

<p><b>March 5-6, 2008</b>  <b>San Antonio,</b>  <b>Texas</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>WASHTO</b>  <b>Committee on Highway Transport</b></p>
<p><b>Monday,</b>  <b>Mar 5, 2008</b></p>	
<p>Meeting called by:  WASHTO Committee</p>	<p><b>All attendees made introductions.</b>  <b>11 states: UT, CO, TX, WA, ND, WY, ID, OK, MO, NE, NM</b>  Also present: Permit services, industry, pilot car associations</p> <p>Opening &amp; Minutes Approval – Richard Clasby made a motion to approve the minutes of Fall meeting in Colorado Springs. Norm Hill made a motion that they be approved and Jim Wright seconded the motion. The motion was approved.</p>
<p><b>Item: Welcome</b></p>	
<p>Discussion:</p>	<p>Carol Davis welcomed everyone to San Antonio and hoped everyone would enjoy the meeting and the city.</p> <p>Keynote Address: Edward Serna, Texas Department of Transportation, Assistant Executive Director for Support Operations.</p> <p>Texas knows that the MC industry is important to the economy of the US. There isn't anything we use as a commodity that doesn't get to us through the trucking industry. We see by the volume of trucks on the road that there is a greater demand for the trucking industry. The roll of the MCD is important to insurance safety, routes, permitting, keeping loads safe.</p> <p>The challenge we all face is the growing volume of truck traffic. This is a good sign that the economy isn't stalling. All the western states are experiencing an increase in permitting numbers. It's great that WASHTO meets to try and find consistency and better ways to move loads.</p> <p>We are experiencing diminishing revenues in the trucking world. This will impact all aspects of the trucking world. This will have a huge effect on the infrastructure, congestion, safety, air quality. And enhancing the value of the asset. We can't maintain the roads and are trying to deal with that. We all need to find ways to address this in our own states. This group could think of ways to help this situation.</p> <p>It's great to have all the TxDOT people here today to participate in understanding the perspectives of other states. It's good for them to see the impact that decisions from TxDOT have on other states. He appreciates all the work everyone in WASHTO and ASSHTO is doing for the transportation industry</p>
<p><b>Item: Discussion Of Alternative And Options For Western Region Permits</b></p>	
<p>Discussion:</p>	<p>Rick gave a list of options that we need to look at for the Western Region Permits (WRP). These goals are to (1) promote uniformity among the WASHTO states and other jurisdictions regarding statues, regulations, and ITS/CVO and their impacts on the transport industry and highway safety. (2) To serve as a forum to review AASHTO's proposed policies on highway transport issues from a WASHTO perspective. (3) To review and monitor research, proposals, and federal and state regulations related to highway transport as they impact WASHTO members and to promote appropriate truck size and width research where needed to assist in the fulfillment of the mission of the committee. (4) To provide a forum to share industry best practices among the WASHTO states. To maximize ITS/CVO applications for the safe, efficient movement of goods and services. (5) To provide communication with the motor carrier industry, chief DOT executive offices, other WASHTO committees, and other organizations regarding the work and</p>

the recommendations of this committee.

Rick discussed what the WASHTO meeting is trying to accomplish. The committee is broken down into working groups. As you participate in this process you will see that we are addressing ongoing projects, some new issues that we are trying to resolve and your input is valuable, both industry and states are welcome. For several years this committee has had great success toward uniformity. We have established a regional permit that works. ID used to be the leader for issuing western region permit but has now run into staffing problems. We have worked for the last several meetings seeking for ways to fix this problem. WA stepped up and said that E-Snoopy could be used for western region permit. Credit cards are one of the challenges. Utah said they could use 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendors for issuing permits. In our last meeting we had a discussion to let vendors use the UT system to issue permits for their customers. Utah's new permit system now has the ability to issue a western region permit that can be accessed by other states, customers or vendors.

Adam Anderson, Utah DOT, gave a demonstration of the UT Western Region Permit that is accessible on the internet. This application form includes all the information needed to issue the Western Region Permit. If states have any suggestions email Adam at mcemployeedevelopment@utah.gov.

Rick and Adam went over questions the programmers provided relating to policy decisions. Some states want to have the actual dimensions on the permit should we allow having a blank field equaling zero. This will force an entry or default to zero. In the rule it says they can't have longer than 53 feet trailer. The question was asked if we want a trailer length box and the committee answered yes. Currently the discussion we have had is that Utah works through an agreement with vendors. In this case they could come in and issue for UT, CO, WY, ND, etc. We could say the permit vendor can issue for states. There is not a way for the system to know there is an agreement between the state and vendor to issue permits. The permit will list who ordered and issued the permit. Rick asked if it would be as easy to put a template together that lists the state and vendor signature, as this is what works for UT. Is there a way of knowing what states the vendors can issue for? Most states agree that we don't need a 3<sup>rd</sup> party agreement because there is already an agreement with Utah that they can issue permits. The system is capable for self-issue. Are we evolving where customers can issue their own permits? Some states may not be comfortable with this. No matter who applies for the permit it has to be adjudicated by Utah. Route updates are in the WASHTO website.

The next policy decision is do we want customers to issue their permit? This permit is really not a self-issue because Utah is adjudicating each permit. It seems no one has a problem with this. Rick asked if some states interested in becoming vendors and CO and MO said they would be interested. Teresa said the sooner CO is allowed to be a vendor the better. There needs to be some discussion on the money because some states are prepared for permits only.

Currently mobile homes are not allowed on the western region permit. Is there some reason why they aren't? Teresa said that they don't fit into the allowed dimensions. Ray said that they have to be under a different permit. Rick said they will just leave it as is.

Teresa showed a chart of those states that allow other states to issued western region permit.

**Item: Wide Based Tires Survey Report, MHTA Model Legislation and Definition of Wide Base Tires**

Discussion: Leanne Emmer, ND Motor Carrier Operations. The New Generation wide based tires. A few conferences ago, Stan Lew approached WASHTO about allowing 600 ppi, and provided reports and studies. WASHTO decided to ask states if they would allot the increase to 600 pounds per inches. Only 10 of the 17 states responded. There were six questions asked in the survey. Five of the states that responded are already allowing the 600 ppi. Utah is allowing 600 ppi except for LCV operations. Four of the states said they would not pursue changing. It looks like most states are allowing at least 550 ppi. OK does not really look at the tire width. Leanna would like to get responses form the states who have not responded. TX and WA said they are still looking at it.

	<p>Stan Lew gave a slide show on the new generation wide base single truck tire. All studies before have been on the super singles. The recent studies the new generation wide base study, which was done at a FHA meeting in October 2007. It was felt by the attendees that they NGDW are close to, if not equal to, the standard ESALS in pavement damage. There is an identity problem where people think they are talking about super singles. The attendees felt that the NGDWQ merited an effort of support due to their environmental promise. CA Air Resource Board has tripled its early action measure aimed at cutting down emissions. Stan met with FL DOT and they said that will approve the draft language where it will say a vehicle equipped with dual tires may have the dual tires replaced by a single tire. At the Blue Book conference they said they will remove the penalty on a tractor with a resale with wide based tires. Mexico has approved the use of wide based tires. Canada just approved priority loads to wide based tires. Snow results, based on used and new tires, shows it is statistically better or equal.</p> <p>Leanne reported on the survey that was sent out asking if the states would be willing to adopt the MHTA model legislation. The WASHTO guide defines a wide based tires is 14 inches or greater. With that we are allowing 500 ppi. If smaller it is reduced down to 10,000 lbs. If it is approved how do we change the guide? The feds state that no states can allow 500 ppi for the tire. No state shall allow less. But technology has advanced beyond this point. Rick said that this is worth getting on the AASHTO agenda. We can't have three standards. The challenge is that Utah still has the old super singles that are still being used so we don't want to change the language to where we start having trouble with them again. Do we really have the authority to change the guide on uniformity? This needs to first be changed in our individual states. If it's at an AASHTO level then it might be the first step to getting this going. Leanne suggested that our committee put together a letter that Rick can take to AASHTO.</p>
Action Item:	Leanna's group will make up letter for Rick to take to AASHTO.
<b>Item: LCV laws</b>	
Discussion:	Rick reported that at the last AASHTO meeting he attended they discussed truck size and weight. There are states that recognize that we need to increased S&W but it looks like before they are willing to look at a change in the LCV freeze they need data. The western states did a study many years ago that showed that trucks in western states are different. The environment has changed so we have an opportunity in this group to potentially change LCV limitations. We ought to consider corridors and where states want to be uniform with each other they should be allowed to.
<b>Item: Chain Laws</b>	
Discussion:	Teresa reported that CO's new law is that they have to have chains in the truck on the I-70 Mountain Corridor from just west of Denver to Vail from Sept 1 through May 31 annually. She asked what states have a chain law. Only UT, CO, WA & WY. She also asked how many have a statute for alternate traction devices. Other than WA (snow tracks, snow boots, etc.) nobody else does. Also, no one is aware of any companies using these devices.
<b>Item: Next Meeting</b>	
Discussion:	Rick led a discussion on where the next WASHTO meeting this fall will be held. Next March we will be meeting in conjunction with SC&RA in Albuquerque. No definite decisions were made
<b>Item: Review of Canadian Experience with Large Commercial Motor Vehicles.</b>	
Discussion:	<p>John Woodrooffe, Transportation Safety Analysis Division, University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute, gave a presentation on a study he's done on S&amp;W in Canada. The objectives were to examine the Canadian size and weight experience, review and summarize current information on the Canadian experience with changes in truck size and weight limits.</p> <p>The purpose is to achieve national uniformity in size and weight regulation and use a scientific approach in developing size and weight policy. Following the study an implementation planning subcommittee was created to develop a plan that will assist each jurisdiction in implementing uniform vehicle weight dimension and configuration regulatory price.</p> <p>A national committee was set up to pursue greater national and /or regional uniformity of policies, regulations and enforcement practices for heavy vehicle weight and dimensions limits</p>

	<p>within Canada and representing Canada in regulatory harmonization discussion being carried out under the North American Free Trade Agreement. The taskforce maintains the federal-provincial territorial memorandum of understanding on interprovincial weights and dimensions, which sets national standards for the size and weight.</p> <p>Each province has its own regulations that are inconsistent with the neighboring province.</p>
--	---

**Item: Safety Performance of LCV's in Alberta**

Discussion:	<p>Dr. Jeannette Montufar, University of Manitoba, gave a presentation on longer combination vehicle safety performance study in Alberta: 1999-2005. The purpose was to help improve the understanding about the safety performance of LCV's relative to that of other vehicles operating on Alberta's LCV network and in urban areas. They defined safety by collisions. LCV's in Canada are defined as vehicles within weight limits and beyond basic length limits. Rocky mountain doubles, turnpike doubles, and triple trailer combination is the definition of LCV's. In the US the definition is different. Another kind they looked at was straight trucks and bobtails. They also analyzed tractor semi-trailers and legal-length tractor double trailers. There were over 2,000 doubles in collisions for 1999-2005. Approximately 300 reports required follow-up. The exposure analysis was an average daily-articulated truck traffic volumes, raw WIM data, vehicle length survey, interviews with vehicle enforcement officers and short term vehicle classification counts. There were 67,269 vehicles in collisions, 49,738 reported collisions, 1,275 people killed and 28,142 injured. In all LCV's there were 65 collisions, which turned out that the collision rate was 25 per 100 M KVT. A similar study for WASHTO could incorporate a similar approach, improve understanding for LCV safety performance, help inform federal reauthorization in 2009, extend and complement existing work, help balance productivity benefits with safety concerns and utilize investments in advanced technologies for collision and exposure measurement.</p> <p>Leanne and her working group have been working with a group on an LCV study. One of the major challenges is finding information that is worth looking at. The question is how do we fund a study and how do we solicit funds. There could be opportunities for grants to fund such a study.</p>
-------------	---

**Item: UCR Update**

	<p>Angel Oliver, TxDOT Motor Carrier Division Credential Supervisor, gave an update on the Unified Carrier Registration. She says this has been a challenge to implement. Texas has experienced a 40 million shortfall because of the new UCR program. TX feels some of it is because of the fee schedule by asking companies to register for 2007 and 2008 at the same time. IN is updating their system right away and will allow the carrier to register for both years. After this update the states will send out a letter telling them to register for 2008. Enforcement for UCR will start on June 1. States who have their own system can't register with their system for 2008 until they are certified by FMCSA. The permits are good for a calendar year.</p>
--	--

**Item: Industry Issues**

Discussion:	<p>Randy Sorenson, Professional Escort Vehicle Operators Association (PEVOA). Randy led a discussion on concerns for state, county and city permits, special interest permits, provisional sheets and uniformity in descriptions. He would like to see if WASHTO could help address some issues of uniformity. PEVOA requests that WASHTO establish a guideline for permits, routing uniformity, and descriptions of various operations to be uniform. He asked that they discuss this in their breakout groups.</p> <p>One person from the industry pointed out that states are not uniform in what enforcements they do. Many times when a truck crosses state lines, the new state enforces things that aren't enforced in the previous state.</p> <p>Doug Ball, SC&amp;RA, discussed pilot car reciprocity. The Best Practices manual has been a useful tool through out the industry and it's a living document. This year he received funding to update the Best Practices Guide. He would like to make a proposal for a model certification program. This way the states can have a true certification for their pilot car people.</p>
-------------	---

**Item: WASHTO Issues**

Discussion:	<p>Teresa Lawser conducted the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of the conference. Chairman Rick Clasby pointed out that</p>
-------------	--

	he has been the chair for five years and has asked Teresa to serve as his vice-chair. The vice-chair will prepare the minutes in the future.
<b>Mar 6, 2008</b>	
<b>Item: Second day start-up</b>	
Discussion:	Teresa broke everyone out into groups.
<b>Item: Committee Assignment Discussions and Work Group Reports</b>	
Discussion:	<p><b>Regional Permits-</b> Teresa Lawser-CO, Group Leader. States Committee: Michelle Teel-MO, Rick Clasby-UT, Todd Blish-OK, Ray Hutchinson-TX</p> <p>Route Surveys-group looked at it and decided that it would be a useful tool to add to the guide as an appendix. Not sure if it would draw attention. Eleven (11) states require traffic or route plan. The group will post it to the web site and Texas will also post a form for a route survey for each state. Would also like the states web sites to link to the WASHTO web site. Put in Carlos email.</p> <p>WY is a weight and pay state and it's not useful for them to be on the western region permit system. MO has been talking about coming on board. They have now agreed to go 46,000 on a tandem, then they are able to sign the agreement.</p>
Discussion:	<p><b>Uniformity Discrepancies And Guide Maintenance-</b> Jim Wright-WA, Group Leader. State Committee: Barry Diseth-WA</p> <p><u>Permit Routing Information</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry asks that states' routing information on permits be more uniform and easier to see on the permits</li> <li>• Routing is difficult to follow when traveling on the road such as looking for next intersecting route, structure location or other detail on the permit</li> </ul> <p>Committee recommendations for permit content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Routing be <u>separated</u> from other permit information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Separate paragraph only for routing or,</li> <li>▪ Separate page for routing</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Increase <u>font size</u> for reading on the road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Possibly bold print</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Show <u>direction of travel</u> on each route <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Northbound I-5 to Eastbound I-90</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Lane number (1, 2, 3 for height loads or other reasons) identify counting from right to left or from left to right on permit</li> <li>○ Route identification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I" (interstate), US, SR (state route)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Indicate <u>mileposts</u> for intersections and structure locations</li> <li>○ Routing displayed in <u>order of travel</u> for consistent flow of information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Including state to county back to state highway</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <u>Contact number</u> displayed on the permit for timely information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quick contact to help if clarification of information needed when on the road</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Indicate point on state route where to/from county or city route so pilot or truck operator can make county information accessible</li> <li>○ Look into <u>combining state and county</u> permits into one</li> <li>○ <u>County and city contacts</u> on separate provisional sheet</li> <li>○ Remove <u>redundant</u> and duplicated information</li> </ul>

	<p><u>Uniformity of Enforcement of Permits</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uniformity in enforcement for violations of a permit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Example: When there is a dimension violation, the permit is confiscated and then the weight provisions of the permit are no longer valid so weight violation back to over legal. Some states consider severity of the violation.</li> <li>○ Example: When there is a dimension violation, the dimension violation goes back to legal but the weight enforcement is based on the allowance of the permit weight <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The committee recommends members review with their enforcement sections and policies for these types of violations</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Example: The load is “off-route”. The permit is confiscated and all violations start at legal limits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Many of the members agreed with this enforcement action</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Enforcement of Laws Not Routinely Enforced</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laws that have been “on the books” for a long time and not normally enforced are now being enforced <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The committee agreed that the law is still active and must be complied with.</li> <li>○ Committee recommends that an education period be provided when enforcing these laws to inform the industry that enforcement will now be taken on these. Education from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Website</li> <li>▪ Scales</li> <li>▪ Trucking Associations</li> <li>▪ Truck stops</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> The committee agrees that these two enforcement sections are directly related policies that are specific to each state. The committee did not make recommendations for enforcement except to agree to review the current policies and procedures with the enforcement agencies in their respective state.</p>
Discussion:	<p><b>Strategic Directions Sub Committee:</b> Leanna Emmer-ND, Group Leader. Committee: Adam Anderson-UT, Larry Gangl-ND, Carol Davis-TX, John Bennett-T Chek, Stan Lew-Michelin, Rob Bluemke-T Chek, Additional Staff from TX</p> <p>Issues discussed at breakout session:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New Generation (NG) Wide Base Tire</li> <li>2. Next step in effort to lift LCV Freeze</li> </ol> <p>The group discussed some of concerns expressed by the committee on the NG wide base tire. One of those concerns was the impact the NG’s wide base tire outer sidewall has on the highway infrastructure. Stan stated studies showed the outer sidewall of the NG tire did not negatively impact the highways. Larry continued to express concern based on the studies. There was also discussion to have members look increasing from 500 to 550 pounds per inch of tire width as opposed to 600 pounds. We discussed, putting a letter together to or presenting to AASTHO in audience, increasing to 550 or 600 pounds per inch of tire width. The group didn’t feel that we as a committee were ready to ask AASTHO for support. Based on the survey, 7 of the 17 states had yet not responded. Of the 10 states that did respond, 4 members stated they would not actively pursue allowing 600 pounds per inch width tire. Two of the 4 already allow 550 pounds per inch of tire width. Two of the 4 states felt if their trucking industry made a request, it would then be considered. The group felt a letter to the directors of unresponsive states was needed requesting members to seriously look at allowing up to 550 pounds per inch of tire width. Adam, Larry, and Leanna will draft that letter. Leanna and Stan would work on a definition of the new generation wide base tire to provide clarity on its difference from the super singles.</p> <p>The group continued discussions on obtaining funding to do a study on LCV’s traveling in the WASHTO states, in an effort to lift the freeze. It was suggested we look at available high priority federal grants. Leanna will do this: visit with Mark Berndt with Wilbur Smith &amp; Associates, with Karen White - FHWA and staff at FHWA in ND FHWA.</p>

## Item: State Reports

### Discussion:

#### WA-Jim Wright

WA is starting self issue permits for weight and dimension, up to superloads, that will go live in June.

#### ID-Raymundo Rodriquez

Gave out information on number of regional permits sold. ID has drop off doing western region permit and had to because of turnover of personnel. They have 2 new permit writers out of 5.

Legislative session is still going on, they are focusing on transportation being in the hole right now. Transportation is hurting right now. Have done some administrative rule making on tire ration and divisible loads. Coming up with a new automated permitting system. Unfortunately, this is about 4 years down the road in completing. ID is looking at some other ways to come up with the permitting system that may speeds things up.

#### WY-John Bezley

WY is going to change the fees for oversize loads and is just waiting for the Governor's signature. Problems at the ports and FMDCSA officers are having a problem with drivers not speaking English. They are getting more and more permits coming in and hoping for a 3<sup>rd</sup> person. Teresa asked John if he would send out a list of new fees.

#### OK-Norm Hill

Two years ago the legislature took the Tax Commission out of the motor carrier agency. He has inherited the weigh stations. They are hoping for 65 million to build new POE's. They've done the preliminary site surveys, the engineering and have talked with Oakridge National Lab to work on electronics for the ports. If the money will work out then they'll have the ability to detect bombs, etc. CVIEW has to work with the Tax Commission and four other agencies, but they are about 97% complete. The CVIEW is functional and downloads are uploading with SAFER. They are still working the bugs out of system. They are hoping they will be operational in late 2009. They are working on Prism and it is in early stages. The industry is going to the legislature complaining about phone waits which may help them. The legislature decided last year to get some money to put in an automated permitting and routing system. It's in the early stages but is starting the process of building a new system. The Legislature is coming up with a new annual permit for \$120 for 15 high, 14 wide, 103 long, 120,000 lbs. Makes no sense and doesn't think it will go through.

#### ND-Leanne Emmer

ND is working on being able to send the permits and fees electronically. This will apply for permit services only right now but they are looking at individual carriers eventually. They are going to join the WASHTO regional permit portion of it. The upcoming legislation is looking at adopting the WASHTO agreement. ND is building more rural inspections sites. MCSAP vehicles will have air currents in them. Want to put applications for OS/OW permits on the internet. May use Utah's system and tweak it for ND needs.

MO-getting ready for another regulation update. Asked if anyone has gotten a letter from FMDSA and would like feedback.

#### NB-Ron Kontos.

Legislation wise NB had one minor bill for self-propelled permits. Bridge Division is looking at a number of things that haven't been addressed in some permitting systems. They need to build an inventory database for substructure, ratings and culverts. The new system they developed was bought out by Bentley (was Belifus). This system really helped them downsize manpower.

#### NM-

	<p>NM went online in December and put COMDATA on it. They are cutting permit issuance down to getting it done quickly. They can do 50-60 permits per hour. Opened a satellite office in Albuquerque. Their legislative session was short and did nothing for transportation. The weight distance tax went electronic and the carriers are not required a permit for it.</p> <p>TX-Ray Hutchinson  TX permits are up 6% over last year. The Texas Legislature increased permit fees and allocated 25 additional FTEs for permitting. They are increasing staff, reorganizing, and going to a single application queue. Regardless of how a permit is issued it goes into a single queue. It's a first for Texas and will improve customer service. Currently training more people for super loads. Will have a specialty permits group and help desk. HB 2093 gives TxDOT administrative compliance and enforcement authority for size and weight laws, and they're currently developing the enforcement program. Routing system-pilot area will be fully implemented this fall. TxDOT is issuing an RFO to capture bridge and sign bridge height information for all lanes. Once the information is captured it will be incorporated into the new routing system. They are commissioning a study with a research institute for LCV's in TX. The purpose of the study is to determine if TX wants to pursue lifting the LCV freeze, or if not, pursue corridors on state highways.</p> <p>UT-Adam Anderson  Since the last meeting UT's permitting system is now almost a complete one stop for the carrier. They can get all permits on line. About 65% of all permits issued are done online and 70% we don't even have to see. Personnel approve the others. They are trying to encourage the industry to use the online permits. Currently working with Structures Division making sure we have the correct height and notations in the system. UT is doing more rebuilding on the I-15 corridor and have raised the bridges in the Ogden area. They are having a structures problem because the building of new structures has cut off routes we can use. There are no changes in the legislature on laws. They are talking about raising weight allowance to 600 psi. This will probably be changed in an administrative rule.</p> <p>CO-Teresa Lawser  CO is passing a divisible load permit bill that will create a new permit up to 110,000 lbs. on secondary roads for divisible loads. CO has increased the clearance height through the Eisenhower tunnel is 13'11". Would have liked them to raise it to 14" but they wouldn't do it. They will put an announcement on the web that WRC can go through the tunnel if under 14". POE's have limited enforcement people.</p>
<p><b>Other Issues:</b></p> <p><b>Next Meeting:</b></p>	<p>FHWA issue-Teresa said DCO sent letters to the regional office saying what CO had spent on CVISN to date and they want back any unspent or unencumbered amounts.</p> <p>Patti from MO says that she got a letter from Kelly Rae, ask other states what they are doing about letter from FHWA on wind farm loads. Are people issuing permits for this? Ray says that TX is running these on state roads since the Feds won't let them run on interstate or national defense roads unless they are broken down. Not all states want this.</p> <p>Albuquerque spring of 2009 join up with SC&amp;RA.  Next fall where should we have it? First choice is Portland, if not, then Utah.  Maybe Alaska in the fall of 2009.</p>

Meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.