



Department of  
Land Use & Transportation

WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON

**RROMAC**

RURAL ROADS OPERATIONS AND  
MAINTENANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**September 13, 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, Matt Pihl, Doug Riedweg, Gary Virgin

**Absent:** Lars Wahlstrom

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

**Guests:** None

### Welcome, Introductions, and Approval of Minutes

Dan Morgan welcomed everyone to the meeting. He announced the meeting is being recorded. Dan thanked staff for providing RROMAC members with copies of “the pink book”: the FY 2018-19 “[Road Maintenance Program](#)”—Dan finds it to be very helpful reference material.

Michael Jamieson made a motion to approve the July meeting minutes; Gary Virgin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the minutes were approved as written.

Dan complimented Washington County staff on preparing detailed and comprehensive minutes.

### Guest Comments

No guests were present.

### Engineering and Construction Services Update – Joe Younkins

Joe Younkins mentioned several projects that are currently, or will impact traffic:

- The [Roy Rogers Road](#) project, which recently went to bid, was the largest project Washington County has ever had. Bids came in within \$100,000 of the \$33,000,000 engineering estimate. Aggregate base prices have climbed recently; \$50 to \$60 per cubic yard is the normal cost. Level (3) three asphalt mix came in at \$80 per ton, which Joe said is still a decent amount. Standard (4) four inch concrete walks cost approximately \$6 per square foot. Joe would love to see lower prices but that is what the market is doing right now.

- The roundabout or signal project at the intersection in Banks is in a holding pattern. The work will affect [Sellers Road, Banks Road and Hwy 47](#). Washington County is working with parks, the railroad and Hampton Lumberyard (who may want to purchase the tracks to increase rail car use). A signal is a more plausible option since roundabouts don't work with trains. More information will be shared around November. Michael asked if these plans were going to change the Salmonberry Trail plans; Joe answered that it will.
- Several high crash intersections in Forest Grove are being reviewed. It's possible posted speed limits will change. Washington County is partnering with the city of Forest Grove and ODOT on this.
- [Clark Hill Road Bridge](#) detour is pushing some traffic over to the River Road project. Joe will bring more information to the next meeting.
- The jurisdiction of [Cornelius Pass Road](#) (CPR) will be transferred to ODOT in the future. The intersection with Germantown Road will have a signal installed and that could happen as early as the spring or summer of 2019.
- The CPR bridge over Rock Creek - Joe is hoping ODOT will take over the project or to "fund exchange" the project with ODOT funds. Washington County has an existing IGA with ODOT to exchange the money on another project in Cherry Grove. The county pays a 6% fee on this type of transaction but it removes the federal regulations associated with the money.

Joe concluded by saying he would like to bring three options for a new Vanderschuere Road bridge to RROMAC's next meeting, to get RROMAC's input on.

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

The [River Road shoulder widening project](#) will connect Hillsboro to Scholls Ferry Road (at the roundabout) with widened shoulders. Even though the Clark Hill Road is detouring traffic on River Road, the contractor is managing the traffic flow well and there haven't been many complaints.

Operations is wrapping up their overlay program. Wet weather has created some issues late in the season but the work is almost complete. Brian Irish presented a brief overview of the status of the in-house work identified in the FY 2018-19 Road Maintenance Program; Brian noted that nearly a quarter of the fiscal year is complete:

- Chip sealing is complete
- Machine patching is ½ way complete
- Contract A work is ½ way complete
- Contract B work is almost finished
- River Road widening and overlay work is making good progress
- Culvert work is progressing well
- Hagg Lake work is 95% complete
- Guardrail is being installed on Scoggins Valley Road

**Department of Land Use & Transportation • Operations and Maintenance Division**

1400 SW Walnut Street, MS 51, Hillsboro, OR 97123-5625

phone: 503-846-7623 • fax: 503-846-7620

<http://www.co.washington.or.us/LUT/Divisions/Operations/tromac>

- Urban local overlay work is going well

Michael asked about work at Haag Lake. Brian said work on the road around the lake is funded in part by the Road Fund and in part by FLAP ([Federal Lands Access Program](#)) funds. Mike asked how Washington County got the FLAP funds. Todd said the funds are similar to a grant and are project specific. Agencies apply for the funds and there's competition among projects. With FLAP projects, the county matches the federal funds, but it is a federal project. Michael asked if we can access more FLAP funds. Todd said we don't have that many federal lands to make it worth requesting more money at this time. Todd complimented Stephen Cruise on getting the Hagg Lake project funded by FLAP, saying Stephen has done a phenomenal job jumping through hoops to get the funds.

Gary asked about Pottratz Road conditions and what the county's plan is to make the road better. Todd said he would provide an update at the next meeting.

Matt asked about oversized load permits, saying they are taking about four days to process, which makes the work unmanageable. Todd said we have a full time employee dedicated to approving permits. Aaron Clodfelter said our staff turns these permits around within an hour maximum timeframe. Aaron will follow up with Matt on this issue.

### **Review of the Gravel Road Upgrade Prioritization Model – Todd Watkins**

Todd began by noting that in previous discussions RROMAC's consensus was it wanted to see preservation of gravel roads instead of upgrading the gravel rural road network. This year Washington County has a robust program to address the preservation of current rural roads. Todd said a resident of Pihl Road attended RROMAC's last meeting; that resident and some of his neighbors are interested in paving a gravel segment of Pihl Road. Todd stated that the last LID to pave a gravel road was Hahn-Davidson, about seven to eight years ago. Steve Franks has been working diligently with the neighbors involved.

Todd noted that Washington County provided an expanded gravel road surface stabilization program this year. This may be a deciding factor for citizens to decide if they want to continue to pursue a gravel road upgrade through the LID process.

Todd reviewed the Gravel Road Upgrades prioritization table RROMAC had used in the past. Todd said it was a massive spreadsheet used during RROMAC's previous prioritization process for upgrading road segments. In the past, dust on the crops was the primary issue. Many other factors were taken into consideration on the spreadsheet to identify possible upgrade candidates and compared the benefits versus costs. Todd reviewed the column headings on the spreadsheet (which was shown on the large screen), noting that the columns are the many criteria used to evaluate the roads. Column headings/criteria included items such as: the type of crops # of homes, average daily traffic (ADT) count, and functional classification.

Todd said it will take some time to create a similar list, with up to date information, for evaluating potential gravel road upgrades. Todd asked if RROMAC would like to use this list and revamp it, start from scratch, or do something in between?

Dan asked about differences between types of traffic on given roads, for example commercial traffic versus local traffic? Todd said in the past staff did not look at the type of traffic, only the volume of traffic. Dan also asked about “community pressure” to pave gravel roads. He asked if some sort of evaluation tool would be a way to respond to such inquiries in a consistent way. Dan also asked what the county’s expectation regarding what gravel roads “should” look like compared to the condition they “should” be in. Dan finds that some people like gravel roads.

Todd explained that expectations surrounding a “good” gravel road are consistent. A gravel road is “good” if it doesn’t have potholes, ruts, and washboards. A good gravel road also needs a decent amount of small particles which we call “fines”. These fines help bind the larger materials but it can have the appearance of mud. However this actually makes the road better to travel on. People have different perceptions and expectations regarding gravel roads. Citizens don’t know what a condition rating “2” or “3” means when it comes to our rating of gravel roads. Dan said he thinks educating the public on gravel roads is really important. He feels surface stabilization has made a huge difference and data from the program is needed to help evaluate gravel roads. Dan asked if we are “too far ahead of ourselves” in considering gravel roads right now. Todd said evaluation would be a multi-step process. Todd also noted that Surface Supervisor Ed Meeuwsen is not a fan of making the surface stabilization program an “across the board” process since it makes grading the roads more difficult during the winter. Ed believes it should be done selectively, with analysis.

Todd asked if RROMAC was interested in reviving the discussion of the gravel road upgrade program and evaluation of gravel roads? Dan asked if there is a huge cost to maintain a gravel road compared to a paved road? Todd said gravel roads are more cost effective due to the high initial cost of paving a road.

Michael asked about the lady who attended RROMAC’s last meeting with an issue about Timmerman Road. He encouraged staff to follow-up with people who raise issues, provide updates and receive feedback. He said this would encourage more positive feelings toward Washington County.

Ken asked what criteria will be used in the future to evaluate gravel roads. Todd said gravel road upgrades are several years out, if we do them at all. Currently the county is focused on maintaining roads. However once we are caught up with maintenance there could be an opportunity to consider gravel road upgrades. Todd said it’s a good idea to start the conversation now. Particularly on how gravel roads will be assessed and rated.

Dan asked about providing information about gravel roads to the public. Todd said he was beginning to work with Melissa De Lyser on educational information associated with not only gravel road maintenance but road maintenance in general. This information is not ready to share with the public yet. Dan said it would be nice to start educating the public about what is a good gravel road – we are not setting expectations. Todd said Steve has been updating the information available on our website about LIDs and other options for upgrading and maintaining gravel roads [the [Gravel Roads webpage](#)].

Mike suggested that instead of saying the Gravel Road Upgrade program is not active; it would be more accurate and helpful to say what we have – to share information about our programs to maintain and improve the condition of gravel roads.

Gary Virgin said in the past, about the time we ran out of gravel road upgrade money, the top candidates were too expensive to do. That will remain a problem because the top candidates were longer sections of road, and now they will be more expensive because chip sealing them is not an upgrade option. Gary also stated in the past, 10% of new funds were allocated to RROMAC for rural roads--the amount was approximately \$150,000 a year. Gary said the gravel road upgrade program did not go away, its funding did. Todd explained that obligation had a sunset clause—it “sunsetted” with the adoption of the new transportation plan. The Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) is now what is driving the funding for paving, the surface stabilization program, shoulder widenings and other road maintenance activities as evidenced by our \$7 million paving program this year.

Todd said it is important to look at the issue of maintenance of roads and upgrading of gravel roads holistically. Once we get through our maintenance work, then we can ask if we want to upgrade our roads. It may be that the surface stabilization program will “do the trick,” and gravel roads not need to be paved. Michael said upgrading gravel roads is a multi-layered process. Maybe just making/improving gravel roads should be considered instead of upgrading them.

Steve said the two themes he heard from this conversation were (1) the need for education about what is a good gravel road, and (2) upgrading gravel roads may not necessarily mean paving them – the condition of gravel roads can be improved by maintenance (grading, dust abatement, surface stabilization).

Allen Amabisca suggested using the current spreadsheet to track and rank the gravel roads. Todd said ranking will depend on RROMAC’s priorities—what is important to RROMAC now. Before, it was crops and dust—what is the committee interested in now? Dan asked to have a road rating column added to the spreadsheet to evaluate the roads. Mike suggested that staff tweak the spreadsheet and bring it back to RROMAC for further discussion.

Keith said the grader operators should be asked what they think is the priority because they drive these roads daily. Also, this old spreadsheet was a snapshot in time. Keith said the committee needs to come up with its own priority spreadsheet for today. Todd said a lot goes into paving gravel roads; there are many issues. The spreadsheet is a tool to use to identify where it makes sense to pave a gravel road and to help explain that to people. Gary said that the committee should be able to defend and explain new gravel road criteria to the public. He said the spreadsheet should be clear and defensible so people can't argue with the ranking. Todd said there will be a new Board of Commissioners this year and we will not know what their inclinations will be regarding the use of funds. To be prepared, it would be helpful if RROMAC would start the conversation now.

### Discuss Next Meeting and Agenda

- Joe will present three Vanderschuere bridge design options.
- Dan said he would like to have on the agenda RROMAC's yearly schedule of meeting topics and schedule.
- Todd said he could present information about the preparation of next fiscal year's Road Maintenance Program.
- Mike suggested there be time at the end of each meeting for each RROMAC member to have one minute to bring up issues and concerns.

### Miscellaneous

Doug Riedweg mentioned when he was driving on Scholls Sherwood Road near the roundabout there were issues with people turning around in people's driveways. Aaron said ECS is working on a solution; a signal is on their radar, to be done in conjunction with the Germantown/Cornelius Pass Road signal installation.

Doug asked if there have been any new rock quarry applications, after the adoption of the county's updated quarry regulations. Todd said there were not.

Steve mentioned an email he had sent recently to RROMAC members about appointments to RROMAC and the upcoming appointment process. There are three openings on RROMAC. Steve requested current members reach out to possible applicants.

No further business is before us; meeting adjourned (Michael made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Doug; passed unanimously).

**Next meeting:** October 11, 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.