

I-5 and I-205 Toll Projects

Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #5 Summary



Subject	Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #5 – Equitable Engagement Workshop
Date and Time	Dec. 10, 2020 3:30-6 p.m.
Location	Online via Zoom
Recording	Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #5 (Main Meeting) - YouTube . Full recordings of the breakout groups can be found on the committee webpage .

EQUITY AND MOBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Attendees	Organization
Abe Moland	Clackamas County Health and Transportation
Amanda Garcia-Snell	Washington County Community Engagement
Bill Baumann	Human Services Council
Philip Wu	Oregon Environmental Council
Diana Avalos Leos	League of United Latin American Citizens; Latino Youth Conference
Dwight Brashear	SMART
Eduardo Ramos	At-large member
Fabian Hidalgo Guerrero	Causa
Germaine Flentroy	Beyond Black/Play, Grow, Learn
Ismael Armenta	At-large member; Oregon Walks
John Gardner	TriMet
James Paulson	WorkSystems Inc Board
Kari Schlosshauer	At-large member; Safe Routes Partnership
Michael Espinoza	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Park Woodworth	Ride Connection
Sharon Smith (Oregon Transportation Commission Liaison)	Oregon Transportation Commission

PROJECT TEAM

Name	Meeting Role	Name	Meeting Role
Hannah Williams	Project team, presenter	Chris Lepe	Project team, breakout group facilitator
Lucinda Broussard	Project team	Carina Garcia	Project team, meeting and breakout group notetaker
Brendan Finn	ODOT Director, Urban Mobility Office, presenter	Chelsea Ongaro	Project team, breakout group facilitator
Anne Presentin	Project team, presenter	Brett Watson	Project team, meeting host
Josh Channell	Project team, breakout group notetaker	Christine Moses	Project team, facilitator
Mike Mason	Project team	Garet Prior	Project team
Ping Khaw	Community Engagement Liaison, presenter	Hanna Grishkevich	Community Engagement Liaison, presenter
Emily Benoit	Project team, breakout group notetaker	Byamba Enkhee	Project team, breakout group notetaker

WELCOME

Meeting facilitator Christine Moses welcomed the group. Christine explained that the purpose of the meeting is to have a workshop to share and learn from the I-205 Toll Project engagement period and to discuss the tools we use to evaluate process equity. Christine reminded all committee members and attendees that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) will record the main meeting and breakout groups. ODOT will post the recordings on the committee webpage.

Christine guided the group through a centering exercise and acknowledged the land to center and honor Native American tribes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Verbal public comment

Christine and Anne Presentin, project team, invited observers to provide public comment at the meeting. No observers provided public comment. Written community member comments submitted prior to the meeting are included at the end of the document.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Project update

Christine introduced Brendan Finn, ODOT Director for the Office of Urban Mobility. Brendan provided an introduction to ODOT's Comprehensive Congestion Management and Mobility Plan. The presentation included a map that showed congestion management highway projects in the region and also displayed the current I-205 and I-5 project limits and potential areas for other tolled corridors in the region. The map showed that the limits for tolling under consideration encompass sections of I-5 and I-205 from the Boone Bridge on I-5 in Clackamas County north to the I-5 and I-205 bridges over the Columbia River at the border between Oregon and Washington states. ODOT and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) are considering initiating a study of this larger regional toll structure in part as a response to questions voiced by stakeholders about comprehensive congestion management and the potential impacts of tolling on individuals and neighborhoods.

- A committee member asked if the Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC) will have the opportunity to weigh in on conversations about revenue sources. The committee member also asked if community input will be part of the process in deciding how toll revenue is allocated.
 - Brendan explained that the committee would be involved in this process and that further study is ongoing to evaluate potential toll revenue and toll implementation costs.
- A committee member voiced concerns about the sequencing of toll implementation and asked for clarification about how this change would impact the work of the committee.
 - Brendan clarified that the work of the committee would continue, but may be looking at a different scale tolling project.
- A committee member emphasized the importance of transparency with implications for revenue under this potentially expanded approach.
- Another committee member voiced a concern about the need for ODOT to be transparent about how they are using the advice from the committee.
- A committee member asked whether geographical limits have been established for where the toll revenue will be allocated.
 - Brendan clarified that this has not yet been defined. ODOT will ask for input from community members and the committee. The OTC has agreed that toll revenue would be spent on the corridor where it was generated but that the definition of what a corridor means will be determined over time.

Committee charter

Christine discussed the revisions to the EMAC Charter, which included changes to the communications section. Committee members had the opportunity to review the charter over email prior to the meeting.

Committee members adopted the Charter.

I-205 and I-5 Toll Projects' Equity Framework

Christine reviewed the changes to the draft I-205 and I-5 Toll Projects' Equity Framework, which included revisions to the definitions of *Black, Indigenous and people of color (BIPOC)* and *economic disadvantage*, an example for the term *economic disadvantage* and replacement of the word *underrepresented* with *excluded*. She also shared a figure illustrating the term *trauma-informed perspective*. Committee members had to opportunity to review the draft Toll Projects' Equity Framework over email prior to the meeting.

Committee members adopted the I-205 and I-5 Toll Projects' Equity Framework.

Mandatory state training

Christine reminded committee members that they are required to complete a mandatory state training online by the end of 2020.

I-205 TOLL PROJECT ENGAGEMENT PLAN AND OUTCOMES

Hannah Williams, project team, gave an overview of the recent I-205 Toll Project engagement period. The project team identified key audiences reached during the engagement period, including commuters, people in the project area, businesses, and communities who are currently or have been historically excluded and underserved by transportation projects. The objective of the engagement period was to provide information about modern tolling and the project. The project team was also seeking feedback on the draft purpose and need statement as well as the alternatives.

Hannah listed some of the tools used in the engagement process such as the online open house survey, advertisements, social media, presentations, briefings, and partnering with community engagement liaisons (CEs).

The following are key highlights for the survey data and outcomes:

- 4,000 survey responses and 600 additional comment submittals.
- Of the 4,000 survey responses, more than half came from Clackamas County.
- 16% of respondents identified as people color.
- Most demographics achieved a proportionate response rate.
- Survey responses show an underrepresentation of Hispanic/Latinx population.
- 7% of survey responses were completed in Spanish, Vietnamese, Russian, or Chinese languages.

Hannah provided an overview of the people reached in the engagement process. Some key highlights below:

- 9,600 people visited the online open house.
- 38,000 views of the Facebook video.

Hannah introduced Ping Khaw and Hanna Grishkevich, who provide community engagement liaison services for the project. Ping explained that liaisons identify and meet the needs of their respective community. Liaisons used different strategies to reach people within their communities such as making personal phone calls, using social media sites, text and chat messages, and engaging people where they are both physically and in virtual spaces.

Hanna provided information on her and other liaisons experiences as part of the outreach effort for the I-205 Toll Project engagement. Hanna noted that she worked directly with primarily people of the Russian and Ukrainian speaking communities. Liaisons used a variety of engagement methods, including information distributed to community members through the radio, Facebook, and email. Hanna identified some barriers with using surveys in certain communities due to distrust and skepticism as well as survey fatigue regardless of language and reading level. Due to the level of distrust in many communities, Hanna noted that approaching people with transparency about the project and communicating their level of influence often yielded better results.

Anne Pressentin, project team, provided an overview of common themes in the survey comments. She also provided an initial evaluation of engagement. She noted successful tactics in reaching broad and diverse audiences, but indicated that it was difficult to reach people during COVID-19.

Anne also reviewed the I-205 Toll Project engagement plan indicators of success. She noted where the engagement met indicators. The project team was successful with the number of comments received, information delivered through trusted sources (CELs) and information translated and in accessible formats. Anne also highlighted areas with mixed or unsuccessful results, like proportional participant demographics and online open house retained viewers, respectively, and where more work is needed to achieve desired outcomes.

BREAKOUT GROUPS

Following a break, committee members split into three breakout groups. In the breakout groups committee members answered questions about the outcomes from the I-205 Toll Project early engagement period, opportunities to refine the equitable engagement plan and how committee members could assist in implementing the equitable engagement plan.

Key highlights of responses to each question are listed below. Notes taken in each breakout group are at the end of this summary. Full recordings of the breakout groups can be found on the [committee webpage](#).

REPORT OUT

Each breakout group facilitator gave an overview of key points for each question.

Question 1a - Do we have the right objectives? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- More focus on community impacts.
- Information regarding revenue.
- Building trust and transparency.
- Engagement, particularly with an equity focus, on how tolling revenue could be used for transportation options and transit improvements.
- Missing a geographic objective.
- Too much information.
- Clear communication of what we heard, how input is being used, and how it's affecting the project.

Question 1b - Did we identify the right voices? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- Small businesses - especially auto dependent (healthcare workers) - particularly those along the larger corridor, and in Southwest Washington and bi-state commuters.
- Activist and environmental justice community.
- Stakeholder groups like advocacy groups.
- Senior centers, ride connections, non-profits providing transportation, carpooling groups.
- Ride connect and ride sharing. Ride share services for people experiencing disabilities.
- Transit dependent folks and youth.
- People without access to technology and internet.
- Workforce development groups and the individuals they represent (e.g., trade schools, community colleges, students and administration).

Question 1c - Did we use the right tools to reach them? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- Mailers, more videos and television advertisements.
- Information stations at grocery stores for people without access to internet and flyers at minority-owned businesses.
- Facebook Live to reach communities of color.
- Partnership with TriMet and C-Tran.
- Faith-based community organizations and their newsletters.
- Additional work with CELs to reach Black, Indigenous and people of color (BIPOC) communities.
- Outreach through more ethnic media outlets.

Question 2 – Did we have the right indicators to measure success? If not, how do we measure engagement and ensure we have equitable processes that lead to equitable outcomes?

- Measures to address:
 - Lack of trust with ODOT - consider measures for building trust and transparency. Ask specific survey questions about whether respondents feel that their input will be used in a meaningful way.
 - How is feedback received by CELs being captured and used?
 - Clearly communicating how revenue will be used to fund projects that are important to the community.
 - Communication of fairness, particularly with economic impacts across different income groups.
- Use community meetings or forums to spread the word.
- Focus more on making sure audience understands the information rather than satisfaction.
- Measure participants' feelings on the engagement.
- Focus more on communities that will be directly impacted and make that clear.

Question 3 – How will you support future engagement?

- In-person meetings and community (after COVID-19).
- Radio station content for people who lack access to internet.
- Oregon Public Broadcasting Think Out Loud segment.
- Facebook Live event (audio only or video) that is also linked to YouTube.

NEXT STEPS

Christine reviewed next steps:

- The project team will use the committee's input to update the public involvement plan.
- The project team will draft process equity evaluation criteria based on the breakout groups' discussion of indicators of success.
- At the February meeting, the committee will begin to develop evaluation criteria for process equity.

Christine also asked for volunteers from the committee to work with the project team to:

- Draft and refine process equity evaluation criteria.
- Identify ways to engage with community members who experience a disability.

Christine thanked the committee members for their time and adjourned the meeting.

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.

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

Community members submitted the following public comments to the committee via email prior to Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #5.

Date received	10/14/2020
Source	Project inbox
From	RJ Shepherd

Subject: Consider Health Impacts of Equitable Tolling

Dear Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee:

Please add the health impacts of reduced air pollution to your criteria in evaluating de-congestion pricing.

This past month, we saw our skies turn dark red, thousands of families displaced, and our air turn toxic. The urgency to reduce Oregon's transportation emissions to address the climate crisis for the sake of our neighbors across the state cannot be overstated.

Dr. Shindell at Duke University shared a bombshell testimony at the House Committee on Oversight and Reform last month: the impacts of air pollution are twice as bad as previously thought. Acting on Climate by transitioning from fossil fuels will save nearly 4.5 million Americans over the next 50 years (1). Saving these lives is valued at nearly \$47 Trillion (2). Regardless of Greenhouse Gas emissions, addressing air pollution alone stands to make our communities significantly healthier, and wealthier.

In your rulemaking, I would ask that you press ODOT and DEQ to reveal the health impacts of the status quo. We know communities of color and poorer communities reside closer to highways and arterials. How many lives will be lost over the next 20 years if we do not implement congestion pricing? How many young students will develop asthma because of the impacts of freeway emissions? How many premature births and deaths of babies are caused by freeway emissions?

A remarkable example to recall is the implementation of E-ZPass tolling in New Jersey. After implementing tolling using E-ZPass, premature births fell by between 6.7% to 9.2% and incidence of low birth weight fell by between 8.5% to 11.3% (3). It is critical to understand how tolling will have similar real-world impacts on children, mothers, and neighbors.

Please address the toll of air pollution in your criteria when evaluating de-congestion pricing.

Sincerely,

RJ Sheperd
North Portland Resident

House Committee on Oversight and Reform. "Oversight Committee and Top Experts Examine New Data on the Health and Economic Impacts of Climate Change," August 5, 2020.

<https://oversight.house.gov/news/press-releases/oversight-committee-and-top-experts-examine-new-data-on-the-health-and-economic>

Roberts, David. "Air pollution is much worse than we thought," Vox Media, Aug. 12, 2020.

<https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2020/8/12/21361498/climate-change-air-pollution-us-india-china-deaths>

Currie, Janet, and Reed Walker. "Does Living Along a Busy Highway Increase Premature Births?," MacArthur Foundation.

https://www.macfound.org/media/files/HHM_Research_Brief_-_Living_Along_a_Busy_Highway.pdf

Date received	12/04/2020
Source	Project inbox
From	Rick Fernandez

Subject: Committee Public Comment

I'd also like to add this comment about tolling.

Are you taking into account that in a post-covid world the economically well off will in large part be working from home and it is unlikely that pre-covid traffic demand will return in the foreseeable future. Many companies have made working from home the new norm. Those who are travelling for work will more and more be front line and low income workers who have no option to work virtually. Tolling will thus add an even greater burden on them. This is not fair. Such workers already have to pay more for transportation while high paid workers stay at home and avoid having to commute. This is no equity in imposing tolling on them.

Your vaunted transportation "improvements" will simply hurt the poor, the working class, and their neighborhoods.

Rick Fernández

Group 1

Question 1

(20 minutes)

Take a look at our engagement objectives, tools for engaging people, who we wanted to engage and outcomes from the recent I-205 Toll Project engagement below. They can also be found in the [I-205 Toll Project engagement plan](#).

Do we have the right objectives? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- *Increase awareness about:*
 - *How modern toll systems work.*
 - *Benefits of tolls.*
 - *Opportunities and constraints with the I-205 Toll Project.*
 - *Project timelines, alternatives for consideration.*
 - *Results of the Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis.*
 - *ODOT's approach to equity.*
- *Gather public input on:*
 - *Draft Purpose and Need Statement, including goals and objectives.*
 - *Draft alternatives.*
 - *Draft evaluation criteria.*
 - *Concerns and potential impacts to consider during the environmental review.*

Group 1

- How was the concept of tolling presented? Why are we doing this and what are the benefits of tolls? Elevate project purpose.
- Start with the “why”. No understanding of project need or purpose.
- More focus on impact to individuals.
- We did too much during this initial phase (bounce rate). Too soon to get some information out. Focus on why the project is needed and receiving input.
- Explaining the alternatives with transparency. Including the alternative to do nothing.
- Revenue.

Group 1

Did we identify the right voices? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- *Audiences:*
 - General public
 - I-205 commuters
 - Nearby residents
 - Committees
 - Underrepresented and underserved communities (specifically, we've previously discussed people living with a disability)
 - Elected officials
 - Businesses
 - Statewide interests
 - Freight
 - Policymakers
 - City and agency partners

Group 1

- Did we identify in the survey responses who were members of these audiences?
- Washington residents, bi-state commuters.
- Definition of policy makers needs more clarification. Activist community and EJ community deserves to be identified.
- Policy groups vs policy makers.
- People without access to internet/technology using mailers.
- Stakeholder groups like advocacy groups should be listed.
- More clarification on statewide interests.

Group 1

Did we use the right tools to reach them? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

Take a look at the [I-205 Toll Project engagement period methods summary](#) for more details on the tools we used to engage.

- *General engagement*
 - *Online open house and survey*
 - *Paid ad/notifications in local papers*
 - *Email to over 6,000 people who requested updates*
 - *Media and press releases*
- *Community-based organizations*
 - *Shared an outreach toolkit with over 100 community groups and neighborhood organizations*
- *Multilingual engagement*
 - *Translated fact sheets and open house survey into Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Simplified Chinese and Traditional Chinese*
 - *Online open house in Spanish*
 - *Welcome/introduction video narrated in Spanish*
 - *Spanish language radio ads on El Rey*
 - *Two videos in Spanish*
 - *Spanish-language Facebook ads*
- *COVID-19 specific engagement*
 - *Social media postings and paid boosts*
 - *“Live” educational webinars*
 - *Community engagement liaison outreach*

Group 1

- Mailers.
- More videos for visual learners.
- Information stations at grocery stores for people without access to internet.
- Short videos to display in public spaces.
- Text heavy and lengthy questions in online open house.
- Visiting women owned and minority owned business to drop off flyers.
- Facebook Live is successful in communities of color.
- Television ads.
- Partnership with TriMet and C-Tran.

Group 1

Question 2

(20 minutes)

Did we have the right indicators to measure success? If not, how do we measure engagement and ensure we have equitable processes that lead to equitable outcomes?

- *Number of comments received similar to or greater than earlier phases*
- *Majority of comments are well informed and within the project scope*
- *Greater than 75% of participants expressed satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of information presented*
- *Greater than 75% of participants expressed satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of information presented*
- *Participant demographics are proportionate to corridor demographics*
- *Delivered project information through trusted community sources (e.g., liaisons)*
- *Limited number of requests for additional information*
- *Online open house “bounce rate” was below average*
- *Project information is translated and provided in compatible formats*
- *At least 3 ethnic media outlets publish factual articles*
- *Traditional and factual media coverage*
- *Comments and question are received from the public at key milestones*
- *Regular attendance and active engagement from partner agencies and stakeholders at and between technical working group meetings*
- *Agency partner staff review, discuss and share input before moving ahead to the next step in the environmental review process*
- *Regional partners provide opportunities for project briefings to facilitate dialogue and partner input*

Group 1

- Explain the benefits of tolling (congestion management).
- Focus more on making sure audience understands the information rather than satisfaction.
- Soft outreach goal that is representative of population.
- Did the survey encourage people to share information about the project?
- Surveys can prompt people to look for more information.
- Clarification on media coverage.
- Use community meetings or forum to spread the word.
- Clear language about jurisdictional partners/regional partners.
- Outreach to stakeholder groups.

Group 1

Question 3

(5 minutes)

How will you support future engagement?

From the [Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee purpose](#): *The committee will support the implementation of the equitable engagement plan by hosting or cohosting meetings, events and/or other activities as determined by the engagement plan.*

Group 1

- Continuing more virtual events in different events.
- Radio stations for people who lack access to internet.
- Organize OPB think out loud segment.
- Facebook Live event (audio only or video) that is also linked to YouTube.

If you need technical support:

Please call or email Brett at 206-922-6223 or bwatson@enviroissues.com.

Question 1

(20 minutes)

Take a look at our engagement objectives, tools for engaging people, who we wanted to engage and outcomes from the recent I-205 Toll Project engagement below. They can also be found in the [I-205 Toll Project engagement plan](#).

Do we have the right objectives? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- *Increase awareness about:*
 - *How modern toll systems work.*
 - *Benefits of tolls.*
 - *Opportunities and constraints with the I-205 Toll Project.*
 - *Project timelines, alternatives for consideration.*
 - *Results of the Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis.*
 - *ODOT's approach to equity.*
- *Gather public input on:*
 - *Draft Purpose and Need Statement, including goals and objectives.*
 - *Draft alternatives.*
 - *Draft evaluation criteria.*
 - *Concerns and potential impacts to consider during the environmental review.*

Group 2

Group 2

- Increase awareness on how money will be spent and constraints on how can be spent.
- Clarify how can address need for better transportation options to address impacts.
- SW Washington is not well represented in the engagement plan or summary. Missing a geographic objective?
- Objectives about transparency - clear communication of what this is, and what it isn't.
- Clear communication of what we heard, how input is being used, and how it's affecting the project. Especially important with BIPOC communities who have often been excluded. May fit in with the evaluation criteria.
- "What we heard and what we did with it/what we've changed"
- Better regional view - How does this project fit into the context of the larger regional tolling map that was shown. Presently seeing small part of vision.
- Engagement, particularly with an equity focus, on how tolling revenue could be used for transportation options and transit improvements. Dialog across region around larger regional tolling concept.
- Increase transparency around the objectives themselves.
- "What gets measured gets managed"
- Building trust and transparency - consider as an objective.
- S.M.A.R.T.I.E. Goals. (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant/Realistic, Timely, Inclusive, Equitable)
- Incorporating trauma-informed perspective in objectives.
- "We're going to take your money was strongly messaged. What we're going to do with your money was not."
- Toll roads in Mexico are not available to general public - example of how we need materials that are informed by community, not just a straight translation from English.
- Understand the context of the growing wealth gap - poor, working people being asked to bear more of the burden with tolls - not everyone is paying their fair share - ODOT cannot solve but should be aware of in outreach.

Group 2

Did we identify the right voices? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- *Audiences:*
 - General public
 - I-205 commuters
 - Nearby residents
 - Committees
 - Underrepresented and underserved communities (specifically, we've previously discussed people living with a disability)
 - Elected officials
 - Businesses
 - Statewide interests
 - Freight
 - Policymakers
 - City and agency partners

Group 2

- Small businesses - especially auto dependent (healthcare workers) - particularly those along the larger corridor and in SW Washington.
- Transportation related businesses that are auto dependent (shuttles, medical rides, taxis).
- Transit dependent populations (multiple reasons) and youth voices.
- Age groups.
- Differentiate different agencies and decision makers.
- Better define groups within categories to increase transparency.

Group 2

Did we use the right tools to reach them? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

Take a look at the [I-205 Toll Project engagement period methods summary](#) for more details on the tools we used to engage.

- *General engagement*
 - *Online open house and survey*
 - *Paid ad/notifications in local papers*
 - *Email to over 6,000 people who requested updates*
 - *Media and press releases*
- *Community-based organizations*
 - *Shared an outreach toolkit with over 100 community groups and neighborhood organizations*
- *Multilingual engagement*
 - *Translated fact sheets and open house survey into Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Simplified Chinese and Traditional Chinese*
 - *Online open house in Spanish*
 - *Welcome/introduction video narrated in Spanish*
 - *Spanish language radio ads on El Rey*
 - *Two videos in Spanish*
 - *Spanish-language Facebook ads*
- *COVID-19 specific engagement*
 - *Social media postings and paid boosts*
 - *“Live” educational webinars*
 - *Community engagement liaison outreach*

Group 2

Please send Hannah Williams any ideas you have for additional tools.

- Text messaging (ex. Slicktext tool).
- Example of senior tax deferred program in SW Wash to reach specific population.
- Targeted mailings.
- Faith based community organizations and their newsletters.
- Additional work with CELs to reach BIPOC communities, hire MORE liaisons.

Question 2

(20 minutes)

Did we have the right indicators to measure success? If not, how do we measure engagement and ensure we have equitable processes that lead to equitable outcomes?

- *Number of comments received similar to or greater than earlier phases*
- *Majority of comments are well informed and within the project scope*
- *Greater than 75% of participants expressed satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of information presented*
- *Greater than 75% of participants expressed satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of information presented*
- *Participant demographics are proportionate to corridor demographics*
- *Delivered project information through trusted community sources (e.g., liaisons)*
- *Limited number of requests for additional information*
- *Online open house “bounce rate” was below average*
- *Project information is translated and provided in compatible formats*
- *At least 3 ethnic media outlets publish factual articles*
- *Traditional and factual media coverage*
- *Comments and question are received from the public at key milestones*
- *Regular attendance and active engagement from partner agencies and stakeholders at and between technical working group meetings*
- *Agency partner staff review, discuss and share input before moving ahead to the next step in the environmental review process*
- *Regional partners provide opportunities for project briefings to facilitate dialogue and partner input*

Group 2

Group 2

- Noted difficulty in getting feedback about satisfaction about something people aren't happy about.
- Trust, hard to obtain - measure over time by going back to same groups.
- Measures to address:
 - Lack of trust with ODOT - consider measures that show building trust and showing transparency.
 - Idea: Ask specific survey questions about whether respondents feel that their input will be used in a meaningful way.
 - How is feedback being received by CELs being captured and used?
 - Clearly communicating and demonstrated understanding of how revenue will be used to fund projects that are important to community = are we communicating "what does this get you?"
 - Communication of fairness, particularly with economic impacts across different income groups.
 - Compatible formats - translation not enough and needs to be people from the community to make sure message resonates.
 - Look at project expenditures - are dollars being spent in a way that shows efforts to engage different communities.
 - Understanding among respondents about current conditions - air pollution - better understanding of tradeoffs.
 - Are we clearly communicating the timeline and phases for rollout of tolling?
 - Are we connecting across larger agencies (counties) and taking advantage of existing meetings to reach people? (both measure and tool).
 - Geographic distribution of responses.
 - Move away from percentages, hard to communicate and people associate them with a school grade scale (60% = D-) - use of Leichhardt scale to assess feelings.

Group 2

Question 3

(5 minutes)

How will you support future engagement?

From the [Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee purpose](#): *The committee will support the implementation of the equitable engagement plan by hosting or cohosting meetings, events and/or other activities as determined by the engagement plan.*

Group 2

We didn't get to this one with longer discussion on the other questions.

If you need technical support:

Please call or email Brett at 206-922-6223 or bwatson@enviroissues.com.

Group 3

Question 1

(20 minutes)

Take a look at our engagement objectives, tools for engaging people, who we wanted to engage and outcomes from the recent I-205 Toll Project engagement below. They can also be found in the [I-205 Toll Project engagement plan](#).

Do we have the right objectives? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- *Increase awareness about:*
 - *How modern toll systems work.*
 - *Benefits of tolls.*
 - *Opportunities and constraints with the I-205 Toll Project.*
 - *Project timelines, alternatives for consideration.*
 - *Results of the Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis.*
 - *ODOT's approach to equity.*
- *Gather public input on:*
 - *Draft Purpose and Need Statement, including goals and objectives.*
 - *Draft alternatives.*
 - *Draft evaluation criteria.*
 - *Concerns and potential impacts to consider during the environmental review.*

Group 3

- Disinformation and social media - include potential challenges and draw backs from false information. Correct and accurate information.
- Share the CBA (cost-benefit analysis).
- How much detail should be provided for how modern toll systems work.
- Give examples of other cities where tolling has been used. What are the effects on the communities too?
- Difficult for people to respond when they don't know the cost or what changes will happen with transportation alternatives (e.g. TriMet). Philosophical responses rather than from facts.
- No vision of where we're going.
- Something for people to reach to, rather than understanding jargon and reaching their own conclusions (staying with status quo).
- Approach survey once knowing the facts.

Group 3

Did we identify the right voices? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

- *Audiences:*
 - General public
 - I-205 commuters
 - Nearby residents
 - Committees
 - Underrepresented and underserved communities (specifically, we've previously discussed people living with a disability)
 - Elected officials
 - Businesses
 - Statewide interests
 - Freight
 - Policymakers
 - City and agency partners

Group 3

- How we engage. How can we partner on a long-term basis? Engagement on the work that's being done.
- Engage deeper with community, not just community partners.
- Senior centers, ride connections, nonprofits providing transportation, carpooling groups. Ride connect and ride sharing. Ride share services for people experiencing a disability.
- Workforce development groups and the individuals they represent (e.g. trade schools, community colleges, students and administration).
- Un-tech savvy people (those who are not using or don't have access to much or any technology).

Group 3

Did we use the right tools to reach them? If the answer is no, what did we miss?

Take a look at the [I-205 Toll Project engagement period methods summary](#) for more details on the tools we used to engage.

- *General engagement*
 - *Online open house and survey*
 - *Paid ad/notifications in local papers*
 - *Email to over 6,000 people who requested updates*
 - *Media and press releases*
- *Community-based organizations*
 - *Shared an outreach toolkit with over 100 community groups and neighborhood organizations*
- *Multilingual engagement*
 - *Translated fact sheets and open house survey into Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Simplified Chinese and Traditional Chinese*
 - *Online open house in Spanish*
 - *Welcome/introduction video narrated in Spanish*
 - *Spanish language radio ads on El Rey*
 - *Two videos in Spanish*
 - *Spanish-language Facebook ads*
- *COVID-19 specific engagement*
 - *Social media postings and paid boosts*
 - *“Live” educational webinars*
 - *Community engagement liaison outreach*

Group 3

- Language radius. Were there interviews?
- Timelines. Go back when there is more information. Make up some of what we lost from not having in person meetings or group meetings (more of a give and take).
- COVID is a difficult time. Come back to the community when we can meet in person.
- More time spent with community groups working with their people (meetings, websites, advertising).
- In person when possible.

Question 2

(20 minutes)

Did we have the right indicators to measure success? If not, how do we measure engagement and ensure we have equitable processes that lead to equitable outcomes?

- *Number of comments received similar to or greater than earlier phases*
- *Majority of comments are well informed and within the project scope*
- *Greater than 75% of participants expressed satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of information presented*
- *Greater than 75% of participants expressed satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of information presented*
- *Participant demographics are proportionate to corridor demographics*
- *Delivered project information through trusted community sources (e.g., liaisons)*
- *Limited number of requests for additional information*
- *Online open house “bounce rate” was below average*
- *Project information is translated and provided in compatible formats*
- *At least 3 ethnic media outlets publish factual articles*
- *Traditional and factual media coverage*
- *Comments and question are received from the public at key milestones*
- *Regular attendance and active engagement from partner agencies and stakeholders at and between technical working group meetings*
- *Agency partner staff review, discuss and share input before moving ahead to the next step in the environmental review process*
- *Regional partners provide opportunities for project briefings to facilitate dialogue and partner input*

Group 3

Group 3

- Too big of a question. What rationale went into making the questions.
- More input from the community more generally.
- Evaluating measures at in person meetings.
- Broken down by support. Do people support alternatives?
- Ask participants at the beginning of the engagement and the end of engagement (e.g. smile faces). Measure their feelings on the engagement. A consistent measure of feeling.
- Satisfaction survey at the end of the engagement. Less than 30 seconds. (Do people understand or like the content? - Measuring if they understand the content moves the needle).
- More than 3 ethnic media outlets. How are your messages showing up on these media outlets? How many media sources are covering this material and are they positive/negative?
- Advertise on more community organization sites/organizations.
- How does this affect me? - Target people who it will affect. People will want to be apart once they know how the project will affect them.
- Making the content so it's readable and make it "talk to me". Bring the content to life.
- Setting expectations low. Then exceeded.
- Self-serving measures (re: limited number of requests for additional information) don't capture engagement.

Group 3

Question 3

(5 minutes)

How will you support future engagement?

From the [Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee purpose](#): *The committee will support the implementation of the equitable engagement plan by hosting or cohosting meetings, events and/or other activities as determined by the engagement plan.*

Group 3

- Virtual limits un-tech savvy people. Person to person will want to be a part of this and support the cause.
- In person meetings (after COVID).
- Prioritize needs (COVID vs transportation vs other community needs).

If you need technical support:

Please call or email Brett at 206-922-6223 or bwatson@enviroissues.com.