



Lane Area Commission on Transportation

895 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, Oregon 97401-2910
541.682.4283 (office)



March 17, 2016

Dear Governor's Transportation Vision Panel Members,

The Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LaneACT) would like to submit the attached comments in response to the Governor's Transportation Vision Panel's (GTVP) preliminary findings. The ACT appreciated the opportunity to attend and participate in the Vision Panel's Regional Forum held in Eugene earlier this year and now, the opportunity to provide comments. The ACT held robust discussions on potential comments at both its February and March meetings, resulting in the attached final comments. The comments are organized into eight categories and topic areas.

The LaneACT would like to call attention to and emphasize the immediate need for increased revenues from the existing gas tax, accompanied by the need to accelerate the transition to new, more equitable, revenue sources, such as a mileage-based fee, and the consideration of carbon taxes.

Thank you for your work on this topic.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sid Leiken".

Sid Leiken
Lane County Commissioner
Chair, Lane Area Commission on Transportation

Attachment: Comments on Governor's Transportation Vision Panel Preliminary Findings



**COMMENTS ON GOVERNOR'S TRANSPORTATION VISION PANEL PRELIMINARY FINDINGS
FEBRUARY 10 AND MARCH 9, 2016**

INTEGRATION and COORDINATION

1. Fail to integrate how business is done across the state (e.g., not just transportation in a vacuum, but closely linked to land use and other issues).
2. Coordination among all state departments should be required to ensure appropriate integration. One specific example in this area is the need for better coordination and efficiency across multiple state entities in the provision of special transportation services.
3. Lacks adequate consideration of public health.
4. Findings should include and address climate change.
5. Timing of carbon taxes is too late.
6. Address how transportation maintenance issues are linked with other public infrastructure needs (e.g. water, sewer, storm). Better coordination and efficiency are needed among the public (and private) infrastructure systems that rely on the road right-of-way.
7. Transportation Options language is absent from the findings.

FUNDING

8. Immediate need to increase the gas tax to help fund transportation system. The need is immediate, and the opportunity is right in this time of low gas prices.
9. The lack of legislative leadership in Salem is an issue and not addressed in the preliminary findings. Stronger leadership in Salem and throughout the state is needed to pass a transportation funding bill.
10. Expand funding alternatives. For example, consider treating road funding as you would fund a public utility district.
11. Everybody benefits from well-functioning transit options, so user fees as the only support is not appropriate.
12. Consider toll road options.
13. State needs to do a better job marketing/educating the public about the need for transportation funding. The general public is unaware of the cost to provide a transportation network and takes it somewhat for granted.

RAIL and MASS TRANSIT

14. Improve rail services for both passenger and freight.
15. Rail service to/in rural areas needs to be considered.
16. Mass transit including passenger rail is under-addressed in the preliminary findings.

FREIGHT (TRUCK)

17. Rural freight roads will not be able to hold up to increasing demand.
18. Other methods for moving freight are essential.

EQUITY and INCLUSION

19. Absence of consideration of seniors, non-walkers, and persons with disabilities in analysis and preliminary findings.
20. Require more coordination among providers of special transportation services; ensuring greater opportunities for improving the efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and service to the end users.
21. Concern that the term “bottleneck” is code for investing in Portland metropolitan area transportation network.

CONNECTIVITY and DEFINITIONS

22. Multi-use (bike/ped) connectivity throughout the valley (e.g., Oakridge to Florence) is a priority.
23. How is a regional path defined? Better definition required.

BOTTLENECKS

24. Most bottleneck solutions just seem to push the same issue out a few years, not resolve it. The slow pace of addressing bottlenecks seems to exacerbate the problem and indeed create even more bottlenecks.
25. Rather than focusing on “bottlenecks” and what appears to be an emphasis on added physical capacity to address them, emphasize investing in cost effective measures to increase and maintain the reliability of freight movement across Oregon.
26. Prioritize safety, promote local economic development and commerce, and enhance the hometown feeling along roadways instead of focusing primarily on widening roads.

ANALYTICAL APPROACH

27. The findings are based on a supply side analysis. Demand side approach has been omitted. For example, land use decisions can change demand for transportation infrastructure.