

URBAN ROAD MAINTENANCE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 20, 2019 (APPROVED)



Members Present:

Tim Connelly
Ray Eck

Daniel Hauser
Michele Limas

Mary Manseau
Marty Moyer

Absent:

Blake Dye
Kimberly Goddard-Kropf

County Staff Present:

Bekah Bishop
Melissa De Lyser
Steve Franks

Sherri McFall
Stephen Roberts
Todd Watkins

Dyami Valentine
Marla Vik

Guests: None

1. Welcome, introductions and approval of January meeting minutes

Chair Hauser called the meeting to order at 4:02pm. He thanked the members for digging into the pedestrian and biking improvements candidates information. He said this is important work, involving millions of tax dollars. If needed, an additional thirty minutes is available to discuss this topic, since the agenda has the meeting ending at 5:30. Chair Hauser explained that while URMDAC meetings are blocked for 4:00-6:00 p.m., we do not want to schedule all the time unless it is productive.

Member Manseau proposed two corrections to the January minutes:

- Page 2 be changed to read Martha Moyer, instead of Ken Moyer
- Page 6 be changed to read the elected vice chair as Ray Eck, instead of Blake Dye

The changes and approval of the minutes were moved by Member Connelly and seconded by Member Eck. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Review of draft FY 2019-20 Road Maintenance Program for URMD surface treatments

Todd shared hard copies of the draft FY 2019-20 Road Maintenance Program. The final document will be published and adopted at a County Commission meeting near the end of this fiscal year. This draft is approximately 90% final at this point, but changes still need to be made. This program represents our routine work, though each year the paving program and culvert and bridge repair

programs have changes. We are spending a little more on rural road paving this year, as a result of the infusion of Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funds. We are able to get further along on the Road Maintenance Priority Matrix and pave some additional rural roads.

We are preparing for a sizable project with Clean Water Services (CWS) in the Aloha area at SW 196th and SW Blanton (within URMD), where there is a substantial drainage problem. Both streets flood. It will be an extensive drainage project. CWS is taking the lead on it and doing the work. We will pay for approximately half of the \$1m project, through a combination of Road Fund and URMD funds. This may not be detailed completely in the draft Road Maintenance Program yet, but it will be in the final.

Member Moyer commented on the CWS beaver defearer maintenance work. CWS plants trees to flow the flow of water, which attract beavers. Todd described "beaver defeaters"; they are typically located in rural areas and are a barrier to push the beavers' natural activity away from the inlet so it doesn't block the culvert. We need to fix and reset them each year.

Member Manseau asked which projects are funded by URMD. Todd walked through the draft Road Maintenance Program and explained how to identify URMD-funded projects. Member Manseau stated that Brian Irish provided her with a crib sheet that describes all the pavement distress indications. She asked how we rate roads that have only a portion of the road needing overlay. Todd replied that we inspect the roads and enter the data into our computer model. When we encounter a small stretch that needs fixing, we can do a patch in that area. If a pothole is called in, we will fix it. We rely on the public to report those.

Member Manseau asked several more questions about development standards and timing. She gave a specific example about Skycrest Parkway and Greenwood, stating the development there is resulting in truckloads of dirt and gravel and the road is falling apart. She asked how the roads are addressed. Todd responded that reporting those instances to our county roads maintenance line (503-846-7623) would result in a service request.

Member Moyer asked what chemical we use for shoulder spray. Todd indicated that it is done by a licensed contractor, at night, in low wind, in three feet swaths or less. Stephen shared that the contractors use an approved mixture of RoundUp Pro, Esplanade and Liberate.

Member Manseau asked about specific instances of vegetation control on Laidlaw Road and why it seems to be missing in certain areas. Todd specified that our work performed by community service crews is only for landscape maintenance, such as weeding and trimming. He indicated that he would look further into the area she described.

Member Eck stated he thought that the February RROMAC/URMDAC joint meeting was unstructured. He stated that in the past there was an overview of URMDAC and RROMAC priorities. Todd replied that previously, committee members had requested more time for members of the two committees to interact with one another and ask questions at the joint meetings. That resulted in a less structured agenda. There was discussion about whether to hold

the joint meeting in the spring or fall. Todd suggested perhaps the URMDAC and RROMAC chairs and vice chairs meet in advance to develop the agenda.

3. Identifying the 150% list for 2019 Ped and Biking Improvements Candidates

Member Eck read an email communication that he sent to Chair Hauser; he feels that staff has too much input on the ped and biking improvements top candidate/150% list. His comments included that every candidate on the list of all candidates is there for a reason and it is the privilege of URMDAC to weed them out.

Chair Hauser offered some comments to try to frame this process. He said that the final top candidate list is the recommendation of URMDAC, and if it desires the committee has the authority to start over and pick whatever top candidates it wants. The public will then comment on the top candidates, URMDAC will make its recommendations to the Board of County Commissioner for candidates to be funded, and the Board then makes the final decision on funding of projects. He hopes to make it very clear that it is neither staff nor he that chooses the top candidates. However, as it does require Board approval, we need to be thoughtful about the development of the top candidate/150% list. It's important to work with staff to craft an effective list.

Chair Hauser also stated that the public's involvement is very important. Proposals for improvements can be submitted at any time, and if determined to be eligible, they will be added to the list of all candidates – the candidate database. Once we develop the 150% candidate list, the public has an opportunity to comment on the candidates on it during the public comment period. URMDAC then selects its list of candidates it recommends for funding, which is given to the Board. We have a responsibility to be good stewards of public dollars.

Stephen Roberts commented, emphasizing that the shared roles of public, committee and staff are complementary. With this process, we try to make best use of URMDAC's and staff time. The top candidate list could potentially be much larger. Back when the Ped/Bike Improvements began, we started with a 400% list. Over the years and through trial and error, we've narrowed this year it to a more functional 150% list to present to the public for comment. This year, using objective and tested criteria, staff has identified a list of candidates it recommends be on the 150% list, for URMDAC's consideration.

Member Manseau asked to move forward with discussion of the staff-recommended 150% list. Steve Franks said he'd like to speak first. He reminded URMDAC that last October staff presented a draft outline of the 2019 selection process to URMDAC, which URMDAC agreed on. A copy of the one-page selection process outline (dated October 17, 2018) used then was included with the meeting materials emailed to URMDAC last week for today's meeting. The process outline stated URMDAC would "Review and provide feedback on draft list of top candidates (prepared by staff) for public comment" at URMDAC's March meeting. Staff has followed the process outline that URMDAC agreed with last fall. Steve shared that he had also reviewed the 2017 committee minutes from when URMDAC last developed the "top candidates" list, and the process used then was essentially the same as it is now. Except then, staff (Ron Del Rosario) unveiled a staff-recommended top candidate list during the meeting when URMDAC was identifying top candidates. URMDAC then agreed to that list, and added several additional candidates. This year,

the staff-recommended top candidate list was sent to URMDAC before its meeting. Steve thanked the staff who served on the staff team who developed the staff-recommended 150% top candidate list. They began this work in April 2018. Steve concluded by stating that at this point in the process, we're not selecting projects; we're determining the top candidates. Member Connelly thanked Steve for a good point.

Chair Hauser opened the meeting for discussion of the 150% Ped Bike Improvements Candidates list. He suggested talking through the list and noting questions, identifying any errors, and defining data and sorting criteria.

Steve reminded members that they had been emailed the following documents last week:

- "Candidate Sorting Evaluation Methodology" (2 pages)
- "LUT Staff Recommended 150% List, 2019 Pedestrian and Biking Improvement Candidates" (a table, 2 pages)
- URMD Pedestrian and Biking Improvement Candidates: Evaluation (a table of all candidates, 5 pages)

Steve also distributed a map titled "Ped and Bike Evaluation, Combined Score" (1 page)

Member Manseau inquired whether Steve had answers to questions she had proposed to him. Regarding #289, Mary pointed out that work was already being done along part of that segment and it could be reduced. Staff agreed and the segment has been reduced in today's shared documents. The cost has reduced as well, from \$514,000 to \$341,000. She asked if this proposed segment is providing community benefit, considering the work that was already being done.

Member Manseau also had a question about #161d and whether the segment can be reduced in length. Staff reviewed the project as proposed and determined that it could not be shortened, due to multiple factors. Member Manseau remarked that this is a candidate that her CPO recommends.

Member Eck asked why the rejected 2017 top candidates are not on the staff 2019 top candidate list. Stephen Roberts answered that after the 2017 cycle, staff reassessed the criteria and developed a fresh top candidate list. Member Eck questioned why the candidate on Rigert Road was removed from the list. Steve reiterated that the proposed Rigert Road improvement was not a ped/bike candidate but an actual construction project, since it turned out to be beyond the scope of an URMD ped and biking improvement project. Chair Hauser recommended that we clearly identify the parameters for potential candidates prior to beginning the next cycle.

Member Eck asked why there are candidates listed with a "low" safety criteria. Chair Hauser indicated that all of these candidates are proposed as a matter of safety. Stephen Roberts clarified that the data is completely objective; if there is a candidate on a road with zero crashes, it will reflect a low safety criteria. However, a candidate with significant pedestrian traffic and no sidewalks on the road can definitely be a safety concern, even if there have been no crashes reflected in the data. Member Manseau shared concern that pedestrian need may not be represented accurately, as some areas that would be frequently used are not due to vehicle speed limit or traffic volume. Chair Hauser indicated these criteria are folded into some of the other

criteria and emphasized the value of members identifying where their communities feel that safety is a factor. Stephen remarked that this is a great example of why URMDAC member feedback from the community is so important.

Member Eck asked when 185th from Kinnaman to Farmington will be widened. Stephen replied that it was considered and rejected in the last MSTIP (Major Streets Transportation Improvement Program) cycle, and will likely be reconsidered in the upcoming cycle. The next cycle is in late 2020, and if it were selected, construction would likely begin in late 2023. He feels that with its proximity to the high school, it should be widened or sidewalks should be added. This is candidate #603a. After discussion, Member Eck amended his preference for this project would be for the segment from Madeline, at the crosswalk, to Farmington.

Member Limas asked about the public comment process. Chair Hauser indicated that piece of the process is coming soon.

Chair Hauser asked why some projects with a medium cumulative rating were prioritized by staff on the staff 150% list above those with a high rating. Stephen replied that some candidates can be leveraged in conjunction with current projects being constructed. He used candidate #206 as an example: an elementary school was reconstructed and traffic light placed. It would be convenient and cost-effective to implement this candidate simultaneously. Chair Hauser clarified then that each of these instances is candidate-specific, and has a lengthy, appropriate reason. He added that unless members have questions about a specific candidate on the staff 150% list, reviewing them individually is unnecessary.

Member Manseau stated she has questions about connectivity, equity and transit. For connectivity, all candidates are listed as high. She observed that some of the candidates have nearby parallel routes and those should be rated lower for connectivity; alternately, some are limited locations where the candidate is the only route in the area, and those should be rated higher. Chair Hauser asked to flag connectivity for the next cycle, to make sure it is a useful criteria. Member Manseau stated, regarding equity, the averages are of a large area. Specifically regarding Cornell, there is a high concentration of people there, yet it is rated as low equity. Member Manseau shared that transit is similar and asked how ratings are assigned. Dyami replied that availability of and proximity to routes was used rather than types of service. Member Manseau replied that she suspected that some of the data is inaccurate and offered to correct it. Chair Hauser thanked her, asked members to add specific candidates if necessary, and requested that Member Manseau provide that information to staff offline. Member Manseau also asked if school districts were asked if they felt the candidates were safe. Steve affirmed that school staff was consulted.

After discussion of the staff recommendations and other candidates, URMDAC members decided on the following changes to the staff recommended list:

Candidates to remove from the list:

#289: Park View Blvd from 185th Ave to Tillamook Dr, \$514,000

Candidates to add to the list:

- #161d: 174th Ave from Bronson Rd to Parkview Dr, \$1,643,000
- #402: Miller Hill Rd from Serah St to Georgene Ct, \$243,000
- #433: Alder St from 74th Ave to 80th Ave, \$1,389,000
- #439: 175th Ave from Arbitus Dr to Rigert Rd, \$1,990,000
- #602: 74th Ave from Alden St to Loganberry Commons Apts, \$1,466,000
- #603a: 185th Ave from Farmington Rd to Madeline St, \$1,713,000
- #609: 174th Ave from Lapaloma Ln to Solano Ln, \$503,000

Chair Hauser closed the discussion by noting that we'll proceed with presenting all of the recommended top candidates (the expanded \$150% list) to the public. Public comment will likely begin June 1.

Member Eck moved and Member Manseau seconded a motion to take the list forward to the public as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Guest comments

No guest comments.

5. Open forum – URMDAC members

Member Manseau requested to change the date of the April meeting to accommodate the State of the County address. Chair Hauser suggested skipping the April meeting and meet next in May. Member Manseau seconded that idea, which members agreed to.

6. Meeting wrap-up: meeting follow-up, set next meeting's agenda

URMDAC members agreed to meet next in May. Topics will include the preparation for the June top candidates public comment period.

7. Meeting adjourned

Meeting adjourned at 6:01 p. m.