



ALEX CUYLER

Intergovernmental Relations Manager
Alex.Cuyler@co.lane.or.us

DATE: June 6, 2017

TO: Joint Committee on Transportation Preservation and Modernization

RE: HB 2017, relating to transportation

Co-Chairs Senator Beyer, Representative McKeown and members of the Committee:

In the lead up to the 2017 Legislative Assembly, the Lane County Board of Commissioners placed the “transportation package” as one of its highest priorities. The Board has reviewed the -3 amendment to HB 2017 and makes the following comments:

- Section 71a appropriates \$107.95 to transportation projects within ODOT’s region 2, but fails to provide any specificity with respect to the actual projects listed in section 5 of that section. This is important to Lane County, particularly for the listed project at (5)(e), Territorial Highway. The detail should be in the next version of the measure to avoid any future conflicts.
- Section 119g is in need of a minor amendment such that it becomes more functional for those counties with a CRD, but that also have identified congestion relief projects which are outside of the bounds of the CRD. Such is the case in Lane County, as we are very large county with at least two key state facility improvement projects that would benefit from the revenue generating mechanism of the CRD.
- Section 71d identifies a suite of priority projects which are to be funded upon a set of approval criteria at subsection (3) of that section. We have become aware of a dispute over the language at (2)(a) regarding the specific location of the Valley Transmodal Facility, identified in the -3 amendment as being located in Lane County, with \$25M being directed to Lane County. We believe Lane County would be an ideal location for such a facility, but are aware there are other locations within the Willamette Valley that have also been working to establish such a facility. The bill should outline more appropriate selection criteria for these funds, and other agencies such as Department of Agriculture and the Oregon Business Development Department should be asked to assist the Department of Transportation with its review.

I have submitted additional information on these issues to your Committee Administrator.

Finally, we express our appreciation for the huge amount of work that has gone into this project. We see safety priorities throughout the measure, which is consistent with the interim Committee’s public testimony from its late summer hearing at the University of Oregon.

SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY