

# **SOUTH DAKOTA**

## **Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program Fiscal Year 2018**

**Date of Approval: Sep 20, 2018**

**Final CVSP**

## Part 1 - MCSAP Overview

### 1 - Introduction

The Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) is a Federal grant program that provides financial assistance to States to help reduce the number and severity of accidents and hazardous materials incidents involving commercial motor vehicles (CMV). The goal of the MCSAP is to reduce CMV-involved accidents, fatalities, and injuries through consistent, uniform, and effective CMV safety programs.

A State lead MCSAP agency, as designated by its Governor, is eligible to apply for grant funding by submitting a commercial vehicle safety plan (CVSP), in accordance with the provisions of [49 CFR 350.201](#) and [205](#). The lead agency must submit the State's CVSP to the FMCSA Division Administrator on or before August 1 of each year. For a State to receive funding, the CVSP needs to be complete and include all required documents. Currently, the State must submit a performance-based plan each year to receive MCSAP funds.

The online CVSP tool (eCVSP) outlines the State's CMV safety objectives, strategies, activities and performance measures and is organized into the following five parts:

- Part 1: MCSAP Overview
- Part 2: Crash Reduction and National Program Elements
- Part 3: National Emphasis Areas and State Specific Objectives
- Part 4: Financial Information
- Part 5: Certifications and Documents

You will find that each of the five eCVSP parts listed above contains different subsections. Each subsection category will provide you with detailed explanation and instruction on what to do for completing the necessary tables and narratives.

The MCSAP program includes the eCVSP tool to assist States in developing and monitoring their grant applications. The eCVSP provides ease of use and promotes a uniform, consistent process for all States to complete and submit their plans. States and territories will use the eCVSP to complete the CVSP and to submit either a single year, or a 3-year plan. As used within the eCVSP, the term 'State' means all the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

## 2 - Mission/Goal Statement

### Instructions:

*Briefly describe the mission or goal of the lead State commercial motor vehicle safety agency responsible for administering this Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan (CVSP) throughout the State.*

**NOTE:** Please do not include information on any other FMCSA grant activities or expenses in the CVSP.

The South Dakota Highway Patrol, Motor Carrier Services, is committed to promoting public safety with professional, courteous and dedicated service, through excellence, education, and equitable enforcement.

#### Motor Carrier Services Goals

- To provide the best quality of service to citizens and members of the motor carrier industry
- To reduce the number and severity of commercial motor vehicle crashes below the FMCSA established goal of .114 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
- To act with integrity and accountability in all aspects of our duties
- To maintain a fair enforcement program which is based on sound principles
- To enhance public relations and awareness through safety and education programs
- To maintain public trust
- To gain voluntary compliance with laws and regulations pertaining to motor carriers
- To remain committed to recruitment, development, and training of the highest quality individuals

### 3 - MCSAP Structure Explanation

#### Instructions:

*Briefly describe the State's commercial motor vehicle (CMV) enforcement program funded by the MCSAP grant.*

**NOTE:** *Please do not include activities or expenses associated with any other FMCSA grant program.*

South Dakota's CMV enforcement program runs almost entirely through the South Dakota Highway Patrol; there are two sub-recipients for the purposes of operating and maintenance expenses from former CVISN programs. South Dakota continues to implement activities that involve the motor carrier industry, law enforcement personnel, and the citizens of South Dakota. We have 110 SD Highway Patrol Troopers that are certified and perform a minimum of 32 Level 3 inspections per year. Currently, there are 62 personnel dedicated to motor carrier enforcement full time when fully staffed. There are 17 sworn personnel, 43 non-sworn inspectors, and 2 New Entrant safety auditors. Sworn personnel consist of 14 motor carrier troopers and 3 command staff (2 Lieutenants and 1 Captain). Currently 33 of the 43 motor carrier inspectors are certified to perform Level I safety inspections. 10 additional inspectors will be certified when we have another class. Twelve of our fourteen Motor Carrier Troopers are Level I certified. The remaining Motor Carrier Troopers will be certified when we have another class. One of the troopers, a sergeant, is not certified but we do plan on him becoming certified. Neither of our Lieutenants are certified but plan to certify 1. The commander of the motor carrier services section is also not certified to perform Level 1 inspections. Our certified inspectors are located at 4 permanent ports of entry, 7 mobile 2-person teams and 14 motor carrier troopers are stationed throughout the state. In FY2013, we created a new position of Master Inspector. This position requires five years of experience, Level 1 certification, hazardous materials certification, and that the individual be either Cargo Tank or Motorcoach certified. The creation of this position provides greater incentivization for increased training, while providing resources for increased enforcement activity and greater public education hours. 9 of our inspectors are now Master Inspectors.

In FFY2016 we were able to add 3 additional troopers to the motor carrier division, going from 11 to 14.

In FFY2016 we were able to create a position of Motor Carrier Trooper Specialist. Like the Master Inspector program, the position requires five years of experience, Level 1 certification, hazardous materials certification, and the individual be either Cargo Tank or Motorcoach certified. Six of the ten troopers were eligible and became Specialists. Four troopers are not eligible due to supervisory duties.

Beyond the 110 SD Highway Patrol Troopers and the troopers and inspectors dedicated to motor carrier enforcement, we have a total of 13 K-9 officers, eleven of whom also contribute by performing a minimum of 32 Level 3 inspections per year as well as dog deployments on commercial motor vehicles. A dog deployment is when the handler uses his police service dog to perform an exterior sniff on a commercial vehicle in search of contraband. Two additional K-9 officers are Level 1 certified and Drug Recognition Experts. These two K-9 troopers perform Level 2 and 3 inspections as well as the dog deployments. These two troopers spend approximately 53% of their time on MCSAP eligible activities throughout the year.

South Dakota has 2 non-sworn personnel that are dedicated full time to New Entrant Audits. Both are Level 1 certified and perform 32 inspections per year.

South Dakota has 2 non-sworn personnel that participate in MCSAP activities at various levels. These staff do MCSAP administrative function in the Headquarters office.

There is a total of 187 personnel for the South Dakota Highway Patrol that perform MCSAP eligible activities to some level.

Participating Agency	Number of Certified CMV Inspectors(Non-sworn)	Number of certified Officers (sworn)	Number of Officers in Column B supported by MCSAP Funds
South Dakota Highway Patrol	45	140	140
Total	45	140	140

\*The figures provided in the table represent the numbers we strive to maintain within the agency. Due to normal turnover within the agency, the number at any given time might be slightly different.

South Dakota Highway Patrol is the lead agency for MCSAP. There are two subrecipients, the South Dakota Department of Transportation and the South Dakota Department of Revenue. Both agencies receive MCSAP funds for operating and maintenance expenses formally attributed to the CVISN grant. They receive funds to operate and maintain programs such as electronic screening, International Registration Program, International Fuel Tax Agreement, and PRISM products.

**4 - MCSAP Structure****Instructions:**

Complete the following tables for the MCSAP lead agency, each subrecipient and non-funded agency conducting eligible CMV safety activities.

The tables below show the total number of personnel participating in MCSAP activities, including full time and part time personnel. This is the total number of non-duplicated individuals involved in all MCSAP activities within the CVSP. (The agency and subrecipient names entered in these tables will be used in the National Program Elements —Roadside Inspections area.)

The national program elements sub-categories represent the number of personnel involved in that specific area of enforcement. FMCSA recognizes that some staff may be involved in more than one area of activity.

Lead Agency Information	
Agency Name:	SOUTH DAKOTA HIGHWAY PATROL
Enter total number of personnel participating in MCSAP activities	187
<b>National Program Elements</b>	<b>Enter # personnel below</b>
Driver and Vehicle Inspections	185
Traffic Enforcement Activities	140
Investigations*	2
Public Education and Awareness	183
Data Collection and Reporting	2
* Formerly Compliance Reviews and Includes New Entrant Safety Audits	

Subrecipient Information	
Agency Name:	SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Enter total number of personnel participating in MCSAP activities	1
<b>National Program Elements</b>	<b>Enter # personnel below</b>
Driver and Vehicle Inspections	0
Traffic Enforcement Activities	0
Investigations*	0
Public Education and Awareness	0
Data Collection and Reporting	0
* Formerly Compliance Reviews and Includes New Entrant Safety Audits	

Subrecipient Information	
Agency Name:	SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
Enter total number of personnel participating in MCSAP activities	1
<b>National Program Elements</b>	<b>Enter # personnel below</b>
Driver and Vehicle Inspections	0
Traffic Enforcement Activities	0
Investigations*	0
Public Education and Awareness	0
Data Collection and Reporting	0
* Formerly Compliance Reviews and Includes New Entrant Safety Audits	

Non-funded Agency Information	
Total number of agencies:	0
Total # of MCSAP Participating Personnel:	0

## Part 2 - Crash Reduction and National Program Elements

### 1 - Overview

*Part 2 allows the State to provide past performance trend analysis and specific goals for FY 2018 in the areas of crash reduction, roadside inspections, traffic enforcement, audits and investigations, safety technology and data quality, and public education and outreach.*

*In past years, the program effectiveness summary trend analysis and performance goals were separate areas in the CVSP. Beginning in FY 2018, these areas have been merged and categorized by the National Program Elements as described in [49 CFR 350.109](#). This change is intended to streamline and incorporate this information into one single area of the CVSP based upon activity type.*

**Note:** *For CVSP planning purposes, the State can access detailed counts of its core MCSAP performance measures. Such measures include roadside inspections, traffic enforcement activity, investigation/review activity, and data quality by quarter for the current and past two fiscal years using the State Quarterly Report and CVSP Data Dashboard, and/or the CVSP Toolkit on the A&I Online website. The Data Dashboard is also a resource designed to assist the State with preparing their MCSAP-related quarterly reports and is located at: <http://ai.fmcsa.dot.gov/StatePrograms/Home.aspx>. A user id and password are required to access this system.*

*In addition, States can utilize other data sources available on the A&I Online website as well as internal State data sources. It is important to reference the data source used in developing problem statements, baselines and performance goals/ objectives.*

## 2 - CMV Crash Reduction

The primary mission of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) is to reduce crashes, injuries and fatalities involving large trucks and buses. MCSAP partners also share the goal of reducing commercial motor vehicle (CMV) related crashes.

### Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

#### Instructions for all tables in this section:

Complete the tables below to document the State's past performance trend analysis over the past five measurement periods. All columns in the table must be completed.

- Insert the beginning and ending dates of the five most recent State measurement periods used in the Measurement Period column. The measurement period can be calendar year, Federal fiscal year, State fiscal year, or any consistent 12-month period for available data.
- In the Fatalities column, enter the total number of fatalities resulting from crashes involving CMVs in the State during each measurement period.
- The Goal and Outcome columns allow the State to show its CVSP goal and the actual outcome for each measurement period. The goal and outcome must be expressed in the same format and measurement type (e.g., number, percentage, etc.).
  - In the Goal column, enter the goal from the corresponding CVSP for the measurement period.
  - In the Outcome column, enter the actual outcome for the measurement period based upon the goal that was set.
- Include the data source and capture date in the narrative box provided below the tables.
- If challenges were experienced while working toward the goals, provide a brief narrative including details of how the State adjusted the program and if the modifications were successful.

### ALL CMV CRASHES

Select the State's method of measuring the crash reduction goal as expressed in the corresponding CVSP by using the drop-down box options: (e.g. large truck fatal crashes per 100M VMT, actual number of fatal crashes, actual number of fatalities, or other). Other can include injury only or property damage crashes.

**Goal measurement as defined by your State:** Large Truck Fatal Crashes per 100M VMT

**If you select 'Other' as the goal measurement, explain the measurement used in the text box provided:**

Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Fatalities	Goal	Outcome
Begin Date	End Date			
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	6	0.1140	0.0630
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	14	0.1140	0.15
01/01/2014	12/31/2014	23	0.1140	0.27
01/01/2013	12/31/2013	24	0.1140	0.23
01/01/2012	12/31/2012	19	0.1140	0.18



## MOTORCOACH/PASSENGER CARRIER CRASHES

Select the State's method of measuring the crash reduction goal as expressed in the corresponding CVSP by using the drop-down box options: (e.g. large truck fatal crashes per 100M VMT, actual number of fatal crashes, actual number of fatalities, other, or N/A).

**Goal measurement as defined by your State:** Actual # Fatal Crashes

**If you select 'Other' or 'N/A' as the goal measurement, explain the measurement used in the text box provided:**

Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Fatalities	Goal	Outcome
Begin Date	End Date			
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	1	0	1
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	0	0	0
01/01/2014	12/31/2014	1	0	1
01/01/2013	12/31/2013	4	0	4
01/01/2012	12/31/2012	0	0	0

## Hazardous Materials (HM) CRASH INVOLVING HM RELEASE/SPILL

Hazardous material is anything that is listed in the hazardous materials table or that meets the definition of any of the hazard classes as specified by Federal law. The Secretary of Transportation has determined that hazardous materials are those materials capable of posing an unreasonable risk to health, safety, and property when transported in commerce. The term hazardous material includes hazardous substances, hazardous wastes, marine pollutants, elevated temperature materials, and all other materials listed in the hazardous materials table.

For the purposes of the table below, HM crashes involve a release/spill of HM that is part of the manifested load. (This does not include fuel spilled from ruptured CMV fuel tanks as a result of the crash).

Select the State's method of measuring the crash reduction goal as expressed in the corresponding CVSP by using the drop-down box options: (e.g., large truck fatal crashes per 100M VMT, actual number of fatal crashes, actual number of fatalities, other, or N/A).

**Goal measurement as defined by your State:** Actual # Fatal Crashes

**If you select 'Other' or 'N/A' as the goal measurement, explain the measurement used in the text box provided:**

Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Fatalities	Goal	Outcome
Begin Date	End Date			
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	0	0	0
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	0	0	0
01/01/2014	12/31/2014	0	0	1
01/01/2013	12/31/2013	1	0	0
01/01/2012	12/31/2012	0	0	0

***Enter the data sources and capture dates of the data listed in each of the tables above.***

MCMIS data covering calendar years 2011-2017 and 2011-2015 FARS as of 08-02-17, A&I state specific crash records.

***Narrative: Describe any difficulties achieving the goal, problems encountered, obstacles overcome, lessons learned, etc.***

South Dakota met its goal of less than .20 large truck fatal crashes per 100M VMT by achieving a rate of .063 large truck fatal crashes per 100M VMT. This exceeded our goal as well as FMCSA's goal of .114 large truck fatal crashes. According to MCMIS state crash data, South Dakota had 6 fatal crashes involving a CMV. While we certainly saw success in CY2016 for our overall CMV fatal crashes, maintaining that low rate is a challenge. Part of our struggle is the very rural nature of our state. Just over 70% of the vehicle miles traveled in our state are rural roads. Generally rural crashes have a higher fatality rate due in part to both higher speeds of travel and longer distances to medical facilities. Another struggle is the low amount of fatal CMV involved crashes, which is good but, only a few number of crashes or fatalities can greatly influence our CMV fatals per 100M VMT rate.

South Dakota had 1 fatal crash with a motor coach involved. While we would obviously like to see that number at zero, it is impractical to design an enforcement program based on the facts of a single crash. South Dakota will continue to perform motor coach enforcement and education by participating in planned motor coach enforcement programs and projects.

South Dakota had zero fatal crashes involving a CMV carrying a hazardous materials. Crash data from A&I indicate a hazardous material was released in 5 crashes in SD, but all 5 are believed to be an error as they likely include diesel fuel from a ruptured fuel tank (diesel or motor oil is listed as the commodity released and only 1 indicates a hazmat number.) This is an education issue for investigating officers that we try to remedy through instruction. One of these four crashes had an involved injury. While we would like to see the number at zero, just like motor coach crashes, it is impractical to design an enforcement program based on the facts of this few of crashes. South Dakota will continue to perform inspections of vehicles and drivers operating a CMV with hazardous materials and cargo tanks. We will operate planned hazmat specific enforcement operations, and education whenever possible.

***Narrative Overview for FY 2018******Instructions:***

*The State must include a reasonable crash reduction goal for their State that supports FMCSA's mission to reduce the national number of crashes, injuries and fatalities involving commercial motor vehicles. The State has flexibility in setting its goal and it can be based on raw numbers (e.g., total number of fatalities or CMV crashes), based on a rate (e.g., fatalities per 100 million VMT), etc.*

***Problem Statement Narrative: Describe the identified problem, include baseline data and identify the measurement method.***

There are many factors considered in crash reduction efforts. High crash corridors are difficult to identify in South Dakota due to the rural nature of the state and the low incidence of injury and fatality involved crashes. According to MCMIS 2016 SD crash statistics, in CY16 South Dakota had 46 injury crashes and 6 fatal crashes involving CMV's. South Dakota has a current CMV fatal involved crash rate of .063 per 100M VMT. Our goal will be to maintain a rate of .15 fatalities per 100M VMT for CMVs. Safety restraint usage has been identified as one of the easiest tools available to help in the reduction of injuries and fatalities in vehicle crashes. When we conduct seatbelt surveys, we see 90% or better seatbelt use, we would like to see 100%. The South Dakota Highway Patrol has a directive that we will not issue warning for observed seatbelt violations. All observed seatbelt violation will be addressed with a citation.

South Dakota's statistical data indicates a wide pattern of crash incidents throughout the state. The crashes that occur are dispersed sparsely through the entire state. This continues to make it difficult to demonstrate a high crash corridor area that has resulted in the majority of fatal and injury crashes. Of the 6 fatal crashes involving a CMV in CY2016, only 1 county had more than 1, with a total of 2 fatal crashes involving a CMV. When you look at injury crashes, one county in South Dakota had 5 injury crashes, 2 counties had 3 crashes, and only 18 counties of 66 even reported an injury crash. Forty eight counties had 0 injury crashes. When you look at all crashes involving a CMV, our two most populated counties had the most occurrences. These two counties are also where we station our staff to address the issue. Routes to the North Dakota oilfield continue to see steady traffic, but at lower numbers than its peak several years ago. While we do not see a crash problem on these routes, a change in the oil market could quickly change traffic numbers, and possibly crash rates. We continue to monitor traffic on these corridors for potential safety hazards and conduct focused inspection activities in these areas.

We will continue to raise awareness for CMV safety issues through public education and traffic enforcement on CMVs. In FY16 we conducted 2088 hours of public education and through the first three quarters of FFY17, we have 1520

hours. A proactive approach through maintaining our public education hours statewide and concentrating our marathon and traffic enforcement efforts in these areas of higher traffic or higher crash occurrences of the state will be priorities for FY18.

South Dakota Highway Patrol utilizes data from the South Dakota Dept. of Transportation to determine the best times and locations to establish roadside checks. This data enables us to schedule personnel at locations based on time of day and day of week that have increased traffic volumes and greater potential for unsafe driving.

South Dakota will continue to promote the use of safety restraint systems. This will be stressed at the appropriate public education forums and during roadside interactions between inspectors and drivers. Our goal will be to maintain a rate at or above 90% compliance for FY2018 when conducting seatbelt surveys.

The enforcement of drug and alcohol offenses will continue to be a priority for SD Highway Patrol. In CY2016, we detected 40 drug and alcohol violations, which was lower than CY2015 in which we had 78. Drug and alcohol violations were 3.2% of the overall OOS driver violations in CY2016. Continued awareness of removing impaired drivers will be stressed to all personnel.

South Dakota motor carrier does not conduct traffic enforcement without an inspection on CMV's. Motor carrier troopers are required to write a vehicle examination report on all traffic stops involving commercial motor vehicles. Further education appears to have reduced the number of past inconsistencies in our reporting. Our SafetyNet Program manager also double checks these records for consistency.

Due to delayed MCSAP funding, as of the end of the 3rd quarter of FY17, we were unable to deploy our South Dakota Highway Patrol owned semi-truck trailer combination to operate TACT style operations targeting traffic violations committed by non-CMV's near CMV's. Since we have now received funding, operations will be conducted as soon as practical, but unlikely to be done in FY17.

In FY2016 starting in the beginning of the 3rd quarter, we were able to add an additional 3 motor carrier troopers to our division. This additional staff focusing on CMV enforcement will assist in meeting the crash reduction goals.

***Enter the data source and capture date:***

MCMIS data covering calendar years 2011-2017 and 2011-2015 FARS, as of 08-02-17.

***Projected Goal for FY 2018***

***Enter Crash Reduction Goal:***

South Dakota's goal will be to achieve a .15 or lower Large Truck Fatal Crashes per 100M VMT.

***Program Activities: States must indicate the activities, and the amount of effort (staff hours, inspections, traffic enforcement stops, etc.) that will be resourced directly for the program activities purpose.***

South Dakota will conduct traffic enforcement activities in the higher traffic volume areas of the state, stressing the importance of safe driving practices and the interactions of CMV's with non-CMV's. Increased scrutiny of drivers will be given on all contacts to determine the physical and mental fitness to safely and legally operate a CMV in order to maintain our current low number of CMV crashes. SDHP Motor Carrier will conduct training sessions for MC Troopers annually at meetings to heighten the awareness of traffic enforcement activities. Only 17 of the 61 MCS personnel have the authority to stop a CMV for a traffic violation. Taking this into consideration, we will also emphasize the importance to state troopers of detecting and enforcing traffic regulations on CMV's at staff meetings. Our goal will be to increase output by a minimum of 5% in areas identified as traffic enforcement violations.

In order to increase enforcement activity and identify illegally licensed, fatigued or non-qualified drivers at inspection marathons, SDHP Motor Carrier will conduct inspection marathon activities in those areas identified as having increased volumes of CMV traffic. These marathons will be comprised of numerous inspectors and state troopers. All drivers for whom an inspection report is generated will have their driver status checked and verified. Continued training will be given to all inspectors at quarterly and annual meetings in the detection and apprehension techniques of impaired drivers. Additionally, South Dakota will participate in the national Operation Safe Driver event. A minimum of 40 inspection marathons will be scheduled. Special emphasis will be given to scheduled activities that coincide with Operation Safe Driver events. During marathons, like Operation Safe Driver, Oilfield Operation and Intercity Marathons, our inspectors will utilize the TACT high-visibility enforcement methodology in identifying non-CMV violations around CMV traffic. With the addition of the 3 troopers assigned to the motor carrier division, we hope to make a bigger impact during these enforcement activities. We plan to use a South Dakota Highway Patrol owned semi-tractor trailer combination to observe and record violations committed by CMV's and non-CMV's while operating the combination in TACT style operations. We will maintain the same number of special enforcement operations, but hope to have a bigger enforcement impact during the operations.

South Dakota will also continue its efforts in safety education programs, emphasizing the importance of safety restraints and safe vehicle operation. South Dakota motor carrier operations are divided into four sections(zones) of the state. Each zone is required to perform a minimum of 400 safety education

hours. Additionally, inspectors will be encouraging the use of seat belts to drivers while conducting inspections. Our goal is to maintain our current safety rate usage above 90% with a desire to continually improve toward 100%. We will also conduct semi-annual spot checks of CMV drivers to determine compliance rates.

In an effort to help keep the crash statistics low we will conduct a total of 40 motor carrier marathons in FY18. 4 - Level 1 Hazardous Material Marathons, 4 - Level 1 Roadside checks, 16 - CVSA Special checks, 4 - Level 1 Intra-City Marathons, 4 - Level 1 Port Marathons and 8 - Level 3 Marathons.

***Performance Measurements and Monitoring: The State will monitor the effectiveness of its CMV Crash Reduction Goal quarterly and annually by evaluating the performance measures and reporting results in the required Standard Form - Performance Progress Reports (SF-PPRs).***

***Describe how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly reporting.***

1. South Dakota Highway Patrol will monitor the crash rate per 100 million VMT through South Dakota Accident Records. This will be done on a semi-annual basis in an attempt to determine if the trend of activity will maintain our objectives. We also will check quarterly reports and monitor the crash rates in the two areas of South Dakota that have been identified as having higher traffic volumes and the higher rates of CMV crashes.
2. Some of the best methods we have identified as being effective in reducing the total number and severity of crashes are public education and traffic enforcement directed toward the use of safety restraint systems and safe driving practices. Quarterly reports will be used to track activity in the area. Our intention is to meet a target of 1,600 hours of public education. South Dakota Accident Records data will be used to measure the usage of safety restraint in crash-involved commercial vehicle drivers as work at increasing or maintaining the current 90% compliance rate.
3. South Dakota will continue to train personnel in detecting drug and alcohol impairment of drivers. Efforts by the motor carrier division, Police Service Dog Unit, Drug Recognition Experts, and interdiction troopers will be monitored for enforcement activity and trends of drug and alcohol impaired driving enforcement on a quarterly basis.
4. South Dakota will conduct 40 motor carrier marathons in FY18. They will be tracked and reported in the quarterly progress report.

### 3 - Roadside Inspections

*In this section, provide a trend analysis, an overview of the State's roadside inspection program, and projected goals for FY 2018.*

**Note:** *In completing this section, do NOT include border enforcement inspections. Border Enforcement activities will be captured in a separate section if applicable.*

#### **Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016**

Inspection Types	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Level 1: Full	2754	2804	2680	2500	2421
Level 2: Walk-Around	9773	8771	8130	9175	8903
Level 3: Driver-Only	15155	15664	16787	17073	18905
Level 4: Special Inspections	2	55	135	174	310
Level 5: Vehicle-Only	27	49	82	82	75
Level 6: Radioactive Materials	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>27711</b>	<b>27343</b>	<b>27814</b>	<b>29004</b>	<b>30614</b>

#### **Narrative Overview for FY 2018**

##### **Overview:**

*Describe components of the State's general Roadside and Fixed-Facility Inspection Program. Include the day-to-day routine for inspections and explain resource allocation decisions (i.e., number of FTE, where inspectors are working and why).*

##### **Enter a narrative of the State's overall inspection program, including a description of how the State will monitor its program to ensure effectiveness and consistency.**

South Dakota's general roadside and fixed facility inspection program consists of 4 ports of entry, 2 of which have inspection buildings that are dedicated entirely to Level 1-3 inspections; 7 fixed scale location that are used on a random basis; 7 mobile teams that travel to sites around the state conducting inspection; and 14 Troopers dedicated to motor carrier enforcement that may use any of the sites if not stopping a CMV on any roadway, as well as the 110 Trooper that perform the minimum 32 commercial vehicle inspection per year. South Dakota has 74 sites around the state where inspectors can perform roadside inspections of motor carriers. These sites include pull off areas of sufficient size from commercial vehicles to small ports of entry that can park multiple commercial vehicles for inspection. These sites are used on a part time basis by our 7 mobile teams and State Troopers throughout the state at random times. There is at least one port open everyday of the week. Mobile crews are scheduled to work high traffic areas and also areas where motor carrier services have received complaints of trucks speeding or other unsafe issues. Other than ports of entries, staff and supervisors periodically monitor road traffic counts to most effectively schedule locations to work. For example, US Highway 83 that runs from Texas to Canada was identified as a high CMV traffic corridor, as well as our highest hazmat transportation route in the state. Our Blunt inspection site is manned at a much more frequent rate than other locations. This site is also having WIM scales and screening equipment installed to most effectively monitor and enforce safety regulations on CMV's.

Mobile team staff and troopers schedule a general area, facility, or county in which they work each day. Troopers will patrol roads for CMV's to identify traffic violations or random inspections. The inspections may take place roadside or CMV's are directed to an inspection facility if within a close distance. Mobile team personnel set up a temporary truck check at various locations usually for the day. They visually screen CMV's for violations and perform random inspections. If traffic numbers for CMV's are low, they will move to an alternative site for the remainder of the day.

Inspections are monitored and supervisors are provided with activity reports for each inspector every other 28 day period. Supervisors also have access to SafetyNet to get information whenever needed.

South Dakota Highway Patrol's two subrecipients do not perform roadside inspections.

## Projected Goals for FY 2018

### Instructions for Projected Goals:

Complete the following tables in this section indicating the number of inspections that the State anticipates conducting during Fiscal Year 2018. For FY 2018, there are separate tabs for the Lead Agency, Subrecipient Agencies, and Non-Funded Agencies—enter inspection goals by agency type. Enter the requested information on the first three tabs (as applicable). The Summary table totals are calculated by the eCVSP system.

To modify the names of the Lead or Subrecipient agencies, or the number of Subrecipient or Non-Funded Agencies, visit [Part 1, MCSAP Structure](#).

**Note:** Per the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#), States are strongly encouraged to conduct at least 25 percent Level 1 inspections and 33 percent Level 3 inspections of the total inspections conducted. If the State opts to do less than these minimums, provide an explanation in space provided on the Summary tab.

### MCSAP Lead Agency

**Lead Agency is:** SOUTH DAKOTA HIGHWAY PATROL

**Enter the total number of certified personnel in the Lead agency:** 0

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - Roadside Inspections					
Inspection Level	Non-Hazmat	Hazmat	Passenger	Total	Percentage by Level
Level 1: Full	3500	250	20	3770	13.00%
Level 2: Walk-Around	9850	400	20	10270	35.41%
Level 3: Driver-Only	14700	150	10	14860	51.24%
Level 4: Special Inspections	80	0	0	80	0.28%
Level 5: Vehicle-Only	0	0	20	20	0.07%
Level 6: Radioactive Materials	0	0	0	0	0.00%
<b>Sub-Total Lead Agency</b>	<b>28130</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>29000</b>	

**MCSAP subrecipient agency**

**Complete the following information for each MCSAP subrecipient agency. A separate table must be created for each subrecipient.**

SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT

**Subrecipient is:** OF TRANSPORTATION

**Enter the total number of certified personnel in this funded agency:** 0

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - Subrecipients					
Inspection Level	Non-Hazmat	Hazmat	Passenger	Total	Percentage by Level
Level 1: Full	0	0	0	0	%
Level 2: Walk-Around	0	0	0	0	%
Level 3: Driver-Only	0	0	0	0	%
Level 4: Special Inspections	0	0	0	0	%
Level 5: Vehicle-Only	0	0	0	0	%
Level 6: Radioactive Materials	0	0	0	0	%
<b>Sub-Total Funded Agencies</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT

**Subrecipient is:** OF REVENUE

**Enter the total number of certified personnel in this funded agency:** 0

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - Subrecipients					
Inspection Level	Non-Hazmat	Hazmat	Passenger	Total	Percentage by Level
Level 1: Full	0	0	0	0	%
Level 2: Walk-Around	0	0	0	0	%
Level 3: Driver-Only	0	0	0	0	%
Level 4: Special Inspections	0	0	0	0	%
Level 5: Vehicle-Only	0	0	0	0	%
Level 6: Radioactive Materials	0	0	0	0	%
<b>Sub-Total Funded Agencies</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	



**Non-Funded Agencies**

Total number of agencies:	0
Enter the total number of non-funded certified officers:	0
Enter the total number of inspections projected for FY 2018:	0

**Summary**

## Projected Goals for FY 2018 - Roadside Inspections Summary

<b>Projected Goals for FY 2018 Summary for All Agencies</b>					
<b>MCSAP Lead Agency: SOUTH DAKOTA HIGHWAY PATROL</b>					
<b># certified personnel: 0</b>					
<b>Subrecipient Agencies: SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</b>					
<b># certified personnel: 0</b>					
<b>Number of Non-Funded Agencies: 0</b>					
<b># certified personnel: 0</b>					
<b># projected inspections: 0</b>					
Inspection Level	Non-Hazmat	Hazmat	Passenger	Total	Percentage by Level
Level 1: Full	3500	250	20	3770	13.00%
Level 2: Walk-Around	9850	400	20	10270	35.41%
Level 3: Driver-Only	14700	150	10	14860	51.24%
Level 4: Special Inspections	80	0	0	80	0.28%
Level 5: Vehicle-Only	0	0	20	20	0.07%
Level 6: Radioactive Materials	0	0	0	0	0.00%
<b>Total ALL Agencies</b>	<b>28130</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>29000</b>	

**Note:** If the minimum numbers for Level 1 and Level 3 inspections are less than described in the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#), briefly explain why the minimum(s) will not be met.

We have increased our goal for L-1 inspections from 2650 to 3500, a 13.2% increase. We plan to maintain an increase in L-1's each year until the 25% recommendation is met. Previous MCSAP Policy goals were far exceeded as the goal of 33% L-3 inspections was met at greater than 50%. We have maintained a high level of L-3 inspections due to crash data. Previous Large Truck Crash causation studies indicate most crashes are caused by driver issues, not equipment issues. Of the top 10 causative factors for CMV's, only 1 (brake problems) was a potential equipment violation. All 9 others were driver controlled conditions. We have focused on doing more driver focused inspections, rather than fewer driver and vehicle combined inspections. Other factors contribute as well. SD currently does not have an NTC instructor that can teach NAS Part A & B in state. We rely on out of state instructor and classes. While we have a modest employee turnover rate, we struggle to get new inspectors to certification training for L-1 inspections within their first months of employment. We try to get each new inspector certified within their first year. We generally budget and schedule for 1 in-state class every other year. In the off years we send inspectors to a class in neighboring states.

**4 - Investigations**

*Describe the State's implementation of FMCSA's interventions model for interstate carriers. Also describe any remaining or transitioning compliance review program activities for intrastate motor carriers. Include the number of personnel assigned to this effort. Data provided in this section should reflect interstate and intrastate investigation activities for each year.*



**The State does not conduct investigations. If this box is checked, the tables and narrative are not required to be completed and won't be displayed.**

## 5 - Traffic Enforcement

*Traffic enforcement means documented enforcement activities of State or local officials. This includes the stopping of vehicles operating on highways, streets, or roads for moving violations of State or local motor vehicle or traffic laws (e.g., speeding, following too closely, reckless driving, and improper lane changes).*

### Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

#### Instructions:

Please refer to the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#) for an explanation of FMCSA's traffic enforcement guidance. Complete the tables below to document the State's safety performance goals and outcomes over the past five measurement periods.

1. Insert the beginning and end dates of the measurement period being used, (e.g., calendar year, Federal fiscal year, State fiscal year or any consistent 12-month period for which data is available).
2. Insert the total number CMV traffic enforcement stops with an inspection, CMV traffic enforcement stops without an inspection, and non-CMV stops in the tables below.
3. Insert the total number of written warnings and citations issued during the measurement period. The number of warnings and citations are combined in the last column.

State/Territory Defined Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Number of Documented CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops with an Inspection	Number of Citations and Warnings Issued
Begin Date	End Date		
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	1458	1569
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	1716	1874
01/01/2014	12/31/2014	2085	2261
01/01/2013	12/31/2013	2017	2224
01/01/2012	12/31/2012	0	0

☒ **The State does not conduct CMV traffic enforcement stops without an inspection. If this box is checked, the "CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops without an Inspection" table is not required to be completed and won't be displayed.**

☐ **The State does not conduct documented non-CMV traffic enforcement stops and was not reimbursed by the MCSAP grant (or used for State Share or MOE). If this box is checked, the "Non-CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops" table is not required to be completed and won't be displayed.**

State/Territory Defined Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Number of Documented Non-CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops	Number of Citations and Warnings Issued
Begin Date	End Date		
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	0	0
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	0	0
01/01/2014	12/31/2014	0	0
01/01/2013	12/31/2013	0	0
01/01/2012	12/31/2012	0	0

**Enter the source and capture date of the data listed in the tables above.**

MCNIS data snapshot as of 06-30-17

## **Narrative Overview for FY 2018**

### **Instructions:**

*Describe the State's proposed level of effort (number of personnel) to implement a statewide CMV (in conjunction with and without an inspection) and/or non-CMV traffic enforcement program. If the State conducts CMV and/or non-CMV traffic enforcement activities only in support of the overall crash reduction goal, describe how the State allocates traffic enforcement resources. Please include number of officers, times of day and days of the week, specific corridors or general activity zones, etc. Traffic enforcement activities should include officers who are not assigned to a dedicated commercial vehicle enforcement unit, but who conduct eligible commercial vehicle/driver enforcement activities. If the State conducts non-CMV traffic enforcement activities, the State must conduct these activities in accordance with the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#).*

The South Dakota Highway Patrol currently has 14 state troopers whose primary focus is commercial motor vehicle enforcement and another 110 state troopers. All troopers are tasked with traffic enforcement of both commercial and non-commercial vehicles. There are state troopers working in at least one area of the state at all times. In the 3rd quarter of FY16 we were able to add 3 motor carrier troopers to the motor carrier division increasing our numbers from 11 troopers to 14 which will assist in meeting traffic enforcement goals and activities. In the past SDHP Motor Carrier has attempted to develop an enforcement effort similar to the TACT program used in other states. We faced difficulty in doing so without having additional funding available for the effort. South Dakota participates in the New Entrant Audit program which encourages solid management principles, safe behaviors, and a safety mindset for companies and drivers. SDHP Motor Carrier does not conduct traffic enforcement on CMVs without an inspection. Motor Carrier troopers are required to write a vehicle examination report on all traffic stops involving commercial motor vehicles. Also, SDHP Motor Carrier currently does not have a method to track which non-CMV stops occurred with a CMV in the vicinity for every traffic stop the SDHP makes. South Dakota will conduct traffic enforcement activities in the higher traffic volume areas of the state, stressing the importance of safe driving practices and the interactions of CMVs with non-CMVs. Increased scrutiny of drivers will be given on all contacts to determine the physical and mental fitness to safely and legally operate a CMV in order to maintain our current low number of CMV crashes. SD Highway Patrol will conduct additional inspection marathon activities in those areas identified as having increased volumes of CMV traffic. These marathons will be comprised of numerous inspectors and state troopers. All drivers for whom an inspection report is generated will have their driver status checked and verified. Continued training will be given to all inspectors at quarterly and annual meetings in the detection and apprehension techniques of impaired drivers. Additionally, South Dakota will participate in the national Operation Safe Driver event.

~~For FY18, South Dakota has budgeted money to operate a Highway Patrol owned semi-truck trailer combination that will be used in traffic enforcement operation. The truck is equipped with a video camera to record traffic violations committed around that vehicle. It is equipped with a police radio to communicate to nearby troopers that can perform a traffic stop on CMVs and non-CMVs that commit violations around that CMV. The combination will be operated in higher traffic urban areas of South Dakota, as well as any traffic crash corridors that can be identified; and in conjunction with special enforcement projects such as Operation Safe Driver, holiday traffic enforcement plans, and local areas in need of special enforcement projects. When completing special operations with the semi-truck trailer combination, traffic stops on non-CMVs committing violations in the vicinity of the semi-truck combination will be recorded and reported to FMCSA by use of an internal special reporting form that troopers can use to track their activity during the operation.~~

### **Projected Goals for FY 2018**

*Using the radio buttons in the table below, indicate the traffic enforcement activities the State intends to conduct in FY 2018. The projected goals are based on the number of traffic stops, not tickets or warnings issued. These goals are NOT intended to set a quota.*

			Enter Projected Goals (Number of Stops only)
Yes	No	Traffic Enforcement Activities	FY 2018
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	CMV with Inspection	1400
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	CMV without Inspection	
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Non-CMV	80
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Comprehensive and high visibility in high risk locations and corridors (special enforcement details)	100

In order to be eligible to utilize Federal funding for Non-CMV traffic enforcement, the [FAST Act](#) requires that the State must maintain an average number of safety activities which include the number of roadside inspections, carrier investigations, and new entrant safety audits conducted in the State for Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005.

The table below displays the information you input into this plan from the roadside inspections, investigations, and new entrant safety audit sections. Your planned activities must at least equal the average of your 2004/2005 activities.

FY 2018 Planned Safety Activities				
Inspections	Investigations	New Entrant Safety Audits	Sum of FY 2018 Activities	Average 2004/05 Activities
29000	0	197	29197	25363

***Describe how the State will monitor its traffic enforcement efforts to ensure effectiveness, consistency, and correlation to FMCSA's national traffic enforcement priority.***

South Dakota MC troopers do not conduct traffic enforcement without an inspection. Motor carrier troopers are required to write a vehicle examination report on all traffic stops involving commercial motor vehicles. South Dakota Highway Patrol obviously makes numerous traffic stops on non-CMV's. Currently we have no method to track which non-CMV traffic stops occurred where a CMV was in the vicinity or involved.

## 6 - Safety Technology

The FAST Act made Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) a condition for MCSAP eligibility. ([49 CFR 350.201 \(aa\)](#)) States must achieve full participation (Step 6) by October 1, 2020. Under certain conditions, the FAST Act allows MCSAP lead agencies to use MCSAP funds for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs associated with Innovative Technology Deployment (ITD) and the PRISM ([49 CFR 350.201\(cc\)](#).)

For PRISM, O&M costs are eligible expenses subject to FMCSA approval. For ITD, if the State agrees to comply with ITD program requirements and has complied with all MCSAP requirements, including achievement of at least Step 6 in PRISM, O&M costs are eligible expenses.

These expenses must be included in the Spending Plan section per the method these costs are handled in the State's accounting system (e.g., contractual costs, other costs, etc.).

### Safety Technology Compliance Status

Please verify the current level of compliance for your State in the table below using the drop-down menu. If the State plans to include O&M costs in this year's CVSP, please indicate that in the table below. Additionally, details must be in this section and in your Spending Plan.

Technology Program	Current Compliance Level	Include O & M Costs?
ITD	Core CVISN Compliant	Yes
PRISM	Step 8	Yes

Available data sources:

- [FMCSA website ITD information](#)
- [FMCSA website PRISM information](#)

**Enter the agency name responsible for ITD in the State, if other than the Lead MCSAP Agency:** South Dakota Department of Transportation

**Enter the agency name responsible for PRISM in the State, if other than the Lead MCSAP Agency:** South Dakota Department of Revenue

### Narrative Overview for FY 2018

#### Problem Statement Narrative and Projected Goal:

**If the State's PRISM compliance is less than full participation, describe activities your State plans to implement to achieve full participation in PRISM.**

**Program Activities: Describe any actions that will be taken to implement full participation in PRISM.**

**Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures that will be used and include how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.**

## 7 - Public Education and Outreach

*A public education and outreach program is designed to provide information on a variety of traffic safety issues related to CMVs and non-CMV's that operate around large trucks and buses.*

### **Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016**

*In the table below, provide the number of public education and outreach activities conducted in the past 5 years.*

<b>Public Education and Outreach Activities</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
Carrier Safety Talks	0	2064	2284	1994	2027
CMV Safety Belt Education and Outreach	0	0	167	191	61
State Trucking Association Meetings	0	0	0	0	0
State-Sponsored Outreach Events	0	0	0	0	0
Local Educational Safety Events	0	0	0	0	0
Teen Safety Events	0	0	106	258	165

### **Narrative Overview for FY 2018**

**Performance Objective:** *To increase the safety awareness of the motoring public, motor carriers and drivers through public education and outreach activities such as safety talks, safety demonstrations, etc.*

**Describe the type of activities the State plans to conduct, including but not limited to passenger transportation, hazardous materials transportation, and share the road safely initiatives. Include the number of personnel that will be participating in this effort.**

In the 5 year table above SD MCS has not tracked our public safety education by these categories or by events. We track public safety education by hours, so in our proposed grant all of the number in the graphs will represent hours not events. Raising the awareness of non-commercial vehicle drivers in their interactions with commercial vehicles will be an important aspect of the public education program for SD MCS. Information on sharing the road will be presented to driver education classes by inspectors and through other venues such as safety booths at the South Dakota State Fair and numerous farm and home shows that are attended SD MCS inspectors. Our goal will be to provide 1,600 hours of public safety education forums. We will utilize our public safety education to help meet our goal through FY18 of reducing the current fatality involved crash rate even further in an attempt to assist in meeting FMCSA's national target of less than 0.114 fatalities per 100 million VMT. Safety restraint usage has been proven to save lives, reduce injury and be an important aspect of safely operating a CMV. We will continue to educate and emphasize the importance of wearing seat belts during safety presentations and roadside inspection activities. Our goal is to maintain a safety restraint usage rate at or above 90%. South Dakota realizes the need for educating carriers of hazardous materials in the proper transportation of their products. Conducting safety education presentations and special roadside checks will be two of the methods deployed to enhance hazardous materials safety. Our goal for FY2018 is to conduct 4 safety presentations and 4 inspection marathons for hazardous material transportation education. Enforcement personnel will educate the public whenever possible on the Electronic Logging Device regulations.

### **Projected Goals for FY 2018**

**In the table below, indicate if the State intends to conduct the listed program activities, and the estimated number, based on the descriptions in the narrative above.**



			Performance Goals
Yes	No	Activity Type	FY 2018
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Carrier Safety Talks	850
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	CMV Safety Belt Education and Outreach	150
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	State Trucking Association Meetings	100
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	State-Sponsored Outreach Events	100
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Local Educational Safety Events	250
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Teen Safety Events	150

**Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct monitoring of progress. States must report the quantity, duration and number of attendees in their quarterly SF-PPR reports.**

In the table above we have listed our goals in hours not events. All hazardous material safety education will be included in the Carrier Safety Talk category as there is no direct location for hazardous material education. SD MCS will attend special events such as farm/home shows, county fairs and the South Dakota State Fair. We will actively seek out motor carriers and other public groups to which we can provide information pertaining to the safe operation in and around CMV's. Additionally, we will continue to provide personnel to speak at formal commercial vehicle driving classes at local vocational/technical schools. SD MCS will strive to meet its goal of 1,600 safety education hours in FY18. In FY16 we performed in excess of 2027 hours of public presentations, well above our intended goal. Stressing the importance of commercial and non-commercial vehicle interactions and safety restraint use will be a priority at all appropriate safety education forums. SD MCS personnel will stress the importance of sharing the road between commercial and non-commercial motor vehicles. We will attempt to reduce the overall rate of accidents caused by both passenger and commercial drivers. South Dakota Accident Records and A&I data will be used to measure the success of effort. We will target both commercial and passenger vehicle drivers at all possible venues. This includes state and local fairs, farm and home shows, driver education programs and our participation in the South Dakota truck driving championships. Additionally, SD MCS officers are requested to present safety education programs for numerous industry partners to promote safe vehicle operations. Our plan to help determine and improve the compliance rate of safety restraint use will be to conduct 8 separate spot checks of CMV's throughout the plan year. Semi-annual checks will be conducted in four separate areas of the state by SD MCS personnel. We will also track data from South Dakota Accident Records to review the compliance rate of safety restraints use with crash-involved drivers. Informational brochures on the advantages of seat belt use will be provided to drivers during these campaigns when available. The education of hazardous material carriers will be a safety education priority for SD MCS. This will be accomplished through providing presentations to transporters of hazardous material products. We will also increase the knowledge base of SD MCS inspectors through training and utilizing hazardous materials software programs as an inspector tool and to ensure compliance with the regulations. Additionally, we will conduct inspection marathons specifically targeted towards hazardous materials operations. We will distribute our safety education and inspection marathon efforts across the four individual geographical areas of the state to ensure that adequate attention is given to the maximum number of carriers. Advanced scheduling of these events will provide for the optimum use of manpower. Special attention will be given to driver inspections to ensure that compliance with the hazardous materials regulations is affirmed. South Dakota will utilize hazardous materials software to verify the proper packaging and loading necessary for safe hazardous materials operations. Enforcement personnel will engage drivers at the time of inspection about the electronic logging device regulations and their operation. We will provide educational information to any company seeking assistance with the new regulations. We will provide information and resources to drivers and companies, as well as the public we can engage at home and farm show type settings.

## 8 - State Safety Data Quality (SSDQ)

The FAST Act allows MCSAP lead agencies to use MCSAP funds for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs associated with Safety Data Systems (SSDQ) if the State meets accuracy, completeness and timeliness measures regarding motor carrier safety data and participates in the national data correction system (DataQs).

### SSDQ Compliance Status

Please verify the current level of compliance for your State in the table below using the drop-down menu. If the State plans to include O&M costs in this year's CVSP, select Yes. These expenses must be included in the Spending Plan section per the method these costs are handled in the State's accounting system (e.g., contractual costs, other costs, etc.).

Technology Program	Current Compliance Level	Include O & M Costs?
SSDQ	Good	No

Available data sources:

- [FMCSA website SSDQ information](#)

In the table below, use the drop-down menus to indicate the State's current rating within each of the State Safety Data Quality categories, and the State's goal for FY 2018.

SSDQ Category	Current SSDQ Rating	Goal for FY 2018
Crash Record Completeness	Good	Good
Fatal Crash Completeness	Good	Good
Crash Timeliness	Good	Good
Crash Accuracy	Good	Good
Crash Consistency	No Flag	No Flag
Inspection Record Completeness	Good	Good
Inspection VIN Accuracy	Good	Good
Inspection Timeliness	Good	Good
Inspection Accuracy	Good	Good

**Enter the date of the A & I Online data snapshot used for the "Current SSDQ Rating" column.**

June 30, 2017

### Narrative Overview for FY 2018

**Problem Statement Narrative:** Describe any issues encountered for any SSDQ category not rated as "Good" in the Current SSDQ Rating category column above (i.e., problems encountered, obstacles overcome, lessons learned, etc.). If the State is "Good" in all categories, no further narrative or explanation is necessary.

**Program Activities for FY 2018 - 2020:** Describe any actions that will be taken to achieve a "Good" rating in any category not currently rated as "Good," including measurable milestones.

**Performance Measurements and Monitoring:** Describe all performance measures that will be used and include how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.

South Dakota will continue to monitor state data quality monthly to ensure it maintains "Good" rating in all categories. Data quality rating will be reported quarterly. If the rating were to drop lower than "Good" rating, measures will be immediately taken to correct the data if necessary and evaluate current procedures to identify any issues that may have caused the rating to go down.

## 9 - New Entrant Safety Audits

The FAST Act states that conducting interstate New Entrant safety audits is now a requirement to participate in the MCSAP ([49 CFR 350.201](#).) The Act allows a State to conduct intrastate New Entrant safety audits at the State's discretion. States that choose to conduct intrastate safety audits must not negatively impact their interstate new entrant program.

*Note: The FAST Act also says that a State or a third party may conduct New Entrant safety audits. If a State authorizes a third party to conduct safety audits on its behalf, the State must verify the quality of the work conducted and remains solely responsible for the management and oversight of the New Entrant activities.*

Yes	No	Question
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Does your State conduct Offsite safety audits in the New Entrant Web System (NEWS)? NEWS is the online system that carriers selected for an Offsite Safety Audit use to submit requested documents to FMCSA. Safety Auditors use this same system to review documents and communicate with the carrier about the Offsite Safety Audit.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Does your State conduct Group safety audits at non principal place of business locations?
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Does your State intend to conduct intrastate safety audits and claim the expenses for reimbursement, state match, and/or Maintenance of Effort on the MCSAP Grant?

### Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

In the table below, provide the number of New Entrant safety audits conducted in the past 5 years.

New Entrant Safety Audits	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Interstate	0	46	211	313	213
Intrastate	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Audits</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>213</b>

Note: Intrastate safety audits will not be reflected in any FMCSA data systems—totals must be derived from State data sources.

### Narrative Overview for FY 2018

Enter the agency name conducting New Entrant activities, if other than the Lead MCSAP Agency:

**Program Goal:** Reduce the number and severity of crashes, injuries, and fatalities involving commercial motor vehicles by reviewing interstate new entrant carriers. At the State's discretion, intrastate motor carriers are reviewed to ensure they have effective safety management programs.

**Program Objective:** Statutory time limits for processing and completing interstate safety audits are:

- If entry date into the New Entrant program (as shown in FMCSA data systems) September 30, 2013 or earlier—safety audit must be completed within 18 months.
- If entry date into the New Entrant program (as shown in FMCSA data systems) October 1, 2013 or later—safety audit must be completed within 12 months for all motor carriers and 120 days for motor carriers of passengers.

### Projected Goals for FY 2018

For the purpose of completing the table below:

- **Onsite safety audits** are conducted at the carrier's principal place of business.

- **Offsite safety audit** is a desktop review of a single New Entrant motor carrier's basic safety management controls and can be conducted from any location other than a motor carrier's place of business. Offsite audits are conducted by States that have completed the FMCSA New Entrant training for offsite audits.
- **Group audits** are neither an onsite nor offsite audit. Group audits are conducted on multiple carriers at an alternative location (i.e., hotel, border inspection station, State office, etc.).

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - New Entrant Safety Audits		
Number of Safety Audits/Non-Audit Resolutions	FY 2018	
	Interstate	Intrastate
# of Safety Audits (Onsite)	29	0
# of Safety Audits (Offsite)	168	0
# Group Audits	0	0
<b>TOTAL Safety Audits</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>0</b>
# of Non-Audit Resolutions	65	0

**Strategies:** Describe the strategies that will be utilized to meet the program objective above. Provide any challenges or impediments foreseen that may prevent successful completion of the objective.

The New Entrant Safety Assurance Program for the State of South Dakota will assist in accomplishing the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) goal of reducing the number and severity of crashes, injuries, and fatalities and meet the program objectives by reviewing new interstate motor carriers to ensure that they have effective safety management programs and completing 262 new entrant safety audits within the statutory time limit of 12 months from the date of entry into the New Entrant Program and 120 days for motor carriers of passengers.

South Dakota currently has an inventory of 231 carriers in the New Entrant pool with no past due carriers.

The SDHP Safety Assurance Program anticipates that approximately 25% of the new entrant carriers will require a non-audit resolution based on previous years data and monthly new entrant statistics obtained from Gotham and the state data base. We further anticipate that approximately 15% of the new entrant carriers will require an onsite safety audit with 85% of the carriers being offsite eligible. The SDHP Safety Assurance Program anticipates conducting 65 non-audit resolutions and 197 safety audits with 168 of those being offsite and 29 being onsite.

In addition, two safety auditors will each conduct a minimum of 32 vehicle inspections and at least 8 hazardous material carrier inspections to maintain certification requirements.

\*\* The Trend Analysis numbers for the SDHP Safety Assurance Program are only for safety audits that were conducted. The numbers do not include non-audit resolutions. The below numbers include non-audit resolutions for the 5 year period.

2012: 0 safety audits, 0 non-audit resolutions, Total 0. (SD began performing safety audits in late 2013.)

2013: 46 safety audits, 20 non-audit resolutions, Total 66.

2014: 211 safety audits, 125 non-audit resolutions, Total 336.

2015: 313 safety audits, 165 non-audit resolutions, Total 478.

2016: 213 safety audits, 79 non-audit resolutions, Total 292.

**Activity Plan:** Include a description of the activities proposed to help achieve the objectives. If group audits are planned, include an estimate of the number of group audits.

The SDHP Safety Assurance Program will use 2 full time safety auditors to conduct approximately 197 new entrant safety audits (75%) and 65 non-audit resolutions (25%) on 262 new entrant interstate motor carriers. Priority will be given to carriers of passengers to insure safety audits are conducted within 120 days. Approximately 85% of the safety audits will be conducted offsite reducing travel time and cost. Approximately 15% of the safety audits will be conducted onsite at the carrier's principal place of business.

The SDHP Safety Assurance program does not anticipate the need to conduct group audits in FY2018 but would be

prepared to do so if there were a sudden influx of onsite carriers. Regionalized scheduling of onsite safety audits will be done to streamline the safety audit process and reduce travel time of the auditors allowing for more onsite safety audits to be performed in a shorter time period.

To maximize the efficiency of the program, offsite eligible carriers will be contacted as soon as possible after the required documents are uploaded to the NEWS website. Auditors will adhere to the New Entrant Safety Audit Process Document for procedure and timeline when conducting offsite safety audits.

The State has a large number of carriers that operate intermittently in interstate commerce in addition to numerous farm and ranch operations. The carriers are often unfamiliar with FMCSR's and the requirements of a new entrant motor carrier. These carriers will be provided pre-safety audit educational information on pre-identified problem areas such as drug and alcohol testing requirements, hours of service rules, and vehicle maintenance to increase their knowledge of the FMCSR's and requirements of the New Entrant program. Assistance with uploading documents will be provided as needed.

***Performance Measurement Plan: Describe how you will measure progress toward meeting the objective, such as quantifiable and measurable outputs (staffing, work hours, carrier contacts, inspections, etc.). The measure must include specific benchmarks to be reported on in the quarterly progress report, or as annual outputs.***

The Supervising Lieutenant will review all safety audits for quality, completeness, and accuracy and will monitor activity throughout the month to guide the program to the established goal. The Supervising Lieutenant will review additions to the New Entrant pool and assign passenger carrier audits for scheduling as soon as practical. The Supervising Lieutenant will monitor progress toward the 262 safety audit goal quarterly to ensure we are meeting or exceeding the goal. Scheduling and assignments will be given and monitored to ensure the most efficient use of time and travel.

The Supervising Lieutenant will review the new entrant inventory on a monthly basis and make assignments based on due date. Priority will be given to any past due safety audits and motor carriers of passengers and hazardous materials. The safety audit process to include scheduling and group audits if necessary will be reviewed to monitor the efficiency of the program. Scheduling and assignments will be reviewed and adjusted to maximize audit completion for onsite audits when travel is required to ensure program efficiency.

The Supervising Lieutenant will review quarterly reports and departmental databases to monitor the quantity and types of educational information provided and insure that the information provided is timely and up to date. New Entrant safety audit failure rates will be monitored and compared to past rates as well as comparative rates with other states New Entrant Programs. Feedback will be sought from New Entrant carriers to gather information regarding the pre-audit information to see if it was helpful, educational, and assisted them in the New Entrant Audit process.

### Part 3 - National Emphasis Areas and State Specific Objectives

*FMCSA establishes annual national priorities (emphasis areas) based on emerging or continuing issues, and will evaluate CVSPs in consideration of these national priorities. Part 3 allows States to address the national emphasis areas/priorities outlined in the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) and any State-specific objectives as necessary.*

#### 1 - Enforcement of Federal OOS Orders during Roadside Activities

##### Instructions:

*FMCSA has established an Out-of-Service (OOS) catch rate of 85 percent for carriers operating while under an OOS order. In this part, States will indicate their catch rate is at least 85 percent by using the check box or completing the problem statement portion below.*

##### Check this box if:

☐ **As evidenced by the data provided by FMCSA, the State identifies at least 85 percent of carriers operating under a Federal OOS order during roadside enforcement activities and will not establish a specific reduction goal. However, the State will maintain effective enforcement of Federal OOS orders during roadside inspections and traffic enforcement activities.**

##### Narrative Overview for FY 2018

**Enter your State's OOS Catch Rate percentage if below 85 percent:** 0%

##### **Project Goals for FY 2018: Enter a description of the State's performance goals.**

As of 08-01-17, according to provided FMCSA data, South Dakota has not inspected a carrier that had been placed OOS. As a result we are at 0% catch rate. We have not failed to identify an OOS carrier during an inspection, we simply have not inspected a carrier that was OOS.

South Dakota will continue to implement strategies and practices to meet and exceed the minimum goal of 85% of out of service carriers identified during roadside inspections. We monitor reports provided by FMCSA and will investigate any occurrence where an employee fails to identify an OOS carrier that has been placed OOS for any reason. Steps will be taken to resolve and prevent any further occurrences until the 85% goal is met or exceeded.

##### **Program Activities: Describe policies, procedures, and/or technology that will be utilized to identify OOS carriers at roadside. Include how you will conduct quality assurance oversight to ensure that inspectors are effectively identifying OOS carriers and preventing them from operating.**

To achieve at least the minimum of 85% of out of service carriers identified during the roadside inspection, South Dakota will:

1. South Dakota Highway Patrol has a formal written directive which is considered policy upon issuance and was issued in FY2013. Internal discipline can and will be done when an employee fails to make every effort to check a carrier's status. Failure to perform the check by the inspector will result in individual education, and up to and including formal discipline being issued to the employee.
2. With the updates by FMCSA, some technical issues seem to have been resolved. Each inspector has access to the portal and Query Central. Any technical issues will be resolved by VOLPE or the state's computer technicians. All South Dakota Highway Patrol Personnel has been upgraded to the latest version of ASPEN that will identify OOS carriers when connected to the internet.
3. Training and education has been performed to instruct roadside inspectors on the use of Query Central and the other systems such as SaferSys.org and ISS. If technical or connectivity issues prevent the use of Query Central, inspectors may have to rely on the other avenues of identifying the carrier's status, such as CDLIS, SaferSys.org, or ISS must be used, the inspectors have been trained in the terminology of the separate systems and how to investigate further if the status is still questionable. We will take the approach that unknown or unverified status is not acceptable.
4. Due to inspectors not being able to find OOS carriers that have no DOT number roadside by a name search in ASPEN, Query Central, or Safer, in July of 2016 all inspectors have been given portal access to MCMIS Generic View. Staff has been instructed to seek

company information and carrier status through MCMIS anytime a vehicle or driver is inspected when they have no DOT number or the carrier status can not be determined in ASPEN. If a carrier is found to be OOS under MCMIS Generic View, the company information can then be transferred to ASPEN to properly document the OOS status and take appropriate enforcement actions.

***Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.***

South Dakota will monitor reports received from FMCSA to monitor the success of these strategies. Any failure to identify an OOS carrier will be investigated and strategies implemented to prevent future occurrences, until the 85% catch rate is achieved. Results of the catch rate and report on any missed carriers will be reported quarterly through SF-PPR reporting.

**2 - Passenger Carrier Enforcement****Instructions:**

*FMCSA requests that States conduct enhanced investigations for motor carriers of passengers and other high risk carriers. Additionally, States are asked to allocate resources to participate in the enhanced investigations training being offered by FMCSA. Finally, States are asked to continue partnering with FMCSA in conducting enhanced investigations and inspections at carrier locations.*

**Check this box if:**

☒ As evidenced by the trend analysis data, the State has not identified a significant passenger transportation safety problem. Therefore, the State will not establish a specific passenger transportation goal in the current fiscal year. However, the State will continue to enforce the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs) pertaining to passenger transportation by CMVs in a manner consistent with the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#) as described either below or in the roadside inspection section.



### 3 - State Specific Objectives – Past

#### Instructions:

*Describe any State-specific CMV problems that were addressed with FY2017 MCSAP funding. Some examples may include hazardous materials objectives, Electronic Logging Device (ELD) implementation, and crash reduction for a specific segment of industry, etc. Report below on year-to-date progress on each State-specific objective identified in the FY 2017 CVSP.*

#### **Progress Report on State Specific Objectives(s) from the FY 2017 CVSP**

*Please enter information to describe the year-to-date progress on any State-specific objective(s) identified in the State's FY 2017 CVSP. Click on "Add New Activity" to enter progress information on each State-specific objective.*

#### Activity #1

##### **Activity: Describe State-specific activity conducted from previous year's CVSP.**

CMV Drug Interdiction

##### **Goal: Insert goal from previous year CVSP (#, %, etc., as appropriate).**

Our goal for FY2017 was to focus on the output measure of number of inspections. In FY15 we increased our goal to 750 total level two and three inspection conducted per year by our police service dog teams. Our FY17 goal was to maintain that level of activity.

##### **Actual: Insert year to date progress (#, %, etc., as appropriate).**

Through the first 3 quarters of FY17, Police Service Dog teams have conducted 690 L-2 and L-3 inspections. These inspections have resulted in 5 drug related violations, 2 alcohol related violations, and 2 CMVs seized through civil asset forfeitures. The arrests and seizure of the 2 CMVs were shared with FMCSA staff and a federal investigation began on the company.

##### **Narrative: Describe any difficulties achieving the goal, problems encountered, obstacles overcome, lessons learned, etc.**

We are on pace to meet the goal of 750 CMV inspections completed by the police service dog teams. We will do more education for the police service dog teams that assists in the interdiction aspect and provides cues and indicators useful to the investigator. We have found that setting a high goal for the L-1 certified police service dog teams may not be the most useful goal. These individuals often concentrate efforts on simply completing inspections, rather than criminal interdiction.

#### Activity #2

##### **Activity: Describe State-specific activity conducted from previous year's CVSP.**

Oilfield Operations.

##### **Goal: Insert goal from previous year CVSP (#, %, etc., as appropriate).**

South Dakota's goal for Oilfield Operations was to operate a minimum of three special enforcement marathons targeted at areas where oilfield traffic has increased in the state. These efforts were to assist us to meet our FY2017 goal to reduce the current fatal involved crash rate to less than 0.20 fatalities per 100 million VMT.

##### **Actual: Insert year to date progress (#, %, etc., as appropriate).**

Through the 3 quarters to date of FY17, we have completed 2 Oilfield Marathons. These marathons have resulted in 84 trucks inspected, 13 OOS violation on the vehicle, 7 drivers placed OOS.

##### **Narrative: Describe any difficulties achieving the goal, problems encountered, obstacles overcome, lessons learned, etc.**

The Northwest part of South Dakota has remained steady through the 3 quarters of FY17. The oil prices remain low so oil field traffic has slowed over past years. Commercial vehicles supporting oilfield operations inspected in South Dakota are at or near the national average for vehicle OOS violations and driver OOS violations. Market fluctuation

in oil prices will dictate the level of CMV traffic. As the price of oil rises, CMV traffic from exploration and well drilling increases exponentially. If the oil prices would increase we will adjust our operations for the increased oil field traffic.

### Activity #3

**Activity: Describe State-specific activity conducted from previous year's CVSP.**

Electronic Logging Devices and Education

**Goal: Insert goal from previous year CVSP (#, %, etc., as appropriate).**

All enforcement personnel for the South Dakota Highway Patrol will receive Phase 1 on-line training made available by the National Training Center. Enforcement Personnel will utilize this training to educate carriers and operator on ELD usage and requirements.

**Actual: Insert year to date progress (#, %, etc., as appropriate).**

All South Dakota Motor Carrier had 2 hours of ELD training at our spring statewide meeting. ELD training was given during our zone meetings for 1 hour. Total hours for ELD training is 3 hours per inspector/trooper through the first 3 quarters of FY17. Training for enforcement personnel outside of the motor carrier division is scheduled for this fall.

**Narrative: Describe any difficulties achieving the goal, problems encountered, obstacles overcome, lessons learned, etc.**

Currently our motor carrier personnel are trained for the ELD change in December 2017. The Phase 1 on-line training was cancelled by the National Training Center. If it is re-scheduled, our personnel will complete the training when offered.

#### 4 - State Specific Objectives – Future

##### Instructions:

*The State may include additional objectives from the national priorities or emphasis areas identified in the NOFO as applicable. In addition, the State may include any State-specific CMV problems identified in the State that will be addressed with MCSAP funding. Some examples may include hazardous materials objectives, Electronic Logging Device (ELD) implementation, and crash reduction for a specific segment of industry, etc.*

*Describe any State-specific objective(s) identified for FY 2018. Click on "Add New Activity" to enter information on each State-specific objective. This is an optional section and only required if a State has identified a specific State problem planned to be addressed with grant funding.*

##### State Objective #1

##### **Enter the title of your State-Identified Objective.**

CMV Drug Interdiction- Police Service Dog Unit

##### **Narrative Overview for FY 2018**

##### **Problem Statement Narrative: Describe problem identified by performance data including baseline data.**

Intelligence reports from numerous groups (e.g., EPIC, MOCIC) have indicated that criminal transportation of controlled substances has migrated into the northern corridors. South Dakota carries two major arteries of the national defense interstate highway system, which have become alternate routes for illegal drug trafficking. Interstates 29 and 90 carry traffic on known drug routes from Canada to Omaha, and from the West Coast into the Minneapolis and Chicago areas. Our efforts to reduce drug and alcohol violations focus primarily on CMV inspections and the detection of drug and alcohol violations.

##### **Projected Goals for FY 2018:**

##### **Enter performance goal.**

Our goal for FY2018 will focus on the output measure of number of inspections and an increase in discovery of CMV drug and alcohol violations. In FY2018 our goal is to perform 450 total level two and three inspections conducted per year, and achieve a 15% increase in drug and alcohol violations discovered in CY16.

##### **Program Activities: Describe the activities that will be implemented including level of effort.**

South Dakota police service dogs will perform MCSAP eligible inspections and dog deployments. Interdiction of commercial motor vehicles and detection of impaired CMV drivers are a priority of all the police service dog team (PSD) troopers. South Dakota has two PSD troopers who are trained for NAS Level 1 inspections and focus a portion of their time on CMV activities to include drug interdiction and the apprehension of alcohol/drug impaired drivers. The 11 remaining canine officers are responsible for CMV drug interdiction and are required to complete 32 Vehicle Exam Reports (VERs). South Dakota Highway Patrol has also added 4 Troopers who are supervised by and work daily with the police service dog unit. These troopers do not have a police service dog with them but their job description involves the criminal interdiction of methamphetamine and other drugs. Their efforts will naturally involve CMV criminal interdiction. Having these troopers working with the police service dog unit, as well as other state and local agencies in a concerted effort to combat drug transportation, sharing of intelligence information, and coordinated investigations for the source to point of consumption will likely have long lasting effects to the illegal drug trade. Since illegal drugs are transported by, and used by some CMV operators, we believe we can affect this segment of the population as well. The police service dog unit also has 3 Drug Recognition Experts (DRE), and increase from 2 in FY17. The DREs are specially trained in detecting persons who are under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Their specialized training assists in the identification, arrest, and prosecution of drivers operating under the influence. An additional training session in CMV regulations will be conducted for the

police service dog unit. This will better educate staff on cues and indicators that can assist an investigator in their interdiction efforts.

***Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.***

South Dakota will continue to record and monitor the number of level two and three inspections completed by police service dog teams as well as the 11 other canine officers, and 4 interdiction troopers. We are establishing an additional goal of an increase in detected drug and alcohol violations. The police service dog unit will receive an additional training session on CMV regulations.

**State Objective #2**

***Enter the title of your State-Identified Objective.***

Reservation Enforcement

***Narrative Overview for FY 2018***

***Problem Statement Narrative: Describe problem identified by performance data including baseline data.***

One of the South Dakota Highway Patrol's core values and priorities is working in partnership with other law enforcement agencies within the state. We have invested time and effort in joint operations, assistance, and support for other state, city, and county agencies. We frequently respond to other jurisdictions to address CMV issues. For example, beyond normal enforcement activities, we conduct intra-city enforcement activities to address CMV concerns within several cities in SD. Native American Indian reservations within South Dakota do not traditionally have motor carrier enforcement programs. Due to jurisdictional issues, South Dakota Highway Patrol Motor Carrier enforcement has only had limited activities within tribal reservation boundaries. The state has received complaints about interstate truck traffic on various tribal reservations. There has been media coverage regarding interstate CMV traffic across SD reservations. Several US and State highways cross reservations in SD. There are 9 tribal reservations within South Dakota. Crashes on reservations are accounted for in crash and fatal traffic crash statistics, but we have had limited opportunity to address driver and traffic issues within the reservation boundaries.

***Projected Goals for FY 2018:***

***Enter performance goal.***

South Dakota Highway Patrol will contact all 9 tribal jurisdictions to offer assistance in CMV enforcement in education or joint enforcement ventures. If an opportunity is available, we will conduct education and enforcement operations in conjunction with tribal authorities.

***Program Activities: Describe the activities that will be implemented including level of effort.***

South Dakota Highway Patrol will contact all 9 tribal jurisdictions within the state to offer education and/or enforcement operations that address CMV traffic. We will offer classroom and practical education to tribal enforcement authorities regarding CMV enforcement. If available, we will conduct enforcement operations with tribal authorities on the reservation.

***Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.***

We will make contact with 9 tribal enforcement authorities and report the status of any opportunities. If available, we will perform enforcement activities on the reservation and report relevant enforcement statistics from those operations.

**State Objective #3**

***Enter the title of your State-Identified Objective.***

## Oilfield Operations

**Narrative Overview for FY 2018****Problem Statement Narrative: Describe problem identified by performance data including baseline data.**

South Dakota does not have active oilfield operations to speak of, but traffic on some routes through South Dakota has fluctuated due to the oilfield operations in North Dakota. CMV traffic on US85 from MM 50 to MM 162, the main route to North Dakota oilfields through South Dakota, has remained stable in the past 4 years. South Dakota has taken a proactive approach to address any of the traffic problems associated with the industry. In the past, Motor Carrier Services has added manpower to the area. We have stationed one of the motor carrier troopers in the area as well as a mobile team of two inspectors. These three individuals try to specifically work associated commercial vehicle traffic on the routes and areas that we have seen the increased traffic. The Highway Patrol has re-allocated manpower and stationed an entire squad on the main corridors to work general traffic and commercial vehicle traffic along these routes. The motor carrier section performs special focused enforcement on the routes as well as day to day enforcement. While the traffic volumes and crash rate has remained stable, both can fluctuate quickly depending on industry activity and commodity prices.

**Projected Goals for FY 2018:****Enter performance goal.**

In FY18, South Dakota will operate a minimum of three special enforcement marathons targeted at areas where oilfield traffic has increased in the state. These efforts will help us to meet our FY18 goal to reduce the current fatality involved crash rate to less than 0.20 fatalities per 100 million VMT.

**Program Activities: Describe the activities that will be implemented including level of effort.**

South Dakota will continue to operate special enforcement details as well as day to day operations that focus on traffic related to oilfield activities. We will operate a minimum of three special enforcement marathons in FY2018, as well as day to day operations that focus on commercial vehicle traffic associated with oilfield operations.

**Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.**

Outside of the 3 special enforcement marathons and the day to day enforcement along the heavily traveled routes, SD will monitor the crash and traffic rates on these travel corridors. We will analyze the out of service rates of the commercial traffic to best focus on the problematic areas discovered, whether it be driver or vehicle related violations. We can then tailor enforcement tactics to address the most frequent and dangerous out of service conditions.

## Part 4 - Financial Information

### 1 - Overview

The spending plan is a narrative explanation of each budget component, and should support the cost estimates for the proposed work. The plan should focus on how each item will achieve the proposed project goals and objectives, and justify how costs are calculated. The spending plan should be clear, specific, detailed, and mathematically correct. Sources for assistance in developing the Spending Plan include [2 CFR part 200](#), [49 CFR part 350](#) and the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#).

Before any cost is billed to or recovered from a Federal award, it must be allowable ([2 CFR §200.403](#), [2 CFR §200 Subpart E – Cost Principles](#)), reasonable ([2 CFR §200.404](#)), and allocable ([2 CFR §200.405](#)).

- **Allowable** costs are permissible under the OMB Uniform Guidance, DOT and FMCSA directives, MCSAP policy, and all other relevant legal and regulatory authority.
- **Reasonable** costs are those which a prudent person would deem to be judicious under the circumstances.
- **Allocable** costs are those that are charged to a funding source (e.g., a Federal award) based upon the benefit received by the funding source. Benefit received must be tangible and measurable.
  - Example: A Federal project that uses 5,000 square feet of a rented 20,000 square foot facility may charge 25 percent of the total rental cost.

#### Instructions:

The spending plan data forms are displayed by budget category. You may add additional lines to each table, as necessary. Please include clear, concise explanations in the narrative boxes regarding the reason for each cost, how costs are calculated, why they are necessary, and specific information on how prorated costs were determined.

The following definitions describe Spending Plan terminology.

- **Federal Share** means the portion of the total project costs paid by Federal funds. Federal share cannot exceed 85 percent of the total project costs for this FMCSA grant program.
- **State Share** means the portion of the total project costs paid by State funds. State share must be at least 15 percent of the total project costs for this FMCSA grant program. A State is only required to contribute 15 percent of the total project costs of all budget categories combined as State share. A State is NOT required to include a 15 percent State share for each line item in a budget category. The State has the flexibility to select the budget categories and line items where State match will be shown.
- **Total Project Costs** means total allowable costs incurred under a Federal award and all required cost sharing (sum of the Federal share plus State share), including third party contributions.
- **Maintenance of Effort** expenditures will be entered in a separate line below each budget category table for FY 2018. MOE expenditures will not, and should not, be included in the calculation of Total Project Costs, Federal share, or State share line items.

#### New for FY 2018

- Incorporation of New Entrant and Border Enforcement into MCSAP

The FAST Act consolidated new entrant and border enforcement under the MCSAP grant. For FY 2018, costs for New Entrant safety audits and border enforcement activities will no longer be captured in separate spending plans. States may opt to identify new entrant and border enforcement costs separately in the budget tables, but are not required to do so.

- Calculation of Federal and State Shares

Total Project Costs are determined for each line based upon user-entered data and a specific budget category formula. Federal and State shares are then calculated by the system based upon the Total Project Costs and are added to each line item.

The system calculates an 85 percent Federal share and 15 percent State share automatically for States and populates these values in each line. Federal share is the product of Total Project Costs X .85. State share equals Total Project Costs minus Federal share. If Total Project Costs are updated based upon user edits to the input values, the 85 and 15 percent values will not be recalculated by the system.

*States may change or delete the system-calculated Federal and State share values at any time to reflect actual allocation for any line item. For example, States may allocate 75 percent of an item to Federal share, and 25 percent of the item to State share. States must ensure that the sum of the Federal and State shares equals the Total Project Costs for each line before proceeding to the next budget category.*

*An error is shown on line items where Total Project Costs does not equal the sum of the Federal and State shares. Errors must be resolved before the system will allow users to 'save' or 'add' new line items.*

*Territories must insure that Total Project Costs equal Federal share for each line in order to proceed.*

- **Expansion of On Screen Messages**

*The system performs a number of edit checks on Spending Plan data inputs to ensure calculations are correct, and values are as expected. When anomalies are detected, alerts will be displayed on screen.*

*The system will confirm that:*

- *Federal share plus State share equals Total Project Costs on each line item*
- *Accounting Method is selected in Personnel, Part 4.2*
- *Overtime value does not exceed the FMCSA limit*
- *Planned MOE Costs equal or exceed FMCSA limit*
- *Proposed Federal and State share totals are each within \$5 of FMCSA's Federal and State share estimated amounts*
- *Territory's proposed Total Project Costs are within \$5 of \$350,000*

*For States completing a multi-year CVSP, the financial information should be provided for FY 2018 only.*

ESTIMATED Fiscal Year Funding Amounts for MCSAP			
	85% Federal Share	15% State Share	Total Estimated Funding
Total	\$2,282,755.00	\$402,840.00	\$2,685,595.00

Summary of MCSAP Funding Limitations	
Allowable amount for Overtime without written justification (15% of MCSAP award amount ):	\$402,840.00
MOE Baseline:	\$345,623.00

**2 - Personnel**

Personnel costs are salaries for employees working directly on a project.

List grant-funded staff who will complete the tasks discussed in the narrative descriptive sections of the eCVSP.

**Note:** Do not include any personally identifiable information in the eCVSP.

Positions may be listed by title or function. It is not necessary to list all individual personnel separately by line. The State may use average or actual salary and wages by personnel category (e.g., Trooper, Civilian Inspector, Admin Support, etc.). Additional lines may be added as necessary to capture all of your personnel costs.

The percent of each person's time must be allocated to this project based on the amount of time/effort applied to the project. For budgeting purposes, historical data is an acceptable basis.

**Note:** Reimbursement requests must be based upon documented time and effort reports. For example, a MCSAP officer spent approximately 35 percent of his time on approved grant activities. Consequently, it is reasonable to budget 35 percent of the officer's salary to this project. For more information on this item see [2 CFR §200.430](#).

In the annual salary column, enter the annual salary for each position.

Total Project Costs are calculated by multiplying # of Staff X % of Time X Annual Salary for both Personnel and Overtime (OT).

If OT will be charged to the grant, only OT amounts for the Lead MCSAP Agency should be included in the table below. If the OT amount requested is greater than the 15 percent limitation in the MCSAP Comprehensive Policy, then justification must be provided in the CVSP for review and approval by FMCSA headquarters.

Activities conducted on OT by subrecipients under subawards from the Lead MCSAP Agency must comply with the 15 percent limitation as provided in the MCP. Any deviation from the 15 percent limitation must be approved by the Lead MCSAP Agency for the subrecipients.

Summary of MCSAP Funding Limitations	
Allowable amount for Lead MCSAP Agency Overtime without written justification (15% of MCSAP award amount):	\$402,840.00

Personnel: Salary and Overtime Project Costs						
Salary Project Costs						
Position(s)	# of Staff	% of Time	Annual Salary	Total Project Costs	Federal Share	State Share
New Entrant Auditors	2	100.0000	\$44,516.00	\$89,032.00	\$89,032.00	\$0.00
MC Trooper	14	100.0000	\$28,571.43	\$400,000.02	\$400,000.02	\$0.00
MC Inspector	43	60.0000	\$20,696.27	\$533,963.76	\$239,443.11	\$294,520.65
<b>Subtotal: Salary</b>				<b>\$1,022,995.78</b>	<b>\$728,475.13</b>	<b>\$294,520.65</b>
Overtime Project Costs						
MC Inspector OT	1	72.0000	\$58,860.72	\$42,379.71	\$42,379.71	\$0.00
MC Trooper OT	1	48.0000	\$85,879.44	\$41,222.13	\$41,222.13	\$0.00
New Entrant OT	2	2.0000	\$66,774.24	\$2,670.96	\$2,670.96	\$0.00
<b>Subtotal: Overtime</b>				<b>\$86,272.80</b>	<b>\$86,272.80</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>TOTAL: Personnel</b>				<b>\$1,109,268.58</b>	<b>\$814,747.93</b>	<b>\$294,520.65</b>
<b>Accounting Method:</b>	<b>Accrual</b>					
<b>Planned MOE: Personnel</b>	<b>\$1,046,842.71</b>					



**Enter detailed explanation of how you came up with the personnel costs.**

Sixty two employees are assigned to the motor carrier section when fully staffed. All work on MCSAP eligible activities. There are 14 Motor Carrier Troopers dedicated to the MCSAP program, 4 of which are sergeants and 10 Troopers. These troopers are assigned to focus 100% of their time on MCSAP eligible activities, unless a law enforcement response requires them, e.g. blizzard response, life threatening crash responses, and crime in progress calls. When these other law enforcement duties are conducted, non-MCSAP time sheet codes are used and no reimbursement is sought for those activities.

There are 43 civilian (non-sworn) inspectors. Time record estimations indicate the motor carrier inspectors spend 60% of their time on MCSAP eligible activities. The Command Staff for the motor carrier division consists of one Captain and 2 Lieutenants. Time records indicate they spend 30% of their time on MCSAP eligible activities. The average pay rate for MC Troopers is \$27.42 per hour. The average pay rate for MC Inspectors is \$18.79 per hour. The average pay rate for Command Staff is \$38.57 per hour. Wage calculations are the calculated average of members in the respective groups based on payroll records. Reimbursement will only be sought on actual time records, not estimations.

There are 110 trooper from outside of Motor Carrier Services but within the South Dakota Highway Patrol that perform Level 3 inspections. All 110 are required to perform 32 inspections per year. We are estimating their cost by multiplying 110 troopers by 32 inspection, multiplied by an average of 20 minutes for a L-3 inspection, by the average trooper salary of \$24.89 per hour. (110 troopers X 32 inspections X 20 minutes= 70,400 minutes/60= 1173 hours X \$24.89= \$29,196.). Due to the very small percentage of time per individual trooper dedicated in this category for MCSAP eligible activities, calculations were made with the average time per inspection and shown as 1 FTE dedicated to 56% of their time of a 2088 hour work year to MCSAP activities.

Police Service Dog Teams (K-9's) are put into two different categories for calculations. To optimize the skill and abilities of the differently trained teams we group the K-9's into L-1 certified teams and L-3 certified teams. There are 11 L-3 certified teams and 2 L-1 certified teams when fully staffed. The L-3 handlers are each required to perform 32 L-3 inspections and dog deployments as the situation dictates on commercial motor vehicles. A dog deployment is when the handler uses his police service dog to perform an exterior sniff of a commercial motor vehicle in search of contraband. We are estimating the 11 handlers will spend an average of 20 minutes on each of the 32 required inspections. This equates to 117.33 hours. We then add 20 dog deployments that these 11 handlers will do for an average of 10 minutes per deployment. This equates to 2,200 minutes or 36.66 hours for a total of 154 hours dedicated to MCSAP eligible activities for the L-3 certified police service dog teams. We then multiply the average wage of \$28.41 per hour for a total cost of \$4375. Due to the small percentage to time per individual K-9 team dedicated in this category, calculation were made with the average time per inspection and dog deployment and shown as 1 FTE dedicated to 8% of their time to MCSAP eligible activities. Due to having to round to a whole number, the cost is shown as \$4745.60. Reimbursement will only be sought for actual time worked on MCSAP eligible activities, not on budgeted amounts.

We are estimating the 2 L-1 certified K-9 teams will spend 53% of their time on MCSAP eligible activities based on timekeeping records. Costs are estimated at 2 handlers spending 53% of their 2088 hours in the year multiplied by the average wage of these two handlers of \$27.43 per hour. This totals \$60,170.

Two full time FTE's will perform required New Entrant safety audits equating to a combined total of 4176 hours (2 auditors X 2088 hours = 4176 hours) in FY2018. At a rate of 21.32 per hour, the auditor FTE's equal the budgeted amount of \$89,032.00.

Overtime for Level 1 and L-3 Hours of Service inspections is budgeted for 2500 hours. 1500 hours will be completed by motor carrier inspectors and 1000 hours will be completed by motor carrier troopers and highway patrol troopers. An average rate for MC Inspectors of \$18.79/hour at an overtime rate of 1.5 equates to \$28.19. 1500 hours at \$28.19 is a total of \$42,285. An average rate for MC Troopers is \$27.42/hour at an overtime rate of 1.5 equates to \$41.13 and is a total of \$41,130. All overtime totals \$83,415. To show in the above table, for MC Inspector OT, we show 1 FTE working 72% of their time at a salary of \$58860.72. (salary is \$28.19 X 2088 hours, % is 1500 hours/2088 hours in a work year). For MC Trooper OT we show 1 FTE working 48% of their time at a salary of \$85,879.44. (salary is \$41.13 X 2088 hours, % is 1000 hours/2088 hours in work year. This totals \$83,601.84. Reimbursement will only be sought for actual time worked on MCSAP OT eligible activities, not on budgeted amounts.

Auditors assigned to perform New Entrant safety audits will occasionally accrue overtime due to travel and other instances where time beyond the 40 hour work period cannot be adjusted. Overtime for safety auditor personnel is calculated at 2 hours per pay period. There are 24 pay periods in a year, so 2 auditors at 2 hours per 24 pay periods calculates to 96 hours per year. (2 FTE X 2 hrs X 24 periods= 96 hours)/ At an overtime rate of \$31.98 per hour, this equates to \$3070.08. In order to show in the above table, we show 2 auditors working 2% of their time at an annual salary of \$66,774.24 (\$31.98 X 2088 hours). This equates to \$2,670.96. Reimbursement will only be south for actual time worked, not on budgeted amounts.

Since we attribute personnel costs to the federal share, state share, MOE, or a combination of all three, to make full account of the program and costs, we have inserted the below chart. The above table only shows costs that have only a state of federal share with no MOE associated. Costs that have a state or federal share, and MOE costs have been changed to make the above table work, though do not accurately reflect the total cost associated.

Position(s)	# of staff	% of Time	Annual salary	Total project Costs	Federal Share	State Share	MOE
HP Trooper	1	56%	\$51,970.00	\$29,103.20			\$29,103.20
MC Inspector	43	60%	\$39,233.52	\$1,012,224.82	\$239,443.11	\$294,520.65	\$478,261.06
MC Trooper	14	100%	\$57,253.00	\$801,542.00	\$400,000.02	\$0.00	\$401,541.98
MC Command Staff	3	30%	\$80,534.00	\$72,480.60	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$72,480.60
L-3 K9	1	8%	\$59,320.00	\$4,745.60	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,745.60
New Entrant Auditor	2	100%	\$44,516.00	\$89,032.00	\$89,032.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
L-1 K9	2	53%	\$57,273.84	\$60,710.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$60,710.27

Totals				\$2,069,838.49	\$728,475.13	\$294,520.65	\$1,046,842.71
MC Inspector OT	1	72%	\$58,860.72	\$42,379.72	\$42,379.71	\$0.00	\$0.01
MC Trooper OT	1	48%	\$85,879.44	\$41,222.13	\$41,222.13	\$0.00	\$0.00
New Entrant OT	2	2%	\$66,774.24	\$2,670.97	\$2,670.96	\$0.00	\$0.01
Totals				\$86,272.82	\$86,272.80	\$0.00	\$0.02
				\$2,156,111.31	\$814,747.93		\$1,046,842.73

### 3 - Fringe Benefits

Show the fringe benefit costs associated with the staff listed in the Personnel section. Fringe costs may be estimates, or based on a fringe benefit rate approved by the applicant's Federal cognizant agency for indirect costs. If using an approved rate, a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement must be provided. For more information on this item see [2 CFR §200.431](#).

Fringe costs are benefits paid to employees, including the cost of employer's share of FICA, health insurance, worker's compensation, and paid leave. Only non-Federal grantees that have an accrual basis of accounting may have a separate line item for leave, and is entered as the projected leave expected to be accrued by the personnel listed within Part 4.2 – Personnel. Reference [2 CFR §200.431\(b\)](#).

Include how the fringe benefit amount is calculated (i.e., actual fringe benefits, rate approved by HHS Statewide Cost Allocation or cognizant agency). Include a description of the specific benefits that are charged to a project and the benefit percentage or total benefit cost.

The cost of fringe benefits are allowable if:

- Costs are provided under established written policies
- Costs are equitably allocated to all related activities, including Federal awards
- Accounting basis (cash or accrual) selected for costing each type of leave is consistently followed by the non-Federal entity or specified grouping of employees

Depending on the State, there are set employer taxes that are paid as a percentage of the salary, such as Social Security, Medicare, State Unemployment Tax, etc.

- For each of these standard employer taxes, under Position you may list "All Positions," the benefits would be the respective standard employer taxes, followed by the respective rate with a base being the total salaries for Personnel in Part 4.2.
- The base multiplied by the respective rate would give the total for each standard employer tax. Workers' Compensation is rated by risk area. It is permissible to enter this as an average, usually between sworn and unsworn—any grouping that is reasonable and clearly explained in the narrative is allowable.
- Health Insurance and Pensions can vary greatly and can be averaged and like Workers' Compensation, can sometimes to be broken into sworn and unsworn.

In the Position column include a brief position description that is associated with the fringe benefits.

The **Fringe Benefit Rate** is:

- The rate that has been approved by the State's cognizant agency for indirect costs; or a rate that has been calculated based on the aggregate rates and/or costs of the individual items that your agency classifies as fringe benefits.
- For example, your agency pays 7.65 percent for FICA, 42.05 percent for health/life/dental insurance, and 15.1 percent for retirement. The aggregate rate of 64.8 percent (sum of the three rates) may be applied to the salaries/wages of personnel listed in the table.

The **Base Amount** is:

- The salary/wage costs within the proposed budget to which the fringe benefit rate will be applied.
- For example, if the total wages for all grant-funded staff is \$150,000, then that is the amount the fringe rate of 64.8 (from the example above) will be applied. The calculation is:  $\$150,000 \times 64.8/100 = \$97,200$  Total Project Costs.

The Total Project Costs equal Fringe Benefit Rate X Base Amount divided by 100.

Fringe Benefits Project Costs					
Position(s)	Fringe Benefit Rate	Base Amount	Total Project Costs	Federal Share	State Share
MC Trooper	35.1100	\$400,000.00	\$140,440.00	\$140,440.00	\$0.00
New Entrant Auditor	35.1100	\$89,032.00	\$31,259.13	\$31,259.13	\$0.00
Overtime	35.1100	\$86,272.80	\$30,290.38	\$30,290.38	\$0.00
MC Inspector	100.0000	\$129,722.00	\$129,722.00	\$129,722.00	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL: Fringe Benefits</b>			<b>\$331,711.51</b>	<b>\$331,711.51</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Planned MOE: Fringe Benefits</b>	<b>\$424,091.43</b>				

***Enter detailed explanation of how you came up with the fringe benefits costs.***

We are calculating a fringe benefit rate of 35.11% applied to all MCSAP salaries. When paid time off is removed from the calculations, the following percentages are being claimed: Health Insurance 19.5%, Social Security/Medicare 7.65%, Unemployment Insurance .1%, Worker's Comp 1.86%, and mandatory retirement of 6%, for a total of 35.11%. Leave for all South Dakota State Employees is accrual based. No leave costs are associated or billed to MCSAP funds. We have no way of attributing non-worked hours to state or MCSAP funds so all leave costs are attributed to state funds.

Since we attribute fringe cost to the federal share and MOE, to make full account of the program and costs, we have inserted the below chart. The above table only shows costs that have only a state or federal share with no MOE associated. Costs that have a state or federal share, and MOE costs have been changed to make the above table work, though do not accurately reflect the total costs associated.

FRINGE

Position(s)	Fringe Benefit Rate	Base	Total	Federal Share	State Share	MOE	
HP Trooper	35.11%	\$29,103.00	\$10,218.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,218.06	\$0.00
MC Inspector	35.11%	\$1,012,224.81	\$355,392.13	\$129,722.92	\$0.00	\$225,669.21	\$0.00
MC Trooper	35.11%	\$801,542.00	\$281,421.40	\$140,440.00	\$0.00	\$140,981.40	\$0.00
MC Command Staff	35.11%	\$72,480.00	\$25,447.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,447.73	\$0.00
L-3 K9	35.11%	\$4,745.60	\$1,666.18	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,666.18	\$0.00
L-1 K9	35.11%	\$57,273.84	\$20,108.85	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,108.85	\$0.00
New Entrant Aud	35.11%	\$89,032.00	\$31,259.14	\$31,259.13	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.01
OT	35.11%	\$86,272.80	\$30,290.38	\$30,290.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Totals			\$755,803.86	\$331,712.43	\$0.00	\$424,091.43	\$0.00

**4 - Travel**

*Itemize the positions/functions of the people who will travel. Show the estimated cost of items including but not limited to, lodging, meals, transportation, registration, etc. Explain in detail how the MCSAP program will directly benefit from the travel.*

*Travel costs are funds for field work or for travel to professional meetings.*

*List the purpose, number of persons traveling, number of days, and total project costs for each trip. If details of each trip are not known at the time of application submission, provide the basis for estimating the amount requested. For more information on this item see [2 CFR §200.474](#).*

*Total Project Costs should be determined by State users, and input in the table below.*

Travel Project Costs					
Purpose	# of Staff	# of Days	Total Project Costs	Federal Share	State Share
Routine MCSAP related travel lodging/meal allowance	28	195	\$36,736.00	\$36,736.00	\$0.00
Conference Travel	10	20	\$15,543.37	\$15,543.37	\$0.00
Training Travel	113	49	\$14,967.57	\$14,967.57	\$0.00
Safety Audit Travel	2	10	\$43.00	\$43.00	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL: Travel</b>			<b>\$67,289.94</b>	<b>\$67,289.94</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Planned MOE: Travel</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>				

**Enter detailed explanation of how you came up with the travel costs.**

**Routine MCSAP related travel (lodging/meal allowance)-**

This item includes motel expenses for special assignment travel and eligible per diem expenses. Special assignment travel includes focused enforcement effort travel such as Passenger vehicle, Oilfield, and Haz-Mat marathons, Operation Safe Driver, Operation Airbrake, Level 1 inspection marathons and similar events where travel is needed. Due to the large size of South Dakota and the small number of personnel available, travel is necessary to conduct these inspection activities. These focused activities range from 3 days to 7 days in length. Inspectors are also eligible for per diem expenses because they travel daily to a location away from their home station. We are budgeting per diem and motel expenses. Per Diem is \$14.00 and State rate hotel rooms are \$60.00 a night. The total budgeted for Routine MCSAP related travel (lodging and meal allowance) is \$36,736.

South Dakota has two different in-state lodging rates. From September 1 to May 31, in-state lodging is paid at \$55 per night. From June 1 to August 31, in-state lodging is paid at \$70 per night. For the routine MCSAP travel related line item, we used \$60 as an average based on the amount of usual travel during the summer at the higher rate.

**Conference Travel-**

CVSA- We intend on sending three people to each of the two CVSA Conferences. We estimate cost of 2 people at each conference. We budget \$200 a night for hotel rooms and \$600 per airline ticket.

NAIC- We plan to send 2 people to NAIC in FY2017. We estimate cost of 2 people at this conference. We budget \$200 a night for hotel rooms and \$600 per airline ticket.

COHMED- We plan to send 3 people to COHMED in FY16. We estimate cost of 3 people at this conference. We budget \$200 a night for hotels rooms and \$600 per airline ticket.

The total conference travel budgeted for is \$15,543.37

**Training Travel**

MCSAP Grant Management Training- We are budgeting budgeting for 2 people to attend the 3 day meeting.

NAS Cargo Tank Inspection class- We are budgeting for travel expenses for 4 people to attend Cargo Tank training in a neighboring state.

NAS Part A&B- We are budgeting for traveling expenses for 8 people to attend NAS Part A and Part B in a neighboring states.

Other Bulk Packaging- South Dakota will plan to attend an Other Bulk Packaging class based on availability in neighboring states.

For various training out of state we budget \$200 a night for hotel rooms and \$600 per airline tickets.

We are budgeting \$4,070 for a district meeting. District meetings are where all 60 motor carrier personnel in South Dakota gather for training. Training includes anything from traffic enforcement, hazardous materials training, inspection training and similar subjects. We are planning for one district meeting. The meeting will be two partial days. Personnel travel in the morning prior to the meeting on the first day and travel home in the afternoon of the next day. We estimate the 60 people in 40 motel rooms rooms for one night at South Dakota's state rate of \$55 per night. This totals \$2,200. We estimate 60 people eligible for per diem costs for 2 days at South Dakota's long form per diem rate of \$32 per day for a total of \$3,840. The total meeting cost is estimated at \$6,040.

We are budgeting for training travel for personnel to attend various in-state training offered throughout the grant year, that cannot be specifically planned for. This training could include field training officer training, to leadership training for supervisors, to other training that has not been scheduled at this time. Routine travel will also include New Entrant Safety Auditor travel expenses.

We are budgeting for expenses related to Instructor development training. We intend to send two individuals to training that will qualify one to teach NAS part A, one to teach NAS Part B, and another to teach General Hazardous Materials. All three will need to attend Instructor Development class. This class is conducted by the South Dakota Law Enforcement Training Center. Housing is available for not cost to the students and no tuition is charged. All other known expenses related to instructor certification are paid for the the National Training Center.

We are budgeting expenses to send 2 people to post crash inspection training at the Nebraska Law Enforcement Training Center in Grand Island NE. We are budgeting 6 days of per diem expenses for both people at South Dakota's out of state per diem rate of \$45 per day for a total of \$540. We are budgeting motel expenses of \$75 per night for 5 nights for a total of \$750. There are no flight expenses due to training in the neighboring state as it would be impractical to fly. Total expenses budget for post crash inspection training is \$1,290.

Total budgeted amount for training travel is \$14,967.57.

We are budgeting expenses for 2 New Entrant Safety Auditors to attend training. New Entrant Program training travel costs are estimations based on anticipated required training for the new entrant safety auditors to remain current and certified in the New Entrant Safety Assurance Program and the North American Standard vehicle inspection and Hazardous Material inspection requirements. New entrant training is currently not schedule on the FMCSA National Training Center calendar for all of FY2018 and the type of required training and location could change. Identifying actual dates and locations is not possible. Training estimations are based on estimated air travel for two auditors to attend required training budgeted at \$1,400 (2 x \$700 = \$1,400). Lodging for two auditors for five nights at the state's allowable rate of \$150 per night is budgeted at \$1,500.00 (2 x \$150 x 5 = \$1,500). Per Diem for meals and expenses for two auditors for 6 days at the state's set rate of \$45 per day is budgeted at \$540.00 (2 x 6 x \$45 = \$540). Total expenses budget for new entrant training travel is \$3440.

**5 - Equipment**

Equipment is tangible property. It includes information technology systems having a useful life of more than one year, and a per-unit acquisition cost that equals or exceeds the lesser of the capitalization level established by the non-Federal entity (i.e., the State) for financial statement purposes, or \$5,000.

- If your State's equipment threshold is below \$5,000, check the box below and provide the equipment threshold amount. See §§[200.12](#) Capital assets, [200.20](#) Computing devices, [200.48](#) General purpose equipment, [200.58](#) Information technology systems, [200.89](#) Special purpose equipment, and [200.94](#) Supplies.

Show the total cost of equipment and the percentage of time dedicated for MCSAP related activities that the equipment will be billed to MCSAP. For example, you intend to purchase a server for \$5,000 to be shared equally among five programs, including MCSAP. The MCSAP portion of the total cost is \$1,000. If the equipment you are purchasing will be capitalized (depreciated), you may only show the depreciable amount, and not the total cost ([2 CFR §200.436](#) and [2 CFR §200.439](#)). If vehicles or large IT purchases are listed here, the applicant must disclose their agency's capitalization policy.

Provide a description of the equipment requested. Include how many of each item, the full cost of each item, and the percentage of time this item will be dedicated to MCSAP activities.

The Total Project Costs equal # of Items x Full Cost per Item x Percentage of Time Dedicated to MCSAP.

Equipment Project Costs						
Item Name	# of Items	Full Cost per Item	% Time Dedicated to MCSAP	Total Project Costs	Federal Share	State Share
Chevrolet pick-up	1	\$42,996.56	100	\$42,996.56	\$42,996.56	\$0.00
Dodge Pick-up	1	\$29,503.00	30	\$8,850.90	\$8,850.90	\$0.00
Dodge Durango	1	\$29,598.00	30	\$8,879.40	\$8,879.40	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL: Equipment</b>				<b>\$60,726.86</b>	<b>\$60,726.86</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
Equipment threshold is greater than \$5,000.						
<b>Planned MOE: Equipment</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>					

**Enter detailed explanation of how you came up with the equipment costs.**

South Dakota Highway Patrol annually purchases an average of 47 vehicles that are used by personnel to perform MCSAP eligible activities to various levels. For FY2018 we are budgeting MCSAP funds to be used to purchase 3 of those 47 vehicles. We plan to purchase 1 Dodge Ram pick-up, 1 Chevrolet pick-up, and 1 Dodge Durango SUV. Total budgeted is \$64,300.00

We are purchasing a Dodge Ram pick-up to be used by command staff. Command Staff spend 30% of their time on MCSAP activities. We are budgeting \$8,850.90 for this purchase.

We are purchasing a Dodge Durango to be used for Command Staff. Command Staff spend 30% of their time on MCSAP activities. We are budgeting \$8,879.40 for this purchase.

We are purchasing a Chevrolet pick-up to be used for a Motor Carrier Trooper. Motor Carrier Troopers spend 100% of their time on MCSAP activities. We are budgeting \$42,996.56 for this purchase.

**6 - Supplies**

*Supplies means all tangible property other than that described in §200.33 Equipment. A computing device is a supply if the acquisition cost is less than the lesser of the capitalization level established by the non-Federal entity for financial statement purposes or \$5,000, regardless of the length of its useful life. See also §§200.20 Computing devices and 200.33 Equipment. Estimates for supply costs may be based on the same allocation as personnel. For example, if 35 percent of officers' salaries are allocated to this project, you may allocate 35 percent of your total supply costs to this project. A different allocation basis is acceptable, so long as it is reasonable, repeatable and logical, and a description is provided in the narrative.*

*List a description of each item requested, including the number of each unit/item, the unit of measurement for the item, and the cost of each item/unit.*

*Total Project Costs equal #of Units x Cost per Unit.*

Supplies Project Costs						
Item Name	# of Units/Items	Unit of Measurement	Cost per Unit	Total Project Costs	Federal Share	State Share
Office Supplies	1	each	\$2,700.00	\$2,700.00	\$2,700.00	\$0.00
Trooper Level 1 Inspection Uniform	10	each	\$100.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$0.00
Nylon Duty Belts	2	each	\$400.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$0.00
Post Crash Inspection Tools	4	each	\$362.50	\$1,450.00	\$1,450.00	\$0.00
Window Tint Meter	14	each	\$150.00	\$2,100.00	\$2,100.00	\$0.00
Printers	4	each	\$400.00	\$1,600.00	\$1,600.00	\$0.00
Safety Inspection Equipment	1	each	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$0.00
HMR Software	20	each	\$475.00	\$9,500.00	\$9,500.00	\$0.00
New Entrant Uniforms	2	each	\$330.00	\$660.00	\$660.00	\$0.00
Pick-up Topper	1	each	\$2,319.20	\$2,319.20	\$2,319.20	\$0.00
Out of Service Manuals	67	each	\$18.53	\$1,241.51	\$1,241.51	\$0.00
Inspector Uniforms	47	each	\$74.10	\$3,482.70	\$3,482.70	\$0.00
Computer Port Replicators	10	each	\$170.00	\$1,700.00	\$1,700.00	\$0.00
Cold Weather Gear	17	each	\$406.99	\$6,918.83	\$6,918.83	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL: Supplies</b>				<b>\$36,972.24</b>	<b>\$36,972.24</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Planned MOE: Supplies</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>					

***Enter detailed explanation of how you came up with the supplies costs.***

**Office Supplies-** We are budgeting \$2700 for various office supplies. This would include pens paper, staples, postage, and like items used to conduct day to day operations and inspections.

**Trooper Level 1 Inspection Uniform-** We are budgeting \$1000 for uniforms for troopers assigned Motor Carrier Services. This is to replace current uniforms as they become unserviceable due to wear and damage. These uniforms are a utility set of uniforms that will be worn when troopers intend to perform primarily level 1 inspections during their shift. Current issued uniforms for troopers are a tailored wool uniform that do not hide dirt and grease, and require dry cleaning. These utility uniforms are machine washable and better suited for the more intensive inspections.

**Nylon Duty Belts-** We currently have 13 sworn personnel who perform L-1 inspections. We are budgeting for 2 nylon duty belts to replace equipment that becomes unserviceable due to wear and or damage. The duty belts include the belt, holster, magazine holder, Tazer holster, handcuff case, baton holder, and flashlight holder. the nylon belts are far more durable and appropriate for wear during inspections on CMV's due to the dirt and grease, and maneuvering under the CMV's. The duty belts are \$400 each for the 2 belts for a total of \$800.

**Post Crash Inspection Tools-** We are budgeting \$1450 for additional tools to perform post crash Level 1 inspections. The tools needed are an air regulator, die grinder, ball valve, and torx driver. We also will need various cut-off wheels, air hose couplers, and hose ends. All equipment is used to test air brakes on a CMV that has been damaged due to a crash. Often the damage prohibits an inspection to verify proper brake performance. These tools will help the inspector bypass damaged components and verify braking



performance, or absence of braking by the CMV involved. Equipment will be purchased using existing state contracts with equipment providers. We are estimating the air regulator to be \$49.75, the die grinder to be \$108.25, the ball valve to be \$24.63, the torx driver to be \$47.05. We have 4 post crash inspection kits across the state. Total to supplement the 4 kits is \$1215. We are budgeting an additional \$235 for the incidental items such as cutoff wheels, couplers and hose ends.

**Window Tint Meters-** We are budgeting for 14 window tint meters to measure tint applied to CMV's windshields and side windows to check for compliance of FMCSR's in 49CFR 393. These meters are \$150 each. The SDHP has meters that were purchased many years ago but are unserviceable or not designed to check windshields or other windows that are unable to roll down as they have a slot in the meter where the window is inserted. Total cost for window tint meters is \$2,100.

**Printers-** We are budgeting for 4 in car printers to replace printers that no longer function. These are thermal printers installed inside vehicles of troopers or mobile team inspectors to print Vehicle Examination Reports and citations to give the CMV drivers at the time of inspection. These printers are purchased from a competitive bid process for \$400 each. This totals \$1,600.

**Safety Inspection Equipment-** We have estimated \$1500 to replace inspection equipment such as creepers, wheel chocks, ladders, and inspector safety equipment that is no longer serviceable.

**HMR Software-** RegScan Hazmat Software- We budgeted \$9,500 for the annual subscription to RegScan Hazmat Software for 20 licenses to assist inspectors with knowledge and enforcement of hazardous material rules and regulations, and inspections.

~~**Semi Tractor Combination expenses-** We are budgeting \$10,000 for various expenses related to operations of a South Dakota Highway Patrol owned semi-tractor trailer combination. The expenses are related to fuel, maintenance, and repair expenses for the combination to operate in TACT style enforcement operations in support of crash reduction goals. The combination is operated in high traffic areas and when traffic violations occur around the combination, a nearby trooper will be given the vehicle description so the vehicle can be stopped and enforcement action taken. This is still a new program and equipment use for South Dakota. Due to delayed funding in FY17, we have no historical average for operating costs for this type of vehicle. Due to no historical cost data and the limited use for special operations, we will only be seeking reimbursement for actual costs of operation. This will be tracked based on actual repair and maintenance receipts by vendors assigned to this equipment. Fuel costs are tracked using vehicle identifying purchases at state fueling facilities.~~

**New Entrant Uniforms-** \$660 is budgeted for one set of uniform replacements for two safety auditors and one set of new vehicle inspection uniforms and gloves for two safety auditors. This is to replace current uniforms as they become unserviceable due to wear and damage.

**Pick-up Topper-** We are budgeting \$2319.20 to purchase a pick-up topper for a pick-up issued to a motor carrier trooper. The topper provides security and cover for the troopers tools and equipment.

**Out of Service Manuals-** We are budgeting \$1,241.51 to purchase updated Out of Service Manuals.

**Inspector Uniforms-** We are budgeting \$3,482.80 to assist in paying for Inspector uniforms. Inspectors work 60% of their time on MCSAP activities. To supply our current inspectors with the proper amount of uniforms we are estimating a total uniform purchase order of \$5,572.48 (60% of \$5,572.48=\$3,482.80).

**Computer Port Replicators-** We are budgeting \$1,700.00 for computer port replicators for 7 mobile teams and 3 office computers. The agency has purchased new computers and the port replicators dock the computer for charging and connectivity. Each computer port replicator is estimated to cost \$170.00.

**Cold Weather Gear-** There are 17 sworn/uniformed members in the Motor Carrier Division. Each member can be exposed to extreme weather conditions during the winter months. We are budgeting for 17 sets of cold weather gear to protect our members from the extremem weather conditions. This is a department wide purchase for all troopers in the state. A set of cold weather gear consists of insulated bottoms and coat liner designed to be worn underneath our existing uniform. We are budgeting an estimated cost of \$6,918.87 for this gear.

## 7 - Contractual and Subaward

*This section includes both contractual costs and subawards to subrecipients. Use the table below to capture the information needed for both contractual agreements and subawards. The definitions of these terms are provided so the instrument type can be entered into the table below.*

**CONTRACTUAL** – A contract is a legal instrument by which a non-Federal entity purchases property or services needed to carry out the project or program under a Federal award ([2 CFR §200.22](#)). All contracts issued under a Federal award must comply with the standards described in [2 CFR §200 Procurement Standards](#).

**Note:** Contracts are separate and distinct from subawards; see [2 CFR §200.330](#) for details.

**SUBAWARD** – A subaward is an award provided by a pass-through entity to a subrecipient for the subrecipient to carry out part of a Federal award received by the pass-through entity. It does not include payments to a contractor or payments to an individual that is a beneficiary of a Federal program. A subaward may be provided through any form of legal agreement, including an agreement that the pass-through entity considers a contract ([2 CFR §200.92](#), [2 CFR §200.330](#)).

**SUBRECIPIENT** - Subrecipient means a non-Federal entity that receives a subaward from a pass-through entity to carry out part of a Federal program, but does not include an individual who is a beneficiary of such program. A subrecipient may also be a recipient of other Federal awards directly from a Federal awarding agency ([2 CFR §200.93](#)).

*Enter the legal name of the vendor or subrecipient if known. If unknown at this time, please indicate 'unknown' in the legal name field. Include a description of services for each contract or subaward listed in the table. Entering a statement such as "contractual services" with no description will not be considered meeting the requirement for completing this section.*

*Enter the DUNS or EIN number of each entity. There is a drop-down option to choose either DUNS or EIN, and then the State must enter the corresponding identification number.*

*Select the Instrument Type by choosing either Contract or Subaward for each entity.*

*Total Project Costs should be determined by State users and input in the table below.*

*If the State plans to include O&M costs that meet the definition of a contractual or subaward cost, details must be provided in the table and narrative below.*

*Please describe the activities these costs will be used to support (i.e. ITD, PRISM, SSDQ or other services).*

Contractual and Subaward Project Costs						
Legal Name	DUNS/EIN	Number	Instrument Type	Total Project Costs	Federal Share	State Share
SD BIT	DUNS	961584880	Contract	\$77,787.00	\$77,787.00	\$0.00
Description of Services: Compute IT accounts						
CW Suter & Sons INC.	EIN	470528839	Contract	\$1,375.00	\$1,375.00	\$0.00
Description of Services: Jefforson Inspection HVAC Maintenance						
Zuercher Technologies	EIN	364521321	Contract	\$34,257.00	\$34,257.00	\$0.00
Description of Services: Records Management System						
Portable Computer Systems INC	EIN	841396969	Contract	\$37,598.60	\$37,598.60	\$0.00
Description of Services: Laptop Computers						
NWE Clock Towers	EIN	460172190	Contract	\$2,857.10	\$2,857.10	\$0.00
Description of Services: New Entrant Auditor Rent						
VAST Broadband	EIN	462667900	Contract	\$1,194.77	\$1,194.77	\$0.00
Description of Services: New Entrant Office Phone and Fax						
SD Dept. of Transportation	DUNS	809588098	Subrecipient	\$430,329.00	\$365,779.65	\$64,549.35
Description of Services: Operating and Maintenance-ITD						
SD Dept. of Revenue	DUNS	809587892	Subrecipient	\$291,800.00	\$248,030.00	\$43,770.00
Description of Services: IRP/IFTA Operating and Maintenance						
<b>TOTAL: Contractual and Subaward</b>				<b>\$877,198.47</b>	<b>\$768,879.12</b>	<b>\$108,319.35</b>
<b>Planned MOE: Contractual and Subaward</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>					

**Enter detailed explanation of how you came up with the contractual and subaward costs.**

**Computer/email maintenance accounts-** The computer user fees are based on 67 computer accounts associated with the motor carrier services section. These accounts assist with computer access and security, as well as management emails and communication. The South Dakota Bureau of Information and Technology, a state government agency, charges all state agencies a fee per month for every computer account. We are budgeting MCSAP funds to be used for an average of 75% of this cost which totals \$51,080.49 for 67 accounts. These costs are allocated at 75% based on a conservative best estimate. The vast majority of activity on the IT accounts and software licenses revolves around MCSAP eligibal activities. We have other ways complete job duties that are not MCSAP activities without the IT accounts such as size and weight permits. We choose not to seek 100% reimbursement due to the occasional non-MCSAP activity done over email. There is no practical way to determine and track if an individual email is a question on a MCSAP inspection, portal account information, or if the email was notification of a co-workers retirement party. The email accounts are intended to allow for efficient communication between employees and agency supervisors. With each user having their own IT account, network safety and accountability for the computer use and employee communications are enhanced. We can ensure personnel are receiving information such as inspections bulletins or regulatory changes and not just hoping they saw the information before it was deleted from a shared account. These accounts also provide the mechanism for driver utilizing EOBR's to transmit log book pages and information to the inspector at the time of the inspection. The 75% is a conservative estimate in absence of a practical way to track subject matter of the accounts, These expenses allow us to effectively communicate in performing our jobs, upload inspection reports, and verify carrier's status at the roadside.

**Windows and Office Software License-** For each computer user, the South Dakota Highway Patrol must pay the South Dakota Bureau of Information and Technology licensing fees for Window 10 and Office 360. The software licensing charge at \$20.25 per month for each user. We are budgeting MCSAP funds to be used for an average of 75% of this cost which totals \$12,210.75.

**NetMotion** is a computer program that keeps our laptop computer connected to any available internet service. This software was purchased by the state through a competitive bid process. 35 licenses are required for the motor carrier division at \$45 each. This is an annual cost of \$1575.

**Jefferson Port Maintenance-** We pay \$1375 annually for a maintenance contract for the Jefferson Port of Entry inspection building. The contract is for the maintenance of the Jefferson POE inspection building's heating and cooling system. This inspection building is used only for the performance of Level 1 to Level 4 inspections. The building serves no other purpose other than performing MCSAP eligible inspections, so 100% of the contract is included in the proposed budget.

**Zuercher Program Maintenance-** SD Highway Patrol uses a software program call Zuercher for records management, case reports, police dispatching and electronic citation completion and issuance. The annual maintenance agreement for the software is \$137,025. Motor Carrier Services makes up approximately 25% of the agency. We are budgeting 25% of the \$137,025 maintenance cost for a

total of \$34,257. This software is necessary for dispatching troopers and inspectors, traffic stop management, criminal case reports, and is how the SD Highway Patrol issues all citations. All of these functions are necessary for MCSAP activities and the completion of CMV inspections.

**Laptop Computers-** The South Dakota Highway Patrol is changing the way it procures laptop computers. Instead of purchasing each unit, the SDHP is entering into a lease agreement that leases each computer for 5 years, for \$5,000. This includes the computer and vehicle docking station. The cost breaks down to approximately \$4200 for the computer and \$800 for the vehicle dock. We have 25 staff that needs the computer and docking station (27 @ \$5,000 = \$135,000), and 7 that only need the computer (7 @ \$4200 = \$29,400). We also have 3 command staff that need the computer and docking station but this cost will be pro-rated at 30% of the cost due to time spent on MCSAP eligible activities (3 @ \$5,000 = \$15,000 X 30% = \$4,500). The total cost is \$168,900 for the 5 year lease. We are budgeting \$33,780 \$37,598.60 for FY18.

The price for these computer is reasonable for the type of laptop with the required features to fulfill our reporting requirements. While the employees that use these computers may not perform MCSAP eligible activities 100% of the time, the need for the computer is virtually 100% based on using it to perform those MCSAP activities. There is work performed on the computers such as management emails, and some report writing on non-eligible activities, but this is out of convenience since the computer is available. The computer's main use is for recording, reporting, issuing, and transmitting Vehicle Examination Reports and citations that are a result of MCSAP eligible inspections. Other uses include programs such as FMCSA's Guard, Safer, Query Central, FMCSA Portal, RegScan Hazardous Materials software, PC Miler, and similar programs that assist inspectors in performing CMV inspections. For those listed as MC Trooper at 100%, they are law enforcement officers, they may still have to respond or take action on highway emergencies or obvious unsafe conditions such as an injury crash or drunk driver that do not involve a CMV. We would not bill MCSAP personnel funds for those activities. When those occasions occur, they respond, but then turn investigations over to non-MCSAP personnel in most occasions and then return to CMV enforcement. For personnel listed as MC Inspector inspector at 60%, their goal and job description is to go to various locations and perform MCSAP eligible inspections among other duties. They occasionally have to write a size and weight permit. This is usually the result of a safety inspection where it was discovered that a permit was required. A violation would be noted on the VER and driver issued a permit with the laptop computer. The computer is necessary to perform their MCSAP functions and only occasionally used in non-MCSAP functions. The 60% time allocation is an average. The users of these laptops are members of our mobile teams that do a higher number of MCSAP inspections, but are the same pay grade as those inspectors in the ports of entry, so are listed together. Their time allocation is higher than 60%, but there are only 14 mobile team members compared to 29 port employees, which results in a lower average. Non-MCSAP use of the computers is out of convenience since the computer is available, but could and have been done without the computer. Since the employees that are using the laptop computers only use them incidentally for non-MCSAP activities, we are seeking 100% reimbursement.

**New Entrant Office Space-** Office space is required for the state New Entrant program to house one of the safety auditors where there are no other available state facilities. One auditor uses an existing state facility where no rent is required. The office space will be used exclusively for the purpose of conducting the state's new entrant safety assurance program. The costs are a recurring monthly expense and include utility and maintenance expenses (minus communication) at a monthly rate. The total requested for office space is \$2857.10.

**New Entrant Office phone and fax-** Phone and fax connections necessary to conduct New Entrant programs from two offices are calculated at the cost to the state of \$1,194.77.

**Department of Transportation Operating and Maintenance-** The South Dakota Dept. of Transportation is the agency that applied for and managed the former CVISN and PRISM grants. That agency still manages the the ITD grant, and the agency responsible for operating and maintenance expenses associated with CVISN/ITD programs. The CVISN program manager is budgeting a total cost of \$430,329. \$365,779.65 for operating and maintenance expenses. This includes \$13,098 for personnel and fringe benefits for administration of the programs and time traveling to conferences. \$5,230 is associated with travel to the CVISN program managers meeting, CVIEW users group meeting, and site inspection. The budget includes \$35,000 for CVIEW annual support (Iteris), \$95,000 for annual support of SDAPS (Bentley Systems) the automated permitting system, \$270,000 for E-Screening annual support (International Road Dynamics) at our facilities, and \$12,000 for Norpass E-Screening program dues.

**Department of Revenue Operating and Maintenance-** The South Dakota Department of Revenue is the agency responsible for IRP and IFTA registration and operating and maintenance expenses associated with those programs. The SD Dept. of Revenue budgeting a total of \$291,800. \$248,030 for cost associated to operating and maintenance for these programs. \$260,000 is associated with IRP/IFTA Annual Support (Explore Systems), \$14,800 is associated with the IRP clearinghouse and dues, and \$17,000 associated with the IFTA clearing hours and dues.

## 8 - Other Costs

Other costs are those not classified elsewhere, such as communications or utility costs. As with other expenses, these must be allocable to the Federal award. The total costs and allocation bases must be shown in the narrative. Examples of Other costs may include utilities and/or leased equipment, employee training tuition, meeting registration costs, etc. The quantity, unit of measurement (e.g., monthly, annually, each, etc.) and unit cost must be included. All Other costs must be specifically itemized and described.

If the State plans to include O&M costs that do not meet the definition of a contractual or subaward cost, details must be provided in the table and narrative below. Please identify these costs as ITD O&M, PRISM O&M, or SSDQ O&M.

Enter a description of each requested Other Cost.

Enter the number of items/units, the unit of measurement, and the cost per unit/item for each other cost listed. Show the cost of the Other Costs and the portion of the total cost that will be billed to MCSAP. For example, you intend to purchase air cards for \$2,000 to be shared equally among five programs, including MCSAP. The MCSAP portion of the total cost is \$400.

Total Project Costs equal Number of Units x Cost per Item.

### Indirect Costs

Information on Indirect Costs ([2 CFR §200.56](#)) is captured in this section. This cost is allowable only when an approved indirect cost rate agreement has been provided. Applicants may charge up to the total amount of the approved indirect cost rate multiplied by the eligible cost base. Applicants with a cost basis of salaries/wages and fringe benefits may only apply the indirect rate to those expenses. Applicants with an expense base of modified total direct costs (MTDC) may only apply the rate to those costs that are included in the MTDC base ([2 CFR §200.68](#)).

- **Cost Basis** — is the accumulated direct costs (normally either total direct salaries and wages or total direct costs exclusive of any extraordinary or distorting expenditures) used to distribute indirect costs to individual Federal awards. The direct cost base selected should result in each Federal award bearing a fair share of the indirect costs in reasonable relation to the benefits received from the costs.
- **Approved Rate** — is the rate in the approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement.
- **Eligible Indirect Expenses** — means after direct costs have been determined and assigned directly to Federal awards and other activities as appropriate. Indirect costs are those remaining to be allocated to benefitted cost objectives. A cost may not be allocated to a Federal award as an indirect cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose, in like circumstances, has been assigned to a Federal award as a direct cost.
- **Total Indirect Costs** equal Approved Rate x Eligible Indirect Expenses divided by 100.

### Your State will claim reimbursement for Indirect Costs.

Indirect Costs					
Cost Basis	Approved Rate	Eligible Costs	Total Indirect Costs	Federal Share	State Share
Modified Total Direct Costs (MTDC)	6.20	\$2,092,305.22	\$129,722.92	\$129,722.92	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL: Indirect Costs</b>			<b>\$129,722.92</b>	<b>\$129,722.92</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>

Other Costs Project Costs						
Item Name	# of Units/Items	Unit of Measurement	Cost per Unit	Total Project Costs	Federal Share	State Share
Conference Registration Costs	7	each	\$550.00	\$3,850.00	\$3,850.00	\$0.00
CVSA Decals	5285	each	\$0.28	\$1,479.80	\$1,479.80	\$0.00
CVSA Dues	1	each	\$7,800.00	\$7,800.00	\$7,800.00	\$0.00
Communications	12	months	\$2,006.85	\$24,082.20	\$24,082.20	\$0.00
Inspection Building Utility Costs	1	year	\$538.50	\$538.50	\$538.50	\$0.00
Inspection site building maintenance	1	annual	\$12,961.50	\$12,961.50	\$12,961.50	\$0.00
Central Services	1	annual	\$21,992.48	\$21,992.48	\$21,992.48	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL: Other Costs</b>				<b>\$72,704.48</b>	<b>\$72,704.48</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Planned MOE: Other Costs</b>	<b>\$279,000.00</b>					

***Enter detailed explanation of how you came up with the other costs.***

**Conference Registration Costs-** Registration fees for 2 people to attend 2 CVSA conferences at per person per conference. This totals \$2200. Registration fees for 3 people to attend COHMED at per person totals \$1650. Total conference registration costs total \$3,850.00.

**CVSA Decals-** We purchase 5285 CVSA Inspection decals at \$0.28 a piece for issuance to equipment that meets the inspection criteria. This totals \$1,479.80.

**CVSA Dues-** CVSA dues are set by CVSA and are \$7800 this year.

**Communications-** Air cards provide cellular internet service for locations other than fixed facilities. We are budgeting for 42 computer air cards used by personnel. We are budgeting for 24 smart phones. We are budgeting for 7 basic phones. This totals \$24,082.20 per year for communications expenses. These services are obtained through at state contract and are uniform throughout the agency. These services ensure computer connectivity for roadside personnel to complete and transfer vehicle inspection, access Query Central, SAFER, ASPEN, QC Mobile, SaferBus and general communications that support daily motor carrier enforcement operations.

**Inspection Building Utility Costs-** We are budgeting \$538.50 for propane to heat the Sisseton Port of Entry Inspection Building. This building is used only for the performance of Level 1 to Level 4 inspections. The building serves no other purpose other than performing MCSAP eligible inspection, so 100% of the cost is included in the proposed budget.

**Inspection building maintenance-** We currently have various inspection buildings throughout the state. These facilities are in need of upkeep and maintenance. Due to the wide variety of materials and labor needed at each individual site, and the variety of need unique to each site, we are budgeting \$6,500.00. No site will have new construction or additions to the structure. Only maintenance or replacement of current facility inventory will be done.

**Mileage-** There are 28 vehicles that are used to directly support MCSAP activities. In FFY16 3 additional troopers were added to the motor carrier enforcement program. Based on past records, MCSAP personnel travel about 450,000 miles per year. We are applying a mileage rate of \$.62/mile, which totals \$279,000. The MCSAP fleet is made up largely of SUVs and pick-ups. We are attributing these expenses as MOE.

**Central Services-** The South Dakota Highway Patrol is assessed administrative fees by various other state agencies and are called Central Services. These fees are specific to the type of expense and can be allocated between MCSAP and non-MCSAP eligible expenses. We are assessed a fee for every financial transaction we do to pay a bill, for example when we purchase office supplies and a check is sent from the state to the vendor, a fee is assessed by BFM. We are budgeting for fees assessed by the SD Bureau of Human Resources. These are fees for processing payroll and time records as well as employee management services. We are budgeting for fees assessed by the SD Bureau of Administration. These are fees based on procurement services and property management services. Procurement fees are based on capital asset purchases such as vehicles, and property management fees are based on facility maintenance and space such as heat and air conditioning. Central Services are not included in SD's indirect cost rate agreement, and not treated or billed as indirect costs. Central Services costs are assigned to purchases encoded as MCSAP eligible purchases and assessed to personnel costs based on time sheet categories for MCSAP eligible work performed. The amount budgeted is based on historical data and past records associated to MCSAP eligible expenses. Total budgeted for Central Services totals \$21,992.48.

## 9 - Comprehensive Spending Plan

The comprehensive spending plan is auto-populated from all line items in the tables and is in read-only format.

ESTIMATED Fiscal Year Funding Amounts for MCSAP			
	85% Federal Share	15% State Share	Total Estimated Funding
Total	\$2,282,755.00	\$402,840.00	\$2,685,595.00

Summary of MCSAP Funding Limitations	
Allowable amount for Overtime without written justification (15% of Basic award amount):	\$402,840.00
MOE Baseline:	\$345,623.00

Estimated Expenditures			
Personnel			
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs
New Entrant Auditors	\$89,032.00	\$0.00	\$89,032.00
MC Trooper	\$400,000.02	\$0.00	\$400,000.02
MC Inspector	\$239,443.11	\$294,520.65	\$533,963.76
<b>Salary Subtotal</b>	<b>\$728,475.13</b>	<b>\$294,520.65</b>	<b>\$1,022,995.78</b>
MC Inspector OT	\$42,379.71	\$0.00	\$42,379.71
MC Trooper OT	\$41,222.13	\$0.00	\$41,222.13
New Entrant OT	\$2,670.96	\$0.00	\$2,670.96
<b>Overtime subtotal</b>	<b>\$86,272.80</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$86,272.80</b>
<b>Personnel total</b>	<b>\$814,747.93</b>	<b>\$294,520.65</b>	<b>\$1,109,268.58</b>
<b>Planned MOE</b>	<b>\$1,046,842.71</b>		

Fringe Benefits			
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs
MC Trooper	\$140,440.00	\$0.00	\$140,440.00
New Entrant Auditor	\$31,259.13	\$0.00	\$31,259.13
Overtime	\$30,290.38	\$0.00	\$30,290.38
MC Inspector	\$129,722.00	\$0.00	\$129,722.00
<b>Fringe Benefits total</b>	<b>\$331,711.51</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$331,711.51</b>
<b>Planned MOE</b>	<b>\$424,091.43</b>		



Travel			
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs
Routine MCSAP related travel lodging/meal allowance	\$36,736.00	\$0.00	\$36,736.00
Conference Travel	\$15,543.37	\$0.00	\$15,543.37
Training Travel	\$14,967.57	\$0.00	\$14,967.57
Safety Audit Travel	\$43.00	\$0.00	\$43.00
<b>Travel total</b>	<b>\$67,289.94</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$67,289.94</b>
<b>Planned MOE</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		

Equipment			
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs
Chevrolet pick-up	\$42,996.56	\$0.00	\$42,996.56
Dodge Pick-up	\$8,850.90	\$0.00	\$8,850.90
Dodge Durango	\$8,879.40	\$0.00	\$8,879.40
<b>Equipment total</b>	<b>\$60,726.86</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$60,726.86</b>
<b>Planned MOE</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		

Supplies			
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs
Office Supplies	\$2,700.00	\$0.00	\$2,700.00
Trooper Level 1 Inspection Uniform	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00
Nylon Duty Belts	\$800.00	\$0.00	\$800.00
Post Crash Inspection Tools	\$1,450.00	\$0.00	\$1,450.00
Window Tint Meter	\$2,100.00	\$0.00	\$2,100.00
Printers	\$1,600.00	\$0.00	\$1,600.00
Safety Inspection Equipment	\$1,500.00	\$0.00	\$1,500.00
HMR Software	\$9,500.00	\$0.00	\$9,500.00
New Entrant Uniforms	\$660.00	\$0.00	\$660.00
Pick-up Topper	\$2,319.20	\$0.00	\$2,319.20
Out of Service Manuals	\$1,241.51	\$0.00	\$1,241.51
Inspector Uniforms	\$3,482.70	\$0.00	\$3,482.70
Computer Port Replicators	\$1,700.00	\$0.00	\$1,700.00
Cold Weather Gear	\$6,918.83	\$0.00	\$6,918.83
<b>Supplies total</b>	<b>\$36,972.24</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$36,972.24</b>
<b>Planned MOE</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		

Contractual and Subaward			
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs
SD BIT	\$77,787.00	\$0.00	\$77,787.00
CW Suter & Sons INC.	\$1,375.00	\$0.00	\$1,375.00
Zuercher Technologies	\$34,257.00	\$0.00	\$34,257.00
Portable Computer Systems INC	\$37,598.60	\$0.00	\$37,598.60
NWE Clock Towers	\$2,857.10	\$0.00	\$2,857.10
VAST Broadband	\$1,194.77	\$0.00	\$1,194.77
SD Dept. of Transportation	\$365,779.65	\$64,549.35	\$430,329.00
SD Dept. of Revenue	\$248,030.00	\$43,770.00	\$291,800.00
<b>Contractual and Subaward total</b>	<b>\$768,879.12</b>	<b>\$108,319.35</b>	<b>\$877,198.47</b>
<b>Planned MOE</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		



Other Costs			
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs
Conference Registration Costs	\$3,850.00	\$0.00	\$3,850.00
CVSA Decals	\$1,479.80	\$0.00	\$1,479.80
CVSA Dues	\$7,800.00	\$0.00	\$7,800.00
Communications	\$24,082.20	\$0.00	\$24,082.20
Inspection Building Utility Costs	\$538.50	\$0.00	\$538.50
Inspection site building maintenance	\$12,961.50	\$0.00	\$12,961.50
Central Services	\$21,992.48	\$0.00	\$21,992.48
<b>Other Costs total</b>	<b>\$72,704.48</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$72,704.48</b>
<b>Planned MOE</b>	<b>\$279,000.00</b>		

Total Costs			
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs
<b>Subtotal for Direct Costs</b>	<b>\$2,153,032.08</b>	<b>\$402,840.00</b>	<b>\$2,555,872.08</b>
Indirect Costs	\$129,722.92	\$0.00	\$129,722.92
<b>Total Costs Budgeted</b>	<b>\$2,282,755.00</b>	<b>\$402,840.00</b>	<b>\$2,685,595.00</b>
<b>Total Planned MOE</b>	<b>\$1,749,934.14</b>		

**10 - Financial Summary**

The Financial Summary is auto-populated by the system by budget category. It is a read-only document and can be used to complete the SF-424A in Grants.gov.

- The system will confirm that percentages for Federal and State shares are correct for Total Project Costs. The edit check is performed on the **"Total Costs Budgeted"** line only.
- The system will confirm that Planned MOE Costs equal or exceed FMCSA funding limitation. The edit check is performed on the **"Total Costs Budgeted"** line only.
- The system will confirm that the Overtime value does not exceed the FMCSA funding limitation. The edit check is performed on the **"Overtime subtotal"** line.

ESTIMATED Fiscal Year Funding Amounts for MCSAP			
	85% Federal Share	15% State Share	Total Estimated Funding
Total	\$2,282,755.00	\$402,840.00	\$2,685,595.00

Summary of MCSAP Funding Limitations	
Allowable amount for Overtime without written justification (15% of Basic award amount):	\$402,840.00
MOE Baseline:	\$345,623.00

Estimated Expenditures				
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs	Planned MOE Costs
Salary Subtotal	\$728,475.13	\$294,520.65	\$1,022,995.78	NA
Overtime Subtotal	\$86,272.80	\$0.00	\$86,272.80	NA
Personnel Total	\$814,747.93	\$294,520.65	\$1,109,268.58	\$1,046,842.71
Fringe Benefits Total	\$331,711.51	\$0.00	\$331,711.51	\$424,091.43
Travel Total	\$67,289.94	\$0.00	\$67,289.94	\$0.00
Equipment Total	\$60,726.86	\$0.00	\$60,726.86	\$0.00
Supplies Total	\$36,972.24	\$0.00	\$36,972.24	\$0.00
Contractual and Subaward Total	\$768,879.12	\$108,319.35	\$877,198.47	\$0.00
Other Costs Total	\$72,704.48	\$0.00	\$72,704.48	\$279,000.00
	85% Federal Share	15% State Share	Total Project Costs	Planned MOE Costs
Subtotal for Direct Costs	\$2,153,032.08	\$402,840.00	\$2,555,872.08	\$1,749,934.14
Indirect Costs	\$129,722.92	\$0.00	\$129,722.92	NA
<b>Total Costs Budgeted</b>	<b>\$2,282,755.00</b>	<b>\$402,840.00</b>	<b>\$2,685,595.00</b>	<b>\$1,749,934.14</b>

**Part 5 - Certifications and Documents**

*Part 5 includes electronic versions of specific requirements, certifications and documents that a State must agree to as a condition of participation in MCSAP. The submission of the CVSP serves as official notice and certification of compliance with these requirements. State or States means all of the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.*

*If the person submitting the CVSP does not have authority to certify these documents electronically, then the State must continue to upload the signed/certified form(s) through the "My Documents" area on the State's Dashboard page.*

**1 - State Certification**

*The State Certification will not be considered complete until the four questions and certification declaration are answered. Selecting 'no' in the declaration may impact your State's eligibility for MCSAP funding.*

1. What is the name of the person certifying the declaration for your State? John Broers
2. What is this person's title? Captain, South Dakota Highway Patrol
3. Who is your Governor's highway safety representative? Lee Axdahl
4. What is this person's title? Director Highway Safety

**The State affirmatively accepts the State certification declaration written below by selecting 'yes'.**

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

**State Certification declaration:**

I, John Broers, Captain, South Dakota Highway Patrol, on behalf of the State of SOUTH DAKOTA, as requested by the Administrator as a condition of approval of a grant under the authority of [49 U.S.C. § 31102](#), as amended, certify that the State satisfies all the conditions required for MCSAP funding, as specifically detailed in [49 C.F.R. § 350.211](#).

**2 - Annual Review of Laws, Regulations, Policies and Compatibility Certification**

*You must answer all three questions and indicate your acceptance of the certification declaration. Selecting 'no' in the declaration may impact your State's eligibility for MCSAP funding.*

1. What is the name of your certifying State official? John Broers
2. What is the title of your certifying State official? Captain, South Dakota Highway Patrol
3. What are the phone # and email address of your State official? 605-773-4578 john.broers@state.sd.us

**The State affirmatively accepts the compatibility certification declaration written below by selecting 'yes'.**

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

I, John Broers, certify that the State has conducted the annual review of its laws and regulations for compatibility regarding commercial motor vehicle safety and that the State's safety laws remain compatible with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (49 CFR parts 390-397) and the Hazardous Materials Regulations (49 CFR parts 107 (subparts F and G only), 171-173, 177, 178, and 180) and standards and orders of the Federal government, except as may be determined by the Administrator to be inapplicable to a State enforcement program. For the purpose of this certification, Compatible means State laws or regulations pertaining to interstate commerce that are identical to the FMCSRs and HMRs or have the same effect as the FMCSRs and identical to the HMRs and for intrastate commerce rules identical to or within the tolerance guidelines for the FMCSRs and identical to the HMRs.

If there are any exceptions that should be noted to the above certification, include an explanation in the text box below.

South Dakota does not require intrastate drivers to have a medical card unless required by an employer, or when operating a school bus. South Dakota's definition of a CMV is a vehicle that exceeds 26,000 pounds GVWR and has more than 3 axles.

**3 - New Laws/Legislation/Policy Impacting CMV Safety**

**Has the State adopted/enacted any new or updated laws (i.e., statutes) impacting CMV safety since the last CVSP or annual update was submitted?**

☒ Yes ☐ No

In the table below, please provide the bill number and effective date of any new legislation. Include the code section which was changed because of the bill and provide a brief description of the legislation. Please include a statute number, hyperlink or URL, in the summary. Do NOT include the actual text of the Bill as that can be very lengthy.

Legislative Adoption			
Bill Number	Effective Date	Code Section Changed	Summary of Changes
1029	07/01/2017	SDCL 49-28A-3	SD's annual adoption of 49CFR 387 and 390 to 397 as amended through January 1, 2017, and parts 171 to 180 as amended through January 1, 2017.
1030	07/01/2017	SDCL 32-22-62, 32-22-8.1 and 32-22-12.1	Size and weight of CMV's referenced in the FAST Act.

**Has the State adopted/enacted any new administrative actions or policies impacting CMV safety since the last CVSP?**

☐ Yes ☒ No