



RROMAC MEETING MINUTES
June 16, 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.

<u>Members:</u>	James Burns	<u>Staff:</u>	Greg Clemmons
	Robert Ewers		Keith Lewis
	Denny Hruby		Victoria Saager
	Eldon Jossi		Dave Schamp
	Wendy Mortensen		Stacia Sheelar
	John Malnerich		Gary Stockhoff
	Doug Riedweg		Todd Watkins
	Gary Virgin		
	Lars Wahlstrom		

<u>Absent:</u>	Matt Pihl	<u>Guests:</u>	
	Dave Vanasche		

Welcome

Bill Ewers called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m. The May minutes were reviewed. Doug Riedweg motioned to approve the minutes and it was seconded by Lars Wahlstrom. All were in favor.

ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES UPDATE

Gary Stockhoff updated the group on 185th Avenue, West View High School to West Union Road is underway; bike lanes and sidewalks will be where they are supposed to be. Brookwood is closed, detours in place; CWS 24" force mains is time critical, going okay. Cornelius Pass paving caused traffic issues – most of it was done over the weekend; striping probably will be done at night. Scholls Ferry and River road roundabout will be done later this summer. Evergreen project also starts this summer from Solar World to the airport; Intel is constructing a 3,000 spot temporary parking lot; still getting good bids. Brookwood interchange discussion will involve all the stakeholders; will advertise in 2013; Glencoe overpass will advertise in 2012 – had an open house last week.

ODOT – UPDATE ON EAGLE ELSNER CONTRACT FOR HWY 219

Dave Schamp talked to Ron Kroop at ODOT and they are not prepared to make a presentation regarding the Hwy 219 contract. Region 2 is the one contracting, not Region 1. The question

was asked why the state is doing the slide repair on Hwy 219 and why it's not being done by contract. Dave will ask ODOT.

URMDAC UPDATE

Dave extended an invitation to the URMDAC Chair and he was not available today. URMDAC is looking at service levels; yesterday's meeting confirmed their recommendations to include safety improvements on Arterials, Collectors, Neighborhood Routes, and Locals. The focus is on bike/pedestrian facilities. URMDAC will make a presentation to the Board on July 12 during the Work Session. If the Board agrees, they will put a proposal on the November ballot for URMD.

URMDAC also recommended performance standards for the county's performance of URMD services. These performance standards will be included in the updated IGA; performance standards will be reviewed and can be amended annually; the IGA will be up for renewal every five years.

Wendy questioned if the PCI target levels would be met prior to any money being spent on improvements. Currently there is no target PCI. URMDAC recommends an average PCI target of 75 – the URMD system average is currently 85 (Transportation Plan target for Neighborhood Routes is 70, 65 for Locals). URMDAC would review the forecasts and modeling annually and reevaluate. This would give them a long term plan that can be adjusted annually. The question was asked does the UGB match the URMD area. Some areas it does not (e.g., Cooper Mountain).

Performance measures were discussed. How do we measure and report our performance? Is RROMAC interested in setting performance measures? The county recently acquired an asset management system and data is currently being uploaded. For pavements we have service level targets, but don't have them for other assets (i.e., bridges, culverts, signs, pavement markings). It is important to have a good understanding of public expectations and service level targets would be good. It will take work to develop these service expectations. Todd distributed an example of how this could look – pavement service levels (attached). This is just an example; gravel roads are dynamic and their condition changes more rapidly than other assets.

Dave asked how RROMAC would like to proceed. There was concern regarding how much time and money would be spent maintaining the database vs. actual work. Dave shared that there are other benefits to the asset management system such as determining where is it best to use the money, projecting needs for the whole system. Gary Stockhoff mentioned that we don't know how many signs we have so we don't know how much it costs to make mandated changes. An example of this is we have until 2014 to change all road identification signs to lowercase. Another example given was pavement markings. We stripe once a year whether it needs it or not. Some areas may need it twice a year so we need a service level target to best use the money.

Dave is hoping that RROMAC will help with setting performance measures and service level targets. It was discussed that this might be added to the agenda each month and staff would

bring performance measures back and share what we now measure and report. Todd will share flagship asset drafts.

WORK PROGRAM REVISIONS

Gravel road upgrade candidates for this year included Jacktown Road, the northerly section. A number of issues emerged – drainage at the curve, sight distance, available road width. Staff looked closely at these issues, especially sight distance at Hackett Lane which needed improvement. Staff met with the property owner, and staff was surprised to learn that the right-of-way width was only 30 feet. The bottom line is the road is too narrow to address the issues, and the property owner is not willing to donate the right-of-way. It will take time to negotiate with the property owner. Therefore the road cannot be constructed this season. It has been removed from the Work Program and replaced by Thornburg Road. The County's goal is to do Jacktown and Evers next year.

Ken Moyle has resigned his RROMAC membership due to the Jacktown Road situation.

MISCELLANEOUS

Dave shared that the County is one of four agencies that received approval of our Best Management Practices back in 2005 – 4(d) Limit 10 from National Marine Fisheries Service. We have just been notified that this has been extended for five years to 2015. This gives us programmatic approval so we don't need permission for every project.

Lars gave a quick update on the Minor Betterment Committee. They have a good group and have a lot of work to do to develop criteria for small improvement projects and prioritize them. Next meeting is July 7 from 3:00-5:00 p.m.

Bill Ewers adjourned the meeting.

NEXT MONTH

Performance Standards
Asset Management Service Levels
Update on Chip Seals
Update on Minor Betterments

Pavement

Routine Service Levels:

Service Level A: Pavement with few unrepaired potholes, ruts, or unsealed cracks. No drop-off at the road surface edge. The shoulder is generally clean and free of debris.

PCI Range: 85 – 100 (Very Good)

Service Level B: Paved Road surface has a minor amount of unrepaired potholes, ruts, or unsealed cracks. A minor amount of drop-off and minor erosion is at the road surface edge. The paved shoulder contains a small amount of debris build-up at the edge.

PCI Range: 70 – 84 (Good)

Service Level C: Paved Road surface has a moderate amount of unrepaired potholes, ruts, or unsealed cracks. A moderate amount of drop-off has developed from at the road surface edge with some erosion. The paved shoulder contains a noticeable debris build-up that may be unsightly.

PCI Range: 55 – 69 (Fair)

Service Level D: Paved Road surface has a significant amount of unrepaired potholes, ruts or unsealed cracks. A significant drop-off has developed at the Road surface edge with noticeable erosion. The paved shoulder contains significant debris that would restrict bicycle or pedestrian use, and be unsightly.

PCI Range: 25 – 54 (Poor)

Service Level E: Paved Road surface has an extensive amount of unrepaired potholes, ruts, or unsealed cracks. Extensive erosion or drop-off has developed at the Road surface edge. The paved shoulder contains debris build-up that would prevent bicycle and pedestrian use, be a hazard to vehicles, and be unsightly.

PCI Range: 0 – 24 (Very Poor)

Target Service Levels

Functional Class	Target Service Level
Arterial	
Collector	
Local	
Neighborhood Route	
Rural Resource	

Functional Class	Target	Condition Tolerance
	PCI	90% of FC Miles Greater Than or Equal to:
Arterial	80	70
Collector	75	65
Rural Resource Route	75*	60*
Neighborhood Route	70	55
Local	65	50

The Target PCI levels are averages established in Policy 21.4 of the 2020 Transportation Plan (Ordinance 588, Washington County, 2002) except for the Rural Resource Route which is not listed specifically in the Transportation Plan.

Maintenance Priority

Mandated
 Essential
 Non-Essential

Citation: *Washington County Transportation Plan Policy 21*