

Task Force on Vehicle Weights and Dimensions Policy Western Regional Meeting

Minutes

Date: Monday December 4 and Tuesday December 5, 2000
Location: Ramada Hotel, Calgary
Chair: John Pearson
In Attendance: (See Attachment 1)

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mr. Pearson called the meeting to order and thanked participants for making themselves available for the discussions. He drew attention to the agenda which had been circulated earlier, and invited comments or requests for additional items.

- Mr. Delaney requested that an update be provided on the status of Alberta's automated special permit system (TRAVIS).
- Mr. Sokil asked that converter dollies and dromedary boxes be added as agenda items under Other Business.

With these additions, the agenda was adopted.

2. Round Table Introductions

A round table introduction of participants was conducted.

3. Minutes of Meeting Held September 9/10, 1999

The minutes of the September 1999 meeting were adopted as circulated.

4. National Developments

a) Ontario/Quebec Agreement

Mr. Pearson provided a brief overview of the agreement reached between Ontario and Quebec in August on harmonization of weight and dimension limits for specific configurations of tractor semitrailers. A copy of the information package released by Ontario was provided to interested participants.

b) Development of uniform VW&D Standards for Atlantic Canada

Mr. Pearson provided a brief presentation on work underway in Atlantic Canada to establish vehicle uniform weight and dimension regulations within the region. He reported that a discussion paper had been issued in early 2000 as a basis for consultation with stakeholders. He noted that public meetings had been held in all four provinces through the spring of 2000, resulting in development and release of a revised discussion paper with proposed weight and dimension limits in the summer of 2000.

He noted that the proposal advocated adoption of all of the dimension limits contained in the national MOU, with the exception of the box length limit on A Train Doubles, which would be increased to 20 metres (from 18.5 m) in response to the recommendation from stakeholders in 1997. He noted that the tandem and tridem weight limits proposed for Atlantic Canada were consistent with the changes introduced in Quebec in 1998, and with the recommendations advanced by stakeholders in

1997. (18,000 kg on tandem groups and 21,000, 24,000 and 26,000 on tridem groups depending on spread). He noted that the discussion paper and further details on the proposed standards could be found on the internet at:

<http://www.comt.ca/english/programs/trucking/index.html>

5. International Developments

a) Update on NAFTA LTSS 2 discussions

Mr. Pearson provided a brief overview of the regulatory harmonization discussions taking place under the NAFTA Land Transportation Standards Subcommittee. He noted that, over the past year, the committee had been pursuing the concept of highway safety performance criteria as a potential basis for regulatory harmonization, and had issued a discussion paper for comment in early 1999. He reported that in October it had been agreed that further work in this area would be undertaken, along with formation of subcommittees to focus on the prospects of improving the consistency of regulations for specialized equipment such as automobile transporters and intercity motor coaches.

b) Regional Pilot Project Initiatives

Mr. Pearson reported that regionally based "pilot project" discussions had been initiated under NAFTA LTSS to identify and prioritize size and weight related administrative barriers and regulatory impediments to efficient movements within "international" trading regions. He noted that three such pilot project regions had been initially identified:

- Ontario/Quebec/Michigan/New York
- Northwest US/western Canada
- Mexico/Southwest US

He reported that preliminary discussion had started on the first of these pilots, with the hope that similar discussions could be launched in western Canada/northwest US in the near future. He noted that the involvement of carriers and shippers in these discussions was very as being critical to the objectives.

c) Federal Highway Administration - Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Study

Mr. Pearson provided a brief overview of the recently completed US study, noting that the work focussed on developing "tools" which could be used to assess the impacts of potential changes in truck size and weight limits, and did not include any recommendations for changes in US policies. He reported that the last federal highway funding bill (TEA 21) had included an assignment to the Transportation Research Board to evaluate the current federal truck size and weight limits and to develop recommendations on possible changes for presentation to Congress in early 2002.

He reported that copies of the Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Study reports (4 volumes) were available on the internet from FHWA (in hard copy or CD ROM format) at:

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/reports/tswstudy/>

6. Vehicle Configuration Issues

a) Tridem Drive Tractors

Mr. Moroz provided a brief report on the use of tridem drive tractors in Alberta. He noted that these operate only under special permits, with conditions, weight limits and dimensions which are based on the results of research, testing and operational trials. He noted that the configurations now in use include single steer trucks and tractors, and that tests of tandem steer tridem drive have been undertaken. He indicated that Alberta and B.C. have collaborated on this issue, and have worked closely to harmonize equipment specifications and permit conditions.

Mr. Oldridge provided a brief report on B.C.'s experience with tridem drives, noting that the initial permits were available only for logging operations, based on interest from that sector. He noted that testing of a variety of logging configurations with tri-drive tractors had been undertaken, and that more recently testing had also been done with a low-bed trailer. He indicated that a "third-party" report on the testing would be available shortly, and that he anticipated making changes to the regulations to accommodate tridem drive tractors within the next six months.

In discussion, Mr. Moroz and Mr. Oldridge indicated that, while the original tri-drive test programs were restricted to specialized applications or commodities, they anticipated expanding the permit program to include all transportation of any commodities.

Mr. Gilks noted that Saskatchewan was interested in looking at the feasibility of using tridem drive equipment, and would be reviewing the results of the testing done in Alberta and BC. He noted that acceptable performance relative to stability and control criteria would be important if a similar permit program were to be initiated.

Mr. Catteeuw noted that there had not been a great deal of interest expressed in the use of tridem drive tractors in Manitoba. He reported that the implications of allowing heavier steering axles, as necessary for tridem drives, would likely raise concerns for highway infrastructure in Manitoba.

Mr. Dolyniuk expressed the hope that the western provinces would work together on this issue, and that BC and Alberta would share the results of their research and testing with the group.

Mr. Loewen noted that, while carriers in Manitoba may not be interested in tridem drive equipment at this time, the ability to use tridem drives in Manitoba would be very helpful to carriers which travel through the province to gain access to the US heavy haul corridors.

Mr. Pinchak reported that the industry's experience with tridem drive tractors has been excellent, and questioned why the weight limit for the tridem is penalized relative to the limits available for tridems on trailers. He noted that some difficulties were also being experienced maintaining the minimum required steering axle weight, particularly when hauling specialized commodities which cannot be readily moved on the trailer.

b) Stabilized Trailers

Mr. Amlin from the Forest Engineering Research Institute provided a brief presentation on this item. He reported that FERIC were considering a program of research and testing to examine the opportunities which might be available to improve the stability and control performance of pony and full trailers. He indicated that the University of Michigan had done work in this area previously, with encouraging results. He noted that, operationally, some types of operations are best suited to truck-trailer configurations, but the weight limit restrictions which apply to full trailers and pony trailers are problematic. He noted that Saskatchewan had introduced several stabilized A train configurations over ten years ago, and appeared to have had good success with the configuration operating at weight limits comparable to a B Train.

He concluded his presentation with an invitation that FERIC would welcome any comments on the proposed work, including its relevance or scope. He indicated that the research could be of interest and relevance to transportation of commodities other than logging applications, and noted that FERIC would welcome discussions with other groups.

Mr. Amlin was thanked for his presentation and **it was agreed** that participants would provide comments or questions to FERIC on the concept and proposed plan as quickly as possible.

Action: All members

7. Regulated Dimension Limits

a) *B Train Double - limit on effective rear overhang*

Mr. Pearson introduced this item, noting that the national standards, as contained in the MOU, included controls to prevent excessive rear swingout during turning based on a maximum swingout of 0.2 meters during a 90 degree turn. He noted that for this reason, the effective rear overhang of semitrailers, in a tractor-semitrailer configuration was limited to no more than 35% of the trailer's wheelbase. He noted that while this control did not appear in the MOU for semitrailers used in B Train Doubles, it appeared to have been implemented in B.C. and Saskatchewan.

He then introduced Mr. Doug Russell from Advance Engineered Products to address the issue. Mr. Russell provided a presentation on the technical issues and on the implications for tank trailer manufacturers of having to comply with a 35% of wheelbase limit on the second semitrailer in B trains. Mr. Russell reported that, based on his analysis, the rear overhang on the second semitrailer in a B Train could be considerably greater than 35% of wheelbase before rear swingout would reach 0.2 meters. He reported similar findings based on his analysis of the turning characteristics of truck - full trailer configurations.

He reported that tank manufacturers could design B trains to respect a 35% of wheelbase limit on rear overhang, but the consequences for stability and control were not positive because a larger diameter barrel and higher centre of gravity for the payload would be required. He reported that Advance were modifying tank trailers to comply with the 35% limit because of customers problems in complying with existing regulations in BC. In light of the fact that turning performance did not appear to be a concern, he asked that consideration be given to dropping, or increasing, the limit on rear overhang to allow greater flexibility to design more stable trailers.

In discussion Mr. Oldridge explained that BC had implemented the rear overhang restriction on B Train semitrailers to address interchangeability of trailers and circumstances where one of the trailers is dropped, with the configuration continues as a tractor-semitrailer. Mr. Gilks reported that the problem arises in Saskatchewan with the definition of a semitrailer, not with the specific limits on a B Train combination. Mr. Moroz reported that Alberta was changing its regulations to limit the rear overhang only on the first semitrailer in a B Train double (to 35% of WB), with no explicit control on the second.

In concluding this discussion, **it was agreed** that the limits currently contained in the MOU should be reconfirmed, with no explicit control on the effective rear overhang on:

- a second semitrailer in a B Train double trailer combinations,
- a full trailer used in an A or C double trailer combination
- a full trailer used in a truck- trailer configuration.

It was further agreed that provincial officials would take steps necessary to accommodate vehicles which meet the current MOU dimension standards, while regulatory or policy changes necessary to remove rear overhang restrictions are made.

Action: Oldridge, Gilks

b) Box Length Limit on A Trains

It was noted that all four western provinces had moved to increase the box length limit on A Trains to 20 metres, from 18.5 metres. Mr. Pearson noted that, if approved, this change would be included in the uniformity package being considered in Atlantic Canada, for introduction in July 2001.

In discussion, Mr. Petit inquired about the status of the proposal to increase the box length limit on B Trains to 21 metres. Mr. Pearson reported that there had been no further progress on this issue, following the report which had been tabled previously. He noted that two technical concerns had been raised in the report; the first related to potential excessive offtracking with longer trailers, and the second related to the stability and control properties of the shorter tractors which would be required within an overall length limit of 25 metres.

c) Roll Tarp Systems

Mr. Pearson introduced this item, and provided copies of correspondence which had been provided by Mr. Legue of Till-Fab Industries on the use of rolling tarp systems on flatbed trailers (Attachment 2). He noted that the desire to harmonize language, application and interpretation of key definitions for vehicle dimensions had been on the agenda for some time. He noted that the US Federal Highway Administration had recently issued proposed changes in their regulations on overall width and length, and circulated copies of a summary to participants (Attachment 3).

Mr. Dolyniuk provided a presentation on the issues (Attachment 4), noting that there was a pressing need to establish consistency in Canada and with the United States in the definition of vehicle width, and on which devices or equipment which are excluded from measurement. He noted that the rolling tarp systems have become widely used throughout North America and provide significant benefits in reducing injuries due to drivers or workers falling from the top of loads. He noted that while the regulations in some jurisdictions may not allow such systems to be eligible for the 10 cm exclusion from measurement provided on each side of the trailer, the widespread use of these trailers suggested that enforcement has been neither rigorous or consistent.

He noted that carriers have substantial investments in this type of equipment, are operating in many jurisdictions, and have experienced greatly improved driver safety and operational efficiency as a result. In concluding his presentation, Mr. Dolyniuk called for harmonization and consistency between jurisdictions on this issue, and proposed that roll tarp systems be allowed in all jurisdictions, on the condition that the overall width not exceed 2.8 metres, and that the width of the cargo remain restricted to 2.6 metres.

In discussion, **it was agreed** that immediate action must be taken on this issue to resolve the inconsistencies between jurisdictions and to clarify the width definition and acceptable exclusions for carriers.

It was further agreed that a definition should be drafted based on the principles that:

- there should be no increase in the regulated width limit for cargo (ie. 2.6 metres)
- any devices or equipment not designed or used for the transportation of cargo can extend up to 10 cm beyond each side of the vehicle
- rearview mirrors may extend up to 30 cm beyond the side of the vehicle

Mr. Dolyniuk prepared and presented a draft definition for this purpose. Following further discussion, a revised draft was prepared as attached. (Attachment 5)

It was agreed that measures necessary to allow the use of rolling tarp systems which comply with the principles and limits described above would be taken immediately, pending completion and implementation of a revised definition.

Action: Alberta, Manitoba

d) Length Limit Exclusions and Exceptions

It was noted that the US proposed rulemaking also addressed length limit exclusions. It was also reported that a request had been received at previous meetings to exclude from measurement of overall length special bumpers used as protection against collisions with wildlife.

In discussion it was suggested that an exclusion of 30 cm on the front of a vehicle and 10 cm at the rear of a vehicle should be provided to accommodate auxiliary non-load carrying equipment. There was not consensus on this proposal, and **it was agreed** that further analysis of the need for exclusions from overall length limits would be undertaken.

Action: Secretary

e) Tandem – Tridem truck

Mr. Barkley reiterated his request that this configuration be recognized in western Canada, with appropriate and consistent regulations within the region. Mr. Oldridge reported that BC would be conducting tests on this configuration in February in pursuit of developing appropriate weight and dimension limits for operation under special permits. Mr. Moroz reported that this configuration can operate in Alberta under permit already.

Mr. Kinvig asked whether this configuration would be restricted to heavy haul operations, or whether it could be used in other applications. Mr. Oldridge reported that BC's current evaluation focussed on specialized trucks with permanently mounted equipment. Mr. Moroz reported that Alberta would be open to any types of operations, noting that testing was currently being carried out on a ready-mix concrete truck. **It was agreed** that BC and Alberta would collaborate in developing permit conditions for this configuration, and that the results would be shared with the group.

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)

8. Regulated Weight Limits

a) Steering Axle Weight Limit

It was noted that a proposal had been tabled from the Western Professional Truck Drivers Association to allow higher weights (ie. greater than 5500 kg) on steering axles for tractor-trailer combinations, and that the western jurisdictions had agreed to evaluate the feasibility within their departments. The jurisdictional representatives indicated that there was nothing further to report beyond the status reports provided in late 1999, in which concerns with the potential impacts on infrastructure had been raised in each province.

b) Tandem Axle Weight Limits

It was noted that the prevalent weight limit on tandem axle groups in Eastern Canada would eventually become 18,000 kg, with the changes planned in Ontario and Atlantic Canada. Mr. Moroz

reported that the Alberta Minister had asked the department to evaluate the potential impacts of such a change for the province.

Mr. Oldridge indicated that no consideration was being given to increasing tandem axle weights because of infrastructure impacts and costs. Mr. Oliver commented that BC preferred to encourage the use of tridems if additional payload is needed because of the lower impact on infrastructure. He indicated that higher weight limits on tandem groups could significantly increase maintenance costs on the highway network, and possibly divert payload away from more efficient configurations such as the B train.

Mr. Gilks supported these comments, noting that there appeared to be little interest from Saskatchewan carriers in increased tandem weight limits.

Mr. Catteeuw reported that Manitoba could not afford to increase highway maintenance costs, and unless there was federal funding for upgrading the highway system, weight limit increases would not likely be supported.

Mr. Oliver asked if the impact study being undertaken by Alberta could be shared with BC.

Action: Moroz

c) Tridem Axle Weight Limits

Mr. Moroz reported that Alberta would be increasing the weight limit on medium spread tridem groups to 24,000 kg (from 23,000) in early 2001. Messrs. Gilks and Catteeuw indicated that such a change was not currently being contemplated in their provinces.

d) Gross Vehicle Weight Limits

Mr. Moroz reported that Alberta would be increasing the maximum gross weight limit for B trains from 62.5 tonnes to 63.5 tonnes in early 2001.

9. Specialized Vehicles - Automobile Transporters

It was noted that efforts had been taken in 1997 to harmonize the special permit conditions for car carriers with the US federal regulations, with the assistance of car carrier industry representatives. It was reported that proposed national permit conditions for stinger steer configurations had been developed, and had received the support of all jurisdictions.

It was further noted that issues regarding the maximum acceptable rear overhang at the rear of the tractor unit had been discussed at previous meetings, with the proposal that the maximum effective rear overhang (including load) not exceed 4.6 metres. It was noted that the normal limit on effective rear overhang for a straight truck would be 4.0 metres, but this could be extended to 4.6 metres for car carriers because automobiles and light trucks are typically less than 2.6 m wide.

Mr. Makarenko from Allied Systems provided a brief report on the dimension limit issues faced by his industry. He noted there are currently no manufacturers of car carrier configurations in Canada, and consequently their fleet is designed and manufactured in the US. He explained that the increasing size of SUV's is posing problems for efficiency, and where 9 cars used to be a common load, only 7 or 8 can be carried today. He indicated that 75% of Allied's fleet would have an effective rear overhang on the truck of up to 5.6 metres, and hence the proposed 4.6 m limit would pose a real problem.

He raised concerns with the complexity of the permit system in Saskatchewan noting that permits are only available on a single trip basis, and that often 20 trucks per day cross the province. He asked that consideration be given to issuing annual or monthly permits.

In concluding this discussion **it was agreed** that:

- Mr. Gilks would discuss the permit system in Saskatchewan with Mr. Makarenko
- The provincial representatives would review the concerns with possible lane intrusion due to excessive effective rear overhang on the truck-tractor, with a view to confirming that the 4.6 m limit cannot be increased

Mr. Pearson noted that this issue was also under review by the NAFTA LTSS 2 committee, and suggested that participation by Allied Systems in the discussion would be beneficial. Mr. Pearson noted non-stinger steer car carriers appeared to be growing in usage, and that a number of performance related issues would arise if the front and rear overhangs used on stinger steer configurations were also allowed on regular tractor-semitrailer configuration. Mr. Makarenko reported that Allied only used stinger steer configurations in Canada.

10. Special Permit Programs - Longer Combination Vehicles

a) Dimension Limits on Rocky Mountain Doubles

It was noted that there was a conflict between provincial permit conditions for Rocky Mountain Doubles related to the maximum hitch offset allowed (on the lead trailer). It was noted that Saskatchewan restricts the offset to a maximum of 1.8 metres, while Manitoba and Alberta allow larger dimensions.

Mr. Gilks reported that a study of the implications of increasing the allowable hitch offset was being undertaken, and if the findings support an increase, the permit conditions will be changed. Mr. Dolyniuk suggested that the research results be shared with all jurisdictions before action is taken with the objective of ensuring consistency in permit conditions.

Mr. Petit questioned whether two 34 foot trailers in a B Train configuration would be considered eligible for a special permit as an LCV. **It was agreed** that the performance characteristics of this configuration would be suitable for consideration in this permit category.

11. Special Permit Programs - Oversize/Overweight Vehicles and loads

a) Review of Proposed Regional Agreement

Mr. Pearson provided a brief overview of the draft agreement which had been prepared at the meeting held in September 1999. He noted that there were a number of action assignments to be pursued following the meeting, and proposed that each of these be addressed.

b) Follow-up Actions

i) Weight limit on 16 wheel configuration

Mr. Farnden reported that an evaluation had determined that 27,500 kg could be supported on 16 wheel configurations generally, and that 31,000 kg could likely be supported on the corridors which had been identified. He noted that the assessment had been looked at using 16 wheels on jeeps), but suggested that other weight limit restrictions would likely apply to 16 wheel jeeps due to the bridge formula He reported that part of the corridor system was on the Alaska Highway, and that Public Works Canada would have to be involved in the assessment for the route from Fort St. John to Fort Nelson.

Mr. Moroz reported that the proposed weight limits would be acceptable to Alberta except during the spring weight restriction period.

ii) Acceptability of Self Steering Dollies

Mr. Oldridge reported that BC had reviewed the policy on requiring manned dollies for long bridge beams, had conducted comparison tests, and remained committed to the current policy requirements. It was noted that, within 30 m overall length limits proposed for the regional agreement, BC would allow self-steering dollies to be used.

iii) Weight Limit "Knock-down" formula

Mr. Farnden provided a brief presentation on the background work and analysis which he had done on the subject. In discussion it was acknowledged that further work was required by the provincial representatives to reach consensus on this issue.

Action: Provincial representatives

iv) Development of a common permit application form

It was reported that further work was required on this issue.

Action: Provincial representatives

v) Other Issues - Water Well Drilling Vehicle Permits

Mr. Whitehead asked that consideration be given to issuing annual permits for water well drilling equipment, as the vehicle configuration doesn't change. Mr. Catteeuw indicated that annual permits are currently available, with route restrictions. Mr. Oldridge reported that annual permits are available, although the fees are billed on a monthly basis.

c) *Route Networks/corridors*

i) Industry update

Mr. Rushfeldt noted that there was no further progress to be reported the proposed heavy haul corridor network. It was noted that work was required to identify corridors in Manitoba.

d) *Next Steps*

It was agreed that a concerted effort should be taken to bring the proposed regional agreement to completion early in 2001.

e) *Report on TRAVIS*

Mr. Moroz provided a report on the work being done in Alberta to develop and implement an automated "One Stop Shopping" system for special permits within the province.

Under Phase 1, due to be completed in January, he reported that the system would allow permit application details to be submitted over the internet, with automated faxing of permit details. He noted that routing details and checks would still be done manually.

Under Phase 2 he reported that the system would be capable of assessing all highways and roads in the province, and that permits would be automatically issued for the entire route to be followed (eg. provincial, municipal and county). He reported that the fees would be allocated back to the municipalities and/or counties. He noted that the system would also store the dimensions of vehicles which had been issued permits, and that the user would be prompted to confirm the dimensions the next time a permit is requested. Phase 2 is to be implemented later in 2001.

He noted that the system is being built by "in-house" computer specialists. He reported that a workshop would be held early in 2001 to demonstrate the permit system, and that internet access would likely be launched by the end of March. He noted that fees could be collected by account, credit card, cheque or cash, and that there would be no changes in fees from the current levels.

In discussion, considerable interest was expressed in the approach and system to be provided. Mr. Moroz indicated that it would be technically feasible to expand the route network inventory to include roads in other provinces if desired.

It was agreed that a common permit application form should be accorded a high priority to ensure that options for expanding or extending Alberta's automated system through the region remain open.

It was agreed that all jurisdictions would provide copies of their application forms to Mr. Moroz.

Action: B.C., Sask, Manitoba

12. Special Permit - Marking, Lighting and Escort Vehicle Requirements

a) Oversize Load Sign

Mr. Moroz reported that Alberta would be revising its policies to permit the use of "oversize load" or "wide load" signs as well as the standard "D" sign. Mr. Oldridge reported that BC had taken similar measures, recognizing the types of warning signs used in the United States, as well as the "D" sign.

Mr. Dolyniuk suggested that use of the "D" sign is confusing to the public, and that it should be phased out over a reasonable period.

b) Escort Vehicle Requirements

A wide ranging discussion on the role and responsibilities of escort vehicles ensued, with consensus emerging on the need to improve the consistency of requirements, to clarify the responsibilities, and to pursue a driver training and certification program.

Mr. Marchand provided a brief report on the work which had been undertaken by Premay to develop a training program for escort vehicle drivers. He noted that 65 drivers were being training, a handbook of "best practices" had been developed, and a series of seminars and workshops were planned. He offered to share the experience which Premay had gained in this work, and to participate in working group to develop a broader based program. He noted that reciprocity of credentials with the US is not likely to be a major concern, because of immigration and insurance constraints for Canadians working in the US.

In discussion **it was agreed** that a training program for escort vehicle/pilot car drivers would be highly desirable. **It was agreed** that governments should be involved to ensure proper "standards" are set for training, instructors are properly accredited, and license "endorsements" are controlled. It was suggested that colleges would likely be able to provide the training and would have access to resources to help develop the course materials.

In concluding the discussion, **it was agreed** that a subcommittee would be formed to further discuss the issue and develop a proposal for further action.

c) Flashing Lights

It was noted that a proposal for standardizing the requirements for warning lights, marking and signs had been completed by the Task Force in July 1999. **It was agreed** that priority should be placed on

standardizing provincial requirements in this area, and that the latest version of the proposal should be circulated to all participants for review and comment (Attachment 6).

Action: All participants

13. Other Business

a) Converter Dollies

Mr. Sokil asked for a review of provincial policies on towing of converter dollies behind trailers. It was reported that this practice is acceptable in all four western provinces provided the dolly is properly licensed and insured and has lights.

b) Dromedary Boxes

Mr. Sokil asked for a review of provincial policies on the use of dromedary boxes on tractors. It was reported that this issue was subject to a clarification in the national MOU in 1994, whereby **it was agreed** that dromedary boxes could be used on tractors. Mr. Gilks reported that there was a technical problem with definitions in Saskatchewan, whereby the "box length" limit for tractor-semitrailers is restricted to 16.2 metres, thereby preventing use of a drom box with longer trailers. He indicated that consideration would be given to changing this provision.

14. Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held in Calgary on March 5 and 6, 2001.

15. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Pearson thanked participants for their contributions, and adjourned the meeting.

Secretary: John Pearson

Date Distributed: January 5, 2001

List of Attachments

- 1. List of Meeting Participants**
- 2. Correspondence from Till Fab Industries**
- 3. US Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Width and Length Exclusive Devices - Summary**
- 4. Submission from Manitoba Trucking Association**
- 5. Proposed Standard Definition for Overall Width and Excluded Devices**
- 6. Proposed Standards for Warning Signs, Signals and Devices for Movement of Overdimensional Loads**

Attachment 1: Participants

Name	Affiliation	Phone	Fax
Alan Robinson	WPTA	(250) 851-9482	(250) 851-9482
Albert Makarenko	Allied Systems (Canada)	(403) 236-2550	(403) 279-6994
Alvin Moroz	Alberta Infrastructure	(403) 340-5189	(403) 340-5092
Bill Sokil	Sokil Express Lines	(780) 479-1955	(780) 474-9325
Bob Dolyniuk	Manitoba Trucking Association	(204) 632-6600	(204) 694-7134
Dale Marchand	Premay Equipment	(780) 447-5555	(780) 447-3744
Dave Pick	Till-Fab Ltd	(519) 424-9191	(519) 424-3524
David Barclay	Sam's General Trucking	(306) 965-2703	(306) 965-2290
Denis Petit	Canadian Freightways	(403) 287-4388	(403) 287-4343
Don Legue	Till-Fab Ltd	(519) 424-9191	(519) 424-3524
Doug Russell	Advance Engineered Products	(306) 721-5678	(306) 721-5010
Ed Kinvig	Peerless Ltd	(250) 492-0408	(250) 492-7353
Eric Amlin	FERIC	(604) 228-1555	(604) 228-0999
Gary Farnden	B.C. Ministry of Transportation & Hwys	(250) 387-7728	(250) 387-7735
Greg Catteeuw	Manitoba Highways and Gov't Services	(204) 945-3898	(204) 948-2078
Greg Gilks	Saskatchewan Highways and Transport	(306) 787-4851	(306) 787-3963
Gus Duda	Lode King Industries	(204) 325-4345	(204) 325-5369
Hans Loewen	Premay Equipment	(604) 439-1621	(604) 435-5998
Jack Whitehead	Alta Water Well Drilling Assn		(780) 368-2344
John Kinsey	Peerless Ltd	(250) 492-0408	(250) 492-7353
John Pearson	Council of DM's Secretariat	(613) 247-9347	(613) 489-0221
Marlow Rushfeldt	Cage Logistics Inc	(403) 223-2022	(403) 223-4006
Mike Oliver	B.C. Ministry of Transportation & Hwys	(250) 387-3353	(250) 356-7718
Patrick Delaney	Petroleum Services Association	(403) 781-7384	(403) 263-7174
Ray Shaw	Can-Am West Carriers	(604) 857-9136	(604) 870-8126
Robert Casarsa	Aero-Kit Industries	(905) 335-2012	(905) 335-8499
Ron Oldridge	Insurance Corporation of BC	(250) 414-7843	(250) 978-8018
Steve Pinchak	Southern Interior Truckers Alliance	(250) 489-2409	(250) 489-0113
Wally Dixon	Southern Interior Truckers Alliance		