From: Nordholm, Gail [DOT]
To: Nordholm, Gail [DOT]
Subject: 2010 December ICEA Conference Roundtable Discussions
Date: Monday, January 31, 2011 3:27:00 PM

TO: County Engineers

CC: District Local Systems Engineers, Service Bureau, and Office of Local Systems

FROM: Office of Local Systems

SUBJECT: 2010 December ICEA Conference Roundtable Discussions

DATE: January 31, 2011

If you have any questions, **please do not reply to this note**. Instead, please contact the county that provided the information in the notes.

http://www.iowadot.gov/local_systems/mailing/2011/january/2010_icea_december_roundtable.pdf

Thanks,

Nicole Fox, P.E.
Secondary Roads Engineer
Office of Local Systems
515.239.1506
nicole.fox@dot.iowa.gov

Some of the documents referenced above are in Adobe Acrobat's Portable Document Format (PDF). If you do not have the Adobe Acrobat Reader software, you can download it free of charge at:
http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep.html.

Mailings are available at the Local Systems Weekly Mailing web address

http://www.iowadot.gov/local_systems/mailing/main_mailing.htm

ROUNDTABLE TOPICS DISCUSSION SUMMARY
FROM DECEMBER 2010 IOWA COUNTY ENGINEERS CONFERENCE

Recorders:
Group 1: Gregg Durbin, District 1
Group 2: Bob Welper, District 2
Group 3: Brian Catus, District 3
Group 4: Vince Ehlert, District 4
Group 5: Joe Albright, District 5
Group 6: Kent Ellis, District 6

Question No. 1 How are counties enforcing their bridge postings? How do counties deal with their bridges being legally rated for 80,000 pounds, when 96,000 pounds is now allowed? Are counties having bridge failures by overweight loads, and how do you prevent them? Do counties feel they are charging enough for overweight permits?

Group 1
1.1 Story Co. had a bridge failure about 2 weeks ago. 5 wood beams were broken on a bridge to a small COOP hog farm. Bridge will be posted for 40 tons before next harvest. Can't post everything 40 tons right away, but will post bridges with problems, that is Story Co.'s approach. If bridge is not posted for 40 tons and farmer crosses it, you won't get any money. Citations involving signs with 3 trucks pictured are often thrown out by judges because they are thought to be too confusing. Silhouettes on posting signs are not to scale.
1.2 Counties can charge more than $10 for permits if they can justify the charges. Don't have to charge $10 because the state charges $10.

Group 2
1.1 Winneshiek: Sherriff does not have equipment to check vehicle weights. Grain elevators with scales that could weigh vehicles are not cooperating. DOT weight enforcement officers have visited county in the past.
1.2 Winneshiek: Bridges are being rated for 96,000 through their consultant.
1.3 Winneshiek: Three bridges have failed under traffic, one by weight and two by collision.
1.4 Winneshiek: County has their consultant analyze the proposed overweight route. Some houses that were to be moved are still on the trailers because no bridge could accept the weight. The County does not charge for the analysis.
Other counties stated they send the bill to the permit holder for determining the oversize route.

Group 3
1.1 A majority of the counties do not enforce the posting. If they are enforced, there needs to be a county resolution and the resolutions are done on a yearly basis.
1.2 The counties try to do regular inspections to verify the ratings and still issue overweight permits – but it is still a wait and see situation. They are working this out with their county attorneys.
1.3 There have been bridge failures in four counties in this group. The engineers try to educate the public through meetings, newspapers, and notice. The biggest publicity occurs when a failure does take place and is reported through the local newspapers.

1.4 Typical overweight permit fees are $10 for single use and $300 for annual use which is within Iowa Code. Most don't feel that the fees cover staffing time required to issue permit or cover cost of potential damage.

Group 4
Most are not because it is difficult to get Sheriff Dept. to enforce. Cedar has had some success coordinating with the Iowa Motor Vehicle Enforcement. Humboldt Co. asked about posting for the 96K loads. Half were, half were not running out and re-posting. The group in total mentioned that 3 or 4 wooden bridge and 1 pony truss structure had occurred over the last year. No new ideas were mentioned regarding prevention. Just about everyone charges $10 for oversize permit, some charge extra for the analysis of an overweight load. A few counties embargo paved routes, but most are embargoing seal-coated. Johnson Co. spells out expectation during the planning and zoning phase. Some mentioned that the exemptions become so numerous that the embargo is ineffective. Some have to close rock roads because the damage is so severe.

Group 5
1.1 Postings are difficult to enforce. Cannot watch all the bridges at the same time. Have called DOT enforcement with no report of the results.
1.2 Consultants have done the ratings on the bridges with no negative results. Hard to monitor.
1.3 You have to be at the location. Very hard to prove the guilty party that destroyed the bridge. Had a non-posted bridge destroyed by a legal load (farm equipment) and no action was taken by the county.
1.4 Fees are dictated by the Iowa Code. Can counties change the fee structure? Some counties in Minnesota set own fee structure. We issue the permits but have no follow-up or enforcement.

Group 6
1.1 Mitchell - Not changing embargo postings. Bound by DOT code. Have had bridge failures due to overloading by waste haulers. Has gone back on sanitation company's insurance for damages. Damage claims of $100,000 have paid for installation of 3 old rail cars.
1.2 Ringgold - County has removed damaged bridges before total failure and before posting would be needed to remove the risk. Have used press releases along with articles in papers to remind haulers that legal loads (96,000 lbs) are 8 tons over the 40T postings. Suggestion was made that vehicle enforcement for counties be funded by fines.
1.3 Woodbury – At next bridge inspection will post at 40T gross load. No mechanism for posting pavement loading.
1.4 All - All counties were in consensus that fines for over-weight loads and permits are inadequate.

Question No. 2 Are counties placing embargoes on their roads in the springtime? If so, what type of surface is the road, and what weight restriction do you give the road?

Group 1
2.1 Polk Co. - No

2.2 Linn Co. - Post every spring. Gravel are 5 ton embargoed. Paved are 10 ton embargoed. Incident involving garbage truck. Garbage truck damaged embargoed road and was fined $2000. Cost to repair the road was $7000. Milk trucks (perishable) are exempt.
2.3 County can't get enforcement. Impractical to monitor embargoed roads.

Group 2
Winneshiek: County does not embargo PCC roads, but does embargo HMA roads.
Clayton County: County has embargoed a gravel road. Allamakee, Chickasaw, Clayton, Floyd, and Winneshiek have embargoed their roads.

Group 3
The counties generally do not place embargoes on their route and try to inform the public of road conditions throughout the season. There are circumstances where they will embargo their roads due to spring flooding. The counties try to control the damages of certain routes by working with farmers with hog confinement or grain farmers where there is heavy seasonal truck traffic. Sometimes overweight permits are issued for a 90 day period. Most cases where embargoes are issued is on black top and gravel roads.

Group 4
No items.

Group 5

Washington County places a 5 ton limit on some of the more heavily traveled roads (roads with large farm operations). If a road gets destroyed, let them use until unusable so they don't destroy other roads in the area.

Group 6

Dallas	No, county talks to schools and waste haulers. 8 ton limit understanding
Dubuque	No, we watch seal coat roads and thinner asphalt roads and will review for possible axel restriction.
Hancock	No, Resolution each year but no embargo.
Hamilton	No
Wright	No
Jasper	No
Louisa	No, we communicate with grain and other haulers to stay on specific routes.
Mills	No, too many exemptions; lack of enforcement
Mitchell	No, gravel
Worth	No
Palo Alto	Yes, have fully embargoed 6T/axel on 6" plain jointed pavements. Has saved tremendously where they have had lots of previous failures.
Polk	Not present

Ringgold	No
Warren	Not present
Wapello	No, School busses stay off sensitive routes upon request
Woodbury	Yes, all sealcoats at 6T/axel at end of March

Question No. 3 Are counties getting their employees MSHA training, so they are able to enter a quarry for rock or sand?

Group 1

3.1 Clinton Co. - No, Sampling is exempt. Can inspect your own shop if you use your loader at quarry. 24 hours initially, 8 hours annually.
3.2 Training only needed if you operate a piece of equipment. If you get out of your truck and do anything other than drive the truck, that is considered a mining operation and you would need training.
3.3 Shop inspection is a problem to consider. If you have your own quarry and use you own equipment, they can come in and inspect your shop.
3.3.1 If equipment is not maintained at shop, they will not inspect your shop.
3.4 If there is no active mining going on and using your own loader, training may not be needed.
3.5 Training is needed if there is active mining going on.

Group 2

Winneshiek: County has employees trained, but they are not in quarry during quarrying operations. They are to stay in the truck or walk to the scale house, only.
Five other counties get their employees trained.
General discussion had understanding that if quarry is actively crushing stone, the training is needed, and if only stockpiling is occurring it is not.
It was noted that various MSHA inspectors have differing opinions on what the rule say.

Group 3

The counties are getting training because most quarries require it. The training is usually an eight hour class. Different quarries have different ways of meeting MSHA requirements. Some quarries will have trained staff assist the counties (thus training is not required). The Counties are aware that MSHA is monitoring the quarries closely.

Group 4

Iowa, Johnson and Cedar have been getting the training. Most are not getting certified and adhering to the quarry restrictions.

Group 5

Quarry sends safety information to the County or the quarry representative will attend the county safety meeting. Van Buren County has own quarry and is under MSHA rules when crushing rock, if the truck drivers are not trained, they stay in the truck while loading.

Group 6

Dallas	No
Dubuque	Yes, entire maintenance crew and some office staff
Hancock	Yes, All employees
Hamilton	Yes, Some office staff
Wright	Yes, Some office staff
Jasper	Yes
Louisa	Yes, Maintenance staff
Mills	No
Mitchell	? Have had an issue
Worth	?
Palo Alto	Yes
Polk	Not Present
Ringgold	No, beginning the process
Warren	Not Present
Wapello	Yes
Woodbury	Yes

Question No. 4 Are counties getting DNR training for operators at fuel sites?

Group 1

4.1 Polk Co. - No

4.2 Clinton Co. - Only needed for underground storage.

Group 2

Not a lot of discussion. It was noted that C Operator training is needed to fill from underground tanks.

Group 3

Generally it is the Counties that have underground fuel storage that receive these training. There were four counties in this group that had underground fuel storage.

Group 4

Counties are only seeking operator training if the site has a Leaking Underground Storage Tank. Almost all facilities have above ground containment facilities.

Group 5

Yes and no. You can get a half day training. Two counties out of the group do the training.

Group 6

Dallas	No.
Dubuque	?, Did underground fuel tanks but not sure..
Hancock	No

Hamilton	No
Wright	No
Jasper	No
Louisa	No
Mills	No
Mitchell	No
Worth	No
Palo Alto	Yes, Trained the Trainer, Class A SPCC 8 hour class
Polk	Not Present
Ringgold	No
Warren	Not Present
Wapello	No
Woodbury	No, Looking at it

Question No. 5 Can any counties share any success they've had at TIF'ing Wind Farms?

Group 1
Story Co. bonded using Wind Farm as economic development.

Group 2
Some counties have had great success. Mitchell and Worth use General Obligation (GO) bonds. Other counties are just starting the process. It was noted that some wind farm companies fix their road damage as they go and others do not.

Group 3
There were not any successes shared in this group. They are aware of other counties that have good success.

Group 4
Howard County has recent experience with Tax Increment Financing of their wind farms. The first year was worth 5.5 Million for the county. They strongly advised hiring a bonding attorney.

Group 5
Tried to TIF a wind farm but the school district opposed.

Group 6

Wright	Yes, got approved 12-1, will be doing 4 bridges and 7 miles of paving. (42 wind turbines) $3.5 million; general obligation bond repaid with TIF.
Mitchell	Yes, Paved 120 miles combined with Worth county.
Worth	Yes, same as above.

Question No. 6 Can counties share any success stories they've had at replacing wood piling with steel piling?

Group 1

6.1 Story Co. - Doing for years. Remove deck and replace piles and steel cap.

6.2 Buchannan Co. - Yes, steel cap frame pier.

- **6.2.1** Loaded combine collapsed bridge. Co. attorney recommended not to pursue, no chance to collect.
- **6.2.2** Linn Co. - Place lien on property if bill not paid.

6.3 Set bridge off to side. Drive piles. Set bridge back on piles.

6.4 Lag wood piles to new steel piles.

6.5 Encase piles in 24 in. CMP and fill with concrete.

6.6 Punch holes in deck to drive piles.

Group 2

Winneshiek: Would consider replacing outside wooden pile with steel. If inside pile needed replacing, they would consider replacing entire bridge.
Other counties they have removed the bridge and replaced abutments. They may drive steel pile between the wooden pile.

Group 3

Counties shared of being able to install the steel piling mostly to add stability to those bridges that had wood abutments or unknown foundation and see this as a benefit to get those bridges off the unknown foundations list. No specific project was mentioned.

Group 4

Not much experience among this group. Bremer Co. still designs wooden bridge bents, but they do not expose the wood pile.

Group 5

Have used as a fix for failing wood backwall piles. Will cut hole in concrete deck and drive piles for a repair of backwalls and piers. Rely on contractors for ideas for method of repair.

Group 6

Louisa	One bridge; contractor did it along with a bridge deck rehabilitation project
Ringgold	Did 2 bridges,
Wapello	Did 3 bridges; drove 2 new piles on outside and 2 through the deck
Woodbury	County still uses some wood piling on bridges. Wood piling is hard to get straight and oversized.

Question No. 7 Other?

Group 1
7.1 Scour

7.1.1 Need POA
7.1.2 Story Co. - Too many to monitor.
7.1.3 Linn Co. - Approaches and roads washing out. Bridge scour is not a problem.
7.1.4 Buchannan Co. - Fatality with loss of approach.
7.2 Linn Co. - Anyone paying Qwest for cut lines? Linn Co. does not pay. 20-30 pending.
7.3 Set up roadway corridor to 300 ft. Then all utility relocation within corridor paid for by utility.

Group 2
7.1 Are any counties permitting manure pipelines?

7.1.1 Allamakee and Winneshiek have allowed manure pipelines in the ROW, figuring it takes trucks and farm equipment off the road.
7.1.2 Allamakee had one permit request a pipeline to be placed in the gutter line of a bridge, but did not allow it due to safety concerns.
7.1.3 Winneshiek paid for placing a host pipe under their road to allow a pipeline to be slid through.
7.1.4 Some counties said they do not issue permits for manure pipelines.

Group 3
No items.

Group 4
Cedar Co. has a 4 day work week in the summer. Others have a 4 day week for the bridge crew. The time limit is generally from Memorial Day to Labor Day. Most labor contracts allow this with ample notice.

Group 5
No items.

Group 6
No items.