WASHINGTON COUNTY
OREGON

RROMAC MEETING MINUTES
February 17, 2011

The purpose of RROMAC is to study rural road operations and maintenance concerns in Washington County, work with County staff to develop program and funding alternatives and make recommendations to the Board of Commissioners.

Members:	James Burns	Staff:	Keith Lewis
	Robert Ewers		Victoria Saager
	Denny Hruby		Dave Schamp
	Wendy Mortensen		Stacia Sheelar
	Ken Moyle		Gary Stockhoff
	Matt Pihl		Todd Watkins
	Gary Virgin		Suzanne Savin
Absent:	Eldon Jossi	Guests:	
	John Malnerich		
	Doug Riedweg		
	Dave Vanasche		
	Lars Wahlstrom		

Welcome

Matt Pihl called the meeting to order at 7:35 a.m. The January minutes were reviewed. Robert Ewers motioned to approve the minutes and it was seconded by Wendy Mortensen. All were in favor.

NORTH BETHANY SUBAREA

Suzanne Savin from the Long Range Planning Division attended to discuss the North Bethany subarea. Several concerns were discussed. Some concerns were; north/south route congestion, a traffic plan after full build out of nearly 5000 dwellings, road connectivity, involvement of the adjacent rural property owners, are the rural impacts being addressed (spraying, etc.), and wildlife migration. The question was asked, "What are RROMAC's opportunities to comment?" This issue will be discussed again at the March meeting.

GRAVEL ROAD UPGRADE POLICY AND FUNDING

The latest version of the Draft Gravel Road Upgrade Policy was distributed. The committee will review the policy and discuss at the March meeting. A motion will be made at that time whether to recommend the policy move forward or be reviewed further. Once the committee approves the policy it will go to the LUT Director for approval.

ROCK CREEK ROAD

Rock Creek Road is not a county road. The only way the County can spend Road Fund money is to get the Board to approve a specific expenditure. Dave Schamp talked to the Board in October and the Board would not approve the repairs based on inadequate right-of-way. Property owners must dedicate the right-of-way or the County must purchase it. Meetings with property owners in 2002 showed little to no interest. Complaints are from commuters and bus drivers. Multnomah County keeps their section maintained. The road is being portrayed as dangerous, but the county has no liability. The county would recommend the road be reverted to gravel and then a new surface applied. The right-of-way alone would cost $10-15k.

Dave would like a recommendation from RROMAC. There was also some discussion on right-of-way width and the railroad impacts. There are four options; 1-Do Nothing, 2-Authorize temporary repairs (potholes, stripe, blade) would last maybe three years, 3-Revert, hard surface (chip seal) would last 7-10 years, 4-Hold out and acquire right-of-way and bring to standards 20 year design.

Jim Burns motioned to go with option three, revert and hard surface. Denny Hruby seconded the motion. Five were in favor, one opposed. Motion carried.

MISCELLANEOUS

Gary Stockhoff shared that the apparent low bidder for the Brookwood, TV Highway to Baseline project was Emery and Sons. Their bid came in 40% below the engineer's estimate. The road will be closed for six months with the first phase being East Main to Golden and the second phase Golden to TV Hwy. They will be putting in three lanes and flattening the curves.

Dave Schamp shared that Greg Miller, County Engineer, was retiring due to health reasons. There will be a retirement celebration for him on March 1 at 2:00 p.m. in the cafeteria at the Public Services building. You are all invited to attend. Gary Stockhoff is the new County Engineer along with his current duties as Capital Projects and Engineering are now one division.

The Minor Betterment Policy was discussed. Additional funding is being directed from House Bill 2001 to the Minor Betterment Program for interim small improvement projects, not full scale projects. A minor betterment project is usually less than $150k and there are no right-of-way needs from property owners. Currently staff decides what gets done, it's reviewed by management, the director, added to the budget and then included in the Work Program for public review and Board approval. It could be any county road, anywhere. Dave Schamp has proposed that the Minor Betterment Review and Selection Committee be expanded to include representatives from the public (two from URMDAC, two from RROMAC, and one from the CCI). Matt Pihl expressed an interest in volunteering to represent RROMAC. We will look for one additional volunteer at the next meeting.

Todd Watkins provided a handout showing clearance information for service drops. In general wires should be a minimum of 17' above the roadway. Call the utility company to report a low wire.

Wendy Mortensen requested a staff report on the relationship between the pavement condition index and road priority matrix and how that relationship may affect rural local roads, specifically the roads hard surfaced under the Gravel Road Upgrade Program. Todd Watkins will follow up.

Matt Pihl adjourned the meeting.

MARCH AGENDA

North Bethany
Gravel Road Upgrade Policy
Volunteers for the Minor Betterment Committee
Work Program Review – Review prior to the meeting.

Draft
Department of Land Use and Transportation
Policies

Subject: Gravel Road Upgrade Program

Approved by: _____

PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to establish the criteria for selecting gravel roads to be upgraded and to provide a discussion of funding level considerations for upcoming program years. It is intended to be consistent with Section 9.0, Roadway Maintenance Policy and Section 21, Road Maintenance/Reconstruction Policy of the Transportation Plan

POLICY

The Gravel Road Upgrade Program (GRUP) shall be managed by the Operations and Maintenance Division and shall be an annual component of the Division's budget and Road Maintenance Program. Project recommendations shall be developed by the Rural Roads and Maintenance Advisory Committee (RROMAC) with assistance from staff. Recommended upgrade projects will be incorporated into the annual program of work which requires approval by the Board of County Commissioners through formal adoption.

Funding for asphalt or chip seal surfacing shall be approximately one percent of the annual Road Fund allocation for routine maintenance and adjusted annually by the Director based on need and available funding. Preparation of the road, including drainage maintenance and improvements, vegetation work, minor widening and base rock additions shall be considered to be needed regardless of the decision to upgrade and shall be funded out of the regular budget allowance.

Sensitivity and High, Medium and Low Value. Point values for each of the nine possible combinations of sensitivity and value have been identified and are used in determining the total agricultural points for the section. These range from 10 points per foot for high value and high sensitivity crops to 0.4 for low value, low sensitivity crops. House points (H) is determined by multiplying the number of houses fronting the road by 400. The Traffic Factor (t) is the average daily traffic (ADT) divided by 100. Finally, the Functional Class Factor (f) is 3.0 for a collector road, 1.0 for a thru local road and 0.1 for a dead end local road.

The cost of the improvement is based on average costs for either a chip seal or a hot mix asphalt concrete surface, current at the time of budget adoption. The determination of surface type is made by staff and shall consider amount of traffic, number of trucks, subgrade conditions, etc. Other factors may add to the cost if specific concerns such as alignment modifications, retaining walls or significant widening requirements need to be addressed.

Generally, AASHTO's "Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT<400)" will be used for guidance in determining the design standard to be applied. In most cases, very little vertical and horizontal modifications will be needed on these low volume roads.

SCHEDULE AND PROJECT COORDINATION

Recommendations for upgrade candidates for the upcoming fiscal year's work program will be made at the November RROMAC meeting. The selection recommendation will consider cost and priority. Additional factors to be considered include proximity with other similar projects, continuation of past projects and completion of gravel road upgrades in an area, thus reducing grading and aggregate costs in an area.

Leveraging gravel road upgrade money to accommodate other needs can be considered by RROMAC on a case-by-case basis.

Table 5-1. Minimum Clearances for Service Drops

(750 Volt and Below, Based on NESC)

Minimum service drop clearance (NESC Table 232-1)

- Over roads, streets, and other areas subject to truck traffic . . . . . 18 Feet*
- Over or along alleys, parking lots, and nonresidential driveways . . . . . 18 Feet*
- Over land travelled by vehicles . . . . . 18 Feet*
- Over state highways (ODOT may require greater clearances) . . . . . 19 Feet*

Minimum clearances over or along residential driveways (NESC Table 232-1)

- If height of attachment will permit . . . . . 18 Feet*
- If not; *(see note 1 on next page)*
  - For service drops 120/240 and 208/120 volts, provided trucks are not anticipated. 14 Feet*
  - For drip loops of service drops 120/240 volts . . . . . 12 Feet*

Minimum clearances over spaces and ways subject to pedestrians/restricted traffic only (NESC Table 232-1)

- At height of attachment . . . . . 14 Feet*
- Drip loops of service drops (NESC Table 232-1, Note 8)
  - For 120/240, 208Y/120 volts, and 480Y/277 volts . . . . . 12 Feet*

Minimum clearances from buildings for service drops not attached to the building (Table 234-1)

- Vertical clearance over or under balconies and roofs *(see Note 2 on next page)*
  - Accessible to pedestrians . . . . . 13 Feet*
  - Not accessible to pedestrians . . . . . 3.5 Feet
- Horizontal clearance to walls, projections, windows, balconies and areas accessible to pedestrians *(see note 2 on next page)*
  - Accessible to pedestrians . . . . . 5 Feet
  - Not accessible to pedestrians . . . . . 3.5 Feet
- Radio and television antennas
  - Not accessible to pedestrians . . . . . 3.0 Feet

Minimum clearances from service drops attached to a building or other installation (over or along the installation to which they are attached) (Rule 234C-3 & Figure 234-2)

- From the highest point of roofs, decks or balconies over which they pass *(see Note 2 on next page)*
  - If readily accessible . . . . . 11 Feet
  - Above a not–readily–accessible roof and terminating at a (through–the roof) service conduit or approved support, the service and its drip loops set not less than 18–inches above the roof. Not more than 6–feet of the service cable over the roof or within 4–feet of the roof edge . . . . . 1.5 Feet
  - In any direction from window openings (except from above) . . . . . 3 Feet
  - In any direction from doors, porches, fire escape, etc. . . . . 3 Feet

*Includes requirements to meet the NESC clearances for ice and wind loading.

Service drop in this table is defined as multiplex insulated conductors cabled on and supported by a bare netural messenger.