



Clackamas County Community Road Fund Advisory Committee Meeting #4

6-8 p.m., Thursday, September 26, 2019
Development Services Building Rooms 119-120
150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City

MINUTES

Attendance

Committee members: Christina Day, Thomas Eskridge, Rich Fiala, Warren Holzem, Roseann Johnson, Vice Chair Glenn Koehrsen, Nathan McCarty, Chair Bill Merchant, James Prichard, Marge Stewart, Patricia Tawney (by phone)

Absent: Stephen Joncus, April Quinn-McGinnis

Board/Staff: Dave Queener, Karen Buehrig, Ellen Rogalin, Randy Harmon, Joe Marek

I. **Welcome** -- Bill called the meeting to order at 8:06 p.m. The minutes of the previous meeting were adopted with no changes.

II. **Community Road Fund (CRF) Overview** (Dave Queener)

Dave reviewed the major points about the Community Road Fund:

- The countywide vehicle registration fee goes into effect in January 2020, and the county will begin receiving the revenue in early 2020.
- \$60/vehicle/every two years
- 40% of the revenue will go to cities in the county, based on population; 10% is going into a county-cities strategic investment fund; 50% goes to the county
- \$5-5.5 million/year for the county
 - \$3.5 million for congestion relief
 - \$1 million for paving local roads
 - \$500,000 for safety projects

He also noted that there is a lengthy delivery schedule of 18 months or more for congestion relief projects, which include design concept, public outreach, preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition and other preparation work before construction can begin. Preparation, excluding any land acquisition, usually uses about 20-25% of the budget. Paving and some safety projects can take place much more quickly.

III. **Local Paving Projects** (Randy Harmon, Manager, Transportation Maintenance)

Approximately one-half of the county's 1,400 miles of roadways are local roads. The county's pavement management system, which we use to review the condition of each road every two years, help us set paving priorities.

In addition to paving, every time we work on a roadway, we are required to bring it up to current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, which can add up to 30% to the cost of a project. We always look for options to combine projects to take advantage of economies of scale with other paving projects and congestion relief and safety projects.

Consultants will do the paving design and contract pavers will do the construction. The plan is to spend \$450,000 of CRF funds on local road paving the first year, and \$1 million per year after that. It costs approximately \$150,000 per mile for a two-inch overlay.

IV. Safety Projects (Joe Marek, Traffic Safety Program Supervisor)

There are safety projects in several different lists, including the Transportation System Plan (TSP), Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP), the five-year capital improvements list and the state safety index list. The 60 projects are listed in priority order based on the safety index number (50%), benefit to cost ratio (crashes prevented – 25%) and health index (25%). The list was reviewed and approved by the Traffic Safety Commission.

The next step will be to refine the cost estimates for the top five projects. Some projects will be able to be completed more quickly (such as adding curve warning signs); others that involve roadway changes or intersections will take longer.

V. Congestion Relief Projects and Evaluation Criteria (Karen Buehrig, Long-Range Planning Supervisor)

Karen explained that the five-year capital projects list includes all projects costing \$50,000 or more that are scheduled to be worked on over the next five years. It includes safety and repair projects that are not on the 20-year Transportation System Plan (TSP) list.

Karen handed out a list of congestion relief projects listed in priority order based on the former TSP rankings as well as new rankings from the evaluation criteria agreed to by this committee. Group discussion included the following comments/questions:

- It would be helpful to have cost information.
- Geographic equity is important, but what if it contrasts with more crashes?
- We need to be able to report to people that the projects will reduce congestion.

Karen reviewed changes in the evaluation criteria, based on discussion at the last meeting:

- *Development* now refers to the impacts of development rather than proximity
- *Traffic impacts* now refers to current average daily trips (ADT) compared to future average daily trips (FADT), rather than just FADT
- *No other funding sources* have been refined
- *Commercial freight* – the suggestion was made, and accepted, to also consider freight corridors

The group agreed to approve the current list of evaluation criteria (with the addition of freight routes consideration) for now, with the understanding that it can be updated later, and ask staff to provide cost estimates for the top 17 projects as indicated on the list of congestion relief projects.

VI. Next Meeting -- The next meeting will be Oct. 17. Bill asked committee members to bring their ideas for any projects that should be in the top 17. Staff will have cost estimates for the top 17 congestion relief projects, cost estimates for the top five safety projects and a priority list of local paving projects.

VII. Adjourn – Bill adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.