

ATTACHMENT A

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Central Oregon Area Commission on Transportation COACT

January 12, 2017

Cascades Conference Room
High Desert Education Service District
2804 SW 6th St, #1010 Redmond, OR 97756

Members: Gary Farnsworth (ODOT), Wayne Fording (Jefferson County), Patrick Hanenkrat (City of Metolius), Gus Burrell (City of Madras), Melvin Ewing (Federal Agency Representative - BLM), Gus Burrell (City of Madras), Barb Campbell (City of Bend), Bill Moseley (City of Bend), Charlie Every (Trucking), Zach Bass (Aviation), Mike Folkestad (Jefferson County), George Endicott (City of Redmond), Tony DeBone (Deschutes County), Peggy Fisher (Federal Agency Representative – Forest Service), Bill Braly (Bike-Ped), Jackson Lester (Transit), Andrea Blum (City of Sisters), Bob Bryant (ODOT), Dennis Scott (City of La Pine).

Guests: Della Mosier (ODOT), David Amiton (ODOT), Amy Pfeiffer (ODOT), Katie Parlette (ODOT), Brandon Mahon (Anderson Perry and Associates), Richard Ross (Cascades East Transit Advisory Committee), Justin Barden (Taylor Northwest LLC), Kevin Misley (Taylor Northwest LLC), Tammy Baney (Deschutes County), Pat Creedican (ODOT), Joel McCarroll (ODOT), Phil Stenbeck (Prineville), Peter Russell (Deschutes County), Seth Crawford (Crook County), Jerry Brummer (Crook County).

Staff

Shelby Knight (COIC), Scott Aycock (COIC)

1. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm. Introductions were made.

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments regarding general COACT business.

Gary Farnsworth stated that the 2018-21 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is published and out for public review. He addressed handout #1, a map of the draft project listings for the 2018-21 STIP. He noted that projects carrying over from the 2015-18 STIP were not included but can be found on the website here:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION4/Pages/Roadworkimprovements.aspx>

There were no public comments on the 2018-21 STIP.

3. COACT Business

A) November 10, 2016 Meeting Minutes (ACTION)

George Endicott motioned to approve the November 10, 2016 meeting minutes. Mike Folkestad seconded. Minutes were approved by consensus.

B) COACT 2017 Schedule

ATTACHMENT A

Scott Aycock explained the 2017 COACT schedule. COACT Board meetings are held on the second Thursday of odd numbered months, Executive Committee meetings are held the first Thursday of even numbered months, and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings may be scheduled, as needed, on the second Thursday of even numbered months.

The COACT 2017 schedule was approved by consensus.

C) COACT Exec Board Appts/Review Guidelines (ACTION)

Gary Farnsworth introduced the process for securing appointments for COACT Chair and Vice Chair for 2017, as outlined in the COACT Operating Guidelines.

George Endicott stated that other ACTs in the state have the option to appoint any elected official to the Executive Committee (not just County Commissioners and the Tribal representative). He asked if approval from the OTC is needed to change the Operating Guidelines. Gary Farnsworth responded yes. Gary Farnsworth stated that the ACT, in tandem with the OTC, reviews the Operating Guidelines every two years. However, the Operating Guidelines may be revisited and ratified at any point. Gary Farnsworth noted that the last update of the Operating Guidelines was in 2011 or 2012. He recommended a motion to delegate a review of the Operating Guidelines to the Executive Committee, to be discussed further with the full ACT.

A review of the COACT Operating Guidelines by the Executive Committee on February 2, 2017 was approved by consensus.

Gary Farnsworth stated that the Executive Committee meeting will be open for anyone to attend. Wayne Fording added that any feedback may be submitted to staff to be presented at the February meeting. Gary Farnsworth requested that COACT staff circulate a prompt for soliciting feedback on the Operating Guidelines.

Barb Campbell motioned to appoint Commissioner Wayne Fording to Chair of the Central Oregon Area Commission on Transportation and to appoint Commissioner Jerry Brummer to Vice Chair. Tony DeBone seconded. Motion was approved by consensus.

D) ACT 101 Workshop

Gary Farnsworth informed there will be an ACT orientation workshop held on February 9th from 3:00-5:00 pm at the Redmond Public Works Training Room. The workshop is aimed at new ACT members and will include an orientation to the ACT's guidelines and policies, an explanation of the ACT's connection to the Oregon Transportation Commission, and a general discussion of how the ACT interacts with transportation. He felt that with the STIP update as well as the upcoming 2017 legislative session, now is the time to work through some mutual awareness and learning exercises to ensure the group is well informed about transportation in Oregon. Gary Farnsworth invited all to attend to learn more about the Area Commission.

4. Region 4 Active Transportation Needs Inventory

A) Summary and Discussion

Gary Farnsworth introduced David Amiton, the Active Transportation Liaison for ODOT Region 4. David Amiton presented on the Active Transportation Needs Inventory Process (the PowerPoint for which can be found here: <https://coic2.org/community-development/central-oregon-area-commission-on-transportation/>). The needs inventory is a three step process:

1. Inventory existing bicycle-pedestrian infrastructure on the state system for Region 4 and identify gaps and deficiencies
2. Select evaluation criteria and weighting
3. Evaluate facilities to help prioritize needs for the state highway system

ATTACHMENT A

David Amiton explained that Region 4 is currently in step two of the process, selection of evaluation criteria and weighting. This step involves solicitation of feedback from partners, local agencies, public officials, and local communities.

Mike Folkestad asked if the inventory includes county roads. David Amiton responded that the inventory refers to state roads almost exclusively, except for local roads that cross the state system.

David Amiton presented an atlas outlining areas with no facilities or sidewalks and/or substandard facilities. An interactive version of the map can be found here:

<http://kai.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=1f0c2acc183d4568b12d8b36ad741a36>

George Endicott asked if the inventory accounts for ongoing or upcoming projects that may be related to bicycle-pedestrian access to the state highway system. For example, the City of Redmond is in the process of building a bicycle-pedestrian trail adjacent to highway 97. David Amiton responded that projects are considered to the extent that they are included in an ODOT right of way. George Endicott responded that the project is not within ODOT right of way, but will be adjacent to the highway for miles. David Amiton clarified that the needs inventory, while focused on the state system, also included a review of local plans to identify projects that had a bicycle or pedestrian component, specifically those that are on or adjacent to the highway system. Moving forward, when a gap or deficiency is identified, the process will consider conditions on or around that area. Additionally, he noted that comments can be added to the interactive map. He asked staff to send the link to the group.

Gary Farnsworth noted that the Highway 20 corridor near 3rd Street in Bend has identified bike-pedestrian deficiencies. Through this process, ODOT has the opportunity, in partnership with the local community, to come up with alternative and creative solutions.

Bill Moseley asked if the process lends itself to development and improvements of bike lanes only or if pedestrian crossings are included. For example, through the urban growth boundary expansion, the City of Bend could expand housing on the East side of the bypass. This would create the need to expand pedestrian crossings. David Amiton responded that the process lends itself to both bicycle lane improvements and pedestrian crossings. Additionally, if existing plans have identified a project on or crossing the corridor, it has been incorporated into the inventory, including projects from the Integrated Land Use Transportation Plan and the TSP.

David Amiton explained that proposed factors and criteria for evaluating the system include: safety, for which the criteria for evaluation include crash frequency and level of traffic stress; connectivity, for which the criteria for evaluation include distance between urban areas, whether the facility serves as a main street and whether it fills a gap in an area surrounded by existing facilities; demand, for which the criteria for evaluation include access to transit or other essential destinations, bicycle touring routes and scenic bikeways, and population and employment density; equity, the criterion for which is the Transportation Disadvantaged Population Index; stakeholder input, the criteria for which include whether a project is or is not identified in an existing plan; and existing conditions, the criteria for which include the presence of existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities. He noted that good criteria are to be objective, consistent, differentiate between needs, are not redundant with other criteria, and are available for the entire region to allow fair evaluation of projects across jurisdictions. He asked those in attendance to weigh in on the factors and criteria presented. Additionally, a Region 4 Active Transportation Needs Inventory Evaluation Factor Survey was made available (and can be found here: <https://coic2.org/community-development/central-oregon-area-commission-on-transportation/>)

Della Mosier asked David Amiton to speak to how access to schools factors in to the criteria. David Amiton explained that schools would fall under “access to transit and essential destinations”. Different destinations will be weighted differently. The State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan placed the greatest importance on transit and schools, meaning access to schools will be weighted with greatest emphasis.

ATTACHMENT A

Bob Bryant commented that the Active Transportation Needs Inventory was identified as a priority for Region 4. While updating the STIP and looking at the investment strategy for transportation, the need for active transportation modes became apparent. The inventory is a tool that allows for better recommendations, prioritization, and utilization of limited funds around active transportation modes.

5. ODOT Freight Plan Update

A) Summary and Discussion

Gary Farnsworth introduced Amy Pfeiffer, Region 4 Planning and Environmental Manager. He explained that ODOT is updating its Freight Plan. He added that the update was catalyzed by provisions around freight outlined in the FAST Act.

Amy Pfeiffer explained that the FAST Act requires ODOT to have a Freight Plan. Additionally, the Plan allows ODOT to use federal freight funds for priorities identified on the system within the plan. The Plan is currently going through an amendment process, the information for which is available here: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ofac.aspx>. Elements of the freight plan amendment process include development of an inventory of need, definition of the freight system, and development of an investment plan.

Criteria for developing the inventory of need, as outlined in the FAST Act, include identification of freight delay areas, intermodal connectors, and non-highway modes (rail, marine and aviation facilities). Amy Pfeiffer noted that the investment priority will heavily consider connections between rail, marine and aviation modes and facilities. Definition of the system is made up of two parts; 1) the National Freight Highway Network (NFHN); and 2) the National Multi-Modal Freight Network (NMFN). The NFHN base is defined by USDOT and allows for the addition of up to 77 miles of urban facilities and 155 miles of rural facilities to be added to Oregon's system and therefore, to be eligible for freight funds. Amy Pfeiffer noted that these additions must meet critical rural and urban criteria, outlined in Attachment D. ODOT is currently working to map the segments that meet these criteria, will overlay it with the inventory of needs, and will solicit feedback for recommendations from the ACTs and metropolitan planning organizations (MPO). The NMFN base is also defined by USDOT. Amy Pfeiffer explained that no Oregon highways are designated as part of the NMFN base system. However, ODOT has requested that US 97, short line railroads, and the port of Coos Bay be added. She noted that nothing has been added thus far but could be in the future.

Mike Folkestad asked how the designations of additional miles to the NFHN, both urban and rural, were determined. Amy Pfeiffer responded that USDOT used a national formula, considering all miles of critical freight corridor across the U.S., to divide up freight miles to each state. Mike Folkestad asked if each state was allocated an equal number of miles. Amy Pfeiffer responded no, each state was allocated a different amount based on the formula. A list of designated miles for each state can be found here: http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/crfc/sec_1116_gdnce.htm.

Amy Pfeiffer spoke to the development of an investment plan. She stated that a total of approximately \$77 M is available through 2022 for freight investment. She noted that \$77 M does not include grant money that is available to MPOs serving over 500,000. In Oregon, only Portland's MPO is eligible for those grants. The statewide investment strategy will consider the needs list, criteria, and potential ready to proceed projects. The investment strategy will be an ongoing process meaning that as projects are funded, others will be added to the list.

Amy Pfeiffer stated that ODOT is currently working to identify critical urban freight corridors. For example, Tyler Deke met with ODOT, the City of Bend and others to identify corridors in the Bend area that he will bring forward to the statewide meeting as critical urban freight corridors. The preliminary findings for such can be found in Handout #3: Potential CUFCs Bend MPO.

ATTACHMENT A

Mike Folkestad asked if cities must apply for segments to be added to the NFHN. Amy Pfeiffer responded yes. Region 4 does not currently have any designated critical urban freight segments on the NFHN. She described the overall process for designation of the additional 77 miles of urban freight corridor. Each region will develop a “wish list” of segments. These lists will go to the MPO policy board for review and finally to a statewide MPO meeting where the final prioritization list for the entire state will be constructed, based on the criteria provided in Attachment D. She asked those in attendance to contact Tyler Deke with any questions or feedback.

Gary Farnsworth asked what’s the process for designating critical rural freight segments. Amy Pfeiffer responded that rural freight corridors must meet one or more of the designated criteria, outlined in Attachment D, to be considered. Statewide maps are being constructed that outline which segments meet each of the criteria. Using these maps, a statewide committee will prioritize the outlined rural segments. Amy Pfeiffer noted that ODOT regions and ACTs will be asked to weigh in on the resulting priority list. Overall, she noted that urban segments will be designated through a more subjective process whereas rural segments will be designated based on data alone.

Barb Campbell asked if the overarching goal of the Freight Plan is to improve movement of freight by rail, marine, and aviation. Amy Pfeiffer responded that the goal is to develop highway improvements that support all modes. Barb Campbell asked if there is a way to capture congestion issues that result from increased freight movement by train. For example, increased congestion, caused by increased rail use, may hold up trucks carrying freight. Amy Pfeiffer responded yes, there is provision in the Bill that allows for development of transportation improvements to rail facilities. She noted however that it is complicated since the FAST Act is highway-centric. If a conflict presents itself, it can be added to the list. Gary Farnsworth added that the investment strategy is focused on the movement of freight rather than the impacts. This means that a road to rail conflict keeping freight from moving could assume a higher priority but that general congestion issues resulting from increased freight movement may not be considered. Bill Moseley wondered if freight slowed by congestion could be considered. Amy Pfeiffer responded yes. Bill Moseley asked if EDCO was on the development of the Bend MPO stakeholder list? Amy Pfeiffer responded yes.

Wayne Fording asked if US 97, specifically the section within Central Oregon, fits the first criterion for rural freight corridors, “rural principal arterial roadway with minimum 25% of annual average daily traffic (measured in passenger vehicle equivalent units) from trucks”. Amy Pfeiffer responded that although there are a significant number of trucks traveling US 97 in the Central Oregon area, there is also a high volume of cars. In Central Oregon, only a small section of US 97 in Madras fits that criterion. However, she noted that rural segments do not have to meet all the criteria to be considered, just a substantial amount. She added that US 97 fits the criterion “determined by the State to be vital to improving the efficient movement of freight of importance to the economy of the State”, due to its significance as a freight corridor, its redundancy to I5, and as a resiliency route.

Peter Russell asked is there a minimum ADT for rural segments. Amy Pfeiffer responded no.

Scott Aycock asked if eligibility is broad for the investments that can be made. Amy Pfeiffer responded yes, if there is a freight component. She noted that \$77 M over five years will not fund large projects but does allow for leveraging funds.

6. 2017 Transportation Investment Strategy Topics

A) Transportation Investment Strategy

Tammy Baney spoke to Attachments E and F pertaining to the Transportation Investment Strategy. Attachment E states that the investment strategy is a response to the Joint Committee on Transportation Preservation and Modernization’s request for identification of funding needs and strategies to address them. ODOT presented a draft Investment Strategy to the OTC in December, focused on highway preservation and maintenance, safety, congestion and mobility, multimodal freight, bicycle pedestrian and public transportation. The Legislature will likely use the investment strategy as a starting point for discussion on needs across the transportation system as they begin developing a transportation funding package.

ATTACHMENT A

The draft Investment Strategy was included as Attachment F. Tammy Baney stated that the ACT, through the OTC, will help inform the Legislature on transportation needs in the state by providing feedback on the Investment Strategy. She highlighted that the current draft speaks to the state system only and will need to be supplemented with information from cities and counties.

Tammy Baney stated that similar themes resulted from both the Governor's Transportation Vision Panel and the Joint Committee on Transportation Preservation and Modernization's statewide discussions around transportation. These discussions showed 1) investment is needed for the preservation and maintenance of the current system; 2) relief is needed for bottlenecks and congestion, specifically to move goods through the state; 3) investments in transit services are needed to increase quality of life, help people meet basic needs, and relieve congestion; and 4) investment is needed to enable successful FEMA response in the event of a major emergency, such as the looming Cascadia event. The OTC, in partnership with ODOT, used these themes to develop the Investment Strategy. Tammy Baney stated that the Strategy is an opportunity for the Legislature to know what the priorities are around transportation, which investments will contribute to the safety and economic vitality of the state, and the return on that investment. The Strategy outlines three investment scenarios. Tammy Baney stated that the OTC is recommending investment scenario one, a moderate additional annual increase in investment, totaling \$570 M. She summarized the Strategy document, which outlines investment priorities for highways, bridges, multimodal freight, safety, bike-ped, and public transportation.

Tammy Baney stated that the OTC developed an appendix for the Strategy which contains funding and financing options for Legislatures to refer to. This list includes gas taxes, registration fees, electric vehicle taxes, new vehicle excise taxes, studded tire taxes, bonding, lottery revenue, employer payroll taxes; and cigarette, alcohol and cannabis taxes. She noted that taxes are not favorable but must be balanced with the economic vitality and safety of Oregon. Additionally, the appendix includes a section on transparency, accountability and efficiency. Tammy Baney stated that this section is a placeholder for legislative action that may be needed as a result of the findings from the management review of ODOT. Lastly, the OTC will be calling on the ACTs to provide feedback and input on the development of a priority project list, to be included in the final Strategy.

Gary Farnsworth stated that the goal of reviewing the Strategy was to ensure that those in attendance are well armed when initiating conversations with Legislators in the coming weeks. Tammy Baney noted the importance of the ACTs in messaging the region's priorities through this process. Gary Farnsworth and Tammy Baney agreed that emphasizing the importance of Highway 97 is vital to the region.

Tony DeBone asked who will begin the discussion around a transportation funding package in the Legislature. Tammy Baney responded that that is still being discussed. It could potentially be the Governor, the OTC, or the Joint Committee on Transportation. Tony DeBone asked if there is a sense for when it will happen in the session. Tammy Baney responded that it is not yet clear. She stated that the ACT will be informed as soon as that information is available. George Endicott stated that the political push from city and county officials, the OTC, and multiple modes regarding the need for a transportation funding package has begun. He noted however, there are still political issues that need to be resolved before a transportation funding package is feasible.

Bob Bryant asked, given importance of the US 97 corridor within the investment strategy, if the OTC has considered coordinating with colleagues in Washington and California. Tammy Baney responded that the OTC met with their counterparts in Washington and California in June of 2016 for the first time since 2008. She stated that the OTC intends to continue discussions around resiliency and the US 97 corridor with Washington and California. She added that these discussions and relationships lend themselves to the strengthening of a federal voice.

Scott Aycock asked if COACT should be prepared with priority projects. Tammy Baney responded that Gary Farnsworth will be an outlet for announcing and engaging COACT when the OTC is ready to begin developing that list, probably in mid-February. She noted that only truly priority projects will make the list, as Oregon is already behind on investment in

ATTACHMENT A

maintaining the current transportation system. Bob Bryant noted that the ACT will be able to readily draw from the needs list that ODOT maintains for Region 4, for input. He added that the list includes a few shelf projects that are “shovel ready”. Tammy Baney stated that may be important to have funding for project planning to develop shelf projects. She added that with the new Administration, the need for more shelf projects may increase. Therefore, the OTC would like to know the importance of planning dollars. Gary Farnsworth added that ongoing dialogue within COACT around prioritization and projects within the community will lend itself to an effective and quick next process. He stated that he will stay accessible and invited members to contact him. Tammy Baney noted that projects that are not funded through this process may be picked up in another funding stream. She added that preparation is key, as the turnaround will be quick.

Bob Bryant stated that this alludes to the assumption that a transportation package will come with earmarked priorities rather than a revenue stream that would allow Area Commissions to fund their own needs over time. He asked Tammy Baney if that assumption was correct. Tammy Baney responded that she hopes to have a package that is a hybrid of the two. Bob Bryant stated that Area Commissions are structured to take those revenues and prioritize projects appropriately. Tammy Baney agreed that there is trust and credibility within the ACTs.

Scott Aycock informed that the City and County Administrators have been working on a joint regional resolution that they have been taking to each local jurisdiction to get passed. The target audience for the joint resolution is the local delegation, although it could also be used to demonstrate local support at legislative committee meetings, etc. The resolution states the need for a transportation funding package. He noted that Jefferson County, Redmond, La-Pine, and Madras have passed the resolution to date and that other jurisdictions are in the process of passing it.

Mike Folkestad wondered what the region will achieve from a transportation funding package, given that politicians will want to fund projects within their respective areas. Tammy Baney responded that Central Oregon is well positioned with both the US 97 corridor and importance of the region in response to a seismic event. She added that statewide prioritized investment is moving to become less siloed.

7. Area Roundtable

A) Discussion of Issues, Needs, Projects, etc.

Jackson Lester thanked those that worked to remove snow during the major snow event. Thus, Cascades East Transit could provide service every day it was scheduled to run. He noted that the transit system closed early one day.

Pat Creedican stated that ODOT struggled to find places to put snow that was removed from roads. Additionally, he noted that snow blowers working long hours for weeks at a time caused worker fatigue and thus worker shortages. He stated that there is the potential for flooding during the melt and with forecasted rain. He commended the level of cooperation that has gone into addressing the snow event. He stated that ODOT will consider the use of fractured rock, as it has become more cost effective. Jerry Brummer cautioned that overuse of fractured rock can lead to worn out equipment.

Gus Burril stated that Madras is dealing with significant snow pack. He noted that snow removal crews have been working tirelessly for 10 straight days.

Barb Campbell asked if FEMA money is available for the region due to the snow event. Pat Creedican responded that there is not a significant enough amount of damage to constitute a federal disaster declaration. He noted that if major flooding occurs, potentially the region will be looking for emergency funds.

Wayne Fording noted that snow removal budgets are being depleted due to the size and length of the event. He noted that the Governor declared a state-wide disaster due to snow across the state. Jackson Lester stated that Crook County declared a state of emergency, specific to the Juniper Acres area. Seth Crawford responded that the County was offered emergency resources from the state but that they were expensive and not available until Friday. Therefore, the County hired a private contractor to clear snow in the Juniper Acres area instead.

ATTACHMENT A

Jerry Brummer stated that the Elm Street Bridge in Prineville is the only bridge that isn't clear span if flooding occurs. He noted that work on the bridge is included in the 2018-21 STIP.

Charlie Every stated that US 97 has been pivotal in moving freight during the snow event. He noted concern around clearing pull out areas for trucks to chain up.

Andrea Blum stated that the City of Sisters is wrestling with where to put snow.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm.

DRAFT

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CROOK, DESCHUTES AND JEFFERSON COUNTY AND THE CITY COUNCILS OF BEND, REDMOND, PRINEVILLE, MADRAS, SISTERS, LA PINE, CULVER AND METOLIUS

A Resolution in support of a Transportation Funding Package in the 2017 Legislative Session * * * RESOLUTION NO. ##### * *

WHEREAS, the need for increased funding to address transportation maintenance, operations, capital construction and safety exists within every City and County in Central Oregon; and

WHEREAS, significant growth in traffic volume has exacerbated congestion and the need for safety and capacity improvements on the state highway systems connecting our communities; and

WHEREAS, investment in transportation infrastructure results in near term job creation in the construction sector and long term job attraction via the addition of system capacity to accommodate economic development; and

WHEREAS, time is the enemy of a deteriorating infrastructure as deferred and forgone maintenance result in exponential and inevitable cost increases; and

WHEREAS, legislative adjustments in transportation funding are infrequent and the buying power of prior adjustments in revenue are eventually eroded via inflation; and

WHEREAS, local funding options are complex and difficult to gain voter approval, yet the State Highway Fund mechanism is established, fair, and preferred by industry stakeholders; and

WHEREAS, the federal Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act is set to expire, leaving a significant funding void in county road programs; and

WHEREAS, preparation for natural disasters and emergency response is not exclusive to western Oregon communities; Central Oregon cities and counties will play an important role in the recovery of Oregon from the Cascadia event; and

WHEREAS, the Cities and Counties of Central Oregon recognize that increased funding to meet these needs will require the development of new revenue sources; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND CITY COUNCILS IN THE COUNTIES OF CROOK, DESCHUTES AND JEFFERSON, OREGON, as follows:

Section 1. The signatories to this Resolution strongly support development of a Transportation Funding Package in the 2017 Legislative Session to generate needed revenue to invest in the maintenance, operation, capital construction, and safety of our transportation systems.

Section 2. The signatories to this Resolution support and encourage participation of our legislative delegation in helping develop and pass a Transportation Funding Package.

Section 3. The signatories to this Resolution pledge support to our legislative delegation's efforts and vote to pass a Transportation Funding Package.

Section 4. This Resolution shall take effect upon its adoption.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2016.

Signature sheet to follow...