

#2745

2010 FEB 24 PM 2: 48

CHILATORY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 23, 2010

Arthur Coccodrilli Chairman Independent Regulatory Review Commission 333 Market Street, 14th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101

re: Proposed Regulation 18-414

Dear Mr. Coccodrilli:

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) recently proposed a final form regulation, Intrastate Motor Carrier Safety Requirements (18-414), in the stated belief that the action is required as a result of a federal audit and necessary to retain full Federal Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) funding. While this belief may be true to some extent, the proposed regulations exceed the mandate in ways detrimental to PA agriculture.

As Members of the House of Representatives, we urge IRRC to return this regulation to PennDOT for revision for the reasons set forth in the February 19, 2010, objections filed on a bipartisan basis by the Republican and Democratic Chairs of the House Standing Committee on Agriculture and Rural Affairs.

We are encouraged by the U.S. Department of Transportation "Interpretation" presented earlier today. This undated Interpretation received by IRRC on February 23, 2010 states, inter alia,"a State **may exempt** commercial vehicles from all or part of its regulations..." (Emphasis added.) While this Interpretation is clear that Pennsylvania may exempt certain vehicles for this and other reasons, the federal interpretation does not confer any exemption not otherwise enacted by Pennsylvania. Consequently, adoption of the proposed regulation in current form would not provide exemptions possible under federal law and desirable to PA agriculture.

This Interpretation by the U.S. Department of Transportation demonstrates the truth of PennDOT's <u>original</u> response to item 23 of the Regulatory Analysis Form, **"There are alternative regulatory provisions that would satisfy the requirements of the FMCSA mandate."** (Emphasis added.) <u>Today's correspondence from the U.S. Department of Transportation proves that alternative approaches to satisfying applicable federal mandates do, in fact, exist.</u>

Independent Regulatory Review Commission re: Proposed Regulation 18-414 February 23, 2010 Page 2 of 4

IRRC's receipt today of the federal Interpretation that proves that the federal mandate will allow less disruptive alternatives than the currently proposed regulations was followed by PennDOT correspondence asserting that its original response to item 23 was mistaken. We believe that IRRC must reject the new assertion by PennDOT that Pennsylvania has no alternatives in light of the clearly contrary evidence presented by the federal Interpretation. We are certain such alternative approaches can reduce the adverse impact and severe cost to the agricultural community that would be newly regulated.

As specified at length in the bipartisan objections by the Republican and Democratic Chairs of the House Standing Committee on Agriculture and Rural Affairs dated February 19, 2010, PennDOT has not met its statutory burden (71 P.S. 745.5) in presenting information required. The Regulatory Review Act requires that a proposed regulation include such specific information so that the public and IRRC can properly consider the proposal. IRRC has ample statutory authority to return the regulation to PennDOT without approval. We strongly urge IRRC to not approve this proposal without first requiring PennDOT to meet its statutory burden.

At the same time, we agree it is desirable for Pennsylvania to retain full Federal Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) funding. We understand that the U.S. Department of Transportation has established March 31, 2010, as the deadline for meeting – not exceeding – its mandates.

If IRRC returns the proposed regulations without approval on February 25, 2010, this federal deadline can still be met if PennDOT revises the proposed regulations appropriately and resubmits them to IRRC by March 10, 2010. The Regulatory Review Act (71 P.S. § 745.7(c) et seq.) provides for PennDOT's revision of the proposed final-form regulations in order to respond to objections raised by IRRC in a manner that would allow adoption of the revised regulation in time to satisfy the federal deadline.

Appropriate revision of the proposed regulations to embrace the federal exemptions permitted for agriculture is of enormous consequence to PA agriculture and its ability to compete with other states that will continue to enjoy the allowed federal exemptions.

Thank you for your service to our Commonwealth.

Independent Regulatory Review Commission re: Proposed Regulation 18-414 February 23, 2010 Page 3 of 5

This letter is from all of the following members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives:

Male

**Sebe** A. Maher, Chairman Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee 40<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Sandra T. Maja

Sandra J. Major Caucus Chairman 111<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Stan Saylor Policy Chairman 94<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Bahn

Matthew E. Baker 68<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Michele Brooks 17<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Gene Digirolamo 18<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Samuel H. Smith Republican Leader 66<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Phillips Verti

Merle H. Phillips Caucus Administrator 108<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Jerry A. Stin

Jerry A. Stern Caucus Secretary 80<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Karen Boback 117<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Den Codes

Bryan Cutler 100<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Andon R Leiting

Gordon Denlinger 99<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Ellis ian L. Ellis

11<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Independent Regulatory Review Commission re: Proposed Regulation 18-414 February 23, 2010 Page 4 of 5

Matt Gabler 75<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

fait 3. Gitagie

Keith Gillespie 47<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

C. Codem Mauri

C. Adam Harris 82<sup>nd</sup> Legislative District

Rob W. Kauffman 89<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

etale 12<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Dend R. Millerd

David R. Millard 109<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

onaR. Obulander

Donna Oberlander 63<sup>rd</sup> Legislative District

. A Aint

**Richard A. Geist** 79<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Seth M. Deore

Seth M. Grove 196<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

ants. Hike nell

**David S. Hickernell** 98<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Mark & Seller

Mark K. Keller 86<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Carl Walker Metzgar 69<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Dan Moul 91<sup>st</sup> Legislative District

in Picket

**Tina Pickett** 110<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Independent Regulatory Review Commission re: Proposed Regulation 18-414 February 23, 2010 Page 5 of 5

Kathy J. Kapp

Kathy L. Rapp 65<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Samuel E. Rohrer 128<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Will F. Tallum

Will Tallman 193<sup>rd</sup> Legislative District

JAM:mg

cc: James Smith, IRRC

Total S. had

Todd Rock 90<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

n O Store Dela.

Richard R. Stevenson 8<sup>th</sup> Legislative District

Sheryl M. Delogier

Sheryl M. Delozier 88<sup>th</sup> Legislative District