency that we are meeting on their behalf.

**MOTION:** Robin Erickson moved to approve to have Fleet Operations and Risk Management work together to revise their rules to include a centralized Accident Review Committee. Robin also asked that Fleet Operations bring with them to the next meeting who will be on the Accident Review Committee.

The motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Driver Eligibility**

Sam Lee stated this has been on the mind of Fleet for a long time. We have been in discussions with Risk Management and we have been partnering with them. I would like to recognize Brian Nelson with Risk Management who has worked closely with us on this proposal today. This proposal is to modify our current rules to deal with drivers who are high risk in a sense that their driving has put them in a different category of risk. We have made some new recommendations as far as driver's license points. The first sections talks about violations. Employees with four or more violations within 12 months would become ineligible to drive. We have looked at industry standards. This is not as stringent as the private sector. Next you see a reference to points and this is the drivers license divisions point standard. Anything over 150 points would put you ineligible to drive. We set it at 150 points because you can go and take a defensive driver class and have 50 points taken off of your record.

Doug Richins asked if it is necessary to have both the four tickets in twelve months and the 150 points. Because wouldn't you have 150 points if you had four tickets? Sam Lee stated more than likely someone with four tickets would have 150 points, but if someone received four speeding tickets they could have 140 points. Four violations within a twelve month period we consider high risk behavior if you don't reach 150 points. Our thinking was someone with a lead foot may or may not reach the 150 point total, but they are receiving moving violations in short period of time.

Doug Richins then suggested moving the points to 140 to capture those who receive four tickets in a twelve month period. Sam Lee stated yes that should take care of it.

Sam Lee then moved onto the Automatic Driver Ineligibility Violations for State Drivers. These violations would automatically make a driver ineligible for a three year time period.

Kevin Walthers asked how do we get some flexibility or appeals process in here. We kind of have it with the 150 points or the four moving violations. I don't want to set a policy that is so rigid that we don't have a chance as managers to make decisions. Sam Lee deferred to Brian Nelson with Risk Management to answer the question. Brian Nelson stated there is a provision in the Fleet Operation rules for a Driver Privilege Review Board. Brian recommended that the board be expanded to allow hearing or a review process for an employee who faces ineligibility. That would be a process available to an employee. This allows agency management to participate in the process for an employee who is facing termination because of ineligibility.

Doug Richins asked what Refusal to take a test required by an implied consent or similar law means. Sam Lee stated his understanding is at the time a driver is pulled over and they refuse to take the drug and/or alcohol test. Refusing to take the test is a violation in itself. Doug McCleve stated if someone is pulled over under suspicion of impaired driving and they refuse to take the test it is automatic disqualification of their driver's license. Doug Richens then asked if it is the only implied consent or implied law that

applies. It just seems overly broad. Sam Lee stated the administrative rule would help clarify that. We would create better language for the rule to help explain it better.

Doug Richens asked if all of the automatic ineligibly violations apply even if they are not driving a state vehicle? Sam Lee stated that is correct. Public Safety does not hand these out very often and we consider these violations are extremely high risk. We chose these specific items as a one and done as the standard and if you receive one you are ineligible to drive for three years. This is already in rule R37-1-8 (6c). Since this is a Risk Management rule I will defer to Brian Nelson. Brian Nelson stated this is a provision that applies to all agencies covered by Risk Management. Currently with our rule there is not a time limit on how long a driver will be ineligible. We are working with Fleet to ensure our rules are the same and we will be adding the three year ineligibility to our rule. Scott Harding asked for clarification. If someone works for the state and receives a DUI they can never drive a state vehicle. Brian Nelson responded yes, that is what rule R37-1-8 states. We intended to change that rule. We do want recognition that people do clean up their record and want them to be able to drive after they do clean up their record.

Greg Sheehan stated the data indicated ninety-seven state employees would be ineligible under the new rule, and ninety of those have a current driver's license. That tells me that the state has deemed only seven of those are ineligible to drive on state roadways. We are making the determination that the other ninety are ineligible. Are we going to far to say the ninety are ineligible even though their licenses are valid. I know with Natural Resources ninety percent of our workforce drive as part of their job and if take away their driving privileges we would put them into a termination mode. We do not have very many sedentary office workers. It worries me that we are making the decision that ninety of them cannot drive. Sam Lee responded we are talking about a very small group of people that would be ineligible. When you consider that we are only making ninety-seven out of the seventeen thousand operators we have ineligible it's a very small percentage. What we are taking about today is raising our standard. The private sector is much more stringent than what we are proposing today. We are raising the bar in our eligibility. Brian Nelson stated to consider looking prospectively at the points. It would be a due process problem if we look at this retroactively. We should look at what accumulates one year after the effective date.

Robin Erickson stated she was from the private sector and looked long and hard at the eligibility. It is a happy medium, and maybe a little to lax. Does the appeal status for the driver show in R37-1-8? Sam Lee stated there is not an appeal process in the current rule, but there is a Driver Eligibility Committee in the accident rule, which we will go over later.

Scott Harding stated that the concern for employees and education for help of an employee. The question would be what type of education process is done before an employee goes to work? Is there training so the employees understand how important the penalties can be by making certain choices? Sam Lee responded there is a new employee orientation with the state, currently there is nothing in place, but we could incorporate the training into the new employee orientation. Risk may have new hire training. Brian

Nelson responded in rule an employee who is driving a state vehicle as part of their essential job function must take the defensive driving course every year. Those who do not drive frequently have to take it every three years. We are currently in the process of creating a training that will incorporate many of the things we are taking about. Again it is in the developmental stage.

Chair Hood asked out of the violations which automatically make a driver ineligible some of them are more clear than others that they should be an automatic ineligibility. You'll be setting up an appeals process in your rule, correct? Sam Lee stated that was correct. Chair Hood then asked if it was creating the Driving Privilege Review Board or is that already in place. Sam Lee stated it will be the Driving Eligibility Review Board.

Doug Richins stated it is good to have an appeals process. I don't think an appellate can overrule something that is in rule. If it states in rule that these things are an automatic disqualification of your driving privilege a Review Board will not be able to overrule it. I suggest we should change the wording to may disqualify the employee, and a determination could be made if it does disqualify the driver. Then the appellate would have the authority to overturn the disqualification.

**MOTION:** Doug Richins moved to change the wording on the Automatic Driver Ineligibility Violations for State Drivers from The following list of violations would automatically disqualify a state employee to the following list of violations may disqualify a state employee. That gives the appeals committee the ability to change the disqualification.

Motion passed unanimously.

Robin Erickson asked if the driver notifies anyone if they receive a speeding ticket. Sam Lee stated they are not required, they are only required to notify their manager if they receive a DUI. Robin Erickson stated so you only know if someone has a ticket when you pull their driving record once a year. Sam Lee stated we pull that weekly.

Greg Sheehan asked if the rule would clarify that the 150 points issue will begin as the effective date of the rule. Sam Lee stated that is the intention.

**MOTION:** Doug Richins moved to make changes under the Motor Vehicle Standards section. Delete the Moving Violations. State employees with four or more moving violations within the previous 12 months will automatically be declared ineligible to drive a state vehicle. Then under the Point Totals change the 150 points to 140 points in both places.

Motion withdrawn since Fleet Operations does not have a problem pulling both tiers of information.

Chair Hood asked what the current standard is to drive a state vehicle. Sam Lee stated the Risk rule states if you receive a DUI, you are ineligible to drive a vehicle for life.

The defensive driver class must be taken. There is a point system for large passenger vans and the preventable accident rule.

Doug Richins asked how Fleet Operations would become aware if a driver received one of the eight ineligibility violations. Margaret Chambers responded we run the drivers license validation weekly and those violations show on that report.

Roxie Huntsman asked for clarification on the Preventable Accident History. It states employees involved in three or more accidents within a three year period will automatically be declared ineligible. Is the rule changing from five years to three years? Sam Lee stated yes that is our intention.

Doug McCleve stated concerns about the automatically be declared ineligible. It should also be changed to may be declared ineligible.

**MOTION:** Doug McCleve moved to change the wording for the Preventable Accident History State employees involved in three or more preventable accidents within a three year time period ~~will automatically~~ may be declared ineligible to drive a state vehicle. Motion seconded by Roxie Huntsman.

Motion passed unanimously

Doug Richins stated the threshold for the Risk Management reserves the right to declare a state driver ineligible if there are significant personal injuries as a result of the accident and/or damage to the vehicle(s) involved in the accident totaling more than \$1800.00 is a very low sum of money. Sam Lee stated Risk Management has backed away from that.

**MOTION:** Kevin Walthers moved to remove the paragraph Risk Management also reserves the right to declare a state driver ineligible after a single preventable accident if there are significant person injuries as a result of the accident and/or damage to the vehicle(s) involved in the accident totaling more than \$1,800. Also remove the whole section on Driver Ineligibility Penalties: Agencies will be informed by the Department of Administrative Services (through the Division of Fleet Operations) when drivers become ineligible to operate a state vehicle. Agencies that knowingly continue to allow ineligible drivers to operate state vehicles shall take full responsibility to cover all expenses including liability up to the current Utah governmental liability caps as a result of an accident caused by the ineligible driver. In summary the agency loses all insurance coverage from Risk Management when they knowingly allow an ineligible driver to operate a state vehicle.

Sam Lee asked if he could make a comment before the committee voted on the motion. Chair Hood gave Sam Lee the floor. Sam Lee stated Fleet Operations needs some ability to enforce this rule. That is why we are coming to you to decide what is appropriate. If you take this away that is our enforcement. If you choose to take that away, you need to come up with another way to help us enforce this.

Kevin Walthers stated that Fleet Operations has access to a cabinet member who has access to the other cabinet members to enforce the rule.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Doug Richins moved to substitute the current motion by taking out the wording Risk Management also reserves the right to declare a state driver ineligible after a single preventable accident if there are significant personal injuries as a result of the accident and/or damage to the vehicle(s) involved in the accident totaling more than \$1800.00. Then leave the first line of the Driver Ineligibility Penalties as is. Remove the second line Agencies that knowingly continue to allow ineligible drivers to operate state vehicles shall take full responsibility to cover all expenses including liability up to the current Utah governmental liability caps as a result of an accident caused by an ineligible driver. In summary the agency loses all insurance coverage from Risk Management when they knowingly allow an ineligible driver to operate a state vehicle. Seconded by Kevin Walthers.

Motion passed with Robin Erickson opposing the motion.

Scott Harding asked if the Motion that was just passed will still give Fleet Operations the ability to enforce the rule. Sam Lee stated it does not. Margaret Chambers stated these policies are currently not in place, and we do need them. The reason we are looking for these policies is we currently have situations in the State where an Agency Accident Review Board has not taken away driving privileges that Fleet Operations feel should be taken away and have not been able to do that. We are looking for a way to deal with situations that are currently happening.

Kevin Walthers stated to turn the enforcement portion over to Risk Management.

Doug Richins stated he brought up the last motion because he thought the language should be in the insurance policy Risk Management has with the agency, not with Fleet Operations and the agency. Margaret Chambers stated that is exactly why we wanted it in both places. We have been working with Risk Management to be the compliance of that. Fleet Operations pays the insurance premiums to Risk Management and then charge them back in our rate. The insurance policy is between Fleet Operations and Risk Management except where an agency owns their vehicles.

Chair Hood stated in an earlier vote we helped create a centralized Accident Review Committee when agencies were not performing that function. Under that committee they can make the determination to make a driver ineligible to drive based on accidents. Sam Lee stated they determine potential discipline up to and including suspension. Chair Hood then stated we are looking at creating an appeal process and a Driving Privilege Review Board under this recommendation correct? Sam Lee stated we are calling it Driver Eligibility Committee. It is yet to be determined if the Driver Privilege Review Board and the Driver Eligibility Committee will be combined. Chair Hood asked if that boards work will determine eligibility based on different types of violations. Sam Lee stated correct. Chair Hood stated that now you are saying that after all of those processes

have occurred you want to take their insurance away from them. Sam Lee stated that agencies that have drivers with multiple accidents yet are doing nothing about it are not being addressed. That is what is driving this. Chair Hood stated if we create this board and have an appeals process in place isn't the penalty to take their driving privilege away from them. You're saying that is not enough, we need to be able to take the insurance away as well. If the past is any indication of the future, the agencies will continue to let the driver drive and we can say their suspended or they do not have driving privilege agencies typically will not do anything without a penalty.

Doug Richins asked for Fleet Operations to bring back new language for the next meeting. Margaret Chambers stated Fleet Operations will come back with due process for the next meeting. She also mentioned this is in our policies that would state the insurance would be lost. Risk Management already has the ten thousand dollar rule that has not been used. Fleet Operations will start using that. We can take it out of our policy, since Risk Management will have it in their policy.

Chair Hood stated she would like to have the language changed to add due process. I guess we would be passing out this recommendation short of including language on Risk Management and the penalties. What impact does that have? Sam Lee stated it gives us less enforcement. What we are looking for today is your direction to continue coming up with this rule. Do you want it to stop today, or do you want us to continue to work on it?

**MOTION:** Doug Richins motioned to enable Fleet Operations to come back with suggested rule that incorporates much of what they have included today and come back with language in a rule format that includes due process. Seconded by Doug McCleve.

Motion passed unanimously.

#### **4. Energy Efficiency Progress/Direction**

Margaret Chambers stated she wanted to give an update to our energy efficiency. I want to give you the results of our exercise of having the vehicles justified. Out of the 530 vehicles that will be replaced this year 85 of them had a size reduction based on the process we put in place. The savings were shown in the Motor Vehicle Review Committee packet.

Chair Hood asked if action was required on this item. Margaret Chambers stated there was not any action needed.

#### **5. Definitions in Administrative Rule R27-1-2**

Margaret Chambers stated during the last meeting we discussed some definitions in rules and are now coming back with what you have said. Sam Lee stated that last time there was some confusion between Margaret and myself. In the top section there is a statement correction. The bottom section is what we are now coming back to you with. The

changes can be found in the Motor Vehicle Review Committee packet. We are asking you to approve the changes to the definitions.

**MOTION:** Greg Sheehan moved to approve the changes as presented. Seconded by Kevin Walthers.

Motion passed unanimously.

## **6. Moving the Preventive Maintenance Schedule to 5,000 and 7,500**

Sam Lee stated the major vehicle manufacturers are moving their preventative maintenance intervals to 5,000 and 7,500 miles. We want to take advantage of that and have the savings to the state by not having to maintain our vehicles at the current interval of 3,000 and 5,000 miles. We are proposing to adopt what the manufacturers are already making their standard.

Doug Richins asked what is considered preventative maintenance. Sam Lee stated the oil change and filter, brakes, air filter, and tire rotation.

Scott Harding asked where are you basing your information off of. Sam Lee stated it is out of the owners manual. Scott Harding stated on extreme duty vehicles 7,500 miles is way too long to wait for maintenance. Sam Lee stated the extreme duty vehicles would be 5,000 miles not 7,500 miles.

**MOTION:** Robin Erickson motioned to move the preventative maintenance schedule to 5,000 miles for extreme duty vehicles and to 7,500 miles for light duty vehicles where the manufacturers have increased the interval schedule. Seconded by Scott Harding.

Motion passed unanimously.

## **7. Continuing the GPS Pilot Program**

Sam Lee stated Fleet Operations has been piloting the GPS for an about a year. We are looking into how we can use GPS technology as a benefit to the state. Under the background section I have listed reasons we use GPS. We have looked at what the private industry is doing; they are using GPS as a tool for fleet management. We have also been studying those same benefits. We have seen the benefits. It is amazing how a driver who is speeding on a regular basis changes his habits once he is informed there is a GPS in his vehicle. We have seen changes based on this. For the most part drivers are not aware the GPS is in their vehicle. We are trying to gather a baseline to go against once we notify the drivers they are in the vehicles. The cost is \$500.00 per unit for hardware and \$30.00 per month for cell service. The industry studies show there is a return on investment from reduced fuel and reduced accidents. Those are where the big savings come from. Fleet Operations is excited about what GPS can do, there is an initial

cost and the ongoing service, but the industry shows a positive return where costs are made up.

Kevin Walthers asked if the unit only works if the car is on. Sam Lee stated the unit is only on when the vehicle is on. Kevin Walthers asked if the car was parked and turned off would we be able to track where the vehicle is located. Sam Lee stated when the unit is turned off it pings its location. Kevin Walthers then stated \$30.00 per month sounds very expensive. Will the price come down when more units are purchased? Sam Lee stated currently we have a small amount of GPS units, so we are not receiving the discounted price. If we do implement this fleet wide the costs would come down. Kevin Walthers On-Star is that same price and this does not give us two way communications. Before we go fleet wide can we investigate a satellite based system where our employees could have two way communications if they were to breakdown. Sam Lee stated Fleet Operations would not be opposed to looking into that.

Greg Sheehan stated he has talked to his Executive Director about the GPS. There is more selling that needs to be done on Fleet Operations part before Natural Resources is going to accept it. It seems like Fleet Operations wants to charge their customers more per month to know what customers are doing. To me the approach has been completely backwards. You should have come to the agencies and stated we have GPS do you have a use for them, instead of just putting them on vehicles without telling anyone and spying on agencies.

Doug McCleve stated we have had discussions at Public Safety about the GPS issues. Most patrol cars in the state have GPS tracking available. The Commissioner of Public Safety has made a commitment to our employees that GPS will not be used as a "big brother" or watching tool. I don't know what the reason would be for not letting someone know a GPS is installed on their vehicle.

Robin Erickson stated it is interesting to listen to the points given. My use of the GPS system is in school busses. It is working very well in the busses. It is being used for two reasons. Reducing idling reduces the fuel costs and pollution. Hopefully the benefits outweigh the negative. Anything is good if you don't look at the negative. I'm over here looking at all of the positives not even thinking about the negatives.

Doug McCleve stated there may be exceptions in state government. Law enforcement needs to be considered. There are not good people out there. I have been threatened to be killed. We need to see who access to the system. It is not a positive thing to have our top law enforcement officials being able to be seen on GPS. I don't want it to be perceived that I'm against GPS. We just need to take into consideration all of the impact.

Kevin Walthers stated we are trying to get our employees to take state vehicles. In my mind adding GPS to the vehicles will give our employees another excuse not to take the state vehicle. This also comes back to Fleet Operations being a customer service agency not an enforcement agency. How do we contain this information so there are only certain people who see the results. In Fleet who are assigned to see the report. Is there a way for

it to be automated where it sends the information straight to the Director. I'm also concerned about the costs. I do not want to see our rates go up as a result of this. It sounded like there would not be a rate increase because of the savings.

Chair Hood asked why was it important that it was a secret where the GPS units were being installed? Why didn't you sit down with the agency Directors and ask them if they would like to have the GPS piloted in their vehicles? Why wasn't it more open? Margaret Chambers responded the implementation didn't roll out the way we intended it to roll out. The reason we put the GPS units in because many of the private fleets are installing them. There is an immediate 30% reduction in fuel used and 30% overtime costs when the GPS unit is installed. It wasn't a secret that we were putting GPS units in the vehicles, the secret was which vehicles we were installing them in. We asked out Fleet Managers to let everyone know we were installing GPS, and that we only had a limited number of units to install. We wanted the big impact of everyone thinking it could be in their vehicle. We wanted the mass reduction of fuel, and people slowing down without having to install on every vehicle. We did have some oops happen as we did the implementation. It was communication all of the way down. We delegated the install to say the new vehicles that are being issued, randomly install GPS in them. We happen to put them in the higher management of Public Safety and if we would have thought about it, it wouldn't have happen. Our intent was not to be "big brother". We tried to roll it out several times that the GPS was installed. We have some agencies coming to us asking for GPS to be installed so they can watch certain employees. Our intent was to have the benefits of it without spending the dollars.

Chair Hood asked if Fleet would be able to achieve those same benefits if the drivers understand the GPS unit is in their vehicle. Margaret Chambers stated we have found out that when drivers do find out the GPS is in their vehicles, their driving changes. Chair Hood stated so there is really no reason not to let everyone know. Margaret Chambers stated there is not any reason to let everyone know. Sam Lee added the reason we did not let people know which vehicles they were in is because we are trying to get a baseline of what the driver is doing according to their normal behavior and then compare that to after they are told the GPS is in their vehicles.

Chair Hood stated you currently have fifty units, Sam Lee corrected the number to twenty five. Chair Hood asked if the proposal today was to expand the number of GPS units. Margaret Chambers said we would like to expand, but we also need to come up with procedures and develop policies for using the GPS.

Greg Sheehan asked if the pilot works well would Fleet install them on all state vehicles. Would it be a standard issue item? Sam Lee stated that is potentially where we are heading. We are still looking at the benefits. I'm not sure I'm ready to say that. Greg Sheehan said to have GPS on the Natural Resources vehicles would be \$270,000 a year you would need to show real factual data to show we would be saving more than \$270,000 a year and achieving other things that are deemed valuable for the state. This is a cabinet level decision Director Hood should be talking to the cabinet members. This has been taken from the bottom up and should have been taken from the top down.

Robin Erickson stated what is nice about a test program you can establish a baseline before you go live. It sounds like you have a test going. You can take your test which shows the positive side of it, the reduced idling, fueling, and accidents. If your test does not show benefits and savings, then you do not go on with it. Do the baseline and the pilot and bring it back and say either, yes we showed benefits, or no it wasn't.

Doug McCleve asked if there was a time period where you test before you notify the driver that there is a GPS in their vehicle, or do you only notify them if they are doing something wrong? How do you determine your baseline? Sam Lee responded that is currently how we are operating. We have put them out into the fleet randomly and we have only identified and told the agency if the driver has had a problem. What we are proposing here is to expend it to a specific agency with about fifty units and tell the agency in six months that GPS was installed and we would be able to look at the baseline compared to the data after the agency is informed. What we are offering here is a cost savings. That is what is driving. If there is not a cost savings then we are not interested. The studies point to a cost savings, and that is what we are going on. Doug McCleve asked how many units do you need and how long do you need them to conduct your pilot program to make your assessment. Sam Lee proposed fifty units for six months. Chair Hood stated the pilot has been going for a year with twenty five units. How many of the original twenty five units installed know they have GPS in their vehicle? Sam Lee stated six or seven out of the twenty five. Chair Hood asked if we take those twenty five and inform everyone they have the GPS then we could gather data for six months and see if it changes their behavior. Sam Lee stated we could but I would like to target a specific group and try to do a more scientific study then what we have done now. We've just put it out there to see what kind of data we would get back. Now I want to do a more specific study on a specific group.

Robin Erickson stated that the temperature is going to change, I don't think six months isn't long enough. Why not let them know. Is it because you are concerned whether or not they will drive the vehicle once they find out GPS is installed. Sam Lee stated I want to know if they are going to idle less, if they are going to speed less, and if they are going to drive fewer miles. Robin Erickson stated if you let them know it will offset that. Sam Lee stated I know, but I do not have a baseline. Robin Erickson said a year prior you already know your baseline with miles traveled and their gasoline consumption. So now you can take the GPS and do gasoline, miles, maintenance, and then do idling. Idling should be able to be figured out by gallons. Then it is a positive you're not watching where they are traveling.

Doug McCleve asked if there is any data from any other studies as to what the baseline should be timeline wise, and at what point we advise someone whether it is cost effective? Or are you going by your own assessment. I'm just wondering if there is a standard for the baseline and process? Sam Lee stated there is not anything specific. We just want to know if you are okay with us moving forward with the pilot and having a formal study of whether this is a good idea or not.

Kevin Walthers said to set up a control study. Set up eight site managers with GPS and eight without. The eight without would be your control. If you have 5500 vehicles with GPS that is \$2,000,000 which is seven percent of your budget. That would be hard to recover just through gas savings. We need to have a goal of what we want out of it at the end.

Chair Hood asked Fleet to come up with strict guidelines and a timeline for your pilot. Seek the advice of the committee members to look at measurements are important and maybe not wait until the next meeting, but circulate a memo with the guidelines and seek feedback from the committee members in the interim. Margaret Chambers stated lets do that and have a formal plan in place for the next meeting. Robin Erickson also asked for a pricing structure to be included.

**MOTION:** Doug McCleve motioned to allow Fleet Operations to move forward with their pilot program. Expand up to twenty five additional units. Prepare guidelines, a timeline, and units of measurement and process those through the committee and bring back a formal presentation for the next meeting. Seconded by Roxie Huntsman.

Motion passed with Greg Sheehan opposing the motion.

**MOTION:** Doug Richins motioned to adjourn.

Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Hood adjourned the meeting at 12:37 p.m.