



Department of  
Land Use & Transportation

WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON

**RROMAC**

RURAL ROADS OPERATIONS AND  
MAINTENANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**November 8, 2018, 7:30 to 9:30 a.m.**

**Walnut Street Center, 1400 SW Walnut Street, MS 51  
Second Floor Training Room 1, Hillsboro, OR 97123-5625**

## MINUTES

**Members Present:** Allen Amabisca, Denny Hruby, Michael Jamieson, Daniel Morgan, Ken Moyle, Doug Riedweg, Gary Virgin, Lars Wahlstrom

**Absent:** Matt Pihl

**County Staff Present:** Aaron Clodfelter, Melissa De Lyser, Steve Franks, Brian Irish, Courtney Threewitt, Todd Watkins, Joe Younkins

**Guests:** Andy Duyck, Chair, Washington County Board of County Commissioners; David McCoy

### Welcome, Introductions, and Approval of Minutes

Dan Morgan welcomed people to the meeting and asked if there were any suggested changes to the draft October RROMAC meeting minutes. Mike Jamieson said he thought clarification was needed on page 4 as to the purpose of the gravel roads subcommittee – that it had to do specifically about the potential paving of gravel roads. Todd said staff would make that clarification. Gary Virgin moved the minutes be approved with that one change, Lars Wahlstrom seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Dan welcomed Andy Duyck to the meeting. Andy introduced himself as the outgoing chair of Washington County's Board of County Commissioners, saying this may be the last RROMAC meeting he attends. He said he's attended RROMAC for 24 years. He said the service of RROMAC members is valued and that they've done a lot for Washington County. Todd Watkins thanked Andy for his staunch support of RROMAC.

Todd announced some personnel and other changes: Jennifer Williams has transferred to Building Services and an Administrative Specialist II has transferred to another division. As a result, we are a short-handed on administrative support. Also, Courtney Threewitt will be on maternity leave starting in December.

### Engineering and Construction Services Update – Joe Younkins

Joe Younkins introduced Ben Lively, Project Manager of the Clark Hill Road Bridge replacement project. Ben shared a PowerPoint that provided an overview of the project, including its timeline, design, and photos (before, during, and after). Joe noted the condition of the old bridge was not uncommon—some bridges are in worse condition, some in better condition. Regarding cost, Ben said the bid was \$598,000 "plus change" and that the final cost was \$600,000-\$620,000. Lars asked if

given its type of construction, would it be possible to widen the new bridge? Joe said that could be done but it would not be easy. Denny said a culvert upstream from the bridge was in bad shape. Traffic on Tile Flat Road was also discussed. Joe said design work on this bridge project began in the fall of 2017, the project went to bid in June 2018, and the road was closed September 7 and reopened October 12.

### **Operations and Maintenance Update – Todd Watkins**

Todd said he had some follow-ups from RROMAC's October meeting. First he reviewed a one-page handout titled "Overview – Washington County Budget Schedule (Subject to Change)" that RROMAC had requested. The schedule starts at the end of January with division budgets submitted to the department's finance group and ends in June with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adoption of the budget. Gary Virgin asked if a Zero Based Budgeting or "add on" budget approach were used to develop the budget. Todd replied the approach is "add on," since Operation's budget is based on Road Fund dollars. Todd explained that Road Fund monies are always in flux. He said staff keeps an eye on the Road Fund balance and does projections. Staff is always building on that projected number. The Road Fund is a standalone fund dedicated solely to road maintenance purposes, so we don't "spend the fund down" to avoid future budget reductions. Dan asked what budget did staff present to the joint RROMAC/URMDAC meeting. Todd said the presentation is the same as the one given to the department director.

Todd noted that at RROMAC's last meeting staff provided an overview of the work program ("Road Maintenance Program" – currently, "the pink book") development schedule. Staff develops the work program and presents the work program and budget to the BCC at the same meeting in June. The BCC first adopts the budget, then adopts the work program for that budget year. On a quarterly basis staff takes amendments to the work program to the BCC. Usually, the first three quarterly amendments are additions to the work program, and the last quarterly amendment is a "clean up." These amendments are routine, and in the form of a simple table.

Mike Jamieson said he was concerned about the bridge list in the work program; he thinks the time frame for it is too short. Todd said Brian is starting to work on developing next year's work program now. He said work RROMAC does related to bridges would be for the multi-year program and helpful to have in the future, but is not urgent.

Lars said we should be aware of the recent election and how that might change things in the future, with newly elected County officials having new priorities. Chair Duyck explained that road maintenance dollars are Road Fund dollars and can only be used for road maintenance purposes, not, for example, social services.

Todd said RROMAC currently has three vacancies and four applications have been received. The applications will go to the BCC in a work session. Thus, RROMAC should have a full membership next year.

As another October meeting follow-up, a letter signed by Dan Morgan on behalf of RROMAC was sent to Matt Pihl with condolences on the death of his father, Hollie Pihl. Todd read the letter.

Todd reported on a recent neighborhood meeting conducted by Aaron Clodfelter, Steve Franks and himself. The meeting was regarding a potential Pihl Road Local Improvement District (LID) to pave a gravel section of the road. A similar meeting was held in 2015 to pave two sections of Pihl. The first section is just past the existing paved portion of Pihl Road that fronts a subdivision; the second section was beyond the subdivision). In 2015 there was a lack of support from property owners for paving both sections. About six months ago two residents again expressed interest in paving Pihl Road. At the recent neighborhood meeting, the proposed LID was rejected again, by about a two to one margin. Todd mentioned RROMAC's direction from earlier this year about using scarce resources to preserve what we have and not go out and pave gravel roads. Todd said there is occasional interest in LIDs. However, this was the first to move forward to a neighborhood meeting in quite a while. In response to a question about what was the objection to the LID, Todd said cost was the main objection. Steve said two other major concerns he had heard were some people like living on a gravel road, since it is part of the area's rural character they like, and there was concern about property owners who opposed the LID being forced to pay for it, and for some that could be a real economic hardship.

Todd discussed Pottratz Road, which Mike brought up with RROMAC previously. Todd showed two maps of Pottratz Road on the screen, "Existing" and "Proposed." In the past, the BCC made the decision to close Pottratz Road. Property owners in the area include the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Weyerhaeuser, and Mike Jamieson. A culvert has been replaced to provide access to BLM land. Barricades are in place on the south end, but people go around them. "Tank traps" are in place at the north end.

Staff is considering re-establishing the north section of the closed portion of Pottratz and removing its County Road status on the lower section. However connectivity would be maintained by changing it to a Public Dedicated Road. No action will be taken until Survey, the Board and property owners are involved. Todd said he just wanted to share what we are currently doing regarding with this issue, that staff is looking into it, but this is not the final word.

Mike said he is concerned about the lack of fire and forestry access to the area and appreciates the work Todd is doing about the road. Todd said there is more to come—it's a slow process and takes

time to put the pieces together. Dan said he is concerned about the dumping of trash at the lower end of the road. Todd said that is a problem that is pervasive throughout the County.

### **Discuss Surface Treatment Candidates for Draft FY 2019-20 Road Maintenance Program – Brian Irish**

Dan said he would like to table the discussion of surface treatment candidates until next month. Brian said he presented the surface maintenance “150% list” at RROMAC’s last meeting. He said he’d like to gather input from RROMAC about it, but beyond that he did not have a great deal to report on. He discussed the “Rural Pavement Condition Index (PCI)” table (dated November 2018) that was distributed as a handout. The table features three lines tracking the PCIs of Rural Arterials, Rural Collectors, and Rural Locals from September 2013 to September 2018. Brian said things are progressing as expected—that levels of distress are what is expected. Dan said that some time ago he wanted to come up with a metric that shows RROMAC and rural roads are progressing in the right direction. He thanked Washington County staff for their work, saying that he has seen this PCI data twice now since he has been RROMAC chair, and thinks it is a good barometer for RROMAC to use and keep evaluating.

Ken Moyle asked if the PCI target of 65 indicated in the table is adequate. Brian said the diamonds on the table indicate the PCI targets (65 for Rural Locals; 75 for Rural Collectors; 80 for Rural Arterials), but actual PCIs are different – they are shown with the lines indicating the PCI data from Sept. 2013 to Sept. 2018. Brian said in his experience, it is a tough call if the PCI target of 65 is adequate, since at 65 PCI then begins to fall significantly. He said PCI targets are established in the County’s Transportation Plan, and staff makes it work. Brian concluded by saying that’s all he had to report, he is available to respond to questions, otherwise it is business as usual for staff.

Alan Amabisca asked about gravel road maintenance—are we behind with it? Todd replied that we are getting back out on the road and starting the grading process again. The extended dry weather lent itself to continued work in other areas. He said it could be construed that we are slightly behind in our ordinary grading work for this time of year. Todd assured Alan that we are ramping up grading efforts and will be able to catch up in a short amount of time.

### **Discuss Formation of RROMAC Gravel Roads Paving Candidate Subcommittee – Todd Watkins**

Todd said in October RROMAC decided to form a subcommittee to talk about criteria for gravel road paving candidates. At the same time, there were also discussions about bridges. He asked if members wanted to have one subcommittee address both topics, or have two subcommittees.

Mike Jamieson suggested it might be helpful to give staff time to update the bridge report so information would be available for the subcommittee. Todd said staff can provide a summary of our bridge network. Todd also explained a new initiative is looking at seismic resiliency alternatives—looking at the state system versus the local system, and ways to get people off the state system onto the local system. This could be a win-win that could come into play since it would involve developing alternate routes to the state system. We could weave that into RROMAC’s discussion of gravel roads, since there might be places where upgrading gravel roads to pavement would make sense related to this interconnected system.

Gary asked if it would make sense to set up criteria to evaluate urgency for bridges? Dan said we need a subcommittee to look at that. Todd said a new twist is the state seismic initiative with cities and counties could play a part in this. It may be possible to garner other funds for improvements that have not been thought of before. Aaron Clodfelter mentioned that the state manages a bridge replacement program, which includes a statewide ranking of bridges based on criteria. Aaron said he could present that model at RROMAC’s next meeting.

After discussion of whether to form one subcommittee or two, Gary made a motion to proceed with two subcommittees, one to look at bridge criteria and one to look at gravel road upgrade criteria. Brian said a tool for the gravel road subcommittee is the gravel road paving candidate matrix. Gravel road upgrades include grading, spot surface stabilization, full surface stabilization, or paving. While there are these four “tiers” of upgrades and paving is the top tier, it is not necessarily the best solution. The subcommittee is focused only on the paving option, and the only thing to discuss is what ranking criteria they would suggest for inclusion. There is no timetable or budget forecasted in the near future for this effort; therefore it is a low priority.

In response to a question about the timing of the subcommittees’ work, Todd said at RROMAC’s last meeting he would have said there isn’t a lot of urgency in considering the paving of gravel roads. However that is now changing due to the state seismic initiative, which may indicate that some gravel routes should be paved. If the state study concludes a county road is an alternate route that could benefit a state route by being paved, that could potentially improve its ranking in the candidate list.

Mike seconded Gary’s motion; the motion passed unanimously. It was decided to wait until RROMAC’s January meeting to select members of the two subcommittees. This is not an urgent matter, but one to keep in front of RROMAC. Dan asked members to start thinking about which committee they are interested in. Brian will work on a framework for the paving subcommittee; Aaron will do the same for the bridges subcommittee.

## **Open Forum – RROMAC Members**

Mike said he would like to have a discussion in the future about different ways to close County roads and ways to provide access to different users. Denny raised the issue of oversize loads and if there are different criteria about certain days and hours oversize loads can operate? Brian said he supervises the technician that approves these permits (“Transportation and Over Dimensional Permits”), and can provide some background. Transportation Permits come to the county via ODOT, and the county’s restrictions depend on the height, width and weight of the load. We have city hours, which restrict movement during heavy traffic hours, modified city hours, which are a little more lax than city hours, or we may choose to restrict them to night travel only on specific nights. It all depends on where they want to travel and the size of the road. Other members either had no concerns or said their concerns had been addressed.

### **Confirm Meeting Follow-Up (What and Who?) and Set Next Agenda**

RROMAC members agreed to not meet in December; the next meeting will be January 2019. Agenda items for the meeting identified at this meeting are:

- Highway bridge program overview -- Aaron
- Seismic resiliency alternatives – Todd
- Paving and bridge subcommittee assignments -- Dan

Dan said according to the “Outline—RROMAC Annual Meeting Topics” that Steve and he reviewed at RROMAC’s October meeting, other January topics would include welcoming new members, a planning discussion for the year ahead, and presentation of LUT’s Annual Report.

Lars thanked County staff for the work they do, and thanked Andy as a steadfast leader of the County. Chair Duyck responded by saying he appreciated that and suggested RROMAC invite new Commission Chair Kathryn Harrington and Commissioner Jerry Willey to attend RROMAC meetings. It was noted that Jerry had attended the last two RROMAC meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m. (Lars made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Doug; passed unanimously).

**Next meeting:** January 10, 2019, 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.