

OUTLINE for 2019 URMDAC SELECTION PROCESS FOR PEDESTRIAN AND BIKING IMPROVEMENTS

Selection process objectives:

1. Keep the process as simple and efficient as possible for all: public, URMDAC, and staff.
2. Minimize the administrative cost to URMD.
3. Avoid “paralysis by analysis” – make decisions in a timely manner, with information readily available.

Staff’s role in the selection process includes:

- Provide clear guidance to URMDAC to keep the process clear and simple.
- Identify and catalogue eligible candidate projects using existing URMD candidate list plus previous bicycle and pedestrian gap analyses, School Access Improvement Study, etc.
- Where appropriate, identify opportunities to combine or bundle candidates for cost and administrative efficiency.
- Identify “top candidates” (consider a “150% list”) for URMDAC to consider. URMDAC will have the opportunity to review and adjust the list prior to the public comment period.

2019 selection process:

1. **January 16 URMDAC meeting: Review draft candidate list**
 - Review and provide feedback on candidate list drafted by staff.
2. **March 20 URMDAC meeting: Confirm top candidates for public comment**
 - Review and provide feedback on draft list of top candidates (prepared by staff) for public comment.
 - Consider using 150% list approach similar to ODOT STIP and WashCo MSTIP.
 - Staff need: Identify the optimal number of top candidates for the public to comment on (considerations include URMDAC’s interest in touring all top candidates, notification, etc.).
3. **April-May: Public comment on top candidates**
 - Minimum 30-day public comment period; 45 days preferable.
4. **June or early July: URMDAC visit/view all top candidates**
 - Field trip(s) or staff provides video walk-throughs of the candidates.
5. **July 18 URMDAC meeting: Review public comments and prepare for decision making**
 - Assumes no URMDAC meeting in August.
6. **September 18 URMDAC meeting: URMDAC selects its candidates to recommend for funding.**
 - Subsequently, URMDAC’s recommendations presented to LUT Director and Board for approval for early funding for design. Done through including URMDAC’s recommended projects in the quarterly update to the Board of the Road Maintenance Program. Projects will be incorporated into FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22 budgets.

(See reverse for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22 improvements funding summary.)

**FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22 FUNDING
FOR PEDESTRIAN AND BIKING IMPROVEMENTS**

In 2019, URMDAC is to recommend pedestrian and biking improvements to be funded in FY 2020-21 & FY 2021-22, utilizing URMD funding and HB 2017 funding. Total funding available for the two fiscal years: \$11.4 million.

Funding Source	Funding Available	Constraints and Considerations	Eligible	Other considerations
URMD	\$3.5 million/year	<p>Must be located within URMD.</p> <p>Located on County Road or Public Dedicated Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalks, pedestrian pathways. • Bike lanes, paths. • Pedestrian crossings at uncontrolled intersections for specific locations where studies have been performed and the conclusions indicate a crossing is warranted. • Lighting improvements associated with an eligible bike/ped improvement – on arterials or collectors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spend funds based on need, not on CPO or Commission districts. • Consider opportunities to leverage URMD/HB 2017 funding with other available funding. • Equity will be a consideration. • With \$11.4 million to allocate over two fiscal years, there is an opportunity to fund larger projects than in the past. Most projects have cost less than \$500,000; only 3 have cost more than \$1,000,000 (1 specially allocated FY 2017-18 project and 2 projects chosen in 2017).¹
HB 2017 (Road Fund)	\$2.2 million/year	<p>Must be located within URMD.</p> <p>Must be on a County Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above.

(See reverse for outline of 2019 selection process.)

¹ In its review of the candidate list, for efficiency purposes, staff will, where appropriate, combine/bundle candidates into larger projects. Smaller projects are more inefficient and costly to build compared to larger projects.