

Minor Betterment Program Review and Selection Committee



Department of
Land Use & Transportation

July 10, 2014
4 p.m. to 6 p.m.
Walnut Street Center
Training Room 1

Members:

Hal Ballard, CCI
Ron del Rosario, County
Ray Eck, URMDAC
Marty Moyer, URMDAC
Shelley Oylear, County
Paul Seitz, County
Dyami Valentine, County
Gary Virgin, RROMAC

Staff:

Brian Irish
Steve Franks
Victoria Saager
Dave Schamp
Stacia Sheelar
Todd Watkins

Absent:

Tim Connelly, URMDAC
Dave Sweeney, RROMAC

MINUTES

Introductions and guest comments

Victoria Saager started the meeting with introductions around the room. Dave Sweeney and Tim Connelly were unable to attend the meeting due to scheduling conflicts.

Dave Schamp, LUT Operations and Maintenance Division Manager, thanked the committee for participating in the process. Dave shared the foundation has now been set and the confidence in the committee is growing.

There were no guests in attendance.

Victoria shared written comments received from citizen, Kat Iverson (attached).

Review MBP policy, history, past projects, project selection schedule

Victoria reviewed the Minor Betterment Program policy, history, past projects and the project selection schedule with the new committee. All of this information is available online.

Review recommendations of last year's committee (November 5 minutes)

Victoria shared before and after photos of last years' recommendations.

Review/amend/adopt materials adopted by last year's committee:

Ground Rules – Reviewed and adopted with no amendments.

Roles and Responsibilities – Reviewed and adopted with no amendments.

Communication Guidelines – Reviewed and adopted with no amendments.

Candidate Evaluation Criteria – Ron del Rosario, Engineering Technician III, for the County has taken over the lead role in managing the minor betterment candidate list from Brian Irish. Ron suggested the committee consider using ODOT safety related data instead of the County SPIS (Safety Priority Index System) and TVFR data. Gary Virgin expressed concern the ODOT information has been horribly out of date in the past. Brian Irish shared the county GIS staff have recently analyzed the ODOT information and found it to be very accurate in the case of safety statistics. Everyone in attendance, from the committee, agreed to move forward with the ODOT Safety information instead of the County SPIS list and the TVFR information.

Shelley Oylear said recent studies from British Columbia do not coincide with the information in the letter received from Kat Iverson. Hal Ballard disagreed with Shelley that the severity of injuries to

cyclists is different based on where you are. Shelley encourages a separation between modes of travel and Hal does not agree. Hal would like to see bikes using the travel lane.

Steve Franks asked why the category weighting percentages were such odd numbers and Brian shared when the committee was first formed, each member was asked for their individual percentage of weighting on each category, those percentages were averaged to reach the final number. Dyami Valentine asked the walkability/connectivity category be called something like "Does it fill a gap".

Ron asked the committee to change "2 blocks" under connectivity to ".25 mile", since "2 blocks" can equate differently depending on the neighborhood.

The committee agreed that all of these suggestions would be acceptable.

Shelley Oylear provided a presentation titled Safety Benefits of Walkways which can be found on the committee webpage.

Discuss "interim" small improvements – paved shoulder vs. sidewalk – site visits?

Victoria pointed out there are 80-100 potential candidates that fall into this category. Todd Watkins shared the committee needs to be deliberate in setting the public's expectations when doing these interim projects. The cost comparison when widening a paved shoulder versus a sidewalk is very different. The public/neighborhoods need to have an understanding of what it is they are getting for this "minor" betterment project. Hal asked for a definition of "interim". Todd said an interim project is not built to ultimate line and grade; it is interim, but it could end up being there a long time if there is never any funding to build the project to the ultimate line and grade.

It was suggested that scoring for separation of modes be eliminated. There was a difference of opinion among the group so Victoria asked the committee to vote on whether the criteria should be changed under the separation of modes and the outcome was two members in favor, five opposed, and one abstained. The scoring for separation of modes remains unchanged. Shelley suggested statistics be provided for future years.

Discuss desired public input

Victoria pointed out the past practice of soliciting input and the only suggested change was to include not only the property owners, but the residents as well. The committee liked the idea of continuing with the interactive map and they were not interested in pursuing a virtual open house.

Identify desired outcomes

The desired outcome was discussed as equitable geographic disbursement. Hal suggested the committee stick with \$150k maximum for each project.

Paul Seitz asked if URMDAC came to the Minor Betterment Committee with a project, would the committee consider co-funding something if it was a good fit for the program? The consensus was yes.

Develop meeting schedule

The next meeting will be in early August and the committee will review eligible candidates.