

Oregon Toll Program

Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #16 Summary



Subject	Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #16
Date and Time	February 23, 2022 3:00-5:00 p.m.
Location	Online via Zoom
Recording	https://youtu.be/-ChDfKgFGYQ

EQUITY AND MOBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Attendees	Organization
Abe Moland	Clackamas County Health and Transportation
Amanda Garcia-Snell	Washington County Community Engagement
Bill Baumann	Community in Motion
Dwight Brashear	SMART
Eduardo Ramos	At-large member
Fabian Hidalgo	Oregon Food Bank
Germaine Flentroy	Beyond Black/Play, Grow, Learn
James Paulson	WorkSystems Inc. Board
John Gardner	TriMet
Michael Espinoza	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Park Woodworth	Ride Connection
Dr. Philip Wu	Oregon Environmental Council
Sharon Smith	Oregon Transportation Commission

Not in attendance: Ismael Armenta (At-Large; Oregon Walks); Kari Schlosshauer (At-Large; Safe Routes Partnership)

PROJECT TEAM

Name	Meeting Role	Name	Meeting Role
Jessica Stanton	Facilitator	Chris Lepe	Project team, breakout group facilitator
Garet Prior	Project team	Nicole McDermott	Project team, breakout group facilitator
Hannah Williams	Project team	Emily Wolff	Project team, breakout group support
Nick Fazio	Zoom host	Anne Presentin	Project team, Breakout group facilitator

Name	Meeting Role	Name	Meeting Role
Joy Agbugba	Project intern, breakout group support	MJ Jackson	Project team
Sylvia Ciborowski	Project team, breakout group support	Greg Mallon	Project team, breakout group support
Kirsten Hauge	Project team, breakout group support	Emma Johnson	Project team, breakout group support
Sam Roberts	Project team, breakout group support	Adela Mu	Project team, breakout group support
Rebecca Steiner	Project team, breakout group support	Logan Cullums	Project team, breakout group support
Scott Bucklin	Public breakout group zoom host		

WELCOME

Jessica Stanton, facilitator, welcomed the committee and opened with a centering exercise. Jessica then gave a brief Black History Month speech about Constance Baker-Motley, the first African American woman appointed to the federal judiciary. Jessica reviewed the Working Together Agreements and discussed the outcomes for the meeting: outlining the recommendation process, gaining consensus on the process, and discussing community input and engagement goals. Jessica then reviewed the agenda and reminded attendees to take breaks as needed over the two-hour meeting.

EQUITY AND MOBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EMAC) AT WORK: SINCE WE LAST MET

Jessica reviewed what was discussed at the December meeting and the feedback that led to the 2022 EMAC gameplan. Jessica then invited the Scuba team to provide updates on what they've covered since January.

A member of the NEPA Scuba Team (Scuba), EMAC sub-team, reported on three agenda items that were covered in their last meeting: 1) the application of the Equity Framework to the Regional Mobility Pricing Project (RMPP), 2) review of the technical team's travel scenarios for the I-205 Toll Project, and 3) a first look at the Low-Income Toll Report development process. The Scuba member went into detail about what was discussed for each item and let EMAC know that a memo will be released for Step One of the Equity Framework and how it's being applied to the RMPP's upcoming efforts.

The Scuba report out concluded with Jessica informing EMAC that the next Scuba meeting will be in March, and they will be discussing more next steps for the Low-Income Toll Report. Jessica reminded EMAC that all members are welcome to attend Scuba meetings.

EMAC RECOMMENDATIONS: PROCESS

Jessica went over the goals for the meeting: agreeing to the process for developing recommendations for the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and learning about ODOT's analysis of selected policy and strategy options. She noted that after ODOT's presentation, the breakout room discussion will focus on which options should take priority over the next five months .

Jessica and the Project Team went over the following recommendation steps:

- In 2021 EMAC created options,
- From Feb-April EMAC will be drafting recommendations, soliciting community feedback, and analyzing key areas,
- From May-July EMAC will be finalizing recommendations and preparing to bring them to the Oregon Transportation Commission for consideration.

Jessica then invited the Navigators, EMAC sub-team, to describe their work over the past couple of months. A Navigator described the process they went through to determine what steps need to be taken as well as the initial list of options to focus on, with low, medium, high barriers for becoming a recommendation by mid-July. The importance of Community-Based Organization (CBO) Involvement and Connecting Climate and Equity were described as selected areas of interest where EMAC has the most opportunity to contribute.

Committee Comments and Discussion

- A Navigator added that a big conversation was about where EMAC can have the most impact, and to prioritize areas that are newer territory or have previously been overlooked.
 - Another Navigator followed up that EMAC is in the unique position to think about all these technical points from the position of equity, which is EMAC's value add.
 - Gareth Prior, Project Team member, added that the topics of CBO Involvement and Climate + Equity are a great opportunity to address equitable issues and transportation efforts in a holistic way. Gareth emphasized that they're tricky topics and ODOT welcomes EMAC's feedback in these areas.
- Jessica asked EMAC if they were ready to move forward with the recommendation process as laid out

- EMAC members nodded and gestured in agreement
- No EMAC members expressed opposition

ODOT ANALYSIS OF POLICY AND STRATEGY OPTIONS

The Project Team explained ODOT's analysis of policy and strategy options using the "low-hanging" and "high-hanging" fruit analogies. Garet began with slides that outlined those options that are low-hanging fruit. He then went into what constitutes the "high-hanging fruit" options.

Committee Comments

- An EMAC member asked about the timing for when the language around low-hanging fruit would shift from "should" happen to "will happen." They asked if there is opportunity to see those low-hanging "suggestions" become concrete commitments in the package that ultimately goes to the OTC for review.
 - Garet noted that the timing will depend on the specific option, but some of these commitments will come in the environmental documents for the toll projects, including the I-205 Toll Project Environmental Assessment scheduled for release in June 2022.

EMAC RECOMMENDATIONS: BREAKOUT ROOMS

Jessica introduced the breakout room discussion question.

For each of the "Messy Middle" recommendations, discuss which policy/strategy options EMAC wants additional analysis and engagement on between now and April/May.

The EMAC attendees were then separated into three breakout groups with Jamboards. Members of the public were also invited to a separate brainstorm and comment session with their own Jamboard. (Note: Some phrases below have been **bolded** to highlight comments toward specific policy and strategy options.)

Breakout Group One

Breakout group one was facilitated by Chris Lepe, project team. A summary of the discussion is included below.

- A committee member **suggested clarifying the role of CBOs and defining their level of autonomy when using revenues coming from tolls.** Also needs clarity on the level of coordination between CBOs and governmental bodies such as the Washington Board of County Commissioners so that the County Commissioners understand how much discretion and control each party has.

- A committee member commented that for **bullet #1 (dedicate revenue to CBOs)**, creating a model for how the funds will flow would help move the needle. The member also agreed that elected officials will want to have clarity and some control over how funds will be distributed to CBOs.
 - The committee member who introduced the topic agreed and added that there are still questions about constitutional requirements for mitigation uses, and whether CBO projects would align with those requirements. CBOs understand community needs, but what they're proposing must be legally permissible. That applies to recommendations from all entities, including EMAC. The member suggested adding a statement to bullet #1 to clarify and align projects with requirements that dictate the use of those funds.
 - Then a committee member asked if what they were saying is that CBOs or whoever administers the funds must operate within regulations set by whatever government body that regulates the use of those funds.
 - The committee member replied that it is important to call that out because not everybody works with CBOs.
 - A committee member responded that EMAC would have to start by understanding the legislation that CBOs must comply with. That level of detail is not available yet, so EMAC will have to dive into it sometime between now and July.

Chris asked whether EMAC should specify a percentage of toll revenue or toll dollar amount that should be dedicated to CBOs when reporting to the OTC.

- A committee member suggested a percentage because revenue amount will vary from year to year. One portion of the revenue should go to ODOT for future projects, and another portion should go to CBOs or other activities to move forward. However, in case the revenue falls short of the forecasted amount, the distributed percentage of funds to CBOs should be increased. This would ensure that CBOs get the funding they planned on receiving.
 - Chris summarized the committee member's idea as a guaranteed base funding amount.
 - The committee member affirmed – whatever it would take to provide more certainty to CBOs in a funding shortfall.
- A committee member wanted to ensure that **actions to reduce VMT do not disproportionately impact equity framework communities**. For example, if the percentage of income spent on tolls is much higher in those communities relative to the

general population, the VMT benefits would be gained at their expense. The impacts of tolls should be spread evenly on communities. However, the committee member was unsure how to measure that impact.

- Chris suggested that question as an opportunity for further analysis and for discussing what VMT strategies are supported by equity framework communities.
- A committee member agreed that more analysis around VMT would be helpful.
- A committee member expressed a desire to invite another committee member to the next community engagement event because they were articulating exactly what the community needs to hear.

Breakout Group Two

Breakout group two was facilitated by Nicole McDermott, project team. A summary of the discussion is included below.

- A committee member suggested adding two options to the messy middle, including:
 - **Tolling should not be operated by a for-profit entity** that would make money, which could go to other areas.
 - EMAC would reconvene 1-2 years after tolling begins to review equity outcomes and to propose changes if the process is not meeting the region's equity needs.
- A committee member liked bullet #1 for CBOs (**toll revenue to CBOs**) but did not think it is feasible for the group to decide on a number before May because relevant data is not available yet.
 - A committee member **agreed that bullet #1 is critical** and added that if EMAC does not have the data to determine the amount or percentage, it should still touch on what financial obligations ODOT has (e.g., for bond holders) that need to be repaid with toll revenue. This would be a starting point to understand how much money might be left. EMAC should get information on that as soon as it is available.
 - The committee member added that it is important to know *how* CBOs will be involved and not just say they will be included. It was discussed that the recommendation to “build into the system where voices from Equity Framework Communities are included in decision-making” is an important piece of the CBO conversation, and therefore should remain in that category.
 - A committee member also agreed that “**dedicated toll revenue to CBOs**” is the **most important on the list, and that it needs to show *how* CBOs will be**

involved. The group may not be able to get to a final policy recommendation, but it could make some progress on determining CBO eligibility, accountability metrics, fundable activities/projects, geographic eligibility (I-205 corridor or regional corridor), etc.

- Turning to the equity and climate section, a committee member noted that it is important for EMAC to continue looking at the **connection between VMT and climate**. It is controversial and people want to avoid the topic, but it is a linchpin to the climate conversation. The committee member also thought that **bullet #2 (investment in alternate options)** is critical and wondered if some of these elements could be more integrated if a **Health Impact Assessment (HIA)** was conducted (**bullet #6**). A committee member provided a link to the [Oregon Health Authority's public health grant](#) as a reference.
- A committee member asked if bullets #1 and #2 are the same.
- A committee member added that there are crossovers between all these transportation goals and with housing and destination goals. This is an important crux in the climate conversation and relates to designing climate-smart communities. Tolling is one tool in climate resiliency.
 - A committee member responded that the connection to other issues (e.g., housing) is perhaps aspirational.
 - Nicole suggested that it could be a recommendation for the Navigators to investigate.
 - The committee member agreed that housing is aspirational, but so is VMT reduction.
- A committee member said that **health and safety (bullet #3)** is also important. As a fellow member pointed out, how a city is planned and laid out will affect how people interact with it.
 - A committee member responded that a **Health Impact Assessment (bullet #6)** could be a way to accomplish this.
- A committee member suggested that **air quality monitoring (bullet #5)** has more to do with conducting ongoing evaluation. It could be part of an evaluation package. The breakout group discussed the possibility of toll policy and pricing being connected to poor air quality days in the future.

- A committee member asked about the interface between toll policy and climate events (e.g., fire evacuation). Power rates during the Texas ice storm were exorbitant. What would a toll policy look like that could be adapted during climate events?

Breakout Group Three

Anne Pressentin, project team, facilitated breakout group three. A summary of the discussion is included below.

Anne began the discussion by asking what would be most useful for EMAC to deliver so the OTC can move recommendations forward.

- A committee member said that the OTC is hoping for on-the-ground perspectives of the communities impacted, the top priorities, and the most critical things it should be thinking about as it sets policies. The OTC wants to focus on recommendations for strategies and goals rather than for specifics (e.g., X percent of revenue). As the OTC knows more detail and builds out the program, it can come back to EMAC to test out some of the more specific metrics.
- The committee member spoke about a cash-based option as an example. That is a specific but not prescriptive recommendation. Some folks are not sophisticated with computers and there need to be ways to get a toll pass that is not via the internet. They need a system where they can call and talk to a person, and that phone service needs more than just English speakers.
- On **bullet #1 for CBOs (dedicate revenue to CBOs)**, a committee member asked roughly how much money EMAC can recommend dedicating. If the budget is small, the outcomes would be relatively small. CBOs are in a good position to hear from constituents and make decisions about what transit programs would help the community. The member wanted to unpack this bullet point.
 - A committee member responded that there are some community-based transportation programs that are supporters or affiliates of TriMet. There may be a place for toll waivers in this statement. CBOs can help identify which organizations would be appropriate to involve. EMAC also needs to think about transportation programs that do not charge a fare.
 - A committee member suggested the term “subsidy,” since the program would be reducing the cost of tolls for some users using toll revenue. The member noted that language may be too specific at this point, however.
 - A committee member said EMAC can work on that language later.
- A committee member commented that **bullet #2 (system should be clear and easy to use)** is important. CBOs can be a resource to provide information or credit for other

transportation system options. Information delivery is crucial for people to understand their full options, including the tolled highway, rideshare, bike routes, bus routes, etc. The program should also communicate different options throughout the year, since people's travel modes and patterns can change. Different travel options should be clear to people.

- Anne summarized that it is important not only to have a clear toll system, but also to help people understand all the travel options they have beyond the tolled facility. They may not be aware of those alternative options or may not know how to use them easily.
- Anne remarked that **bullet #3 (baseline for Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) investment)** is a high priority for Navigators, but it does not mention CBOs. She asked if the statement needs to be separated out to different pieces.
 - A committee member responded that there are many CBO conversations going on that concern this goal. This sentence does not specify the role of CBOs, so EMAC may need to clarify it. The member also asked, how much construction are we talking about? How lucrative is this project? If it is a 200-million project, EMAC will also need to talk about work force utilization.
 - A committee member added that DBE should be clearly defined. DBEs could be roughly categorized as CBOs. Perhaps the language needs to specify the size of the business.
 - A committee member replied that the language could be to “leverage DBEs to inform investment.” To another committee member’s second point, the member said that DBEs may not be happy with being called CBOs. The member also commented that EMAC needs clarity for what pieces of the toll project will be part of the DBE goal.
- A committee member said they would like **bullet #4 (establish fair enforcement policies)** to be in the foundational statements. The language could be something like, “Use CBOs to develop policies to reduce impacts.” EMAC should frame this goal as an action to *achieve* these goals rather than focusing just on CBO *involvement*.
 - A committee member suggested saying that CBOs “support” the development of these options, since CBOs are not contracted to develop them.
 - A committee member agreed that the OTC is not delegating this task. It is working with CBOs to establish policies.
- Anne asked if the emphasis is on *how* the program is delivered or on the *impact* and *who* is impacted.

- A committee member responded that perhaps the focus is not just on CBO involvement, but on developing these policies to mitigate the impact and using CBOs to develop those policies. In order to achieve the desired outcomes, the OTC needs to work with CBOs in the development process.
- A committee member added that a big question is, *which* CBOs should be involved?
- On bullet #1 in the climate and equity section, a committee member commented that the second sentence (“Further work needs to be done...”) acknowledges the need for further work, which is good. However, the member **suggested stronger language to say that the toll program is designed for demand management and to reduce VMT**. This position could help the program achieve equitable outcomes if it is **paired with investment in everything in bullet #2 (alternative travel options)**.
 - Anne asked if the first sentence is a policy statement, and the second sentence is an implementation statement.
 - A committee member responded that the program is using the tool of pricing/tolling to influence demand and revenues from the system. Toll rates should be set to influence demand management on the roadways. Some toll revenue will go to the I-205 Improvements Project, but EMAC’s passion is on using toll revenue to support alternative travel options. There needs to be significant investments in those alternatives for the toll program to be equitable.
 - A committee member responded that there needs to be more discussion on the idea of tolling as demand management. The member agreed with the premise but was unsure how to express it in this sentence.
 - A committee member agreed that the “Further work needs to be done” sentence needs to be stronger. **The toll program should be fueling an ongoing effort to achieve the investments in bullet #2 (alternative travel options)**. There needs to be a connection from “further work” to those investments.
 - A committee member agreed that the statement should be as clear as possible for transparency and clarity.
 - A committee member suggested that the sentence is more of a policy statement. It is saying that there needs to be more work on the following bullets, which are the action items that will help meet the goals set out in the first statement in bullet #1.
 - A committee member suggested that “further work” is what needs to be done between now and July, not what EMAC is recommending *in* July.

- A committee member summarized that the breakout group agrees in general with the direction of the messy middle options. There just needs to be some wordsmithing done on a few of the bullet points.

Public Breakout

Garet facilitated the public breakout room. A summary of the discussion is included below.

- On the climate and equity section, a member of the public commented that the program should go beyond “trying not to make things worse.” There should be a tangible improvement and indicators that will demonstrate whether the program is successful. People should have decision-making power and have influence that is more impactful than “seats at the table” and “voices will be heard.”
- On the CBO section, a member of the public suggested more concrete language around influencing decisions.
- A member of the public wanted to see more detail about evaluating success for all three areas.
- A member of the public commented that **bullet #2 in the climate and equity section (investment in alternative options) is vague** and may need to be narrowed down. The member of the public asked if the bullet only applies to the segment of I-205 or if it is part of a larger framework. The details would depend on context.
 - Garet responded that it applies to both. ODOT is trying to achieve consistency and determine what should be recommended for the whole system and what should be recommended for I-205 specifically.
 - A member of the public replied that every neighborhood is different, so connectivity, transportation needs, and potential solutions are going to be different. However, there does need to be consistency in policy and approach. The member of the public liked what Garet said but was struggling to see how to get from general policy to location-specific recommendations so that these ideas can be put into practice.
 - Garet brought up an example from Los Angeles, where they set up a grant program for CBOs to address impacts of tolling as they see fit.
- A member of the public asked if the recommendation is proposing to ask CBOs what they need.
 - Garet responded that is one way to do it.
 - A member of the public responded that the language should indicate a clear intention to meaningfully involve communities in the decision-making process.

The process needs to recognize the harm that highways have caused, especially in low-income and BIPOC communities. The solution development process must be community-based and must seek to acknowledge and counteract past harms. Involving CBOs is really important, but it should not be the only way the community is involved.

- A member of the public remarked that repairing harm is different from “doing no more harm.” On I-205, adding a lane to the highway and adding earthquake improvements to a bridge does not repair past harm. They do not impact a community in the way that building I-205 did. The statements need to clarify whether they are overarching goals or location-specific.
 - Gareth agreed. There are some high-level equity questions that are raised on a project-by-project basis. Step 1 is to address the harm that ODOT has created. Step 2 is to look at how ODOT can improve equity. It is trying to expand access to jobs, education, healthcare, and DBE investment. For example, the ODOT Rose Quarter contract with Raimore is the largest construction contract for a Black-owned firm in the country.
- A member of the public expressed being a native Oregonian and has been paying for years to maintain the highway. If there is going to be a toll, it should be on new lanes, not existing lanes. The member of the public thinks of tolling as a tax and opposed it.
 - Gareth responded that ODOT received direction from the Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis that it would not be feasible to physically separate out a lane as a free lane due to cost. That is why ODOT is looking at the option to toll all lanes.
 - A member of the public mentioned living on a side street that is used as an alternative to the highway, which may be unusable if tolling is implemented.
- A member of the public commented that there are around 100,000 vehicles that travel on I-205 every day. Not even half of that traffic is only traveling a couple of miles on the highway and would even have the option to use side streets. Most people are probably just passing through or traveling longer distances. What is the concern for them?
 - Gareth responded that that is a question ODOT will have to work on. People traveling from out-of-state will not necessarily see the local benefits of tolling. There *is* a lot of hop-on, hop-off traffic along the I-205 corridor. ODOT will definitely have to consider the issue of out-of-area traffic, especially on I-5.
- A member of the public remarked that there should be language about helping small businesses and DBEs invest in climate-friendly infrastructure. One thing that often keeps DBEs from contracting with ODOT is that the necessary equipment is expensive (and often environmentally harmful). There should be a cradle to-grave approach, not just

investing in businesses that are large enough to secure the contract. In addition to looking at engagement with DBEs, another member of the public recommended evaluating workforce demographics.

- A member of the public pointed out that the chat is disabled on the YouTube livestream for EMAC meetings, so the public cannot submit comments that way.

Wrap-Up and Report Out

Following the breakout room discussion, members and staff were brought back together and a brief report out was provided by someone from each breakout room. The report out covered the discussion captured above for each breakout group (see [meeting recording \[video; 1:24:07\]](#)). In addition, the following general comments were provided during the report out.

- A committee member expressed confusion about what the messy middle areas are, and wanted to make sure that the Navigators are clear before going out into the community.
- A committee member questioned if distributing funds directly to CBOs is desirable or possible.
 - The Project Team suggested bringing that part of the conversation for the next Navigators meeting. A Navigator said that question may not need to be answered directly because they're on the path to having to get all the recommendations approved regardless.
- Gareth reported that a common theme in the public room was a desire to make passive language into active, concrete actions.
- Gareth also noted that the public room led to discussions about how DBEs are sometimes required to have certain capacities or equipment prior to getting construction contracts with ODOT and beyond; can ODOT help DBEs prepare to be ready to receive one of these construction contracts?

Jessica thanked the groups for reporting out and reminded the group that these conversations will continue at the next Navigators meeting in March.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT UPDATE AND EMAC'S NEXT STEPS

MJ Jackson, project team, gave an update on the I-205 Toll Project webinars held in mid-February and she noted the engagement for the I-205 Toll Project environmental assessment (EA) will begin in June 2022.

The Regional Mobility Pricing Project will be conducting intense engagement this spring including surveys, webinars, briefings and regular committee meetings. Feedback from EMAC members at this time is key to project progress and targeted outreach efforts. The project team

encourages EMAC members to engage with the public through their networks and platforms to ensure we reach as many people and groups as possible.

Committee Comments

- A committee member invited all EMAC members to come to Black engagement events, including Juneteenth. There are tons of events for members of the Black community of all ages that EMAC is welcome to attend.
- A committee member said that the community needs to know everything we are doing and all the agencies and partners that are involved. He asked for an update on all the things that have been done already, as well as what's coming, to make it easier to spread that information to networks.
- A committee member suggested that upcoming outreach should be framed to include information about how feedback is incorporated into decision-making. He added that EMAC should target groups that are getting funding for climate and equity outreach.
- A committee member acknowledged that EMAC is embarking on a tricky project, and that they can't be afraid to get out in front of people. He said that it's important people feel as if they have gotten the opportunity to provide their feedback.
- A committee member said that it's useful to partner with select CBOs and ask them how they want to be included. Jessica encouraged the member to connect with his network and report back to the group.

PUBLIC COMMENT DISCUSSION

Jessica posed the question: Is there anything that you're hearing in your communities that you'd like to discuss?

Committee Comments

- A committee member asked how EMAC and the Project Team are going to model or measure diversion, and how diversion fits into modeling compared to Equity Framework Communities.
 - Garet encouraged EMAC members to watch the I-205 traffic effects webinar that took place on February 15 and 16, including the video at the beginning of the webinar, which describes how rerouting is being studied and addressed in the I-205 Toll Project EA. A link to the webinar was shared in the chat.

The Project Team then shared the background on the new Urban Mobility Strategy branding.

NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING

Jessica went over the next steps for subcommittees and the EMAC. Navigator calendar invites have gone out, and Scuba invites will soon. The next EMAC meeting is April 27, 2022.

Note: This document is only a summary of issues and actions from this meeting. It is not intended to be a transcript of the meeting, but rather an overview of points raised and responses from the Project Team. We have posted a full recording of the meeting on the [committee webpage](#).

The information in this document, and the public and agency input received, may be adopted or incorporated by reference into a future environmental review process to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Please note that committee member and public comments during meetings are part of the public record and open to public records requests through the Oregon Public Records and Meetings Law.

Si desea obtener información sobre este proyecto traducida al español, sírvase llamar al 503-731- 4128.

Nếu quý vị muốn thông tin về dự án này được dịch sang tiếng Việt, xin gọi 503-731-4128.

Если вы хотите чтобы информация об этом проекте была переведена на русский язык, пожалуйста, звоните по телефону 503-731-4128.

如果您想瞭解這個項目，我們有提供繁體中文翻譯，請致電：503-731-4128。

如果您想了解这个项目，我们有提供简体中文翻译，请致电：503-731-4128。

For Americans with Disabilities Act or Civil Rights Title VI accommodations, translation / interpretation services, or more information call 503-731-4128, TTY (800) 735-2900 or Oregon Relay Service 7-1-1.

MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

Three committee members completed the meeting evaluation. Results are outlined below.

Question 1: What topics or issues do we need to address or revisit in future meetings? (3 answered)

- Resolve issue brought up in today's meeting.
- I liked Sharon's question about the mechanism for paying CBOs or if they are choosing from a "menu." Not necessarily delivering the projects themselves. I thought of this point as them choosing/informing what projects move forward. Like choosing where crosswalks and traffic calming are needed (for example).
- Future community engagement

Question 2: What aspects of today's meeting and/or the preparation for the meeting did you like or dislike? (3 answered)

- Liked 2 hr format.
- I liked the breakout rooms. I would like to know more about should we aim for high level policy (Sharon requested this in our breakout) or offer detailed recommendations (requested by the public via Garet's report out. It seems like we should do both and jump between those levels... do we all agree with that? That some are high level, and some are detailed.
- Just learn what is the messy middle

Question	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Skipped
3. The meeting met my expectations for equitable involvement and treatment of committee members, consistent with the guiding principles in the Committee Charter.	2	1	0	0	0
4. The presentation and speakers were engaging and encouraged dialog.	3	0	0	0	0
5. I clearly understood the meeting objectives and knew what we were trying to accomplish.	2	1	0	0	0
6. The communications and materials sent in advance of the meeting were relevant, advanced my learning, and contributed to my ability to meaningfully participate.	2	1	0	0	0
7. I had the opportunity to speak, be heard, and contribute to decisions under consideration.	3	0	0	0	0

MEETING CHAT BOX RECORD FROM ZOOM

15:02:37 From Bill Baumann to Everyone:

I still have calendar entries from Hannah

15:03:23 From Nicole McDermott (she/her), WSP to Everyone:

Thanks, Bill. We will have Hannah cancel those to avoid confusion.

15:08:07 From Gareth Prior to Everyone:

Pastor Don Coleman in Richmond, VA

15:08:47 From Nick Fazio to Everyone:

Wangari Maathai - environmentalist

15:10:51 From Dwight Brashear, SMART to Everyone:

My mom and dad who refused to raise my siblings and I in the Jim Crow South.

15:25:16 From sharon smith to Everyone:

sorry I am late

15:25:28 From Jessica Stanton to Everyone:

Welcome, Sharon!

15:39:49 From Joy Agbugba to Everyone:

For each of the Messy Middle recommendations, discuss which policy/strategy options you want additional analysis and engagement on between now and April/May?

15:40:53 From Joy Agbugba to Everyone:

Nick Fazio

505-870-4449

nick.fazio@wsp.com

15:41:28 From Gareth Prior (he/him), ODOT to Everyone:

https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/EMAC_Messy%20Middle%20Reference%20Sheet_remediated.pdf

15:41:37 From Gareth Prior (he/him), ODOT to Everyone:

Reference sheet link above

16:45:59 From Joy Agbugba to Everyone:

How do we improve how we are connecting with Equity Framework communities?

16:46:07 From Joy Agbugba to Everyone:

What engagement activities would you like to participate in?

16:48:35 From Hannah to Everyone:

Germaine, excited to see those events. Thanks for sharing!

16:50:41 From Hannah to Everyone:

Here's the link Abe shared. <https://ohapublichealthfunding.org/en/environmental-public-health-and-climate-change-communicable-disease-prevention-and-or-emergency-preparedness/>

16:57:30 From Emily Wolff to Everyone:

Link to the I-205 webinar: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BV-ecyAm444>

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

See attachment.

Oregon Toll Program

Committee Meeting #16 – Public Comments



Date received 2/14/2022
Source Project inbox
From Jane Coombes

Subject: Webinar Questions/Committee Public Comment

What are your plans for Borland Road which will be the only option for people to avoid the toll fee? Our home has a view of Borland and every weekday between 3.30/4.00 pm the traffic is backed up all the way to at least Fields Bridge.

Athey Creek Middle School is being built on Dollar street with an entrance on Borland and a roundabout. A school with a finish time of 4 pm is going to congest the traffic even more with school buses and parents picking up children.

It appears that there has been no comments on what will happen to Borland Road. If you make a toll also on Borland, what about residents? Are we going to have to pay to get in and out of our homes?

Borland Road needs serious consideration.

Date received 2/15/2022
Source ODOT staff
From Clackamas County Coordinating Committee
To Oregon Transportation Commission
CC EMAC

Subject: Emphasizing the Opportunity IJA Funding Presents to Oregonians Dependent on I-205

The attached letter from the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee to the Oregon Transportation Commission is included in the EMAC public comment packet for Meeting 16 because EMAC, along with several other committees and entities, was copied on the letter.

Letter attached.

February 15, 2022

Oregon Transportation Commission
355 Capitol Street NE, MS #11
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Emphasizing the Opportunity IIJA Funding Presents to Oregonians Dependent on I-205

Dear Chair Van Brocklin and Members of the Commission:

This body submitted the attached public comment to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) with the expectation our request would be heard, considered, and discussed for the benefit of the public and those communities facing the impacts of tolling. However, prior to your first public hearing the ODOT Urban Mobility Office (UMO) instead responded to our public comment on your behalf. While the technical discourse in UMO's letter to C4 was informational, it did not address the policy question posed to the OTC. Our expectation is that the OTC still consider our public comments and respond to our policy request.

We therefore feel obligated to write again to reemphasize our public comment so that the OTC, ODOT, stakeholders, and the public clearly understand our request.

Please use existing resources, which may include funding from IIJA and HB 3055, to diversify the funding for the I-205 Widening and Seismic Improvements Project to accomplish the following goals:

- **Protect the current construction timeline of Phase 1A of the I-205 Bottleneck Project**
- **Delay tolling on I-205 to allow time for a cohesive regional approach to congestion pricing and tolling to be developed and implemented in a thoughtful, regionally supported manner.**

To be clear, we are not requesting that all of the IIJA funds be used solely for the I-205 Bottleneck Project to avoid tolling. Rather, we are asking you to develop a funding plan to keep Phase 1A of the I-205 project on its current construction schedule while providing the region the time it needs to develop a toll program that is balanced and thoughtful. We suggest that ODOT staff use the tools created in HB 3055 together with a portion of the IIJA funds to accomplish this goal.

As we noted in our last letter, ODOT supported a regional request to our federal delegation to deliver new federal funds to Oregon in order to "diversify funding" for the I-205 project. The congressional delegation made good on that request, and now we implore you to honor what ODOT co-supported in that letter.

Why do all of these communities along the southern I-205 corridor continue to press this issue? The legislature identified the I-205 Widening and Seismic Improvement Project as a statewide priority in HB 2017, and it is the only project that did not receive direct construction funding in HB 2017 even though it was more ready and affordable than other projects of its size. The daily failure of I-205 to handle existing traffic leads to crippling diversion today in Gladstone, Oregon City, West Linn, Canby, and other nearby communities throughout and around Clackamas County. ***Tolling this corridor ahead of the rest of the region will add undue burden on our communities, and additionally leads to diversion on already failing systems.*** ODOT's current communications suggest that by 2045 the impacts of diversion caused by tolling could be minimized, but that completely ignores the Oregonians you represent today. Our collective constituencies need certainty that there is a path to solving current and future diversion issues. The future safety and livability of these communities is threatened by the current proposal.

ODOT's current approach would toll I-205 before the regional tolling plan receives federal approval. This is problematic as the Regional Mobility Pricing Program (RMPP) may never be approved. We ask that you direct ODOT staff to develop a cohesive, region-wide plan for congestion pricing and tolling that shows how the I-205 Toll Program is integrated into the RMPP and direct staff not to toll I-205 until such time that the RMPP obtains full federal approval.

You have received legislative direction to develop a regional tolling and congestion pricing system. This system, if successful, will impact the way people choose to move through the region. It could create new travel options, generate revenue, and fund repairs and improvements to our ailing system. It will also fundamentally change travel behavior in the region, impact where families work and live, change where businesses locate and grow, and put pressures on many Oregonians who feel stressed by the cost of living in an already expensive place to live. For this new program to work it must be done right and it must be done in partnership with the region. We simply ask that you use some of the IIJA resources along with the tools available in HB 3055 to keep Phase 1A of the I-205 project on schedule while allowing the region the time it needs to develop an integrated approach to implement congestion pricing and tolling.

Sincerely,



Commissioner Paul Savas
Clackamas County
C4 Co-Chair
RIACT Vice Chair



Mayor Brian Hodson
City of Canby
C4 Co-Chair
RIACT Member

C4 Membership: Clackamas County; the Clackamas Cities of Canby, Estacada, Gladstone, Happy Valley, Lake Oswego, Milwaukie, Molalla, Oregon City, Rivergrove, Sandy, Tualatin, West Linn, Wilsonville; Clackamas CPOs, Hamlets, and Special Districts; Ex Officio Members including Metro, MPAC Citizen Port of Portland, Urban and Rural Transit

Attachment:

December 06, 2021 Public Comment to the OTC RE: Allocation of Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act Funding to I-205 Improvements Project

CC:

Governor Kate Brown
Senators Ron Wyden and Jeff Merkley
Congressional Representatives Kurt Schrader, Suzanne Bonamici, Earl Blumenauer, and Peter DeFazio
Oregon Senate President Peter Courtney
Oregon House Speaker Dan Rayfield
Oregon Legislature Joint Committee on Transportation
Clackamas Caucus
Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee
Metro, including JPACT and MPAC
Metro Mayors Consortium
Multnomah and Washington Counties (and respective Coordinating Committees)
Clackamas County Business Alliance
Westside Economic Alliance
Chambers of Commerce along the I-205 Corridor

December 06, 2021

ATTACHMENT

Oregon Transportation Commission
355 Capitol Street NE, MS #11
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Allocation of Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act Funding to I-205 Improvements Project

Dear Chair Van Brocklin and Members of the Commission:

On behalf of the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4), we request the State of Oregon use a portion of the funding from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) to diversify the revenue sources for the I-205 capital improvements bottleneck project between Stafford Rd and OR-213, including the Abernethy Bridge. While we recognize the IIJA is bigger than just one project, it is the priority of this policy group to advocate on behalf of the I-205 project and the communities that will be directly impacted by any diversion stemming from a toll program. ODOT's current proposal to toll I-205 ahead of the rest of the region is not necessary. Tolling and congestion pricing has regional implications and must be implemented in a cohesive and coordinated manner.

In June 2021, ODOT joined C4 and 35 other stakeholders on a letter that explicitly stated new federal investments could "diversify the funds to construct this critical project now, and potentially prevent the need to toll the Abernethy Bridge years ahead of the implementation of a comprehensive regional pricing program." That letter is attached.

Between the \$1.2 billion coming to Oregon directly and the \$100 billion in competitive grants made available through IIJA, we believe there is enough flexibility to change the funding paradigm of this bottleneck project of regional and statewide significance. Combined with the funds made available by HB 3055 in the 2021 State Legislature, ODOT has the opportunity to correct a policy decision that unfairly tolls a roadway that has no meaningful alternative routes and that already experiences diversion into local communities.

IIJA is a gift to Oregon, and can be a resource that brings our communities together. Please take this opportunity to prioritize IIJA funds for the I-205 capital project in order to allow time for a cohesive regional approach to congestion pricing and tolling to be developed and implemented in a thoughtful, regionally supported manner.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Commissioner Paul Savas
Clackamas County
C4 Co-Chair
RIACT Vice Chair



Mayor Brian Hodson
City of Canby
C4 Co-Chair
RIACT Member

Attachment: June 2021 Federal Funding Support Letter to Oregon Congressional Delegation

Date received	2/21/2022
Source	Project inbox
From	Christian Kruse

Subject: Committee Public Comment

The proposed I-205 toll road as well as the future I-5 toll puts an immense burden on Canby's lower income workers.

Canby's location on the southern end of Portland Metro means workers have few choices of employment within the city and have no choice but to commute via either I205 or I5. Many are working class people who work in trades, and therefore have no choice but to drive work vehicles to their jobsite. While many people within the Metro area may be able to telecommute, tradesmen have no such opportunity. Putting the burden of an additional tax on an already low income people is as morally wrong as it is inequitable. In fact, its a regressive tax on the working poor.

To have these tolls proposed at a time the state has surpluses is an added insult. Canby residents already pay gas taxes on their daily commute as well as Metro taxes while receiving no additional services. Gas taxes ARE user taxes. These tolls create a toll wall for Canby workers

Oregonians are not looking for additional taxes while the state already has a surplus. Find a new source of revenue that doesn't penalize the working poor.