



Governor's Transportation Vision Panel Roadways and Bridges Subcommittee

MEETING MINUTES, September 9th

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #4 MINUTES

September 9th, 2015
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

ODOT Headquarters, Room
240

355 Capitol St. NE,
Salem OR 97301

Subcommittee Chair:

Susie Pape

Subcommittee Members:

Sen. Betsy Johnson

Martin Callery

Joanne Verger

Annette Price *(by phone)*

Brad Hicks *(by phone)*

Panel Co-Chairs:

Gregg Kantor *(by phone)*

Tammy Baney *(by phone)*

Panel Sponsor:

Karmen Fore

Resources and Support:

Sam Haffner

Travis Brouwer

Pete Pande

Mark Lear, PBOT *(by phone)*

Topic 1: Introductions and Discussion of Agenda/Meeting objectives

Introductions

Tammy provided an overview of the Panel's charge:

- The Vision Panel is still charged with developing a 30-year transportation vision for the state of Oregon. Alongside this 30 year vision is the need to look at the immediate and strategic priorities for the state around transportation
- In the last steering committee meeting, a suggestion was made to develop a series of recommendations actionable over the next 4 years that can begin to advance this 30-year vision. While the Panel should identify actions to be taken over the next 4 years to advance the needs of transportation, the objective of the panel remains centered on this 30-year vision
- The Governor has charged the Panel with putting additional emphasis on addressing the major transportation challenges of *seismic resiliency* and *transportation congestion*

Comments and questions:

- A lot of valuable work went in to the efforts at a transportation package in the 2015 session. Value both in philosophy and its political bipartisanship. It is important to make sure that this work does not get lost.
- When we look at conditions of the system, particularly around seismic and infrastructure, the needs extend beyond roads and bridges. We have major port needs. Commodity notwithstanding, should we take the long view and consider whether we have a container port closer to the ocean? A major undertaking like this would require rail, port, and road investments. This will require the subcommittees to cross-pollinate and share concepts and recommendations as they develop.
- We ought to tie this work to the Oregon Business Plan. Identify where the priority investments are needed and get the business community behind recommendations. The priority investments may be limited to a small number of projects and not cover every region, so it is important to demonstrate the statewide value.
- There is a lot of work that individual members can do talking with stakeholders and constituents. An example raised was capacity for utility cables on the I-5 Willamette River Bridge. *(note: Travis and Paul looking into this issue with bridge team. Can share answers with Subcommittee)*
- How do we make infrastructure multifunctional?

Topic 2: Discussion of timeline and Regional Forums

Based on the draft calendar, the current subcommittee phase would run into December, with regional forums taking place in the new year, and finalization of recommendations in March and April

Comments and questions:

- Timing will be important, particularly with the December holiday season and the legislative session in February. We don't want to exclude the participation of legislators in during the session.
- What is the rush to complete this work in early spring? Gregg commented that the mission is not to rewrite the Oregon Transportation Plan, but rather to identify a vision and the top items that the state needs to do. Some of these items may be further study around issues rather than solutions themselves.
- What is the best use of our time? Is there opportunity to continue this group's work beyond the spring. Gregg: there is potential for the governor to ask the group to dig deeper at issues identified. We may not be the Panel or set of experts needed to really dig into the topics that we identify.
- Tammy added that there is nothing that precludes us from assessing where we are in the New Year and check in with the Governor.
- When we talk about the short term 4 year priority actions, can this be phased in or does action need to be right away? Phasing in could be easier. The important piece is that whatever action is undertaken, it sets us on a trajectory toward the 30 year vision.

Topic 3: Discussion of subcommittee scoping

Comments and questions:

- It seems impossible to discuss the work of this subcommittee without bringing in seismic issues. *Travis:* Our thinking is that the Seismic Sub comes up with overall recommendations around seismic issues, and that this group would integrate the seismic needs with the general needs of the roadways and bridge system. In the past, ODOT has looked at these issues separately, but it is important to integrate seismic needs in the overall prioritization of the system.
- The seismic group cannot forget about the ports and rail component of transportation resiliency. They will be looking at resiliency across all modes.

Topic 4: Presentation on 2015 Transportation Legislation

- The proposed transportation package was called the Oregon Sustainable Transportation Act (HB 2281)
- Travis shared a 2-page handout that provides an overview of funding sources and investment priorities in HB 2281 (*shared with Panel via email on 9/9*)
- Revenue for roadways and bridges (excluding transit, etc.) would have totaled \$206 Million annually. This revenue would have come from a 4-cent gas tax increase, an increase in license fees, registration fees, and new vehicle title fees.
- A new vehicle title would have helped to address the challenges of less revenue for transportation from new and more fuel efficient vehicles.
- Even with the proposed \$10 increase in registration fees, Oregon would continue to have the lowest registration and title fees in the nation
- The state-county-city split of this \$206 would have continued at 50%, 30% and 20% respectively. Cities and counties would have primarily put money into needed basic maintenance of roadways
- ODOT worked closely with legislators to determine where the \$103 Million for state roads would be spent; approximately 50% for bridges, 30% for bonding and 20% for pavement, culvers and safety.
- Travis shared a handout of bridges identified for repair over the next 20 years with this revenue. Seismic need was integrated into this bridge program. With an integrated funding strategy, more can be achieved.
- Additional revenue for bridges would have taken care of about 1/3 of the outstanding bridge need.

Comments and questions:

- Q: Does the 4-cent increase tackle the inflation issue? A: This 4-cent increase would have backfilled for the revenue lost due to inflation since the 2009 JTA. In the future some kind of indexing may be needed so that you don't lose the purchasing power due to inflation.

- There is a public perception challenge when a large amount of revenue is spent on small bridges with limited significance to the state or region. Example raised was a bridge at Camp Sherman.
- It's important to note the needs identified by the DMV to upgrade their computer systems. Will these needs cut into any recommendations we make around projects or revenue?
- Challenge faced in the 20-year Bridge Program. Can you look at individual bridges or do you need to look by segment?
- In shoring up the bridges on 97, can you enhance the highway to be closer to an interstate route? A: this investment would allow for 97 to serve as the primary freight corridor through the state and a critical lifeline route in a major seismic event. We can coordinate some of those investments with strategic capacity improvements, such as an additional climbing lane. We won't bring 97 up to 4 lanes border-to-border any time soon, but you can make strategic investments to improve capacity.

Discussion on statewide priorities:

- Is there possibility in the legislature for temporary diversion of other expenses toward transportation?
 - The good news is that the bipartisan group came together with divergent views and came together with a proposal in the middle. The bad news is that we may not be able to break out of individual silos.
- Fear that transportation gets triangulated by other issues. This is the backbone of our economy and we cannot afford to have it be triangulated.
- We face needs for education, human services. At the same time we face a very limited 17-19 budget. Limited capacity for ODOT to fund anything beyond basic repair work.
- The last gas tax increase was voted for as a "jobs bill". We need to get back to this framing around transportation need.
- How do we set priorities that reflect the highest statewide need rather than a 'peanut butter' approach?
- The challenge for anyone in the political realm and for this Panel is to rise above the politics around transportation and identify priorities for the state

Discussion around roadways of local versus statewide significance

- What role can the OTC play in ensuring local road and bridge funding is effectively prioritized?
- Important to keep in mind that it is all part of an integrated transportation system. The system cannot function without meeting the first mile/last mile need

Topic 5: Discussion of Subcommittee Work Plan

Discussion around future meetings:

- Importance of having time for Panel discussion rather than just presentations
- Need to arrange an additional steering committee meeting (face to face)

Additional speakers, stakeholders to be brought in:

- Major system users; (Truckers, AAA)
- System advocates; (AOC, LOC)

Issues and actions:

- Identify areas where for immediate agreement or recommendation (i.e., indexing or prioritization around urban/rural)
- Identify where the political realities and challenges are

Action items:

Item:	Person(s) responsible:	Deadline:
Share Travis's printed handouts with members via email	Sam	<i>(included with minutes)</i>
Arrange a 2 nd steering committee meeting (face to face)	Tammy?	ASAP