

## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

February 01, 1999 Hearing Room D

8:30 a.m. Tapes 12 - 13

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Rep. Bob Montgomery, Chair

Rep. Mike Lehman, Vice-Chair

Rep. Jim Hill

Rep. Jeff Kropf

Rep. Jerry Krummel

Rep. Jane Lokan

Rep. Jackie Taylor

Rep. Vicki Walker

Rep. Larry Wells

**MEMBER EXCUSED:** Rep. Richard Devlin

**STAFF PRESENT:** Janet Adkins, Administrator

Brad Daniels, Administrative Support

**MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:** HB 2478 Public Hearing

HB 2193 Public Hearing and 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 12, A		

001	Chair Montgomery	Opens meeting at 8:32 a.m. Opens public hearing on HB 2478
<b>HB 2478 PUBLIC HEARING</b>		
006	Janet Adkins	Committee Administrator. Introduces 11 amendments ( <b>EXHIBIT A</b> ).
020	Grace Crunican	Director, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Explains that they will be presenting an overview of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process and present a specific project as an example.
030	Doug Tindal	Statewide Maintenance Manager, ODOT. Describes the three phases of a project: Project Planning, Preliminary Engineering and Construction ( <b>EXHIBIT B</b> ). Emphasizes the public involvement in each project stage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project PlanningóDiscusses the number of sources that identify problems or possible improvements (citizens, industry, maintenance crews, etc.).</li> </ul>
062	Crunican	Notes the importance of bridge and pavement management systems that identify technical problems. Stresses the systemsí function of identifying problems that often go unnoticed by the general public.
087	Tindal	Continues describing how problems are identified. Underlines that problem identification occurs prior to the STIP process. Explains how projects are defined to address specific problems. Reiterates that public input occurs during this stage.
108	Rep. Lehman	Asks if Tindal knows how the Fort Hill project originated.
115	Tindal	States that the project was recommended by local government and appeared in a safety priority index.
118	Rep. Lehman	Asks if citizen input has been a part of the Fort Hill project.
120	Tindal	Replies that the project has gone through the public process, including Citizen Advisory Committees.
130	Rep. Lehman	Asks if STIP projects go through the same notification process as land use projects.
134	Tindal	Replies no. States that the draft STIP acts as a form of public notification.
136	Crunican	Adds that ODOT does advertise public hearings in the appropriate areas.
146	Tindal	Returns to the Project Planning portion of his presentation. Describes the STIP

		<p>process and the beginning of funding decisions. Underlines that extensive public involvement is involved in developing the STIP. Discusses the next stage of a project's anatomy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary EngineeringóExplains that preliminary design now occurs, including extensive surveying, analysis of alternatives and environmental impact statements.</li> </ul>
185	Rep. Lehman	Asks if the STIP reflects all the costs starting with preliminary engineering.
187	Tindal	Replies yes.
189	Rep. Lehman	Asks where the costs associated with everything before preliminary engineering appear on the budget.
192	Tindal	Responds that these costs are not attributed to individual projects, but are allocated to indirect costs. Stresses that Crunican is very interested in assigning these costs to specific projects.
194	Crunican	Notes that the initial costs are accounted for in the budget.
206	Rep. Lokan	Asks at what point in the process stakeholders are notified.
212	Tindal	Replies that this type of notification is now occurring at Fort Hill, and ODOT does solicit public involvement.
218	Crunican	Adds that an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) is now being formed in the Polk, Yamhill and Marion County area. Refers to two points of public contact: the ACT and the draft STIP.
244	Rep. Lokan	Asks if ODOT has the tendency to avoid changing projects after the public has expressed dissatisfaction.
255	Tindal	Replies that project plans do change often and sometimes dramatically.
265	Crunican	Notes that the Fort Hill area is not as populated as other areas, but community development can change the nature of projects that appear in the draft STIP.
277	Tindal	<p>Continues his description of the Preliminary Engineering phase. Discusses the design and bidding process. Comments on the number of required permits, the competition in the bidding process, and continued public involvement. Moves on to the last phase of a project's anatomy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ConstructionóRelates the finalization of bids, project lay out, the construction process and completion of the project.</li> </ul>

353	Tindal	Reviews the geography and the history of the Eddyville-Cline Hill project, as well as its movement through the three project stages: Project Planning, Preliminary Engineering and Construction ( <b>EXHIBIT C</b> ).
415	Tindal	Emphasizes the size and detail of construction plans for a project like Eddyville-Cline Hill. Discusses the estimated project costs and when they were documented in the STIP.
430	Crunican	Notes the change from the 1993-98 STIP to the 1995-98 STIP. Explains that this change reflects a federally-mandated requirement for a fiscally-constrained STIP. Stresses that \$400 million worth of projects that did not have identified funding were dropped as a result, and ODOT received criticism because of this situation.
<b>TAPE 13, A</b>		
046	Rep. Kropf	Asks about changes during the construction phase and how the changes are approved or implemented.
052	Tindal	Replies by describing the different thresholds, defined by dollar amounts, that are reached depending on the size of the change. Explains that change orders are a common occurrence and may not overrun the original budget authorization; however, if they overrun a project by 5% or more, project managers must go to the Transportation Commission (OTC) for approval.
082	Chair Montgomery	Asks about the definition of a project.
085	Crunican	Replies that even relatively small jobs are classified as a projects. Notes that the issue of drainage has created large cost overruns. States that each project does have a contingency part of its budget. Indicates that, before going to the OTC, project managers must discover where the money is going to come from in order to fund the change.
121	Rep. Kropf	Asks how early retirements have changed the engineering and change order process. Asks if the process has slowed as a result of retirements.
135	Tindal	Concedes that expertise has been lost, but enough people are on the team to ensure that the project concept remains consistent.
156	Bob Russell	Director of Government Affairs, Oregon Trucking Association. Supports HB 2478 and the ñ1 amendments.
165	Bob McKellar	Oregon Forest Products Transportation Association. Recognizes the complexity of the transportation issue. Supports HB 2478, especially section 8, as an important step in improving communication. Supports the ñ1 amendments.
191	Betsy Earl	Associated Oregon Industries (AOI). Acknowledges AOI's proposed gas tax

		increase. Agrees with the need for greater clarity in ODOT's budget. Supports HB 2478 and ñ1 amendments.
206	Gary Conkling	Associated General Contractors (AGC). Notes the importance of contractors in the transportation process and their particular insight into transportation issues. Recognizes that a more informative budget structure would be beneficial. Expresses AGC's support for ODOT and HB 2478. Notes that the bill has improved over the last few days. Supports ñ1 amendments.
274	Bill Penhollow	Association of Oregon Counties. Supports HB 2478 and ñ1 amendments, but expresses some reservation about the transfer of funds from one category to another. States that a 10%, rather than 5%, spending limitation would provide greater flexibility without requiring the involvement of the legislature.
311	Susan Schneider	City of Portland. Testifies for David Barenberg from the League of Oregon Cities. Supports HB 2478 on his behalf.
326	Rep. Wells	Asks how HB 2478 would affect cities and counties.
330	Penhollow	Replies that cities and counties have projects in the STIP and are affected by the state process. Notes that most of these projects are administered by ODOT.
367	Roger Martin	Oregon Transit Association and member of the Efficiency Committee. Describes the make-up of the Efficiency Committee. States that he has no position on the bill.
430	Martin	Explains that HB 2478 asks for more reports and volumes of material that legislators may not even read. Stresses the lack of money, and opines that further funding is necessary to solve the problems of ODOT. Emphasizes that the weak quality of ODOT stems from their inability to compete with private sector or local government salaries.
<b>TAPE 12, B</b>		
044	Ralph Groener	American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Supports HB 2478. Acknowledges that a gas tax increase is tied to passage of HB 2478. Expresses a desire for the committee to hear from transportation workers.
075	John Watt	Consortium of Southern Oregon Businesses. Cites the legislature's responsibility for making the state function smoothly. Supports HB 2478 as a good starting place. Notes that ODOT has been criticized enough and now is the time for solutions. Commends ODOT's involvement and accountability. Warns against the deterioration of the infrastructure. Refers to page 4, subsection 5 and stresses that stakeholders should be involved.
136	Chair Montgomery	Notes that Legislature has never intended to indiscriminately beat up ODOT.

145	Kathy Thole	City of Grand Ronde. Asks that "stakeholders" be included in the consultation list on page 4, subsection 5. Asks the committee to invite Sen. Gary George or listen to the testimony on SB 356. Stresses that Sen. George was not notified of this bill
178	Chair Montgomery	Expresses opposition to any suggestion of businesses paying for road improvements.
210	Thole	Reports that the public was not sufficiently notified about the Fort Hill project ( <b>EXHIBIT D</b> ).
216	Rep. Lehman	Expresses his understanding that the public notification process for the Fort Hill project is still occurring.
221	Thole	Emphasizes that County Commissioner Propes introduced the project without notifying the public.
232	Rep. Lokan	Enters into the record a letter of testimony from Dick Jones ( <b>EXHIBIT E</b> ).
248	Rep. Krummel	Asks if Jones supports HB 2478.
253	Rep. Lokan	Replies yes.
255	Adkins	Enters into the record an e-mail from Melvin Zucker of the Oregon Transportation Institute. Notes that Zucker expresses concern about lack of, or vagueness in, the definitions and categories of HB 2478 ( <b>EXHIBIT F</b> ).
283	Chair Montgomery	Closes public hearing on HB 2478 and opens public hearing on HB 2193.
<b>HB 2193 PUBLIC HEARING</b>		
287	Adkins	Explains HB 2193, a bill that extends the driver license, identification card and disabled parking permit renewal period from four to eight years and doubles renewal fees. Notes that HB 2193 does not affect the two-year vehicle registration renewal period.
337	Kelly Taylor	Government Relations Section, ODOT. Explains the purpose behind HB 2193. Indicates that HB 2193 does not change the basic requirements for drivers or ID holders. Underscores that the bill would decrease the inconvenience of going to the DMV. Notes that the bill saves money by eliminating the need for two full time employees (FTE) ( <b>EXHIBIT G</b> ).
381	Chair Montgomery	Inquires about elderly drivers.

389	Rep. Taylor	Responds that these people, like everyone else, would be seen every eight years.
396	Chair Montgomery	Asks if a bill that would require people over 80 years old to get checked every year or two would complicate HB 2193's proposed changes.
400	Taylor	Responds that more stringent requirements for older citizens would be possible.
403	Rep. Walker	Supports HB 2193 as eliminating the annoyance of visiting the DMV.
421	Rep. Wells	Expresses concern about older people paying for a full eight years in advance.
435	Rep. Kropf	Commends the common sense of HB 2193. Supports the bill.
456	Rep. Hill	Asks if the FTE savings will be reinvested.
459	Taylor	Replies that Ways and Means will be making that decision.
<b>TAPE 13, B</b>		
037	Adkins	Notes that she checked with law enforcement, and they have no problems with the bill. Asks Taylor why the fees are increased.
047	Taylor	Replies that the purpose of the fee increase is to hold other funds stable and to recover the DMV costs.
057	Adkins	Asks Taylor to explain the repealed section.
060	Taylor	Notes that renew by mail program would be repealed, but not immediately. Explains that there will be a transition phase to lessen the predicted workload increase in eight years.
066	Rep. Wells	States that he has just renewed his license in person. Asks if he will have to return to the DMV in four years to pay for an additional eight years.
074	Taylor	Replies that he will still have one more option to renew by mail, but he will be transferred to the eight year cycle when he renews in person again.
083	Chair Montgomery	Closes public hearing on HB 2193 and opens work session HB 2193.
<b>HB 2193 WORK SESSION</b>		

089	Rep. Hill	<b>MOTION: Moves HB 2193 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.</b>
		<b>VOTE: 8-0</b> <b>EXCUSED: 2 ñ Rep. Devlin, Rep. Krummel</b>
	<b>Chair Montgomery</b>	<b>Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.</b>  <b>REP. TAYLOR will lead discussion on the floor.</b>
109	Adkins	Explains the itinerary for Friday's field trip.
142	Chair Montgomery	Closes meeting at 10:05 a.m.

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Brad Daniels, Janet Adkins,

Administrative Support Administrator

#### **EXHIBIT SUMMARY**

**A ñHB 2478, -1 amendments, Staff, 6 pp.**

**B ñHB 2478, written testimony, Grace Crunican, 8 pp.**

**C ñHB 2478, written testimony, Doug Tindal, 1 p.**

**D ñHB 2478, letter, Kathy Thole, 2 pp.**

**E ñHB 2478, letter, Dick Jones, 1 p.**

**F ñHB 2478, e-mail, Melvin Zucker, 5 pp.**

**G ñHB 2193, testimony, Kelly Taylor, 2 pp.**