



United Transportation Union

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATIVE BOARD, AFL - CIO 

921-11th STREET • SUITE 502 • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814-2873 • (916) 441-2051 • FAX(916) 441-2054 1

March 2, 1993

*FWA-97-2176-3
QA 17551*

LEGIS. / REGS. DIVISION
MARCH 9 12:40
RECEIVED

FHWA Docket No. MC-92-10
Room 4232, HCC-10
Office of the Chief Counsel
Federal Highway Administration
400 Seventh Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20590

Gentlemen:

Re: FHWA Docket No. MC-92-10

I am writing with regard to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which appeared in the Federal Register dated Friday, January 15, 1993, relative to the above-captioned docket number.

In this connection, I am enclosing a copy of the pertinent portion of a communication which I received from a local officer/member of our organization, who is also a commercial driver.

Please allow the enclosed comments and supplemental information to be the submission of this office to your agency in your consideration of the proposal to amend FHWA Docket No. MC-92-10 regarding mandatory minimum training requirements for operators of longer combination vehicles (LCVs).

I am requesting that the enclosed comments be made a part of the official record of this proceeding.

I am enclosing a self-addressed, stamped postcard in order to receive verification of your receipt of the enclosed comments.

Very sincerely,

James (J.P.) Jones
State Legislative Director

JPJ/lw
enclosures

DOCKET MC-92-10-2
PAGE 1 OF 2

In regards to Federal Highway Administration's ANPRM (FHWA Docket NO. MC-"**92-10**) RIN **2125-AC92** regarding mandatory minimum training requirements for operators of longer combination vehicles, our position is as follows:

We are opposed to longer combination vehicles (**LCVs**) and therefore we do not support mandatory training requirements. However, if **LCVs** are, in fact, out on the road, it would be important to have proper training, Let me reiterate however, we do remain opposed to **LCVs**.

DOCKET MC-92-10-2
PAGE 2 OF 2