

Minutes

Date: Thursday Sept 9 and Friday Sept 10, 1999
Location: Holiday Inn, Calgary
Chair: John Pearson
In Attendance: (See Attachment 1)

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mr. Pearson called the meeting to order and welcomed participants. He noted that the primary objective of the meeting was to complete development of a proposal for a western regional agreement on special permitting of oversize/overweight loads.

2. Round Table Introductions

A round table introduction of participants was conducted.

3. Report on National Meeting held June 28, 1998 (Toronto)

a) *National Standards*

Mr. Pearson provided a brief overview of the discussions which occurred at a national meeting of the Task Force held in Toronto at the end of June. He noted that the minutes of this meeting, and background documentation for several of the discussion items were available from the Secretariat or on the internet at www.tac-atc.ca/programs/rdc/trucking

b) *NAFTA Harmonization*

Mr. Pearson noted that a primary focus of the national meeting in Toronto had been on the work of the NAFTA Land Transport Standards Subcommittee. He reported that the NAFTA subcommittee on harmonization of vehicle weight and dimension regulations had been active since 1995, and had issued two reports over the past year:

“Harmonization of Vehicle Weight and Dimension Regulations Within the NAFTA Partnership”, and

“Performance Criteria In Support of Vehicle Weight and Dimension Regulations: Background Paper”

He reported that the NAFTA committee would be considering recommendations for safety performance criteria and acceptable thresholds as part of the foundation to be used for regulatory harmonization discussions.

c) *Proposed Standards for Signing, Marking & Lighting of Overdimensional Loads*

Mr. Pearson reported that agreement had been reached in Toronto on common, minimum standards for signing, marking and lighting of overdimensional loads. Copies of the recommendations were distributed, and a request for comments on the acceptability of the proposals for western Canada was extended.

In discussion it was suggested that consideration be given to recognizing the “Oversize Load” sign as an alternative to the “D” sign. In addition, it was requested that the standard be clarified to ensure that jurisdictions would not require rotating beacons or warning lights to be covered when not in use.

d) Car Carriers – Special Permit Conditions

Mr. Pearson reported that two amendments to the standard permit conditions for car carrier configurations had been proposed at the meeting in Toronto to address problems which had arisen with excessive rear overhang. He noted that the proposals had been endorsed in principle pending further consultation with the auto carrier industry.

e) Box Length on A train doubles

It was reported that it had been agreed to proceed with implementation of a 20 metre box length limit on A trains as a western regional standard. It was reported that Alberta had amended its regulations to accommodate this change, Saskatchewan and Manitoba were making permits available, and B.C. was in the process of preparing a regulatory amendment.

f) Steering Axle Weight Limits

It was noted that a proposal had been tabled in Toronto from the Western Professional Truck Drivers Association to allow higher weights (ie. greater than 5500 kg) on steering axles for tractor-trailer combinations. In review of the proposal, jurisdictional representatives reported as follows:

B.C. – Mr. Oldridge reported that this proposal could not be supported by the Ministry of Transportation and Highways because of the implications for increased infrastructure damage.

Alberta – Mr. Krumins reported that the proposal was still under review, noting that concerns had been raised within the department, particularly from the enforcement perspective.

Saskatchewan – Mr. Gilks reported that the review had raised similar concerns for infrastructure damage, and that his department could not support the proposal.

Manitoba – Mr. Cateeuw reported similar concerns had been raised, but noted that permits could be made available to address circumstances where higher steering axle loads could not be avoided (such as specialized equipment).

4. Minutes of Meeting Held November 23, 1988 (Nisku)

The minutes of the meeting held in Nisku were adopted as circulated.

5. Business Arising

a) Transportation of hay bales

Mr. Moroz provided a brief report on the status of discussions with respect to Alberta's special permit conditions for movement of hay bales. He noted that a number of carriers had been working with the department on the issues and that a second draft of the position paper had been issued for comment at the end of July. He noted that some of the changes being contemplated included:

- allowing an extension of the box length on tractor semitrailer configurations
- capping the overall length limit at 25 metres
- limiting the effective rear overhang on straight trucks to 4 metres
- requiring special attention to placement and securement of hay bales on the vehicle

6. Regional Harmonization of Special Permit Conditions for Oversize/Overweight Vehicles and Loads

The discussions which had taken place regarding the proposals which had been developed in Nisku were reviewed. Each jurisdiction reported on the acceptability of the proposed axle and vehicle weight limits. Mr. Cateeuw reported that his department could not support any increases in axle and/or gross vehicle weights beyond the current caps which exist in their permit programs.

Mr. Rushfeldt provided a brief presentation on the work which his committee had completed to date in identifying candidate corridors for heavy haul movement (depicted on a series of maps). He noted

that further work needed to be done in this area, in particular in selecting potential corridors in Manitoba.

Mr. Pearson reported that a submission on candidate routes had also been received from the Northern B.C. Truckers Association. Mr. Bragg also provided a submission on candidate routes from BCTA.

Following a discussion, **it was agreed** that the work of the committee should focus on achieving two objectives:

1. Preparing a western regional “envelope” permit agreement based on the lowest common denominator of existing weight and dimension limits.
 - a. Provides a description of vehicle configurations which would be acceptable for travel throughout network under permit (with recognition that lower weight limits on posted bridges must be respected)
 - b. “One stop shopping” for permit – good for travel in all participating jurisdictions
 - c. Tridem drive tractors will not be included in the initial agreement (ie. local permit policies/conditions would continue to apply)
2. Developing the concept of a network of heavy haul “corridors” on which higher weights or greater dimensions could likely be achieved in the longer term.
 - a. Acknowledgement that some routes may require upgrading to accommodate target loads or dimensions

Effort was then directed to developing a proposal for Objective 1 (Attachment 2). Outstanding issues respecting the proposal were as follows:

- weight limit for 16 wheel configurations (Action: B.C.)
- “knock-down” formulas (Action: All jurisdictions)
 - single to tandem
 - tandem to tandem
 - tandem to tridem
- acceptability of self-steering dollies (Action: B.C.)

It was further agreed that invitations should be extended to Parks Canada and Public Works Canada to participate in the project. It was also suggested that, if possible, participation of municipal governments would be beneficial to the objectives of the proposed agreement.

It was agreed that the proposed agreement would be circulated to all participants for comment, with a view to completing the proposal by early November 1999.

Action: All members

It was noted that the concept of “one-stop shopping” for special permits may take time to implement, as there were a number of issues which would have to be sorted out within and between jurisdictions on both the financial and operational sides. However, it was agreed that development of a common permit application form should be accorded a high priority by jurisdictions.

Action: Jurisdiction representatives
Secretary

With respect to the proposal to develop a network of heavy haul corridors, it was agreed that comments should be provided to the secretary on the proposed routes received to date, along with any proposed additions to the candidate network.

Action: All members

7. Other Business

a) *Overloads on Drive Axles for permanently mounted equipment*

A review of issues and policies regarding specialized equipment which has axle weights greater than the regulated provincial limits was undertaken. It was noted that special permits were generally available for such equipment, except in spring ban periods, when overload permits are usually only available for specific essential commodities or equipment.

b) *Climber 4000 load shifting device*

The characteristics of this device were discussed, and it was generally agreed that its use would violate the suspension load equalization requirements contained in provincial regulation. It was noted that the tridem drive concept would likely be preferable in increasing traction while maintaining load equalization.

c) *LCV's*

Mr. Catteeuw noted that efforts had been taken in the past to harmonize weight and dimension limits for LCV's in western Canada. He noted that Manitoba currently limits the length of Rocky Mountain Doubles to 30 metres, and asked for clarification of the policies in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Mr. Moroz and Mr. Gilks indicated that the length limit for Rocky Mountain Doubles had been increased to 31 metres. Mr. Catteeuw asked for available background documentation on this change to support the case for an increase in length in Manitoba.

Action: Moroz, Gilks

d) *Box Length limit on B trains*

Mr. Sokil asked for clarification of the status of the proposal tabled in 1998 to allow an increase in the box length limit on B-Trains to 21.5 metres. Mr. Pearson reported that an analysis of the stability, control and turning performance implications of the change had been presented to the committee previously, with the conclusions:

- the low speed offtracking would exceed the defined threshold of acceptability if the sum of the trailer wheelbases exceeded 17 metres
- other aspects of performance would not likely be negatively impacted

He noted that there was an important outstanding issue with respect to the implications of reducing the available space to fit a tractor to the combination between the overall length limit and the box length limit. He noted that, while previous stability and control research had indicated that a "window" of 3 to 3.5 m appeared to sufficient to accommodate a tractor of adequate wheelbase, industry had argued that tractors with wheelbases in this range were unsuitable for B Trains. He noted that this concern had been addressed through an amendment to the MOU in 1994 to increase the overall length to 25 m while, leaving the box length limit at 20 m. He suggested that the safety concerns raised by industry in the past with shorter wheelbase tractors would have to be addressed if an increase in box length, without an increase in overall length, were to be contemplated.

e) *Tandem – Tridem truck*

Mr. Barkley urged that this configuration be recognized in western Canada, with appropriate and consistent regulations within the region. Mr. Parker reported that FERIC had been conducting tests on a tandem-tridem straight truck, and noted that a report on the results would likely be available in January.

It was agreed that consideration should be given to developing consistent treatment of this configuration, and that the research being conducted by FERIC should be reviewed when available.

f) Escort vehicle specification

The specification for escort vehicles included in the proposed standards was reviewed. In discussion it was noted that the 6000 kg upper limit on the GVW of escort vehicles would preclude the use of large straight trucks as escorts. However, it was acknowledged that the proposal constituted minimum standards, and that individual jurisdictions could choose to be more liberal in applying these standards if desired (eg. Larger escort vehicles could be permitted by a jurisdiction)

g) Municipal involvement

Concern was raised that involvement of municipalities in any regional permitting agreement was of critical importance to the objectives simplifying administrative and operational requirements for heavy haul movements.

8. U.S. Report

Mr. Galt from the Montana Department of Transportation was introduced and welcomed to the meeting.

Mr. Galt provided a brief report on the work of WASHTO (Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials), particularly in the area of regional permitting for oversize/overweight loads. He expressed interest in the discussions of the committee and in the draft proposal on a regional permitting agreement. He indicated that this would likely be of great interest to WASHTO, and offered to provide a briefing at their next meeting. He suggested that there were good opportunities to collaborate with WASHTO in this area, noting that the differences in the “envelope” permit vehicles which had been developed appeared to be relatively small.

He reported that the Western Governors Association had recently placed high priority on improving the efficiency of transportation in the western U.S., and were in the process of developing a “round table” discussion forum to consider a number of issues, including truck size and weight limits. He indicated that the participation of Canadian jurisdictions in these discussions would be desirable in the future, although the current membership of the “table” would not accommodate full Canadian participation. He noted that particular attention was being paid to the bridge formula, and to changes in methodology which might be possible.

Mr. Galt reported that the recent federal highway funding bill (TEA 21) had increased the funding available for highway rehabilitation and improvements. He noted that Montana was developing and planning candidate projects for longer term improvements, and suggested that if Canadian carriers or highway agencies had specific suggestions for improvements which are needed in Montana these should be forwarded to him at:

Mr. David Galt,
Montana Department of Transportation,
Box 3649,
Helena, Montana 59620

Tel: (406) 444-9263
Fax: (406) 444-7638
Email: dgalt@state.mt.us

9. Adjournment

There no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 PM.

Secretary: John Pearson

Date Distributed: October 12, 1999

Attachment 1: Participants

Name	Affiliation	Phone	Fax
Alan Robinson	WPTA	(250) 851-9482	(250) 851-9482
Alvin Moroz	Alberta Transportation	(403) 340-5189	(403) 340-5092
Andy McEachern	Peerless Limited	(250) 492-0408	(250) 492-7353
Bill Murray	Alta Water Well Drilling Assn	(780) 934-4271	(780) 934-4865
Bill Rowe	Nowasco - Fracmaster	(403) 531-5187	(403) 236-8740
Bill Sokil	Sokil Express Lines	(780) 479-1955	(780) 474-9325
Bob Dolyniuk	Manitoba Trucking Association	(204) 632-6600	(204) 694-7134
Dave Galt	Montana Dept of Transportation	(406) 444-6140	(406) 444-9263
Dale Marchand	Premay Equipment	(780) 447-5555	(780) 447-3744
David Barclay	Sam's General Trucking	(306) 965-2703	(306) 965-2290
Denis Petit	Canadian Freightways	(403) 287-4388	(403) 287-4343
Ed Baerg	Kootenay Dairy Transport	(250) 542-5286	(250) 542-4083
Gary Farnden	B.C. Ministry of Transportation & Hwys	(250) 387-7728	(250) 387-7735
Greg Catteeuw	Manitoba Highways and Transportation	(204) 945-3898	(204) 948-2078
Greg Gilks	Saskatchewan Highways and Transport.	(306) 787-4851	(306) 787-3963
Hans Loewen	Premay Equipment	(604) 439-1621	(604) 435-5998
Imants Krumins	Alberta Transportation	(403) 340-5189	(403) 340-5092
Jerry Topilka	Alta Water Well Drilling Assn	(780) 962-3594	(780) 962-4990
Joe Bragg	Triton Transport	(604) 464-6406	(604) 464-4707
John Kinsey	Peerless Limited	(250) 492-0408	(250) 492-0408
John Pearson	Transportation Association of Canada	(613) 489-2220	(613) 489-0221
Lloyd Atkin	Alberta Transportation	(403) 340-5189	(403) 340-5092
Marlow Rushfelt	Speedy Heavy Hauling	(403) 223-2022	(403) 223-4006
Pat Sams	Aspen Trailer Group	(780) 955-2540	(780) 955-2533
Rick Barclay	Sam's General Trucking	(306) 965-2703	(306) 965-2290
Ron Oldridge	Insurance Corporation of BC	(250) 387-6444	(250) 356-8986
Séamus Parker	FERIC	(604) 228-1555	(604) 228-0999
Ted Reiniger	Manac Western	(780) 447-1559	(780) 447-2515

**Attachment 2 –
Draft Western Regional Agreement on Oversize/Overweight Special Permits**

**Harmonization of Special Permit Conditions for
Movement of Indivisible Loads and Specialized Heavy Haul Equipment**

Objectives:

1. Phase 1: Today

- To establish an “envelope” of vehicle dimensions and weights which will be acceptable to all participating jurisdictions for special permit travel on a broad network of highways under provincial/territorial jurisdiction
- To establish a mechanism for “one stop shopping” for special permits for vehicles which fall within the described envelope, for travel in all participating jurisdictions

2. Phase 2: Future

- To identify and establish a series of corridors within western Canada to facilitate intra- and inter-jurisdictional travel which are capable of accepting vehicle configurations and weights commonly used by heavy haul industries
- To establish “one stop shopping” for special permits for travel on these corridors

Proposals

1. Weight Limits

Axle Configuration	Limit – Phase 1 Network Wide	Limit – Phase 2 Corridors
Tire Loading	Max 10 kg/mm	Max 10 kg/mm
Steering Axle (single tires)	9100 kg (20,062 lb)	9100 kg (20,062 lb)
Single Axle	9100 kg (20,062 lb)	9100 kg (20,062 lb)
Tandem Steer (single tires)	15,200 kg (33,510 lb)	Cap based on 10 kg/mm
Tandem Axle Group	21,000 kg (46,297 lb)	23,000 kg (50,706 lb)
Tridem Axle Group		
2.4 – 3.0 m spread	27,000 kg (59,525 lb)	27,000 kg (59,525 lb)
> 3.0 m spread	27,000 kg (59,525 lb)	29,000 kg (63,934 lb)
Tridem Equivalent		
2.4 – 3.0 m spread	27,000 kg (59,525 lb)	27,000 kg (59,525 lb)
> 3.0 m spread	27,000 kg (59,525 lb)	29,000 kg (63,934 lb)
16 Wheel Configuration	27,500 kg (60,627 lb)*	31,000 kg (68,343 lb)
Gross Vehicle Weight	60,000 kg (132,277 lb)	

** Note: 16 wheel configuration is currently limited to 23,000 kg in British Columbia – the feasibility of allowing this configuration at higher weights under special permit is being evaluated.*

2. Interaxle Spacing Requirements:

(Minimum spacing required to obtain maximum axle weights)

	Phase 1 – Network <i>(to be completed)</i>	Phase 2 – Corridors <i>(to be completed)</i>
Single to Single		
Single to Tandem		
Single to Tridem		
Tandem Steer to Tandem		
Tandem to Tandem		
Tandem to Tridem		
Tridem to Tridem		

“**Knock-down Formula**” – reduction in allowable axle weight when minimum interaxle spacing requirement is not met: **To Be Determined**

Dimension Envelope

1. Without pilot car

	Phase 1 – Network	Phase 2 – Corridors
Overall Length	27.5 m (90.2 ft)	
Overall Width	3.5 m (11.5 ft)	
Overall Height	4.3 m (14.1 ft)	

2. With pilot car(s)

	Phase 1 – Network	Phase 2 – Corridors
Overall Length	30 m (98.4 ft)	
Overall Width	3.85 m (12.6 ft)	
Overall Height	4.3 m (14.1 ft)	

3. Warning Signs, Signals and Devices for Movement of Overdimensional Loads

- as specified in the national standards (July 1999)

Notes:

Phase 1 (Network)

- weight limits are dependent upon use of appropriate equipment (ie. rated capacities of tires, axles, suspensions etc)
- tridem drive trucks or tractors are not included in envelope permit agreement
- use of self-steering dollies sought throughout network
- each jurisdiction to provide listing of available routes and posted bridges
- participation by federal and municipal governments to be pursued

Phase 2 (Corridors)

- proposed corridor network to be documented and distributed for consultation
- jurisdictions to assess viability and/or impacts of proposed weights on identified corridors

Attachment 3 – Proposed Heavy-haul Corridors (Initial Draft)

