



# Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor

Oregon Transportation Commission  
Office of the Director, MS 11  
355 Capitol St NE  
Salem, OR 97301-3871

**DATE:** April 27, 2026

**TO:** Oregon Transportation Commission

*Lisa Sumption*

**FROM:** Lisa Sumption  
Interim Director

**SUBJECT:** Consent Item 05 – OTC Public Involvement Policy

**PRESENTED BY:** Policy, Data, & Analysis Division Administrator Amanda Pietz

**Requested Action:** Consent Approval

Approve the updated Oregon Transportation Commission Public Involvement Policy.

**Background:**

The Oregon Transportation Commission Public Involvement Policy was established to guide staff in meeting state and federal public participation requirements for statewide planning processes and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development. The OTC has committed to meaningfully involving the public in important decisions by providing an equitable and transparent engagement and communications decision-making structure that builds public trust.

The current policy was last approved by the OTC in 2020. The current update has strived to:

- Engage meaningfully with stakeholders.
- Create equitable and transparent engagement that builds public trust and fosters ongoing relationships with communities.
- Improve consistency of ODOT public involvement processes.
- Reduce redundancies in 2020 policy and reorganize document.
- Review the effectiveness of the policy and provide updates.
- Incorporate review elements of the new Capital Investment Plan

The updated policy was released for public review from November 19, 2025, to January 23, 2026, meeting the requirements for a minimum 45-day comment period. An online survey via Cognito was used to collect feedback and was distributed via GovDelivery. The GovDelivery notification included the following groups:

- Area Commission on Transportation Members
- Modal Committee Members
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)
- Cities and Counties
- General Interested Parties

ODOT received 24 written comments and reviewed each individual suggestion to update the policy based on public feedback. The comments received from public review are included in the draft policy with tracked changes. Many comments have been incorporated into the final draft policy, while other more general comments did not change the policy directly but continue to help staff working on statewide plans, the STIP and the Capital Investment Plan.

ODOT requests that the OTC approve the final draft Public Involvement Policy. Following approval, the revised policy will be posted to the ODOT Public Involvement Policy internet page and shared with staff for implementation.

**Previous Commission Action and Discussion:**

In late 2025, the Commission agreed to update the policy, addressing changes to federal and state regulations and incorporating guidance for outreach commitments as part of ODOT's new Capital Investment Plan.


**Outcomes:**

**With the approval** of the updated OTC Public Involvement Policy, ODOT can implement these new changes in their public outreach for statewide plans, Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan, and the Capital Investment Plan.

**Without approval** of the updated OTC Public Involvement Policy, ODOT will be unable to implement new changes that incorporate state and federal regulations for public involvement. Additionally, new guidelines for the Capital Investment Plan will not be included.

**Attachments:**

- Attachment 01 – OTC Public Involvement Policy
- Attachment 02 – Draft Policy with Tracked Changes from Public Review
- Attachment 03 – 45-Day Public Review Comment Log

 <p><b>Oregon Transportation Commission</b></p> <p><b>POLICY</b></p>	NUMBER <b>TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION-11</b>	SUPERSEDES <b>2020 Public Involvement Policy</b>
	EFFECTIVE DATE <b>XX/XX/2026</b>	PAGE NUMBER <b>01 of 06</b>
	REFERENCE	
SUBJECT <b>PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT POLICY</b>		

**PURPOSE**

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) establishes the following policy and core implementation expectations to guide public involvement efforts by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff. These expectations ensure compliance with state and federal public involvement requirements and agency objectives for statewide planning processes, the Capital Investment Plan (CIP), and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development.

**POLICY:**

The OTC and ODOT are committed to implementing decision making structures that build public trust by making decisions in an open and transparent manner considering public feedback.

**OBJECTIVES**

1. Improve consistency of OTC and ODOT public involvement processes.
2. Guide ODOT staff regarding public involvement processes, including coordination within the agency, and with partners.
3. Ensure that all applicable state and federal public participation requirements for statewide planning, CIP and STIP development are met or exceeded.
4. Solidify the OTC and ODOT’s commitment to meaningfully engage the public during the creation and annual update of the CIP.
5. Engage diverse voices across the state to create resilient and sustainable plans that consider the needs of all people living in Oregon.
6. Ensure the Oregon Transportation Plan’s outreach engagement policies and commitments are applied.

## **BACKGROUND**

The OTC and ODOT are committed to achieving the vision of the Oregon Transportation Plan: “Oregon’s transportation system supports all Oregonians by connecting people and goods to places in the most climate-friendly, equitable, and safe way.” Achieving this goal requires a unified transportation plan that considers all modes of Oregon’s transportation system as integral parts of a single system.

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is a key component of the long-range transportation system plan for the state. It establishes a vision and policy foundation to guide transportation system development and investment. The OTP, along with its associated statewide mode and topic plans, guide decisions by ODOT and partner transportation agencies. This guidance is carried forward into local and regional transportation plans.

The Capital Investment Plan, or CIP, is ODOT’s mid-range planning document for identifying planned investments over 10 years. Project concepts in the CIP will be refined as they move through the planning and scoping phases. Projects will have the opportunity for appropriate public involvement both in the CIP and when they are programmed in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Involvement at both stages will be reflective of the purpose of the document.

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, or STIP, is the ODOT’s federally required programming document for the statewide intermodal program of transportation projects. The document consists of projects funded with federal and state funding.

The OTC has final authority over these efforts, including adoption of statewide plans, as well as approval of the CIP and STIP. The Commission will deliberate and make decisions on these and other topics in public meetings, with materials posted prior to the meeting and opportunity for public comments to be submitted verbally or in writing at the meeting.

## **CONTEXT**

ODOT recognizes public involvement is not a one size fits all approach. Each effort should engage meaningfully early in the process with a diverse use of engagement methods and tools. Public involvement should support meeting people where they are, building understanding for informed feedback, while also balancing efficient and effective use of OTC and ODOT resources.

The OTC Public Involvement Policy is applicable to all appropriate state and federal policies.

## **POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**

The following guidelines apply to all ODOT statewide plans, the STIP, and when specifically noted the CIP. These guidelines guide coordination with partner organizations including but not limited to Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), local government agencies, and the general public.

## **GENERAL EXPECTATIONS**

### *Processes*

1. Abide by all applicable state laws<sup>1</sup> referenced below, and federal laws<sup>2</sup> and rules in implementing public involvement processes for the development and update of statewide transportation plans and the development of the STIP.
2. Meet the State of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal 1: Citizen Involvement – The purpose of Goal 1 (660-015-0000(1)) is "To develop a citizen involvement program that ensures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process."
3. Meet the State of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation Planning (660-012-000(1)(g) which states "(g) Engage underserved populations in decision-making and prioritize investments serving those communities."
4. Ensure that all public meetings follow the Oregon Public Meetings Law (ORS 192.610 to 192.705), including holding meetings at locations and times that are convenient, accessible and transparent to the public.
5. Hold public hearings consistent with requirements under Oregon Revised Statute 192.
6. Comply with ORS.183.750 in providing public communication in language that is plain and clear as possible.
7. Apply the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, to ensure public involvement uses accessibility standards for communications and outreach.
8. Comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (49 CFR 21 and 23 CFR 200) to assure that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, and national origin be excluded from participation.
9. Ensure meaningful language access for persons for whom English is their second language or otherwise cannot communicate in English.
10. Ensure protection of personal information when collecting any identity-related data.
11. Provide a minimum 45-day formal public review and written comment period for major changes for proposed statewide transportation plans and draft CIP.

---

<sup>1</sup> Including Oregon Statute and Policy: ORS 182.535 – Environmental Justice Council; HB 4077 (2022); and SB 420 (2008).

<sup>2</sup> 23 CFR Part 450.210 Interested parties, public involvement, and consultation.

12. Provide a minimum 45-day formal public review and written comment period for development of the draft STIP.
13. Provide a 15-day public review of proposed amendments of the adopted STIP.
14. Evaluate and incorporate public input into long-range statewide transportation plans, STIP, and CIP before their adoption by the OTC.

### *Engagement Methods*

15. Work to create fair and meaningful public involvement by<sup>3</sup>:
  - Leveraging data to inform and understand the community demographics.
  - Building durable community relationships with community members outside of the project lifecycle to understand their transportation needs.
  - Involving a broad representation of communities by using community-preferred engagement techniques.
  - Developing specific strategies that address specific barriers for underserved communities.
  - Documenting how community input impacted the final projects, program, or plans, and communicating with the affected communities how their input was used.
16. For each decision-making process evaluate the appropriate level of public involvement (e.g., inform, consult, involve, collaborate, or empower<sup>4</sup>.) Document which level of public involvement was used and why for a 45-day formal public review.
17. Provide early, continual, and inclusive public involvement opportunities (CFR 450.210).
18. Incorporate appropriate partners including but not limited to individuals and organizations that are interested in or affected by transportation decisions such as: transportation disadvantaged groups<sup>5</sup>; local agencies; interested members of the public; private providers of transportation; users of public transportation; users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities; seniors; representatives of people with disabilities; providers of freight transportation services; business interests; other interested parties; and organizations who are interested in or affected by transportation

---

<sup>3</sup> U.S Department of Transportation. [Promising Practices for Meaningful Public Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making](#). October 2022.

<sup>4</sup> International Association of Public Participation IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation, 2018.

<sup>5</sup> The Oregon Transportation Plan defines Transportation Disadvantaged: Includes communities of color, people experiencing low income, older adults, youth, and people with disabilities, who are at a significant disadvantage without access to convenient, safe, well-integrated transportation alternatives. All of these groups are often without easy access to cars and live in locations without convenient, safe transportation alternatives.

decisions.<sup>6</sup>

19. Actively seek out opportunities for public review and comment at the regional and local level through a variety of engagement practices, including in-person and virtual public meetings, public notices, online open houses, virtual tools, and other methods of outreach.
20. Ensure outreach engages all applicable parts of the state and recognize the difference in needs of each region.
21. Create a plan to share gathered feedback and comments with planning and project teams during the project development or update of state transportation plans, the CIP, and the STIP.
22. Inform affected state and federal land use agencies such as; natural resources agencies and land management agencies; local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation; and other partners including advisory committees formed under Oregon Revised Statutes or otherwise appointed by the Governor, the OTC or ODOT to assist with specific transportation issues during the development of statewide transportation plans, CIP, and the STIP.
23. Develop statewide transportation plans, the CIP, and the STIP in consultation and cooperation with the providers of transportation systems and services such as ACTs, MPOs, metropolitan and non-metropolitan area local governments, and others.
24. For any significant changes that require a 45-day formal public review, notify impacted ACTs.
25. Coordinate with the ODOT representatives of the ACT during the development and update of statewide transportation plans, the STIP, and CIP to ensure ACTs receive information at key milestones and public review.
26. Changes to a significant goal or policy in a plan should be completed only after meaningful engagement and input with the directly affected partners and advisory groups.
27. Commit to transparency by reviewing 45-day formal public review comments, documenting changes made, and sharing review of comments with the OTC for statewide plans, CIP and STIP.

### *Tools*

28. Utilize tools from the Office of Engagement and Civil Rights including the Equitable Engagement Compensation Program (EECP), Community Impact

---

<sup>6</sup> Tribal Governments follow their own engagement process. Please refer to ODOT's Tribal Consultation process. Tribal Governments are not a part of the public involvement process.

Analysis, Equitable Engagement Guide, Index Map, Right to Access Plan, and community-based organizations to effectively identify and engage with diverse communities.


29. Utilize communication tools such as but not limited to: websites; email lists; newsletters; individual letters; press releases; and social media; advisory committees; online open houses; webinars; partner meetings and presentations; listening meetings; public hearings and meetings; hybrid and virtual meetings; and focus groups.

### **SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR THE CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN**

7. Seek input from ACTs, the public, MPOs, and local governments on prioritizing the OTP goals which will be used by the OTC to determine investment priorities in the CIP every three to five years.
  1. Annually seek input from the ACTs on potential investments to be included in the CIP.
  2. Annually share finalized CIP list with ACTs, MPOs, local governments, and the public.

### **ASSESSMENT OF OUR PRACTICES**

1. Review the effectiveness of this public involvement policy at key milestones and implementation actions as needed to ensure that they provide full, meaningful and open access to all interested parties and revise the process as appropriate.
2. Partner with the Office of Engagement and Civil Rights to identify a review of public involvement efforts and outcomes.
3. Solicit and review comments from local officials and other interested parties regarding the effectiveness of these consultation procedures through the federally-required Local Consultation Survey at least every five years, allowing at least a 60-day public review and comment period.
4. Provide a minimum 45-day formal public review and comment period for this proposed public involvement policy and implementation actions before adoption by the OTC.

 <p><b>Oregon Transportation Commission</b></p> <p><b>POLICY</b></p> <p>Date:</p>	NUMBER <b>TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION-11</b>	SUPERSEDES <del>1994-2020</del> <b>Public Involvement Policy</b>
	EFFECTIVE DATE --	PAGE NUMBER 01 OF 0 <del>8</del> <b>7</b>
	REFERENCE <del>1994 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURES</del> <u>Pending</u>	
SUBJECT <b>PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT POLICY</b>		

**PURPOSE**

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) establishes the following policy and core implementation expectations to guide public involvement efforts by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff. These expectations ensure compliance with public involvement overall and specific to meet state and federal public participation involvement requirements and agency objectives for statewide planning processes, the Capital Investment Plan (CIP), and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development.

**POLICY**

~~The OTC will make decisions in an open and transparent manner, considering public feedback and conducting outreach and engagement on policy and funding decisions. The OTC and ODOT are committed to implementing decision-making structures that build public trust.~~ The OTC and ODOT are committed to implementing decision making structures that build public trust by making decisions in an open and transparent manner considering public feedback.

**OBJECTIVES**

- a) Improve consistency of OTC and ODOT public involvement processes.
- b) Guide ODOT staff regarding public involvement processes, including coordination within the agency, and with partners.
- c) Ensure that all applicable state and federal public participation requirements for statewide planning, CIP and STIP development are met or exceeded.

- d) Solidify the OTC and ODOT's commitment to meaningfully engage the public during the creation and annual update of the CIP.
- e) Engage diverse voices across the state to create resilient and sustainable plans that consider the needs of all people living in Oregonians.
- f) Ensure the Oregon Transportation Plan's outreach engagement policies and commitments are operationalizedapplied.

## **BACKGROUND**

The OTC and ODOT are committed to ~~efforts aimed at~~ achieving the vision of the Oregon Transportation Plan: "Oregon's transportation system supports all Oregonians by connecting people and goods to places in the most climate-friendly, equitable, and safe way." Achieving this goal requires a unified transportation plan that considers all modes of Oregon's transportation system as integral parts of a single system.

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP), is a key component of the long-range transportation system plan for the state. It establishes a vision and policy foundation to guide transportation system development and investment. The OTP ~~and, along with its component associated~~ statewide mode and topic plans, guide decisions by ~~the Oregon Department of Transportation-ODOT~~ and ~~local~~ partner transportation agencies. This guidance is carried forward into local and regional transportation plans, and are reflected in the policies and decisions explained in local and regional plans.

The Capital Investment Plan, ~~or (CIP),~~ is ~~the Oregon Department of Transportation's ODOT's~~ mid-range planning document for identifying planned investments over 10 years ~~for all funding sources.~~ Project concepts in the CIP will be refined as they move through the planning and scoping phases. Projects will have the opportunity for appropriate public involvement both in the CIP and when they are programmed in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Involvement at both stages will be reflective of the purpose of the document.

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, or STIP, is the ~~ODOT's Oregon Department of Transportation's~~ federally required programming document for the statewide intermodal program of transportation projects. The document consists of projects funded with federal and state funding.

The OTC has final authority over these efforts, including adoption of statewide plans, as well as approval of the CIP and STIP. The cCommission will deliberate and make decisions on these and other topics in public meetings, with materials posted prior to the meeting and opportunity for public comments to be submitted verbally or in writing at the meeting.

## **CONTEXT**

ODOT recognizes public involvement is not a one size fits all approach. Each effort should engage meaningfully early in the process using with a diverse use of engagement methods and tools. that Public involvement should support meeting people where they are, building understanding for informed feedback, while also balancing efficient and effective use of OTC and ODOT resources.

The OTC/ODOT's Ppublic Iinvolvement Ppolicy is applicable to all appropriate state and federal policies.

## **POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**

The following implementation actionsguidelines apply to all ODOT statewide plans, the STIP, and when specifically noted the CIP.~~These guidelines guide coordination with partner organizations including but not limited to Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), local government agencies, and the general public.~~

~~STIP development, and where specified, guide coordination with partner organizations including but not limited to Area Commissions on Transportations (ACTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) and local government agencies. The following implementation actions apply to the Capital Investment Plan when specifically noted to support public involvement in the annual development of the CIP and when not otherwise specific to statewide transportation plans and the STIP.~~

## **GENERAL EXPECTATIONS**

### *Processes*

1. Abide by all applicable state laws<sup>1</sup> referenced below, and federal laws<sup>2</sup> and rules in implementing public involvement processes for the development and update of statewide transportation plans and the development of the STIP.
2. Meet the State of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal 1: Citizen Involvement – The purpose of Goal 1 (660-015-0000(1)) is “To develop a citizen involvement program that ensures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.”
3. Meet the State of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation Planning (660-012-000(1)(g) which states "(g) Engage

---

<sup>1</sup> Including Oregon Statue and Policy: ORS 182.535 – Environmental Justice Council; HB 4077 (2022); and SB 420 (2008)

<sup>2</sup> 23 CFR Part 450.210 Interested parties, public involvement, and consultation.

underserved populations in decision-making and prioritize investments serving those communities."

4. Ensure that all public meetings follow the Oregon Public Meetings Law (ORS 192.610 to 192.705), including holding meetings at locations and times that are convenient, accessible and transparent to the public.

5. Hold public hearings consistent with requirements under Oregon Revised Statute 192.

~~5.6.~~ Comply with ORS.183.750 in providing public communication in language that is plain and clear as possible.

~~6.7.~~ Apply the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, ~~to public involvement to ensure the Department of Administrative Services to ensure public involvement uses~~ accessibility standards for communications and outreach.

~~7.~~ Comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (49 CFR 21 and 23 CFR 200) to assure that no person shall, on the grounds of race, colorsex, and national origin be excluded from participation.

~~8.~~ Comply with additional federal nondiscrimination authorities that prohibit discrimination based on sex, age, and disability.

~~9.8.~~ Ensure meaningful language access for persons for whom English is their second language or otherwise cannot communicate in English with limited English proficiency (LEP).

~~10.9.~~ Ensure protection of personal information when collecting any identity-related data.

10. Provide a minimum 45-day formal public review and written comment period for major changes for proposed statewide transportation plans, draft CIP and the STIP. ~~Transportation facility plans will follow specific requirements provided in the State Agency Coordination Program (OAR 731-015-0065).~~

11. Provide a minimum 45-day formal public review and written comment period for development of the draft STIP.

~~11.12.~~ Provide a 15-day public review of proposed amendments of the adopted STIP.

~~12.13.~~ Evaluate and incorporate public input into long-range statewide transportation plans, STIP, and CIP before their adoption by the OTC.

## Engagement Methods

~~13.14.~~ Work to create fair and meaningful public involvement by<sup>3</sup>:

- Leveraging data to inform and understand the community demographics.
- Building durable community relationships with community members outside of the project lifecycle to understand their transportation ~~wants and~~ needs.
- Involving a broad representation of communities by using community-preferred engagement techniques.
- Developing specific strategies that address specific barriers for underserved communities.
- Documenting how community input impacted the final projects, program, or plans, and communicating with the affected communities how their input was used.

~~14.15.~~ For each decision-making process ~~evaluated~~define the appropriate level of public involvement (e.g., inform, consult, involve, collaborate, or empower.)<sup>4</sup> Document which level of public involvement was used and why for a 45-day formal public review.

~~15.16.~~ Provide early, continual, and inclusive public involvement opportunities (CFR 450.210). ~~for transportation disadvantaged<sup>5</sup> groups.~~

~~16.17.~~ Incorporate appropriate partners including but not limited to individuals and organizations that are interested in or affected by transportation decisions such as: transportation disadvantaged groups; local agencies; interested members of the public; private providers of transportation; users of public transportation; users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities; seniors; representatives of people with disabilities; providers of freight transportation services; business interests; other interested parties; and organizations who are interested in or affected by transportation decisions.<sup>6</sup>

~~17.18.~~ Actively seek out opportunities for public review and comment

---

<sup>3</sup> U.S Department of Transportation. *Promising Practices for Meaningful Public Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making*. October 2022.

<sup>4</sup> International Association of Public Participation IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation, 2018U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *Public Participation Guide: Selecting the Right Level of Public Participation*.

<sup>5</sup> The Oregon Transportation Plan defines Transportation Disadvantaged: Includes communities of color, people experiencing low income, older adults, youth, and people with disabilities, who are at a significant disadvantage without access to convenient, safe, well-integrated transportation alternatives. All of these groups are often without easy access to cars and live in locations without convenient, safe transportation alternatives.

<sup>6</sup> Tribal Governments follow their own engagement process. Please refer to ~~ODOT's~~ODOT's Tribal Consultation process. Tribal Governments are not a part of the public involvement process.

at the regional and local level through a variety of engagement practices, including in-person and virtual public meetings, public notices, online open houses, ~~virtual tools~~, and other methods of outreach.

~~18-19.~~ Ensure outreach engages all applicable parts of the state and recognize the difference in needs of each region.

~~19-20.~~ Create a plan to share gathered feedback and ~~commitments~~ with planning and project teams during the project development or update of state transportation plans, the CIP, and the STIP.

~~20-21.~~ Inform affected state and federal land use agencies such as: natural resources agencies and land management agencies; local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation; and other partners including advisory committees formed under Oregon Revised Statutes or otherwise appointed by the Governor, the OTC or ODOT to assist with specific transportation issues during the development of statewide transportation plans, CIP, and the STIP.

~~21.~~ Develop statewide transportation plans, the CIP, and the STIP in consultation and cooperation with the providers of transportation systems and services such as ACTs, MPOs, metropolitan and non-metropolitan area local governments, ~~special districts such as transit and port districts~~, and others. ~~Ensure statewide perspective from both urban and rural areas.~~

~~22.~~ ~~Work with MPOs to coordinate public involvement in the planning processes for statewide transportation plans and the STIP (CFR 405.208).~~

~~23-22.~~ Notify impacted ACTs regarding significant amendments to the approved STIP. Significant changes to the STIP will follow the procedures in this policy and any other requirement in rule or statute. For any significant changes that require a 45-day formal public review, notify impacted ACTs.

~~24.~~ Coordinate with the ODOT representatives of the ACT during the development and update of statewide transportation plans, the STIP, and CIP to ensure ACTs receive information at key milestones and public review.

~~25-23.~~ Changes to a significant goal or policy in a plan should be completed only after meaningful engagement and input with the directly affected partners and advisory groups.

~~26. Promote transparency by being responsive to formal comments and providing information on outcomes.~~

~~24. Commit to transparency by reviewing 45-day formal public review comments, documenting changes made, and sharing review of comments with the Oregon Transportation Commission for Statewide plans, CIP and STIP. publicly posting comment review with what changes were made following formal public review.~~

### Tools

~~27-25.~~ Utilize tools from the Office of Engagement and Civil Rights including the Equitable Engagement Compensation Program (EECP), Community Impact Analysis, Equitable Engagement Guide, Index Map, Right to Access Plan, and community-based organizations to effectively identify and engage with diverse communities.

~~28-26.~~ Utilize communication tools such as but not limited to: websites; email lists; newsletters; individual letters; press releases; and social media; advisory committees; online open houses; webinars; partner meetings and presentations; listening meetings; public hearings and meetings; hybrid and virtual meetings; and focus groups.

## **SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR THE CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN**

1. Seek input from ACTs, the public, MPOs, and local governments on ~~the prioritizing the OTP~~ goals which will be used by the OTC to determine investment priorities in the CIP every three to five years. ~~The OTC will set priorities among the OTP goals.~~

~~2. Annually seek input from the public, MPOs, and local governments on potential investments being added to the CIP.~~

~~3-2.~~ Annually seek input from the ACTs on potential investments to be included in the CIP through an ACT identification of priorities from those investments under consideration. ~~Constrain list to investments that could be reasonably funded.~~

~~3.~~ Annually share finalized CIP ~~list~~ with ACTs, ~~the public,~~ MPOs, ~~and~~ local governments, and the public.

## **ASSESSMENT OF OUR PRACTICES**

1. Review the effectiveness of this public involvement policy at key

milestones and implementation actions as needed to ensure that they provide full, meaningful and open access to all interested parties and revise the process as appropriate.

1.2. Partner with the Office of Equity Engagement and Civil Rights to identify a review of public involvement efforts and outcomes.

2.3. Solicit and review comments from local officials and other interested parties regarding the effectiveness of these consultation procedures through the federally-required Local Consultation Survey at least every five years, allowing at least a 60-day public review and comment period.

3.4. Provide a minimum 45-day formal public review and comment period for this proposed public involvement policy and implementation actions before adoption by the OTC. ~~Any revisions to the adopted policy shall undergo a minimum 45-day public review and comment period.~~

# OTC Public Involvement Policy Comment Log

## Question #1 Are there any changes you would make to the policy?

Comm. #	Name	Organization	Comment Question #1.1	Proposed Action
1.1	Jerry Fraizer	Personal	Annual ODOT financial audit	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) and Capital Investment Plan (CIP). This policy does not track any financial record. Comment shared with CIP staff.
2.1	Hector Dominguez Aguirre	Personal	Adding in point 12 or 26 in Processes a paragraph acknowledging the use of digital tools to lower barriers of participation and, at the same time, commit to the protection of personal information by minimizing the collection of PII to the minimum.	<p>Thank you for your comment. We've added a new guideline, (#6) to comply with ORS.183.750 to provide public communication in language that is plain and clear as possible.</p> <p>Guideline #18 updated to include virtual tools on the list of engagement practices.</p> <p>New guideline, #10 added to ensure protection of personal information when collecting any identity-related data.</p>
2.1	Hector Dominguez Aguirre	Personal	In the 'SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR THE CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN' section, it would be welcome to add a timeline for the annual public input request. It could be connected to budget or after auditing notes.	Thank you for your comment. We've added a new guideline for the specific text for the CIP section, (#2) to annually seek input from the ACTs on potential investments to be included in the CIP.
2.1	Hector Dominguez Aguirre	Personal	The policy lacks of measures for reporting back to the public about performance metrics and methods that include audits (internal or done by third parties) that can inform public engagement and participation. Performance metrics and information should be release in open data formats to the public following transparency and accountability best practices.	Thank you for your comment. The assessment of our practices section, (#1) has been updated to review the effectiveness of this policy at key milestones.

3.1	Jill Dobson		<p>Yes. The policy is strong on legal requirements, but several changes would improve clarity, accountability, and public trust.</p> <p>1. Be clearer about how public input affects decisions. The policy says ODOT will “meaningfully engage” the public, but it does not explain how people can tell whether their input mattered. I recommend requiring a short, public summary that explains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What the public said.</li> <li>• What changed because of that input.</li> <li>• What did not change, with a brief explanation.</li> </ul> <p>This would make engagement more transparent and easier for the public to understand.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Guideline #27 has been updated to promote transparency to review formal comments, document changes made and share how feedback was incorporated with the OTC for changes that require a formal 45-day public review.</p>
3.1	Jill Dobson		<p>2. Explain why a certain level of engagement is chosen. The policy lists different levels of public involvement (inform, consult, involve, collaborate, empower), but it does not require staff to explain why a specific level is used. For decisions with larger impacts, staff should clearly explain why a higher or lower level of engagement is appropriate.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Guideline #16 updated to document which level of public engagement was used for key public review comments and milestones.</p>
3.1	Jill Dobson		<p>3. Emphasize early public involvement. Public input is most meaningful when it happens before key decisions are made. The policy should more clearly state that engagement must occur early enough to influence priorities, scope, and funding—not after those decisions are largely set.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Methods of early public involvement were added to the context section. Per CFR 450.210, early public involvement is also stated in #17.</p>
3.1	Jill Dobson		<p>4. Align the policy with plain language and meaningful access requirements. This policy is intended to guide public engagement, yet the document itself is written at a college-level reading standard and relies heavily on technical and legal language. As written, it is difficult for many members of the public to read and understand.</p> <p>This creates a disconnect with ODOT’s stated commitments to meaningful engagement, equity, and public trust, as well as with the intent of Oregon public involvement requirements, ADA accessibility, Title VI, and limited English proficiency obligations. A public engagement policy should model the accessibility it expects from public-facing engagement materials.</p> <p>At a minimum, the policy should require that public-facing engagement materials meet plain-language standards and either revise this policy accordingly or provide a clear, plain-language public version.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The policy’s purpose, background, context, and policy implementation have been revised for plain language.</p> <p>New guideline (#6) added to comply with ORS 183.750 in providing public communication in language that is simple and clear as possible.</p>

			Meaningful access requires more than legal accuracy— it requires information that people can reasonably comprehend.	
4.1	Mary Stewart		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed ODOT Public Involvement Policy 2025. I appreciate ODOT’s continued commitment to transparency, early engagement, and compliance with state and federal public participation requirements.</p> <p>While the policy establishes a solid framework, I respectfully offer the following comments and recommendations to strengthen its effectiveness and accountability:</p> <p>1. Clarify How Public Input Influences Decisions The policy emphasizes documenting public feedback, but it does not clearly describe how that input affects final decisions. I encourage ODOT to: Explicitly explain how public comments are considered in decision-making; and Provide a brief public summary explaining why key suggestions were or were not incorporated into final plans.</p> <p>This would improve trust and demonstrate that engagement is meaningful, not merely procedural.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Guideline #27 has been updated to promote transparency to review formal comments, document changes made and share how feedback was incorporated with the OTC for changes that require a formal 45-day public review.
4.1	Mary Stewart		<p>2. Add Measurable Equity and Engagement Benchmarks The policy appropriately prioritizes engagement with underserved and historically marginalized communities. To ensure consistent implementation, ODOT should consider: Establishing measurable participation or outreach benchmarks; Tracking participation by geography and demographic factors where legally permissible; and Publicly reporting on engagement outcomes. Clear metrics would help evaluate whether equity goals are being met.</p>	Thank you for your comment. We have updated our Assessment of our Practices section, (#2) to commit to partnering with ODOT’s Office of Engagement and Civil Rights to identify reviewal of public involvement.
4.1	Mary Stewart		<p>3. Strengthen Accountability Across Programs and Regions Because the policy allows flexibility in implementation, public involvement quality may vary across regions or programs. I recommend: Developing minimum public engagement standards applicable to all statewide plans, STIP processes, and the Capital Investment Plan; and Periodically auditing engagement practices to ensure consistency.</p>	Thank you for your comment. We have updated our policy implementation text to clarify applicable points for the CIP. The policy in the future will have the chance to adopt all standard guidelines to statewide plans, the STIP, and the CIP. As the CIP is still in development, not all guidelines are applicable at this moment.
4.1	Mary Stewart		<p>4. Address Digital Access and Participation Gaps The policy encourages virtual engagement tools, which increase convenience but may exclude some communities. ODOT should: Commit to providing non-digital participation options for major planning efforts; and</p>	Thank you for your comment. Guideline #18 updated to include the use of virtual tools. This guideline also lists in-person engagement

			Clearly communicate alternative ways to engage for individuals without reliable internet access.	methods such as in-person meetings.
4.1	Mary Stewart		5. Increase Transparency in the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) Process Given the significance of the CIP, ODOT should: Clearly show how public and partner input aligns with final investment decisions; and Publicly explain major deviations from stated public priorities. This would strengthen confidence in the fairness and responsiveness of the investment process.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. Comment shared with CIP staff for consideration of financial reporting.
5.1	Amanda Rapinchuk	Clatsop County	Clatsop County recommends consideration of the following additional Capital Investment Plan guideline: Seek input from interest-holders in rural areas on routes that serve as key connections between rural and urban communities, ensuring that rural corridors with significant recreational travel from urban residents are meaningfully considered.	Thank you for your comment. We have added guideline #20 to ensure outreach engages all applicable parts of the state.
6.1	Kevin McGrane		Process 8's blanket deference to undefined "federal nondiscrimination authorities" is unwise when "nondiscrimination" is the phrase being used by federal agencies to penalize policy protections against race/age/disability-based discrimination. ODOT is already bound to adhere to applicable law, so this entry is unnecessary and its commitment to undefined policy requirements may be counterproductive.	Thank you for your comment. We have revised guideline #8 to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to assure that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, and national origin be excluded from participation.
7.1	Ed Fitch	Redmond	Yes there should be a commission meeting once a year in Central Oregon. ODOT needs to be more transparent with its budget particularly with local governments	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not pertain to ODOT's budget or commission meetings. Comment shared with the OTC.
8.1	Geert Aerts		More bicycle transportation projects.	Thank you for your comment. This policy does not pertain to bicycle transportation projects. Comment shared with respective program staff.
9.1	Kelly Wood		Please include funding options and limitations so that it is clear which funding can be used on which plans/projects. It is curious that the plans include a variety of transportation modes but funding appears to primarily come from gas tax and federal funding for new projects. Is there a unique funding source for bikes and pedestrians? Obviously this infrastructure is radically expensive too but a \$15 excise tax does not remotely begin to cover construction and maintenance of bikepaths/bikelanes.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not pertain to funding and maintenance and or bike paths/bike lanes. Comment shared with respective program staff.
10.1	M J Basti		Maintain and augment rail systems especially on the coast. Passenger rail from North Coast to	Thank you for your comment. This policy does

			<p>Central and South Coast to Central would decrease vehicle traffic, congestion and carbon emissions. Electric trains are common in Europe. Add toll roads to parts of I 5 corridor and highly congested sections of the coast highway - use the tolls collected for the roads where the tolls are collected. Don't add a toll to a part of the coast route and use the money for something other than the coast highway. Tolls promote users paying for what they use and how they use the road eg hauling construction materials or RV use. Its time visitors pay for the roads they use heavily in Oregon. I would rather pay a toll for a road then have the price of a state park become out of reach for local residents. Schedule Town Halls in each of the counties who have roads in high need of repair. There are alot of commuters in the Tillamook area who work near Portland - their needs are important - they need to be able to afford to continue living in the rural areas.</p>	<p>not pertain to Oregon's rail system or toll system. Comment shared with respective program staff.</p> <p>New guideline #20 added to ensure outreach engages all parts of the state and recognize the difference in needs of each region.</p>
11.1	Doug Parrow		<p>Include an item under which planning staff would actually listen to public comments and adjust their plans based on those comments.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Guideline #27 has been updated to promote transparency to review formal comments, document changes made and share how feedback was incorporated with the OTC for changes that require a formal 45-day public review.</p>
12.1	FRANK STEVENS	Troutdale Resident	<p>yes I would add more detail into the how portion of direct outreach to communities and action related policy engagement, the policy paper reads very much like an informational community engagement not a dynamic engagement of the local communities, feels like just checking a box for community input, also add the need for rapid response policy community engagement</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Guideline #16 updated to document which level of public involvement was used and why for key public review milestones. Guideline #27 has been updated to promote transparency to review formal comments, document changes made and share how feedback was incorporated with the OTC for changes that require a formal 45-day public review.</p>
14.1	Judy Taylor		<p>No. It seems well thought out and written.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
15.1	Mark M		<p>Eliminate DEI and climate. Focus exclusively on roads</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We've written this policy to ensure we are reaching all Oregonians as much as possible regardless of topic.</p>

17.1	David Collins		Well information of what all this chatter is really.	Thank you for your comment. One of our objectives in updating this policy was the use of plain language and organization. We've tried to update the policy using plain language to the extent possible.
18.1	Peter Seaman		Yes: I would say explicitly that when public opinion runs counter to the vision, then the vision will prevail ("the vision of the Oregon Transportation Plan: Oregon's transportation system supports all Oregonians by connecting people and goods to places in the most climate-friendly, equitable, and safe way"). If ODOT were actually committed to this vision, then not one single bit of auto- or truck-centric construction would take place until bicycle infrastructure throughout Oregon is built to the same standard. The vision compels such action, so why aren't you doing it?	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. Comments shared with respective program staff.
19.1	Theresa Brand		No I think it is excellent and thorough	Thank you for your comment.
20.1	Anonymous		Please put bikes back in a bike lane or on the shoulder of the road in rural settings, not in the roadway. It is just too hazardous for bikes to be in the roadway. Bikes need to be on the other side of the fog line on roads without a bike lane. "Shoulders". In most rural areas there is not enough room for bikes in the roadway, and bikes run the risk of getting hit when drivers cannot see them due to curves, if in the roadway and not on the shoulder. Also, some shoulders are not big enough for a bike at all. This policy should be for City Planning Only /Metros and only when a road is built or rebuilt or relocated that a cost benefit be done to even see if a bike lane can be done within the budget already set or they should apply for grant money. The Policy will need to reflect the modification would need to be made for rural / non-city roads to see if there are very clear "recognized exemptions" and how to apply them including the "Scenic Bikeways" unless they are closed to drivers. Walk the bike in the ditch if there isn't enough roadway shoulder after the fog line. Bike do not act like cars; they are more like a deer in the road. We do not need bike lanes everywhere; we need a cost benefit analysis to see if a bike lane or shoulder widening is needed on a % of use and apply for a grant if needed. Redo the definition of Bicycle - it's not 3 or 4 wheels, only 2. That would be a Tricycle or Quadricycle. And no, they should not be included in rural roadways or shoulders.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not pertain to bicycle transportation projects. Comment shared with respective program staff.
21.1	Frank Gray		There is nothing that I see in the plan to address the growth E-bikes. Currently the maximum speed of an e-bike is 28 mph and some can be overridden. These bike are heavier thus have a higher inertial load which increases the chance of injury. Serious	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP

			bicycle injuries have increased in recent years due to e-bikes.. Bike paths should have speed limit signage and be policed if the E-Bikes are going to be allowed on them. Also many e-bikes are not-pedal assist and only require the turn of a throttle to move. Pedestrian paths should be for pedestrians not motorized vehicles.	and CIP. This policy does not pertain to bicycle transportation projects. Comment shared with respective program staff.
22.1	David Guettler	River City Bicycles	There needs to be a greater commitment to pedestrian and bicyclist safety	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not pertain to bicycle transportation projects. Comment shared with respective program staff.
23.1	Jamie Stasny	Clackamas County Department of Transportation & Development	A) We recommend adding “and CIP” following “STIP” to items #10, #20, and #21. This would ensure ACT members have the opportunity to provide input on all issues and that ODOT staff bring not only STIP but also CIP amendments to ACTs for review.	Thank you for your comment. Guideline #11 updated to include the draft CIP. Guideline #21 and #22 have been combined and updated to #24 requiring to notify ACTs for of any significant changes that require a 45-day formal public review.
23.1	Jamie Stasny	Clackamas County Department of Transportation & Development	B) We recommend that local governments be specifically listed as stakeholders to be engaged prior to any decisions on item #15. i. It is very difficult for local jurisdictions to meaningfully engage on a topic when the agendas for the OTC are not available until 7 days before the meeting. Adding local governments as stakeholders would ensure there are opportunities for jurisdictional partners to meaningfully engage prior to OTC decisions.	Thank you for your comment. We have updated the list of appropriate partners to include local agencies. Comment shared with the OTC.
23.1	Jamie Stasny	Clackamas County Department of Transportation & Development	C) We recommend that the role of ODOT region staff be clearly defined in this policy, with engagement being conducted in a similar manner for the CIP as is currently done with the STIP.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. The guidance of this policy is specific to these three groups and guidance is carried forward into local and regional transportation plans.
24.1	Alfredo Haro	Metro	Page 1 Purpose The description is overly long and hard to follow. Recommended edit for brevity and clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) establishes the following policy and core implementation expectations to guide public involvement efforts by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff. These expectations</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. The purpose section updated with suggested updates for language clarity.

			ensure compliance with state and federal public participation requirements and support agency objectives for statewide planning processes, the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development.	
24.1	Alfredo Haro	Metro	Objectives The document doesn't mention "data" or "data-informed" much. Include a data mention in the objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use data-informed demographic analysis to guide meaningful engagement with Oregon's diverse communities and develop resilient, sustainable plans that address the needs of all residents.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. We recognize the importance of incorporating data analysis. Please refer to guideline #15 in leveraging data to inform and understand community demographics.
24.1	Alfredo Haro	Metro	Page 2 First paragraph: The last sentence is overly long and hard to follow. Recommended edit for brevity and clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The OTP, along with its associated statewide mode and topic plans, provides direction for decision-making by ODOT and partner transportation agencies. This guidance is carried forward into local and regional transportation plans.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. The background section has been updated based on your feedback.
24.1	Alfredo Haro	Metro	Page 3 Processes: Action 7: Be more consistent with the ODOT Title VI non-discrimination statement and specifically mention "programs and activities." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assure that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, age, sex, and disability as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related authorities, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefit of, or be otherwise discriminated against under any of the programs or activities it administers.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. We have written the Public Involvement policy to ensure compliance with both state and federal regulations. We have revised guideline #8 to comply with Title VI to assure that no person shall, on the grounds or race, color and national origin be excluded from participation.
24.1	Alfredo Haro	Metro	Include guidance related to Oregon's Plain Language Law <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure public-facing documents use clear, plain language consistent with ORS 183 by avoiding jargon, using straightforward sentence structure and presenting information in an easy-to-understand format.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. New guideline #6 has been added to comply with ORS 183.750 in providing public communication in language that is simple and clear as possible.
24.1	Alfredo Haro	Metro	Include guidance related to Oregon's environmental justice law <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure environmental justice considerations consistent with House Bill 4077 by identifying and engaging communities defined as "environmental justice communities," evaluating potential disproportionate impacts and ensuring meaningful participation throughout planning and decision-making processes.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. We have updated our general expectations footnote to include Oregon's Environmental Justice (EJ) laws and statutes: ORS 182.535 EJ Council; HB 4077 (2022); and SB 420 (2008).

24.1	Alfredo Haro	Metro	Page 6 Update language to reflect project selection guidance and direction in the federal regulations.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not pertain to bicycle transportation projects. Comment shared with respective program staff.
24.1	Alfredo Haro	Metro	<p>Specific Guidelines for the Capital Investment Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seek input from ACTs, the public, MPOs, and local governments on the goals which will be used to determine investment priorities every three to five years. The OTC will set priorities among the OTP goals with the funding expected to be available.</li> <li>2. Annually seek input from the public and local governments on potential investments to add to or remove from the CIP.</li> <li>3. Cooperatively work with the MPO when seeking input on potential investments to add or remove from the CIP within an MPA. Provide a description of how the prioritization of proposed investments considered are consistent with the policies and project priorities of the metropolitan transportation plan and any project prioritization direction provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.</li> <li>4. Annually seek input from ACTs on potential investments through an ACT identification of priorities from those investments under consideration with the funding expected to be available.</li> <li>5. Annually share finalized CIP list with ACTs, the public, MPOs, and local governments.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Guideline #22 references developing statewide transportation plan, and the STIP in consultation with ACTs, MPOs, and other applicable transportation groups.</p> <p>We have updated # 2 in the specific guidelines for the CIP section to annually seek input from the ACTs on potential investments to be included in the CIP.</p> <p>We have updated the specific guidelines for the CIP, (#3) to annually share finalized CIP with ACTs, MPOs, local governments, and the general public.</p>

## Question #2 Do you have any additional feedback you'd like to provide?

Comm. #	Name	Organization	Comment Question #2	Proposed Action
1.2	Jerry Frazier		Transparency of funding and administrative cost	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not track funding and administrative costs.

				Comment shared with CIP staff.
2.2	Hector Dominguez Aguirre	Personal	The policy should include an impact assessment requirement for capital investment projects that identifies groups and population impact by these projects. Engagement plans should prioritize these groups in addition to open input and feedback.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. Comment shared with CIP staff.
3.2	Jill Dobson		<p>At its core, public engagement is meant to build trust. That happens when people can see how their input influences decisions—not just that engagement steps were completed.</p> <p>This policy is thorough in outlining processes and legal requirements, but it places far more emphasis on compliance than on outcomes. Without clearer expectations for transparency, early involvement, and how public input shapes decisions, the policy risks functioning as a documentation and liability tool rather than a true trust-building framework.</p> <p>Strengthening the policy to focus on influence, clarity, and accountability would better align it with its stated goals and with public expectations.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have updated the policy to prioritize early public involvement in the context and general expectations section.</p> <p>Guideline #26 has been updated to promote transparency to review formal comments, document changes made and share how feedback was incorporated with the OTC for changes that require a formal 45-day public review.</p>
6.2	Kevin McGrane		The policy cites the EPA for its public participation spectrum, not the International Association of Public Participation that the EPA cites for that model.	Thank you for your comment. Footnote #3 updated to reference the International Association of Public Participation IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation.
6.2	Kevin McGrane		"Transportation disadvantaged" definition references the common equity measures, but in doing so misses core elements of the issue: people unable to access private motor vehicles. That inability might indirectly be related to race or age as are listed in the present definition, but that definition overlooks much more direct impacts like debt, criminal history, vision, language, licensing, etc.	Thank you for your comment. The OTP's definition for transportation disadvantaged includes those without access to private vehicles and transportation alternatives.
6.2	Kevin McGrane		I strongly approve of the decision to report the feedback received from public outreach, good or bad, as well as reporting on ways that outreach affected decisions.	Thank you for your comment guideline #26 has been updated to promote transparency to review formal comments, document changes made and share how feedback was incorporated with the OTC for changes that require a formal 45-day public review.
7.2	Ed Fitch	Redmond	I am the Mayor of Redmond. We have suffered over the past 10-15 years by a lack of investment	Thank you for your comment. This policy

			here even though Redmond is one of the fastest growing communities in the State. We are now having to fund investments in ODOT facilities. This should not be the case given the limited resources Redmond has available.	focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not track funding and administrative costs. Comment shared CIP staff.
8.2	Geert Aerts		Bicycling needs to be made safer. Too many bicyclists get killed.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not pertain to bicycle transportation projects. Comment shared with respective program staff.
10.2	M J Basti		Electric vehicles are driving up the price of electric for household use due the the increasing shortage of electric generation sources. A well maintained gas powered vehicle can be equally efficient. Lithium battery powered vehicles are not as safe when fires are taken into account. Propane or natural gas powered vehicles are safer. Basing registration fees on auto manufacturers mpg specs is unrealistic. I have a 6 cylinder promaster van than gets 21.5 to 22 mpg on the coast. Cut the speed limit instead of punishing gas powered vehicle owners. Establish mini bus service that interconnects with light rail trains. Encourage towns with old train stations to rehabilitate the stations and use rail as public transportation. This will decrease the wear and tear and congestion on roads. Light rail could also service delivery services like Amazon, UPS, Fed Ex	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not pertain to vehicle or public transportation projects. Comment shared with respective program staff.
12.2	FRANK STEVENS	Troutdale Resident	ODOT continues to implement policy language concerning, public safety and the transportation of goods and people for sustainability, climate and multi model transportation but in reality, the funding percentage actions continues to focus on past practices that research shows do not work such as induced demand, the ODOT transportation action hierarchy is still focused on the movement of goods and people by SOV and trucking and additional highway construction. ODOT is out of touch with the realities of on the ground communities who can no longer afford car ownership or are in rural areas with roads in disrepair, this policy looks like just another checkbox item with no action at the local level. As a Goal 1 CIC member in my community, I have never been approached or asked for input on ODOT local projects unless I go to ask ODOT on my own. Adding how ODOT is	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP rather than project specific public involvement. We've added guideline #19, to ensure outreach engages all applicable parts of the state.

			going to implement community engagement policies that keep homeless off of our highway property (especially under bridges), keep shared paths multi modal transportation options cleared, install lighting, repair aging road networks and install multimodal options and other public safety policies should be a central action item in your policy framing. As a 34-year resident of East County and the Columbia River Gorge (particularly route 30) where requests for a decrease in speed limits and rural/suburban infrastructure safety upgrades take a back seat to I84 highway construction, I would include pilot projects in your policy language as well. This policy feels very siloed and inclusive to the continued use of past practices.	
13.2	Cub Hale		Please fix highway 26 near milepost 13 going to the coast. It is a disgrace having a major Highway with a section that is continually being temporarily repaired and having to slow to 25 mph. If ODOT is unable, hire an engineer and contractor who can.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. Comment shared with region staff.
15.2	Mark M		Eliminate -. Focus exclusively on roads	Thank you for your comment. We've written this policy to ensure we are reaching all Oregonians as much as possible.
16.2	Matthew Lehman	OCWCOG	<p>The regional ACTs should be utilized more for public engagement. Over the past several years, communication from OTC has been directed TO the ACTs, but the appearance is that communication from the ACT's TO the OTC is not valued. Therefore, participation in the ACT's has decreased, and frankly, it is now viewed as a check-box item rather than a forum to discuss regional transportation issues. There is an opportunity to reinvigorate the ACTs and that can be done by actually involving ACTs in the process, rather than using them as a means of disseminating information about the decisions that are made by the OTC.</p> <p>I would also add that in nearly every instance when I have engaged with our regional ODOT staff regarding transportation issues, the immediate, knee-jerk response is to let me know all of the reasons why they are helpless to address the issues raised. It is very disheartening, and leads once more to LESS participation and more distrust.</p>	Thank you for your comment. One of the goals of ODOT's new CIP is to provide the opportunity for increased participation from the ACTs. Comment shared with respective program staff.
17.2	David Collins		So far Oregon government is lacking big time.	Thank you for your comment. We hope to improve our public involvement efforts and

				standard with the update of this policy.
18.2	Peter Seaman		The policy seems like a lot of box-checking and allows you to do pretty much anything you'd like to do. I know that when I've contacted ODOT about my transpoFrtation concerns, they aren't taken into account in any way that I can discern. So I'm not expecting anything different in future. ODOT will continue to build climate-destroying, inequitable, and unsafe roads.	Thank you for your comment. We hope to improve our public involvement efforts and standard with the update of this policy.
19.2	Theresa Brand		Great job!	Thank you for your comment.
20.2	Anonymous		Make the exemptions clearer for modifications. Make the roadway for vehicles only if the shoulder isn't wide enough and allow designation that bikes are not allowed in some areas. Make shoulders and bike lanes that are big enough to have bikes allowed OR tell bikers to walk the ditch and have a sign that bikes are not allowed in that stretch of roadway. Have a cost benefit analysis when upgrading a road to have a bike lane or the shoulder widened with a grant process.	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not pertain to bicycle transportation projects. Comment shared with respective program staff.
22.2	David Guettler	River City Bicycles	Please allocate more funding to make our current roads safer	Thank you for your comment. This policy focuses on public involvement efforts for Statewide Planning, STIP and CIP. This policy does not track funding and administrative costs. Comment shared with CIP staff.
23.2	Jamie Stasny	Clackamas County Department of Transportation & Development	A) We greatly appreciate the opportunity to comment and the effort from ODOT to engage stakeholders on this updated policy.  B) From a local government perspective, additional effort is needed to support true collaboration around project development. An example of this is the current lack of continuity of communication between local staff and ODOT leadership staff throughout project development and selection.	Thank you for your comment. We have updated guideline #26 to commit to transparency by reviewing 45-day formal public review comments, documenting changes made, and sharing a review of comments with the OTC.
24.2	Alfredo Haro	Metro	Feedback was gathered from senior leadership from Metro regional government's Planning, Development and Research department. Thank you for inviting us to provide input.	Thank you for your comment. We appreciate your review.