

01.11.2018  
WSP CVEO LMCC  
GA Building  
10 AM

Attendees: Karl Nagel, Captain Dahl, Captain Foster, Linda Powell, Jeremy Marceau, Mike Mullen, Steve Sloniker, Alexis Young, Russell Hallgren, Jonas Mast and Patrick Johnson

Agenda: Follow-up from last LMCC to discuss troopers getting part A training and certification

MM: CVEO authority is not limited by statute; it is limited by the Chief

- CVEOs should have the authority to enforce the top 5-collision causing infractions

All CVEOs: why can't the role of the CVEO evolve just as troopers do?

PJ: Tacoma CVEO equivalents and SDOT can enforce rules of the road

MM: taking a different approach than the previous authority argument → historical approach

- Equipment is fifth on list of collision-causing factors

CD: CVEO's can't enforce top 4 factors as CVEOs?

- MM: would be hesitant to do level 3s as a trooper; just want to enforce behaviors that contribute to top 5 collision-causing factors

PJ: greater authority to CVEOs would allow carriers to be more proactive and assist insurance companies

MD: so CVEOs want to be able to stop trucks for more than just equipment violations?

- Not interested in writing tickets?
- AY: don't you have to issue a ticket for carrier to know of violation?
  - o All: NO!
- CF: It is almost better to not write a ticket but have it on the inspection report

CD: Officer discretion – take appropriate action because it is the right thing to do

- Want to have the authority to stop trucks for other than inspections?

MM: Can offer a better service to the public if CVEOs can have greater authority

CD: Inquires about practice in other states/jurisdictions

PJ: Brings up SDOT and Tacoma

Jeremy: Offers additional research

CF: Interested in national trend

Caucus (requested by WSP) @ 10:57

Jonas: speculates that WSP will allow/offer the stop but not ticket issuance

- How many of the CVEOs in the group would accept that?
  - o All

Return 11:14

CD: Loves data; interested in what other states are doing

- Asks CVEOs to do homework
- Won't have an informed discussion without more data

KN: currently have limited authority for CVEOs

- Doesn't see any change on the horizon without more data
- Not a mandatory subject of bargaining

CD: If it's just passion then that is not substantive

- Doesn't think any further discussion regarding authority is necessary

CF: Wants to be fully prepared before they take it to the Chief (hence, research/data request)

- Even if other states don't have the authority, it doesn't mean WSP will say 'no'

AY did not note time of adjourning; approximately 11:30

Take-away:

We didn't get completely denied for once

Conduct research and present it at next meeting