



# Oregon Energy Strategy

## Transportation Electrification Policy Working Group

### Meeting 2

**April 10, 2025, 9:30-12:30**

#### Post-Meeting Notes

##### Meeting Summary

*Jillian DiMedio and Jessica Reichers (ODOE) facilitated a meeting to identify and discuss strategies to address the barriers raised in the prior PWG meeting. Jillian presented draft issue statements intended to synthesize feedback from the prior meeting and requested written feedback on these draft statements.*

#### In-Meeting Notes

##### Participants

ODOE	Other Participants	PWG Members
Alan Zelenka	Brian Hurley, ODOT	Brett Morgan, Climate Solutions
Edith Bayer	Stefenie Griggs, ODOT	Ingrid Fish, City of Portland
Evan Elias		Jamie Johnson, Green Energy Inst. at LC Law Sch
Hugh Arceneaux		Jana Jarvis, Oregon Trucking Association
Jessica Reichers		Jeff Hammarlund
Jillian DiMedio		Juan J Serpa Muñoz, EWEB
Joshua Price		Kate Hawley, Pacific Power
		Kyle Whatley, TriMet
		Lewis Lem, City of Portland
		Nancy Bennet, PGE
		Rebecca Smith, RHA
		Tonio Moro
		Charlie Tracy, OTEC
		Bret Stevens, Daimler
		Kate Hawley, Pacific Power
		Logan Telles, City of Eugene

##### Introduction

- Jillian DiMedio (ODOE) kicked off the call and introduced ODOE support staff. Jillian reviewed ODOE’s mission and reminders on how to use WebEx. Jillian welcomed PWG members providing further input through ODOE’s [public comment portal](#).
- Jillian reviewed the scope of the Transportation Electrification PWG and how it relates to the scope of the other four Energy Strategy PWGs. Jillian also reviewed the role of PWGs in informing the policies and recommendations that will be advanced in the Energy Strategy.

- Jillian reviewed the present meeting objectives, agenda, and PWG roster.<sup>1</sup> Jillian explained that a couple new members have joined the PWG today and asked that members introduce themselves in the chat.
- Jillian reviewed the forthcoming meeting schedule and explained that an additional breakout meeting and a final, plenary PWG meeting are planned for later in April and May. Jillian explained that the breakout meetings are intended to identify barriers, strategies, and policy actions associated with the pathways indicated by the energy pathways modeling. Jillian explains that this structure is intended to promote discussion but that PWG discussions are intended to be fluid and not unduly restricted.
- Jessica Reichers (ODOE) reviewed the Group Agreements of the PWG. Jessica reiterated the invitation that PWG members provide input through the comment portal and reviewed the factors and focus areas intended to guide PWG member meeting participation. Jessica explains that the modeling results should be supplemented by PWG member experiences and expertise.

### Presentation

- Jillian reviewed summaries of input heard from other PWGs relevant to the Transportation group and discussions.<sup>2</sup>
  - Jana Jarvis: Curious as to whether there's business representation in other PWGs? Reflects not seeing conversations on MDHD BEVs in other PWGs.
    - Edith: there is business representation in other PWGs, but would have to refer to PWG member list for specifics.
  - Bret Stevens: to be clear, the items summarized here do not reflect the whole of other PWG discussions? It's the role of Transportation Electrification PWG members to address MDHD BEV issues in this Transportation PWG.
- Jillian briefly reviewed policies relevant to transportation<sup>3</sup> to consider and inform PWG efforts and stated that she has shared these lists prior to the present meeting. Jillian explains that ZEV infrastructure relies on federal funding and that that is an uncertainty relevant to consider in the present discussions.

### Vehicle Electrification:

- Jillian reflects that more than 120 comments came in on Vehicle Electrification in the last meeting; Jillian shared themes and issue statements for review a week prior to the present meeting for PWG member review and comment. Jillian then read through the issue statements she has identified, explaining that these will be a foundation for identifying strategies to overcome the barriers and issues identified.<sup>4</sup>
- *Ingrid: Can we add to the funding barrier that we have a transportation system funding model that is reliant on fossil fuel funding sources and does not incentivize reducing VMT and using fuel efficient vehicles.*
  - *from Jessica Reichers to everyone: 10:00 AM: Thanks, Ingrid. Good flag, and we can add that to our list of barriers, for sure. And feel free to bring up*

<sup>1</sup> These materials are available at slides 6, 7, and 8 here: [2025-04-10-OES-PWG-TE-Presentation.pdf](#).

<sup>2</sup> These summaries are available at slide 14 here: [2025-04-10-OES-PWG-TE-Presentation.pdf](#).

<sup>3</sup> These policies are available at slide 15 here: [2025-04-10-OES-PWG-TE-Presentation.pdf](#).

<sup>4</sup> These issue statements are available at slide 18 here: [2025-04-10-OES-PWG-TE-Presentation.pdf](#).

*potential solutions for this in the conversation (you don't have to stick to the things on the screen right now, if you feel something is missing).*

- Jillian explains that the Strategy will not be able to exhaustively address every potential policy area or recommendation; prioritizing issues will be a vital step informed by PWG input. Jillian explains that timing of recommendations will be important for prioritizing recommendations based on where state policies are most needed or could be most impactful in the near term. Jillian added that policies need not be universally applicable across the state and may recognize, for instance, differences in policies for COU and IOU territories. Jillian also stressed importance to avoiding duplication of other ongoing policy workstreams.

#### Whiteboard Exercise 1: Vehicle Electrification<sup>5</sup>

- Jillian reviewed Miro tips and instructions. Jillian reviewed the structure of the Miro board and the intention that the brainstorming address the barriers identified and summarized from the prior meeting.
- Jessica went over a Miro testing exercise with the group. Jessica welcomed team members providing input through the chat window.
- Rebecca, RHA: Expresses interest in the line regarding hydrogen awareness in the issue; are hydrogen public awareness within scope for this exercise?
  - Jessica; yes. There are cross-cutting issues, so relevant to include. Jillian adds that, as she isn't certain that that specific area is an area of discussion for LCFs, it's valuable to add here.
- The PWG undertook the silent brainstorming activity for 10 minutes.
- Jessica reflects seeing barriers around MDHD electrification; would like to discuss strategies and means to address these barriers. Asks Jana, Bret what measures might help address industry concerns, what information might be needed?
  - Jana: says there are barriers as to 1) range (dependent on conditions) along with battery weight failing to satisfy hour-of-service limitations and operational needs and 2) vehicle cost.
  - Jana says their policy request is for a delay in the implementation of the ACT
  - Jessica; offers understanding operational limitations and where electrification might be feasible might as a strategy or solution
  - Jana; adds timely charging installation as a barrier that needs to be addressed
  - Bret Stevens; says he'd like to sell more ZEVs and that, as an OEM, Daimler has taken on risk for transition. Says there will be a wholesale shift suddenly once a ZEV is cost-effective. Important element for Energy Strategy is accounting for cost of electricity and how that compares to diesel; says 31 to 32 cents per kWh is the current parity rate with diesel.
  - Bret explains recent clean diesel developments should be incentivized; says new diesel trucks emit "1/60" the emissions of pre-2007 diesels.

---

<sup>5</sup> The final whiteboards for this meeting are transcribed below and available for viewing at [04/10 TE PWG - Meeting 3: Strategies to Overcome Barriers - Miro](#).

- Bret adds incentivizing OEMs to build efficient vehicles is a valid solution; needs a viable market segment to design trucks for high volume markets such as those for day cab, interurban regional haul trucks, and an M2 business class pickup and delivery.
- Jana says ACT fails to provide for sale of new clean diesel trucks and this may be a barrier to realizing interim efficiency gains
- Bret says this is largely a DEQ discussion; but from an Energy Strategy standpoint, there's an infrastructure shortage to provide for charging
- *from Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability to everyone: 10:27 AM*
- *An appropriate transportation funding model that incentivizes efficient vehicles will tip the ROI for Daimler customers. They are not currently incentivized to drive clean trucks.*
- *from Stefenie Griggs to everyone: 10:30 AM*
- *Thanks Bret and Jana for sharing your perspective. I am going to shamelessly plug a project ODOT is working on to address MHD ZEV infrastructure via the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure (CFI) grant program. We will be reaching out to stakeholders in the future continue this conversation in how we can address the ZEV infrastructure barriers with this project.*
- *from Stefenie Griggs to everyone: 10:30 AM*
- [https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/ORDOT/subscriber/new?topic\\_id=ORDOT\\_1095](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/ORDOT/subscriber/new?topic_id=ORDOT_1095)
- *from Stefenie Griggs to everyone: 10:31 AM*
- *Sign up for updates on the CFI grant program at the link above*
- Jessica; adds that EVs have a role in managing the grid that should be appreciated as an element of solution to these barriers. It also would be helpful to discuss specific use-case needs for trucks to determine how an electrification transition could be best managed.
- Kyle Whatley, TriMet; from a public transit perspective. For MDHDs; technology is still advancing but not quite there. California agencies that mandated transition needed exemptions, a policy for allowing requests of exemptions where technology is unavoidable. Exemptions reflecting delays from infrastructure buildout.
- Jessica requests that Kyle has specific requests for where flexibility is needed.
- Nancy Bennett, PGE; regarding infrastructure, TX siting and permitting is a problem.
- Jana; says California has provided \$1 billion or more to support transition; Oregon has not provided similar funding
  - *from Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability to everyone: 10:38 AM Good point Jana.*

#### Whiteboard Exercise 2: Grid Integration

- Jillian reviewed grid integration comments and summarized issues reflected from the prior meeting's identified barriers.
- In advance of the whiteboard exercise, Jessica reiterates that the purpose of this exercise is to focus on solutions rather than barriers.
- The PWG undertook the silent brainstorming activity for 10 minutes.
- Jessica reflects comments on utility rate-setting; asks if EV rate strategies, per Juan, Nancy, Kate and Charlie, if utility rates following EV load growth are being appropriately passed on the

ratepayers; an issue that there's no way to capture/quantify EV benefits to the grid; and concerns around demand pricing, especially because of MDHD charging. Jessica asks if members can speak to measures to address these problems and set rates appropriately.

- Charlie Tracy, OTEC: From a COU perspective, to the extent any load contributes to peak hours, that'll lead to cost impacts. COUs have a good sense of what the cost of additions to peak loads is; the ability to shift loads to off-peak hours is very beneficial. A solution would be to add battery storage, in particular to charging locations; additionally, providing an open, simple means for load control for EVs; a policy that would shift load off peak hours would be simplified if there weren't a hodgepodge of methods to shift load. Thinks a state union requiring open-source load control software would be valuable. Not much opportunity from a rate-setting perspective.
- Jessica; time-of-use hasn't been widely used by utilities, but IOUs are exploring these. Is there a barrier to COUs using time-of-use rates?
- Charlie; there's not a barrier here, but as a not-for-profit org, and an org facing low BPA rates, without much of a BPA price signal; it means there's little incentive for time-of-use rates
- Juan; EWEB is doing a conservation potential assessment and demand response potential assessment and electrification potential assessment and solar potential assessment. He expects utilities will face concerns that differ from utility-to-utility; an electrification potential assessment may show that conservation measures may be sufficient to address load growth. These assessments help evaluate whether a price signal is expected to support a demand-response program. Because EWEB faced stagnant load growth that is suddenly increasing, targeted conservation is being explored as a cost-effective means to reduce peak demand. A suggestion would be to support utilities at a state level in planning efforts; it takes money and expertise to understand utilities' circumstances.
- Nancy, PGE: Her sense is that managed charging and shifting load on a voluntary basis is being explored; incentives around panel upgrades and chargers to build infrastructure has been successful, and awareness and messengers besides utilities would be valuable to share DR issues, especially given data privacy concerns. V2G capabilities generally aren't available except for school busses; so, technology from vehicles and trust from consumers are needed. PGE is also working on VPP technology, and feels that there are technological barriers.
- Juan, EWEB: ODOE has provided EWEB with data on where EV loads are expected, and EWEB has been able to use that data to identify loads and make value assessments; providing that data where needed would be valuable.
  - Jessica: ODOE appreciates the comment and flags that ODOE has a program to map where EVs are currently online
  - Jana recommends folks reach out to Jason at Titan Freight, says Jason has done an analysis of cost of charging for freight and how time of charging can be managed for specific routes.
  - Jessica appreciates the comment: asks if PGE/PAC have programs to assist freight in considering electrification?
  - Nancy; unsure of specifics, can collect data if folks are interested. Would say, in terms of rates, what drives PGE loads is data centers; EVs are not a huge driver of load. So, rate classes for other industrial customers is the bigger issue in PGE's mind.

- Bret Stevens: Fleets have difficulty adjusting to rate schedules because this expertise is not core to their operations; thinks a risk of loss or grace period policy could help fleets in electrification transition; says Daimler has experience with fleets not understanding rate schedules and paying high electricity rates shortly after acquiring electric trucks. Fleets need a backstop or risk of loss provision because of their importance to national supply chains and the scale of the electric transition. Says no amount of consulting on the front end can adequately address this risk.
  - Adds this issue can also apply to light-duty drivers who may plan for certain electricity rates but face some volatility based on electricity demand.
  - Something like a state backstop would be great, but that would face funding challenges; thinks otherwise utilities should be invested in providing power efficiently and effectively to customers; there needs to be coordination between utilities and fleets.
- Jessica; ODOE often hears that demand charges put stressors on fleet operators; however, utilities face challenges when electricity loads are unpredictable. Are there opportunities to respond to both these challenges and the tension between them?
  - Juan; clarifies that he has not worked on rates, but planning and coordination between fleets and utilities should be a solution.
  - Charlie; agrees, adds that analyses such as forward modeling can help in this planning, but also states that demand charges are a consistently difficult-to-communicate policy towards consumers. It's hard to send price signals that are useful to end users; thinks time of use is a better approach than demand response, because it's easier to work with. From his perspective though, this EV charging issue is no different than any other intermittent load issue and utilities have dealt with this issue since the dawn of time without identifying a single, satisfactory policy solution. Technological progress, such as in batteries, may be necessary to improve managing intermittent loads.
- Jessica opened the floor to hear if any members have points to raise from the customer side of grid integration.
  - Brett Morgan, Climate Solutions: expressed agreement with earlier statement that providing certainty as to projected rates would be valuable. Also says Climate Solutions is seeing data reflecting consumers feeling pressured by rate increases, but that things like renewable energy and batteries provide for net cost savings.
  - Jamie Johnson, Green Energy Inst. at LC Law Sch; they're curious about solar and battery storage as means to manage load and demand. Also curious about efficiently interconnecting large loads to the grid. Curious if other states have progressed further in incorporating large loads onto their grids
  - Jessica; would love hearing what fleet owners need before they could contemplate grid integration.

### Whiteboard Exercise 3: VMT reduction

- Jillian reviewed VMT reduction comments and summarized issues reflected from the prior meeting's identified barriers.
- The PWG undertook the silent brainstorming activity for 10 minutes. Jillian also asked that PWG members review all topics to indicate support where applicable.

- Jessica asked if folks have questions on funding for transit? Jillian asked that the drafter explain the strategy described as the state should allow districts to utilize other funding tools by ordinance, not ballot measure.
  - Tonia Moro; depending on the type of district incorporation, districts have more authority with regard to taxation. For example, the Rogue Valley Transportation District is currently organized under a particular district statute, they cannot issue an ordinance to impose a payroll tax. More flexibility for small and medium-sized districts to adjust their revenue supply would be helpful.
  - Tonio; also added a comment on limiting CMAT funding; those funds are more beneficial when they go towards transit projects and are subject to appropriate limitations; it would be helpful for the state to address this need, as competition among jurisdictions operates as a barrier.
- Jamie; curious about legislative transportation package and wonders how the Strategy will address that legislation.
  - Jillian; ODOE is willing to include particular elements of the transportation package as, if they do not pass, they may still be included in the Energy Strategy. Jessica; ODOE isn't here to debate specific bills, but relevant policies are still in-scope.
  - Jamie: the Oregon Transit Association has been supporting a portion of this package to increase incrementally over time the payroll tax that is applied throughout the state to at least 4% sooner than later to meet transit operating costs
- Jeff Hammarlund
  - Based on his experience in city planning, thinks several measures to make cities less dependent on single-occupancy vehicle cities. Thinks rethinking city planning in ways similar to Paris or smaller, less car-dependent cities to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel would be beneficial.
  - Jessica; are cities considering policies towards walkable cities? What steps would be needed?
  - Ingrid; a barrier is parking revenue. Transportation funding model is not set up for improved walkability; if parking revenue were taken away, there'd be no way to fund basic services. Need a funding model that make it an easy choice for people to choose biking, walking; that is more efficient, and it should be more expensive to drive SUVs and heavier vehicles. Acknowledges that there can be regressive impacts, but these can be managed; additionally, phased process would be valuable. Current transportation package doesn't further these goals; need levers to disincentivize heavy vehicles.
  - Jillian: Are there states, municipalities that do this funding right?
    - Ingrid; London, Copenhagen. Not a question of how to do this; need a road usage charge and formula for weight and efficiency of vehicle to assess charge. On heavy-duty, freight, and cargo side, more research may be needed.
    - Jessica wonders a task-force would be appropriate to this issue.
  - from Jillian DiMedio, ODOE, she/her to everyone: 12:02 PM
  - Thanks Ingrid. If you have ideas that would be better align funding with climate goals (beyond those you've already added to the board), make sure you add them to the miro!

- *from Brett Morgan He/Him to everyone: Minnesota and Colorado are interesting examples of states rethinking revenue models*
- *from Brett Morgan He/Him to everyone: And the Virginia Smart Scale Program*
- Logan Telles; in creating more walkable environments in Eugene; thinks more about reducing speeds, lowering speed limits, providing improved pedestrian crossings. State-funding is valuable for this; tricky because these projects assess cost-benefit on a fatality basis; need a fatal crash history to satisfy the cost-benefit of this
- *from Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability to everyone: Yes! To a a taskforce.*
- *from Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability to everyone: Agree with Logan. Reducing speeds makes it harder to drive and easier to walk.*
- Jana Jarvis; Portland isn't as dense as cities like London or Paris. Agrees with Ingrid that funding currently comes from cars and trucks. To reduce VMT in commercial vehicles, need an economic downturn. Reduced VMT conversation should be focused on passenger vehicles.
- *from Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability to everyone: Also I'd add that the gas tax needs to stay. It is a built in already excepted carbon tax that needs to be adjusted to inflation and added to a RUC that is based on weight and fuel efficiency.*
- Bret Stevens: Commercial vehicles in Oregon shoulder higher cost-to-operate burden than other states because of weight-mile taxation. Economic factors need to be considered; Bret thinks Oregon funding is broken and thinks users of benefits. Bret Stevens adds that idling is less efficient than cruising.
  - *from Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability to everyone: Agree that we need to reduce congestion, lowering speed strategies are mostly for residential streets not highways*
  - Jessica asks that Bret direct comments towards providing solutions
  - *from Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability to everyone: But there should be some consequences for the air quality impacts from diesel trucks to incentivize the market to go towards EVs*
  - *from Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability to everyone: Agree with Jana on counter-intuitive statement*
- Jeff: Regarding urban planning; will talk to colleagues about urban planning. Agrees Portland is not London or Paris, but states that there are many medium-sized cities that nonetheless are pedestrian friendly.
- Ingrid: agrees with Jana that goods movement needs to happen; thinks solutions towards urban last-mile efficiency are valuable and work well in dense areas if there are hubs where largest vehicles can be directed. Portland is working on how to support these smaller vehicles that assist with last-mile transit.
  - Jillian; what would be helpful from the state in these initiatives?
  - Ingrid: funding model. Local jurisdictions could layer onto a smart state-wide funding model; need a better state-wide funding model.



### Next Steps

- Jillian: Miro board will be closed after this meeting. Next meeting will be April 30; asks for additional comments by Tuesday, April 15. Jillian will aim to produce a summary by April 18.
- Jillian reminds PWG members that the last breakout meeting will be April 30; ODOE will bring drafts on April 30 for the PWG to react to.
- May 21 will be a final, plenary PWG where draft recommendations will be shared among groups.
- Additionally, Complementary Analyses and an update on jobs will be provided on April 16; Jillian asks that PWG members listen to this presentation or the recording before the next meeting.
- Jillian reviewed a draft agenda for April 30, with goals to:
  - Review and discuss compilation of strategies to overcome barriers;
  - Discuss policy implications of complementary analyses;
  - Share any relevant information from other WGs;
  - Learn about example policies in other states / regions; and
  - Discuss final policy actions).
- Jillian asked that PWG members consider, in advance of the next meeting, what strategies are most important to overcoming identified barriers, and these could be implemented, and what policies or best practices are being implemented in other jurisdictions and whether these can be implemented in Oregon.

### Virtual Meeting Chat

Ingrid Fish	All Participants	My connection seems to be having trouble connecting to audio. I'm going to leave & try reconnecting.
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Thanks, Ingrid.
Ingrid Fish	All Participants	I'm good. Audio is working now.
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Great!
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Jessica Reichers, Technology & Policy Manager at ODOE.
Rebecca Smith for RHA	All Participants	Rebecca Smith, Renewable Hydrogen Alliance. Working with transit agencies on zero emission buses.

Nancy Bennett	All Participants	Nancy Bennett, Portland General Electric
Bret Stevens	All Participants	Bret Stevens - Daimler Truck
Logan Telles, City of Eugene	All Participants	Logan Telles, City of Eugene transportation planner
ctrary	All Participants	Charlie Tracy, Oregon Trail Electric Coop, Working on rural charging
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Hello Everyone, I'm Ingrid Fish with the City of Portland's Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. I'm excited about the work I'm doing to update the zoning code to support zero emission delivery vehicles and enable them to locate micro-hubs in strategic areas of Portland. More info can be found here: <a href="https://www.portland.gov/bps/climate-action/documents/bps-micro-delivery-hub-feasibility-report/download">https://www.portland.gov/bps/climate-action/documents/bps-micro-delivery-hub-feasibility-report/download</a>
Kyle Whatley	All Participants	Kyle Whatley - TriMet - deploying a fleet (pilot) of 60' fuel cell electric buses
Tonia Moro	All Participants	Tonia Moro, public interest attorney in So. Or; been Chair of the Rogue Valley Transportation District for 10 years; the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is embarking on our discretionary funding solicitation, primarily CMAQ funds and it always presents opportunities and challenges.
Hugh Arceneaux, ODOE	All Participants	Energy Strategy public comment portal: <a href="https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/">https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/</a> (we'll provide this link again at the end of the meeting)
Jamie Johnson, Green Energy Inst. at Lewis & Clark Law School	All Participants	Hi all - Jamie Johnson, staff attorney at the Green Energy Institute at Lewis & Clark Law School. I'm excited about finding strategies that both lower emissions and make our communities healthier and more resilient.
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	The low-carbon fuels barriers do seem to speak to business concerns.
Josh Price, ODOE	All Participants	<a href="https://www.oregon.gov/energy/Data-and-Reports/Documents/OES-PWG-Member-Lists.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/energy/Data-and-Reports/Documents/OES-PWG-Member-Lists.pdf</a>

Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Can we add to the funding barrier that we have a transportation system funding model that is reliant on fossil fuel funding sources and does not incentivize reducing VMT and using fuel efficient vehicles.
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Thanks, Ingird. Good flag, and we can add that to our list of barriers, for sure. And feel free to bring up potential solutions for this in the conversation (you don't have to stick to the things on the screen right now, if you feel something is missing).
Josh Price, ODOE	All Panelists	<a href="https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVIKq8yAg=?share_link_id=178758379813">https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVIKq8yAg=?share_link_id=178758379813</a>
Josh Price, ODOE	All Panelists	Copy and paste link into browser or use the link sent you in the email from me.
Tonia Moro	All Participants	What is the key to moving them?
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	An appropriate transportation funding model that incentivizes efficient vehicles will tip the ROI for Daimler customers. They are not currently incentivized to drive clean trucks.
Stefenie Griggs	All Participants	Thanks Bret and Jana for sharing your perspective. I am going to shamelessly plug a project ODOT is working on to address MHD ZEV infrastructure via the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure (CFI) grant program. We will be reaching out to stakeholders in the future continue this conversation in how we can address the ZEV infrastructure barriers with this project.
Stefenie Griggs	All Participants	<a href="https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/ORDOT/subscriber/new?topic_id=ORDOT_1095">https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/ORDOT/subscriber/new?topic_id=ORDOT_1095</a>
Stefenie Griggs	All Participants	Sign up for updates on the CFI grant program at the link above
Bret Stevens	All Participants	I have to run! Be right back though. Jana's got this
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Good point Jana.
Bret Stevens	All Participants	California has decades of policy build up that ACT/ACF was standing on. Oregon should look back in time at what California did in the past and work

		it forward from there. Grabbing the latest and greatest from CA exposes us to failure risk
Jeff Hammarlund	All Participants	Jessica and workgroup members, These are important barriers and potential solutions. However, the barrier that I would like to add comes from my background as a urban planner (and many years ago, the senior transportation planer with the City of Beaverton). It involves rethinking the many development codes and regulations that serve to encourage single occupancy auto travel and discourage bicycle, pedestrian, public transit travel. The transition to EVs will help but we also need to revisit these codes. About 30 years ago we took a small bite at this apple with the LCDC's Transportation Planning Rule. We did little things like encouraging more covered bicycle parking, encouraging public transit to have stops right next to high traffic stores, minimizing the use of cul-de-sacs, and much more. But this was just the low hanging fruit. There is so much more that can be done as Paris and other cities that are giving high priority to substantivity and carbon emissions.
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Thanks, Jeff! OUR third brainstorming activity is around "Reducing VMT," so your thoughts about this will inform that section, and feel free to jump in with additional thoughts when we get there.
Josh Price, ODOE	All Panelists	<a href="https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVIKq8yAg=?share_link_id=157129805875">https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVIKq8yAg=?share_link_id=157129805875</a>
Brett Morgan He/Him	All Participants	I think it was in PGE's last TE report, but something like 90% of their consumer EV charging is happening off peak due to proactive communication and off peak rates incentives. It's been a while since I dug around in those reports and maybe PGE can speak to it more
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	That's great, Brett! Thank you!
Bret Stevens	All Participants	Our fleets are currently experiencing the longest and most impactful freight recession in recent history. Asking fleets to have a level of planning a utility can consume is an challenging ask. Can they give some indication, probably, but the height of the barrier being asked by utilities is too much. Fleets buy trucks throughout the year based on freight contracts secured, the macro freight market, and specific region's micro economics. The MHD space is more complex than it is given credit for.
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Hi, Jamie - I see your hand raised and will call on you next.
Jamie Johnson, Green Energy Inst. at Lewis & Clark Law School	All Participants	Thanks, Jessica, sounds great!

Tonia Moro	All Participants	we need to focus on distributed resources.
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Thanks, Tonia.
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	We are really focused on utilities work to realize their 100 renewables commitments and want to point out the tension between that and increasing rates and the need to build out new electricity generation and upgrade grid infrastructure to support transitioning all of our buildings and transportation fuels to electricity. Please let us know how City staff can support these efforts.
Jillian DiMedio, ODOE, she/her	All Participants	Re Jamie's comment: Flexible Connection is one solution being explored by utilities in California: <a href="https://www.canarymedia.com/articles/transmission/a-new-way-to-fix-grid-bottlenecks-for-ev-charging-flexible-connection">https://www.canarymedia.com/articles/transmission/a-new-way-to-fix-grid-bottlenecks-for-ev-charging-flexible-connection</a>
Josh Price, ODOE	All Participants	<a href="https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/">https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/</a>
Jamie Johnson, Green Energy Inst. at Lewis & Clark Law School	All Participants	Thanks, Jillian! definitely curious about flexible connection!
Jillian DiMedio, ODOE, she/her	All Participants	Also, for additional thoughts and comments, here is our comment portal: <a href="https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/">https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/</a>
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Additional barrier: People move to the Pacific Northwest to enjoy the mountains, ocean and wilderness areas. We do not have easy, frequent, enjoyable and affordable public transportation to allow people to access these places without using an SOV. People want to take toys like boats, canoes, SUPs and dogs to enjoy the outdoors. It is very hard to do this via public transit.
Josh Price, ODOE	All Panelists	<a href="https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVIKq8yAg=?share_link_id=927279873435">https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVIKq8yAg=?share_link_id=927279873435</a>
Jeff Hammarlund	All Participants	Need to revisit existing development and building codes to ensure they are more “bicycle, pedestrian and public transit friendly” and less oriented around encouraging single occupancy auto travel
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Bret, I see your hand raised and will call on you next.

Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	The transportation package is does not get us closer to reaching climate goals. It is a package designed to increase revenue and does not embed funding strategies to encourage EVs, bikes or transit.
Jillian DiMedio, ODOE, she/her	All Participants	Thanks Ingrid. If you have ideas that would be better align funding with climate goals (beyond those you've already added to the board), make sure you add them to the miro!
Brett Morgan He/Him	All Participants	Minnesota and Colorado are interesting examples of states rethinking revenue models
Jessica Reichers	All Participants	Thanks, Brett!
Brett Morgan He/Him	All Participants	And the Virginia Smart Scale Program
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Yes! To a a taskforce.
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Agree with Logan. Reducing speeds makes it harder to drive and easier to walk.
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Also I'd add that the gas tax needs to stay. It is a built in already excepted carbon tax that needs to be adjusted to inflation and added to a RUC that is based on weight and fuel efficiency.
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Agree that we need to reduce congestion, lowering speed strategies are mostly for residential streets now highways
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning &	All Participants	not highways

Sustainability		
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	But there should be some consequences for the air quality impacts from diesel trucks to incentivize the market to go towards EVs
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Agree with Jana on counter-intuitive statement
Josh Price, ODOE	All Participants	<a href="https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/">https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/</a>
Hugh Arceneaux, ODOE	All Participants	<a href="https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/">https://odoe.powerappsportals.us/en-US/energy-strategy/</a>
Ingrid Fish, City of Portland, Planning & Sustainability	All Participants	Thanks!

Miro Whiteboard

Below is a transcription of the feedback received in the 4/10/25 Miro Whiteboarding activity. The whiteboard is also available for review at: [04/10 TE PWG - Meeting 3: Strategies to Overcome Barriers - Miro](#)

Whiteboard Exercise 1

<b>Topic 1: Vehicle Electrification</b>			
<b>Issue: High Costs / Lack of Funding</b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u>	<u>Uncategorized</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State should offer guaranteed loan program for class 2c and up</li> <li>Direct clean fuels money to charging deserts</li> <li>State should address lack of rebates for 2b class - should start a class 2b vehicle share program</li> <li>While I appreciate the existing state rebate for charging station projects, it does not cover enough of the cost. As a municipality we'd prefer a more traditional grant program with a more traditional funding split and an application maximum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need for state funding mechanisms to address the high incremental capital and operational costs associated with transit ZEBs, which are at least 46% more expensive than conventional transit vehicles.</li> <li>Generalized lack of funding sources dedicated to ZEV / ZET Adoption beyond the Priv Tax</li> <li>Utility rate structures that provide cost relief for charging when recognizing the grid benefits that can be provided by ZEVs</li> <li>The current transportation funding model does not incentivize driving efficient vehicles. If we want people and the market to move towards EVs we need to embed that value in our transportation system funding model. This is not rocket science. Vehicles should be charged per mile driven based on a formula of weight and efficiency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Oregon market alone cannot drive costs down for ZEV MHD's. Once the vehicles achieve cost parity with ICE, there will be a wholesale shift. Policy should focus on EVSE readiness and availability</li> <li>OR and NW region need an explicit clean transportation strategy. The OSES will address this to a certain extent, but really need to look at our disparate transportation policies and programs and our goals and seek to better align CFP, CPP, etc. with those goals. (RHA)</li> <li>No one is going to like this, but provide direct funding to the OEM's to design and build the vehicles. Taking \$200m off the funding required to develop the trucks will have a cost reduction impact far greater than subsidizing the customer at time of sale.</li> </ul>	



	<p>Meaning that lighter and more efficient vehicles that cause the least amount of harm should pay the least and vehicles that are heavy and cause more wear and tear on the roads and more environmental harm should pay more. Road Usage Charge (RUC) formula: weight + efficiency = per mile fee. This should apply to every vehicle, not just the most fuel efficient vehicles. (+1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ZEV trucks cost 3 times as much as ICE and present operational inefficiencies</li> </ul>	
<p><b><i>Issue: MHD ZEV Technology</i></b></p>			
<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ACT is broken and there is no fixing it with the current proposals. Instituting a "fake credit market" will only add to the uncertainty and complexity. Delay ACT until the vehicles are ready.</li> <li>Develop a ZEV Action Plan (like Oregon's 2021 ZEV Action Plan — now ready for an update with clearer accountability).</li> <li>ACT should allow for credit fungibility between all vehicle classes. The exclusion of CL7/8 Tractors into their own class greatly limits the ability for OEM to achieve compliance and continue to provide ICE products where ZEV products don't work</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A consistent ZEV technology assessment is needed, as the technology for medium- and heavy-duty (MHD) vehicles is still evolving. Depending on operating characteristics and demand, these vehicles face significant limitations—including restricted range, charging time and infrastructure challenges, reliability and availability concerns, hydrogen supply constraints, emergency planning for thermal events, and limited redundancy in operations.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State should use state and transit fleets to create market for manufacturers</li> <li>• ACT regulation require % sales regardless if there are ZEV options in some use cases</li> <li>• Advanced Clean Trucks &amp; Omnibus Rule should be a current requirement/policy.</li> <li>• ZEV vehicle types will only grow as the markets mature and costs decrease. Costs will only decrease when volumes go up. Low volume vehicle types will not be the focus until the higher volume vehicles classes markets grow. Policy and incentives should focus specifically on the vocations where ZEV trucks can work, even if in limited volumes</li> <li>• State should develop clean hydrogen at state and transit fleet sites (electrolysis and clean electricity solar and wind – using eminent domain if need be ) and enable the sale of the fuel to public sector</li> <li>• State should condemn renewable methane supplies and develop the sources for jurisdictional fleets and public sale through trucking gas to stations.</li> <li>• Elec Utilities should not rely on EVs</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus strategies on the ZEVs that are available and create incentives or those that are less available</li> <li>• State should use state and transit fleets to create market for manufacturers</li> </ul>			
<b><i>Issue: Consumer / Dealer Awareness</i></b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a state-funded dealership awareness program and/or incentive program for ZEVs</li> <li>• State should be actively campaigning/selling EVs and fuel efficient vehicles to the public via radio/tv/social media, etc. Educate about benefits and why people should care. Either the State does this themselves or coordinates with partners to do this.</li> <li>• Consider a statewide webpage/education video - potentially similar to how Oregon Friendly Driver program works but with EV information</li> </ul>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u>	<u>Uncategorized</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ZEV technology is not mature for commercial vehicles and while hydrogen looks feasible there are currently no commercially available class 8 trucks available in the market</li> <li>• Need state - ODOEs OCVRP program -- sponsored, developed communications and requirement that dealers post them on electronic spaces and physical spaces</li> <li>• ZEV technology for commercial vehicles is currently only battery electric and the majority of use cases are not applicable for battery electric</li> </ul>
<b><i>Issue: Technical Assistance</i></b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider creating a technical assistance grant for both EV infrastructure design/engineering and/or fleet conversion</li> </ul>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to support fleet development, esp. in places with smaller utilities without fleet programs?</li> </ul>	<u>Uncategorized</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities must have ability to recover costs for TE and infrastructure</li> <li>• There is very little public money available for subsidizing a transition to ZEV for commercial vehicles</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State should develop and deploy technicians to service govt fleets and otherwise engage in training the private sector</li> <li>• There is virtually no infrastructure available for commercial ZEV fleets</li> <li>• State should develop third party trained consultants to help jurisdictions/private fleets obtain grant moneys - example- small transit districts to best access STIFF grant funding (ODOT put more resources from planning focus to technical support focus) (+1)</li> </ul>
<b>Issue: Charging &amp; Fueling Access</b>			
<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easier integration with the grid for heavy duty charging infrastructure</li> <li>• OR needs to add capacity crediting to CFP for H2, similar to what CA and WA allow for.</li> <li>• Remove requirement that electricians have additional training for federal funds</li> <li>• Engage in utility planning to support development of charging options that work for the grid and for people / fleets.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BUILD THE CHARGERS FIRST!!! The vehicles will come when the tech matures and the costs come down. Focusing funding/permitting streamlining/policy on getting the networks out there will create the greatest benefit.</li> <li>• Create more state-funded ZEV infrastructure opportunities, especially for MHD</li> <li>• Encourage L1 or simple socket charging at more locations, like airports or MFD</li> <li>• Energization targets for New TE infrastructure to expedite delivery of charging and system improvements needed to support</li> </ul>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For some transit agencies/routes BEV buses might not make as much sense as something like and electric trolley or light rail (because even on-route charging can impact frequency and you would need adequate space for the infrastructure). It could be beneficial if the state assisted with feasibility studies to assist medium size cities to evaluate light rail or trolley buses utilizing overhead wire</li> </ul>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more state funding to support infrastructure (+1)</li> <li>• Need a rate design that provides enough incentive for multifamily</li> <li>• Only 1 public charging station in Oregon for class 7 &amp; 8 trucks</li> <li>• DEQ policy doesn't recognize the improvement value of clean diesel trucks using renewable diesel</li> <li>• Oregon has lost the financial incentives to make renewable diesel commercially viable</li> </ul>

<b>Issue: Charger Reliability / Maintenance</b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perhaps create approved list of vendors/models for state supported charging station projects - make reliability and interoperability key factors in who is approved</li> <li>Remove requirement that electricians have additional training for federal funds</li> </ul>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u>	<u>Uncategorized</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish state standards for charging reliability and maintenance (+1)</li> <li>Work with high schools, community colleges and higher education institutions to funnel students into this field. It is the future, we need to support the training and encourage people to enter this field.</li> <li>Only 1 public charging station in all of Oregon for heavy-duty trucks (+1)</li> </ul>
<b>Issue: Interoperability &amp; Standards</b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce interoperability requirements for state funded EV infrastructure projects</li> <li>Network Roaming requirements as seen in California for any public funding</li> </ul>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Station vandalism is an issue with cords getting cut. Standards should be created and required for EVSE manufacturers to make their stations able to easily replace the cord component when damaged, or to implement solutions that protect the cords such as being retractable.</li> <li>Charging DERMS open standard</li> <li>Need to develop regs and standards for H2 fueling infrastructure, including alignment</li> </ul>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u>	<u>Uncategorized</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable for heavy duty charging - virtually no infrastructure available</li> </ul>

	with standards for safety, H2 purity and testing protocols, and operability. Likely need an inter-agency working group to address this with Weights and Measures, ODOE, ODOT, DEQ, etc. (RHA)		
--	---	--	--

Whiteboard Exercise 2

<b>Topic 2: Grid Integration</b>			
<b>Issue: Load Management / DER / BESS</b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u>	<u>Uncategorized</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carriers can't depend on off-duty hours to charge vehicles when freight is a 24 hour/day activity</li> <li>Commercial charging needs are different from personal vehicle charging needs</li> <li>State subsidies for BESS and Stationary. Or Utility subsidies for BESS/Stationary. Could be coupled with requirements for TOU enrollment with networked equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open standard for EV Derms</li> <li>Jurisdictions/state should develop electricity source (micro grid) for fleets to reduce load pressure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PUC should open an investigation into the load management issues.</li> <li>Studies on load management in winter-peaking areas. much of the work on load management, rate structures etc. is for areas with summer peaking electricity demand. More work looking at how these work in winter peaking months would help better inform work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More awareness about customer actions to support grid. Incentives from utilities + trusted voices on this topic</li> </ul>
<b>Issue: Consumer Awareness – Load Management</b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u>	<u>Uncategorized</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is not enough of "what's in it for them". The programs do not disaggregate EV charging vs general household energy use well enough. As opposed to increasing rates in a TOU fashion, decrease rates to truly incentivize. Perhaps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing EV-specific utility rate cases to help reduce demand charges tied to fleet charging operations.</li> <li>Develop "risk of loss" strategies to encourage enrollment. Many individuals would rather stay with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need trusted organizations to promote.</li> </ul>

<p>have the utility commit to a 'cap' in the event electricity use behaviors don't change fast enough so individual rate payers don't have to risk seeing an increased bill. Maybe grace periods with opportunities for coaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities need to complete service territory-specific demand response and electrification potential assessments to understand the value of load management and timelines for programs to be implemented that provide a clear price signal for customers to participate and for the utility to implement.</li> <li>• time of day costs vary significantly and impact freight costs accordingly</li> </ul>	<p>their current plan vs risking paying more in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need third party operation -co-funded by utility rate payors and shareholders and state funding</li> </ul>		
<b><i>Issue: Utility Rates / Ratemaking</i></b>			
<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity rates should incentivize the use of EVs and especially incentivize the use of EVs during peak renewable generation times and discourage use during periods of the day when we are reliant on coal. There also needs to be public education &amp; awareness strategies implemented to support charging as much as possible off-peak.</li> <li>• add tiered rates! and incentives for management</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rulemaking or legislative direction to PUC to support utility planning incorporating rate structures supportive of EVs</li> <li>• PUC should create a rate class for vehicle charging and engage in avoided cost analysis (to utility improvements/resiliency) as well as ev and pass through those costs into rates.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• carriers need clear information about how to financially work with EV trucks</li> </ul>

<b>Issue: Utility Capacity / Upgrades / Interconnection</b>			
<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PUC should adopt rules to require more non-utility owned (get the IOU ROI drag out of the process) distributed resources and provide financing guarantees for projects;</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemptions from state purchase mandates may be necessary in cases of utility upgrade delays, allowing operators to maintain reliable service during the transition period</li> <li>• Funding programs dedicated to utility upgrades and charging equipment are needed to help offset upfront implementation costs. These should encompass all charging solutions, including plug-in, overhead, and inductive systems.</li> <li>• Explore opportunities to utilize and build out and scale level one charging infrastructure for light duty vehicles. This is a cheaper more efficient use and most people do not travel enough per day to need level 2 charging. Education and awareness campaigns should support this effort.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research the benefits and risks of relying/using level 1 charging at much larger levels than is currently being utilized. For example, does relying on level 1 charging damage residential electrical systems? (+1)</li> </ul>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More consistent and cohesive planning will help.. Providing grant funding to support upgrades</li> <li>• The power requirements for commercial vehicles equal the power requirements of a small city</li> </ul>
<b>Issue: Historic Planning and Investment Patterns</b>			
<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the state has mandated certain TE targets, the utilities should be required to provide commensurate investment. Either the state doesn't believe in the TE targets, or they are unwilling to support</li> </ul>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Chargers to areas with excess capacity by coordinating with utilities</li> </ul>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PUC demands prudent expenses so more signals from PUC to support investment are necessary</li> <li>• Do not necessarily agree with this barrier</li> <li>• PUC should open an investigation</li> </ul>



	the utilities as a back stop for stranded assets		
<b>Issue: COU Resources and Incentives</b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct clean fuels \$\$ to rural areas</li> <li>• BPA EE program needs to prioritize EV infrastructure</li> </ul>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State assistance/support for COU's to implement DRPAs and EPAs.</li> <li>• Consider creating supplemental state funding source for utilities to engage in TE work. Historically clean fuels credits through the utility have been the primary funding source in our area, but the value of clean fuels credits have significantly decreased as more people generate them but demand stays relatively consistent. Or perhaps considering measures that would help increase demand for clean fuel credit purchase could also be a potential solution</li> </ul>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u>	<u>Uncategorized</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utility rates need to be negotiated with commercial uses rather than dependent on time of day</li> </ul>

### Whiteboard Exercise 3

<b>Topic 3: VMT Reduction</b>			
<b>Issue: Transit Investment</b>			
<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transit is heavily subsidized and to expand capacity will require more public support and dollars</li> <li>• Transit ridership has declined since the pandemic and has not regained previous ridership levels</li> </ul>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State should increase payroll tax;</li> <li>• state should allow districts to utilize other funding tools by ordinance not ballot measure</li> </ul>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhere between barrier and opportunity: curious what comes out of the transportation package. will likely have a big impact on everything VMT</li> </ul>	<u>Uncategorized</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State should restrict CMAQ money to transit projects</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bikes should not be taxed to generate funds for the transportation system at this point. People who are using bikes take heavier vehicles off the road and cause the least amount of wear and tear on the road. The current transportation funding model does not incentivize driving efficient vehicles. If we want people and the market to move towards EVs we need to embed that value in our transportation system funding model. This is not rocket science. Vehicles should be charged per mile driven based on a formula of weight and efficiency. Meaning that lighter and more efficient vehicles that cause the least amount of harm should pay the least and vehicles that are heavy and cause more wear and tear on the roads and more environmental harm should pay more. •Road Usage Charge (RUC) formula: weight + efficiency = per mile fee. This should apply to every vehicle, not just the most fuel efficient vehicles.</li> <li>• State should restrict CMAQ money to transit projects</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light rail or electric trolley service could potentially help increase ridership and increase TOD potential in some mid size Oregon cities outside Portland metro area. It would be expensive but feasibility studies would be a start</li> </ul>	
<b>Issue: Transportation Funding</b>			

<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discretionary funding should be limited to development on transit routes</li> <li>• State should develop and provide technical services to enable jurisdictions to use limited improvement districts</li> <li>• Long term alignment of EV adoption goals and RUC that scales revenues more directly with VMT</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding models for alternative transportation measures need to be divorced from vehicle funding sources. Gas taxes, registration fees, weigh/miles for commercial, etc. are already spread too thin and are desperately needed for the existing roadways that promote economic growth. This is also an Oregon Constitutional matter.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOT needs to be accountable for 2017 before they ask for more \$\$\$.</li> <li>• Gov't accountability will solve both the funding problem and public perception of new funding asks</li> <li>• Long shot: consider revisions to Oregon's constitutional requirement for proportionality of road use and funding for maintenance</li> </ul>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• road funding comes from fuel taxes and WM taxes and is dependent on usage - other modes do not contribute sufficiently to support additional funding when road maintenance funding isn't adequate - would require general fund dollars</li> </ul>
---	--	---	--

**Issue: Land Use / Development Patterns**

<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDC charges need to increase for new road development; gas tax limited to/mostly used for current inventory maintenance</li> <li>• Give current TPR laws more teeth, ensure that CFEC results in changes in local planning</li> <li>• Regions should begin planning for managed retreat</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bike infrastructure remains unsafe. Bike lanes comingled with traffic is not the solution. Dedicated bike infrastructure that is not comingled with vehicle lanes.</li> <li>• VMT reduction in the commercial vehicle space comes from economic downturns - this should not be a goal for medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles</li> <li>• Need to build in driving disincentives - reduced parking; congestion fees</li> <li>• GHG Planning Rule Like CO or MI, req projects to be screened with criteria and have equal offsets from other projects that decrease VMT.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to revisit current codes and org</li> <li>• implement Climate Friendly Area zoning requirements in Oregon Administrative Rule</li> <li>• Support mixed use development in urban areas</li> <li>• consider effects of latent and induced demand resulting from land use and roadway capacity projects</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

**Issue: Safety**

<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VMT transition to Public Transit will NOT occur until members of the public feel safe. Zero tolerance policies, proactive enforcement during times of high use, increased safety and security park and ride.</li> <li>• Harsher penalties when drivers hit ped/bk</li> <li>• Maximize technical assistance opportunities for smaller communities. SRTS technical assistance and ARTS technical assistance are great, but could potentially be expanded to help more with project identification</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bike advocacy programs could help in general</li> <li>• State assistance starting and expanding automated enforcement programs. The legislative changes have been great, but police staff time and court staff time continue to be barriers to implementation</li> <li>• Unhoused community members experience a lot of traffic exposure and make up a large number of fatal bike and ped crashes. State support in studying this and proposing solutions would be very helpful</li> </ul>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the subject of speed reduction - MassDOT did an interesting data project with Kittelson to evaluate speed limits on a (I believe) statewide level and recommend roadways for speed limit reduction. They also have a very context based speed limit setting methodology. They were able to map their contexts and pair it with cell/connected vehicle data to do this. A larger scale GIS analysis like this could help given limited staff time to put into the speed zone investigations</li> </ul>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit needs to invest in ridership safety to encourage participation</li> <li>• prioritize investment in high concern areas</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Issue: Transportation Options for Rural &amp; Low-Income Residents</i></b></p>			
<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there an opportunity to leverage state funding to promote affordable housing development in close proximity to transit. Perhaps proximity to transit could be a criteria for how funding is prioritized. TOD style affordable housing could be helpful</li> <li>• Odot and regional transit districts need to work on moving people conveniently out of small urban/rural areas to the urban areas where there is accessible/reliable public transportation and private hale</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E bike and scooters in rural areas could be supported in small towns</li> <li>• Consider statewide e-bike incentive or bike purchase incentive for low income residents</li> <li>• increasing e-bike subsidies especially for income-qualifying Oregonians</li> </ul>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to get a positive ROI for rural transit options so local communities have to prioritize this in their budgets</li> </ul>

<p>services - ie. Medford to Portland, the Dalles to Portland, Bend to Eugene.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need an affordable, easy and frequent (every 15-30 minutes) public transit option to give people access to the coast, vineyards and mountains which enables people to bring dogs, SUPS, mountain bikes, surf boards, etc. SOV use needs to be limited at trailheads and on strategic roads to incentivize use of public transit. Parking lots at ski resorts should be turned into ski-in ski-out lodging. This is one of the major reasons Portlanders own vehicles. They want to be able to access our wilderness /natural areas. (+1)</li> <li>• Collaborate with Amtrak to expand frequency of existing lines in the state / interregional (+1)</li> </ul>			
<b><i>Issue: Intermodal System Completeness</i></b>			
<p><u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand wheeled access on existing transit (e.g. bikes and wheelchairs) to ensure those needing these modes of transportation have access</li> </ul>	<p><u>Create New Policy/Program</u></p>	<p><u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More regional and interregional active transportation facilities? (+1)</li> <li>• Investments in walkability of areas around transit stations</li> </ul>	<p><u>Uncategorized</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize connections that would have the most benefit to reducing VMT and invest there</li> <li>• identify and close critical gaps in local and state active transportation and transit networks</li> </ul>
<b><i>Issue: Cultural Perceptions</i></b>			

<u>Revise Existing Policy/Program</u>	<u>Create New Policy/Program</u>	<u>Additional Study or Data Needed</u>	<u>Uncategorized</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can change this by creating accessible/reliable/convenient public transportation</li> <li>• Create better accessibility for pets and equipment (e.g. bikes, skis) on transit</li> <li>• Transit needs to be more affordable, enjoyable, efficient and reliable than SOVs. If this happens, people will make the easy choice to switch to transit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better access to affordable, clean car sharing. See HourCar in Minnesota as an example. E.g. they have vehicles that come with free passes to state parks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Especially in the west where cities are not dense enough to get the value out of alternative mode investment</li> <li>• invest and expand existing local and state Transportation Demand Management programs aka Transportation Options</li> <li>• provide resources for workplace and employe based transportation demand management programs outside the Portland Metro area</li> </ul>