

URBAN ROAD MAINTENANCE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Approved Minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 15, 2020



Members Present:

Blake Dye	Melissa Laird	Dick Steinbrugge
Ray Eck	Michele Limas	Joe Wisniewski
Daniel Hauser	Mary Manseau	

Members Absent:

Bhaskar Aluru	Kimberly Goddard
---------------	------------------

County Staff Present:

Steve Franks	Michael Nemeyer	Chuck Schable
Lt. Dave Marzilli	Stephen Roberts	Todd Watkins

Guests:

None

1. Welcome and Introduction to Meeting

Chair Eck opened the meeting at 3:47 p.m. and welcomed attendees and members. He invited URMDAC members to introduce themselves.

Michael Nemeyer shared proper video meeting etiquette.

2. Approval of June 2020 Meeting Minutes

Chair Eck requested that the draft June minutes be changed to reflect that he stated that CPOs are concerned about losing the engagement of community members unless they start holding CPO virtual meetings.

Member Manseau moved to approve the June 2020 minutes as corrected. Member Hauser seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Report from Washington County Sheriff's Office (WCSO)

Lieutenant David Marzilli introduced himself and shared a brief report on the status of the WCSO during the Covid-19 pandemic. He answered various questions from URMDAC members. Lt. Marzilli referred to the Sheriff's Office [Traffic Complaint Report Form](#) and the Sheriff's Office Traffic Hotline (503-846-3998, extension 1145).

4. Update on Operations & Maintenance Division Work

Todd Watkins gave an update on the work currently being done by the Operations & Maintenance Division. He also shared information about the county road Service Request System (SRS).

Chair Eck requested a paper copy of the “FY 2020-21 Road Maintenance Program.” All other members will receive a [link to the digital report](#).

Chair Eck requested a quarterly update of the Service Request System (SRS).

5. Discuss 2019 Pedestrian and Biking Improvements Process

Members reviewed their responses to the three questions posed about the 2019 process, which had been suggested earlier by Member Laird:

1. 2019 process – what worked?
2. What needs improvement for the 2021 process (be specific)?
3. What are your ideas going forward to 2021 (to address the needs improvement and any new ideas)?

Member Laird began with her observations, had she been a committee member (though she participated in the 2019 process, as an observer).

- a. Thorough planning and good execution.
- b. Staff review and recommendations showed expertise and helped with understanding.
- c. Online ped and bike candidate map.
- d. Candidates’ notes page staff provided, with data about each candidate.
- e. Having member selections before the vote at the meeting increased interaction.
- f. Criteria needs to be understood and agreed to prior to meeting, such as defining weighting terms.
- g. Weighting of criteria needs to be agreed to prior to meeting.
- h. Feels that process moved efficiently last year; the opportunity to reprioritize before voting at the same meeting kept it moving along.

Member Dye shared his insights regarding the process. He shared that many of his suggestions mirrored those made by Member Laird. He shared the following additional comments:

- a. Availability of professional staff to ask questions.
- b. Reflecting on history and purpose of candidate.
- c. Emphasized the importance of bringing in the community and addressing their diverse needs.

Member Hauser shared that URMDAC is charged with selecting projects that serve the greater community at large, and perhaps geographic distribution is not the best method. He stated that taxes continue to be raised and those taxes do not always serve all populations that need them. He provided the following additional comments:

- a. Level of staff work invested made the process more organized and rational.
- b. Emphasis on safety and equity.
- c. Efforts to reduce bias were important.
- d. Data and photos of candidates were valuable .
- e. Process was efficient, using a modest amount of time and resources.

- f. Question of the value and validity of the data created challenges; need better data to determine if the improvement will positively impact communities of color and low-income residents
- g. There were challenges surrounding multi-lingual outreach; how can we do a better job of partnering with community organizations and existing advocates in our area to improve equity of candidates
- h. Thinks having a table of combined data as well as granular data would create a better picture.
- i. Wants to ensure we are selecting the best projects with the biggest impact in an efficient manner.
- j. Encourages better long-range planning data, such as census, safety and equity

Member Manseau thanked Member Laird for the worksheet with the three questions she provided. She shared the following suggestions:

- a. Staff visits to all top candidate sites provided comprehensive data and prevented surprises.
- b. Individual site visits chosen by individual URMDAC members were helpful.
- c. Appreciative of URMDAC members providing additional top candidates to the list offered by staff.
- d. Found value in URMDAC members providing their selections for candidates to be funded prior to the final meeting.
- e. Weighting of the candidates that members recommended for funding was helpful.
- f. Suggests adding a meeting to the 2021 process.
- g. Felt like the 2019 process was shorter than needed.
- h. Improved communication regarding other revenue sources or concurrent projects that would/may impact candidates.
- i. Would like to see safety category expanded: traffic volumes, speed data, number of traffic incidents, right of way cost, road length.
- j. Would like to see better coordination with school access study.
- k. Would like geographic distribution to be a category.
- l. Would like to determine a different way to consider final votes; last year felt very pressured.
- m. Would like staff to ask for an update to the School Access Study. Chair Eck stated that an update will be provided in October.
- n. Would like to see improved website access for pedestrians and cyclists.
- o. Wants URMDAC to send a recommendation to our Board to lobby for Twenty is Plenty.

Member Limas thanked Member Laird for her preparation and for sharing her observations of the process. She gave the following additional comments:

- a. Staff's objective perspective of candidates was valuable in removing bias.
- b. Liked the 2017 committee group site visits, as well as individual visits, though she did observe possible bias towards candidates that are visited by the entire committee.
- c. Appreciative of adding another meeting to the 2021 process.
- d. Agrees that last year's final voting was hurried.
- e. Blind spots in diversity and inclusion need to be highlighted and addressed; feels it may be dangerous to make selections based on ethnicity or race.
- f. Household income or age may be a better indicator of candidate usefulness, as those in low-income areas tend to use ped and bike lanes more frequently.

Todd indicated that staff could possibly create videos of the candidate sites to possibly mitigate the effort required for actual site visits. Member Laird requested that all members be heard before staff makes suggestions. Member Eck asked Todd if he is referring to videos for all candidates. Todd deferred any additional discussion until after all members are heard.

Member Steinbrugge shared that he observed the 2019 process and agrees with most of the suggestions made by members today. He made the following recommendations:

- a. With how equity is defined and prioritized, he believes an ethnicity heat map may enhance the ability to consider equity.
- b. Suggested looking at the backlog of ped and bike candidates, as he understands it is a long list, and determine what is still valid.
- c. Agrees that videos would be very useful

Member Wisniewski stated he also agrees with today's suggestions and will add comments later in the discussion.

- a. Supports adding an additional meeting prior to the final voting.
- b. Have a meeting at beginning of the process for staff to present data and expertise.

Member Eck indicated that he observed the process was the same as previous years', with some enhancements. He shared the following additional suggestions:

- a. Members' grading of candidates prior to the final meeting added value and saved time.
- b. Staff 150% candidate recommendations were helpful.
- c. Lack of time at the end of the process caused a vital step of evaluation to be missed.
- d. Agrees that prior candidate lists should be reviewed.
- e. Last year's issues were due to increased funds and increased number of projects.

This discussion wrapped up with Member Laird summarizing her understanding of the committee's preference for a process, which includes: possibly utilize site videos to inform members; make individual member selections and have more time to discuss them and advocate for them together in a meeting; and finally, possibly hold a separate meeting to reprioritize individual selections and vote to determine final projects, or do this in one longer meeting. She highlighted Member Hauser's emphasis on efficiency.

6. Guest Comments

There were no guests.

7. Meeting Wrap Up

- Discuss future agendas:
 - a. Member Manseau would like to discuss bike and ped improvement outreach in more detail.
 - b. Capital Projects in URMD
 - c. GainShare Projects
- Schedule next meeting: Wednesday, August 19, 2020, 3:45-5:45 p.m.

8. Meeting Adjourned

Chair Eck adjourned the meeting at 5:48 p.m.