Agenda

July 13, 2017 – 2:30 to 4:30 pm

129,000 Pound Large Truck Network

NDDOT Room 312

2:30 Call to Order, Introduction/Roll Call of Attendees – Brad Darr

2:40 Introductory Remarks by Ron Henke – NDDOT Interim Director

2:55 Review of Legislation/Discussion

3:15 Review of UGPTI Study/Discussion

3:35 Permit process in place for August 1st when legislation takes effect/Discussion

4:00 Potential process for adding new roads to network/Discussion

4:30 Adjourn

Brad called meeting to order at 2:36

Attendee’s – Ron Henke, Brad Darr, Wayde Swenson, Andy Peterson, Tom Bodine, Jay Schuler, Capt. Eldon Mehrer, Jason Benson, Daniel Zink, Chuck Steffan, Lance Meyer, Jason Thorson, Andy Harris, Melanie Gaebe, Jackie Darr, Ben Ehreth

Introductory Welcome – Ron Henke

Ron gave a brief review of the Executive Truck Size and Weight Study. Ron outlined the study by UPGTI, what the primary findings were of the study. A copy of the final study was provided to the committee on flash drives and a hard copy was placed in each member’s folder. From the study from UPGTI, HB1255 was introduced and passed by the legislative body, requiring the DOT to establish a limited transportation network system for 129,000 pound large truck network. There are 2 routes, I-29 and I-94 that are in the Federal transportation bill. If the bill passes these two highways will accommodate loads up to 129,000. The bill requires the committee to establish a committee and identify members of the committee. The goal today is to get approval of processes procedures, and axle weights. Identify process and routes to be considered to be on the 129,000 network. This committee can only impact state highways. This group will impact loads from 105,500, GVW up to 129,000, pound GVW network.

Discussion of Legislation –

Question asked, what highways are built up to accommodate weight. Ron stated we build highways to accommodate ESAL’s not weight. Bridges are by weight. A large truck study which was provided on the thumb drives, will give key findings on the study to answer questions. Pavements are not impacted by the Gross vehicle weight loads but on the axles. In the study, there was concern with intersections issues, with turning radius for over length vehicles. Ron stated that the 129,000, pound large truck network would align with South Dakota and Montana, Montana however, has unlimited axles but shut down at weights. Brad made reference to the UPGTI study for weights.

Question asked, will Minnesota change? Ron stated, there is no indication of weight changes for Minnesota.

Chuck Steffan asked if I-29 and I-94 will be changed to accommodate new weight limits. Ron stated that this will go in to effect, subject to federal approval. Chuck asked if there is a timeline. Idaho took about a year to go into effect. Just looking at the network there is obvious connectivity issues.

How long has SD and Montana been at current levels… Jackie Darr stated, prior to 1991 ISTEA (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act) freeze was in effect.

Minnesota was not going over 80K pounds. Can we learn from these two states, and can our pavement handle the increased weight limits?

Brad: Idaho has been the model for our study, we will take committee information and move to what is best for our state.

Slide presentation: Brad Darr presented key findings from the study.

2015 Budget bill directed NDDOT to work with UPGTI to complete study. The information is in the packet and Flash drive, additional item allows the department to use the Federal bridge formula to make sure bridge and roads can handle increased load weights. Legislation will allow users to purchase permits over 105,500 pounds. The cost of the permit $100.00 a month or $700.00 a year. Or users can purchase a single use permit. Section 2 of HB 1255 addresses fees for permits.

Question was asked if additional weights attributed to additional crashes for Commercial shippers and Ag producers. At this time, there is no data to support crash information with increased weight with larger truck vehicles, however, miles will be reduced.

Dan Zink stated that he believes the current finding is inconsistent with reduced miles. Dan Zink states if trucking weights are increased to shippers, that they will ship rather than use rail, and he does not believe that the trucking miles will decrease with additional weight limits.

Long term effects, deterioration will increase with additional load weights.

Jason state, counties with older bridges do not have complete plans for actual determination. Harmonization study dug into 129,000 pound Idaho study. In addition NDDOT hired UPGTI, put 2nd document together comparing law to compare network, to determine if additional concerns need to be met. Idaho has used since 1998.

Brad Stated; UPGTI study, dug into Idaho’s process to add roads to the network. Copy of form is in the packet for review. The internal engineering review, route report will require us to work with the Districts, see attached flow chart. The outline requires public hearings for each potential segment to be added to the network. The public pushed to not have mountainous roads added to network. Discussion on NDDOT Request form and process alignment. If an entity or individual wants to add a segment, the firm will need to get background information prior to sending to engineering for validity to add to network.

Idaho does an off tracking review, determines how Semi’s wheels do not track with each other going around curves, ND will not have problems on main highways. ND will have max length restrictions, or we can dictate what kind of load can be hauled. If you limit the length you limit the weight. Idaho is looking at tweaking their process as well. Idaho is looking to push the review out to the Districts to review roadways. Geometrics will need to be reviewed through mountainous terrain.

Jason asked if someone brings forward a segment of road to add to the network to accommodate a specific industry, can a specific segment of road be changed to meet the needs of specific industries only. Response is, this will be added into the Public input portion of process.

Statement will NDDOT restrictions be as Idaho where they go segment by segment rather than roadway for industry. Brad stated this is the Idaho rules, NDDOT will not follow the same rules. This committee will determine if we approve by segments or by corridor.

Dan Zink stated their might be impacts to local county roads and city streets. Will our process include impacts to local and county roads? Can we can add to the form if the committee makes that choice? Jason, stated that we could request information from counties to determine industry needs in the vicinity. It will be up to law enforcement to enforce weight restrictions within the city. Eldon stated that the ESAL impact on roadways is less in most cases if properly loaded than it would be at 105,500. The study indicates there will be less impact on roadways. Jason states that bridges will deteriorate at a higher rate. Dan stated that there is no estimate on bridges or intersection roads due to the long loads. A question was asked, how will roundabouts will be effected? Ron stated typically WB67 guideline is used for roundabouts, Ron stated we do not see extra length being an issue.

Idaho adds information on upcoming road repairs to the information for guidelines Idaho requires a public hearing prior to all segment changes. ND will need to make the decision if we have a public hearing prior to changes. Will do whatever is best for ND.

UPGTI review. What are the concerns with Idaho process? Public upset that every segment takes 9 to 12 months for review process. Idaho has issues with board meeting scheduling. . There are flaws in the process. UPGTI thinks the form is too long. We should add economic viability to our form. Idaho Law only allows for segment review, rather than by corridor. The process was stopped for interstate integration. We do not have to stop for process. Question was asked if law would allow for transport to travel off the corridor or segment of road for gas, lodging food and other services. Federal law allows for 1 mile off of interstate. This committee will make the determination if weighted vehicles will have the same authorization for allowable travel off the segment for service needs. Vehicles will still be required to have a permit to legally haul at additional weights. A similar permit is available for winter driving. Dan Zink asked how cost of permit is determined. Jackie stated fee is determined by the Legislature. The only one that is not in the bill is the single trip permit.

Jason asked if the law explicitly allows for any load to travel 1 mile off then interstate for motel, fuel, and lodging, pick up and drop of load. Brad stated, the law does not address this. The law allows DOT Director to make Policy and Rules so it could be addressed.

Online form, versus paper form. NDDOT would prefer electronic form. As opposed to paper form. Electronic form system will determine the time involved to approve roadway. An interim committee will need to be formed to review all information and processes, will need to keep the Districts involved in the process and any changes.

Question was asked, will the Director have the final say to determine segments. Brad stated yes. The law is written to define the Director’s roll in the process.

Permit Policy will go into effect on August 1, 2017. The NDDOT and Highway Patrol have worked together to implement the policy.

Lance asked if trucks will be allowed to enter city limits with permits or only on Highways, and does every city have their own permitting system available? The cities will permit, their own roads as will the counties. The DOT has segments that HP issues permits for the DOT. Question was asked, will the city have to make adjustments to their permitting system, if so, where will the funds come from? Lance with the league of cities stated, cities will be impacted by long loads.

Chuck Steffan stated, one of the advantages for increased load weight, is that trucks can double stack containers rather than making the load longer. Containerized systems can be double stacked to alleviate long loads. The Committee thinks it is beneficial to add systems, rather than segments. Verbiage can add into permit that the load cannot go off the state highway in city limits. Brad stated there should be logical truck routes to accommodate industry within city limits.

Cities would need assistance looking at streets and bridges to approve routes, to get the routes upgraded to the system. Wayde stated that the law only allows for state highways. Will likely need additional permitting. Oil impacted cities handle their own permitting. Most counties handle their own permitting.

Current LCV permit process is in place. The process uses the outer bridge formula for calculations. Only one check in place, the permit is good on state and US highways, not valid during state spring load restrictions, and follows the same permit fee schedule.

UPGTI put together ideas for adding routes to current system. The system would follow the Idaho model.

Flow chart on how it could work in ND (ITD Form 4886)

Jason asked if the policy on permitting states that the permit belongs to the truck or the driver, or the load. If it is a onetime permit or if it is for the load the truck is carrying that day? Jackie Darr stated that all permits in the state of North Dakota belong to the truck that is hauling the load.

Dan Zink questioned the timing and the believe that UPGTI states it is too slow, he believes that the Idaho process is good, and we will need the time to study the impact to other companies, such as rail lines. Question was asked if once the route is added, there be a time it will come off the system. States that the process needs to be done correctly rather than the worrying about the speed of the process. However, Idaho industry thinks the process is too slow, and did have a road come off the system, due to public and city outcry that the road went through a little town with mountains on either side.

A process needs to be included for the DOT to review for engineering and safety. Committee will need to come up with a process. (Flow chart) and will need to include a process of appeal and repeal. Eldon asked what the appeal process looks like. Committee should determine where the appeal lies and where it goes if rejected. Eldon asked if the speed of the process would allow for new information to come about that would affect the appeal process. Ron and Brad stated there are several opportunities for Director to kick back.

Ben stated that some of the jurisdictions have their own permitting processes, and the flow chart does not allow for the other jurisdictions to give input. Jackie states this is just for state highways. Counties should be included in the routing review process. Lance states that he agrees that counties, and local jurisdictions should have the right to approve or reject, will need to add a process for the local jurisdiction to review with input.

Question was asked, how will cities and counties pay for upgrades to roads. Will counties or cities change their policies to accommodate the new loads? Communication will need to be made with localities to get comments to and from public outreach meetings.

Brad stated to Dan Zinc, maybe there is opportunity to get input from short line railroads first prior to coming to the public event. Dan states exposure to all impacts is important to the railroads. Dan states that the committee is going to get a lot of pressure to add segments. Question asked, where will you limit other industries into the feedback process. Department of Ag. Believes that input from all parties should be allowed. Ron stated all industries will have the opportunity to be heard at public hearings and public meetings. Dan states that it is more than local jurisdictions that will be impacted. Dan stated that if 281 is added to the 129,000 pound line the impact to short-line rail will be significantly impacted.

Comment out of Idaho study, Jackie stated there may be limited input at one public meeting and not enough room at another meeting to accommodate public needs. Question was asked how the Legislature chose roads to add to the network. Dan states that the impact to all short line railroads will be significant. As far as public outreach, what kind of format will there be. Brad would like to have meetings and online comments. Dept. of Ag, would like town hall meetings, but more outreach is better. Online forms are better as people may say more in a form rather than in a public meeting. The benefit to public meetings is there is an opportunity to educate people about the process. As far as the application and request form (Jason) asked if it will still be the industry who submits the form, or can self-employed truckers submit as well. Statement is that whomever submits the form there will still be the need to provide points of transit from A to B and justification as to why the committee should add to segment.

Question was asked about the urban corridor piece and where the turning points in the city would be located. Origin and destination using local roads will be looked at in the permitting process. Question was asked if there is any information on how the short lines will be effected.

Dan Zink asked about adding the 129,000 corridor to established routes, will it actually reduce the number of trucks on the road. Dan believes the wording is horribly one sided. Jackie stated the form is submitted by one company and only one company, the information received is how it will benefit the company submitting the form. Yes, other industries will access and use the road, but the form as it is now, is for a specific company to submit the request. Jason states this new increased load weight will benefit Farm, Ag, and industries close to state highways. This will also open corridor up to additional industries. Ben asked if Idaho study did any modeling or predictions. No one was aware of any modeling.

Brad stated that there is one other administrative piece that will affect the law. We currently charge a fee for loads that are restricted to legal weight during Load restrictions now we anticipate loads being on the road during the restrictions. We will need to have an administrative hearing and code changed prior to Load Restrictions coming on prior to next year. The Department needs to have more discussion prior to committee review. Brad states that he anticipates trucks being allowed on roads, as long as they are permitted. Brad will work with legal to identify the intent for divisible loads.

Committee will meet again in 3 weeks @ 1:00 pm. Use Doodle poll to request dates and times.