CENTRAL OREGON
AREA COMMISSION ON TRANSPORTATION
(COACT)

November 8, 2018 3:00 – 5:00 PM
Redmond Public Works Training Room
243 E. Antler Ave. Redmond OR

AGENDA

3:00 1. Call to Order and Introductions
Commissioner Jerry Brummer, Chair

3:05 2. Public Comments
A) General Comments
Commissioner Jerry Brummer, Chair

3:10 3. COACT Business
A) September 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes (Action) Attachment A
B) Election Debrief; implications for COACT membership
Commissioner Jerry Brummer, Chair

3:25 4. Oregon Transportation Commission Workshop
A) Debrief Outcomes of Discussion on the Role of ACTs
Commissioner Jerry Brummer, Chair Attachment B

3:45 5. COAR (Aviation) Grant Program
A) Grant Program Overview and COACT Role
B) Central Oregon COAR Applications
C) Delegate Review to Subcommittee; COACT Ex. Comm. (Action) Attachment C Attachment D
Gary Judd, Aviation Mode Rep
Scott Aycock, COIC

4:15 6. ODOT Updates
A) Road and Bridge Reporting Guidelines – additional info Attachments E & F
B) ConnectOR Update
Bob Townsend, ODOT

4:30 7. Regional Roundtable
A) Updates on issues and items around the region
COACT Members

5:00 ADJOURN
DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Central Oregon Area Commission on Transportation
COACT
September 13, 2018
Redmond Public Works Training Room
243 E. Antler Ave., Redmond, OR

Members:
Robert Townsend (ODOT), Jerry Brummer (Crook County), Jeff Monson (Commute Options), Wayne Fording (Jefferson County), Steve Uffelman (City of Prineville), Dave Thomson (BPAC), Pat Hanenkrat (City of Metolius), Ron Cholin (Crook County), Gary Judd (Aviation), Tony DeBone (Deschutes County), Melvin Ewing (BLM), Barb Campbell (City of Bend), Wendy Holzman (BPAC).

Guests:
Chris Doty (Deschutes County), Scott Smith (City of Prineville), David Amiton (ODOT), Tyler Deke (Bend MPO), Darrel Newton (DOWL).

Staff: Scott Aycock (COIC), Hailey Barth (COIC)

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Meeting called to order by COACT Chair Jerry Brummer at 3:05pm. Introductions were made.

2. Public Comments
   A) General Comments
      Commissioner Jerry Brummer, Chair

   There were no public comments.

3. COACT Business
   A) May 10, 2018 Meeting Minutes (ACTION)

   Andrea Blum motioned to approve the July 12, 2018 meeting minutes. Steve Uffelman seconded. Minutes were approved by consensus.

4. Pavement and Bridge Reporting
   A) Informational Update
      Robert Townsend, ODOT

Robert Townsend, ODOT Region 4 Area Manager, provided the group with an update on House Bill 2017’s transparency clause. Robert mentioned that group members should have received email messages regarding the inventory items as required by the Bill. He said that local jurisdictions now have to conduct inventories of road and bridge conditions around Oregon, and ODOT will post the results online.
Robert played a brief informational video for the group that explained the rating system for road and bridge conditions, and how local cities and counties can rate pavement conditions themselves using an online system. The video explained the following:

- Local jurisdictions will rate pavement conditions in their areas
  - Good: smooth ride
  - Fair: wheel ruts, bumpy ride
  - Poor: cracks and potholes on roadway surface
- Local representatives can utilize maps on ODOT’s website to find out their locations to rate
- After rating, local jurisdictions will report their findings to ODOT via the online system

Robert asked Scott Smith if he has seen the email for this request. Scott answered not yet, but noted that it should be coming soon so group members should be prepared to conduct their reporting.

Robert said as ODOT moves forward, group members should be receiving email summaries of the work to be done by the end of September 2018. He noted that later in the fall of 2018, these rating forms will be online. Robert said that ODOT is in the testing phase of this program and they are looking to recruit volunteers. Robert noted there will be two new local agency liaisons at the November 2018 COACT meeting to talk about this request in more detail. He added that the deadline for reporting is February 2019.

5. ODOT 2021 – 2024 STIP Update
   A) STIP Process Discussion
   B) 2021 – 2024 STIP Update
   Robert Townsend, ODOT

Robert provided the group with a handout that depicted ODOT’s 2021-2024 Region 4 Scoping List, also known as ODOT’s “150% list”. Robert explained that this list shows potential ODOT projects, the type of work, a description of the project, and the county the work is located in.

Robert told the group if they have a project in the pipeline and do not see it on the list, to call ODOT and have it added. Robert said ODOT wants to scope all ideas, identify risk, and add it to the list if the project is of value and funding is available.

Robert commented that the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) and the All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) Programs have been newly added to the Region 4 Scoping List.

Robert explained the timeline of the Region 4 Scoping list and highlighted the following:

- July 2018 – February 2019: Project scoping period
  - Identifying costs, schedules, and risk factors associated with the project
- March 2019 – June 2019: Leverage opportunities will be identified
- July 2019: Finalize 100% list for the draft Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP)
- February 2020: Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to release draft STIP for public review
- June 2020: OTC approves STIP
- Sep 20: USDOT approves STIP

Darrell Newton asked if House Bill 2017 opportunities will be included on the upcoming STIP. Robert answered yes, and noted there will be leveraging opportunities.
Steve Uffelman said that Prineville has an opportunity to use Peters Road for an upcoming project, and said this effort needs to be on ODOT’s radar because it will give more access to the hospital and schools. Robert said this project is a good example because even though it is not a priority to ODOT, it’s good to have it on the Region 4 Scoping List for leverage in the future.

Jeff Monson asked when more information on the projects will be made available. Robert said that every project has a draft business case, and the projects currently on the scoping list are fluid. Robert added if Jeff had a certain project in mind he could provide more information.

Wayne asked Robert what the “miscellaneous” and “Enhance” projects listed on the Region 4 Scoping List mean. Robert said they are added for transparency as ODOT will have some financial commitments regarding the match.

Robert shared a graphic of the STIP development process, noted its complexity, and then shared existing projects with the group.

Barb Campbell asked if SRTS is a designated funding source for communities, yet also competitive. She wondered if somebody else could get Region 4’s funding for this. Robert said there is no “community” money, its state money, and it is competitive across the state. He noted that SRTS money is allocated to low-income schools first.

Tyler Deke said there is $15 million available in this current funding round, but over $100 million of ask in the submitted applications. He said these programs are hyper-competitive. Jeff clarified these were not submitted applications, but submitted letters of intent.

Robert shared with the group the specific guidelines for Enhance, Safety, and Active Transportation, all leverage opportunities. He stated that there is not much funding available across all of Region 4. Robert noted there are currently no Enhance projects with current funding.

Chris Doty asked if the numbers are a collective amount. Robert answered yes. David Amiton said that the different pots of money have to be assigned to leverage, that is why the funding breakdown is so complicated.

Robert commented that ODOT is hoping COACT members agree to write letters of support for the following:

- Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) Grant
  - ODOT applied last year and was unsuccessful
  - ODOT has met with executive staff in DC from the federal Department of Transportation to discuss their application
- SRTS
  - Applications due October 15, 2018

Robert asked group members to share any upcoming projects their jurisdictions have that may require COACT letters of support.
Chris provided an update on Deschutes County and noted the following:

- The County has submitted a letter of intent to build a sidewalk on C Avenue in Terrebonne
  - Most walking and biking occurs North of school
  - This project will help resolve current safety issues

David provided an update on the current SRTS projects in the pipeline for the following cities:

- Redmond
  - Reconfigured sidewalks and ADA ramps
- La Pine
  - Sidewalk added on the East side of Coach Avenue near the school
- Warm Springs
  - Recently adopted Safety Corridor Plan
  - Path pedestrian improvements near school
- Bend
  - Streetscape projects along Neff Road
- Madras
  - Sidewalk infill on A Street between 5th and 7th
- Sisters
  - New roundabout at US 20 and Locust

Jerry asked if the group is interested in writing a letter of support for the projects discussed.

*Wayne motioned that COACT creates a letter of support for both the INFRA Grant and the SRTS Program. Scott Smith seconded. The motion was approved by consensus.*

Scott Aycock stated that these letters of support will be discussed at the October 2018 COACT Executive Committee meeting.

6. **COACT Purpose, Goals and Operating Guidelines**

   A) OTC Survey and October 18-19 Workshop – Request for Input
   B) Group Discussion of COACT Purpose and Any Desired Changes

Robert Townsend, ODOT and All COACT Members

Jerry asked the group to stay focused during this discussion as main points will be taken to the OTC workshop in October 2018.

Scott Aycock asked Robert to give an update on the OTC and what they are asking of the group. Robert said all COACT Board Members should have received an OTC survey via email. Robert highlighted the following:

- All ACT chairs have been invited to sit at the table with the OTC during the workshop
- OTC chairs will review what is working at each ACT, the ACT’s purpose, and long term goals
  - Purpose of ACTs used to be focused on project selection
  - The OTC is looking for what else is important to the ACTs
Wayne asked Robert if the earmarking of Enhance money will continue by the OTC. Robert answered that this topic will be part of the conversation moving forward as HB 2017 is Fix-It driven. Robert reminded the group that there is still no funded Enhance program. Robert said he anticipates future leverage dollars changing.

Scott Aycock asked if the same response is around Connect Oregon with funds being earmarked. Robert answered yes, exactly the same response.

Scott Aycock noted that this is the first time COACT has had the door open to discuss what to keep, change, regarding group goals for quite a while. Scott highlighted the following regarding the update to the ACT’s operating guidelines:

- They were adopted in 1999 and last revised in 2012
- The OTC will take survey responses and use them as a framework for all ACTs
- COACT may need to adjust their own operating guidelines as a result.

Scott Aycock explained that the attachment in the handout titled “COACT Purpose and Goals Framing Questions” was created to draw out group members’ thoughts surrounding the current process and allow them to think together about their goals for the future.

Scott Aycock said he will ask the group the following questions, compile a report of their answers, then present the report at the upcoming COACT Executive Committee meeting.

1) From your perspective, what are the key opportunities for COACT to address and focus our work on over the next 5-10 years?

Chris said it would be nice to know what COACT can work on from the OTC’s perspective. He noted that he would like to hear how the OTC views the ACTs, for example if they are sounding boards or something else? Chris said in the past the ACTs have been focused on ranking applications and focusing on regional priorities, and noted he does not see this opportunity as much anymore.

Wayne said last time around, the OTC sent the ACTs a survey to ask what their most important priorities were after cutting funding. He said the group needs to get back to the work they would do in the past to keep COACT members active and at the table. Wayne said COACT should be making important decisions for the region.

Chris added that there are a lot of federal funding opportunities with a short application deadline, so it would be helpful for COACT to prepare on the shelf proposals for known issues throughout the region. He said the group should have conversations in advance of grant deadlines and set regional priorities as a way to stay on top of current issues.

Tyler Deke agreed with Chris and said COACT should prioritize major highway projects so funding opportunities can be utilized once made available.

Barb said COACT is more focused on prioritizing funding than anything else. She noted the projects are already planned by the community and COACT tries to rank projects as a whole area. Barb added that she feels the COACT members compete for available funding throughout the region.
Jerry commented that he feels like Central Oregon has lost local control over available funds and COACT does not get to provide the same level of input as in the past. He asked if other group members agree. Wayne said the region never had control over the money, the group was only able to help steer it along. He said COACT should be careful about demanding control over money, but agreed that providing that input is missed by the group.

Wendy Holzman asked if the group would be interested in focusing on needs of the entire region, rather than specific projects and focusing how dollars are to be spent. She wondered if COACT is needed as a sounding board for ODOT’s projects. Chris said that ODOT needs COACT’s feedback on specific projects. He also stated the group needs to determine what they value as an ACT, such as large projects like the north end of Bend, Terrebonne, or the roundabout in Sisters.

Scott Aycock asked if the group had any other feedback for the following question:

2) Do you still want COACT to focus on the four Purpose statements currently listed in the Operating Guidelines?

Wayne agreed it is time for the ACT look at the bigger picture, for example, regional strategies and economic development in Central Oregon.

Chris said that these are all still worthwhile goals. Chris said the challenge moving forward will keep keeping COACT members engaged in a way that provides value to meetings. He said:
- No more “filler” agenda items
- Less busy work between meetings
- Engagement drops at meetings with multiple presentations

Patrick Hanenkrat said a few years ago group members were more actively involved during meetings and noted recently members just sit and listen during COACT meetings. He noted it would be nice to be given the freedom to make comments and have more discussion during meetings.

Scott Aycock said he notices that many state plans require feedback from the ACTs, but often they only provide a brief presentation to the group. He said it is hard for folks to provide meaningful feedback in such a limited time frame. Jeff added that implementation phases of state modal plans should be brought to COACT for a better understanding on how they can help locally.

Tony DeBone said COACT needs to think more broadly about the “transportation issues” affecting Central Oregon. Tony added that it may be beneficial for the group to dive into each other’s TSPs to compare when is happening in each city. Chris commented that this would help strategize projects around the region.

Chris said that knowing each other’s financial situation is helpful as there will come a point when group members will need to compete for available funds and we should consider priority of needs together as a region. Jerry noted that group members have done a good job at being aware of each other’s needs as a region, and stated that there is more traffic on Highway 97 than anywhere else so that is where the majority of the money will end up.
Barb commented that it sounds like some of what the group is talking about is like what the Metropolitan Planning Organization does and stated this will be needed when Bend blends into Redmond.

Wendy said having more representation from all modes of transportation at the table was a great change for COACT. Wendy noted that the number one priority of citizens is safe transportation modes, and keeping this topic as a concern of the group is very important. Barb asked if all voices are represented at the COACT table, and wondered if anyone is missing from the group.

Robert commented that ODOT would be delighted to not dominate this meeting’s agenda. He also noted that difficult conversations will be needed in the near future surrounding submitted Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) applications. Scott Aycock mentioned that there has not been a COACT Technical Advisory Committee meeting in a couple years, and said perhaps this would be a good topic for that group.

Jeff said the SRTS program can be used an example something the group can look at more closely.

Robert said the following COACT Purpose statement will be brought up at the OTC workshop, and asked group members to think about it:

- To advise the Oregon Transportation Commission on state and regional policies affecting Central Oregon’s transportation system.

Steve asked if there is a means for COACT to have a greater impact on issues relating to current priorities. Robert said action needs to be taken on something that is specific, for example the ACT could present a glaring concern to the OTC.

Scott Aycock said this body is enabled by the OTC, but COACT’s Purpose statement mentions advocating to area legislatures. He said ODOT would not be able to participate in such advocacy, but the group could always bring issues to the Central Oregon Cities Organization or another advocacy outlet.

Wayne said there is a lot of value to sit at the COACT table. He commented he is from Jefferson County so it is helpful to hear what is going on around the region and how the different needs tie together.

Dave Thomson introduced himself and said he is the alternate chair for BPAC and said there are a lot of different aspects pertaining to safety within the transportation system. He highlighted the following:

- Distracted and impaired driving is a major issue in Central Oregon
- Police officers and engineers should be included in forums about transportation
  - They see firsthand the issues arising in town
- Drivers in the south end of Bend are constantly speeding

Dave said law enforcement officials have noted they want an engineering solution to the hazards in the region regarding transportation. He said in the meantime money needs to be spent on stronger enforcement. Jeff suggested adding enforcement and education to future COACT discussions.

Barb commented that she agreed with Dave about including police officers in transportation forums because they have access to data that the general public will not always see.
Scott Aycock commented that many of the group’s suggestions align with question in the OTC survey about creating “area strategies”.

Wayne said the group should definitely look at all of the current TSPs because there is a bottleneck on major state highways.

Gary Judd asked what the priorities are for airplane needs in Central Oregon and questioned what role air transportation plays in COACT. Wayne said these are great questions to bring to the OTC Workshop as they are not only important to the region as a whole, but individual communities as well. Wayne added COACT needs to think about how to keep trucking, rail, aviation, and other modes of transportation engaged.

Pat asked if the questions in the handout are coming from COIC or the OTC. Scott Aycock said that the Executive Committee created some and that some were from the OTC survey.

Wayne said he does not think other ACTs are as engaged as this group, and noted COACT has made good use of their time. Scott noted that COACT has been looked to as a leader in the past for other ACTs.

Robert said he would imagine COACT will be getting an entire new set of goals based on the upcoming OTC workshop. Scott Aycock said he expects that the group can always edit and add more.

Barb commented she went to Salem and learned more funding was to be made available for Region 4.

Scott Aycock asked for any additional comments.

Wayne said he hopes they leave a bit more on the table to keep these ACTs engaged and added the Cascadia Subduction Zone event should also be considered in future COACT efforts.

Chris said this group is here for a purpose, and suggested more work should be done with TSPs and other big picture goals.

Robert said he is thankful for COACT and noted Central Oregon has a strong group.

Jerry said this topic will be revisited after the OTC workshop and added this will also be an agenda topic at the November 2018 COACT meeting.

7. **Roundtable**
   A) Open Discussion
   All

There was no Roundtable discussion.

**ADJOURN**

*Jerry Brummer adjourned the meeting at 5:01pm.*
COACT PURPOSE AND GOALS QUESTIONS

Summary Outcomes of Discussion at September 13, 2018 COACT Meeting - DRAFT

All comments are provided in the Sept. 13, 2018 draft meeting minutes. This document summarizes key consensus points among the group.

1) From your perspective, what are the key opportunities for COACT to address and focus our work on over the next 5-10 years?
   • We need to hear from the OTC what they are contemplating we could do.
     o Need to know if we can be more than a sounding board.
     o Earmark process has taken away some of the more significant work that we used to do regarding ranking projects
   • Significant consensus among attendees on the opportunity to develop a set of high-level regional priorities for existing and upcoming funding opportunities (there is significant overlap here with the Area Strategies proposal discussed below)
     o Most discussion was around major transportation infrastructure needs/big ticket items for the region as a whole.
     o Have projects ready on the shelf when funding processes are announced. Otherwise it’s hard to meet proposal timelines.
     o This will also help us think through grant programs like FLAP and hopefully work together as a region to direct resources to the highest-priority needs.
     o Would need to ID a set of criteria/principles such as safety, economic development, congestion, etc. with which to determine priorities.
     o Technical Advisory Committee would be a good resource for this effort.
   • Do not want meetings filled only with information updates.
   • COACT is very valuable and we need to keep the group together and engaged.
   • We need to find ways to meet the needs of rail and aviation going forward – aren’t seeing the same types of expanded transportation funding opportunities as the other modes.

2) Do you still want COACT to focus on the four Purpose statements currently listed in the Operating Guidelines?

   • “To provide a forum for the discussion, understanding and coordination of transportation issues affecting the Central Oregon region.
   • To review the process for determining transportation infrastructure, capital investments and project prioritization in the Central Oregon region.
   • To advocate Central Oregon transportation issues to neighboring regions, area legislators and other interested organizations.
• To advise the Oregon Transportation Commission on state and regional policies affecting Central Oregon’s transportation system.”

• The group believes that all of these purpose statements are still worthy.
  o Even if the OTC Charter went away there is still value in this meeting.
• But we’ve been losing ability to provide local/regional ranking of projects.
• Has been some concern with some projects getting funded that wouldn’t have been considered as regional high priorities (example given was the Sunriver/97 paving project. This also speaks to the need to have projects ready for quick turnaround funding opportunities).
• The group questioned about how it is to advise the OTC if there isn’t a formal means for providing ACT input on an ongoing basis? Should the ACT Chairs be at OTC meetings? Are there other examples of specific types of feedback desired by the OTC?
  o How can we more effectively engage with the OTC, but also other bodies such as the legislature, to get our needs met better?
  o The group would like to provide input to the OTC on policy/legislative/funding issues, but also to engage legislators and other bodies (e.g. LOC, AOC, OTF) separately.

3) Are there other goals that you have for COACT?

• Discussion about the role of aviation in the overarching transportation network. They have a separate agency and some of their funding sources, e.g. ConnectOR, have been decreasing. Would like to see aviation more integrated into the overall system.
• Discussion about adding a law enforcement component to the COACT table – i.e. we should be focusing on not just engineering and programming but enforcement as well.
  o This is one example of how COACT could provide a broader forum for other dimensions of transportation
• After the different modal plans are adopted, we should hear about how they are being implemented and evaluated. Can help us better understand how to connect with them.
• Develop more-detailed transportation budgets for ODOT showing the maintenance program, capital program, etc. and what their prognosis is given HB 2017.

4) Would it be a good use of COACT resources to develop “Area Strategies”? These Area Strategies would be derived from local Transportation System Plans (TSPs) and Facility Plans and would serve as a basis for prioritizing investments in the future. Area Strategies would include prioritization across modes as well as include the entire transportation system – including state and local systems.
• Yes, this overlaps with the stated interest in building a list of high-level regional priorities discussed above.
  
o Perhaps not at the fine level of detail because that is duplicative of existing work. Depends on what the OTC is looking for here.
  
o For all modes.
  
o Should include consideration of major disasters like Cascadia and how we are, or are not, incorporating that into the regional transportation network and priorities.

5) Given the goals that you have for COACT, how would you like to accomplish them? Are there any processes that COACT should engage in to achieve those goals? (For example – if COACT is going to “advocate Central Oregon transportation issues to neighboring regions, area legislators, and other interested organizations,” how should we accomplish that goal?)

No discussion on this point.

6) Are there any changes to meeting structure and frequency, group composition, governance, etc. that would help achieve those goals?

• There was some discussion of having more frequent TAC meetings to realize the goals we outlined.
• Primary desire here is to return to this question after the OTC provides new direction. Should tailor our tool (e.g. meeting frequency, types of meetings, etc.) to the goals we identify.
Aviation System Action Program (ASAP)

Central Oregon ACT
COAR Grant Program

- COAR Grant Program is funded through aviation fuel and jet fuel taxes.

- The program funds projects in the following categories and according to the following priority order:
  - 1st priority – Assist with match requirements for FAA AIP grants
  - 2nd priority – Safety and infrastructure development
  - 3rd priority – Aviation-related economic benefits related to airports
COAR Cycle 2018-19 Timeline

September 17 – October 19
Grant application available.

October 22 – November 2
ODA’s completeness review

November 2 – December 21
ACT review and grading

January 16
Aviation Review Committee compiles project list to recommend to Aviation Board

February
Aviation Board reviews, reprioritizes (as needed) and approves recommended apps

February and on going
Staff notifies awarded projects and begins the agreement process
ACT Review

Statutory Considerations - The reviewing ACTs must take into consideration the following statutory considerations, as per ORS 367.084:

(6) In selecting transportation projects the commission shall consider:

(a) Whether a proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor;

(b) Whether a proposed transportation project results in an economic benefit to this state;

(c) Whether a proposed transportation project is a critical link connecting elements of Oregon’s transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system;

(d) How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant from any source other than the Connect Oregon Fund;

(e) Whether a proposed transportation project is ready for construction; and

(f) Whether a proposed transportation project has a useful life expectancy that offers maximum benefit to the state.
ACT Review

• Each ACT will complete the substantive review of the applications and complete the ACT Review form.

• ODA and the Aviation Review Committee created criteria applicable to the ACT review form.
Frequently Asked Questions

• Does the ACT rank projects?
  o The ACT’s role in the COAR grant process is to review applications for airports within their ACT and complete one review sheet per project application, based upon the applicant’s responses.
  o The application scoring is formulated based upon the selections made on the review forms.
  o It will be at the discretion of each ACT to review the collective list of statewide projects and provide their preferences to their member serving on the Aviation Review Committee (ARC), but ultimately it will be the ARC that will rank and recommend projects to the State Aviation Board.
Overview
HB 2017 (Keep Oregon Moving) Sections 11 and 12 require us to collect and display some performance and accountability information online. We’re calling this the Transparency, Accountability and Performance Website.

Requirements and Current Status
Keep Oregon Moving Sections 11 and 12 require ODOT to post or link to:

Bridge and pavement condition reports from cities, counties, and ODOT
- Worked with the Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities to develop bridge and pavement conditions reporting standards that were approved by Oregon Transportation Commission.
- Communicated with local agencies about pending reporting requirement, including providing a guide and a video to help agencies prepare for reporting.
- Developing web form for collecting local agency condition reports. User testing targeted for October.

Information on transportation projects in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
- ODOT’s Project Tracker map or project web pages already include all required information except amount spent to date.
- Project team is working on enhancements to ODOT’s Project Tracker to display and quality test amount spent to date information.

On-time and on-budget information on completed projects
- A task group is finalizing the processes and determining the best visualization for displaying the data.

City and county transportation spending reports from Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities.
- LOC and AOC are required to report city and county transportation spending in various categories to the Legislative Assembly annually.
- ODOT is working closely with AOC and LOC to ensure data is accessible and can be linked to.

Internal audit results approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission
- Working with ODOT Audit Section to ensure reports are posted.
Project websites for city, county, and Connect Oregon transportation projects

- The web form that is being developed for collecting bridge and pavement condition reports will also be used to collect project website addresses from local agencies.

To be Accomplished by ODOT before February 1, 2019

Highlights include:

- Design and build TAP site landing page. Identify and develop method for displaying various reporting components.
- Provide local governments with bridge condition data.
- Develop and test local government reporting interface. Provide training to local governments on submitting the required information online.
- Develop and communicate process for suspending highway funds to agencies that fail to report.
- Implement communication plan.

Timeline

- Now: Communicate with local governments, associations and others.
- October 2018: Local bridge condition report shared with local agencies.
- October 2018: Test reporting web form.
- December 2018: Web form and instructions sent to local agencies.
- January 2019: Virtual question and answer session to help local agencies report.
- February 2019: Infrastructure condition reports received from local governments.
- April 1, 2019: OTC reports infrastructure conditions to legislature.
- December 1, 2019: OTC certifies compliance to legislature.
CITY AND COUNTY
Guide for bridge and pavement condition reporting

Oregon Department of Transportation
You’ve got to report on your bridge and pavement conditions — Now what?

Here at ODOT, we’re pros at evaluating pavement conditions. So are some of you in cities and counties! Others of you have never done this before and do not have the resources to become experts. To help us all meet the expectations in HB 2017, Section 11, we’ve developed this brief guide and a helpful video.

What’s required?
Section 11 of House Bill 2017, Keep Oregon Moving, requires the Oregon Transportation Commission, in coordination with counties and cities, to develop a set of uniform standards for describing and reporting on the condition of the transportation infrastructure owned by the state, counties and cities. It requires the following:

- The infrastructure must include pavement and bridges.
- Every city and county must submit the report to ODOT by February 1 of each odd-numbered year, starting in 2019.
- The reports are to be posted on an ODOT transparency and accountability website.
- Any city or county that doesn’t file a report may not receive any payments from the State Highway Fund until the report is filed.

The Oregon Transportation Commission adopted standards supported by cities and counties in 2018. To make this mandate easier to meet and focus on the most important routes, the standards require cities and counties to report only on the conditions of paved federal-aid roadways within their jurisdictional responsibility. Local agencies without any paved federal-aid roads will check a box on the report documenting they have no federal-aid roadways in their jurisdictions and report on their Certified Road Mileage.

Pavement Reporting:
It’s as easy as 1, 2, 3!
In order to make reporting easy, we’ve boiled it down to three easy steps.

1. Check the map: Use the maps linked below to find your federal-aid roads that you have to report on. If you don’t have any federal-aid roads, skip to step 3.
2. Go survey: Use the tools and examples in this document to rate pavement conditions as good, fair, or poor. We’ve also produced a video to help you visualize the process. For bridges, ODOT will post your bridge condition data online.
3. Report: Enter your summary pavement and bridge condition data in an online form ODOT is creating. If you city or county doesn’t have any federal-aid roads, click the box showing that you have sent us your Certified Road Mileage.

How do I find my federal-aid roadways?
The Federal-aid system is shown on ODOT’s city and county maps, and ODOT has developed an interactive mapping tool that shows federal-aid roads along with city and county boundaries.

Paved roadways are defined as hard surfaced roadways consisting of jointed Portland cement concrete, asphalt concrete or bituminous surfacing (oil mat surfacing).
Unimproved, gravel, brick or stone roadways are excluded from reporting requirements.

How will I survey my pavement conditions?
Don’t put it off! Pavement needs to be dry in order to get good results. Be sure to collect your pavement data this summer or fall, before rain or snow arrives. You can use whatever collection process works best for you as long as you are able to report pavement condition as good, fair and poor. Attachment A shows photos and descriptions of the three condition categories. You can also view a video describing these categories.

How will I report pavement conditions?
We will provide a website with a secure and easy-to-use report form. The form will ask for total centerline mileage of paved federal-aid roadway within your agency’s jurisdiction, as well as a breakdown of pavement graded as good, fair and poor. If your city or county isn’t responsible for any federal-aid roadways, you must report that you have zero miles and check the box to tell us you have submitted your agency’s Certified Mileage total to the ODOT Road Inventory and Classification Unit.

Bridge Reporting:
How will I get bridge data?
Local governments must also report information on the condition of all their bridges, whether they are on federal-aid highways or not. ODOT maintains bridge condition data and will post this data online so local governments can report by the deadline. In October we will pull a report on the conditions of local bridges. The report will list individual bridges by jurisdiction with the condition of each bridge as of October 2018.

How will I report bridge conditions?
Using the October 2018 local bridge condition report as a resource, you’ll fill in the number of bridges in your jurisdiction and the total number of bridges each category: good, fair, poor. You’ll also have a space to provide additional information if needed.

The website and report form will be available toward the end of 2018. We will notify cities and counties when the form is ready.

If you have questions, email us at Transparency@odot.state.or.us.
### Asphalt

**How does it look?**
- Pavement is stable, with a new or lightly worn appearance.
- Minor cracking may be present, but cracks are generally less than ¼" wide or are well sealed.
- May have sporadic cracking in the wheel paths with no or only a few interconnecting cracks and no areas that are breaking up into smaller pieces.
- No noticeable material from underneath the road surface has moved.
- There may be minor patching.

**How is the ride?**
- Good riding qualities.
- Rutting may be present but is generally less than ½".

### Concrete

**How does it look?**
- Original surface texture may be worn in wheel tracks exposing some coarse gravel.
- An occasional crack, but cracks are tight.
- There is no concrete break up.
- There are no sections that are higher/lower than others at the joint. There may be places where sections are higher or lower but they are less than ⅛".

**How is the ride?**
- Ride qualities are good.
- Rutting may be present but is generally less than ½".
Asphalt
How does it look?
• Pavement structure is generally stable with only minor areas of structural weakness or deterioration evident.
• Cracks, if present, have widths generally less than \( \frac{3}{4} \)".
• Wheel paths may have widespread, but not continuous, cracking with no or only a few interconnected cracks and no break up or places where the surface underneath has moved.
• Interconnected cracks forming complete patterns, or with break up or movement, are very small localized areas and not representative of the rest of the section.
• The pavement may be patched but not excessively.

How is the ride?
• Although riding qualities are good, deformation is more pronounced and easily noticed.
• Rutting may be present but is less than \( \frac{3}{4} \)".

Concrete
How does it look?
• A few concrete panels may have cracks, corner breaks, or divided slabs with no more than minor break up or areas above or below the surface at the cracks.
• Patches made of concrete material may be present and are in good condition.

How is the ride?
• There may be sections that are higher/lower than others at the joints, but the ride is still good.
• Rutting may be present but is less than \( \frac{3}{4} \)".
Asphalt

How does it look?
• Areas of instability, structural deficiency, or advanced pavement deterioration are frequent.
• Large crack patterns, heavy and numerous patches, potholes, or deformation is very noticeable.

How is the ride?
• Riding qualities range from acceptable to poor.
• Rutting, if present, is generally greater than ¾”.

Concrete

How does it look?
• Many concrete panels exhibit large cracks, corner breaks, or divided slabs.
• Some joints and cracks show loss of support from underneath.
• Patches may be present and are deteriorated or made of non-concrete material.
• Places where parts of the road rise above or below the road surface have a major effect on ride quality.

How is the ride?
• Ride qualities range from acceptable to poor.
• Rutting, if present, is generally greater than ¾”.