

URMDAC Members' Responses to the Three Questions Posed at URMDAC's July 2020 Meeting

August 17, 2020

During URMDAC's discussion during its July 2020 meeting of the 2019 ped and biking improvement process, Chair Eck asked members to email Steve the responses they mentioned during the meeting to the three questions used to frame the discussion:

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)?*

The responses received from URMDAC members present follow (Bhaskar Aluru and Kimberly Goddard-Kropf did not attend the meeting).

RAY ECK

1. The process pretty much followed the same path as the ones prior had. Session seemed to further enhance the process with slight tweaks to make the process better. Staff gave their list off projects @ 150% & members were able to add projects. There was selection grading done by staff before the last selection meeting.
2. The last process missed a very vital portion because of lack of time & disruption by two participants including myself. Because of this missed time, the selection process for reasons stated missed this vital step.
3. Not a new idea but a missed one in the last process -

After all of the numbers are crunched by staff & the projects are almost etched in stone, there has been one other step included in the past. At this time members should have time to give feed back on their highly ranked projects that did not make the calculated project list. This gives the member time to explain why his or hers project belong on the final list of projects. After that, all of the members have the opportunity to change their voting as they see fit. Number crunching may then change the final project list.

Additional topic I brought up with Danial -

The difference of the two graphs being the one URMDAC made & the one Staff made. I think there are some things on the Staff one that is not needed but also stuff on the URMDAC one that is needed. Equity seems to be WHAT???

DANIEL HAUSER

What worked?

- Appreciated the level of staff work invested in helping us winnow down the many many projects to a manageable and rationally organized list
- Emphasis on safety and equity carried through from process design to project selection
- Efforts to reduce bias and proximity driving selected projects
- Pictures of project candidates
- Relatively efficient - we got to a set of great projects with only moderate time and resources consumed

What needs improvement?

- Better data about where people of color and low-income residents are at so we can ensure investment in their neighborhoods
- Greater feedback from communities of color
- More multilingual resources and outreach

MELISSA LAIRD

1. 2019 process – what worked?

- Overall selection process: thorough planning and well executed
- Staff review and recommendations. Provided professional expertise/insight
- Online Ped and Bike map. Able to view each candidate via Google map
- Notes page Steve provided to use in personal selection process
- Having the members' selection results before the meeting. Allowed time to reflect on results and be prepared for discussion at the selection meeting

Additional comments I heard from the meeting:

- Equity and safety focus – Daniel
- Individual member site visits – Mary
- Efficient – Daniel
- Historical perspective – Blake
- Same process with improvement tweaks – Ray

2. What needs improvement for the 2021 process (be specific)?

- Make sure all criteria well understood and agreed upon before selection meeting (equity, safety, etc). Balance what is needed to make a good decision with desire for more data.
- Discuss and agree if any criteria should be more heavily weighted than other criteria (financial equity, etc.) before selection meeting.

Additional comments I heard from the meeting:

- Value and doubt of equity data – Daniel
- Desire for 2 meetings: Members do their pick, discussion with members, ability to change your picks – Mary
- Multi-lingual outreach did not provide much input – Daniel
- More communication from staff on gainshare – Mary
- More cost data – school access study – geographic criteria – Mary
- Lack of time & member disruption from 2 members (includes him) – Ray

3. What are your ideas going forward to 2021 (to address the needs improvement and any new ideas)?

- The 2019 process allowed members to see candidates that had broad member selection and hence do not need to be discussed. The selection meeting should stay focused on the 'outliers': candidates that were #1 or #2 for a member yet did not make the cut. Allow members to 'make the case' for his/her selection and allow for real time changes in voting. Allow members to change their minds through persuasion of other members.

MICHELE LIMAS

I don't have anything additional to add for the three questions. I believe my comments were the same as Blake's and Melissa's. I am going from memory and don't have my notes in front of me

MARY MANSEAU

<p>1. 2019 process – what worked?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff visits to all sites providing more comprehensive data• Individual site visits by URMDAC members—limiting staff from selecting sites members will see• Staff selecting initial picks with URMDAC members supplying additional projects• URMDAC members selecting projects prior to meeting• Weighting project selections• The schedule for 2019—with the exception of the need for an additional meeting for scoring
<p>2. What needs improvement for the 2021 process (be specific)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional opportunity for URMDAC members to adjust project selection after initial project selection submitted by either<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Adding an additional meeting or○ Providing copies of all member selections to other committee members to allow adjustments• Improved communication to URMDAC about other revenue sources• Geographic distribution should be a consideration• Expand the “safety” category to include<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ # of reported incidents—broken down between auto, ped and bike○ Posted speed limit○ Traffic volumes• Breakdown of cost between ROW and other costs• Length of road or cost per foot for improvement• Better coordination with School Access Study• Issues outside of the criteria should be considered on a case-by-case basis
<p>3. <i>What are your ideas going forward to 2021 (to address the needs improvement and any new ideas)?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 meetings for scoring• Updated School Access Study• Look to other ways to provide safety for walkers and bikers, for example 20 is plenty for areas inside URMD• Improved website access of Ped and Bike improvement proposal<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ From the Washington County homepage the search Function works using Pedestrian improvements or Sidewalks!

- Using the tabs does not work so well
 - The Transportation tab on the Washington County homepage takes you to the Transportation Services page. On the Transportation Service page, the link takes you to Minor Betterment page. The description for Minor Betterments on the Transportation Service page does not provide clear information that Minor Betterments is where one looking for bike and ped improvements would go.
 - From WC-Roads, the tab to reach the Bike and ped proposal form is labeled Road Improvements.

DICK STEINBRUGGE

#1 and #2: I think the committee veterans captured very well anything I might have to offer for questions #1 and #2.

#3: Geographic distribution of candidates and those selected for funding may be something to consider in 2021.

JOE WISNIEWSKI

1. I wasn't a member in 2019, so I didn't have anything to provide regarding the 2019 process.

2. Same as item #1.

3. Suggested that the group discusses the rating process and goals/intent of how to score the projects prior to bringing preliminary scores to the group. After initial discussion each member completes the scoring individually prior to meeting to discuss preliminary scores. At the preliminary score meeting members can discuss their reasoning for how they scored each project. Members should then have the opportunity to revise their scores based on the discussion with the group.