

Oklahoma Commercial Vehicle Information Systems Self-Evaluation




**Oklahoma
Department of
Transportation**

In Coordination With:



**U.S. Department of
Transportation**



June 2004

1.0 Introduction.....1

2.0 FMCSA Evaluation Template.....2

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Template.....56

1.0 Purpose

1.1 Purpose

This document provides the framework and structure for Oklahoma's ongoing Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) evaluation plan. The evaluation framework is intended to provide an assessment of the following:

1. Oklahoma's status and progress in meeting CVISN Core Capability (formerly called "Level 1") compliance targets, utilizing the evaluation templates developed by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA);
2. Status and progress in meeting the state's specific implementation goals, including quantitative estimates of motor carrier and state cost savings / productivity improvements associated with implementation of CVISN deployment projects.

The document is intended to be updated annually, and / or upon implementation of key deployment milestones, to assist in progress monitoring and program refinement.

The document provides templates to address the evaluation process as proscribed by FMCSA, as well as templates for state-defined metrics. Electronic copies of the evaluation templates have been provided to ODOT, enabling ODOT and other participating state agencies to update evaluation data on an ongoing basis.

1.2 Organization

The Evaluation Plan is organized as follows:

Section 2 - A completed copy of the FMCSA templates for self-evaluation, completed as of the date of most recent publication of this document. Future versions will include a summary of accomplishments during the previous year.

Section 3 - A quantitative evaluation of motor carrier and state productivity and effectiveness improvements resulting from implementation of automated screening, credentialing and safety assurance projects.

2.1 Self-Evaluation as Proscribed by FMCSA

FMCSA, in association with a variety of state reviewers and the Batelle Institute, has developed a self-evaluation instrument for use by states in measuring their progress in CVISN Core Capability deployment, deployment costs, and lessons learned.

The completed forms, detailing the fourth quarter 2003 status of Oklahoma's program are included in Section 2.3 of this document.

2.2 Recommended Process for Periodic Update of FMCSA Evaluation Forms

It is recommended that the Oklahoma CVISN Team update the FMCSA CVISN evaluation template annually and / or as key deployment milestones, as defined in the CVISN project plans, are reached. With each iteration of forms update, it is recommended that a brief textual summary / power point presentation detailing accomplishments since the previous evaluation be prepared to assist the team in outreach / education efforts with key CVISN stakeholders, agency executive management and other key decision-makers.

2.3 FMCSA Evaluation Results

Information About Respondents	
1	Name of person primarily responsible for completing the form: Ron Curb
2	Telephone number of person completing the form: 405-521-2536
3	Agency, department, and division of person completing the form: Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Planning Division, Strategic Planning
4	Names of other persons providing supporting information on the form: Lynne Jones, OCC John Hardridge, DPS Gene Gilstrap, OTC Steve Smith, OTC
5	Date when the form was completed (mm/dd/yyyy): 2/27/2004

I. Credentials Administration

IRP Credentials

Item	Question
6	Approximately how many commercial motor carrier accounts and commercial vehicles (power units) now have IRP credentials in your state?

Number of IRP Carrier Accounts (rounded to nearest hundred)	Number of IRP Commercial Vehicles (rounded to nearest hundred)
11,609	179,000

The 11,609 accounts are total accounts that were active at some point in 2003; not all these accounts renewed (many carriers who formerly IRP credentialed in Oklahoma could not provide proof of physical address here, so did not renew during the year, explaining the apparent discrepancy in # of transactions and # of accounts)

7	An IRP credentialing transaction is defined as the process of obtaining new registrations, renewals, or supplemental credentials for one or more vehicles. Approximately how many of each of the various types of credentialing transactions were processed in the past 12 months (or the latest reporting year) in your state, including CVISN, electronic, walk-in, paper-based, or legacy system transactions? Show both the total number of IRP transactions and the total number of IRP credentialed vehicles.
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	New IRP	Renewal IRP	Supplemental IRP
Total number of transactions per year	673	5,881	10,077
Total number of vehicles credentialed per year			

Could not run # of vehicles associated with each transaction type, but OK IRP credentials about 179,000 power units

8

Considering every credentialing transaction as having four main steps (shown below at left), complete the table below to show the estimated percentage of each step or part of your state's IRP transactions that now are or soon will be completed using CVISN electronic technology. Include all types of credentialing transactions—new, renewal, and supplemental—in your estimated percentages.

Percent = (Number of CVISN IRP transactions / total number of IRP transactions) * 100

Note:

- A. Oklahoma's large carriers use an EDI / Bulletin Board to submit IRP applications; credentials are mailed out to carriers. OK plans to implement web-based credentialing, including an EFT component, for smaller carriers and has funds in hands to do so; however, the state is replacing its mainframe IRP legacy system with an Oracle client / server system and will not initiate development of web-based credentialing capabilities until the new system is completed (at least 12 months out).
- B. IRP staffers currently review the EDI applications manually, then upload application data directly into the IRP system (no data entry required). This step is thus partially automated. With replacement of the IRP legacy system, the EDI / bulletin board application process will be web-enabled, and application data verification and upload will be automated, eliminating the need for manual review and upload. EFT will also be implemented, providing opportunities for carriers using the EDI process to pay for credentials electronically. However, implementation of these enhanced capabilities is estimated to be more than 12 months out.

		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months
Step 1	Carrier transmits the application to the state (See note A)	45%	45%	45%
Step 2	State processes the application	0%	0%	0%
Step 3	Carrier pays the fee to the state	0%	0%	0%
Step 4	State issues the official credential	0%	0%	0%

Item Question

9

Consider the percentage of commercial motor carrier accounts in your state that apply for IRP credentials electronically. Complete the table below to show the approximate percent of motor carrier accounts using CVISN for IRP applications now and those expected to be applying for such credentials using CVISN in the near future.

	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months
Carrier Accounts	7%	7%	7%

Note: 7% of Oklahoma's renewals were completed in 2003 using the EDI bulletin board system. We thus estimate that approximately 7% of all carriers IRP registering in Oklahoma are registering electronically. 67% of the vehicles registered are registered via the EDI system; 74% of all supplemental applications were filed using the EDI system.

10	<p>Consider a credentialing system as having two parts: a “front-end” user interface or data entry part and a “back-end” database management and data processing or reporting part. Use check marks (✓) in the table below to indicate who owns and who operates each of the various parts of your state’s electronic credentialing system for processing IRP credentials. If the ownership or operation is a joint effort, briefly describe the arrangement in the space below.</p>			
	Owned by Your State	Owned by Vendor	Operated and Maintained Mainly by State Employees	Operated and Maintained Mainly by Vendor Employees
	✓		✓	
	✓		✓	
11	<p>Comments on special ownership or other types of operation/maintenance arrangements for your state’s IRP credentialing system (if applicable):</p>			
12	<p>Which third-party vendor (if any) does your state use for any aspect of IRP credentialing?</p> <p>Check all that apply:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ACS/VISTA/MVS Express</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Polk/COVERS/COVERSnet</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CACI International Inc.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): ___Oklahoma will contract with a local vendor to modify the Maryland IRP system for Oklahoma use. The resulting system will be a state-owned and state-maintained system.</p>			

Item	Question			
13	<p>If carriers in your state now can (or soon will be able to) pay fees and costs related to IRP credentials electronically, use check marks (✓) in the table below to show the methods that they can use now and in the near future.</p> <p>The IRP and IFTA web-credentialing projects include EFT capabilities. Specific capabilities are currently under discussion, but will likely include credit card as well as ACH credit / debit, and may also include electronic checks.</p>			
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Carriers Can Use Now</th> <th>Carriers Can Use in 6 Months</th> <th>Carriers Can Use in 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> </table>	Carriers Can Use Now	Carriers Can Use in 6 Months	Carriers Can Use in 12 Months
Carriers Can Use Now	Carriers Can Use in 6 Months	Carriers Can Use in 12 Months		
Credit card				
Debit card				
Automatic clearinghouse (ACH) credit				
ACH debit				
Other automatic withdrawal or account sweep service				
Other electronic payment method (please specify):				
14	<p>If your state now issues (or soon will be able to issue) official IRP credentials electronically, use check marks (✓) in the table below to show the issuing methods used now and in the near future.</p>			
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>State Uses Now</th> <th>State Will Use in 6 Months</th> <th>State Will Use in 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> </table>	State Uses Now	State Will Use in 6 Months	State Will Use in 12 Months
State Uses Now	State Will Use in 6 Months	State Will Use in 12 Months		
E-mail messages				
Internet/HTML/Web-based				
Facsimile/fax machine				
Other method of issuance (please specify):				

Item	Question
15	<p>What is the schedule for your state to join the IRP Clearinghouse?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Already participate in the IRP Clearinghouse<input type="checkbox"/> Expect to join within 6 months<input type="checkbox"/> Expect to join within 12 months<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expect to join within 1 to 2 years<input type="checkbox"/> Do not plan to join the IRP Clearinghouse
16	<p>Which type of computer connections do carriers use to participate in your state's IRP electronic credentialing system?</p> <p>Check all that apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Internet/HTML/Web-based system<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic bulletin board system<input type="checkbox"/> Carrier automated transaction (CAT)<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____
17	<p>About how often are your state's IRP credentialing data updated and transferred to CVIEW (or another centralized system) where the data can be accessed for roadside safety or credentials checks?</p> <p>Check one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Hourly<input type="checkbox"/> Daily<input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 to 6 days<input type="checkbox"/> Weekly<input type="checkbox"/> Twice monthly<input type="checkbox"/> Monthly<input type="checkbox"/> Less often than once per month<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable<input type="checkbox"/> Other interval (please specify): _____ <p>Oklahoma will issue an RFP for CVIEW implementation within the next 30 days. It is anticipated that IRP status updates will be transmitted to the CVIEW on a nightly (or more frequent) basis.</p>

Item	Question
18	<p>If your state provides IRP credentialing data to an outside organization for electronic screening (for example, PrePass), about how often are the IRP credentialing data typically transferred to the electronic screening or clearance system?</p> <p>Check one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Hourly<input type="checkbox"/> Daily<input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 to 6 days<input type="checkbox"/> Weekly<input type="checkbox"/> Twice monthly<input type="checkbox"/> Monthly<input type="checkbox"/> Less than once per month<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable<input type="checkbox"/> Other interval (please specify): _____ <p>Note that upon implementation of the Oklahoma CVIEW, the CVIEW will be updated nightly with IRP data. CVIEW will push that data nightly to SAFER, where it will be accessible to the PrePass central database.</p>

IFTA Credentials				
Item	Question			
19	Approximately how many commercial motor carrier accounts and commercial vehicles (power units) now have IFTA credentials in your state?			
		Number of IFTA Carrier Accounts (rounded to nearest hundred)	Number of IFTA Commercial Vehicles (rounded to nearest hundred)	
		4,200	N/A – Oklahoma does not charge for decals, thus does not track number of decals issued	
20	An IFTA credentialing transaction is defined as the process of obtaining new registrations, renewals, or supplemental credentials for one or more vehicles. Approximately how many of each of the various types of credentialing transactions were processed in the past 12 months (or the latest reporting year) in your state, including CVISN, electronic, walk-in, paper-based, or legacy system transactions? Indicate both the total number of IFTA transactions and the total number of IFTA credentialed vehicles.			
	Note that quarterly IFTA tax reporting is a larger processing burden than IFTA renewals / new accounts, and that Oklahoma receives approximately 16,800 quarterly filings each year			
		New IFTA	Renewal IFTA	Supplemental IFTA
	Total number of transactions per year	Not Available	4,200	Not Available
	Total number of vehicles credentialed per year			
21	Considering every credentialing transaction as having four main steps, complete the table below to show the estimated percentage of each step or part of your state's IFTA transactions that now are or soon will be completed using CVISN electronic technology. Include all types of credentialing transactions—new, renewal, and supplemental—in your estimated percentages. Percent = (Number of CVISN IFTA transactions / total number of IFTA transactions) * 100			
	Note that Oklahoma has engaged a contractor to develop a new Oracle-based, client server IFTA licensing and tax management system, including web-based credentialing and quarterly filing capabilities. The web system will include EFT capabilities. It is anticipated that the web-based system will be up and running within the next 18 months, but not within the next 12 months.			
		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months
Step 1	Carrier transmits the application to the state	0%	0%	0%
Step 2	State processes the application	0%	0%	0%
Step 3	Carrier pays the fee to the state	0%	0%	0%
Step 4	State issues the official credential	0%	0%	0%

Item	Question															
22	<p>Consider the percentage of commercial motor carrier accounts in your state that apply for IFTA credentials electronically. Complete the table below to show the approximate percent of motor carrier accounts using CVISN for IFTA applications now and those expected to be applying for such credentials using CVISN in the near future.</p> <p>See Note on question 21.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Now</th> <th>In 6 Months</th> <th>In 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Carrier accounts</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months	Carrier accounts	0%	0%	0%							
	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months													
Carrier accounts	0%	0%	0%													
23	<p>Consider a credentialing system as having two parts: a front-end user interface or data entry part and a back-end database management and data processing or reporting part. Check the boxes below to indicate who owns and who operates each of the various parts of your state's electronic credentialing system for processing IFTA credentials. If the ownership or operation is a joint effort, briefly describe the arrangement in the space below.</p> <p>The IFTA replacement system will be owned and maintained by Oklahoma.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Owned by Your State</th> <th>Owned by Vendor</th> <th>Operated and Maintained Mainly by State Employees</th> <th>Operated and Maintained Mainly by Vendor Employees</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Front-end user interface system and related central-office hardware</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Back-end database management system and hardware</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Owned by Your State	Owned by Vendor	Operated and Maintained Mainly by State Employees	Operated and Maintained Mainly by Vendor Employees	Front-end user interface system and related central-office hardware	✓		✓		Back-end database management system and hardware	✓		✓	
	Owned by Your State	Owned by Vendor	Operated and Maintained Mainly by State Employees	Operated and Maintained Mainly by Vendor Employees												
Front-end user interface system and related central-office hardware	✓		✓													
Back-end database management system and hardware	✓		✓													
24	<p>Comments on special ownership or other types of operation/maintenance arrangements for your state's IFTA credentialing system (if applicable):</p>															
25	<p>Which third-party vendor (if any) does your state use for any aspect of IFTA credentialing?</p> <p>Check all that apply:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ACS/VISTA/MVS Express</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Polk/COVERS/COVERSnet</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CACI International Inc.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): <u>Oklahoma is contracting with a local vendor to develop a state-owned system</u></p>															

Item	Question			
26	<p>If carriers in your state now can (or soon will be able to) pay fees and costs related to IFTA credentials electronically, check the boxes below to indicate the methods that they can use now and in the near future.</p> <p>The IRP and IFTA web-credentialing projects include EFT capabilities. Specific capabilities are currently under discussion, but will likely include credit card as well as ACH credit / debit, and may also include electronic checks.</p>			
		Carriers Can Use Now	Carriers Can Use in 6 Months	Carriers Can Use in 12 Months
	Credit card			
	Debit card			
	Automatic clearinghouse (ACH) credit			
	ACH debit			
	Other automatic withdrawal or account sweep service			
	Other electronic payment method (please specify):			
27	<p>If your state now issues (or soon will be able to issue) official IFTA credentials electronically, check the boxes below to indicate the issuing methods used now and in the near future.</p>			
		State Uses Now	State Will Use in 6 Months	State Will Use in 12 Months
	E-mail messages			
	Internet/HTML/Web-based			
	Facsimile/fax machine			
	Other method of issuance (please specify):			

Item	Question
28	<p>What is the schedule for your state to join the IFTA Clearinghouse?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Already participate in the IFTA Clearinghouse</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Expect to join within 6 months</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expect to join within 12 months</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Expect to join within 1 to 2 years</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Do not plan to join the IFTA Clearinghouse</p>
29	<p>Which type of computer connections do carriers use to participate in your state's IFTA electronic credentialing system? (Check all that apply)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Internet/HTML/Web-based system</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Electronic bulletin board system</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Carrier automated transaction (CAT)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): <u>Oklahoma will provide a web-based IFTA credentialing and tax filing system. The system will also accommodate downloads directly from a carrier's fleet management system</u></p>
30	<p>About how often are your state's IFTA credentialing data updated and transferred to CVIEW (or another centralized system), where the data can be accessed for roadside safety or credentials checks? (Check one)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hourly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Daily</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 to 6 days</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Weekly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Twice monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Less often than once per month</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other interval (please specify): Note that Oklahoma is in the process of issuing an RFP for CVIEW implementation. Upon implementation of CVIEW, the IFTA system will transmit IFTA status updates to the CVIEW nightly (or more frequently).</p>
31	<p>If your state provides IFTA credentialing data to an outside organization for electronic screening (for example, PrePass), about how often are the IFTA credentialing data typically transferred to the electronic screening or clearance system? (Check one)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hourly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Daily</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 to 6 days</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Weekly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Twice monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Less often than once per month</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other interval (please specify): <u>Note that upon implementation of the Oklahoma CVIEW, the CVIEW will be updated nightly with IFTA data. The CVIEW, will push that data nightly to SAFER, where it will be accessible to the PrePass central database.</u></p>

Credentials Other Than IRP and IFTA

Item	Question																																
32	If your state issues any other kinds of permits or credentials besides IRP and IFTA, complete the table below to indicate approximately how many applications were received for each kind of credential using CVISN technology in the past 12 months (or the latest reporting year) in the first column. Then indicate in the second column how many were received by all methods combined (walk-in + paper forms + legacy system + CVISN, etc.).																																
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2" style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">Type of Permit or Credential</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Number of Applications Received per Year</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Applications Received Using CVISN</th> <th style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Total Applications Received by All Methods (CVISN + Non-CVISN)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Single state registration system</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">2,926</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Single trip (motor carrier, use fuel, permit)</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">10,468</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Registration (30-, 60-, 90-day)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Envelope permits</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,638 annual OS/OW type permits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oversize/overweight (the total shown here includes some permits that might be considered "envelope" permits, with weights and dimensions that can be readily accommodated on a variety of "standard" routes"</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">188,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hazardous materials</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weight/distance</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">OK is not a third tier tax state</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highway use tax</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others (please specify):</td> <td></td> <td> 396 USDOT #'s to Intrastate carriers 278 DSTPs 12,691 insurance filings 201 interstate exempt certificates 8,993 authorizations to operate or change authorization 832 intrastate and interstate exempt carriers revoked </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of Permit or Credential	Number of Applications Received per Year		Applications Received Using CVISN	Total Applications Received by All Methods (CVISN + Non-CVISN)	Single state registration system		2,926	Single trip (motor carrier, use fuel, permit)		10,468	Registration (30-, 60-, 90-day)			Envelope permits		1,638 annual OS/OW type permits	Oversize/overweight (the total shown here includes some permits that might be considered "envelope" permits, with weights and dimensions that can be readily accommodated on a variety of "standard" routes"		188,000	Hazardous materials		42	Weight/distance		OK is not a third tier tax state	Highway use tax			Others (please specify):		396 USDOT #'s to Intrastate carriers 278 DSTPs 12,691 insurance filings 201 interstate exempt certificates 8,993 authorizations to operate or change authorization 832 intrastate and interstate exempt carriers revoked
Type of Permit or Credential	Number of Applications Received per Year																																
	Applications Received Using CVISN	Total Applications Received by All Methods (CVISN + Non-CVISN)																															
Single state registration system		2,926																															
Single trip (motor carrier, use fuel, permit)		10,468																															
Registration (30-, 60-, 90-day)																																	
Envelope permits		1,638 annual OS/OW type permits																															
Oversize/overweight (the total shown here includes some permits that might be considered "envelope" permits, with weights and dimensions that can be readily accommodated on a variety of "standard" routes"		188,000																															
Hazardous materials		42																															
Weight/distance		OK is not a third tier tax state																															
Highway use tax																																	
Others (please specify):		396 USDOT #'s to Intrastate carriers 278 DSTPs 12,691 insurance filings 201 interstate exempt certificates 8,993 authorizations to operate or change authorization 832 intrastate and interstate exempt carriers revoked																															

II. Roadside: Safety Information Exchange

Item	Question
33	<p>How many permanent, fixed weigh scale sites (with a scale house or other permanent structure and with a static scale installed in the ground) does your state operate? Consider each site on a divided directional lane separately. For example, if your state has separate northbound and southbound weigh stations near the same milepost, count them as two sites.</p>
	<p>11 sites; 2 do not have working scales</p>
34	<p>How many of these permanent weigh scale sites (with a scale house structure) are also used now for vehicle safety inspections and/or credential or compliance checks?</p>
	<p>11 sites are used by the OCC for safety inspections; however, the Oklahoma DPS is the MCSAP organization within Oklahoma and is responsible for the lion's share of inspections. The DPS, except very occasionally, does not use the weigh stations for inspections. Rather, more than 90% of safety inspections are completed on a random basis at roadside from mobile units.</p>
35	<p>How many so-called "plug-and-run" weigh scale sites does your state operate now?</p>
	<p>1</p>
36	<p>How many of these plug-and-run sites are also used now for vehicle safety inspections and/or credential or compliance checks?</p>
	<p>1</p>
37	<p>In the past 12 months (or the latest reporting year), approximately how many commercial vehicles were weighed at your state's permanent weigh scale sites (where a scale is installed in the ground), counting all types of permanent weigh scale sites combined, including those with a scale house and those that are plug-and-run sites?</p>
	<p>Oklahoma's fixed scales are operated by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission and the Oklahoma Tax Commission. The OCC does not have weight enforcement authority. The OTC has authority to enforce registered weight only. Only the DPS has authority to enforce the state's size and weight authority. DPS operates mobile enforcement operations only. Thus, the fixed scales weigh approximately 1.7 million vehicles annually to check operating weight against registered weight.</p>

38	How many of your state's permanent weigh scale sites (where a scale is installed in the ground) are also international or interstate ports-of-entry?	
	Number of international ports-of-entry (between the U.S. and another country)	<p style="text-align: center;">Sites 0</p>
	Number of interstate ports-of-entry (between states within the U.S.)	4 of Oklahoma's fixed scales are located proximate to the border with neighboring states
39	Approximately how many mobile or portable scale systems (meant to be moved from place to place and used on top of the pavement surface) does your state operate now?	
	39 sets of 4 Haenni scales	
40	In the past 12 months (or the latest reporting year), approximately how many commercial vehicles were weighed using state-owned mobile or portable scales in your state?	
	DPS weighed 10,241 vehicles in FY 2003 using portable and semi-portable scales.	
Item	Question	
41	How many permanent roadside inspection-only sites (without a static weigh scale installed in the ground) does your state operate now?	
	Oklahoma has 13 roadside sites where officers routinely set up portable weighing equipment to conduct both size and weight and safety inspections. OK has more than 120 locations where MCSAP officers routinely conduct safety inspections (these are not necessarily sites with developed facilities, rather they are rest stops, parking lots, empty lots and / or sites where ROW is sufficient to safely accommodate pullover and parking of CVs for roadside inspections.	
42	In the past 12 months (or the latest reporting year), how many commercial vehicles were inspected (for example, Level I, II, or III) by your state's personnel or at your state's weigh and/or inspection facilities, counting all permanent, plug-and-run, mobile, and inspection-only sites combined?	
	DPS – 15,254 OCC - 799	

43

How many full-time equivalent (FTE) officers and/or inspectors does your state employ in a typical year to perform commercial vehicle safety inspections?

DPS – 39 (the 39 officers spend 51% of their time on MCSAP and size and weight compliance, 49% on general traffic and other enforcement)

OCC – 19 (OCC officers primary function is SSRS and other OCC authority enforcement; perform safety inspections only rarely, although they are certified to do so)

44

What percent of your state’s officers/inspectors involved in CVO or enforcement now use laptop computers equipped with Aspen or equivalent, or are expected to start using laptops soon, to support the inspection process?

Percent = (Number with laptop computers / total number of officers or inspectors) * 100

	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months
Percent of officers	DPS – 100% OCC – 100%	DPS – 100% OCC – 100%	DPS – 100% OCC – 100%

45

Is CVISN technology used at any of your state’s permanent weigh scale sites to aid the inspection selection process (for example, Aspen with Inspection Selection System, ISS, or connection to SAFER)?

- No (go to Question 46)
- Yes

Which of the following scenarios best describes how the inspector’s professional judgment, experience, or discretion is typically combined with CVISN computer-based information systems for commercial vehicle inspections in your state? (Check all that apply)

- Inspector obtains numeric ISS ratings after inspector decides which vehicles to inspect
- Inspector obtains numeric ISS ratings before inspector decides which vehicles to inspect
- Computerized decision or selection algorithm queries a database and then, in real time, selects which vehicle to inspect and at what level (inspector has little or no discretion)
- Other method of using CVISN technology in inspection selection

Note that when CVIEW is fully deployed, officers at fixed scales and officers with appropriate communications in their mobile units (all DPS MCSAP officers have satellite communications) will be able to enter a DOT or plate number and view a “pass / fail screen”, which shows whether carrier / vehicle is “good to go” re: IRP, IFTA, SSRS and other credential status and carrier safety status; parameters outside acceptable range will be highlighted so that officer has ability to pull out of queue at weigh station / roadside for further inspection, with some idea of nature of potential problem

Item	Question								
	If none of the scenarios (in Item 45) apply to your situation, describe below how your state uses computer-based information systems in commercial vehicle inspections.								
46	<p>How many of your state's permanent weigh/inspection sites (where a scale is installed in the ground) are connected now to CVIEW (or equivalent) for carrier or vehicle electronic data "snapshots" (or equivalent)? How many new sites are expected to be connected soon for snapshots? Consider each site on a divided directional lane (for example, eastbound and westbound) separately.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Now</th> <th>In 6 Months</th> <th>In 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Number of sites</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months	Number of sites	0	0	11
	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months						
Number of sites	0	0	11						
47	<p>Does your state download or copy database files or full carrier safety profiles from a central system for use on roadside computers, or does it query the central system remotely from the roadside only as needed?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Downloads full database files for use on roadside computer</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Queries a central database from remote roadside computer as needed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Combination of download and query; methods vary within the state</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable – but plan is that when CVIEW is deployed, remote sites will query CVIEW central site; note that this will be manual queries where plate or DOT number is keyed into CVIEW query screen</p>								
48	<p>How often does your state usually update the carrier safety and credential information from a central system for use on computers at roadside weigh/inspection locations?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hourly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Daily</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 to 6 days</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Weekly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Twice monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Less often than once per month</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other interval (please specify): _____</p> <p>When CVIEW is deployed, data will be updated nightly (or more frequently). It is anticipated that once Oklahoma data is pushed to SAFER nightly by the Oklahoma CVIEW, that the PrePass central site will be updated nightly by SAFER, and that the PrePass central site will update local screening databases nightly or more frequently.</p>								

Item	Question								
49	<p>How many of your state's laptop computers supporting commercial vehicle safety inspections are configured (or will be configured soon—including existing and new laptops) for wireless data transfer with a central database management system (for example, SAFER or CVIEW)?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Now</th> <th>In 6 Months</th> <th>In 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Number of laptops</td> <td>DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS</td> <td>DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS</td> <td>DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS When SAFER develops capabilities for satellite connectivity, 100% of DPS laptops will be able to communicate with SAFER; OK is working with satellite vendor for CVIEW connectivity via DPS networks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months	Number of laptops	DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS	DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS	DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS When SAFER develops capabilities for satellite connectivity, 100% of DPS laptops will be able to communicate with SAFER; OK is working with satellite vendor for CVIEW connectivity via DPS networks
	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months						
Number of laptops	DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS	DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS	DPS – 100% have satellite access to SafetyNet / OLETS / NLETS When SAFER develops capabilities for satellite connectivity, 100% of DPS laptops will be able to communicate with SAFER; OK is working with satellite vendor for CVIEW connectivity via DPS networks						
50	<p>What kinds of wireless systems or protocols does your state use or plan to use?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Analog cellular</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Digital cellular – had this capability in the past; CDPD is no longer available (discontinued by AT&T)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satellite communication</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other system (please specify): _____</p>								

III. Roadside: Electronic Screening

Item	Question
51	<p>Does your state now offer CVISN electronic screening to enable safe, registered, enrolled vehicles to bypass one or more open weigh stations, or does your state expect to offer electronic screening in the near future?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Now offers electronic screening</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Expects to offer electronic screening within 6 months</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Expects to offer electronic screening within 12 months</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does not now offer and does not plan to offer electronic screening (go to Question 60)</p>

52	<p>In which electronic screening program or partnership does your state participate or expect to participate?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HELP/PrePass</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Norpass</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Self-administered</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe your program or partnership):</p>
-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

53	<p>At how many permanent weigh sites (where a static scale is installed in the ground) does your state now offer (or plan to offer) electronic screening? (The 6- and 12-month estimates should include the sum of both existing and new sites.)</p>								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Now</th> <th>In 6 Months</th> <th>In 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Number of permanent sites that have or expect to have electronic screening</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months	Number of permanent sites that have or expect to have electronic screening	7	7	7
	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months						
Number of permanent sites that have or expect to have electronic screening	7	7	7						

54	<p>At how many other sites (remote from an existing permanent weigh or inspection site) does your state now use (or plan to use—including existing and new sites) electronic screening technologies?</p> <p>Oklahoma is discussing implementation of an enhanced remote screening pilot project; however, implementation of this project is likely more than 12 months out</p>								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Now</th> <th>In 6 Months</th> <th>In 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Number of remote screening sites that use or plan to use electronic screening</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months	Number of remote screening sites that use or plan to use electronic screening	0	0	0
	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months						
Number of remote screening sites that use or plan to use electronic screening	0	0	0						

55	<p>How many high-speed mainline weigh-in-motion (WIM) devices does your state have installed or plan to install (including existing and new devices)?</p> <p>Note: Oklahoma is planning implementation of at least one mainline WIM in association with a fixed site; however, implementation is likely more than 12 months out. Because fixed scales in Oklahoma are not currently authorized to enforce the state's size and weight laws, the WIM would be used to verify actual weight against registered weight limits.</p>								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Now</th> <th>In 6 Months</th> <th>In 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mainline WIMs</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months	Mainline WIMs	0	0	0
	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months						
Mainline WIMs	0	0	0						

Item	Question								
56	<p>How many reduced-speed ramp or sorter-lane weigh-in-motion (WIM) devices does your state have installed or plan to install (including existing and new ramps/devices)?</p>								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Now</th> <th>In 6 Months</th> <th>In 12 Months</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ramp or sorter-lane WIMs</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months	Ramp or sorter-lane WIMs	0	0	0
	Now	In 6 Months	In 12 Months						
Ramp or sorter-lane WIMs	0	0	0						

57	Counting each time an enrolled, transponder-equipped vehicle encountered an electronic screening site, in the past 12 months (or the latest reporting year), approximately how many:	
		Number
	Commercial vehicle electronic screenings were performed by your state's system?	403,818
	Screened vehicles were given a green light transponder signal to bypass an open weigh or inspection station?	357,026
	Screened vehicles were given a red light transponder signal to enter a weigh or inspection station?	46,792
58	What is your state's prevailing random pull-in rate? That is, in approximately what percentage of electronic screening-site encounters would a safe, enrolled, transponder-equipped vehicle still be given a red light and requested to enter a weigh/inspection station?	
	Percent = (Number of red lights / number of station encounters) * 100	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Random pull-in rate varies from time to time or from carrier to carrier (If rate varies, briefly describe your state's method of determining pull-in rate in the space provided below:)	
	5% random pull-in rate; actual pull-in rate averages 11.6%	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Averages 0 to 5 percent <input type="checkbox"/> Averages 6 to 10 percent <input type="checkbox"/> Averages 11 to 15 percent <input type="checkbox"/> Averages greater than 15 percent <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	
Item	Question	
59	How are in-vehicle transponders purchased and distributed to motor carriers and vehicles? (Check all that apply)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Purchased and distributed by state government, without direct charge to the participating motor carrier <input type="checkbox"/> Purchased by state government and distributed by a third party (outsourced) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purchased and distributed by interstate program or partnership (for example, PrePass) <input type="checkbox"/> Purchased directly from vendor by motor carrier <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____	

IV. General Information About CVISN

Item	Question
60	<p>Does your state use or plan to use the EDI (Electronic Data Interchange) or the XML (Extensible Markup Language) computer programming format or language as your state's standard for CVISN deployment? (Check all that apply)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EDI</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> XML</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____</p>
61	<p>Which of the following funding sources does your state use for deploying and operating CVISN technologies? (Check all that apply)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> State general revenue funds budgeted for department of transportation/highways</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> State general revenue funds budgeted for law enforcement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> State general revenue funds budgeted for safety/public utilities</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State dedicated funds (special taxes, registration fees, or permit fee surcharges) collected from users (that is, from motor carriers) – toll match used for CVISN matching funds</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal grants – MCSAP funds used for satellite communications; CVISN deployment funding used for most other CVISN deployment projects</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Federal matching funds or subsidies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Up-front transponder fees charged to motor carriers</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Per-bypass fees charged to motor carriers</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> R&D or deployment funds from alternative sources (give examples)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private sources (give examples) – Public / private partnership funds (PrePass) used to implement electronic screening</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Local government (city, county, regional planning) sources (give examples)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Private sources (give examples)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Local government (city, county, regional planning) (give examples)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____</p>
62	<p>Use the space provided below to add to, clarify, or expand on your answers, especially with information about aspects of your state's deployment that were not covered in the questions. Please send completed templates and supporting information to Vince Brown at Battelle, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201-2693, or via fax (614-424-4250) or email (brownv@battelle.org) by December 19, 2003. Be sure to keep a copy of your completed template for your records.</p>

CVISN Cost Self-Evaluation Template

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

Version: October 17, 2003

When completed and sent to U.S. DOT, this template will become part of your state's CVISN Self-Evaluation Report, as required in the ITS Partnership Agreement between your state and the federal government.

Send completed templates to Vince Brown at Battelle, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201-2693, or via fax (614-424-4250) or email (brownv@battelle.org). by December 19, 2003. Be sure to keep a copy of your completed template for your records. You are welcome to attach additional pages to the completed templates with clarifications and supporting information. If you attach additional pages, please indicate the template item number to which your information is related. If you are completing the form by hand, please print.

Information About Respondents	
1	Name of person primarily responsible for completing the form: Ron Curb
2	Telephone number of person completing the form: 405-521-2536
3	Agency, department, and division of person completing the form: ODOT, Planning Division, Strategic Planning
4	Names of other persons providing supporting information on the form: Penny Williams, OTC Brit Baber, OCC
5	Date when the form was completed (mm/dd/yyyy): 3/1/04

I. Electronic Credentialing

6 One-Time (Start-Up) Purchase Costs for Equipment and Materials (Including Installation Costs and Excluding Leased Equipment)						
	Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Expected Service Life, Years	Comments and Qualifiers	
a	Computer network servers for electronic credentialing	1	55,000	E		Server is to host replacement IRP legacy system as well as replacement IFTA system
b	Personal computers (desktop or laptop) for state employees to use in electronic credentials administration	6	1,200	E		6 development workstations
		6	1,200	E		6 PCs for central office as part of PRISM implementation; available for motor carriers to use on-site to obtain US DOT # / update MC 150s upon application for IRP renewals / new accounts
c	Consumable supplies and materials for outreach, internal and external publicity, training, or supporting the deployment of electronic credentialing					

6 One-Time (Start-Up) Purchase Costs for Equipment and Materials (Including Installation Costs and Excluding Leased Equipment)					
	Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Expected Service Life, Years	Comments and Qualifiers
d Other central office or branch office network hardware and peripherals for electronic credentialing (specify function):	45	1,000	E		Oklahoma tag agents are appointed by legislature. A portion of the tag agents (estimated to increase to 45 tag agents) provide credentialing services for CVs. Upon PRISM implementation, and following implementation of web-based credentialing (allowing for self-issuance of cab cards), tag agents will need printers capable of printing 2-D bar codes. The OTC, per legislative mandate, is required to provide the tag agents with any specialized equipment required to provide licensing services to Oklahoma tax payers. If tag agent printers are not capable of printing 2-D bar codes, the OTC will have to furnish capable printers to requesting tag agents.
Printers	2	5,000			High-capacity printers for OTC central offices capable of producing 2-D bar coded cab cards upon PRISM implementation
Bar code readers	2	800			2 bar code readers for testing during PRISM implementation / alpha testing

7	One-Time (Start-Up) Purchase Costs for Software	Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Expected Service Life, Years	Comments and Qualifiers
a	Credentialing software packages purchased for back-end database management and data processing or reporting	1		E		Oklahoma will engage local vendor to modify Maryland IRP system and develop associated web-based credentialing / EFT capabilities; cost estimate not yet developed
b	Credentialing software packages purchased for front-end user interface and data entry					
c	Other software purchased for electronic credentialing start-up (specify function)	2	54,000	E		Oklahoma is purchasing 2 Oracle processing licenses and 1 year of support to move of IRP and IFTA systems from mainframe platform to client / server platform
			2,000	E		OK is purchasing Microsoft Source Safe (configuration management software) for 6 developers
			1,000	E		Bar-coding software for PRISM Implementation

8	One-Time (Start-Up) Costs for Labor	Total Labor Hours	Total Labor Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers
a	State employee labor for new electronic credentialing software development				To be provided after evaluation of Maryland system is complete, and after receipt of vendor estimate for modifications to meet Oklahoma requirements
b	State employee labor for new hardware configuration (after original installation)				To be provided after evaluation of Maryland system is complete, and after receipt of vendor estimate for modifications to meet Oklahoma requirements
c	Contractor labor for new electronic credentialing software development				To be provided after evaluation of Maryland system is complete, and after receipt of vendor estimate for modifications to meet Oklahoma requirements
d	Contractor labor for new hardware configuration (after original installation)				To be provided after evaluation of Maryland system is complete, and after receipt of vendor estimate for modifications to meet Oklahoma requirements
e	Third-party vendor labor for software development				
f	Third-party vendor labor for hardware configuration				
g	Labor for existing (legacy) system interface and/or modification (state employee labor plus contractor or vendor labor)				To be provided after evaluation of Maryland system is complete, and after receipt of vendor estimate for modifications to meet Oklahoma requirements
h	Labor for training associated with credentialing system deployment				To be provided after evaluation of Maryland system is complete, and after receipt of vendor estimate for modifications to meet Oklahoma requirements
i	Other start-up labor costs for electronic credentialing (specify function)				

9 Recurring (Annual) Costs for Operating and Maintaining Electronic IRP Credentialing System (Excluding Labor)		Total Annual Cost to State, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers
a	Membership fees paid to IRP Clearinghouse	15,800	E	Oklahoma is not yet a member of the IRP Clearinghouse; will implement membership as part of legacy system replacement effort
b	Fees paid to third-party IRP credentials administrator (for example, VISTA, Polk) for operating a back-end database management and data processing system			
c	Fees paid to third-party IRP credentials administrator (for example, VISTA, Polk) for operating a front-end user interface and data entry system			
d	Lease payments for computer equipment (specify function in comments section at right)			
e	Recurring costs for marketing, outreach, publicity, etc.			
f	Other recurring (annual) costs for electronic IRP credentialing operation and maintenance, excluding labor (specify function):			

Include all labor charges for IRP credentials administration, including processing the applications, handling payments, issuing the final credentials, serving customers, analyzing computer systems, programming, reporting, and management. **If you report labor dollars, use the fully loaded amount, including fringe benefits and other overhead-type labor costs.** Provide annual costs for your state’s baseline credentials administration function, for comparison with the costs for your state’s corresponding credentialing function after the deployment of CVISN technologies.

		Legacy System Labor (Pre-deployment) Provide hours and/or \$			CVISN Labor (Post-deployment) Provide hours and/or \$			Comments and Qualifiers
		Annual Labor, Hours	Annual Labor Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Annual Labor, Hours	Annual Labor Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	
10	Recurring (Annual) Labor for IRP Credentialing							
a	State employee annual labor		60,000	A				Includes annual IT support costs for maintenance of IRP systems; does not include processing costs. System is currently housed on a mainframe with many other shared applications; IT staff is dedicated only part-time to IRP system maintenance
b	Contractor annual labor							
c	Third-party vendor annual labor							
d	Other recurring (annual) CVISN-related electronic IRP credentialing labor cost elements not listed above (specify function):							

11 Recurring (Annual) Costs for Operating and Maintaining Electronic IFTA Credentialing System (Excluding Labor)				
	Total Annual Cost to State, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers	
a	Membership fees paid to IFTA Clearinghouse	1,000	E	OK will join IFTA Clearinghouse as part of its IFTA Credentialing project
b	Fees paid to third-party IFTA credentials administrator (for example, VISTA, Polk) for operating a back-end database management and data processing system			
c	Fees paid to third-party IFTA credentials administrator (for example, VISTA, Polk) for operating a front-end user interface and data entry system			
d	Lease payments for computer equipment (specify function in comments section right in this row)			
e	Recurring costs for marketing, outreach, publicity, etc.			
f	Other recurring (annual) costs for electronic IFTA credentialing operation and maintenance, excluding labor (specify function):			

Include all labor charges for IFTA credentials administration, including processing the applications, handling payments, issuing the final credentials, serving customers, analyzing computer systems, programming, reporting, and management. **If you report labor dollars, use the fully loaded amount, including fringe benefits and other overhead-type labor costs.** Provide annual costs for your state’s baseline credentials administration function, for comparison with the costs for your state’s corresponding credentialing function after the deployment of CVISN technologies.

		Legacy System Labor (Pre-deployment) Provide hours and/or \$			CVISN Labor (Post-deployment) Provide hours and/or \$			Comments and Qualifiers
		Annual Labor, Hours	Annual Labor Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Annual Labor, Hours	Annual Labor Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	
12	Recurring (Annual) Labor for IFTA Credentialing							
a	State employee annual labor		\$60,000					IFTA IT support only; does not include processing costs. System is currently housed on a mainframe with many other shared applications; IT staff is dedicated only part-time to IFTA systems maintenance
b	Contractor annual labor							
c	Third-party vendor annual labor							
d	Other recurring (annual) CVISN-related electronic IFTA credentialing labor cost elements not listed above (please specify):							

13 General Question About Your Electronic Credentialing System	Comments and Qualifiers
Is your electronic credentialing system available (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> In only selected regions within your state <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statewide	Will be available statewide

II. Roadside: Safety Information Exchange

14 One-Time (Start-Up) Purchase Costs for Equipment and Materials (Including Installation Costs and Excluding Leased Equipment)						
	Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Expected Service Life, Years	Comments and Qualifiers	
a					Computer network servers for safety information exchange, including mobile network servers used in roadside enforcement	
b	51	1,000	E		RFP for CVIEW implementation will be issued sometime in March / April 2004. Will update this section upon selection of successful vendor and final contract negotiation (estimated for May / June, 2004)	
c					Desktop personal computers for administering the safety information exchange system (including desktop computers used at roadside check stations)	
d	59	4,000	A		Scale House Communications Upgrade Project includes purchase of laptops for OCC and OTC personnel at each scale site; these laptops will be used to access centralized systems including CVIEW	
e					Laptop personal computers for roadside use in inspections for safety information exchange	
f					Portable printers for mobile enforcement	
g					Wireless modems for vehicle and/or roadside use	
					Consumable supplies and materials for outreach, internal and external publicity, training, and supporting the deployment or safety information exchange	
					Other central office, branch office, roadside, or mobile telecommunications equipment for safety information exchange (specify function):	
	39	1,500	A		Satellite units in DPS mobile units	
					Monthly communication costs average \$147 per unit	

	T1 lines to fixed scales	7	3,000	E		T1 lines are being extended to all fixed scales; monthly fees are estimated at \$514 per site; dual sites will share a T1

15	One-Time (Start-Up) Purchase Costs for Software	Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Expected Service Life, Years	Comments and Qualifiers
a	Safety information exchange software purchased off the shelf					RFP for CVIEW implementation will be issued sometime in March / April 2004. Will update this section upon selection of successful vendor and final contract negotiation (estimated for May / June, 2004)
b	Other software purchased for safety information exchange start-up (specify function):					

16 One-Time (Start-Up) Costs for Labor		Total Labor Hours	Total Labor Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers
a	State employee labor for new safety information exchange software development (for example, CVIEW)				RFP for CVIEW implementation will be issued sometime in March / April 2004. Will update this section upon selection of successful vendor and final contract negotiation (estimated for May / June, 2004)
b	State employee labor for new hardware configuration (after original installation)				
c	Contractor labor for new safety information exchange software development				
d	Contractor labor for new hardware configuration (after original installation)				
e	Third-party vendor labor for software development				
f	Third-party vendor labor for hardware configuration				
g	Labor for existing (legacy) system interface and/or modification (state employee labor plus contractor or vendor labor)				
h	Labor for training associated with safety information exchange system deployment				
i	Other start-up labor costs for safety information exchange (specify function)				

17 Recurring (Annual) Costs for Operating and Maintaining Safety Information Exchange System (Excluding Labor)					
		Total Annual Cost to State, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers	
a	Lease payments for computer equipment for safety information exchange (specify function)				
b	Telephone and internet service charges	\$3,598	E	Annual cost for T1 service at fixed scales	
c	Wireless communication charges	\$68,796	A	Annual cost for satellite communications	
d	Charges for linking to central data services (for example, AAMVAnet)				
e	Other recurring (annual) costs for safety information exchange operation and maintenance, excluding labor (specify function)				
18 Recurring (Annual) Costs for Labor (provide hours and/or \$)					
		Annual Labor, Hours	Annual Labor Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers
a	State employee annual labor				
b	Contractor annual labor		\$65,000	A	MCSAP unit IT budget for system support (does not include CVIEW)
c	Third-party vendor annual labor				
d	Other recurring (annual) safety information exchange labor costs (specify function):				

III. Roadside: Electronic Screening (Clearance)

Unless otherwise indicated, provide **only those costs that were incurred by your state**. For example, if a private organization or partnership other than your state pays for and installs transponder readers, wiring, computers, etc., at the roadside for electronic screening at no cost to the state, then do not list the costs for that equipment or infrastructure below. If your state purchases its own screening or computing equipment (for example, to interface with the private organization's equipment), then list your state's costs for the state-owned equipment. If a system or device is used in more than one CVISN function, **count it only once**. For example, if a computer database stores and shares information on credentials and inspection history with your state's electronic screening system, then determine the system's primary function, list the system in that section of the cost template, and count the computer and the database costs only once.

19 One-Time (Start-Up) Purchase Costs for Equipment and Materials (Including Installation Costs and Excluding Leased Equipment)						
		Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Expected Service Life, Years	Comments and Qualifiers
a	Computer network server dedicated to electronic screening					Screening hardware / software provided by PrePass at no cost to state
b	Desktop personal computer dedicated to electronic screening					"
c	Laptop personal computer dedicated to electronic screening					"
d	Mainline (highway speed) weigh-in-motion (WIM) scale					No WIMs in place
e	Sorter lane (ramp speed) WIM scale					"
f	In-vehicle transponder purchased by state for distribution (free of charge) to motor carriers enrolling vehicles in electronic screening					Transponders provided to enrolled carriers by PrePass at no cost to state
g	In-vehicle transponder purchased by state for resale (cost-recovery or other basis) to motor carriers enrolling vehicles in electronic screening					"
h	Automated vehicle identification (AVI) equipment/system (specify type, for example, DSRC, optical, video, other)					Screening hardware / software provided by PrePass at no cost to state
i	Telecommunication equipment between upstream site and weigh station/base					Screening hardware / software / communications provided by PrePass at no cost to state

19 One-Time (Start-Up) Purchase Costs for Equipment and Materials (Including Installation Costs and Excluding Leased Equipment)						
	Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Expected Service Life, Years	Comments and Qualifiers	
j	Electronic sign for weigh station	1	40,000	E		Oklahoma plans to deploy VMS at fixed scales to notify vehicles on mainline of scale closure due to mainline backup; estimated cost per sign is \$25,000, based on initial deployment; 10 additional signs planned for deployment
k	Loop detector for weigh station					
l	Upgrade of existing fixed-site weigh station infrastructure (excluding items listed above) for electronic screening (specify function):					
m	One-time start-up fees paid to electronic screening provider or partnership (for example, PrePass, Norpass)					
n	Consumable supplies and materials for outreach, internal and external publicity, training, or supporting the deployment of electronic screening					
o	Other central office or branch office network hardware and peripherals purchased for electronic screening (specify function):					
20 One-Time (Start-Up) Purchase Costs for Software						
	Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Expected Service Life, Years	Comments and Qualifiers	
a	Electronic screening software purchased off the shelf					
b	Other software for electronic screening start-up (specify function)					

21	One-Time (Start-Up) Costs for Labor	Quantity Deployed	Unit Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers
a	State employee labor for electronic screening software development				
b	State employee labor for new hardware configuration (after original installation)				
c	Contractor labor for electronic screening software development				
d	Contractor labor for new hardware configuration (after original installation)				
e	Third-party vendor labor for software development				
f	Third-party vendor labor for hardware configuration				
g	Labor for existing (legacy) system interface and/or modification (state employee labor + contractor or vendor labor)				
h	Labor for training associated with system deployment				
i	Other start-up labor costs (specify function):				

22 Recurring (Annual) Costs, Operating and Maintaining Electronic Screening System (Excluding Labor)			
	Total Annual Cost to State, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers
a	Lease payments for computer equipment for electronic screening		
b	Annual payments made to electronic screening administrator/vendor/partnership (for example, PrePass, Norpass)		
c	Annual maintenance cost for mainline WIM scale		
d	Annual maintenance cost for sorter-lane WIM scale		
e	Annual maintenance cost for other roadside equipment (AVI, transponder readers, etc.)		
f	Recurring costs for marketing, outreach, publicity, etc.		
g	Other recurring (annual) costs for operation and maintenance, excluding labor (specify function):		

23	Recurring (Annual) Costs for Labor (Provide Hours and/or \$)	Total Labor, Hours	Total Labor Cost, \$	Actual (A) or Estimated (E)	Comments and Qualifiers
a	State employee annual labor				
b	Contractor annual labor				
c	Third-party vendor annual labor				
d	Other recurring (annual) electronic screening cost elements not listed above (specify function):				

Use the space provided below to add to, clarify, or expand on your answers, especially with information about aspects of your state’s deployment that were not covered in the questions. Please send completed templates and supporting information to Vince Brown at Battelle, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201-2693, or via fax (614-424-4250) or email (brownv@battelle.org) by December 19, 2003. Be sure to keep a copy of your completed template for your records.

CVISN Benefits and Lessons Learned Self-Evaluation Template

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

Version: October 17, 2003

When completed and sent to the U.S. DOT, this template will become part of your state's CVISN Self-Evaluation Report, as required in the ITS partnership agreement between the state and the federal government.

Send completed templates to: Vince Brown at Battelle, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201-2693, or via fax (614-424-4250) or email (brownv@battelle.org) by December 19, 2003. Be sure to keep a copy of your completed template for your records. You are welcome to attach additional pages with clarifications and supporting information. If you attach additional pages, please indicate the template item number to which your information is related. If you are completing the form by hand, please print.

Information About Respondents	
1	Name of person primarily responsible for completing the form: Ron Curb
2	Telephone number of person completing the form: 405-521-2536
3	Agency, department, and division of person completing the form: ODOT, Planning Division, Strategic Planning
4	Names of other persons providing supporting information on the form: John Hardridge, DPS Lynne Jones, OCC Gene Gilstrap, OTC
5	Date when the form was completed (mm/dd/yyyy): 2/15/04

I. Benefits of CVISN Deployment

Item	Question or Topic
6	<p>Does your state use CVISN electronic credentialing for IRP? <input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 7) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (Continue)</p> <p>a. How has electronic credentialing affected the convenience, typical turnaround time, or processing time for IRP credentialing transactions, from the motor carrier's point of view, compared with using the legacy system of credentialing?</p> <p>OK currently uses an EDI / Bulletin system, enabling large carriers to download application information directly from their fleet management systems. Carriers then transmit this information to the state using a VPN. Credentials are express mailed back to the carrier, generally within 24 to 48 hours of uploading their application data. Oklahoma implemented this system several years ago (prior to the state's involvement in the CVISN program) to replace the practice of allowing carriers to send tapes to the state with application information.</p> <p>b. What feedback have you observed from the IRP-credentialed motor carriers you serve?</p> <p>Oklahoma credentials more than 111 carriers and 120,000 CVs annually using this system, more vehicles than virtually any other state in the country credentials. The reason that these large carriers establish physical locations in Oklahoma and credential in Oklahoma is because we offer this convenience. Manual renewals, manual supplementals are not an option for carriers with thousands of power units.</p>
7	<p>Does your state use CVISN electronic credentialing for IFTA? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 9) But this is in the works <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Continue)</p> <p>a. How has electronic credentialing affected the convenience, typical turnaround time, or processing time for IFTA credentialing transactions, from the motor carrier's point of view, compared with using the legacy system of credentialing?</p> <p>b. What feedback have you observed from the IFTA-credentialed motor carriers you serve?</p>

8	How has CVISN electronic credentialing affected the internal operation of your state's credentials administration office, compared with using the legacy system of credentialing?
<p>Oklahoma implemented the tape system, and subsequently the EDI / Bulletin Board system, because we could not otherwise accommodate the volume of credentials processed by the IRP section. The electronic system has enabled the state to meet the demand for credentials processing. With replacement of our IRP mainframe legacy system with a client / server –based system, we will also be enhancing the EDI capabilities, providing a web-enabled transmittal option (obviating the need for the Bulletin Board), and providing upload capabilities directly to the legacy system (obviating the need for manual review and manual upload to the back-end system). The existing system meets the needs of carriers very well, and has eliminated the need for state data-entry of application information from EDI / Bulletin Board users. The system enhancements will improve system capabilities from state employees' perspective, by eliminating the need for manual review of each application received via the EDI / Bulletin Board system.</p>	
<p>Does your state use CVISN safety information exchange to support your state's roadside inspection program?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 10) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (Continue)</p>	
9	What benefits have you observed, as reported to you by system managers, inspectors, other state employees, or motor carriers? Try to quantify the benefits as much as possible, in terms of labor hours, inspection volume or perceived efficiency, changes in maintenance trends observed for truck brakes, and/or changes in the percentage of out-of-service orders issued during a typical inspection period. Also consider less tangible benefits such as better working conditions, job satisfaction, or career opportunities.
<p>All DPS MCSAP officers have satellite units on their cars. With the satellite units they can upload inspection reports directly from the field to SafetyNet, obviating the need to upload inspections via modem at the end of shift. They can also do plate verifications and checks via OLETS and NLETS, increasing their efficiency. These capabilities improve officer efficiency, eliminate the need for end-of-shift uploads and reduce turn-around times to get inspections to SAFER / MCMIS.</p>	

Item	Question or Topic
10	<p>Does your state use CVISN electronic screening (preclearance)? <input type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 11) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, electronic clearance at 7 sites (Continue)</p> <p>What benefits have you observed, as reported to you by system managers, inspectors, other state employees, or motor carriers? Try to quantify the benefits as much as possible.</p> <p>Reduction in mainline backups due to ramp queuing. Oklahoma has implemented a pilot project at one port, providing internet access to the SAFERsys.org site. This allows scale officers to enter DOT numbers and verify carrier credential status. To date, the program has been effective in identifying carriers through the scales who are deficient in SSRS and other carrier-based credentials, increasing citation revenues. When the CVIEW is fully deployed, we anticipate additional related benefits.</p>
11	<p>Has CVISN freed state employees to perform other functions? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (go to Question 12) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Continue)</p> <p>If so, specify what the other functions are and how this change has affected the staff involved.</p>

II. Institutional Issues

Item	Question or Topic
12	<p>How did the degree of cooperation or coordination among various state agencies affect your state's initial deployment of CVISN technologies and infrastructure?</p> <p>Agency cooperation can clearly move projects forward, or stall them, depending on the degree of cooperation, or lack thereof. There can be endless coordination and little cooperation.</p> <p>ODOT, an organization with no current authority for CV operations, has been an excellent project leader, receiving statewide ITS earmarks for 3 years running, and distributing them equally to ITS and CVISN applications. ODOT has also worked to balance state needs with individual agency interests / priorities.</p>
13	<p>How did the availability, support, and quality of vendors, consultants, or contractors and/or subcontractors affect your state's initial deployment of CVISN?</p> <p>Like many states, Oklahoma initially envisioned accomplishing CVISN project deployment through use of in-house resources. Like many states, Oklahoma came to realize that its in-house employees are a scarce resource in high demand, subject to the variable needs of many competing projects and priorities. The state has recently decided to contract out some portions of its deployment to third party vendors (CVIEW) and to engage contractors to assist in design / development of state-owned systems (IRP; IFTA; Transportation Database – SSRS; and, potentially, OS/OW). After 12+ months of limited forward motion, projects are beginning to move forward as a result. It was not so much quality / availability of vendors, but a recognition by the various agencies involved in CVISN planning / deployment, that either the required expertise did not reside in house, or that in-house resources were already engaged 100+% in addressing ongoing agency needs, that has led to the decision to engage outside resources to assist in the deployment effort. In our view, this is a critical lesson learned to stress to other states – in-house resources are generally fully utilized; it is imperative to bring in not only specialized expertise, but, even where specialized resources may not be required, to bring in outside contracted resources to augment in-house resources. It can also be very useful to engage the services of outside system architect / project management resources to help guide project-specific contractors. Without state staff devoted full-time to CVISN deployment, finding time to properly manage project-specific contractors can be challenging.</p>

14	<p>Describe any issues or problems that arose related to questions of jurisdiction, as they affected your state's initial CVISN deployment. For example, did some CVISN functions bridge two or more existing state agencies, requiring new or unexpected forms of coordination?</p> <p>Early on, the Oklahoma CVISN Team made a conscious decision to ignore some political realities to move the overall program forward. For example, the agencies operating Oklahoma's fixed scales do not have size and weight enforcement authority. The team discussed whether it should focus on this institutional issue and work to convince the legislature to change this situation, and decided that it was in the best interest of the state to move forward on other fronts where statutory authority already existed – replacing antiquated legacy systems, implementing automated credentialing, joining national Clearinghouses, implementing the state CVIEW, upgrading communications to scale houses and mobile units, building relationships among the various agencies with CVO responsibilities, and tackling sticky political issues only when we had accomplished the many other aspects of CVISN functionality / coordination that were more easily accomplished.</p> <p>There is currently a bill in the Oklahoma legislature which would move all CVO functions except MCSAP and size and weight enforcement from 3 other agencies to ODOT. The CVISN team has chosen to continue moving forward as if the ultimate location of CVO functions were not in question. To do otherwise would bring all projects to a grinding halt.</p>
15	<p>Briefly describe your state's approach to balancing data privacy with data availability, as these competing interests affected your state's CVISN deployment, both initially and as part of your state's ongoing use of CVISN technologies.</p>
16	<p>How has CVISN deployment affected your state's general approach to maintaining a high level of data quality (reliability, accuracy, and timeliness)?</p>
17	<p>What institutional barriers did you encounter (and overcome, if applicable) in planning for and deploying CVISN technologies and infrastructure? For example, did you encounter any barriers caused by existing regulations, state policies, or established work rules?</p> <p>See question 14.</p>
18	<p>How did your deployment fit in with any institutional barriers you encountered?</p>
19	<p>Conversely, how did your state's CVISN deployment bring about changes to the established institutions in your state?</p>

20	<p>What were the personnel or human resources constraints or issues (for example, shortage of trained, available staff) that most affected your state's deployment of CVISN?</p>
<p>See question 13. Waiting for in-house resources to be freed up has delayed initiation of several projects by 12-18 months; we are now at the point where we are engaging outside resources to assist in our deployment.</p>	
21	<p>Describe any other institutional issues you observed that would be of interest or value for other states considering a CVISN deployment.</p>

III. Technical Challenges

Item	Question or Topic
22	<p>What were the most challenging technical issues in deploying CVISN for electronic credentialing (IRP, IFTA, other permits and credentials) in your state?</p> <p>To be determined....</p>
23	<p>What were the most challenging technical issues in deploying CVISN for safety information exchange in your state?</p> <p>Oklahoma has satellite units in each of its MCSAP mobile units. However, satellite systems cannot yet deal with internet protocols, and SAFER is not yet "satellite" ready. The state is thus waiting for its satellite vendor to develop capabilities to enable internet access to SAFER / Query Central, and / or waiting for FMCSA / Volpe to develop satellite interface capabilities. In the meantime, we can access systems only through the OLETS portal on the DPS networks (NLETS, OLETS and SafetyNet on the DPS network).</p>
24	<p>What were the most challenging technical issues in deploying CVISN for electronic screening (clearance or weigh station bypassing) in your state?</p>

25

What technical challenges did you observe in integrating the various functions of CVISN across all of your state's commercial vehicle operations (CVO)?

Once the CVIEW is deployed, Oklahoma enforcement personnel will be able to enter a plate number or carrier DOT number into the CVIEW query screen, and will be able to view an "alert screen" detailing any safety or credential status information that falls outside of acceptable parameters for that vehicle / carrier. However, this capability is of limited utility in mobile applications (officer has insufficient time to view / key in plate number or DOT number at mainline speeds and receive response before vehicle is gone), and at high volume weigh stations where vehicles are queued at fixed scale, allowing officer 3-5 seconds to view plate, key in number, get response and pull vehicle out of queue. Further, fixed scale enforcement personnel is limited – even if we know that 15 vehicles across the fixed scale per hour should be pulled over for further inspection, we are hard pressed to provide the personnel to accommodate 15 additional inspections of paper documents, driver and / or vehicle.

Two potential solutions come to mind:

1. Promulgation of a rule by FMCSA to standardize the format and placement of apportioned plates, significantly increasing the efficacy of plate readers at both mainline and (particularly) ramp speeds. Plate readers could then be used to digitize the plate, feeding a query that would hit against the CVIEW and provide information back to the officer in the scale house re: a "pass/fail" reading based on snapshot information contained in the CVIEW. The officer could then pull "failed" vehicles out of the ramp queue for further inspection.
2. Establishment of a program similar to the MCSAP program, where state funds for size, weight and credential enforcement at fixed scales can be augmented by federal funds (in many states, the fixed scale operation is by an agency other than the MCSAP agency)

26	Overall, would you characterize hardware or software as the greater challenge in CVISN deployment? <input type="checkbox"/> Hardware <input type="checkbox"/> Software
	Why? Institutional issues are still the greatest challenge. We have (or there exists) hardware and software to enable enforcement personnel to electronically read electronic logs, read “black box” data from the engine at mainline speeds; we know that transponders can be used to identify carriers, drivers, load data (cargo, haz mat, etc.) – but we have no authority to access these data (unless, in the case of transponders, a carrier is enrolled in a clearance program). Basically, we have the ability to electronically track the good guys who authorize us to track and bypass them. Searching for the “bad guys” – the problem carriers and drivers -- is still looking for the needle in the haystack, although it is a somewhat smaller haystack by virtue of the fact that some of the “good guys” are now transponder-equipped. We need to start considering mandatory transponder issuance for MCSIP carriers. We need to engage in a very focused dialogue with ATA, the National Truckload Carrier Association, state associations and other industry avenues to move forward with initiatives along the lines of the airline industry and FAA model, to better level the playing field for safe and legal carriers and to increase the effectiveness of enforcement activities in identifying and changing the practices of higher risk carriers and drivers.
27	Considering all of the technical challenges faced by your state in deploying CVISN, which tools or approaches tended to work the best in overcoming them? Muddling through. Talking with states who had been there, done that. Talking with individuals at Volpe, etc. The technical challenges are really not the showstoppers.

IV. Innovative Financing

Item	Question or Topic
28	<p>It is assumed that CVISN infrastructure deployment is financed primarily through a combination of (a) state transportation, law enforcement, and regulatory and/or public safety funds and (b) federal (DOT, FHWA or FMCSA) earmark funds. Describe any unusual or innovative approaches to paying for your state's CVISN infrastructure deployment beyond these funding sources.</p> <p>Used toll road credits for CVISN matching funds.</p>
29	<p>If your state employed innovative financing methods, describe your method of learning about these funds, applying for them, and administering their expenditure.</p>
30	<p>If your state employed innovative financing methods, describe any special terms and conditions or strings attached that affected your state's deployment of CVISN technologies and infrastructure.</p>
31	<p>What interagency issues did you encounter relative to funding for CVISN? For example, did your state use any pooled funds or funds from combined sources outside the CVO area, or did your state piggyback the CVISN deployment by leveraging other, non-CVO funding sources?</p>

V. Public-Private Partnering

Item	Question or Topic
32	<p>How did the degree of cooperation or coordination between your state and the motor carriers or trucking associations affect your state’s initial deployment of CVISN technologies and infrastructure?</p>
33	<p>Describe the role of the private sector (for-profit industries; businesses; independent foundations; or private, not-for-profit agencies, etc.) in collaborating on your state’s CVISN deployment. Did the private sector provide direct funding or in-kind contributions to the deployment (for example, labor or materials and facilities) that helped the state’s deployment of CVISN technologies?</p> <p>The HELP, PrePass public / private partnership was key to providing electronic screening in Oklahoma. State funds were not available to implement a state-owned / maintained program.</p>
34	<p>What were the challenges and lessons learned in cooperating with private-sector partners in your state’s deployment?</p>

VI. ITS Standards and Architecture

Item	Question or Topic
35	<p>Describe your state’s approach to implementing ITS standards and achieving consistency with the national ITS architecture. For example, how did the standards help or hinder your state’s CVISN deployment?</p> <p>Oklahoma implemented EDI standards for IRP application data exchange because it was the industry standard at the time of implementation. We will use XML in some aspects of CVISN program deployment because it is the standard expected by receiving systems (SAFER) and where it makes sense from a cost / design standpoint for the state. Transponder and other device interoperability standards promulgated by the federal government are in the best interests of all states and carriers, as it enables “plug and play” capabilities among various vendor systems</p>
36	<p>Did implementing the standards or maintaining consistency with the ITS architecture present any challenges or barriers to your state’s deployment?</p> <p>No</p>
37	<p>What methods of overcoming these challenges would you recommend for states beginning their CVISN deployments?</p>

VII. Other Benefits or Lessons Learned

Item	Description of Benefit or Lesson
38	<p>What are the most important lessons your state has learned in planning for and/or deploying CVISN technologies for electronic credentialing?</p> <p>Reliance on in-house resources alone leaves states vulnerable to the competing demands of a host of other projects, day-to-day routine demands, and changing priorities. Vendor / contractor (acting as state employees) assistance is invaluable. Carriers must be involved in both initial design and beta testing.</p>
39	<p>What are the most important lessons your state has learned in planning for and/or deploying CVISN technologies for safety information exchange?</p> <p>There is no one wireless technology (at least in the west!) which meets all needs at present. Satellite (limited connectivity), CDPD (very slow), broadband wireless (limited coverage), wi-fi (very limited coverage), 800 MHz (very expensive; topo limitations) can all play a part. As time goes by, we assume that capabilities will increase, costs will come down, but mobile communications are currently a key limiting factor in information exchange / information access. Also, see question 40...</p>
40	<p>What are the most important lessons your state has learned in planning for and/or deploying CVISN technologies for electronic screening?</p> <p>The lion's share of vehicles are not transponder-equipped. States with CVIEWs deployed are all dressed up with nowhere to go. We have a wealth of information about the safety and credential status of vehicles on our highways, available to us at fixed sites and potentially available to use in mobile units, but we are limited in our capabilities to access it in relation to non-transponder-equipped trucks – 80+% of the trucks on the road.</p> <p>We need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a federal rule standardizing the placement and format of apportioned plates so that plate readers at fixed scales and at strategic roadside locations can read, reliably digitize the plate and electronically hit against the CVIEW to deliver information to enforcement officers (or some other means of AVI for non-transponder equipped vehicles) - federal subsidy / enhancement of operating funds for non-MCSAP organizations enforcing state size and weight and credential regulations to enhance enforcement functions - federal investment / incentives to improve mobile communications / reduce associated costs / increase associated coverage - a federally sponsored initiative to work with industry to identify mechanisms to better take advantage of available technologies to improve the productivity of safe and legal carriers and identify / change the practices of higher risk carriers / drivers
41	<p>What are the most important lessons your state has learned in planning for, deploying, and/or integrating CVISN technologies across all CVO functions?</p> <p>See the questions detailed above</p>

2.0 FMCSA Evaluation Template

42	Looking back, what are the most important steps you would have taken (or avoided taking) if you had known at the beginning what you know now about deploying CVISN technologies?
Brought in vendors / contract employees to deploy systems from the beginning	
43	What was the greatest surprise your deployment team encountered in deploying or using CVISN technologies?
44	Briefly describe your best-case scenario for CVISN deployment. If all barriers were to disappear and the system were to be widely adopted and operated as efficiently as possible, what are the most important benefits you would expect your state and the country as a whole to experience?
Reduced accidents; reduced wear and tear on the state's highway infrastructure; ability to accommodate increased demand for credentials processing without increasing staff; ability to deploy additional FTEs from credentials processing to revenue recovery functions such as audit; higher operating productivities for safe and legal carriers; improved motor carrier compliance.	
45	What benefit or lesson learned, not covered in any previous question, do you think of as important for other states to know as they plan and make progress in CVISN deployment?

Use the space provided below to add to, clarify, or expand on your answers, especially with information about aspects of your state's deployment that were not covered in the questions. Please send completed templates and supporting information to Vince Brown at Battelle, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201-2693, or via fax (614-424-4250) or email (brownv@battelle.org) by December 19, 2003. Be sure to keep a copy of your completed template for your records.

This page intentionally left blank.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

3.1 Purpose

The evaluation templates proscribed by FMCSA provide an effective means of measuring activity, accomplishments and costs incurred in implementing core capabilities. Completion of these templates also provides a means to share lessons learned among participating states. This section of the evaluation is designed to provide an effective means to measure results – outcomes of these activities.

The purpose of the productivity / effectiveness evaluation process outlined here is to provide a mechanism which can be used by Oklahoma to measure the productivity improvements resulting to both state agencies and carriers associated with deployment and subsequent use of CVISN core capability functionality. The process is also designed to provide a measure, over time, of improved effectiveness of safety assurance, screening and compliance efforts as a result of core capability implementation.

3.2 Oklahoma CVISN Goals

Oklahoma's CVISN goals and objectives provide the basis for development of the productivity / effectiveness evaluation. Oklahoma's primary goals and objectives are as follows:

3.2.1 Improve Administrative Efficiency

Specific objectives include:

- Continue to improve the level of customer service provided in Oklahoma.
- Improve state and motor carrier productivity and motor carrier compliance by reducing the steps, paper, dollars or people required to fulfill regulatory obligations.
- Improve safety compliance and motor carrier accountability through provision of timely, current, accurate credential status information to the roadside.

3.2.2 Maximize CV Operational Safety, Security and Productivity

Specific objectives include:

- Focus safety assurance and screening resources on higher risk motor carriers to reduce crashes, maintain security of shipments, improve operational productivity of safe and legal motor carriers, and reduce public and private sector unit costs per violation / citation issued.
- Improve the operating productivity of safe and legal motor carriers and maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of enforcement resources by allowing for mainline screening and bypass at key locations throughout the state.

3.2.3 Improve Freight Flows by Increasing CVO Operational Productivity

Specific objectives include:

- Maintain and enhance mobility on priority freight corridors.
- Increase available funding dedicated to freight flow mobility improvements.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

3.3 Recommended Evaluation Framework

The recommended evaluation framework includes measurement of productivity / effectiveness improvements in a variety of key areas related to electronic credentialing, screening and safety assurance, as follows:

3.3.1 Electronic Credentialing

Related measures of productivity improvement / effectiveness include:

- Administrative cost savings to state agencies associated with electronic credentialing
- Change in state agency FTE requirements for credentials application processing subsequent to implementation of electronic credentialing
- Change in annual FTE requirements / maintenance costs for credentialing systems operations and maintenance upon implementation of new legacy systems
- Administrative cost savings to motor carriers related to electronic credentialing
- Operational cost savings to motor carriers related to electronic credentialing
- Change in effectiveness of revenue recovery functions such as audit subsequent to implementation of electronic credentialing.

3.3.2 Electronic Screening

Related measures of productivity improvement / effectiveness include:

- Reduction in the number safe and legal vehicles through fixed scales, enabling scale officers to focus a higher level of scrutiny on potentially higher risk carriers
- Increase in the number of productive enforcement / compliance activities at fixed scales associated with availability of safety / credential status information at the roadside (note that over time, this may result in decreased instances of noncompliance, as has occurred over time with widespread implementation of safety inspections)
- Operational savings to motor carriers related to mainline bypass

3.3.3 Automated safety Assurance

Related measures of productivity improvement / effectiveness include:

- Reduction in the number safe and legal vehicles subject to safety inspection as a result of availability of safety and credential status information at the roadside; resulting operational savings to safe and legal carriers and reduced cost of "productive" inspections to state enforcement officers
- Increase in the number of productive inspections associated with availability of safety / credential status information at the roadside (note that over time, this may result in decreased instances of noncompliance, as occurred over time with widespread implementation of safety inspections according to CVSA guidelines)

3.4 Evaluation Templates

This section includes the evaluation templates for measuring productivity / effectiveness improvements. The facing page for each completed template provides a summary of the benefit type being demonstrated, limitations of the current data, and recommendations for update of the evaluation framework and measures. It should be noted that in many instances, the system improvements referenced in the evaluation template are not yet in place. The post-deployment savings, operational efficiencies, and productivity improvements shown in the templates are projections only in these instances. The projected data are included only to illustrate the type of information that the template will demonstrate upon update by the state following deployment. The discussion accompanying the templates does not provide detailed discussion about projected savings, as these are estimates at best, without benefit of post-deployment, or even Beta Test,

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

experience. As data are entered into the templates based on post-deployment / Beta Test experience, it is expected that the state will provide a more detailed discussion of actual benefits in the accompanying text.

Where current information was available, templates were completed for the base pre-deployment year for which data were available. In some instances, the state is not tracking information as defined by the template, so current year data could not be included. The intent is that the state may begin tracking the data required to provide base-year data for these templates prior to deployment.

It should also be noted that template fields which are shaded require annual (or periodic) update by the agency responsible for generating the field information. Unshaded fields update automatically when shaded fields are changed.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 1. State Agency Administrative Cost Savings Associated with Electronic Credentialing for IRP, IFTA and SSRS / other Carrier-based Authorities.

CVO Process Change:

Electronic credentialing for IRP, IFTA, SSRS and other carrier licenses / authorities will enable motor carriers, service bureaus and tag agents to submit credential applications electronically to the state via the Web. In addition, the EDI Bulleting Board system currently in use will be transitioned to a web-based transmittal, and application processing capabilities associated with EDI applications will be enhanced to allow automatic upload and verification of these applications. The electronic credentialing system will upload application / renewal data received via the web-based system and EDI system to agency legacy systems, calculate fees, notify applicants of fees dues, accept and process electronic fund transfers, validate and process applications, and, ultimately, may issue credentials back to the carrier electronically. In addition, the automated system for IFTA will accept, validate and process IFTA quarterly returns and associated tax payments.

Template Purpose:

Template 1 enables the state to estimate cost savings and FTE productivity gains associated with implementation of electronic credentialing for interstate CV registrations (IRP); fuel tax licensing and quarterly returns (IFTA); and carrier operating authorities (SSRS and other OCC-issued credentials).

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

At the time of publication of this document, these automated credentialing systems are not yet in place. Thus the post-deployment year numbers shown in Exhibit 1 are projections for illustration purposes only. Number of vehicles registered and total number of applications processed are actual data for 2003 (IRP and IFTA), and 2001 (SSRS and other OCC-issued credentials).

Shaded fields require update by the responsible agencies annually or upon system deployment. Unshaded fields will update automatically, except as indicated in Note (B) on the facing page.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 1. Administrative Savings to State Agencies Associated with Credentialing Processing Costs Avoided Upon Deployment of Electronic Credentialing							
Year: _____							
Activity	Number Vehicles Registered	Total Number Applications Processed	Post-deployment Year # Transactions Processed Electronically (A)	Minutes Saved / Avoided Per Transaction (B)	Per Hour Labor Cost (Loaded)	Post-deployment Year % Transactions Processed Electronically	Post-deployment Year Cost Savings
Average FTE Hourly Cost					\$ 25.00		
Average Data Entry Contract FTE Hourly Cost					\$ 15.00		
Data Entry							
IRP (1)	59,000		5,900	3	\$ 15.00	10%	\$ 4,425
IFTA License		4,200	420	5	\$ 15.00	10%	\$ 525
IFTA Quarterly Return		16,800	1,680	10	\$ 15.00	10%	\$ 4,200
SSRS / Other OCC		7,364	736	6	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 1,840
Checking							
IRP Applications Submitted Using EDI system (2)		7,863	7,863	20	\$ 25.00	100%	\$ 65,525
Other IRP Applications Submitted (3)		9,677	968	20	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 8,067
IFTA License		4,200	420	5	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 875
IFTA Quarterly Return		16,800	1,680	15	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 10,500
SSRS / Other OCC		7,364	736	5	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 1,533
Costs avoided due to increased accuracy of applications (fewer returned applications)							
	% of Paper Applications Requiring Phone Follow-up (4)						
IRP Renewals (2,3)	75%	6,202	980	30	\$ 25.00	16%	\$ 9,188
Other IRP Applications (2,3)	5%	11,338	7,851	30	\$ 25.00	69%	\$ 4,907
IFTA License	1%	4,200	420	30	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 53
IFTA Quarterly Return	5%	16,800	1,680	30	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 1,050
SSRS / Other OCC	5%	7,364	736	30	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 460
Payment Processing							
IRP (2,3)		17,540	8,831	30	\$ 25.00	50%	\$ 110,388
IFTA Quarterly Return (5)		8,400	840	30	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 10,500
SSRS / Other OCC		7,364	736	30	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 9,200
Renewal / Quarterly Return Pre-processing (Includes printing / mailing records / forms to each carrier)							
IRP (3)		9,677	968	5	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 2,017
IFTA License		4,200	420	3	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 525
IFTA Quarterly Return		16,800	1,680	3	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 2,100
SSRS / Other OCC		7,364	736	3	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 920
Printing / Postage Costs Avoided							
IRP (6)		5,481	548		\$ 3.00	10%	\$ 1,644
IFTA License		4,200	420		\$ 1.00	10%	\$ 420
IFTA Quarterly Return		16,800	1,680		\$ 1.00	10%	\$ 1,680
SSRS / Other OCC		7,364	736		\$ 1.00	10%	\$ 736
Total Costs Avoided							
IRP							\$ 192,065
IFTA License							\$ 2,345
IFTA Quarterly Return							\$ 28,980
SSRS / Other OCC							\$ 14,229
Total							\$ 237,619
Total FTE Savings (6)							4.48
(1) In 2003, Oklahoma registered almost 180,000 IRP vehicles annually. 120,000 of these are estimated to be credentialed using the EDI Bulletin Board, indicating that data entry is already automated. Only the vehicles registered outside of the EDI system are shown here.							
(2) IRP application transactions submitted using EDI system. Note that enhancements to processing capabilities for applications submitted using the EDI system will result in automated checking / payment processing for all IRP renewals and other applications submitted via the EDI system.							
(3) IRP application transactions submitted not using EDI system.							
(4) Percent of applications received requiring phone follow-up prior to implementation of automated system.							
(5) Assumes 50% of IFTA returns are filed with payment attached (50% owe money vs. have credit due).							
Actual numbers must be updated annually following deployment.							
(6) Renewals excluding EDI renewals							
(7) FTE "savings" indicates number of FTEs which can be redeployed to other activities and / or number of new hires avoided							
(A) Current values are projections only. Shaded fields require annual update following deployment.							
(B) Current values are projection only. Fields requires verification following deployment							

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 2. State Agency Administrative Cost Savings Associated with OS / OW Permitting.

CVO Process Change:

Web-based oversize / overweight (OS / OW) permitting will enable motor carriers and service bureaus to submit permit applications electronically to the state via the Web. The web-based permitting system will upload permit application data received via the web-based system the DPS permitting legacy system, enable routing of the permit via the web, calculate fees, notify applicants of fees dues, accept and process electronic fund transfers, validate and process applications, and issue the routed back to the carrier electronically for some types of permits

Template Purpose:

Template 2 enables the state to estimate cost savings and FTE productivity gains associated with implementation of web-based permitting for OS / OW permits.

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

At the time of publication of this document, an automated permitting system is not yet in place. Thus the post-deployment year numbers shown in Exhibit 2 are projections for illustration purposes only.

Shaded fields require update by the responsible agencies annually or upon system deployment. Unshaded fields will update automatically, except as indicated in Note (B) on the facing page.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 2. Estimate of Annual State Administrative Savings Associated with Automated OS / OW Permitting						
Year:						
State Activity	Permits Issued Annually (A)	Permits Capable of Automated Issuance (A)	Permits Issued Electronically (A)	State Staff Processing Time Saved (B, 1)	Per Hour Cost (Loaded) (B)	Total Annual Savings
Permit processing, including data entry, route identification, return faxing (2)	200,000	120,000	36,000	10	\$ 25.00	\$ 150,000
Annual FTE Savings Potential						2.88
(1) Time saved shown in minutes						
(2) Includes data entry, verification of faxed applications						
(A) Field value requires annual update by DPS OS / OW permitting office.						
(B) Requires verification / periodic update by DPS.						
Assumptions:						
- 60% of permits issued can be issued electronically						
- 30% of permits which can be issued electronically are issued electronically						

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 3. Change in State Agency Operations and Maintenance Costs Post CVISN Electronic Credentialing Project Deployment

CVO Process Change:

State legacy systems managing the IRP, IFTA and SSRS functions will be replaced as part of the CVISN systems improvements. Mainframe legacy systems will be replaced by client / server systems which are expected to be easier to modify and maintain. Over the long-term, it is anticipated that system operational and maintenance costs may decrease over time as a result of the system replacements.

Template Purpose:

While Template 1 enables the state to estimate savings in application / payment processing time resulting from electronic application, Template 3 enables the state to measure changes in system O&M costs and related FTE requirements associated with replacement of mainframe legacy systems with client / server systems for interstate CV registrations (IRP); fuel tax licensing and quarterly returns (IFTA); and carrier operating authorities (SSRS and other OCC-issued credentials).

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

At the time of publication of this document, current year estimates of the data required for columns 1 and 2 of the facing table are not available. Pre and post-deployment year information will need to be added to the table by the agencies responsible for these functions.

Shaded fields require update by the responsible agencies annually or upon system deployment. Unshaded fields will update automatically.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 3. Change in State Agency O&M Costs								
Post CVISN Electronic Credentialing Project Deployment								
Pre-deployment Year:			Post-deployment Year:					
System	Annual Labor Hours (or Other Unit Types) Pre-deployment	Average Hourly Labor (or other Unit) Cost	Total Annual Costs Pre-deployment	Annual Labor Hours (Loaded) (or Other Unit Costs) Post-deployment	Average Labor (or other Unit) Cost	Total Annual Costs Post-deployment	Annual Cost Savings (3)	FTE Delta
CPI (1)								
Years (2)							0	
IRP								
- State IT Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Contractor Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Hardware / Software Purchases / Licences			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Communications			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Web Portal Fees			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Other (Specify)			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
Total IRP			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
IFTA								
- State IT Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Contractor Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Hardware / Software Purchases / Licences			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Communications			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Web Portal Fees			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Other (Specify)			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
Total IFTA			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
SSRS								
- State IT Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Contractor Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Hardware / Software Purchases / Licences			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Communications			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Web Portal Fees			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Other (Specify)			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
Total SSRS			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
Total			\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	

(1) Expressed as a percent; if CPI = 2.82, enter as .0282
 (2) # years between pre and post-deployment Year, calculated field
 (3) Formula "Inflates" pre-deployment costs to post deployment year using CPI

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation

Exhibit 4. Change in DPS Operations and Maintenance Costs Post CVISN Web-based Permitting Project Deployment

CVO Process Change:

Enhancements to the state's OS / OW permitting system to accommodate web-based permitting may affect annual system O&M costs.

Template Purpose:

While Template 2 enables the state to estimate savings in application / payment processing time resulting from electronic permit application, Template 4 enables the state to measure changes in system O&M costs associated with automated OS / OW permitting.

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

At the time of publication of this document, current year estimates of the data required for columns 1 and 2 of the facing table are not available. Pre and post-deployment year information will need to be added to the table by the agencies responsible for these functions.

Shaded fields require update by the responsible agencies annually or upon system deployment. Unshaded fields will update automatically.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 4. Change in DPS O&M Costs								
Post CVISN Automated Permitting Project Deployment								
Pre-deployment Year:			Post-deployment Year:					
System	Annual Labor Hours (or Other Unit Types) Pre-deployment	Average Hourly Labor (or other Unit) Cost	Total Annual Costs Pre-deployment	Annual Labor Hours (or Other Unit Types) Post-deployment	Average Labor (or other Unit) Cost	Total Annual Costs Post-deployment	Annual Cost Delta (3)	FTE Delta
CPI (1)								
Years (2)							0	
OS / OW Envelope Permit								
- State IT Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Contractor Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Hardware / Software Purchases / Licences			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Communications			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Web Portal Fees			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Other (Specify)			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
Total OS / OW Envelope Permit			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
OS OW Permits Requiring Bridge Analysis								
- State IT Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Contractor Labor			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Hardware / Software Purchases / Licences			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Communications			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Web Portal Fees			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
- Other (Specify)			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
Total OS / OW Permits Requiring Bridge Analysis			\$ -			\$ -	\$0.00	
Total			\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	
(1) Expressed as a percent; if CPI = 2.82, enter as .0282								
(2) # years between pre and post-deployment Year, calculated field								
(3) Formula "inflates" pre-deployment costs to post deployment year using CPI								

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 5. Annual Administrative Cost Savings to Motor Carriers Associated with Electronic Credentialing for IRP, IFTA, SSRS.

CVO Process Change:

Implementation of electronic credentialing for IRP, IFTA, SSRS and other carrier authorities / licenses will result in both administrative and operational productivity improvements for motor carriers as well as for the state. Motor carriers submitting applications via the web (non-EDI process) will still need to data enter the basic application data. However, many aspects of application preparation will include "pick and click" routines, some data will be remembered and automatically entered in other parts of the application, some fields will be populated with default data (which the carrier can override as necessary). These convenience features are expected to reduce the time required to complete the application. In addition, EFT payment functionality will significantly reduce motor carrier time required to process payment instruments for submittal to the state. The application checking / verification features built into the web and back-end EDI processing systems will minimize the number of applications rejected by the state, and thus minimize the need for phone follow-up with motor carriers.

Template Purpose:

Template 5 provides an estimate of savings in application / payment processing costs resulting from electronic application associated for interstate CV registrations (IRP); fuel tax licensing and quarterly returns (IFTA); and carrier operating authorities (SSRS and other OCC-issued credentials).

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

Fields in Exhibit 5 in Columns labeled (A) are updated upon state update of Exhibit 1. The shaded field (average hourly labor costs) and the column labeled (B) (minutes saved / avoided per transaction) should be verified / updated by the state based on carrier information provided during system Beta testing.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 5. Estimate of Annual Administrative Cost Savings to Motor Carriers Associated with Credentialing Processing Costs Avoided Upon Deployment of Electronic Credentialing for IRP, IFTA and SSRS							
Year:							
Activity	Number Vehicles Registered (A)	Total Number Applications Submitted (A)	Post-deployment Year # Transactions Processed Electronically (A)	Minutes Saved / Avoided Per Transaction (B)	Per Hour Labor Cost (Loaded)	Post-deployment Year % Transactions Processed Electronically	Post-deployment Year Cost Savings
Average FTE Hourly Cost					\$ 25.00		
Application / Renewal Preparation							
IRP (1)	59,000		5,900	2	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 4,917
IFTA License		4,200	420	3	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 525
IFTA Quarterly Return		16,800	1,680	7	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 4,900
SSRS / Other OCC		7,364	736	4	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 1,227
Costs avoided due to increased accuracy of applications (fewer returned applications)							
	% of Paper Applications Requiring Phone Follow-up (4)						
IRP Renewals (2,3)	75%	6,202	980	30	\$ 25.00	16%	\$ 9,188
Other IRP Applications (2, 3)	5%	11,338	7,851	30	\$ 25.00	69%	\$ 4,907
IFTA	1%	4,200	420	15	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 26
IFTA Quarterly Return	5%	16,800	1,680	30	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 1,050
SSRS / Other OCC	5%	7,364	736	15	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 230
Payment Processing							
IRP (2,3)		17,540	8,831	30	\$ 25.00	50%	\$ 110,388
IFTA Quarterly Return		8,400	840	30	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 10,500
SSRS / Other OCC		7,364	736	30	\$ 25.00	10%	\$ 9,200
Postage Costs Avoided							
IRP (3)		5,481	548		\$ 0.65	10%	\$ 356
IFTA License		4,200	420		\$ 0.37	10%	\$ 155
IFTA Quarterly Return		16,800	1,680		\$ 0.37	10%	\$ 622
SSRS / Other OCC		7,364	736		\$ 0.37	10%	\$ 272
Total Costs Avoided							
IRP							\$ 124,848
IFTA License							\$ 11,207
IFTA Quarterly Return							\$ 15,772
SSRS / Other OCC							\$ 1,729
Total							\$ 153,555
(1) In 2003, Oklahoma registered almost 180,000 IRP vehicles annually. 120,000 of these are estimated to be credentialed using the EDI Bulletin Board, indicating that data entry is already automated. Only the vehicles registered outside of the EDI system are shown here.							
(2) IRP application transactions submitted using EDI system. Note that enhancements to processing capabilities for applications submitted using the EDI system will result in automated checking / payment processing for all IRP renewals and other applications submitted via the EDI system, reducing need for phone follow-up and reducing payment processing time.							
(3) Includes IRP application transactions submitted not using EDI system.							
(4) Percent of applications received requiring phone follow-up prior to implementation of automated system.							
(A) Column updates based on data entered by State in Exhibit C-1.							
(B) Column values are estimates only. Requires verification / update based on Beta testing with carriers.							
Note: Shaded fields require periodic update by the state based on data provided by motor carriers.							

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 6. Annual Operational Cost Savings to Motor Carriers Associated with IRP, IFTA, SSRS and other Carrier-based Authorities / Licenses.

CVO Process Change:

Implementation of electronic credentialing for IRP, IFTA, SSRS and other carrier authorities / licenses is expected to result in significant operational productivity improvements for motor carriers. The web-based application process and automated back-end processing for EDI submittals will not significantly reduce the turn-around times for larger carriers submitting who are already submitting applications via the EDI bulletin board, as these carriers are already obtaining their credentials within 48 hours of application submittal. However, the web-based process will significantly speed up the process for the 40 percent of motor carriers who currently submit paper-based applications.

Template Purpose:

Template 6 provides an estimate of savings in carrier operating costs resulting from electronic application associated for interstate CV registrations (IRP); fuel tax licensing and quarterly returns (IFTA); and carrier operating authorities (SSRS and other OCC-issued credentials). When a carrier is adding a vehicle, that vehicle may sit idle until apportioned plates and cab cards are received. This template enables the state to estimate the productivity savings associated with getting that vehicle on the road faster by reducing the turn-around times associated with credentialing vehicles added to a carrier's fleet.

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

The "add vehicle" and "replace credentials / plates" transactions shown in Exhibit 6 are estimates only and should be verified by the state during the implementation year. Prior to initiation of Beta testing, it is recommended that the state survey carriers regarding the typical lag time between receipt of a new vehicle and getting the credentials required to "get the vehicle on the road", and also the time required to replace lost credentials. Hourly operating costs and other assumptions in the table should also be verified prior to or during beta testing. After completion of Beta testing, the state should survey the same carriers regarding post-deployment lag time between receipt of a new vehicle and getting the credentials required to "get the vehicle on the road", and also the time required to replace lost credentials.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 6. Estimates of Annual Motor Carrier Operational Savings					
Associated with Automated IRP, IFTA and SSRS Credentialing (1)					
Year:					
Activity	Vehicles (A)	Vehicles Added Annually Electronically (A)	Run Time Gained per new Vehicle through Immediate Access to Credential (2, B)	Per Hour Costs Avoided by Getting Vehicle on Road Faster (B)	Value of Post Deployment Productivity Gains
<i>Average Hourly Operating Costs</i>				\$ 60.00	
<i>Fixed costs as a percentage of Total Hourly Operating Costs</i>				35%	
Add new vehicles to IRP registration base	21,480	13,747	12	\$ 21.00	\$ 3,464,244
Replace lost credentials / plates	3,580	2,291	12	\$ 60.00	\$ 1,649,520
Total Annual Operational Savings					\$ 5,113,764
(1) Productivity Increase due to 24-hour access to credentials: getting vehicles on the road faster					
(2) Time shown in hours					
(A) Field value requires verification by motor carriers during Beta testing					
Assumptions:					
- 12% of vehicles are replaced by carriers annually					
- 2% of credentials / plates are lost, damaged, or for other reasons are replaced annually					
- Hourly motor carrier vehicle operating costs equal \$60. Fixed costs plus profit equal 35% of total hourly costs.					
- Costs avoided related to replacement credentials are equal to full hourly operating costs (vehicle is presumed to be en route at time of replacement need)					

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 7. Motor Carrier Administrative and Operational Cost Savings Associated with Automated OS / OW Permitting.

CVO Process Change:

Web-based oversize / overweight (OS / OW) permitting will enable motor carriers and service bureaus to submit permit applications electronically to the state via the Web. The web-based permitting system will upload permit application data received via the web-based system the DPS permitting legacy system, enable routing of the permit via the web, automated fee calculation, electronic notification to applicant of fees dues, acceptance and processing of electronic fund transfers, electronic validation and processing of applications, and electronic issuance of the routed back to the carrier for some types of permits

Template Purpose:

Template 7 enables the state to estimate motor carrier administrative and operational cost savings associated with implementation of web-based permitting for OS / OW permits.

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

At the time of publication of this document, an automated permitting system is not yet in place. Thus the post-deployment year numbers shown in Exhibit 7 are projections for illustration purposes only and require verification and update upon system deployment.

Shaded fields require update by the responsible agencies annually or upon system deployment. Unshaded fields will update automatically.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 7. Estimates of Annual Motor Carrier Administrative and Operational Savings Associated with Automated OS / OW Permitting							
Year:							
Savings Type	Permits Issued Annually (A)	Permits Capable of Automated Issuance (A)	Permits Issued Electronically (B)	Average Per-permit Reduction in Applicant Processing Time (2, C)	Average Run Time Gained per Vehicle through Access to Automated System (3, C)	Per Hour Cost (Loaded) (D)	Total Dollars Saved Annually
Operational Savings	200,000	120,000	36,000		0.5	\$ 60.00	\$ 1,080,000
Administrative Savings	200,000	120,000	36,000	30		\$ 25.00	450,000
Total Savings							\$ 1,530,000
(A) Field value requires verification by DPS OS / OW permitting office. Fields will update automatically upon update of Exhibit 2.							
(B) Current field value is projection only. Requires annual post-deployment update.							
(C) Requires motor carrier verification during Beta testing.							
(D) Fields will update automatically upon update of Exhibits 5 and 6.							
(1) Costs avoided due to 24-hour access to credentials; getting vehicles on the road faster							
(2) Time shown in minutes							
(3) Time shown in hours							
Assumptions:							
- 60% of permits issued can be issued electronically							
- 30% of permits which can be issued electronically are issued electronically							

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 8. Change in Revenue Recovery Functions Subsequent to Implementation of Commercial Vehicle Electronic Information Exchange Window (CVIEW)

CVO Process Change:

Implementation of the Oklahoma CVIEW will result in periodic download of information from the IRP, IFTA and SSRS legacy systems to the CVIEW database. Reporting routines will be developed to enable state agencies to compare jurisdiction states among the credential types, and to compare IFTA and IRP jurisdiction miles during the same period. Report results may be used by audit staff in selecting carriers for audit and preparing for audit of selected carriers.

Over time, if electronic credentialing is able to sufficiently reduce FTE requirements for application processing, the state may be able to redeploy resources to revenue recovery functions such as audit.

Template Purpose:

Template 8 can be used to document pre and post deployment audit and revenue recovery efforts to determine whether audit resources are increasing and / or whether audit efforts are resulting in higher revenue recovery effectiveness.

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

Pre-deployment audit labor hours and dollars recovered via audit must be completed for the fiscal year prior to CVIEW deployment. Post-deployment audit labor hours and dollars recovered via audit will need to be provided annually following full deployment of the state's CVIEW.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 8. Change in State Agency Revenue Recovery Functions							
Post CVISN Electronic Credentialing Project Deployment							
Pre-deployment Year:				Post-deployment Year:			
System	Annual Audit Hours Pre-deployment	Annual Dollars Recovered via Audits Pre-deployment	Dollars Recovered per Audit Hour Pre-deployment	Annual Audit Hours Post-deployment	Annual Dollars Recovered via Audits Post-deployment	Dollars Recovered per Audit Hour Post-deployment	Post-deployment Revenue Recovery Delta
IRP							\$ -
IFTA							\$ -
SSRS							\$ -
Total	0	\$ -		0	\$ -		\$ -

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 9. Reduction in Number of Safe and Legal Vehicles through Fixed Scales

CVO Process Change:

Oklahoma uses the PrePass system for mainline screening at seven fixed scale facilities. The PrePass system enables PrePass enrolled transponder-equipped trucks which meet state-established safety and compliance parameters to be cleared at mainline speeds. Those vehicles cleared through the PrePass process do not have to pull into the fixed scale for further inspection. At present, approximately 12 percent of commercial vehicles passing Oklahoma's fixed scales are equipped with PrePass transponders, reducing the number of safe and legal vehicles coming through the fixed scales by approximately 12 percent. By reducing the number of safe and legal vehicles moving through the fixed scales, the potential for mainline backup and associated safety hazard is reduced. In addition, the reduction in number of safe and legal vehicles through the fixed scales enables scale officers to focus resources on potentially higher risk carriers and vehicles.

Template Purpose:

Template 9 enables the state to document the volume of commercial vehicle traffic passing Oklahoma's fixed scales, to monitor the percentage of trucks passing the scales that are transponder-equipped, the number of transponder-equipped trucks legally bypassed, and the number and percentage of transponder-equipped trucks called into the scale facility for further inspection.

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

Truck volume data will require periodic update by ODOT. Counts of transponder-equipped vehicles passing the fixed scales and count of vehicles legally bypassed will require annual update by HELP, Inc., the provider of the PrePass system.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 9. Reduction in Safe / Legal Vehicles Through Fixed Scales						
Base Year: 2003		Current Year:				
Fixed Scale	Vehicles Passing Scale Annually (1)	# Transponder-equipped Vehicles Passing Scale, Annualized (2)	% of Vehicles Passing Scale that are Transponder-equipped (2)	# Transponder-equipped Vehicles Legally Bypassed (2,3)	# Transponder-equipped Vehicles Called into Scale for Further Inspection (2)	% Transponder-equipped Vehicles Called into Scale for Further Inspection (2)
Annual Hourly Operating Costs (4)						
Average minutes of "stop" timed for vehicles through fixed scales						
<i>PrePass-Equipped Fixed Scales - 2003</i>						
Colbert NB	1,255,500	203,097	16%	63,153	8,208	12%
Colbert SB	1,255,500	213,592	17%	64,245	7,905	11%
Davis NB	1,904,760	183,329	10%	35,767	5,267	13%
Davis SB	1,904,760	184,102	10%	38,262	5,741	13%
El Reno WB	3,920,400	365,094	9%	120,843	8,345	6%
Tonkawa NB	1,123,200	142,192	13%	9,852	3,619	27%
Tonkawa SB	1,123,200	144,965	13%	24,904	7,707	24%
Total	12,487,320	1,436,371	12%	357,026	46,792	12%
Annual Hourly Operating Costs (4)						
Average minutes of "stop" timed for vehicles through fixed scales						
<i>PrePass-Equipped Fixed Scales - Future Year _____</i>						
Colbert NB						
Colbert SB						
Davis NB						
Davis SB						
El Reno WB						
Tonkawa NB						
Tonkawa SB						
Total	-	-		-	-	
(1) Data supplied by PrePass for Calendar Year 2003						
(2) Estimates based on ODOT ADT counts						
(3) # transponder-equipped vehicles legally bypassed is relatively low as scales are not open 24 / 7						

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 10. Change in “Productive” Enforcement / Compliance Assurance Activities Pending Implementation of Fixed Scale Communications Upgrades and CVIEW Deployment

CVO Process Change:

Oklahoma’s fixed scales are operated by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission (OCC) and the Oklahoma Tax Commission (OTC). Vehicles which move through the fixed scales are checked to ensure that their weight is compliant with the maximum registered weight on their IRP cab card (or intrastate registration documents), and to ensure compliance with other registration, tax and insurance requirements. The volume of vehicle through the fixed scales precludes verification of all paper documents. Officers must currently use random inspection as well as targeted inspections based on officer expertise and knowledge of compliance history of specific carriers to determine which vehicles to pull out of the queue for further inspection.

With implementation of the state CVIEW and installation of high speed communications / computer upgrades at fixed scale facilities, scale officers will be able to key in a plate number and query against the CVIEW for many of the vehicles rolling over the fixed scales. The CVIEW query response will alert officers to which vehicles may be registered at a weight lower than the operating weight registering on the fixed scale, as well as registration, insurance and tax payment compliance deficiencies. The electronic query capabilities are expected to significantly increase the effectiveness of the inspection selection decisions at fixed scales.

Template Purpose:

Template 10 enables the state to compare the number of vehicles pulled out of the queue for further inspection pre- and post-CVIEW deployment, as well as the number of citations issued as a result of further inspection and percent of enforcement actions resulting in a citation before and after CVIEW deployment, providing a measure of enforcement action productivity.

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

Shaded values will require annual update following full deployment of the Oklahoma CVIEW and related query capabilities.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 10. Change in "Productive" Enforcement / Compliance Assurance Activities Pending Deployment of Communications Upgrades / CVIEW Deployment at Fixed Scales									
Pre-deployment Year OCC: 2001					Post-deployment Year OCC:				
Fixed Scale	Vehicles Passing Scale Annually (1)	Enforcement FTEs	# Vehicles Potentially Subject to Enforcement / Compliance Actions (2)	# Vehicles Checked via CVIEW (3)	# Vehicles Pulled Out of Queue for Further Compliance Inspection (4)	% Vehicles Inspected for Compliance	# Citations Issued Subsequent to Enforcement / Compliance Actions	% of Enforcement / Compliance Actions Resulting in Citation	Revenues Collected as Result of Enforcement / Compliance Actions
Pre Communications Upgrades / CVIEW Deployment - OCC									
<i>Fixed Scales and Mobile Operations</i>									
Total	12,487,320	19	1,700,000		41,494	2%	2,348	6%	\$963,790
Post Communications Upgrades / CVIEW Deployment - OCC									
<i>Fixed Scales and Mobile Operations</i>									
Total									
Pre-deployment Year OTC: 2003					Post-deployment Year OTC:				
Fixed Scale	Vehicles Passing Scale Annually (1)	Enforcement FTEs	# Vehicles Potentially Subject to Enforcement / Compliance Actions (2)	# Vehicles Checked via CVIEW (3)	# Vehicles Pulled Out of Queue for Further Compliance Inspection (4)	% Vehicles Inspected for Compliance	# Citations Issued Subsequent to Enforcement / Compliance Actions	% of Enforcement / Compliance Actions Resulting in Citation	Revenues Collected as Result of Enforcement / Compliance Actions
Pre Communications Upgrades / CVIEW Deployment - OTC									
<i>Fixed Scales and Mobile Operations</i>									
Total	12,487,320	37	1,700,000		N/A		10,000		\$900,000
Post Communications Upgrades / CVIEW Deployment - OTC									
<i>Fixed Scales and Mobile Operations</i>									
Total									
(1) Estimates based on ODOT 2002 ADT counts									
(2) Estimate based on shift reports provided by OTC									
(3) Number of CVIEW queries on plate / DOT									
(4) Vehicles pulled out of queue for further inspection of documents based on random call-in, officer expertise, result of CVIEW query									

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 11. Operational Savings to Motor Carriers Resulting from mainline Bypass

CVO Process Change:

Oklahoma uses the PrePass system for mainline screening at seven fixed scale facilities. The PrePass system enables PrePass enrolled transponder-equipped trucks which meet state-established safety and compliance parameters to be cleared at mainline speeds. Those vehicles cleared through the PrePass process do not have to pull into the fixed scale for further inspection, saving approximately five minutes of operating time and one half gallon of gas for each stop avoided.

Template Purpose:

Template 11 enables the state to calculate the annual operating savings to motor carriers resulting from stops avoided through its mainline bypass program. The program is currently estimated to save industry more than \$1.7 million annually in productivity improvements. Gas consumption savings are estimated at almost 180,000 gallons annually. As the number of transponder-equipped vehicles increases in the future, operational and fuel savings are expected to increase as well.

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

Shaded values will require annual update based on data provided by PrePass. OTA should be able to supply information regarding changes in hourly operating costs.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 11. Operational Savings to Motor Carriers						
Related to Mainline Bypass						
Base Year:	2003		Current Year:			
Fixed Scale	Vehicles Passing Scale Annually (2)	# Transponder-equipped Vehicles Passing Scale, Annualized (1)	% of Vehicles Passing Scale that are Transponder-equipped (1)	# Transponder-equipped Vehicles Legally Bypassed (1,3)	Annual Industry Operating Savings Related to Stops Avoided	Annual Fuel Savings (4)
Annual Hourly Operating Costs (4)					\$ 60.00	
Average minutes of "stop" timed for vehicles through fixed scales					5	
<i>PrePass-Equipped Fixed Scales - 2003</i>						
Colbert NB	1,255,500	203,097	16%	63,153	\$ 315,765	31,577
Colbert SB	1,255,500	213,592	17%	64,245	\$ 321,225	32,123
Davis NB	1,904,760	183,329	10%	35,767	\$ 178,835	17,884
Davis SB	1,904,760	184,102	10%	38,262	\$ 191,310	19,131
EI Reno WB	3,920,400	365,094	9%	120,843	\$ 604,215	60,422
Tonkawa NB	1,123,200	142,192	13%	9,852	\$ 49,260	4,926
Tonkawa SB	1,123,200	144,965	13%	24,904	\$ 124,520	12,452
Total	12,487,320	1,436,371	12%	357,026	\$ 1,785,130	178,513
Annual Hourly Operating Costs						
Average minutes of "stop" timed for vehicles through fixed scales						
<i>PrePass-Equipped Fixed Scales - Future Year _____</i>						
Colbert NB					\$ -	-
Colbert SB					\$ -	-
Davis NB					\$ -	-
Davis SB					\$ -	-
EI Reno WB					\$ -	-
Tonkawa NB					\$ -	-
Tonkawa SB					\$ -	-
Total	-	-		-	\$ -	-
(1) Data supplied by PrePass for Calendar Year 2003						
(2) Estimates based on ODOT ADT counts						
(3) # transponder-equipped vehicles legally bypassed is low as scales are open only for relatively short period during 24-hour period when trucks are traveling by scales						
(4) Based on estimates provided by PrePass of 1/2 gallon gas savings for each stop avoided						

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 12. Change in “Productive” DPS Enforcement / Compliance Assurance Activities Pending Implementation of Mobile Communications Upgrades and CVIEW Deployment

CVO Process Change:

The Oklahoma Department of Public Safety is responsible for implementation of the Motor Carrier Safety Assurance Program (MCSAP) in Oklahoma. The DPS unit responsible for MCSAP enforcement, Troop S, operates on a mobile basis, conducting roadside inspections at numerous pull-out locations throughout the state. Currently, inspection selection decisions are made on a random basis, as a result of factors in a vehicle’s operation or appearance that alert an officer of a potential need to inspect, and based on officer expertise / knowledge of safety and compliance history of specific carriers.

Upon implementation of the state CVIEW and mobile communication upgrades to enable officers to query the CVIEW (as well as Query Central and / or SAFER) from the roadside, officers will be able to query these systems based on plate and / or DOT number. Results of the query can be used in making inspection selection decisions.

Template Purpose:

Template 12 enables the state to compare the number of vehicles stopped for potential inspection before and after CVIEW / communication upgrades, the number of vehicles checked via the CVIEW, resulting number of inspections, and number of “productive” inspections (inspections resulting in a violation or out of service (OOS) order).

Variables Requiring Periodic Update:

Shaded values will require annual update following full deployment of the Oklahoma CVIEW and related query capabilities.

3.0 Productivity / Effectiveness Evaluation Templates

Exhibit 12. Change in "Productive" DPS Enforcement / Compliance Assurance									
Activities Pending Deployment of Satellite Upgrades									
/ CVIEW Accessibility from Mobile Sites									
Pre-deployment Year:		2001			Post-deployment Year:				
Fixed Scale	# Officers Assigned to Mobile Inspections	# Vehicles Subject to Mobile Enforcement / Compliance Actions (1)	# Vehicles Checked via CVIEW, SAFER, Query Central	% Vehicles Checked via CVIEW, SAFER, Query Central	# Inspections Conducted	# OOS (Driver and Vehicle) Issued as a Result of Inspection Actions	# Violations Associated with Inspection Actions	Violation Rate (2)	OOS Rate (3)
Pre Satellite Upgrades / CVIEW Deployment									
Total	39	15,764	0	0	15,764	4,586	41,566	2.6	29.09%
Post Satellite Upgrades / CVIEW Deployment									
Total									
(1) Number vehicles stopped by DPS for potential inspection									
(2) Average number of violations associated with each inspection completed									
(3) Percent of inspections resulting in OOS issuance									