

**URBAN ROAD MAINTENANCE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 18, 2019**



---

Members Present:

Tim Connelly  
Blake Dye  
Ray Eck

Kimberly Goddard-Kropf  
Daniel Hauser  
Michele Limas

Mary Manseau  
Marty Moyer

County Staff Present:

Rebekah Bishop  
Melissa De Lyser  
Steve Franks

Sherri McFall  
Shelly Oylear  
Marla Vik

Todd Watkins

Guests:

Dick Steinbrugge  
Melissa Laird

---

1. Welcome, Introductions and Approval of July Meeting Minutes

Chair Hauser called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm. He thanked Steve for his work on preparing and sharing information in advance of the meeting. Members, guests and staff introduced themselves.

Member Manseau shared concern about the level of detail in the minutes. She suggested eliminating written minutes in the future and utilizing only the meeting recording for historic purposes. Chair Hauser stated that staff will think this through.

For the draft July meeting minutes Member Manseau said she would like to change language on page 4 from "Member Eck refused and the amendment died" to "Member Eck declined and the amendment died."

Approval of the July minutes with aforementioned edits was moved by Member Manseau and seconded by Member Moyer. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Guest Comments

There were no guest comments.

3. Pedestrian and Biking Improvements for FY 1920-21 and FY 1921-22

Chair Hauser opened discussion on pedestrian and biking improvements. Member Manseau began by stating that she believes financial equity is important. She shared a list she had compiled of approximate total dollar amounts for candidates in the north, south, west and east regions of the county.

Chair Hauser expressed appreciation that staff and URMDAC members had considered equity among candidates and that equity is important to the Board of Commissioners. He shared that the Board has trusted URMDAC and historically agreed with its choices. He hopes URMDAC will send them an agreeable proposal again this year.

Member Eck requested definitions of low, medium and high equity, as applied here. Chair Hauser shared that equity was defined at our March meeting; the definition includes areas with above average concentrations of historically vulnerable populations, and generally follows census tracks.

Member Manseau expressed concern that some projects selected by members as their first choice are not included towards the top of the table that shows the point scores of candidates (Table 2). She believes committee members should have an opportunity to speak about their first choices.

Member Dye stated that he would like to consider selections in relation to areas that have not received attention historically. Chair Hauser agreed that geographic equity is something that could be considered as members rank their selections, though perhaps not as a formal factor, as some areas have newer development and sidewalks. Bekah Bishop reminded URMDAC that there is an URMD Pedestrian and Biking Improvements Map showing these projects on their website (link: <http://washco.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2dc1d9518a234612a177bb1c5cf4773c>). It was suggested that during the next selection cycle, geographic distribution of projects might be considered more formally.

Prior to this meeting, committee members had submitted their top 10 selections to Steve. Document titled "Table 1: URMDAC members' 2019 Top Candidates Scoring, Ranked 1-10" showed those results. Points were then attached to each choice (10 points for first choice, 9 points for second choice, etc., down to 1 point for 10<sup>th</sup> choice) and a table of top candidates showing point scores was prepared. Document titled "Table 2: URMDAC Members' 2019 Top Candidates Scoring – Point Scores" showed those results. The point scores of top candidates were reviewed. Table 2 indicated, as one potential scenario, that URMDAC could recommend funding of the first 13 candidates listed on the table, since their estimated costs total \$11,431,000 (only \$31,000 over the \$11,400,000 available). Members were invited to speak in support of their choices.

Discussion ensued regarding using the points as a tool to prioritize candidates. Todd shared that URMDAC is not beholden to this method and is free to select any project. Chair Hauser indicated that he'd like to use this tool to keep the process moving forward. Member Eck indicated that he no longer wants to select all the candidates that he previously selected; he now wants to choose differently.

URMDAC members held extensive discussion about the prioritization of candidates.

**URBAN ROADS MAINTENANCE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 18, 2019**

---

Chair Hauser asked if anyone wanted to support reprioritizing candidates from the way the candidates were listed in Table 2, showing the point scores. Member Manseau stated that members should have the opportunity to reconsider all candidates, and that this is why she believed URMDAC should have held a meeting in August.

Member Connelly asked the minutes to reflect his opinion that this process of repeated reconsideration and shifting of points is ridiculous.

Member Goddard agreed with Member Connelly and stated that this process will take forever if we continue in this manner.

After more discussion, Member Manseau moved to recommend the following candidates to the Board of Commissioners, with Miller Hill as an alternate project. Member Moyer seconded. In favor: Members Limas, Dye, Goddard, Hauser, Manseau, Moyer. Opposed: Members Connelly (due to Miller Hill being included as an alternate) and Eck.

Candidate Recommendations

- 629 Scholls Ferry at 77<sup>th</sup> Pedestrian Crossing
- 309 Filbert Sidewalk
- 161d 174<sup>th</sup> (Bronson) Sidewalk
- 623 170<sup>th</sup> at Florence Pedestrian Crossing
- 29 Blanton Sidewalk
- 636 192<sup>nd</sup> Sidewalk
- 433 Alden Sidewalk
- 609 174<sup>th</sup> (Lapaloma) Sidewalk
- 445/471 Butner/Downing Sidewalk
- 446 Park Way (Devonshire) Sidewalk
- 550 Meadow Sidewalk
- 436 139th Sidewalk
- 602 74<sup>th</sup> Sidewalk

Alternate

- 402 Miller Hill Sidewalk

4. Debrief Selection Process/Thoughts for Next Selection Cycle (2021)

There was discussion about what worked well in this selection cycle and what could possibly change for the next cycle.

Steve highlighted, for the benefit of URMDAC’s newer members, that this is the first year that URMDAC members provided their selections to staff before the meeting, choices were weighted, and that information was provided to URMDAC members in advance of the selection meeting.

Member Manseau stated that she would like information about average daily traffic; posted speeds and number of incidents itemized, rather than a compiled safety score; information about right-of-way; and that the School Access Improvement Study document would be helpful.

**URBAN ROADS MAINTENANCE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 18, 2019**

---

Member Eck emphasized that he would like URMDAC to meet the month prior to selecting candidates in the next cycle and suggested going around the table with each individual candidate for discussion. He would also like to discuss which candidates may align with Gain Share opportunities. Member Manseau said she would like each member to identify their list of their top choices and then have an additional meeting to refine those individual choices of members. Member Connelly said he appreciated that there was enough time in the process (between meetings) to visit candidates sites.

Steve reminded the committee members this is the first cycle in which staff visited all the top candidates, and the information presented to URMDAC this cycle was more comprehensive than previous cycles.

Member Eck shared that in prior years URMDAC met almost every month to do business and also to learn.

Chair Hauser encouraged members to be thoughtful about their comments and that in every meeting we need to have good, positive dialogue.

Member Goddard liked the process and was able to seek the information she needed from staff. She likes Member Manseau's suggestion about using the School Access Improvement Study. She also appreciated the time to visit candidates.

Member Dye reminded URMDAC that he initially asked for more time for this meeting. He also appreciated the time to visit candidates. He shared that URMDAC has a view from the pedestrian perspective but he believes it also helps to have professional expertise guiding these decisions.

Chair Hauser shared that he appreciates staff's attention to the details of these candidates, and that he leaned heavily on the data and recommendations made by staff.

Todd expressed that all of these projects add value to the community and this work is going to be good for the community, no matter where the projects land. He thanked all the members for their passion and dedication to the process and to their communities. He praised Marla and her team in Capital Project Services; they have taken this work to heart.

Member Connelly stated that Washington County does as well and better than other counties in the state. He emphasized that we do a great job with road funding and projects.

5. Guest Comments

Melissa Laird shared that she completed an independent review of all the top candidates and is pleased that 8 of the 10 candidates she selected are in the final 13 candidates that URMDAC is recommending for funding. She believes the similarity is a testament to the diligence and attention that URMDAC members give to this work. She stated that she appreciates their work. She lives north of Highway 26 in the Oak Hills area and has applied to be a member of URMDAC.

Dick Steinbrugge indicated that he has also applied to serve on URMDAC. He shared that the meeting was fascinating and that it is always difficult to apply insufficient resources to overwhelming needs. He appreciates the spirit of the URMDAC discussions.

**URBAN ROADS MAINTENANCE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 18, 2019**

---

Steve shared that at the end of this year there are expected to be four vacancies on URMDAC and requested that members encourage people to apply to serve on URMDAC.

Member Manseau asked if paper URMDAC applications would be provided at future URMD project open houses. Melissa de Lyser replied they would be.

6. Open Forum – URMDAC Members

Open Forum was not held due to time constraints.

7. Confirm Meeting Follow-Up and Set Next Agenda

Next meeting date: October 16.

Member Manseau suggested the following as meeting topics: sidewalk issue paper; resolution and order 86-95 update; discussion about using paved width of streets with no parking to be used as temporary pedestrian access (which staff had said earlier was not viable); posting speed on alleys and narrow residential roads at 15 mph; “throwaway” transportation projects; and the “20 is Plenty” program, which she believes only applies to cities. She would like to discuss whether “20 is Plenty” could also be applied to urban unincorporated areas.

Chair Hauser requested a review of committee bylaws.

Todd asked members to consider whether they want to hold a joint meeting with RROMAC next year.

8. Meeting Adjourned

Meeting adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

***Next meeting: Wednesday, October 16, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.***