



## Safety & Mobility Policy Advisory Committee

### MEETING SUMMARY

February 26, 2025  
10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.  
Via Microsoft Teams

#### MEMBERS:

- ☐ Steve Bates, OTA
- ☐ Kevin Campbell, AAA
- ☒ Ed Chamberland, ACEC
- ☒ Marie Dodds, AAA
- ☐ Jason Fender, TFT Const.
- ☒ Stratos Flanders, Knife River
- ☐ John Gambatese, OSU
- ☒ Walt Gamble, AGC
- ☒ Mark Gibson, OTA
- ☒ Erik Havig, ODOT
- ☒ John Hickey, APAO
- ☒ Jana Jarvis, OTA
- ☐ David Kim, Chair
- ☐ Evan Sether, OSP
- ☒ Erik Zander, OTA

#### RESOURCES:

- ☒ Christy Jordan, ODOT
- ☐ Angela Kargel, ODOT
- ☒ Mike Kimlinger, ODOT
- ☐ Justin Moderie, ODOT
- ☒ Oscar Njuju, ODOT
- ☐ Audrey Lawson, ODOT
- ☐ Tova Peltz, ODOT
- ☐ Carla Phelps, ODOT
- ☐ Amy Ramsdell, ODOT
- ☒ Katie Scott, ODOT

#### FACILITATOR:

- ☒ Bill Gross, Mobility Program

#### GUESTS:

- ☒ Katherine Benenati, ODOT  
Communications
- ☒ Jason Armstrong, Wildish  
Construction

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS AND OUTCOME
<b>Roll Call, Minutes &amp; Agenda Review</b> Bill Gross & Mike Kimlinger	Bill Gross took roll call. Draft minutes from the <a href="#">January 7, 2025</a> meeting were approved. Mike Kimlinger chaired the meeting in place of David Kim who could not attend due to a schedule conflict. Mike welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda topics for the meeting.
<b>Work Zone Safety Awareness Week Update</b> Katherine Benenati	Katherine Benenati said Work Zone Safety Awareness Week is scheduled for April 21 <sup>st</sup> thru 25 <sup>th</sup> . She said this year's theme will emphasize the wide range of professionals working in and around highway work zones—not just construction workers, but also incident responders, state troopers, tow truck drivers, maintenance crews, flaggers, and cleanup teams.  Katherine said ODOT is planning a news media event at the Capitol State Park in Salem at noon on April 22 <sup>nd</sup> . She said ODOT Director Strickler is confirmed to speak, and they plan to invite Governor Kotek, OTC

	<p>Chair Brown, and key legislators to speak and participate as well. She said they have also reached out to key partners, including SEIU, AWE, AGC, APAO, OSP, and the Oregon Tow Truck Association, to collaborate on the event. Katherine said they are also searching for ODOT employees who would be willing to talk about their personal experiences in or near work zones at the event.</p> <p>Walt Gamble suggested having the winning work zone safety billboards from the recent high school contest on display. John Hickey suggested having the next round of winners attend (depending on the timing of announcing the next winners) and introduce them at the event. Katherine said she will look into incorporating those suggestions.</p>
<p><b>Legislative Update</b> Mike Kimlinger</p>	<p>Mike Kimlinger asked John Hickey to lead the discussion, since he attended the legislative hearing. John said there were two panels testifying at the Joint Committee on Transportation hearing in favor of Senate Bill 711, which provides for issuing citations using automated speed safety cameras in work zones. (Mike Kimlinger provided <a href="#">a link to a recording</a> of the committee hearing testimony.) John said the panel included himself, Jason Fender, Ed Chamberland and Stratos Flanders. John said he felt overall, the committee was positive towards the bill. He said the concept of the bill is to have ODOT and OSP create a program for using the cameras, and any revenue generated from the citations would be used to cover program operating costs. He said there would be signs in the work zones notifying drivers that the cameras are being used.</p> <p>John said there wouldn't be cameras installed in every work zone. He said there would be a limited number of units that could be used strategically at different locations. Jana Jarvis commented that an important aspect of the system is that it would only be applicable when workers are present in a work zone. Ed Chamberland asked if ODOT and OSP could comment on the bill. Mike Kimlinger said the governor must give permission for agencies to comment on legislation.</p>
<p><b>Mobility Program Performance Metrics</b> Bill Gross &amp; Christy Jordan</p>	<p>Bill Gross shared a slide presentation that included the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobility project review performance measures</li> <li>• A performance measure established for ORS 366.215 Stakeholder Forum reviews (including other project review activity)</li> <li>• Project re-vet activity</li> </ul> <p>Bill said topics for a future SMPAC meeting would include results from the program's recent customer satisfaction survey and training. Christy Jordan explained that the performance measures were adopted by the Mobility Program as a result of the Secretary of State audit that was published in September 2020.</p> <p><b>Project Review Performance Measures:</b></p> <p>Bill explained that these performance measures are related to the Mobility Considerations Checklist, which is used by the Mobility Services Team (MST) to analyze temporary work zone safety and mobility impacts related to work zones. He said analysis of these forms represents the bulk of the work done by</p>

program staff, and that project review criteria in the Mobility Advisory Committee (MAC) [Charter](#) determines if and how these impacts are shared with the committee for input. Christy further explained that the following two performance measures were adopted, from a change framework project that looked at the review process to determine appropriate review timeframes:

- 120 calendar days: This is the target for regions to submit checklists to the MST for review prior to their desired deadline for having the document signed-off.
- 60 calendar days: This is the target for the MST to complete its review of the forms (including, if necessary, sharing with the MAC).

Bill shared the following slide showing Mobility Checklist review data over the previous two years:

Statistic	2023 Results	2024 Results
Total Checklists reviewed and signed-off	90 Checklists	92 Checklists
Average calendar days for the Mobility Services Team to complete a Checklist review <i>(target is no more than 60 calendar days)</i>	38 Days	41 Days
*Average calendar days before the sign-off deadline that Regions submitted their checklist for review <i>(target is at least 120 calendar days)</i>	78 Days	71 Days
<i>*Note: Even though the 120-day target was not met, no projects were delayed as a result.</i>		

Bill said that even though the regions overall did not meet the 120-day target, it has not been an issue as many projects with moderate/minor impacts often don't require that much lead time for a review. Also, no projects have been delayed as a result. Christy added that the program will likely adjust the targets down, now that there is historic data available.

Bill then shared the following slide that breaks down how the Checklists are shared with the MAC for input, depending on the impact severity as defined in the [MAC Charter](#):

Statistic	2023 Results	2024 Results
Not shared with the MAC (Impacts were considered <u>low</u> )	41%	46%
Shared via <u>email</u> (Impacts were considered <u>moderate</u> )	34%	38%
Shared at a <u>MAC meeting</u> (Impacts were considered <u>high</u> )	19%	11%
Shared via <u>email</u> and <u>MAC meeting</u> (Impacts initially shared via email, then followed up at a meeting for further clarification/discussion)	6%	5%

### ORS 366.215 Stakeholder Forum and other MAC Review Activity:

Christy said the Mobility Program adopted a performance measure indicating that collaboration efforts between ODOT and its stakeholder partners will result in at least 95% of permanent reductions subject to the statute will be supported by the Stakeholder Forum. She said the intent of the performance measure is to ensure that the MST is providing the tools and resources to set up the regions for success when presenting projects to the committee; and to ensure the Stakeholder Forum is receiving the information it needs to provide its recommendations to the agency.

Bill shared the following slide showing Stakeholder Forum review data over the previous two years:

ORS 366.215 Stakeholder Forum Reviews	2023 Results	2024 Results
Number of projects seeking Stakeholder Forum support	30	18
*Percentage supported first time by the Stakeholder Forum	97%	94%
Percentage supported overall by the Stakeholder Forum	100%	100%

*\*Note: A total of two projects (one in each year) did not receive initial support when first shared with the Stakeholder Forum. Both projects have since been supported after follow-up meetings.*

Bill shared the following slide showing MAC support for Temporary Impacts and Permanent (Non-ORS 366.215) Impacts:

Temporary Impacts (Mobility Checklist Sign-Off)	2023 Results	2024 Results
Total seeking support	19	11
*Percentage supported first time shared	89%	55%
Percentage supported overall	100%	100%
<p><i>*Note: A total of 7 projects were initially not supported, and all were supported in subsequent email follow-ups. It is important to note that only "high impact" temporary work zone projects are shared in a meeting, and these 7 projects represent less than 4% of the 182 Checklists signed off during the 2-year timeframe.</i></p>		
Permanent (Non-ORS 366.215) Impacts	2023 Results	2024 Results
Total seeking support	1	1
Percentage supported	100%	0%

Mark Gibson asked if there were any underlying reasons for the temporary impacts that were not supported the first time. Christy said there were a variety of reasons including requests to reduce the advanced notification timeframes for accommodating unannounced oversize loads and concerns for Critical Route Pair conflicts.

Erik Zander commented that he believes the data shows that the MAC process is working. He said just because a project doesn't get supported the first time, isn't necessarily a bad thing. He said the last thing we should do is rush a review of mobility and work zone safety through the process.

Ed Chamberland asked if follow-up meetings or emails caused any delays to a project reaching its PS&E (Plans, Specifications & Estimates) deadline. Christy said that has never happened, and that these statistics are consistent with the recent internal audit which found most projects are able to be resolved the first time going through the MAC. Ed commented that he's experienced the process for several years, and that there used to be some real "nail biters" that project teams experienced. He said it really seems like the process is working well and added "kudos to these results."

#### **Project Re-Vet Activity:**

Christy explained [ODOT's Operational Notice PD-16](#) requires project teams to communicate proposed changes from the contractor that affect mobility (including additional restrictions, longer duration restrictions, or more severe restrictions). The communication is necessary, so that the MST can re-engage with the MAC when there are significant changes. Bill shared the following slide showing projects that were re-vetted by the MST over the past two years.

Statistic	2023	2024
Total Re-Vets	25	38
Average calendar days for the Mobility Services Team to review.	16 Days	15 Days
Average calendar days before their sign-off deadline that Regions submitted their updated checklist for re-vetting.	34 Days	23 Days

Erik Zander commented that re-vets can sometimes be frustrating when there were aspects about the project that were overlooked the first time. Among the re-vetted projects, he suggested there are probably a handful of learning experiences that we can take from them to use for training. Christy agreed, and said the statistics will help the MST identify themes or common issues.

John Hickey said we don't want to discount contractor ingenuity. He said during construction, there are some factors that come to light that you just can't predict or analyze in the design phase.

Walt Gamble commented that looking back on 10 years he's been involved in the MAC; he said the process sometimes "turned into a little chaotic drill for all of us." He added, "it's been a monumental improvement and it's a lot, lot less stressful."

## SMPAC 2024 Review All

Bill shared the following slide showing committee discussion items and actions from 2024 to open the discussion:

2024 SMPAC Meeting Activity Recap	
Meeting	Items
1/10/2024	DEI advisory committee training held for the SMPAC, MAC and Freight Advisory Committees.
2/28/2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2024 Work Zone Safety Symposium Debrief (the symposium was held on 2/15/2024).</li> <li>Work Zone Near Miss/QR Code Reporting Data shared with the SMPAC.</li> <li>Update on the planned internal audit of Mobility Advisory Committee impacts on project delivery (results were shared at the Jan. 2025 meeting).</li> </ul>
4/24/2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ODOT/OTA/OSU Truck Roundabout Access Study results presented to SMPAC.</li> <li>Update on the ODOT MAC charter review task force and proposed charter changes presented to SMPAC.</li> </ul>
6/26/2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAC Charter discussion follow-up, and introduction of the new MAC bike/ped representative.</li> <li>ODOT's plans for using the research data from the ODOT/OTA/OSU Truck Roundabout Access Study.</li> <li>Vulnerable Road User Assessment Report presented to SMPAC.</li> <li>Update on proposed legislation for automated speed enforcement cameras in work zones.</li> </ul>
8/28/2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recap of the full closure of I-5 for the Region 1, I-5 over 26<sup>th</sup> Ave Bridge Project.</li> <li>Billboard Safety Contest results and plans for the next contest.</li> <li>Update on ODOT plans to refresh the Mobility Procedures Manual, including looking at Critical Route. Pairs to see if they are working as the agency has intended.</li> </ul>
10/23/2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SMPAC work group established to create a work zone safety training video and scholarship contest.</li> <li>Work zone speed zone camera proposed legislation shared with the SMPAC for input.</li> </ul>

Suggestions from the committee members for 2025 included the following:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The frequency of SMPAC meetings is appropriate and should not be reduced.</li> <li>• Continue looking at ideas to improve driver education related to work zones and continue to make strides towards adding more information into the driver manual.</li> <li>• Move the April SMPAC meeting to coincide with the Work Zone Safety Awareness media event at the Capitol and hold an in-person meeting in Salem.</li> <li>• Conduct another review of work zone field visits for ODOT design staff (potentially at the June SMPAC meeting).</li> <li>• Explore more opportunities for full highway closures (similar to the I-5 over 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue project in Region 1) to provide positive separation between traffic and road workers.</li> <li>• Work with DMV to consider adding some education content to the Drivers Manual and other materials related to safely driving around trucks.</li> <li>• Consider training for ODOT staff related to keeping Critical Route Pairs open and avoiding “blanket” restrictions.</li> <li>• Get a better understanding of ODOT's incident response vehicles as a potential way to slow traffic in work zones.</li> <li>• Plan to have Mark Gibson deliver the same presentation he gave at the Work Zone Safety Symposium about truck impacts for the SMPAC members.</li> <li>• Review the updated Mobility Procedures Manual that is being completed this year, as per the recent internal audit recommendation.</li> </ul> <p>Jana Jarvis provided a general comment that the SMPAC and the MAC provides a unique opportunity compared to other states where users of the system discuss impacts about projects and work through potential issues. She said it has ended up with better results for the highway system. Mike Kimlinger said he agreed with Jana, that the committees provide a very necessary and useful engagement for ODOT.</p>
<b>Work Zone Safety Training Video/Scholarship Contest follow-up</b> John Hickey	John Hickey said the training video is next on his to-do list, now that the Work Zone Safety Symposium is over. He said the video should also include guidance related to driving with trucks when entering work zones as well. He hopes to have the video completed by end of summer or in fall of 2025.
<b>Work Zone Safety Symposium Debrief</b> John Hickey	<p>Some comments from the committee about the recent Work Zone Safety Symposium:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The event was well attended. About 260 people attended out of 289 registrations, which is down slightly from last year's total of 309 registrations.</li> <li>• Starting the event with the billboard contest winners (and the video footage) was well received.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The temporary traffic control/lawsuit session was a new concept but went well.</li> <li>• The project showcase presentations were well received.</li> <li>• Ending the conference at 2pm worked well, as more people stayed to the end.</li> <li>• The legislative session that is taking place at the same time made it difficult for some people to be able to attend. The February timeframe seems to be ideal for pavement workers before the construction season kicks off.</li> </ul>
<b>Final Comments</b>	Bill Gross thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting.
<b>Action Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Katherine Benenati to bring the suggestions from the SMPAC members for incorporating the billboard design winners in the Work Zone Safety Awareness Event back to the planning group in ODOT Communications.</li> <li>• Bill Gross to look into rescheduling the April meeting to the same date as the Work Zone Safety Awareness event in Salem (Tuesday, April 22<sup>nd</sup>) and hold an in-person meeting that day.</li> <li>• Bill Gross to provide copies of the Mobility Program Performance Metrics slide presentation to the committee (this was emailed to the members after the meeting on 2/26/25).</li> </ul>