



# Governor's Transportation Vision Panel

## Roadways and Bridges Subcommittee

### MEETING MINUTES, February 24<sup>th</sup>

#### SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #3 MINUTES

**February 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015**  
**10:00 am – 12:00 pm**

**ODOT Headquarters, Room  
240**  
355 Capitol St. NE,  
Salem OR 97301

**Subcommittee Chair:**

Susie Pape

**Subcommittee Members:**

Sen. Betsy Johnson

Tim McLain

Steve Phillips

Joanne Verger

Annette Price

Brad Hicks

**Panel Co-Chairs:**

Gregg Kantor (*by phone*)

Larry Campbell

**Panel Sponsor:**

Karmen Fore

**Facilitator:**

Cheralynn Abbott

**Resources and Support:**

Sam Haffner

Paul Mather

Jerri Bohard

Mary Stern

Craig Honeyman

#### Topic 1: Introductions and review of minutes and key issues document

Proposed Subcommittee meeting time change:

- Tuesdays from 12pm to 2pm
- Committee members present agreed to change meeting time

The Minutes were approved as written

Comments on "key issues" document and "stakeholders lists":

- Governor's office wants to ensure that outside stakeholders are involved in this process. This includes presenting to subcommittees as well as feedback as drafts of the vision are developed.
- We should consider the way other states handle their highways and bridges. Is Oregon's structure of state, county, and federal roads the most efficient way to structure the transportation system?
- Consider bringing in a speaker that can address questions of decision making process behind projects involving state roads in local communities (Eugene bypass given as an example)
- Need to consider the importance of public involvement in these local decisions. State highways dramatically impact local communities and economies. States have taken different approaches to the governance of these high-impact decisions

#### Topic 2: Discussion on role of ACTs

- We should be sensitive to the role of the ACTs. We need to consider whether our main focus is on the solutions that the agency delivers, or the way that the agency does its work. It is important to consider how we can do things better, but we should also be focused on transportation solutions we can deliver.
- Ensure clarity of purpose in this Subcommittee's work. Some clarity will come from work with ACTs.
- Important to develop bullet points for talking with ACTs about what the Panel seeks to accomplish
- Given time constraints, it would be most efficient to invite ACTs to the Subcommittee. This shouldn't preclude informal conversations between committee members and ACTs.
- ACTs and other stakeholders can help us further identify what the *problems* are.
- It is also important to consider the needs of other Subcommittees in getting ACT input. It needs to be coordinated effort [note: item for steering committee]
- A promise was made to legislators to separate our work from the work of the 2015 Legislative Session. Work with ACTs needs to be coordinated to honor this intent.
- This committee is in listening mode: a formal list of bullet points may not be needed, but goals of the Panel should be communicated

Action Item: Annette Price to develop bullet points for ACTs, share with Subcommittee members. [note: this work can inform a *stakeholder survey*: an action item identified by Steering Committee.]

<b>Topic 3: Discussion on the committee’s role in addressing governance questions:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Karmen: the fundamental question is in how we fix our transportation system. These are threshold questions for the public. Governance issues are important but are innovation questions.</li> <li>• Work of this subcommittee can be accomplished fairly easily. It may be as simple as bringing in stakeholders and identifying needs and priorities</li> </ul>		
<b>Topic 4: Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) Report Card with Jerri Bohard</b>		
<p>Jerri Bohard gave an overview of agency progress since the 2006 OTP. For a copy of the memo Jerri shared in advance of the meeting, <a href="#">click here</a>. For a copy of the meeting presentation, <a href="#">click here</a>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OTP is a statewide guidance document. Its framework also impacts decision making of cities and counties</li> <li>• This report card looks at what ODOT has accomplished as an agency</li> </ul>		
<b>Topic 5: ODOT Challenges and Opportunities Discussion with Paul Mather, Mary Stern (AOC) and Craig Honeyman (LOC)</b>		
<p>Paul Mather discussed some of the challenges and opportunities facing Oregon’s state roads system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most fundamental challenge is funding. This group could engage on the issue of inflation; how do we insulate our system to protect our investment long-term</li> <li>• We need to focus on maintaining what we have, and build a sustainable fund around that. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why not focus on expansion of the system? Expansion is a discussion to have, but first we have to maintain and retain what we have already invested in</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As we engage the local ACTs, we often end up with a ‘peanut butter’ approach, where funding is spread across regions. Funding thorough legislature often leads to similar results. We are well served deploying funds in a strategic manner that sees transportation as a system rather than a sum of projects. This group is in a position to address this in unique ways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An example of this is Portland; how can we improve 205 so that we are not singularly reliant on I-5? We do not have the funds to make significant improvements to both. Coos Bay connections can also relieve freight in Portland</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Conflicts between modes: much of this stems from the highway fund’s constitutional restrictions. We need long-term dedicated funds for other transportation modes. Work on this is being performed by other groups. Example: idea of an excise tax on bike equipment</li> <li>• Efficient use of funds: we share our federal funding with local jurisdictions more than other states. This creates challenges. An easy solution is “fund exchange” where federally allocated funds are exchanged with state funds and provided to local jurisdictions without strings attached <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is this a statutory roadblock? No, “fund exchange” is limited by a lack of state transportation dollars</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Orphan Highways: there highways in state control that should be in local control and vice versa. Transfer is easy but roads need to be in good shape and there needs to be revenue to maintain it.</li> <li>• The North Carolina model has major downsides; local jurisdictions should have say in local road issues and local road decisions should not rest with a state agency.</li> <li>• Technology is changing exponentially; how do we ensure that we are ready?</li> </ul>		
<b>Action items:</b>		
<b>Item:</b>	<b>Person(s) responsible:</b>	<b>Deadline:</b>
Develop letter and talking points on GTVP for ACTs	Annette Price	Completed