

Minor Betterment Program Review and Selection Committee



Department of
Land Use & Transportation

October 22, 2014

4 p.m. to 6 p.m.

**Walnut Street Center
Training Room 1**

Members present:

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

Absent:

Hal Ballard, CCI
Tim Connelly, URMDAC

Staff:

Todd Watkins
Steve Franks
Victoria Saager
Roberta Garcia

Guests:

Tim Glassman
Jason Yurgel

MINUTES

Introductions

Victoria Saager called the meeting to order and attendees introduced themselves.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the August 13 meeting were approved.

Guest Comments

There were two guests in attendance: Tim Glassman, Jason Yurgel.

Mr. Glassman is interested in how the committee works and also noted he submitted a comment for Candidate 245a (113th Avenue). Mr. Glassman states it's a very dangerous road and has very little sidewalk with lots of high traffic. He would like to see sidewalk on both sides of the road.

Mr. Yurgel addressed Candidate 292 (107th Avenue) which proposes a fence along 107th near Kennedy Street. There is a creek on the side of the road as shown in the photo presented by Mr.

Yurgel. Mr. Yurgel states this is his neighborhood, and he submitted a comment and would like to oppose selection of this candidate. He stated that, "An argument that is made by proponents is that someone might fall into the creek." Mr. Yurgel jokes and states no one has fallen, except him. There are Section 8 Housing apartments and single family housing in the area, as well as community garden areas. Communities like the connection to nature. There used to be nutria in this creek, he states. Building a fence creates a barrier to this community area. Kids play in the creek and families also go to walk in the area. There are 30 to 40 people that walk their dogs in this pet friendly area. TriMet offers



neighborhood grants that support these types of areas that connect communities to nature. City of Beaverton is planning the Beaverton Creekside District and creekside promenades with pathways. They are doing open houses on this subject. One of the things that people continue to note at these open house events is that they don't want a fence that keeps them from the creeks. He did not poll

his neighborhood but did have conversations with neighbors, and not a single community member wanted a fence.

Victoria thanked Mr. Glassman and Mr. Yurgel for their input. She also noted that Candidate 292 is actually not eligible for Minor Betterment funding because it is a public dedicated road. It is also not eligible for URMD Safety Improvement funding since it is inside the City of Beaverton (not within the URMD boundary).

Todd Watkins said that, as an engineer, he was looking at Candidate 292 from the perspective of safety and looking at fall protection. He noted that Mr. Yurgel's comments provided a different perspective that may be helpful when considering other projects in the future.

Regarding Candidate 292 being ineligible Victoria clarified that, to be eligible for Minor Betterments, a project must be on a county road. A county road is a public road under county jurisdiction that has been established by the Board as a county road under ORS 368.016 and has been assigned a county road number. There are many public roads under county jurisdiction that are dedicated to public use, but they are not county established roads. The county does not maintain these public dedicated (aka local access) roads. In fact, using Road Fund (gas tax) dollars on a public dedicated road requires specific Board action under ORS 368.031. Since Minor Betterments are funded by Road Fund, projects on public dedicated roads are not eligible.

The committee discussed the historical process which established county roads, noting that whatever a road's status was in 1980 was adopted and grandfathered in. Now a road would need to meet the county design standards in order to be adopted as a county road. Committee members ask that Scott Young come in and provide an authoritative report on this issue.

Ray Eck stated that in the last URMDAC meeting Dave mentioned that some streets can be next to each other; one can be a county road and the other a public dedicated road. (Maintenance of public dedicated roads inside the Urban Road Maintenance District is provided by URMD because the URMD ordinance specifically includes them.)

Review "short listed" candidate packets, including public input/comments

The committee members acknowledged they had reviewed the [candidate packets](#) and the [public comments](#).

Develop list of recommended projects

Victoria noted that the estimated total cost of all the candidates is \$1 million and the committee only has \$500,000.

There was discussion on the importance of selecting candidates that eliminate school bus routes and the difficulty in selecting projects with limited CPOs represented in the candidate list. Ray Eck asked which candidates would eliminate a bus route. Ron Del Rosario responded that would be candidates 176 and 161a.

Committee members asked what recommendation Ron would make. Ron said his candidate picks are: 245a, 161a and 176, for a total cost of \$526,000.

The committee discussed several candidates in more detail:

- **#161a** - 174th Avenue - Cannot do the entire requested candidate. This segment would connect to the existing pathway near Bethany Elementary. If this segment is built, the school would no longer need bus service. The estimate is high due to the potential permitting costs from Clean Water Services.

- **#213a** – Saltzman Road - Candidate was divided into two sections, existing pathway connection, potentially fill in ditch and possibly fill with pervious pavement.
- **#141** – Science Park Drive – Sidewalk segments near Sunset High School.
- **#350** – Rock Creek Blvd. – Sidewalk from apartment entrance to 185th Avenue. The estimate is high due to the potential permitting costs from Clean Water Services and consultant fees for design. Rock Creek Elementary and Westview High schools are nearby.
- **#223a** – Kaiser Road – Cannot do the entire requested candidate. This segment of pedestrian path leads to a school and a park. There is a missing section of sidewalk from north to south. Is no longer on the list. THPRD completed the project and it looks really new, Marty says.
- **#245a** – 113th Avenue – Provides a north and south pathway, even though it is not on both sides of the roadway. There could be a second phase for \$150K to \$200K. It's going to be very tight in the right of way, Ron states. Guest Tim notes that four feet is much better than what currently exists. Parents use this route when going to Lost Park. Site distance issues also make it more difficult for crossing. In terms of design it may be easy to build and hopefully at a reduced cost.

Victoria shared Tim Connelly's email which notes his input on selection of candidates:

161a - better access

245a - keeps pedestrians off of 113th

213a - better access to school

176 - Keep off the list

Dave Sweeney proposed making 161a a first choice. Victoria asked the committee if there was any opposition. No opposition heard. Committee agreed to include 161a on the list.

Gary Virgin proposed 161a and 245a, with no member opposition.

Dyami suggested that they make a summary of comments. Ron noted this is being accomplished currently and will be included next year.

- **#176** – 173rd Avenue – Candidate has been divided into four segments and is also near a school. There was discussion from the committee on Shelley's suggestion that #176 be added as it would not be eligible for any other funding. She also proposed that URMDAC pay part of the cost of this project. Dave Schamp asked if it's a public project rather than a local. Todd responded that the neighbors on the west side were on board in getting sidewalks, bike paths, and street crossing to the schools nearby, and the gaps on 170th are now a city street. Shelly and Todd noted that pedestrians need to walk to Lisa and then have to cross at another street, due to development focused on the control of population movement, lots of use from the north. Gary stated that the school kids can't go north-south, just east-west. Shelley stated they don't know if it would eliminate a bus as the bus route impacts other areas that still need access to schools. Shelly stated it may be scaled down to south of Lisa. Marty stated that they should select this candidate as it does not have any other funding.

Ray asked about the language describing a candidate as a pedestrian pathway. Ron explained that it's a technicality because if it is called a sidewalk it would have to meet the standards and a 5-foot width. There are places where there would be less space for sidewalks.

Gary nominated candidate 176, Marty seconded and all agreed.

Paul asked if there were any other candidates that anyone thinks should have been added. Hearing no input, Marty moved that they recommend candidates 161a, 245a, and 176. Paul seconded the motion and all agreed.

- **#210** – Barnes Road - Median improvement requested by the neighborhood to stop cut through traffic. It was suggested that this candidate be taken off as not something that they should be considering. There were some plans to do a raised space to obstruct vehicle movement (flexible barriers); this was intended as an emergency access only. Maybe the solution would be to create a left turn area. Paul asked if there was a reason to keep it on the list. The committee agreed this issue could be better addressed by Traffic Engineering staff. All agreed to remove this candidate from the list.

Finalize list of recommended projects

Selected candidates:

#161a - 174th Avenue

#245a – 113th Avenue

#176 – 173rd Avenue

Victoria noted a \$526,000 total estimated cost for these three candidates. Dave Schamp will take the committee's recommendation through internal review, then include these projects in the budget and road maintenance program for fiscal year 2015-16 presented to the Board for approval. They will likely be constructed in 2016-17.

Next meeting date and agenda

The next URMDAC meeting is November 19, 2014. Committee discussed the possibility of creating a list of projects that could be used as a recommendation to URMDAC in selecting URMD Safety Improvements.

Victoria will send an invite for the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned