

## TILLAMOOK COUNTY ROAD ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: December 11, 2006

*MEMBERS PRESENT:* Chairperson Curt Schonbrod, John Gettman, Bob Garrigues, Gary Hanenkrat, Ray Streeter, Darcy Jones and Gary Hercher (late arriving)

*MEMBERS ABSENT:* Bob Reed and Stephen Macartney

*STAFF:* Liane Welch, Director; Pat Oakes, Engineering Project Supervisor; and Kay Saddler, Recorder

*PUBLIC:* Gus Meyer, Dora Norwood, and Commissioner Mark Labhart

*Item 1. Call meeting to order, review agenda:* Meeting called to order by Curt Schonbrod at 3:00 p.m. and stated that there will be adjustments to the agenda, adding 3b Budget Update.

*Item 2. Review and approve minutes for 11-13-06:* John Gettman moved to approve the minutes with corrections. Bob Garrigues seconded the motion; unanimously approved. Corrections were made as followed:

Item 6 5. Road Department Maintenance Report:

Item 7 (Public Comments) Darcy Jones expressed his concern about the "build then ask for permission attitude" ~~of some contractors and subdivision planners~~ *within the County Road right-of-way within developed communities*. An example of this was the trees being planted in the road right-of-way, that have now grown enough to prevent trucks, like the fire department's and even his own construction vehicles, from traveling the roadway without causing damage to the truck mirrors. ~~Homeowner and Subdivision Associations~~ *Some developed communities* are not allowing the trees and other vegetation to be cut or trimmed as it is along most County roads. Further discuss was held regarding right-of-way issues, which will be included in the encroachment presentation.

*Item 3a. Advisory Committee Members:* Liane Welch thanked Ray Streeter for his service to the County Road Advisory Committee (Committee) and shared that he had decided to retire and not re-apply for appointment to the Committee. Of those expiring December 31, 2006, as of this afternoon, only John Gettman's application for re-appointment had been received by the Board of Commissioners. Applications were given to Bob Garrigues and Gary Hercher at the meeting and submitted to the Board of Commissioners following the meeting; an application will be mailed to Bob Reed, with a note attached indicating applications for the Committee are being accepted through December 18, 2006.

- ◆ New member interview: It was announced that Stephen Macartney and Gary Hanenkrat had been appointed by the Board of Commissioners earlier this month. Gary was introduced and welcomed. Liane Welch shared that five people were interviewed and those not selected agreed to be considered for future vacancies. Dora Norwood asked if the Committee would consider having alternates appointed by the Board of Commissioners to improve quorum issues at meetings. Curt Schonbrod indicated he would discuss this with the Commissioners. A brief discussion was held concerning the time of day future meetings would be held, with no decision at this time to change the current schedule from the second Monday of the month, from 3-5p.m.

*Item 3a. Budget Update:* Liane Welch explained that Congress finished last session on Friday and she was told today that Congress did not authorize extension regarding PL 106-393; therefore Tillamook County Public Works (PW) will be short 1.7 million dollars, effective July 1, 2007, not 2008 as she thought. Liane would like to dedicate a Committee meeting to look at the budget and discuss what type of business does the PW what to be in; brainstorm on options to

increase revenues for PW and how to proceed forward with the shortfall and the challenges on hand. Pat Oakes shared that the funding history and what was done in the past is available through the PW website: [www.co.tillamook.or.us/gov/pw/funding](http://www.co.tillamook.or.us/gov/pw/funding)

Options/suggestions from the Committee and Public were:

- County fuel tax, which lead to a brief discussion about what are the laws and issues with or without the cities joining in on the fuel tax increase and how the fuel prices is currently different throughout the county already.
- Go to the voters for a tax increase dedicated to road maintenance, which lead to a brief discussion of past attempts. It was explained that even though the value in property goes up, property tax increases does not go to PW, goes to schools and other public services.
- Copying United Ways idea of asking for donations for PW, coloring in a thermometer as funds are received.
- Establish street/road maintenance improvement fees, system charges, utility permit fees, and increase current fees collected.

*Item 4. Johnson Bridge Presentation:* See Attachment A

*Item 5. Encroachment Presentation:* Pat Oakes asked that this presentation be held over for next month's meeting, due to needing more than fifteen minutes to provide the information. Consensus was to place this on January's agenda.

*Item 6. Public Comments:* None

*Item 7. Discussion about next meeting date and agenda items:* Next meeting would be Monday, January 8, 2007, from 3-5 p.m. Agenda will include the presentation regarding the encroachment policy. A brief discussion regarding the scheduling of a meeting, following the opening of the bids for the Johnson Bridge Project, was held and tentatively forecasted as the agenda item for February's meeting.

*Item 8. Adjourn:* Curt Schonbrod adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

### Johnson Bridge Detour Bridge Presentation Charts

CHART CONTENT	CRAC QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION
<b>1. JOHNSON BRIDGE DETOUR BRIDGE</b>  To provide recommendations from CRAC to BOC re: implementation of a detour bridge or not as part of the Johnson Bridge replacement project (Milepost 3.18 on Long Prairie Road)	<b>N/A</b>
<b>2. PROJECT DETAILS</b> (map +)	<b>N/A</b>

### 3. THE FUNDING ISSUE

Original Grant	\$ 8,003,000	(for the six bridge project)
Earned or estimate interest	\$ 534,313	(based on a conservative anticipated interest rate)
Expended or pending	\$ (6,042,883)	
	=====	
Available/Projected Funds	\$ 2,494,430	(for Johnson Bridge construction)
Engineer's Cost Estimate	\$ 2,278,458	(for Johnson Bridge construction not including detour bridge)
Additive Alternate Cost Estimate	\$ 527,042	(detour bridge)
	=====	
Current Total Cost Estimate	\$ 2,805,500	
<b>Difference needed for Johnson</b>	<b>\$ (311,070)</b>	This amount excludes unforeseen remaining change orders for Johnson and Sorenson <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/>

Comments:

- what grant funds not spent must be returned to the State
- Committee members did not realize funds for project could include cost of improving roads to be used as part of the detour
- figures are based upon Engineer's estimate, not on bid

<p><b>4. WHY THE \$311K SHORTAGE IS SIGNIFICANT</b></p> <p>Jan 07 bid advertisement          Feb 07 bid opening</p> <p>We need to have a clear decision to be made on whether we want a detour bridge or not (subject to funding).</p> <p>Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidding contractor on the hook until Additive Alternate Decided</li> <li>• <u>However</u>, if we stall several months, future bids could be very high or possible no bidders</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Not utilized</b></p>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>
<p><b>6. QUESTION NEEDING RECOMMENDATION TO BOC</b></p> <p>Do we want to include a detour bridge in the project?          If so, where does the \$311K shortage come from?</p>	
<p><b>7. CRAC QUESTION 1: why not construction in 1 construction season...</b></p>	
<p><b>8. BACKGROUND</b></p> <p>Construction Schedule (reasoning for 2 season construction)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-water work window (work within ordinary high water of the river is regulated by Division of State Lands, Army Corp of Engineer and Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife): July 1 thru Sept 15.</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> construction season (including detour bridge):             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ contractor to build embankments</li> <li>○ construct contractor work bridge (upstream)</li> <li>○ construct containment platform</li> <li>○ build detour bridge (downstream)</li> <li>○ demolition of existing bridge</li> <li>○ build interior bent</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>- problem with regulatory departments – they seldom let the work actual start on July 1</p>
<p><b>9. [BACKGROUND #2]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work thru Winter doing other non in-water work, if possible</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> construction season (1 month estimated):             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Remove contractor work bridge</li> <li>○ Remove detour bridge</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>▪ work schedule will need at least 14 months, and include parts of both “in-water work windows” from both 2007 and 2008</p>

<p><b>10. CRAC QUESTION 2:</b> What are traffic counts on the road:</p> <p>Traffic Count Information:                  Long Prairie Rd Average Daily Traffic:                  Year 1999: 1450 all traffic (with commercial truck count being 290)                  Year 2025: 2306 all traffic (with commercial truck count being 435)</p> <p>Above based on estimated 1% traffic increase per year</p>	<p><b>Asked where these numbers came from; during evaluation ODOT did an actual count by hired contractors who actually sat at the intersection and did a physical count of the traffic, numbers were 10% of presentation numbers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ explained off from the actual application in 2000 and thought to be an ODOT count that the raw data was adjusted for the seasonal/summer traffic average</li> <li>▪ during project, the estimated traffic count is closer to 1500</li> </ul> <p><b>Asked how many are actually log trucks using this as a bypass from Hwy 6?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ report did not go into that kind of detail</li> </ul> <p><b>What do all these numbers actually represent?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ numbers represent the daily average traffic, going in both directions, that would need to be re-routed</li> </ul> <p><b>Why can't new bridge be built next to current bridge and then tear down old one, makes more sense than spending a half-million dollars on a temp bridge?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pat Oakes explained design issues that were discussed 2 ½ years ago: that the perfect location for the bridge was in the current location because of alignment issues and at that time with a detour bridge in mind that did not interfere with the house/property on the northeast corner of the bridge. If the new bridge was located anywhere else, all the time and money spent would be wasted, due to all the variables involved (alignment on center line, speed issues, transition issues, construction speed issues, abutment issues and road approaches), in designing a bridge.</li> </ul> <p><b>If bridge were to collapse today, where would PW detour the traffic today?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PW isn't really sure; that's why we are having this discussion; if it fell after this discussion, PW would look at what was discussed and Committee's recommendation</li> <li>▪ Progression of presentation should help answer this</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. PROS AND CONS</b></p>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>

<p><b>12. DETOUR BRIDGE (OPTION 1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ allows full, existing traffic</li> <li>+ no direct traffic impact to downtown Tillamook (i.e. existing)</li> <li>+ Temp detour bridge piers in-water during the Winter (contractor responsible for clearing debris)</li> <li>- cost (\$527K)</li> <li>- above (cost risk increase)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Contractor has access to both sides of the river</li> <li>+ Legal load limits would be on detour bridge; temporary limits on bridge now would not exist; Engineer Dept reviews and processes all over size/over dimension permits</li> </ul> <p><b>**Can the currently permitted trucks of the 105,000 GVW cross the detour bridge?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pat Oakes could not answer at this time as he relies on information from the Engineers for the analysis and calculations.</li> <li>▪ Currently, Engineering Dept evaluates case by case, does not expect any extra limits on detour bridge. Because conditions with the current bridge keep changing, changes to the load limits keep changing. That size of load probably would be pushing the limits, depending on the number of axles. If loads can be taken over an unrated bridge, loads could go over the detour bridge.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detour bridge piers, 40 feet between the 5 piers in-water during winter</li> <li>- Public in work zone from both sides all day long</li> <li>- Construction during possibly one “flood season”</li> </ul>
<p><b>13. NO DETOUR BRIDGE (OPTION 2A)</b></p> <p><b>A. NO DESIGNATED ROUTE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ no added signing required</li> <li>- emergency services (they want direct/less timely routes, if possible)</li> <li>- heavy loads to/from the Port</li> <li>- not assisting public with route ID</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Big/heavy loads can not turn from Hwy 6 to Hwy 101 – real safety issue &amp; concern</li> <li>- Big/heavy loads can not make turn from McCormick Loop on Hwy 101 without dragging or blocking intersection – real safety issue &amp; concern</li> <li>- Big/heavy loads would cause the stacking up of traffic behind them, when trying to make turns onto or off Hwy 101 – real safety issue &amp; concern</li> </ul>
<p><b>14. NO DETOUR BRIDGE (OPTION 2B)</b></p> <p><b>B. MCCORMICK LOOP DETOUR ROUTE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ alt route designated</li> <li>+ less cost</li> <li>- additional wear and tear to McCormick</li> <li>- some cost or improvements to existing road (McCormick)</li> <li>- residential road near 3<sup>rd</sup> St (25 mph). Based of past contacts: little citizen support for added traffic to this route</li> <li>- less than ideal intersection at Hwy 101</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Some \$ or improvements would be made to McCormick Loop possibly before improvements would otherwise be completed</li> <li>- Big/heavy loads can not make turn from McCormick Loop on Hwy 101 without dragging or blocking intersection – real safety issue &amp; concern</li> <li>- Big/heavy loads would cause the stacking up of traffic behind them, when trying to make turns onto or off Hwy 101 – real safety issue &amp; concern</li> <li>- cost would be tremendous (definitely greater than the shortage already discussed) to rebuilt intersection of McCormick Loop and Hwy 101 to make it a safe and compatible intersection for making the turns in either direction</li> </ul>

<p><b>15. NO DETOUR BRIDGE (OPTION 2C)</b>  <b>C. HWY 6/101 DETOUR ROUTE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ alt route designated</li> <li>+ less cost</li> <li>- Oversize loads thru downtown Tillamook (little support from City of Tillamook based on indirect or informal contacts i.e. already ID'd as a city concern thru the Tillamook Refinement Plan)</li> <li>- Added traffic congestion during Summer season</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Big/heavy loads can not turn from Hwy 6 to Hwy 101 – real safety issue &amp; concern</li> <li>- Big/heavy loads would cause the stacking up of traffic behind them, when trying to make turns onto or off Hwy 101 – real safety issue &amp; concern</li> </ul>
<p><b>16. DO WE WANT A DETOUR BRIDGE?</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>N/A</b></p>

<p><b>17. IF YES, WHAT ARE ADDITIONAL FUNDING OPTIONS?</b></p>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>
<p><b>18. FUNDING OPTIONS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ROAD FUND CONTINGENCY</b> (each annual budget includes \$400-500,000 contingency).</li> <li>• <b>ROAD FUND UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE</b> (FY07 budget includes a \$1.1 million unappropriated balance to help absorb impacts of a future decrease in federal forest funding).</li> <li>• <b>STP EXCHANGE FUND</b> (in recent years ~\$200,000 has available each year from the Surface Transportation Fund. Tillamook County has used these dollars in the past to fund most of its road overlay program). PARTIAL SOLUTION ONLY.</li> <li>• <b>TRANSFER FROM GENERAL FUND</b> (has not occurred since the 1990's)</li> </ul>	<p>Funding &amp; option discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ probably no money from Safety Net; use of Road Contingency would wipe out it, impacting all county roads for future service/maintenance</li> <li>▪ money should come from General Fund since it benefits the general public; however, General Fund will be decreasing from loss of Safety Net funds</li> <li>▪ use the most economical option; too bad if it inconvenience some, that's life</li> <li>▪ there are other alternate routes to get in and out of Tillamook County, even though it would be more time/money to the haulers; use those routes, even though the impact would be great</li> <li>▪ options without the detour not a good idea to add to the local congestion during the summer because of the increased amount of RVs and general traffic of tourist in our area</li> <li>▪ using Marolf Loop &amp; 12<sup>th</sup> St not a recommended route, even though available because of the schools, residential zoning and in City jurisdiction</li> <li>▪ major problem with the permitted over size/over dimension loads traveling in Tillamook County; would be a bigger/increased problem for Engineering Dept to process</li> </ul> <p><b>**Asked how often these over size/over dimension loads actually travel over Johnson Bridge?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ number not available at this time</li> </ul> <p><b>Asked what the term permitted loads mean?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ refers to over size/over dimension loads based upon weight and length</li> <li>▪ these loads get a route from ODOT that must be traveled; ODOT coordinates with the County – Engineering Dept discusses what route can be used within Tillamook County</li> <li>▪ concerns expressed about the annual permitted haulers &amp; impact on them</li> <li>▪ concerns expressed about the special one-time permitting of the over size/over dimension haulers</li> <li>▪ concerns expressed if Planning Dept (Bill Campbell) has/will approve permit for detour bridge       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ according to conversation Liane Welch had with Bill Campbell, PW is “good to go” on this permit</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Asked if possible to delay Johnson Bridge replacement and have different design and location of Bridge evaluated</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ too costly and not within timeline</li> <li>▪ toll bridge option was not in options presented, as it was not discussed prior to meeting (bridge would need to be built first and there are too many other issues involved with “toll bridges/roads”)</li> </ul> <p><b>What do we do if the actual bid exceeds our capability to fund it?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ becomes a decision point – the Board of Commissioners can stop the bid process because it is not in the best interest of the County to proceed</li> </ul>

\*\* Answers to be addressed at the next meeting



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ we are obligated to come up with the difference</li> <li>▪ important to place the bid out at the best possible timing</li> </ul> <p><b>Asked about design and height of detour bridge?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ that is left up to the contractor to include in the bid, but would be within the specifications required</li> </ul> <p><b>**Do the “pilings” need to go down to the base rock (during design meeting, core samples showed that to be at 52 feet in some places)?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ that’s all part of the Engineering design, actual specification currently not available</li> <li>▪ might be fixture pilings instead of to base rock pilings</li> <li>▪ will be designed to support the over size/over dimension loads</li> <li>▪ will be designed and built to last the 2 years; different requirements than one built to “last a lifetime”</li> </ul>
<p>19. Not utilized</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>N/A</b></p>
<p><b>20. RECOMMENDATION?</b></p>	<p>Discussion held regarding the timeline schedule:              Early January – month long bid              Early February – open bids; to be awarded by March              May – do prep work              July 1 to Sept 15 – do in water work              Sept 16 to June 30 – work out of water on approach, with some winter break, continuing with out of water work              July 1 – back to the in water work, finishing project</p> <p>Without the actual dollar amount known for the project, with or without the detour, the Committee unanimously agreed the Committee could not make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners at this time. It was agreed that a special meeting, in February, following the opening of the bids, would be held to discuss the recommendation.</p>