8:00 AM – 8:30 AM
I. CALL TO ORDER.................................................. Vice-Chair Paul Degges, TN
II. INTRODUCTIONS – OPENING REMARKS.................................................. P. Degges
   A. SCOH Members, AASHTO Staff, and Michigan Room Monitors
   B. New AASHTO Engineering Staff
III. Presentation – Orientation for New SCOH Members................................. Marty Vitale, AASHTO

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM
IV. SCOH SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS (1.5 HOURS)
   A. OVERVIEW OF AASHTO PRESIDENT KIRK STEUDLE’S EMPHASIS AREAS FOR 2012..................Kirk Steudle, MI
   B. REPORTS (5 MINUTES EACH)
      1. Bridges and Structures ................................................................. Mal Kerley, VA
      2. Construction .................................................................................. Michael Lewis, RI
      3. Design ............................................................................................. Barry Schoch, PA
      4. Highway Transport ........................................................................ Mark Gottlieb, WI
      5. Maintenance .................................................................................. Carlos Braceras, UT
      6. Materials ......................................................................................... Grant Levi, ND
      a. Chloride Levels in Grout in Bridges
      7. Right-of-Way and Utilities ............................................................... John P. Campbell, TX
      8. Systems Operations and Management .............................................. TBD
      9. Traffic Engineering ....................................................................... Bernie Arseneau, MN
      10. Asset Management ....................................................................... Ananth Prasad, FL

10:00 AM – BREAK
10:15 AM – 11:45 AM
V. SCOH STRATEGIC PLAN LIASON REPORTS (1.5 HOURS)
   A. REPORT (5 MINUTES EACH)
      1. Freight ......................................................................................... TBD
      2. Cutting Fatalities by Half by 2030 .................................................. Tom Cole, ID
         a. Toward Zero Deaths Strategic Plan ......................................... Tom Cole, ID or Bernie Arseneau, MN
      3. Congestion ................................................................................... TBD
      4. Climate Change ............................................................................ Rick Land, CA
      5. Performance Management ............................................................ Jerry Younger, KS
      6. Communicating the Value of Transportation .................................. TBD
      7. Research and Emerging Technology .............................................. Ken Sweeney, ME
      8. Workforce Planning and Development .......................................... TBD
      9. System Preservation ..................................................................... John Barton, TX

11:45 AM – 12:00 NOON
VI. PRESENTATION
   A. Update on Scan Programs (relocated item)
      1. International Scan Program ....................................................... John Baxter, FHWA
      2. Domestic Scan Program ............................................................. Mark Van Port Fleet, MI

12:00 NOON – LUNCH
TECHNICAL MEETING PRELIMINARY AGENDA

1:00 PM – 2:00 PM [10 mins presentation + 10 mins Q&A each]

VII. TRIENNIAL REVIEW OF TECHNICAL SERVICE PROGRAMS .......................................................... Vice-Chair Degges, TN
   A. National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP) .................................................. Dan Grasser, WI
   B. Technology Implementation Group (TIG) ...................................................................................... Ken Sweeney, ME
   C. Snow and Ice Cooperative Program (SICOP) ............................................................................... Rick Nelson, NV

2:00 PM – 2:30 PM

VIII. PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS – REVIEW RESOLUTIONS TO BALLOT
   A. PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE RESOLUTIONS
      1. National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP) ................................................. Dan Grasser, WI
         a. PAR: NTPEP Adjustment to Voluntary Contributions from AASHTO Member Departments
      2. Standing Committee on Highways ............................................................................................ Carlos Braceras, UT
         a. PAR: Request to Expedite the Review of Buy America Requirements Related to Utility Work on Federal-aid Projects
   B. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE AASHTO GOVERNING DOCUMENTS
      1. Right of Way & Utilities ........................................................................................................... Matthew W. DeLong, MI
         a. PAGD: Modification to Charge Statement for the Subcommittee on Right of Way and Utilities (distribute when available)

2:30 PM – 3:00 PM

IX. SCOH STRATEGIC PLAN LIAISON REPORTS (CONTINUED)
   A. Project Delivery ......................................................................................................................... Terry Gibson, NC
      1. Draft Recommendations from Joint Working Group on Project Delivery

X. “HOT TOPIC” DISCUSSION (Led by Vice-Chair Degges, TN)
   A. State Funding for Road Construction and Maintenance – With declining funds at both the federal and state level, how are you taking care of your core mission? What are the challenges and opportunities?

3:00 PM – 3:15 PM Break

3:15 PM – 4:00 PM

XI. PRESENTATIONS
   A. AASHTOWare Pontis 5.2 (relocated item) ................................................................................ Max Valerio, NM
   B. Domestic Scan: Best Practices for Risk-Based Forecasts of Land Volatility for Corridor Management and Sustainable Communities ............................................................... Matthew W. DeLong, MI
   C. Domestic Scan: Best Practices in Highway Maintenance Performance Measuring ......................... Don Hillis, MO
   D. National LTAP Association on Potential Joint Activities with AASHTO ......................................... Victoria Beale, OH

4:00 PM – 5:00 PM

XII. ROUND TABLE TOPICS ............................................................................................................. P. Degges, TN
   A. What are your state’s strategies for keeping down fatalities while VMT starts to increase? Hands-free laws? Impaired driving laws? Other?
   B. State Match Issues – what are you doing to prevent Federal money from going unused?
   C. How do states measure the quality of their road construction projects beyond “on-time” and “on-budget”?
   D. Federal Natural Disaster Recovery Funds – Have states been able to improve and/or better align FHWA’s ER process and FEMA’s PA process and paperwork?

5:00 PM

XIII. TRAC Awards ............................................................................................................................. Kirk Steudle, MI

5:15 PM ADJOURN
AASHTO Winter Maintenance Technical Service Program (WMTSP)
Snow and Ice Cooperative Program (SICOP) Pooled Fund
May 18, 2012 Review

Background

The WMTSP/SICOP programs were developed in 1994 by AASHTO after the International Winter Technology Scanning Tour to Japan and Europe. The purpose was defined in AASHTO Administrative Resolution 3-94 which states: “In order to experiment with snow and ice control technology and systems not now in use in this nation, to determine their suitability to the United States and help introduce the use of those with most promise, the AASHTO Board of Directors endorses the concept of establishing a voluntary AASHTO Snow and Ice Pooled Fund Cooperative Program, under which testing by AASHTO Member Departments volunteering to sponsor and conduct tests can be supported financially with public sector funds voluntarily contributed by AASHTO Member Departments, Federal agencies, toll authorities, counties and cities.” Beyond the principal mission stated above, the program was directed to work towards establishing a sustainable systems approach to snow and ice control in the United States—one involving the vehicle, the driver, the equipment, the materials and practices, and the receiving environment. Energized with new operational technologies being used in Japan and Europe coupled with the research outcomes from the Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP) the WMTSP was well positioned to guide the development and implementation of improved snow and ice control equipment, materials and practices, and enhanced work force development techniques. The result has been that many states and local governments have updated their equipment, retrained their workforce and changed their operations from a reactive snow and ice control program to a pro-active program. They are also using techniques for identifying and reducing the negative impacts to the receiving environment while improving highway safety, reliability and mobility.

Accomplishments

- Workforce Development Training Suites
  - Technology transfer and training were deemed the first steps in moving the existing workforce from a reactive snow and ice control program to pro-active operations. A suite of eight Computer Based Training (CBT) modules was developed to provide comprehensive training in all aspects of winter roadway maintenance for state and local governments. These CBTs were completed beginning in 2004 and updated in 2009-2010 to include new findings in NCHRP studies and latest best method practices. Thirty-five state DOTs, Federal Highway Administration, National Association of County Engineers, and American Public Works Association participated in the pooled fund to develop the CBTs. Beginning in 2005 a metric version of the CBTs was developed with funding from the Ontario Good Roads Association and three Canadian Provinces and the City of Calgary. A complete listing of the CBTs, their content and features can be found on the SICOP web http://www.transportation.org/sites/sicop/docs/CBT_Flyer_v2b%5B1%5D.pdf. Thirty five state DOTs contributed to the pooled fund for this project.
  - WMTSP received requests from several state DOTs to redevelop the CBTs so they could be easily updated, operate in a web browser and be in Shareable Content Object Reference Model (SCORM) compatible, enabling the CBT to launch from, and work with, the standard SCORM Learning Management System (LMS) they had in place in their training programs. A contract was signed in November 2010 for that redevelopment work. The work will be completed in fall 2012. Thirty state DOTs and the Aurora and Clear Roads consortiums have contributed to the pooled fund for this work.

- Winter Maintenance Equipment Innovations
  - A new generation of highway maintenance equipment was needed to implement the research findings of the SHRP Anti-icing/RWIS projects. In 1995, WMTSP provided technical support to the state Departments of Transportation of Iowa, Michigan, and Minnesota as they formed a consortium to define this next generation equipment. The final report for that project can be found at website www.intrans.iastate.edu/reports/concept4.pdf.
The concept vehicle project evaluated all the equipment innovations discovered on the 1994 International Winter Technology Scanning Tour and configured them to integrate on US made equipment. By 2004, according to input from a Midwest US equipment integrator, most state DOTs were ordering their new trucks equipped with all the functionalities listed in the Highway Maintenance Concept Vehicle Final report listed above, except the friction measuring and mobile-freeze point detection devices.

- WMTSP currently is continuing its efforts to locate both domestic and international private sector opportunities to develop and market these friction measuring and salinity testing technologies to optimize treatment strategies.

- National Winter Maintenance Peer Exchanges
  - As each state made its journey to pro-active snow and ice control operations, new equipment was being developed and field-tested, new chemistry came into the marketplace, and new methods of technology transfer were implemented. While progress had been phenomenal, there was a need to bring state DOT snow and ice control experts and the private sector providing equipment and materials together to share information and network on snow and ice control related issues. There was also a need to bring research organizations into the discussion so they would fully understand where the communication, knowledge and technology gaps existed so strategies could be developed to bridge those gaps. WMTSP took the lead in organizing, contracting for facilities and meeting logistics and preparing the final report and research needs statements (RNS) for Winter Maintenance Peer Exchanges in 2007 (36 state DOTs attending), 2009 (30 state DOTs attending) and 2011 (41 state DOTs attending). WMTSP also conducted a survey prior to the 2011 Peer Exchange to determine how important the 2009 RNS were to their agency operations and also if they had additional unmet research needs to be considered at the 2011 Peer Exchange. 42 state DOTs responded which was a great help determining how well the efforts of the Peer Exchange were meeting the needs of each agency, determining their unmet research needs, and obtaining input from those who might not be able to attend the upcoming 2011 Exchange.
  - Progress for each RSN is recorded on spread sheets for each Peer Exchange. WMTSP organizes this progress and posts it to the Peer Exchange website at: [http://www.westerntransportationinstitute.org/professionaldevelopment/peer-exchange/default.aspx](http://www.westerntransportationinstitute.org/professionaldevelopment/peer-exchange/default.aspx).

- Communications with the Winter Maintenance Community
  - WMTSP created a subscriber-based list serve for the snow and community in 1996. It is an effective way to keep the community (state and local governments, contractors, vendors, etc.) connected and provides an useful way to share successes and solve problems that typically are being encountered for the first time and therefore do not have documented solutions to try. Currently over 800 public and private sector users have signed up and regularly use this service. Typically a posting for information has responses during the same day as posting. Many “thank you very much” have been received from those who were in need. The web site can be found at [http://www.transportation.org/default.aspx?siteid=88&pageid=2174](http://www.transportation.org/default.aspx?siteid=88&pageid=2174). The list-serve is also useful in communicating the publishing of NCHRP reports, Peer Exchange updates, meetings, etc.

**Goals/Objectives**

- Future Outlook Statement
  - Provide a world-class Winter Maintenance Technical Service Program
    - Identify, communicate, and facilitate the use of emerging winter maintenance research, technologies, materials, equipment & programs.
    - Expand workforce development and training opportunities by promoting the AASHTO’s suite of eight CBTs in both CD-ROM and web-based applications.
Promote strategies for dealing with sustainability and climate change.
Serve as a clearinghouse for winter maintenance efforts and research organizations: TRB, NCHRP, Aurora, Clear Roads, PIARC, and AASHTO member States.

Guiding and Focusing WMTSP
- To accomplish the program objectives outlined in AASHTO AR-3-94, the WMTSP works collaboratively with Highway Subcommittee on Maintenance (HSCOM), Highway Safety and Reliability Technical Work Group (HS&R TWG). The WMTSP Four Year Program (2012-2015) approved at the July 16, 2011 WMTSP meeting and subsequently presented and accepted at the AASHTO HSCOM HS&R TWG meeting on July 17, 2011 is posted on the SICOP website www.sicop.net, click on Documents.
- Emerging, critical and cross-cutting issues listed in the work plan
  - Performance management & performance measures
  - Workforce development
  - International & domestic best method practices
  - Integrating sustainability into winter operations
- Projects, products, and liaison efforts are detailed in the four year work plan
- Questions dealing with how to encourage involvement by all state DOT members were part of the focus of a HS&R TWG survey conducted in Spring 2012 by the WMTSP SICOP Coordinator. Survey participants submitted excellent strategies to involve state DOTs who can't travel to AASHTO meetings.

Financial Assessment

List of States that contributed to the SICOP Program 6455 Annual $4,000 Contribution:
- FY 2009=AK, AL, CO, CT, ID, IL, KS, MD, ME, MI, NC, ND, NY, OR, PA, TX, UT, VA, VT, & WI.
- FY 2010=AK, AL AZ, CA, CO, GA, IA, ID, IL, KY, KS, MD, MI, MN, MO, ND, NH, NJ, OH, TN, TX, UT, WI, & WV.
- FY 2011=AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, GA, HI, IL, IN, KS, KY, MA, ME, MI, MN, MO, NC, ND, NH, NV, OH, OK, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WI, WV, & WY.

List of States that contributed to the Computer-based Training Program 6456:
- FY 2009=MA
- FY 2010=AZ, CA, DE, ID, IL, KS, MA, MD, ME, MI, MO, ND, NH, OH, OR, SD, TN, UT, VA, & WA.
- FY 2011=AL, AZ, CA, CO, District of Columbia, DE, IA, ID, IL, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, MN, MO, NH, NV, OH, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV, & WY.

Breakdown of how funds were spent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SICOP 6455</th>
<th>7/1/08..6/30/09</th>
<th>7/1/09..6/30/10</th>
<th>7/1/10..6/30/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>$112,800</td>
<td>$123,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$74,161</td>
<td>$83,097</td>
<td>$87,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$11,480</td>
<td>$28,089</td>
<td>$20,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ 5,569</td>
<td>$ 7,167</td>
<td>$ 1,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 6,981</td>
<td>$ 5,565</td>
<td>$ 1,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI/RWIS CBTs 6456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$73,800</td>
<td>$184,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$45,745</td>
<td>$43,308</td>
<td>$50,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 9</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification of needs, additional resources, and opportunities for funding
  o Needs—although significant progress has been made in implementing pro-active snow and ice control practices, additional effort is needed on "system concept" set forth in 1994 in AR-3-94 and solutions for the emerging, cross cutting issues associated with "sustainable transportation" in winter operations.
  o Additional resources—increased and enhanced collaboration with the international snow and ice community is needed.
  o Opportunities for funding—WMTSP members actively participate on boards and committees of TRB, Aurora, and Clear Roads, and have representation from FHWA at each of the WMTSP meetings to avoid duplication of efforts and leverage funding for research and implementation of findings.

Benefit/Cost Analysis—three benefit/cost studies addressing total systems winter maintenance operations using the proactive technologies taught in the anti-icing and RWIS CBTs have been published:
  o NCHRP Project 20-07(117), Benefit-Cost Study of RWIS and Anti-icing Technologies, with most state DOTs reporting B/C ratios from 2:1 to 13:1
  o Transportation Research Board Record No 2107, March 2009, pp 95-103, produced approximately 17% savings in operational costs.
  o The Indiana DOT reported in Maintenance Decision Support System: Statewide Implementation Final Report for FY09, a savings of $12.1 million in salt use and $1.4 million in compensation for overtime by using MDSS in the 2008-2009 winter season.
Part 1 – Accomplishments

Selected Statistics and Activities:

- Received and reviewed 80 plus technology nominations over the last five years.
- Selected 44 technologies for nationwide marketing since 2001. These technologies have impacted State DOT operational areas as follows:
  - Work Zone and Traveling Public Safety – 17 technologies
  - Construction Operations – 17 technologies
  - Design Operations – 16 technologies
  - Traffic Operations – 14 technologies
  - Maintenance Operations – 14 technologies
  - Environmental Protection Operations – 6 technologies
- Formed and facilitated 25 Lead States teams since 2001 with three more forming.
- Formalized the Lead States team process, publishing a guidebook for use of Lead States Team chairs and members in 2007.
- Completed a redesign of the AASHTO TIG website in 2011 for all AASHTO committees and subcommittees members to quickly find technologies pertinent to their subject areas.
- Broadened inclusion of RAC membership on the Executive Committee in 2011 to strengthen critical communications with the technology development area of State DOT operations.
- In October 2011, approved the first three SHRP2 technologies to pilot implementation through the AASHTO/TRB/FHWA process being developed.

Part 2 - Future Goals and Objectives

Outlook Statement:

- Expedited implementation of new or improved technologies, improving cost-effectiveness in all areas of operations, is critical to providing essential transportation services in the current economic environment.

Emerging Issues:

- SHRP2 technologies are beginning to become available for deployment. The next five years should offer more opportunities for accelerated technology implementation than has been the norm since the original SHRP research program was completed more than a decade ago.
Projects to Address Issues:

- AASHTO TIG is planning SHRP2 implementation activities in conjunction with TRB and FHWA. Once SHRP 2 products have been deemed to warrant State DOT deployment by the responsible SCOH subcommittees, TIG Executive Committee will take action to help expedite nationwide implementation.

Strategies to encourage involvement of State DOT members:

- The AASHTO TIG website was recently redesigned for easier use by State DOTs or individual AASHTO Subcommittees.
- Additionally, TIG Executive Committee assigned members to serve as liaison with each SCOH subcommittee.

Communication activities and efforts to provide assistance and technology transfer to the transportation community:

- TIG revamped individual focus technology marketing plans to be more robust and inclusive with better branding ties to AASHTO and TIG
- Additionally, TIG will implement a comprehensive communications plan to facilitate information flow amongst states and CEOs. The new plan includes more use of technology (i.e. webinars), partner resources and social media to better align with target audience needs.

**Part 3 - Financial Assessment**

Identification of needs, additional resources, and opportunities for funding:

- TIG Lead States Teams will need additional support in future years as resources provided by the State DOTs continue to diminish.

Cost/Benefit Analysis based on the expenses of TIG compared to the benefits received:

- Examples of benefits provided by the expedited implementation of new technologies are many, touching virtually every operational area of State DOTs and providing a wide variety of benefits. Benefits resulting from three TIG-promoted technologies and the degrees of nationwide impact are briefly described on page 3 to demonstrate the return on investment provided by AASHTO TIG operations.
- The Revenues and Expenditures, broken down into Contractor, Travel, Administration, and Other, for TIG are detailed on page 4. Also detailed on page 4 is the state involvement in TIG, both financially as well as “participation.” State participation includes serving on the Executive Committee, submission of new technologies in response to the 2011 solicitation, or having a member on an active Lead States Team.
## Technology Benefits

### TowPlow Snow Removal Equipment

- **Technology**: TowPlow Snow Removal Equipment
- **Benefits**: The brainchild of a State DOT maintenance office supervisor in Missouri, TowPlow allows a single truck and driver to clear two full lanes in a single pass, greatly increasing efficiency of snow clearing operations. Cost of the TowPlow is recovered after approximately 1000 hours of operation. Use after that is long term cost savings to taxpayers.

### Cable Median Barrier Systems

- **Technology**: Cable Median Barrier Systems
- **Benefits**: Cable Median Barrier (CMB) construction cost is less than half the cost of the barrier systems used in the past, providing either quite significant monetary cost savings for taxpayers or the construction of up to twice the number of lane miles for the same level of taxpayer investment. Virtual elimination of cross median crash fatalities is reported across the country by agencies installing these barriers on new locations.

### Automated Machine Guidance Systems

- **Technology**: Automated Machine Guidance Systems
- **Benefits**: Automated Machine Guidance (AMG) Systems save agencies and contractors time and money by improving speed and accuracy of highway construction processes. AMG eliminates need for much of the skilled manual control and surveying labor required for traditional methods. Use of these systems improves job safety by considerably reducing the numbers of workers in heavy equipment work areas.
# Technology Implementation Group (TIG)

## Participation and Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributed States</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$202,654.53</td>
<td>$200,271.64</td>
<td>$241,679.26</td>
<td>$196,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating States</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$101,699.43</td>
<td>$103,532.30</td>
<td>$136,043.26</td>
<td>$94,684.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$38,873.48</td>
<td>$36,812.69</td>
<td>$43,451.26</td>
<td>$20,431.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$29,058.32</td>
<td>$34,699.67</td>
<td>$48,163.18</td>
<td>$36,192.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$46,559.83</td>
<td>$5,459.76</td>
<td>$17,923.56</td>
<td>$16,920.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$216,191.71</td>
<td>$180,505.20</td>
<td>$245,581.99</td>
<td>$168,229.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In FY09, Other includes the purchase of meters for the Surface Resistivity LST at 35,046

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$(13,537.18)</td>
<td>$19,766.44</td>
<td>$(3,902.73)</td>
<td>$27,770.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Service Program Self-Evaluation:
National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP)

NTPEP is a technical-service program first established in 1994, which conducts coordinated evaluations on a wide array of highway safety products, maintenance products and construction materials.

The goal of the program is to provide quality and responsive engineering for the testing and evaluation of products, materials, and devices which are commonly used by the AASHTO Member Departments of Transportation. The primary services of the program is to conduct product evaluations and manufacturing audits of traffic safety devices/ materials, construction materials, maintenance materials, and provide the corresponding reports.

Program Activities and Accomplishments for FY10 through FY12

- During the 2010 fiscal program year, NTPEP conducted major field demonstration projects and nationally-coordinated laboratory testing in 16 product categories. Additionally for FY10 the reinforcing steel audit program was launched beginning with 14 manufacturing facilities. The audit program for both HDPE plastic pipe and reinforcing steel was brought fully under the direction of NTPEP employees during FY10.

- During the 2011 fiscal program year we launched the revised online reporting data base; Data Mine 2.0. This data base allows real time reporting of data for review by agencies and manufacturers. This permits states quick access to information for products and review of manufacturing facilities for qualification and use on projects. While the NTPEP program continues to expand, the Data Mine will grow to allow additional products and services as needed.

- Additionally we revised our NTPEP website to better reflect the program offerings and provide easier access for manufacturers and states to committee information. In FY 2011 our audit program was expanded to include welded wire reinforcement and PVC pipe. Testing programs that were added for FY2011 included Asphalt Release Agents which are now evaluated through the Texas Department of Transportation and reported online through Data Mine.

- During the 2012 fiscal program year the program is growing with additional testing in the field and laboratory for Polymer Concrete Overlay materials and Concrete Adhesive Anchors. Polymer Concrete Overlays will be evaluated for friction surface properties on pavements and bridges; Concrete Adhesive Anchors will be evaluated for non-load bearing applications. Both of these evaluations are slated to launch in June of this year. We are also expanding the manufacturing audit program to include Geotextiles and Geosynthetic Reinforcement materials. This program is expected to grow quickly as both domestic and international manufacturers are interested in qualifying products for sale in the United States. We also expect to add evaluations for concrete coatings later in FY12.

- NTPEP has worked closely with the Subcommittee on Materials for development and revision to standards and more recently developed working relationships with the Subcommittees on Maintenance and Subcommittee on Bridges and Structures to assess the need for evaluation of products within these areas that would benefit from the NTPEP process.
Currently the voluntary contribution for this program by member Departments is $7,500.00. In return NTPEP generated over $1.8 million in product testing and audit data in 2011. While the program as a whole represents a substantial return on investment, a recent evaluation by the Texas Department of Transportation focusing on the savings of utilizing just the Reinforcing Steel (REBAR) audit program, reflected an annual savings in excess of $10,000. These savings were realized by utilizing the audit information to qualify steel producers rather than sending inspection teams to audit the facilities for approval. In this reference the investment was fully returned by adopting one program. Additional savings can be realized by implementation of this program and reduction in time used for the initial qualification of materials through individual state efforts.

Ongoing Activities supporting NTPEP expansion and promotion:

NTPEP staff maintains the committee website, http://www.ntpep.org and works with a contractor for updates and revisions to the online Data Mine Database. The program’s success is largely due to public-private partnerships. Therefore presentations are made at various regional and national conferences and liaison reports are provided to other AASHTO committees. In order to encourage use of the data generated through this program the staff works with the technical experts within the committee to offer peer exchanges when requested by states. During these peer exchanges in addition to discussing program details the subject matter experts offer guidance regarding implementation. The peer exchange program has helped to bridge the implementation gap.

Recently the group implemented a standardized process for bringing new product categories forward for inclusion in either the audit or evaluation programs. This yields a more efficient process for development of consensus testing requirements and audit processes. Currently the new categories under consideration include warm mix asphalt technologies, elastomeric bridge bearing pads, an audit program for guardrail and an audit program for precast concrete products.

Goals for Next 3 Years:

In order to accommodate additional technical testing initiatives requested through our members, our program will continue to grow. We will also set the following goals for the program and use the tools noted to achieve these goals:

- **Increase the use of NTPEP audit results and test data through speaking engagements, training opportunities, and peer exchanges**
- **Improve collaborative** via online communication through the committee website.
- **Enhance data reporting capabilities** and further expand the online data resources.
- Facilitate interim discussion with Technical Committees and Industry through web conferences, if requested.
- **Establish a greater presence in the AASHTO community** by broader collaboration with various subcommittees and the AASHTO Accreditation Program.
- **Structure organization to handle program growth.** Program growth will require additional personnel resources.
National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP)

### Participation and Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Testing Fees</th>
<th>Audit Fees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributed</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
<td>$1,246,840.38</td>
<td>$356,423.28</td>
<td>$1,963,263.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$322,500.00</td>
<td>$1,359,606.36</td>
<td>$427,820.00</td>
<td>$2,109,926.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$330,000.00</td>
<td>$1,497,897.45</td>
<td>$357,250.00</td>
<td>$2,185,147.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$315,000.00</td>
<td>$1,281,988.25</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,596,988.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In FY12, NTPEP Testing and Audit Fees were collected under one Program

### Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12 (As of 4/9/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP</td>
<td>$887,040.99</td>
<td>$1,193,672.07</td>
<td>$901,371.45</td>
<td>$746,246.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP - Audit Program</td>
<td>$26,485.65</td>
<td>$25,436.64</td>
<td>$79,553.51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$913,526.64</td>
<td>$1,219,108.71</td>
<td>$980,924.96</td>
<td>$746,246.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grand Total</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP</td>
<td>$85,898.21</td>
<td>$101,881.55</td>
<td>$95,481.03</td>
<td>$66,455.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP - Audit Program</td>
<td>$39,130.65</td>
<td>$42,303.49</td>
<td>$62,050.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$125,028.86</td>
<td>$144,185.04</td>
<td>$157,531.97</td>
<td>$66,455.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grand Total</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP</td>
<td>$328,058.09</td>
<td>$398,319.97</td>
<td>$351,805.18</td>
<td>$396,911.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP - Audit Program</td>
<td>$146,513.57</td>
<td>$219,631.51</td>
<td>$297,746.42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$474,571.66</td>
<td>$617,951.48</td>
<td>$649,551.60</td>
<td>$396,911.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grand Total</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP</td>
<td>$18,107.32</td>
<td>$18,053.63</td>
<td>$54,920.31</td>
<td>$8,497.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP - Audit Program</td>
<td>$2,609.85</td>
<td>$11,891.46</td>
<td>$1,877.78</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$20,717.17</td>
<td>$29,945.09</td>
<td>$56,798.09</td>
<td>$8,497.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Grand Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP</td>
<td>$1,319,104.61</td>
<td>$1,711,927.22</td>
<td>$1,403,577.97</td>
<td>$1,218,110.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPEP - Audit Program</td>
<td>$214,739.72</td>
<td>$299,263.10</td>
<td>$441,228.65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$1,533,844.33</td>
<td>$2,011,190.32</td>
<td>$1,844,806.62</td>
<td>$1,218,110.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net $429,419.33 $98,736.04 $340,340.83 $378,877.31
STANDING COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAYS (SCOH)

AMENDED AGENDA

BUSINESS MEETING

Room Michigan AB – TRAVERSE CITY, MICHIGAN
Saturday, May 19, 2012  8:30 AM – 12:00 Noon
Conference Call Number: 1-866-299-7945 and Passcode: 4370119#

I. Call to Order and Opening Remarks ................................................................. Vice-Chair Paul Degges, TN

II. Roll Call and Minutes from Detroit, Michigan, October 15, 2011 ....................Secretary John Baxter, FHWA

III. Call for Agenda Amendments ............................................................................ Vice-Chair Degges, TN

IV. Update on Center for Environmental Excellence ........................................ Carlos Braceras, UT

CONSENT AGENDA: A single Motion to accept all the items on this Consent Agenda is in order. After such a Motion is made and seconded, any member may remove an item for separate action. The Consent Agenda Motion will then be voted upon for the balance of the reports. After the Consent Agenda Motion for item IV. and V.A. through D. has been acted upon, the items removed will be taken up in order.

V. Summary of SCOH Ballots from October 2011 to May 2012 (information)........Vice-Chair Degges, TN

VI. Work Plans (action) ......................................................................................... Vice-Chair Degges, TN

A. Future Meetings, Conferences, or Workshops of Interest to SCOH Members (information)

B. Subcommittee
   1. Bridges and Structures .................................................................................. Mal Kerley, VA
   2. Construction .................................................................................................... Michael P. Lewis, RI
   3. Design ............................................................................................................. Barry Schoch, PA
   4. Highway Transport ........................................................................................ Mark Gottlieb, WI
   5. Maintenance ................................................................................................. Carlos Braceras, UT
   6. Materials ....................................................................................................... Grant Levi, ND
   7. Right-of-Way and Utilities ............................................................................. John P. Campbell, TX
   8. Systems Operation and Management ............................................................ TBD
   9. Traffic Engineering ....................................................................................... Bernie Arseneau, MN

C. Joint Committee
   1. Technology Implementation Group (TIG) ...................................................... Ken Sweeney, ME
   2. AASHTO/ACEC ........................................................................................... Paul Mattox, WV
   3. SCOP-Asset Management (SCOP/SCOH) ................................................ Ananth Prasad, FL

D. Special Committee
   1. NTPEP Oversight Committee ........................................................................ Dan Grassar, WI
   2. Special Committee on U.S. Route Numbering .............................................. Ken Sweeney, ME
   3. Special Committee on Wireless Technology ................................................. William A. Brown, VA

VII. Technical Service Program Reviews (action to continue programs) ..........Vice-Chair Degges, TN

A. National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP) .................. Dan Grassar, WI
   B. Technology Implementation Group (TIG) .................................................... Ken Sweeney, ME
   C. Snow and Ice Cooperative Program (SICOP) ............................................ Rick Nelson, NV

VIII. Motions — PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

A. PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE RESOLUTIONS
   1. National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP) ............. Dan Grassar, WI
      a. PAR: NTPEP Adjustment to Voluntary Contributions from AASHTO Member Departments
AMENDED AGENDA

2. Standing Committee on Highways.........................................................Carlos Braceras, UT
   a. PAR: Request to Expedite the Review of Buy America Requirements Related to Utility Work on Federal-aid Projects

B. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE AASHTO GOVERNING DOCUMENTS
   1. Right of Way & Utilities .................................................................Matthew W. DeLong, MI
      a. PAGD: Modification to Charge Statement for the Subcommittee on Right of Way and Utilities (distribute when available)

IX. Reports
   A. NCHRP 20-7 .......................................................................................Paul Degges, TN, and Chris Jenks, TRB
   B. Special Committee on U.S. Route Numbering (action) ..........................Ken Sweeney, ME
   C. Technology Implementation Group (TIG) ........................................Ken Sweeney, ME
   D. AASHTO/ACEC Joint Committee ......................................................Paul Mattox, WV
   E. SHRP2 Implementation Task Force ..................................................Neil Pedersen, TRB
   F. Connected Vehicle Update ..................................................................Jeffrey Lindley, FHWA

X. Presentations
   A. Executive Director’s Report and Update on Reauthorization ...............John Horsley, AASHTO
   B. FHWA Activities ..............................................................................John Baxter, FHWA
   C. Transportation Association Canada, Chief Engineers’ Council Update ....Greg Johnson, MI
   D. PIARC Update – U.S. National Committee ........................................Tony Kane, AASHTO
   E. Standing Committee on Research (SCOR) Update ...............................Floyd Roehrich, AZ
   F. Standing Committee on Environment (SCOE) Update ........................Kevin Walsh, MA
   G. Sustainable Transportation Committee (STEICS) Update .....................Rick Land, CA

XI. Old Business .........................................................................................Vice-Chair Degges, TN

XII. New Business .......................................................................................Vice-Chair Degges, TN

XIII. Adjourn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Number</th>
<th>Date Created</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HW-11-14     | 09/19/2011   | FHWA Docket No. FHWA-2010-017 - DRAFT LETTER to FHWA                    | Affirmative: 43 of 52  
Negative: 0 of 52  
No Vote: 10 of 52                                                      |
| HW-11-15     | 10/24/11     | FHWA Docket – FHWA-2010-0159                                            |                                                                         |
| HW-11-17     | 11/14/2011   | The Highways Subcommittee on Systems Operation and Management on the NTCIP accepted the proposed NTCIP 1203 v03, “Object Definitions for Dynamic Message Signs (DMS), Parts 1 and 2,” as a Recommended Standard, approved the document with 35 (affirmative) to 0 (negative) vote on October 21, 2011. | Affirmative: 38 of 54  
Negative: 0 of 54  
No Vote: 16 of 54                                                      |
| HW-11-18     | 12/07/11     | Converting Three (3) NCHRP Research Reports 692, 680, and 668 to AASHTO Publication.  
NCHRP Report 692, Decision Making for Outsourcing and Privatization of Vehicle and Equipment Fleet Maintenance  
NCHRP Report 680, Manual for Emulsion-Based Chip Seals for Pavement Preservation | Affirmative: 40 of 52  
Negative: 1 of 52  
No Vote: 11 of 52                                                      |
| HW-12-01     | 01/05/2012   | Advanced Transportation Controller (ATC) 2070 Standard V03.03            | (Results not confirmed as the results are missing) Confirmed: Affirmative: 39 |
| HW-12-02     | 01/09/2012   | Systems Operations and Management (SO&M) Guidance”                       | Affirmative 36 (this is not confirmed as the results are missing) confirmed |
| HW-12-03     | 02/14/12     | SCOH Spring Meeting Survey – Topics and Attendance                       | Response, Count  
Friday, May 18, 2012 (Technical Meeting): 32,  
Saturday, May 19, 2012 (Business Meeting): 30  
ALTERNATE: 6  
WILL NOT be represented, 8                                              |
| HW-12-04     | 02/24/12     | SCOH Ballot on AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities    | Affirmative: 38  
Negative: 2  
No Vote: 12                                                            |
| HW-12-05     | 04/18/12     | SCOH Ballot of the Proposed AASHTO Pavement Management Guide            | Pending distribution                                                   |
WHEREAS On October 29, 1995, the AASHTO Board of Directors adopted Administrative Resolution AR-8-95, entitled “Shared Financial Support of AASHTO’s NTPEP,” as part of the National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP) technical service program, and ordered that it be operated from pooled funds from AASHTO member departments; and

WHEREAS, AASHTO has successfully implemented said technical services program, to assist states with their coordinated evaluation on a wide array of highway safety products, maintenance products and construction materials including establishment of a national auditing program for manufactured products, and

WHEREAS, The program continues to expand as additional product categories are brought forward by the states, and

WHEREAS, There continues to be a decline in state testing resources to adequately evaluate complex or new materials, and

WHEREAS, The NTPEP program has been very successful and could be an excellent template for expanding evaluations for bridge and pavement maintenance, and

WHEREAS, The Subcommittees on Maintenance and Materials are actively pursuing use of NTPEP for development of additional evaluations of products, such as warm mix asphalt additives and elastomeric bridge bearing pads, and

WHEREAS, The following products were added in the last three fiscal years for field and laboratory evaluation: asphalt release agents, polymer concrete overlay materials, high friction surface courses, concrete anchor systems, and

WHEREAS, The following manufacturing process have been added in the last three fiscal years for standardized manufacturing audits: reinforcing steel, welded wire reinforcement, polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe, geotextile fabrics, and reinforced geosynthetic materials, and

WHEREAS, Voluntary state membership dues have not increased since 2008 in accordance with AR-1-08, despite expansion of the program, increased complexity of testing services performed by NTPEP and addition of staffing to cover technical services; and

WHEREAS, The AASHTO Board of Directors and the AASHTO Executive Committee endorsed and authorized continuation of the joint funding concept where participating AASHTO member departments and industry share costs with revenue from industry testing fees being utilized primarily for product testing, reporting and distribution of reports, and with revenue from AASHTO member departments collected through voluntary pooled fund contributions primarily utilized for engineering, administrative and consultant support to run the program; and

WHEREAS, The NTPEP technical service program was evaluated this fiscal year, 2012 for its effectiveness and legitimacy among transportation users, and the funding mechanisms to support the program if it is to be continued, and now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, That the AASHTO Standing Committee on Highways supports an increase in the voluntary state contribution to $12,000, as recommended by the National Transportation Product Evaluation Program Oversight Panel.

SCOH-BOD
WHEREAS, Since the initiation of the federal-aid highway program in 1916, utility relocation work has been eligible for federal-aid participation as a construction cost item to the extent States are obligated to pay for such work; and

WHEREAS, the Buy America law (23 USC 313) was enacted in 1982; and

WHEREAS, AASHTO supports compliance with the Buy America law; and

WHEREAS, The Federal Highway Administration recently modified its implementation of Buy America to include third party utility work; and

WHEREAS, Third party utilities are not owned by, nor are their operations directly controlled by, State or local highway agencies; and

WHEREAS, Third party utility owners have the right to set their own standards, use their own stock, and apply their own procurement and contracting methods; and

WHEREAS, Third party utilities are not integral to transportation projects; and

WHEREAS, As a result of FHWA’s Chief Counsel’s decision in 1985, contracts let by third party utilities are exempt from other federal-aid construction regulations such as Davis-Bacon wage rates, Equal Employment Opportunity, and Minority Business Enterprises; and

WHEREAS, The Federal Highway Administration is currently reviewing whether the property rights aspect of utility reimbursement eligibility removes the Buy America regulation;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Members of the Standing Committee on Highways of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials support the Federal Highway Administration’s efforts to reassess the applicability of Buy America requirements to utility work on federal-aid projects; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Standing Committee on Highways requests that FHWA expedite the completion of their review of third party utility property rights and whether these rights exempt them from Buy America.
WHEREAS, The regulatory control of outdoor advertising along the national interstate and primary system is provided for by the Federal Highway Beautification Act (HBA) and administered by the Federal Highway Administration.

WHEREAS, The AASHTO member state departments of transportation are delegated the responsibility to enforce the controls established by the HBA and which delegation is memorialized in individual state-federal agreements.

WHEREAS, Failure to effectively control the display of outdoor advertising in accordance with the provisions of the HBA is punishable by the consequential loss of up to 10% of federal transportation funding.

WHEREAS, There is no current AASHTO Standing Committee or Subcommittee to represent the issues and facilitate professional dialog associated with outdoor advertising control among member DOT’s, FHWA regulators and the regulated industry.

WHEREAS, A majority of the 48 member state DOT’s that do not prohibit (four member departments prohibit) Outdoor Advertising (OA) assign outdoor advertising control to the right of way function.

RESOLVED, That the AASHTO Governing Documents be amended to expand membership of the Right of Way and Utilities Subcommittee (SCORWU) to include the highest ranking position responsible for regulatory control of OA and to provide a forum for collaboration among AASHTO members on the issues of policy and practice for the effective regulatory control of OA in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Beautification Act.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, To accordingly re-designate the RW&U Subcommittee as the Highways Subcommittee Right of Way, Utilities, and Outdoor Advertising Control.

Approved at its meeting on 5/3/2012 by 38 members present RW&U, Portland, OR

New Charge Statement (Bold Italics=new language):
Highways Subcommittee Right of Way, Utilities, and Outdoor Advertising Control

The subcommittee shall review the laws and regulations of the Federal Government, member states, and territories pertaining to public acquisition and management of real property for transportation related purposes. The subcommittee will also review issues related to the placement of utilities on highway rights-of-way and issues of policy and practice for the effective regulatory control of outdoor advertising in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Beautification Act. It shall provide a forum for collaboration among AASHTO members and the exchange of experiences, innovations, and best practices; and will recommend such laws, rules, regulations, and procedures so as to improve the quality and efficiency of Right-of-Way, Utilities, and Outdoor Advertising Control operating practices. The Right-of-Way process includes Right-of-Way scoping/mapping, appraisal review, consultant management, relocation, acquisition, property management, condemnation coordination and management, and program management, including local public agency coordination and certification. The Utilities process includes utility coordination, utility relocation, utility accommodation, subsurface utility engineering and utility pole safety. Each Member Department shall be entitled to membership thereon. The Outdoor Advertising (OA) member shall be the highest ranking position responsible for regulatory control of OA.

The subcommittee may establish liaison relationships with appropriate offices of the Federal Highway Administration and such other entities having a role and responsibility in the areas of Right-of-Way, Utilities, and Outdoor Advertising Control.

The subcommittee shall work cooperatively with other AASHTO committees and subcommittees and shall report to the Standing Committee on Highways on its actions, publications, recommendations, and resolutions promoting the general purpose of the Association. Each Member Department shall be entitled to membership; however, in those states where the Right-of-Way, Utilities, and Outdoor Advertising Control functions report to different organizational units, the state shall designate one (1) voting member on the subcommittee.