HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

March 28, 2001 Hearing Room D
8:30 AM Tapes 74-76

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Bruce Starr, Chair

Rep. Alan Brown, Vice-Chair Rep. Jeff Merkley, Vice-Chair

Rep. Richard Devlin Rep. Jeff Knopf Rep. Donna Nelson Rep. Joanne Verger Rep. Cliff Zauner

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Diane Rosenbaum

STAFF PRESENT: John Leon, Committee Administrator

Kate Campeau, Committee Assistant

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD: HB 2870 – Public Hearing

HB 3351 – Public Hearing HB 3355 – Pubic Hearing HB 3075 – Work Session

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

| TAPE/# | Speaker | Comments |
|-------------------|----------------|---|
| TAPE 74, A | A | |
| 004 | Chair Starr | Calls meeting to order at 8:32 a.m. Opens a public hearing on |
| | | HB 2870. |
| HB 2870 - | PUBLIC HEARING | |
| 006 | John Leon | Committee Administrator. Reads synopsis of HB 2870, which requires the Department of Transportation to transfer ownership and control of a portion of a state highway to the city or county upon request of the city or county. Introduces –1 Amendment (EXHIBIT A). States that there is a fiscal statement but no revenue impact. |
| 015 | Tom Mann | Highway 214 Alliance, formerly known as Concerned Business Owners of 214. States that he is the drafter of this bill. Reads from written testimony (EXHIBIT B). Details that the bill mandates the transfer of any portion of a state highway to a requesting municipality's request. Second, it transfers with that road preservation and maintenance money from ODOT, and third, it allows new road improvements on the transferred highway to be done to the specifications of the local municipality. |
| 100 | Rep. Zauner | States that negotiations with ODOT are challenging and speaks to the possible solutions. |
| 150 | Rep. Verger | Asks which formula will be adopted. |
| 155 | Mann | Answers that he prefers the original bill. |
| 157 | Rep. Verger | States that partnership should always be equal and this bill is |

| | | weighted heavily on the side of local government. Contributes that in her mayorial experience ODOT was always extremely | | |
|---|-------------------|--|--|--|
| | | cooperative and very fair to local government. | | |
| 170 | Mann | Agrees with Rep. Verger that bill is not perfect. Also agrees that partnership definition needs to be looked at more closely. | | |
| 190 | Rep. Verger | States that ODOT is not able to do jurisdictional change with all roads. States approval of the formula approach. | | |
| 210 | Rep. Zauner | States that the -1 amendments came at request of the City of Woodburn. | | |
| 220 | Rep. Brown | Asks definition of state highway and if there is any impact of federal funding. Asks if there is anything in the bill to ensure that funds are dedicated funds. | | |
| 240 | Mann | Answers that he cannot answer the first two questions and defers to ODOT. Continues that any money is intended to be dedicated funds. Talks about deferred maintenance, i.e., that any money came for ODOT for that state highway would be dedicated to that highway for preservation or improvement. | | |
| 260 | Rep. Rosenbaum | Asks if under this system we would maintain uniform road standards and not a patchwork of standards. Talks about equal partnership language being deleted in the –1 amendment. | | |
| 270 | Mann | Answers that City of Woodburn wanted to eliminate any dealings with ODOT; however, in the original bill consultation with ODOT was included. States preference of original bill for this reason. | | |
| 300 | Rep. Nelson | Asks about funding. | | |
| 320 | Mann | Answers that Senator George worked up this formula and that estimates are about \$8-10,000 per lane mile to maintain a road. | | |
| 340 | Rep. Nelson | Asks about the process. | | |
| 366 | Mann | Answers that the bill was written broadly to accommodate the process. States that he is here today to start the discussion. | | |
| 378 | Rep. Nelson | Asks about accountabilities and responsibilities for contracting work to be done. Talks about government contracting rules. | | |
| 420 | Mann | Answers that public and private partnerships would mean access to decisions. | | |
| 440 | Rep. Kropf | States that in the fiscal analysis ODOT makes a point that it would be in local government's best interest to wait until the project is completed and requests ownership of that project. Asks about process of establishing ownership of a project. | | |
| 480 | Doug Tindall | Maintenance Engineer, ODOT. Speaks on the effects of HB 2870. Submits written testimony (EXHIBIT B). Speaks to concerns ODOT has regarding this bill and the formula needed to implement the changes suggested. Talks about negotiating before the project is finished. Comments that formula method would smooth things out in one way but that it also takes away the flexibility to do transfers. | | |
| TAPE 75, A | | | | |
| 040 | Chair Starr | Closes the public hearing on HB 2870. Opens a public hearing on HB 3351 and HB 3355. | | |
| <u>HB 3351 & HB 3355 - PUBLIC HEARING</u> | | | | |
| 050 | Rep. Rob Patridge | State Representative, District 50. Testifies on HB 3351 and HB 3355. Speaks on task force bill. States that recommendations of the tool. force were not setification. | | |
| the task force were not satisfactory. HR 2870 – PURLIC HEARING | | | | |

HB 2870 – PUBLIC HEARING

Rep. Nelson Asks what the price is per lane mile of state highways, referring

| | | to county road out of Lafayette, connecting to Highway 240. |
|-------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 110 | Dava Tindall | Asks if \$215,000 a lane mile is the correct amount. |
| 110 | Doug Tindall | States that there is a very narrow right-of-way and therefore it is |
| 150 | Chair Starr | very difficult to make an estimation of cost. Asks if this bill is about the transfer of state roads to the county |
| 130 | Chan Stan | or city. |
| 160 | Tindall | Answers yes. |
| 170 | Rep. Verger | Asks what the advantage would be to ODOT if local jurisdiction |
| 170 | Rep. Verger | would take over and ODOT would still be doing the |
| | | maintenance. |
| 179 | Tindall | Says that ODOT would transfer a sum of money on an annual |
| | | basis for the local entity to perform maintenance. |
| 188 | Rep. Verger | Asks if there would be an exchange of money at the beginning. |
| 190 | Tindall | States that the concern is that the formula would take away |
| | | flexibility of establishing jurisdiction. |
| 200 | Andrea Fogue | League of Oregon Cites. Reads from written testimony |
| | | (EXHIBIT D) . States that the formula is good in concept, but |
| | | that the testimony heard from ODOT is correct in that it takes |
| | | away jurisdictional flexibility on a case-by-case basis. Continues |
| | | that only city or county is expressing desire to take over a project |
| | | and that ODOT should have the same authority and option in |
| 207 | John Ocholl | order to be a full partner in this process. |
| 297 | John Oshell | Association of Oregon Counties. Testifies that the main problem is inadequate funding. Continues that jurisdictional transfers are |
| | | extremely complex and that when funding is tight things get |
| | | really creative. Concludes that transfers should be mutually |
| | | agreeable to both parties. |
| TAPE 74, B | | agreeable to both parties. |
| 040 | Chair Starr | Asks how much money the City of Woodburn has put up in |
| | | order to work with ODOT. |
| 060 | Fogue | Answers that she does not know. |
| 070 | Chair Starr | Asks if this is a change in position with Woodburn. |
| 080 | Fogue | Answers no. |
| 090 | Chair Starr | Ask s if the letter from Mayor Jennings is based on the bill as in |
| | | its original form or as amended. |
| 100 | Fogue | Answers that it is based on the bill including the amendments. |
| 136 | Rep. Verger | Reflects that red lights are indeed safety issues and that there are |
| | | man areas in need throughout the state; however, this committee |
| | | needs ti address the funding for ODOT so that they are able to do |
| 150 | D M.1 | the job that they are people want them to do. |
| 150 | Rep. Nelson Chair Starr | Counters that the administrative rules need to be removed. |
| 160 | Chan Stan | Closes the public hearing on HB 2870 and opens a public |
| HR 3351 _ PI | BLIC HEARING | hearing on HB 3351. |
| 180 | Leon | Gives an overview of HB 3351. |
| 200 | John Strahl | Director of Roads, Parks and Planning, Jackson County. Reads |
| 200 | voim strain | from written testimony (EXHIBIT E). Discusses current |
| | | statutes that result in inequitable and inefficient management of |
| | | the road system, primarily county roads within city limits. |
| 260 | Rep. Kropf | Points out that current law allows for this. |
| 263 | Strahl | Replies that current law only allows for the transfer to take place |
| | | basically at the city's request. Continues that there are many |
| | | more roads that have not been transferred and that unless the city |
| | | takes steps to make it happen, it will not happen. |
| | | |

| 300 | Rep. Devlin | Asks how Jackson County would feel about being mandated to |
|-------------------|---------------|---|
| | | transfer funds when roads are transferred. |
| 320 | Strahl | Answers that funds are transferred in Jackson County. |
| 330 | Rep. Devlin | Asks if Jackson County is unique in this practice. |
| 340 | Strahl | States that it is fiscally impossible for some counties to do this. |
| 350 | Rep. Merkley | Asks for clarification as to why all of the streets are transferred. |
| 360 | Strahl | Answers that it varies with each city. |
| 400 | Mike McKillip | City Engineer, City of Tualatin. Reads from written testimony |
| 1 00 | wike weighip | (EXHIBIT F). States that acceptance of roads has many issues |
| | | |
| | | and considerations. Details the reasons why a city would accept |
| T. DE D | | jurisdiction of a road. States his opposition to the bill. |
| TAPE 75, B | at t a | |
| 050 | Chair Starr | States sensitivity to relationships between cities and counties. |
| 060 | Rep. Devlin | Asks if through traffic is relatively heavy and if it is primarily |
| | | truck traffic. |
| 080 | McKillip | Answers that there is an extremely large amount of truck traffic |
| | • | passing through Tualatin. |
| 100 | Roger Martin | City of Medford. States her opposition to the bill. |
| 130 | Chair Starr | Closes public hearing on HB 3351 and opens a public hearing on |
| 150 | Chair Stair | HB 3355. |
| ПВ 3355 DIII | BLIC HEARING | 11 D 5555. |
| 133 | Leon | Gives the committee an overview of the bill. |
| 150 | Strahl | |
| 130 | Suam | Speaks briefly on this bill and its effect on Jackson County and |
| | | submits written testimony (EXHIBIT G). States that this bill |
| | | would allow for the creation of combined road maintenance of |
| | | state highways and county roads in the areas where the counties |
| | | and the ODOT maintenance district choose to create such an |
| | | entity. |
| 170 | John Watt | States that there are amendments with this bill. States that |
| | | language with regards to administration needs to be included. |
| 200 | Tindall | Reads from written testimony (EXHIBIT H). |
| 240 | Rep. Verger | Asks Tindall to comment on his statement that cooperation can |
| | | be legislated. |
| 250 | Tindall | Responds that his comment was referring to creating a new |
| 230 | 1 main | governmental entity. States that existing law makes it difficult to |
| | | • |
| | | take the next step. Continues that the Accounting Section and |
| | | the Department of Justice are very good at their jobs protecting |
| | | the state, but perhaps not so good at protecting the public's |
| | | interest. Agrees that cooperation cannot be legislated. Offers |
| | | that barriers can be removed to allow people to cooperate. |
| TAPE 76, A | | |
| 050 | Rich Peppers | Oregon Public Employees Union. Testifies in opposition to the |
| | | bill and submits written testimony (EXHIBIT I). |
| 070 | Chuck Logan | Jackson County Roads and Parks. States that employees express |
| | - | concern about this type of bill and its impact on further |
| | | employment and benefits. |
| 088 | Russ Peterson | Highway Maintenance, ODOT. States that this bill would |
| | | impact accounting and budgeting systems, operational |
| | | emergency responses, and the safety of employees. Details that |
| | | |
| | | the bill would create a new layer of local government and create |
| | | a forced-merge situation. States that partnering needs to be |
| 120 | D W C | expanded and explored. |
| 120 | Rep. Kropf | Asks if there would be a loss in jobs. |
| 130 | Peterson | Answers no because the department is already understaffed. |
| | | |

| 136 | Chair Starr | Closes public hearing on HB 3355 and opens a work session on HB 3075. |
|--------------|--------------|--|
| HB 3075 - PU | BLIC HEARING | |
| 140 | Sen. Starr | MOTION: Moves HB 3075 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation and BE REFERRED to the committee on Ways and Means. |
| 144 | Rep. Merkley | States that he supports passing HB 3075 on to Ways and Means but without a do pass recommendation. |
| 160 | | VOTE: 6-1-2 |
| | | AYE: Brown, Devlin, Kropf, Starr, Verger, Zauner |
| | | NAY: Merkley |
| | | EXCUSED: Rosenbaum |
| 165 | Chair Starr | ABSENT: Nelson The motion CARRIES. Closes the work session on HB 3075 and adjourns the meeting at 10:38 a.m. |

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Kate Campeau, John Leon, Administrative Support Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A – HB 2870, -1 amendments, submitted by staff, 1 p. (MISSING)

B – HB 2870, Tom Mann, Highway 214 Alliance, written testimony, 2 pp.

C – HB 2870, Doug Tindall, ODOT, written testimony, 2 pp.

D – HB 2870, Mayor Richard Jennings, written testimony, 2 pp.

E – HB 3351, John Strahl, Jackson County, written testimony, 2 pp.

F – HB 3351, City of Tualatin, written testimony, 2 pp.

G – HB 3355, Jackson County, written testimony, 2 pp.

H – HB 3355, Doug Tindall, ODOT, written testimony, 2 pp.

I – HB 3355, OPEU, written testimony, 4 pp.