

Review of January and February 2015 GTVP Roadways and Bridges Subcommittee Meetings:

January 14th: Overview of the “Conditions of the System” report, Paul Mather :

Key takeaways:

- The current highway trust fund is not sustainable
- Deferring investment in maintenance now will increase costs in future
- Large share of bridges were built in the 1960’s and designed for a 50-year lifecycle

January 14th: ‘County Road Needs Study’ Presentation and City needs discussion, Mary Stern and Craig Honeyman:

Key takeaways:

- Counties get 30% and Cities get 20% of Highway Trust Fund
- Most regions are getting about ½ the funding they need
- To simply keep up with what we have today would require \$170 million annually
- Panel asked Mary what would counties want from GTVP? *Mary*: Key priorities are a sustainable funding source and the ability to maintain what is built
- Craig Honeyman (LOC) noted that Oregon cities recognize the importance of multi-modal options and connectivity. Any proposals from this Panel or funding packages need to include multi-modal options. That being said, the priority need of cities is maintenance and preservation of what has already been built.
- Craig noted that a survey has been conducted on the needs of cities across Oregon. The gap in funding needed to simply maintain roads added up to \$300 million per year.

Panel discussion:

- Multiple layers and jurisdictions: Are they adding value? Can we be more efficient by merging City, County, State oversight while still making it locally responsive?
- the importance of predictability as a guiding principle in transportation investments across the state, not just equity between regions

February 3rd: Overview of OTP and OHP Roadway Elements, Erik Havig:

Key Takeaways:

- Mobility goal is closely tied with economic objectives
- Efficiency goal is a key to maximizing capacity of existing investment
- We are in a triage with declining revenue. Preserving and maintaining system is investment priority.
- The OTP does not call out specific projects for implementation but lays a framework to prioritize and act strategically.

February 3rd: Costs of Congestion Presentation, Susie Lahsene and Marion Hayes:

Key Takeaways:

- Economy in MPOs growing faster than population, resulting in an economy increasingly reliant on exported goods
- 1 in every 4 sales dollars in manufacturing comes from foreign customers
- Congestion’s economic impact includes limits on access to labor in addition to markets
- Congestion impacts business outside of the metro area as well; reliance on corridor and Port of Portland
- Companies are moving from off-peak to off-off-peak. Unpredictability and logistics challenges compound costs.

- We can't end congestion but we can reduce congestion's projected growth in the region
- There is a 240% return on investment for transportation projects identified.

February 24th: ODOT Challenges and Opportunities Discussion, Paul Mather, Mary Stern, and Craig Honeyman:

Key Takeaways:

- 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
- We need to focus on maintaining what we have, and build a sustainable fund around that.
 - 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
- As we engage the local ACTs, we often end up with a 'peanut butter' approach, where funding is spread across regions. Funding through 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

Subcommittee Scoping Discussions:

General Scope:

- Work of this subcommittee can be accomplished fairly easily. It may be as simple as bringing in stakeholders and identifying needs and priorities

Scope of Seismic Issues:

- The Innovation & Seismic Subcommittee is charged with looking at the larger resilience plan and disaster response, not just surface transportation structures.
- While the other subcommittee is charged specifically with seismic resiliency, Panelists noted that this committee cannot ignore seismic issues on roads and bridges in developing its recommendations.

Scope of Agency Governance Issues:

- Should the primary focus of the committee be on the transportation solutions the agency delivers, rather than the secondary question of *how* the agency does its work?
- 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.
- Karmen noted that the fundamental question is in how we fix our transportation system. These are threshold questions for the public. Issues related to transportation agency governance are important but may be questions for the innovation subcommittee

Issues Identified by Subcommittee:

Issues/Questions	Sub-questions	Work with other subcommittees?
How to handle the anticipated worsening of congestion and economic impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is return on investment to reduce vehicle load and congestion? • Should our goal be to reduce the increase or actually reduce congestion? • How to deal with bottlenecks where highways are main streets of smaller cities and towns? • How can automated vehicles reduce congestion/increase capacity? Is this an alternative to adding lanes? [note: something for I&S to consider] • 	<i>Work with I&S Sub on automated vehicle question</i>
How to handle multiple uses of roads and bridges, that may have compatibility issues and that affect differentially impact safety, congestion, economic impact, sustainability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicycles, Pedestrians • Passenger vehicles • Light commercial vehicles • Transit vehicles • Heavy truck freight 	<i>Link to BPTPR and AMFR subcommittees</i>
How to address safety risks and congestion posed by at-grade road and RR crossings?		<i>Review with Freight Rail subcommittee?</i>
Where can efficiencies be achieved to enable better use of our expenditures?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminating duplicate or overlapping ownership and management. • Streamlining work so state agencies can deliver more effectively. • Improving ability to work with Federal agencies and other states. • Identifying, testing and adopting “better practices.” 	<i>Potential issue for innovation subcommittee.</i>
How can we identify and develop effective public/private partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<i>Review with Transportation Finance subcommittee?</i>
How to ensure appropriate balance between maintenance of existing roadway and bridge infrastructure and enhancements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is our current approach ensuring the right mix? • How do we build support for what’s needed to avoid significant, higher costs in the future? • How do we ensure other modes are not hurt by the high cost of maintaining our large existing road and bridge inventory? (Are we hampered by our road-oriented legacy?) 	
How much of our efforts and investment should be directed to mitigating impact of a Cascadia seismic event?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we best align the goals of seismic resiliency and maintenance? 	<i>Review with Innovation & Seismic subcommittee?</i>
How do we balance the needs of different regions and communities across Oregon?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the state better allocate transportation funds to rural communities with large public road networks relative to their population? 	<i>Highly likely issue for other subcommittees.</i>
What are the innovations in the field of road and bridge design, construction and operation that show the most promise and should be considered in our near term (2-10 year) planning and investment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<i>Potential issue for innovation subcommittee.</i>

DRAFT Concepts for Recommended Actions -WORKING DOCUMENT

Recommended Action Themes	Brief Description	Notes
Fix-it First' Transportation Investment	Prioritize investment in maintenance of existing roadways and bridges to avoid future deferred maintenance costs	<i>Recommendations would ensure that maintenance of existing assets are prioritized. However, current levels of funding are insufficient for maintenance, and recommendation alone does not address enhancement, safety improvement, seismic, etc.</i>
Jurisdictional transfer of Orphan Highways	Transfer control of urban state highways that do not provide a significant statewide function to cities and counties. Conversely, transfer county and city roads to state highway agency where appropriate	<i>Action could have positive impact on efficiency of state and local agencies. However, jurisdictional transfer difficult without revenue to maintain and enhance assets. Currently a hot topic in Portland metro area (Barbur, Powell, 82nd); may be useful to refine recommendations based on potential outcomes</i>
TBD, prioritization of specific roadway corridors for increased investment		<i>A prioritized list could be developed separate from recommended actions lists. Panel should determine if within scope (parallel work by STIP, OTC, ACTs)</i>
Transportation enhancements of rural main streets	Make investments that both enhance safety and reduce bottlenecks along highway segments that act as main streets of small communities	
Invest in north-south freight corridors outside the Willamette Valley	Identify and enhance trucking routes outside the Willamette Valley that can relieve freight bottlenecks along the I-5 corridor, including, but not limited to, US 97.*	<i>*HWY 97 saw a 25% increase in trucking coming up from California in 2014. Statewide significance as congestion mounts along I-5</i>
Work to steer federal formula funding and grant funding toward seismic retrofitting	Work with Oregon's federal delegation to ensure that the Federal Highway Trust Fund considers the needs of seismic retrofitting in its state allocation formula, and that TIGER Grants and other federal discretionary transportation grants include seismic issues in their selection criteria.	<i>A strong case can be made for the region's unique need and the avoided national economic loss from proper investment. However, action is required at the federal, rather than state level. Federal transportation revenue is declining.</i>
Streamline work between transportation agencies	Identify ways to streamline administrative, maintenance, and regulatory work of state and local transportation agencies to deliver work more effectively	<i>2009 JTA called for further considerations around agency structure.</i>
Streamlining Federal regulatory requirements	Identify ways to streamline administrative and regulatory challenges to local transportation projects that come with federal funding.	<i>Transportation Finance group identified 'fund exchange' as method to reduce regulatory requirements and costs that come with federal funds. Would require additional state revenue to exchange.</i>

DRAFT Work Plan for Future Meetings:

(for subcommittee discussion)

Date	Topic(s)	Goal	Speaker(s)	Reading(s)
Jan 12	Conditions of the System: State, county and city roads	Provide overview on condition of Oregon's highway and bridge system, including future funding challenges	Paul Mather (ODOT), Mary Stern (AOC), Craig Honeyman (LOC)	Oregon Transportation Plan Oregon Highway Plan
Feb 3	OTP/OHP Cost of Congestion	Understand the context for policies related to highways and the economic benefits of the highway system.	Erik Havig, Susie Lahsene, Cost of Congestion	Oregon Transportation Plan Oregon Highway Plan Cost of Congestion State of the System 2014
Feb 24	OTP Updates State, City, and County Roads: Opportunities and Challenges	Identify challenges to meeting OTP goals Understand the roadway needs of local communities.	Jerri Bohard (ODOT), Mary Stern (AOC), Craig Honeyman (LOC)	OTP "Report Card" 2014 County Road Needs Study
Sept 9	Overview of proposed 2015 transportation legislation	Understand the investment priorities in the proposed transportation package Discuss potential role of Panel in expanding upon or refining work accomplished	Travis Brouwer	GTVP Updates Packet
<i>Future Meeting 1 (late September)</i>	<i>Potential Topic: Bottleneck issues along freight corridors Freight Plan</i>	<i>Understand the movement of freight by highways and key constraints on freight movement.</i>	<i>TBD</i>	<i>Oregon Freight Plan</i>
<i>Future Meeting 2 (Mid-October)</i>	<i>Potential Topic: Investment in safety for all modes</i>	<i>Understand needs around safety enhancement and the return on investment for safety improvements</i> <i>Role of the roadway network for bicycles and pedestrians.</i>	<i>Troy Costales, ODOT?</i> <i>Jerry Norquist?</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Future Meeting 3 (Early November)</i>	<i>Potential Topic: Bridge needs across the system Seismic plus report</i>	<i>Understand needs related to bridges and seismic resiliency.</i>	<i>Bruce Johnson, ODOT</i>	<i>Seismic Plus Report</i>
<i>Future Meeting 4 (Early December)</i>	<i>TBD</i>			