

Minor Betterment Program Review and Selection Committee



Department of
Land Use & Transportation

November 19, 2014

3 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Walnut Street Center

Training Room 1

Members present:

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

Staff:

Todd Watkins
Steve Franks
Victoria Saager
Roberta Garcia

Guests:

None

Absent:

Tim Connelly, URMDAC
Dave Sweeney, RROMAC

MINUTES

Introductions

Victoria called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and attendees introduced themselves.

Committee recommendations for 2015-2016

The committee reviewed their [recommendation](#) for projects to be funded in 2015-2016. Dave Schamp will take the recommendation through the approval process.

Recommendations for URMD Safety Improvements

The committee reviewed the list of eligible candidates for URMD Safety Improvements and discussed what they would like to recommend to URMDAC. The following recommendations and observations were offered:

- One part of 174th is being funded as a Minor Betterment (#161a); the other candidate (161b) is recommended for URMD funding.
- Both Saltzman candidates (#228 and #213) are recommended.
- The McDaniel candidate (#338) is recommended.
- The Bronson candidate (#030) is recommended.
- The 113th candidate (#245) is recommended.
- Targeting older neighborhoods in CPO 7 and CPO 1 is recommended.
- Supporting candidates that are near schools is recommended.
- Building on other projects, continuing corridors, and bundling projects to get better bids is recommended.
- Geographic expansion and identifying candidates that exceed the scope for Minor Betterments is supported.

Street lights

Victoria noted that street lights have been required in new developments since 2008. Neighborhood street lighting is funded by property owners. The average assessment is about \$43 per tax lot per year, but the actual cost varies from one assessment area to another depending on the style of lighting installed and the number of tax lots sharing in the cost.

There are many older neighborhoods without street lights. To get street lights added to a neighborhood, at least 51% of the property owners in the area must petition the Board of County Commissioners to request the formation of a street light assessment area. In addition to ongoing operating costs, the benefiting property owners must also pay any up front costs of new street light

installation. Once requesters learn that they have to convince their neighbors (or landlords) to support and then pay for street lights, requests are usually withdrawn.

On major streets (Arterials and Collectors) street lights are funded by Road Fund (gas tax). Traffic Engineering staff reviews requests for street lights on major roads and installs only those street lights that meet warrants for safety reasons. Requests are usually denied unless there is a history of crashes that lighting could improve.

When Minor Betterment or URMD Safety Improvement projects get constructed along streets that do not have street lighting, requests for street lighting are becoming common. The users of new pedestrian facilities would like street lights, but on neighborhood streets the adjacent property owners may not want to pay for the lighting.

The question has come up whether the Minor Betterment evaluation and scoring criteria should be changed to give extra points to candidates that already have street lighting. After discussion, the committee decided not to change the scoring criteria based on whether street lights already exist along a candidate. There was a suggestion that the candidate description might mention whether there were street lights or not.

Debrief this year's process

The Committee had the following observations on what went well and opportunities to improve next year's process:

- Good opportunity to select meeting times.
- Good data and presentations from staff.
- Having candidate packets on website helpful.
- Good communication, outreach to public.
- Good input opportunities for public, on citizen's schedule.
- Process went well, goes well with URMDAC, able to complete bigger projects.
- Excellent work by Ron assembling candidate information, breaking down bigger candidates into smaller segments that met committee's criteria.
- How to get more public comments? Noted that with fewer candidates being considered, we received fewer public comments.
- Focus more on connectivity, finishing corridors.
- Safe Routes to Schools plans to complete an inventory of sidewalks around 50 schools. That work can feed into this program. Input from schools will be included.
- Would be good to get feedback on completed projects, changes in scope, accuracy of original cost estimates. Noted that URMDAC regularly gets this feedback, but RROMAC does not.
- Updates on Gain Share projects would also be interesting.

Thank you, committee members!

Victoria and Dave thanked the committee members and presented them with certificates and tokens of appreciation.

Meeting adjourned