



**MINOR BETTERMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**August 4, 2011**

<u>Members:</u>	John Douglas, URMDAC	<u>Staff:</u>	Victoria Saager
	Bonnie Hadley, URMDAC		Dave Schamp
	Brian Irish, Staff		Stacia Sheelar
	Marty Moyer, CCI		Todd Watkins
	Shelley Oylear, Staff		
	Linda Peters, CCI		
	Doug Riedweg, RROMAC	<u>Consultant:</u>	Leslie Howell
	Stephen Roberts, Staff		
	Lars Wahlstrom, RROMAC		
	Aisha Willits, Staff		
	Jinde Zhu, Staff		
<u>Absent:</u>	Matt Meier, Staff	<u>Guests:</u>	

**Welcome**

Leslie Howell opened the meeting with introductions and review of the last meeting minutes. The minutes were approved.

**Issues Bin Discussion:**

Brian reported that available TVFR and SPIS crash data covers all current candidates. Census based criteria – Aisha shared an Equity Analysis demographics map (attached) which was developed by Metro for the 2014-2015 Regional Flexible Funding that highlights areas with underserved populations based on population density, age, poverty level, etc. She noted that it doesn't address car ownership. Bonnie shared that she thinks it's good information, but too much detail and over analysis could open the committee up to criticism and take too much staff time. Linda felt that the public equity information was good and she liked the detail.

It was suggested that the Population Density and Demographics be moved to the Community Support category and Community Support be changed to Community. Brian will make this change.

Lars Wahlstrom suggested the census based information be used as a second tier criteria; get the list in order and then factor this in to the equation.

The group agreed to use the criteria as described by Aisha, but to include it as a second criteria under Community. Leslie asked the group if they were ready to move forward with the criteria as modified and everyone agreed they were.

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Victoria reported that a news item inviting the public to comment on the draft evaluation criteria was posted on July 15 on the county's website (<http://www.co.washington.or.us/LUT/News/mbc-invites-public-comment-on-draft-evaluation-criteria.cfm>). The invitation was highlighted in the Friday Roadwork News broadcasts sent to over 600 subscribers on July 15, July 22, and July 29. It was also posted on the [Washco Oregon Roads Twitter page](#) and the [Washington County Roads Facebook page](#). No comments were received.

Leslie explained that the evaluation criteria are a tool to be used to help the group form a recommendation on top projects. Assigning weights to the different criteria categories is a way for the group to reflect their sense of what is most important. She reminded the group at the last meeting they indicated they would like the opportunity to do this. The weights will be used by the staff in the spreadsheet showing the evaluation of all the projects. Math will be applied and the projects prioritized, but the group will still have the chance to discuss and use their judgment in deciding which projects to recommend. Each member filled out a worksheet assigning “weights” to each of the criteria categories. These weights were then averaged. One member of the committee was not present (Matt Meier), so he was asked to complete a worksheet after the meeting. After a poll of all members, including Matt Meier at a later date, the results were as follows:

Safety	43%
Connectivity	28%
Cost	15%
Community	14%

The group talked about the results and some members shared why they weighted a given category the way they did. After the discussion, Leslie asked if the committee would like to complete a second worksheet to reflect any new thinking after the discussion. No one felt that was necessary and they agreed to the averaged weights that resulted from the first round.

## **Minor Betterment Project Applications**

Maps and lists of all projects submitted are available on the website. Brian talked about the projects on the list and gave the group some details on types of projects, CPO locations, etc. Doug asked what the difference was between a pedestrian facility and a pedestrian pathway. Pedestrian facility = crosswalks, pedestrian activated beacons, etc; Pedestrian Pathway = an asphalt path or sidewalk.

## **Public Comment**

There were no members of the public present at the meeting.

## **What's Next?**

The next meeting will focus on review of the draft evaluation of projects. The goal is to have a draft evaluation of the projects done before the next meeting, and staff will try to get something out to the committee in advance of the meeting. Leslie reminded the group that a discussion of how to get public material on the website, or through the organizations represented on the committee. The schedule of meetings might need to be adjusted slightly to accommodate this review. The process at this point calls for a September meeting and a follow up meeting in October to make final recommendations.

The next meeting is September 8, 2011, 3:00-5:00 p.m., Training Room 1