



MINOR BETTERMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
September 8, 2011

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

Welcome

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

Dave Schamp introduced Andrew Singelakis and announced \$500,000 would be available for funding of minor betterment projects. Andrew thanked the group for their work.

Issues Bin Discussion:

There were no pending issues.

Evaluation Criteria:

Brian Irish asked the group if there were any questions about the slight modifications to the scoring of the evaluation criteria that he had communicated to them. There were no questions. The candidate list evaluation was reviewed and the committee asked questions and discussed their impressions of the results. There was discussion about the number of arterials in the top portion of the list and why that might be. And the group also discussed the distribution among the different CPO's. Brian provided some observations of the analysis:

- A “natural break” occurs at a weighted score of 20+ points for the top candidates. (13 candidates)
 - 9 candidates = Pedestrian Path or Pedestrian Facility related

- 3 candidates = Widening & bike lane
 - 1 candidate = Signal Work
- Top Safety candidates were 7 tied with weighted scores of 11.61. These 7 were also the top rankings overall.
 - Top Connectivity candidate's weighted scores were 2 tied at 8.40. One candidate happens to be top ranked candidate overall, while the other is #46 overall (Ped path on Huntington from Cedar Hills to Glenhaven, MB #206).
 - Top Cost candidate scored 2.81 due to a grant from SRTS. It is ranked #48 overall (Ped path on Leahy from 88th to 90th, MB #154). This will be constructed via the Traffic Engineering department. Several others tied at 2.81.
 - Top Community candidates scored 3.50 (Ped facility @ Barnes Elementary on Walker Rd, MB #240 [#27 overall]) and 3.13, respectively (Ped path on Rock Creek Blvd from Rock Creek Rd to Malheur, MB #61 [#30 overall]). Several others tied with 2.80 and 2.43.
- CPO Breakdown of the top 13:
 - CPO 1: 7
 - CPO 7: 4
 - CPO 6: 1
 - CPO 3: 1
- Candidate #250, which is widening & bike lane on Cornell Rd from 119th to Saltzman Rd and is ranked #3 overall to be constructed at least in part by CPM in the very near future.

John Douglas told the group he had some different thoughts about the weighting allocations since reviewing the results of the evaluation. He handed out a write up of his thoughts (attached). He asked if the weights were final. Leslie explained that from a process standpoint it would be best not to go back and redo the weights,. Everyone had a chance to indicate their preferences, and unless there was a mistake they were considered final. The evaluation, however, is not the final recommendation and the group has the opportunity to recommend whatever group of projects they would like. She encouraged John to use his insights as the group further discussed their recommendations. He agreed with this approach.

The committee had considerable discussion about what candidates to include in a short list for further consideration. Todd suggested that there might be some projects further down on the list that would make sense to consider now because of other work planned by the County. The decision was made to take a closer look at the top 20 candidates (excluding Candidate #250 mentioned above that will be completed soon) and up to an additional 5 candidates. These five will be identified by staff either because of adjacent project economies or CPO equity. Brian will provide cost estimates, photos, maps, etc. of the top candidates for review. Leslie asked the group if there is any additional information the committee will need to form their final recommendation in October.

The committee talked about how to engage the public in the project at this point. Leslie suggested the group narrow the list to some smaller number and host an open house to get public input. The committee could use that input to make their final recommendation in October. After some discussion the committee decided they did not feel an open house would be helpful and they would prefer to have the evaluation matrix and a short list available on the web, with some mechanism for the public to provide their input. A request was made for mapping of the shortlist (if possible) and a packet of information about each project (simple) that would help inform the committee and anyone looking on the web about the nature of each candidate. Leslie asked the group if everyone could agree to this approach and all agreed. She also asked if the Division Manager and Andrew Singelakis were OK with no open house and they concurred.

Leslie asked Victoria to create a web tool for comments and to talk with Linda Peters about how best to communicate with the CPOs and educate them on the information. Lars Wahlstrom recommended we look for ways to share the costs with other agencies or businesses.

Bonnie Hadley asked Brian to flag any projects that may be impacted by larger projects that are being planned that may address the concerns.

Public Comment

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

What's Next?

The next meeting will focus on the review of the top candidates, including more refined cost estimates. The schedule calls for the committee to make a recommendation on the projects to be pursued this year. Leslie asked the committee to be thinking about this and to make sure they have what they need to make a recommendation in October (additional information, input from constituents etc) There may also be a debriefing meeting in November to talk about what went right/wrong with this process.

The next meeting is October 13, 2011, 3:00-5:00 p.m., Training Room 1

Minor Betterment Evaluation

Issues and/or Concerns for Review

Community vs. Safety

- 1) After reviewing the complete weighted evaluation of candidates, I feel that it would better suit our communities by lowering the weighting of safety in order to increase the weighting of Community.
 - a) Arterials will typically score higher in the safety evaluation due to traffic volumes, speed, and vehicle accidents (w/o pedestrians or cyclists)
 - b) Without a thorough Community Observation (place, people, various times and dates, and possibly seasons), it is imperative that “community support” be given an increased scoring.
 - c) Concerned citizens, CPO’s and organizations who routinely interact with and observe said Minor Betterment Candidates are inherently qualified to determine whether or not a candidate meets what they would consider a safety hazard.
 - d) With an increased weighting in community support, we effectively empower our citizens. By empowering our communities we give them the means to let their voices be heard, in return they will empower others and gain an invested interest in the neighborhood and community.
 - e) By incorporating the community’s wishes and concerns (more minds focused on a project), the projects selected will become more defensible to scrutiny should issues arise in the future. Somewhat similar to asking for community input when conducting urban renewal projects or others, such as the TV Highway project.

Other Concerns

- 2) After recently speaking with a County Commissioner regarding the possibility of diverting URMD maintenance funds into safety projects, his understanding was that the funds would be coupled with those of the Minor Betterments funds and projects.
 - a) Given the above listed intent, I believe that our current weighting would be a broken system without the increased weighting of “Community Support”. This is most likely the only way that our citizens can truly voice their concerns and/or wishes regarding safety implementations with their tax dollars.