Oregon Freight Advisory Committee
February 25, 2004

Introductions

Freight Advisory Committee Chair, Tom Zelenka, opened the meeting at 1:00 PM. Self-introductions were made.

Local Bridge Project Selection Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (HBRR) Committee Recommendation

Handouts:

- HBRR Committee Recommendation to Oregon Transportation Commission, Local Bridge Projects to be Selected for Funding Under 2003 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
- February 12, 2004 letter to the Oregon Transportation Commission from David Bragdon, Metro Council President, and Rod Park, Metro Council District 1, Chair, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

On behalf of Metro and JPACT, Bridget Wieghart spoke to the FAC regarding the Sellwood Bridge, which the HBRR Committee did not recommend for funding under the 2003 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The Portland Transportation System Plan (TSP) lists the Sellwood Bridge as being on a Minor Truck Route. A Minor Truck Route in the City's TSP is meant for local deliveries or pickups. Metro and JPACT agree this bridge clearly meets the criteria for serving local commerce, if not more.

The application materials indicated that historically, 23% of HBRR funds has been targeted to large bridges. By choosing not to recommend the Sellwood Bridge for funding, Metro and JPACT feel that the FAC is not meeting the 23% guideline.

Steve Gerber supported Bridget's comments. He pointed out that even though the bridge is designated as a Minor Truck Route, it is an important part of the overall system and not dealing with that part of the system would affect the overall freight system within the city of Portland.

Doug Tindall, Interim Chair of the HBRR Committee, provided a status report on the HBRR Committee's recommendations, the process for which was described in detail at the January 26 meeting. The HBRR Committee, which has two City, two County and three ODOT representatives, made the difficult decision to remove the Sellwood Bridge from the list of recommended projects. He said that the list of projects was presented to the Oregon Transportation Commission on February 19 for their information. On March 3, the OTC will meet by telephone to make a final decision regarding the list.

Bob Russell then reviewed work of the FAC's Local Bridge Subcommittee. The Sellwood Bridge issue was a struggle from the standpoint that HB 2041 contained specific criteria for project selection, which are different than the traditional methods of project selection that ODOT

has employed. When the process began, the FAC Projects Subcommittee and HBRR Committee worked on parallel tracks. The hope was that in the end, consensus would be reached and a unified position could be presented to the OTC. In the initial stages the process needed to move quickly. As a result, some changes happened mid stream. For example, it was originally thought that the freight screen would be part of the technical ranking score. After reading HB 2041, there was a threshold question. Victor Dodier and Doug Tindall went through all of the applications to identify which bridge deficiencies represented a barrier to freight mobility. From that point forward, projects had to meet that minimum qualification before being considered. The HBRR Committee initially started with their traditional approach, which was 23% of the funding would be dedicated to large bridges and the remainder to small bridges. However, there was nothing in HB 2041 regarding a split between big and small bridges. When the Sellwood Bridge application was reviewed, the question became, "should it be replaced with this pot of money?" The Local Bridge Subcommittee felt that using the $43 million requested for the Sellwood Bridge would have a greater contribution to freight mobility if the funds were used to replace or repair small bridges.

Another factor that went into the subcommittee's decision was the Sellwood Bridge has been weight restricted at 64,000 pounds for 20 years. This supports its designation as a Minor Truck Route serving origins and destinations within southeast Portland. The bridge does not appear to serve regional and national markets.

Even under the best of conditions the Sellwood Bridge would cost about $90 million to replace. That cost could fluctuate because preliminary engineering and environmental work have not yet been done. Multnomah County has not identified any funding sources for the remaining cost of replacing the bridge. Based on these and other factors, the Local Bridge Subcommittee voted not to recommend the Sellwood Bridge for OTIA III local bridge funding.

In conjunction with the Oregon Farm Bureau, Oregon Forest Products Transportation Association, Oregon Refuse and Recycling Association, and Manufactured Homes Association, the Oregon Trucking Associations (OTA) conducted nine meetings around the state. Truckers, local governmental officials, and ACT members were invited to attend meetings. Local representatives reviewed each bridge for its freight mobility significance. OTA Board of Directors voted unanimously to support the recommended list of small bridges. They did not vote to support funding for the Sellwood Bridge.

Doug Tindall said that under the HBRR recommendation, there are 138 bridges in 32 counties that would be fully funded. There is one bridge that would be partially funded. The applicant would be responsible for identifying any remaining funding.

In response to a question from Susie Lahsene on whether or not the Sellwood Bridge meets the criteria for freight mobility, Doug Tindall said there were a couple of issues when the HBRR Committee evaluated the application for the Sellwood Bridge. One was that the application from Multnomah County and the subsequent information from them indicated that replacing the bridge would increase truck traffic on the bridge and Tacoma Street. Mr. Tindall questioned how to reconcile that with the South Willamette Riverfront Crossing Study, which said that the intention was to limit capacity on Tacoma Street and to make improvements on other regional

routes. He did not feel he received an acceptable answer. Multnomah County and ODOT disagree as to whether a new bridge should be two or four lanes wide and how a bridge with four lanes would connect to a two lane street (Tacoma Street).

Susie Lahsene noted that a project done in phases could be considered fully funded if preliminary engineering, for example, were called "phase one" of that project. She suggested that the FAC take a look at funding preliminary engineering as long as a commitment is made by Multnomah County regarding the remaining funds that are needed.

DE Bridges said the trucks crossing the Sellwood Bridge are most likely lightweight delivery trucks. The industrial community in that area of Portland does not use the bridge for what he calls "real freight." Real freight, in his opinion, moves locally and nationally. He feels it is very important for a small community like Falls City to receive funding to repair a bridge which serves 50,000 acres of timber. If those 50,000 acres of timber are accessible, many jobs would be available. Mr. Bridges has a similar concern with the Oswego Canal Bridge (#6 on the recommended list). That bridge serves a residential community and he feels it should not be considered for funding under this funding source.

Tom Zelenka reminded meeting attendees that the FAC must focus on freight mobility. Everyone agrees the Sellwood Bridge needs to be replaced. If there is an indictment of the process, it would be the absence of agreement on a long-term transportation solution for the south Portland area. The historic genesis of the split in funding (23% to big bridges) was to protect the "little guys." The bill emphasizes the need for economic stimulus, sooner rather than later. Since preliminary engineering and environmental work have not been completed for the Sellwood Bridge, the cost would increase and the timelines would lengthen. He is concerned that Metro documents on regional freight do not mention the Sellwood Bridge. This pot of money may not be the correct one to use for the Sellwood Bridge.

In response to a question about whether a bridge project could be funded partially with OTIA III funding and partially with other funds, Doug Tindall said yes but that many jurisdictions would not be able to match the funds.

Doug Tindall said that subsequent to the February 19 OTC meeting, the assistant attorney general was asked by the OTC to find out whether HB 2041 would allow projects which were partially funded. The FAC would also like to know the answer. Mr. Tindall could not answer this question. Susie Lahsene agreed to frame the question in an email to Gregg Dal Ponte who offered to distribute an answer to members of the Local Bridge Subcommittee after it is received.

Martin Callery moved to adopt the recommended list of bridge projects as developed (excluding the Sellwood Bridge). Bob Russell seconded the motion. DE Bridges supported the motion, but noted he still had a concern regarding the Oswego Canal Bridge. By vote of the Freight Advisory Committee the motion was approved with several dissenting votes.

Chair Zelenka thanked the Local Bridge Subcommittee and all those who worked so hard in gathering information and preparing the recommended list of bridge projects.

Gregg Dal Ponte recognized Victor Dodier his efforts and dedication to this process.

Update – FAC Freight Projects Subcommittee Work

Handouts:

- FAC Freight Projects Subcommittee Work Towards Freight Mobility Project Selection (PowerPoint presentation)
- Draft 2-25-2004 Questions/Comments/Issues
- Identifying High Priority Freight Mobility Projects – Summary of the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee Approach, February 2004
- Prioritizing Freight Mobility Projects (presentation for the NWTC, February 11, 2004)
- Gregg Dal Ponte's Summary of his 1-26-2004 FAC Meeting Comments
- Draft HB 2011 Opportunity Sites (as initially identified on 12-15-03; last updated 2-25-04)

As follow up from the January FAC meeting, Gregg Dal Ponte prepared a brief summary of his comments regarding the Freight Project Subcommittee's recommendation on receiving oral input from the ACTs, MPOs, and other groups and the FAC's role under HB 2041, Section 11 regarding freight mobility, access to industrial lands, and/or access to job creation sites.

Steve Kale developed a Freight Mobility Projects Web link on the FAC Web site that includes a three page summary on identifying high priority freight mobility projects. He also delivered a presentation on prioritizing freight mobility projects at the Northwest Transportation Conference held in Corvallis on February 11, 2004.

March 1 is the deadline for ACTs, MPOs, and others to submit high priority freight mobility project materials. Those materials should focus on identifying projects for the 2006-2009 STIP and on identifying projects for HB 2041, Section 11. Materials should be sent to Martin Callery by email and/or surface mail by the March 1 deadline.

After March 1, Mr. Callery will forward all submitted materials to ODOT staff who will develop a master spreadsheet of projects. They will also make the submitted materials available in electronic form through the FAC Web site.

The Freight Projects Subcommittee has not yet fully decided how the rest of the process will go, but plans are to review submitted materials and evaluate which additional projects should be added to the list. They will also review and rate each of the 56+ projects according to the prioritization factors. After the review is complete, a tiered list of first, second and third highest priority projects will be developed for the FAC to review on March 30. The FAC will then submit its recommendations to the OTC (on or before April 6 for inclusion in the OTC agenda packet) for the April 28-29 Commission meeting in Coos Bay.

Bob Russell plans to schedule more statewide information gathering meetings after the list of 56+ projects is more "solidified" with some priorities established.

Chair Zelenka said that the projects should be reviewed and evaluated based on whether they are multimodal in nature and whether they would create or retain jobs.

Bob Russell said that it is difficult to prioritize these projects because of the different funding sources involved – some have federal earmarks, some are already in the STIP, etc. He hopes that after the OTC identifies funding sources, the FAC will have another opportunity to provide input. Randy Papé responded that the OTC wants to increase the emphasis on the multimodal aspect of the transportation system.

Nick Fortey asked the FAC to consider developing additional data sources that would help the MPOs develop their regional plans and for the rest of the state as it continues to make investment decisions. Having better data would help to make better decisions in the future.

Short Sea Shipping Initiative

Presentation: Short Sea Shipping Initiative

Lyn McClelland, U.S. Maritime Administration, said that short sea shipping is defined as waterborne cargo movement that does not cross an ocean. The Maritime Administration is supporting the U.S. merchant marine maritime industry to help grow a fleet that can move domestic cargo and a reasonable portion of international trade by water.

Embedded in a law that passed Congress on January 20 was a section that required the Maritime Administration to report to the House and Senate committees on appropriations, within 90 days from passage of the act, on congestion in major container ports around the country and all the strategic ports which handle military goods. On February 16, Ms. McClelland met with representatives from Washington, D.C., the Port of Portland and others to talk about congestion and how it affects efficiency through the port.

The U.S. waterway system has about 9,000 marine cargo facilities and about 350 major container or commercial cargo ports. There are 25,000 miles of inland and coastal waterways connecting 152,000 miles of rail, 460,000 miles of pipelines and 45,000 miles of interstate highways. One standard East Coast barge tow carries the payload of 180 trucks. The fuel required to power a truck 100 kilometers will power a vessel 370 kilometers. Barges carry 27% percent of the containers that move through the Port of Portland. Another 15% move by rail and 58% move by truck service to the port.

Many factors contribute to why the U.S. needs short sea shipping. Among them are congestion, truck/traffic safety issues and air pollution in urban areas. Economic growth relies on a smooth flow of goods and adequate infrastructure to handle increases in goods movement.

Some of the challenges faced by short sea shipping include the formation of partnerships with the trucking industry; implementing a single bill-of-lading interface and shore-side distribution systems; and developing reliable schedules with trucking, rail, and/or ocean container connections. Another challenge comes from the Jones Act which requires that freight moving

between ports in the United States must move on U.S. owned, registered and crewed vessels, which increases costs.

In conclusion, Ms. McClelland said that there is a need to establish a national intermodal freight policy that integrates robust short sea shipping within the U.S. marine transportation system. She also said that a big issue is educating the public, including state departments of transportation, metropolitan planning organizations, shippers, railroads, and truckers about the benefits of short sea shipping.

Future initiatives include the development of partnerships with the public and private sectors and creation of a Maritime Administration short sea shipping program.

Urban Commodity Flow Data Collection and Analysis Using Global Positioning Systems

Presentation: Portland Commodity Flow Data Collection

Susie Lahsene introduced Dr. Thanit Puthpongsiriporn of Oregon State University, Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering. She believes the FAC has an opportunity to be better informed on where commodities are moving on the road system and what parts of the road network are particularly troublesome for some industries.

Dr. Puthpongsiriporn said that the Portland Commodity Flow Data Collection is a collaborative effort between OSU, the Port of Portland and Metro. It is sponsored by Transportation Northwest (TransNow), which is headquartered at the University of Washington and is considered a showcase for transportation research and education in the Pacific Northwest.

The Portland Commodity Flow Data Collection effort is intended to improve the speed and efficiency of commodity flow by better understanding the role that the trucking industry plays and the requirements it places upon the infrastructure supported by the Oregon Department of Transportation.

The project objectives include collecting freight transportation data, focusing on Portland to improve the Metro commodity flow model. The project will also evaluate the effectiveness of Global Positioning System (GPS) technology for the collection of commodity flow data.

A pilot study to be conducted in about a month is intended to provide a better understanding of commodity flow inside the Portland metro area. It will target carriers that make local deliveries at intermodal terminals and warehouses in the Portland area.

The types of data to be collected will be routing information, truck classification, commodity type and tonnage. Drivers selected for the pilot study will need to interact with the data collection system very little. Any data collected will be anonymous and cannot be used in any other way than the data collection specific to the pilot study.

Dr. Puthpongsiriporn asked FAC members to contact him if they knew of any trucking companies that might be willing to participate in the pilot study.

Susie Lahsene emphasized that the pilot study will test the technologies, not generate the data. Ultimately, if the technology works and is feasible, it can be used to help improve the data collection process.

Bob Russell said that OTA has already provided contact information on three major warehouses in Portland. Gregg Dal Ponte offered to provide contact information for ODOT's ITS office.

Freight Planning in Portland

Presentation: Freight Planning in Portland

Steve Gerber, City of Portland, provided an overview of Portland's freight planning efforts. In late 2002, Portland adopted a Transportation System Plan. In 2003 the city formed a freight committee that began to work toward a freight master plan. An open house for the freight master plan was held in February 2004. A Freight Framework Plan and Implementation Plan will go before the City Council in July of 2004 and 2005 respectively.

Mr. Gerber's presentation covered freight tonnage growth, freight-related employment, freight movement "drivers," implications for Portland from growth in freight volumes by all modes, and the need to improve freight movement in the Portland area.

He also reviewed the objectives of the Portland Freight Master Plan, which include identifying opportunities to improve operations and provide for conflict resolution, updating policies and regulations.

The Freight Master Plan will be completed in two phases. Phase one (Framework) will focus on policy analysis and recommendations, issues identification, project listings, street improvement guidelines, and education and public involvement. Phase two (Implementation) will focus on policy recommendations, needs analysis, additional project listings from needs analysis, funding alternatives for the freight system, area or site projects, TSP modal plan amendments or update, and education and public involvement.

The City of Portland and Mr. Gerber were acknowledged for their work in regard to the Portland Freight Master Plan.

Roundtable

Bob Russell would like the FAC to have an opportunity to hear the presentation regarding federal funds flexibility which was given at the February Transportation Commission workshop.

Next Meeting/Adjournment

The Freight Advisory Committee will schedule a meeting in late March. The FAC will be notified when a date is chosen.

Chair Zelenka adjourned the meeting at 4:15 PM.