Agenda

March 28, 2019 2:00 to 4:00 pm

129,000 Pound Large Truck Network

NDDOT Room 310 and 311

Conference Number available

**Participant Dialing Instructions**
1. Dial your Access Number:
                   1-877-820-7831
2. Enter the Participant Passcode:
                   708933#

2:00 Call to Order, Introduction/Roll Call of Attendees – By phone Lance Meyer ND League of Cities, Jason Benson ND Assoc. of Counties

Kevin Sonsalla ND Dept. of Commerce, Nancy Huether NDDOT, Chuck Steffan ND Motor Carriers, Jon Ketterling NDDOT, Eldon Mehrer Highway Patrol, Jackie Darr Highway Patrol, Ron Henke NDDOT, Justin Schlosser NDDOT, Brad Darr NDDOT, Craig Faul NDDOT, Scott Zainhofsky NDDOT. Doug Goehring ND Dept. of Agriculture, Dan Zink Shortline Railroads, Melanie Gaebe ND Dept. of Agriculture, Wayde Swenson NDDOT

2:10 Approve Minutes from November 28, 2018 No amendments, Doug Motioned to approve, Chuck Seconded the motion, all in favor. Motion approved unanimously.

2:15 Red River Valley Multiple Highways -Transystems – Sugar beet haulers- Applications come in for short segments, study showed this was a problem in Idaho. NDDOT received 2 applications, we approved one that was a 10-mile stretch. It is hard to get the economic need from the application. Once segment is approved, the segment is open to all users. The legislative intent is to have connectivity to the system. At the county commission meeting, Commissioners were asking what they should do, either accept the states permit or come up with a permit on their own. Most of the counties on the east side of the state were not taking the states permit but using their own. All of these permits originate on the city or county system to start. The county has to look at their network and roadway conditions. No process for what is the true ESAL comparative? Jackie stated we still have the seasonal LCD permits. Jackie asked if LTAP tested the ESAL system, Brad stated they tested the roadway system. Analysis was done, but it all goes back to the individual truck. When we did this for the Red River Valley Sugar Beet system, Transystems asked Great plains to do an analysis. From analysis it was claimed that there was 40% less damage to the roadway. The study shows that on pavement because all the axles are legal, there is no additional damage to the roadway. Dan said we spoke briefly about the sugar beet, is the response specific to the sugar beet commodity, or does it open the segment up to all commodities to use. Brad said, once the requested segment is opened up, it is opened up to any truck with a permit. Dan asked is part of the application process is to include other commodities that may be generated? Brad said no. But that concern did come out in the study with Idaho.

The state has no concern on bridges or pavements. Transsystems was at the Commission meeting and it was pointed out to the commissioners, that with two trailers they have 2 points of rotation, no turning issues, and more brakes and that means more safety. Brad and Craig attended most commission meetings in person, occasionally attended by phone. Richland county had no concerns, and up and down the Red River Valley there were no concerns. Traill County did not want to approve the segment, but their roads are controlled by Grand Forks County and Grand Forks is in favor of the segment. Grand Forks took the lead and had a conference call to discuss permitting. Grand Forks used NDDOT permit and has a proposed permit should this application get approved. Jackie asked for clarification on the maps. Eldon asked about connectivity portion, does this provide the intent of connectivity? We have had the Sugar beet industry; most are restricted to legal weight. Some of the counties are very knowledgeable about the sugar industry. Specific dates were determined for permitting. Believe this enhances the ability for industry to move their product. Ron stated I don’t know how well it meets the limited network if it is specific to one industry, it does not limit the hauling from Dec. – to February, how is this only limited?

Dan stated This will have a direct affect to the short line railroads. Doug motions to approve, Chuck seconded. Prior to vote, discussion was continued; Dan stated that representing the railroad industry, that this goes broader than the application suggests, it is broader than just the sugar beet industry.

There are more industries that will use this, than just the sugar beet industry.

Jason stated that speaking with Grand Forks county, and Walsh county, based on the comments from commission meeting, they are supportive of the network, Cass county had concerns, generally outside of having an ethanol plant in Lynchburg north of I94, limiting the use of state 18, generally we will not have a lot of problems with vehicles, as they will have to stay on state 18. Will have some work at the county level, how will permit process work. It was stated that the process would be similar to Grand Forks and Walsh county. Brad states Grand Forks permit pretty much mimics states permit. County will limit to winter window, should limit the use of the routes, as those are the key 129K vehicles. The other part is when looking at the type of equipment that people might haul other commodities, will they start buying new equipment to haul 129K if they have no route to haul on, not sure the industry will go that direction. If counties are limiting this to the winter, it will fit into the old LCV permit, runs from Dec. 1 to March 7th. LCV increased since people now know they can haul on many highways. Brad asked if counties would limit to the winter, Cass county has not approved a process at this time. But will be similar to Walsh County and Grand Forks County, adding additional winter permit to accommodate 129,000 LBS. Eldon asked why we wouldn’t continue and include all of 18 to the interstate, will have a gap if we don’t include it and people will still use it and hope they don’t get stopped by a trooper. There is two miles of road that will have an issue. For continuity, we should include the rest of 18 for connectivity to the interstate. The city does have the responsibility to maintain the roadway. Brad said they called him and are asking how they would permit. If we give them that section of 18, then industry would be able to fuel their vehicles. As it sits now, they can obtain a permit, but cannot get off permitted segment to refuel. Doug motioned to amend as discussed, Chuck seconded motion. Dan Zink opposed the motion, must vote no for consortium. Motion approved with 1 nay.

* Public input
* Discussion and Recommendations for Director – Doug Goehring motioned to amend the request, Chuck Steffan seconded, all approved

2:30 ND 1806- Dixon Brothers- Fuel **-** Brad and Craig met with the county commission**.** KLJ did further analysis to make sure their designs would accommodate additional loads. Commission was in favor.

* Public input Dixon brothers hauls from Refiner, to 83 to Minot, additional route is approved routes, once in Minot will need a piece if county 12. Minot will go along with request. The county has more concerns and has not committed to approval. Concerns were raised with the county being part of the county consortium, they have their own 129,000 LB network. Law 391202 passed, the county belongs to Load Pass, they have to follow what the county is doing. At Mandan city commission meeting, applicant stated they would be interested in hauling west on I94 into Montana. Lance with City of Minot, will need to take to City council, does not see any issues. Intersection of 55th street and county road 12 will need updates to sign off. Lance will work with the county to promote route. There are no bridges or roadways that would be impacted, where the state is concerned. Jackie asked where the roundabout was going to be located. Asked if the City had any issues with the route request. The city had no concerns. Chuck asked the committee to recommend the approval, and if it would push it through the county to approve? Jackie Darr asked if they don’t get Minot’s approval will they would still have loads going in or out?
* Jason motioned to approve, Doug seconded, all in favor. Motion passed.

* Discussion and Recommendations for Director

2:45 US 12- TranSystems- Gravel

* Public input – from gravel pit to US 12
* Discussion and Recommendations for Director - Craig and Brad met with City Commission, presented application, Bowman County commission was acting for the township, Township was there, denied request, but did offer a minimum maintenance road as an alternative and gave them access to US 12. Transsystems accepted. Scott pointed out that this is a small segment of road, but it does have continuity, does have active use for locals. Scott stated, this one is not a piece to the larger system, applying for a temporary project, the other applications are going to a permanent location. Do not see US 12 coming as an addition to the network in the future as it does not have the same system connectivity. Eldon asked if any other company will be using the pit or location for any other purpose, it is a sand pit that other companies use. Montana would like to have US 12 added for winter time hauling. Doug stated might create more connectivity if it was open. Jackie stated if it is for 2 months is it worth the work? Eldon stated that the small area for short duration, but if it included all of HWY 12, it would be different. Eldon Motioned to deny application, Ron seconded. Kevin Sonsalla opposed the motion.

3:00 Update on Admin Rule with Attorney General – it is Jackie’s understanding that there has been no change since the last update.

3:15 Road Trains Study/Pilot Legislation – the department has been moderating legislation. Was originally a study with a pilot program amended on house side, if study makes sense will go to a pilot program. Potentially could be a study on road trains. Definition of road trains is in question. …Australia has determined that 2 trucks constitute a train. NDDOT legislators are stating 400 feet long, had 200K requested for study, but was pulled… changed from shall study to shall consider. Removed emergency clause as well.

Chuck Motioned to adjourn, Doug seconded.

4:00 Adjourn