



Department of
Land Use & Transportation



Approved Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 21, 2021

Members Present:

| | | |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Ray Eck | Melissa Laird | Joe Wisniewski |
| Linda Feldhan | Mary Manseau | |
| Daniel Hauser | Dick Steinbrugge | |

Members Absent:

| | | |
|---------------|------------------------|---------------|
| Bhaskar Aluru | Kimberly Goddard-Kropf | Michele Limas |
|---------------|------------------------|---------------|

County Staff Present:

| | | |
|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Aaron Clodfelter | Sherri McFall | Dyami Valentine |
| Melissa De Lyser | Cindy Remy | |

Guests:

None

1. Welcome, Introductions and Approval of Minutes

Vice Chair Laird opened the meeting at 3:46 p.m. and welcomed members and other attendees. She invited URMDAC members and staff to introduce themselves.

Member Laird asked if any members request changes to the March minutes.

Member Manseau asked for an adjustment be made on page two to Shelley Oylear's comments regarding coordinating candidate crossings with traffic signals: the current language is vague and Shelley's comment was only referring to candidate crossings on NW 185th Ave.

Member Steinbrugge asked for an adjustment be made on page three to his comments about candidate 206, Huntington/Cedar Hills. In the meeting, he was specifically asking what the school district policy is regarding students crossing a 5-lane arterial, noting that he remembered that it was not considered safe in the past.

Member Manseau moved to approve the March 2021 minutes with the requested changes. Chair Eck seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Review 2021 URMD Pedestrian & Biking Improvements Website

Melissa DeLyser shared the online open house website for the public comment period of the Pedestrian & Biking Improvement process. The public comment period will be June 4 through July 2. She indicated that demographic questions would be added that could give the county an

impression of what type of constituent is commenting. The questions are the same ones used by Metro Regional Government, for consistency. We can use the demographics to modify our future outreach to make it more equitable and inclusive, hoping to enhance the diversity of constituents who are commenting.

Member Manseau asked if the icon maps link to additional information. Melissa shared that unfortunately it currently does not because the maps are not yet mobile device friendly.

Member Steinbrugge asked if pedestrian crossings could be more descriptive. There was discussion about what to add to the descriptions. Sherri indicated that we could indeed add some limited descriptive language; however, we need to avoid being too specific, as we are early in the process and change could be necessitated in the design phase. He also asked if we could use the term “candidates” or “possible projects” vs “proposed projects”, as proposed seems more committed than appropriate at this stage of the selection process. Melissa encouraged using “proposed,” as it’s what’s been used historically. Members Hauser, Laird and Eck shared they were neutral about the term “proposed” and Member Steinbrugge agreed to it, in light of the support of the term from other members.

Member Hauser indicated that he would like the demographic question asking about ethnicity to allow more than one response, for constituents with mixed ethnicities. Melissa indicated that the intent is for multiple answers to be allowed for that question and she will make sure it’s corrected. He asked about Washington County Safe Harbor languages and why Spanish is the only language into which these demographic questions are translated. Melissa explained that LUT only serves the non-incorporated regions of the county and the translation threshold is for languages that make up at least 6% of the community; Spanish is the only language that meets that legal threshold. She also shared that as we receive current census data, that may change. Member Hauser pointed out that it is his hope, as we continue to think about how we can keep expanding and reaching out to give more people access, and as we get more data and keep trying to reach additional communities, that we can and will do more than what is legally required. He expressed that he understood it is late in this cycle to make changes.

Member Laird stated she wants to review the upcoming MSTIP x3 planning changes utilizing equity principles rather than the current equality principles.

3. Guest Comments

There were no guests present.

4. Meeting Wrap Up

Schedule Next Meeting: July 21, 2021

Review July 21 meeting agenda: Committee members agreed that the substantive portion of the July meeting will be reviewing the results of the public comment period in June and discussing the candidates.

5. Adjournment

Member Manseau moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:44 p.m. Member Hauser seconded. Motion passed unanimously.