

Oregon Toll Program

Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Summary



Subject	Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #6 – Process Equity
Date and Time	Feb. 3, 2021 3:30-6 p.m.
Location	Online via Zoom
Recording	Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #6 - YouTube

EQUITY AND MOBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Attendees	Organization
Abe Moland	Clackamas County Health and Transportation
Amanda Garcia-Snell	Washington County Community Engagement
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
James Paulson	WorkSystems Inc Board
John Gardner	TriMet
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

Absent: Bill Baumann - Human Services Council

PROJECT TEAM

Name	Meeting Role	Name	Meeting Role
Anne Presentin	Project team, interim facilitator	Chris Lepe	Project team
Hannah Williams	Project team	Lucinda Broussard	Project team
Garet Prior	Project team	Maria Isabel Ellis	Project team
Heather Wills	Project team	Mike Mason	Project team
Josh Channell	Project team	Emily Benoit	Project team
Francisco Ibarra	Project team	Nicole McDermott	Project Team
Nick Fazio	Project team	Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara	Metro

WELCOME

Meeting interim facilitator, Anne Pressentin, welcomed the committee members as they joined the meeting. Anne invited Lucinda Broussard, project team, to provide some opening remarks. Lucinda thanked the committee for their time, acknowledged the strong foundation established by the prior facilitator, Christine Moses, and discussed prioritizing the search for a new facilitator.

Lucinda introduced two new project team members from Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Garet Prior, Toll Policy Manager, and Maria Isabel Ellis, Economic Equity Manger. Maria and Garet briefly introduced themselves and their roles in the Urban Mobility Office (UMO) at ODOT.

Anne asked Amanda Garcia-Snell, committee member, to guide the group through a centering exercise. Following the centering exercise, Anne indicated the project team is working in coordination with ODOT's tribal liaison to create a new land acknowledgement for a virtual environment that is authentic and honors the communities indigenous to the region.

Anne reviewed the meeting goals and Fabian Hidalgo Guerrero, committee member, reviewed the group's agreements for working together. Anne provided an overview of the meeting agenda and indicated a meeting evaluation would be distributed to the committee during the meeting and approximately 5 minutes would be allocated at the end of the meeting to gather committee feedback.

PUBLIC COMMENT AND COMMITTEE REPORT OUT

What committee members heard from their communities

Dwight Brashear and Kari Schlosshauer, committee members, reported out to the committee what they have been hearing from their communities.

- Dwight indicated his comments are based on being a committee member and personal conversations he is having with people in his network and are not comments on behalf of the city of Wilsonville, which has not taken an official position on tolling. He has not spoken with anyone yet who is in support of tolling, but people are in support of increased funding for transportation and transit projects overall. Also, people have a desire for increased investment in alternative modes of transportation, anything other than single occupancy vehicles, and they support roadways that are parallel to I-205. Some people have shared with him that they are not sure tolling can be made equitable, and that the work the committee is doing will be tested to determine equitable outcomes.
- Kari echoed Dwight's comments, but has heard from people who are in support of tolling. She indicated she has heard a lot of questions about how to make an equitable tolling system and how the process will prioritize community and mitigation efforts.

Committee member discussion of comments received prior to the meeting

Anne asked if the committee would like to discuss any comments received prior to the meeting.

- Ismael Armenta, committee member, indicated he noticed some themes in the comments received – concerns around diversion, a lack of transportation options, and impacts to low-income communities.

Note: Written community member comments submitted prior to the meeting are included at the end of this summary.

Verbal public comment

Anne and Josh Channell, project team, invited observers to provide live public comment.

- Paul Edgar, member of the public, from Oregon City, expressed concerns regarding the impacts on downtown Oregon City. Paul believes that tolling would cause diversion and have negative consequences for Oregon City and freight transport. See [Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #6 \[video\]](#); 00:23:00.

TOLL PROGRAM UPDATE

Garet Prior, project team, provided a Toll Program update. Garet explained there were two purposes to the update. First, to be transparent and share information with the committee as it becomes available to ODOT. Second, to share the same information with the EMAC that is being shared with other groups so there is a consistent message about the Program. Garet presented a series of slides to provide additional information on questions previously asked.

- Comments have been received that state it is unclear how toll revenue will be spent. Garet said that part of the answer to that question is that tolling will be a vital part of funding for projects included in the Comprehensive Congestion Management and Mobility Plan. Garet presented a map that identifies highway and bicycle and pedestrian projects within the region. The map was presented to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) in November 2020 and shows where tolling fits with other projects currently underway or planned in the region. Garet also presented a bar chart that shows some of the relationship between availability of tolling revenue and funding needed for regional projects.
- Comments have been received that identify concerns about fairness, diversion, equity, climate, and congestion management. Garet said that to address these concerns the approach to the I-5 Toll Project is shifting to include an expanded study footprint to look at I-5 and I-205 system-wide tolling.
- Garet explained the I-205 Toll Project is moving forward through the National Environmental Policy Act process. Comments have been received that the connection between the I-205 Toll Project and the I-205 Improvements Project is unclear. Garet indicated toll funding is needed to complete the construction of the I-205 Improvement

Project to make it safer and less congested, including the critical seismic improvements to the Abernethy Bridge and eight other bridges, and a third lane in each direction.

- Comments have been received that expressed concerns about the impact of tolling on finances, health, and indicated a need for more transit. Garet said that addressing these concerns will be a focus for the EMAC over the next year. At the next EMAC meeting we will address the 2021 work plan, including how the committee provides input on outcome equity performance measures, I-205 mitigation improvements and strategies, and makes recommendations for equity and mobility strategies to the OTC.

Committee Questions

Committee members asked clarifying questions and the project team provided responses.

- A committee member asked what happens if the revenue from tolling does not meet expectations. How will the revenue be allocated and will community projects still get funding? What safety net is in place to make sure some money still goes to the community?
 - Lucinda said the OTC adopted a policy that net toll revenue (the revenue after bills are paid) stays in the corridor where it was collected. Revenue has not yet been forecasted and how the money gets divided on the corridor is also not yet known.
- A committee member asked for clarification on whether the OTC has already made a decision about what projects get paid for first since there are some projects identified on the map in the presentation that are not reflected on the chart in the presentation ([Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Presentation](#) [slides 13 and 14]).
 - Lucinda indicated the bike/pedestrian and multimodal projects shown on the map are already being done by other agencies and are not connected to the toll projects.
- A committee member asked a follow up question related to funding for mitigation. The member indicated they did not see mitigation included in the chart ([Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Presentation](#) [slide 14]) and they would like to see mitigation in place prior to tolling implementation.
 - Lucinda explained that mitigation is part of the toll program and there will be funding for mitigation as part of the implementation cost for the projects. Tolls won't happen without mitigation.
- A committee member reiterated the concern that toll revenues will go toward paying back bonds on road projects and there will not be money left for multimodal projects. The member asked if the committee will have the ability to influence decisions about how toll revenue is used.
 - Lucinda indicated the projects on slides 13 and 14, including the multimodal projects, are already happening. Other multimodal projects or mitigation measures identified as part of the toll project will be shown on the map once they

are known. The committee will have the opportunity to weigh in on those mitigation measures. Garet added that additional clarity would be provided to the committee on when members will discuss multimodal and other measures as they discuss the work plan at the next EMAC meeting.

STEP 2: PROCESS EQUITY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Hannah Williams and Chris Lepe, project team members, led a review on what was presented and heard from the committee in previous meetings about process equity.

Hannah explained that the information included in the [draft process equity performance measure document](#) in the committee's meeting packet was developed based on prior feedback from the committee, community liaisons, a public survey and the public involvement plan. This information will be revised based on the discussion today and once finalized will be incorporated into the environmental documents and the updated Public Involvement Plan.

Hannah continued with a review of the major themes on equitable engagement from the December meeting and a reminder of the work done during Step 1: Identify Who/What/Where of the Toll Projects' Equity Framework.

Chris reviewed terms and definitions for goals and objectives, evaluation criteria, and performance measures. He indicated that the performance measures should be meaningful and achievable if the team works really hard. Chris then provided an example goal, objective, evaluation criteria, and performance measures.

There were no clarifying questions from the committee on the major themes from previous meetings or the terms presented.

Anne presented a reflection question to the committee and asked they take 2 minutes to think back to the December meeting and the task at hand today and write down their thoughts and ideas.

Reflection question: *What aspect of process equity is critical, but also difficult to measure?*

- A committee member indicated low income individuals living near/on the facilities will see increased traffic in neighborhoods and is there a way to quantify health impacts?
- Another committee member added to the idea that health impacts should be quantified and are important to consider in performance measures. The member also noted it's difficult to capture the line between inclusivity and tokenism. The member noted the draft performance measures were a good draft.
- A committee member reflected on the key concept of trust and transparency and how difficult it is to measure these concepts. If people do not feel heard then they keep asking the

same question – so how do you relay that the input provided has been absorbed and had an influence on the decision?

Anne indicated those reflections were a great segue to the workshop discussion.

STEP 2: PROCESS EQUITY PERFORMANCE MEASURES WORKSHOP

Following a break, Chris oriented the committee to the [draft process equity performance measures hand out](#). Chris provided an overview of four questions that the project team would like the committee to respond to as initial feedback on the draft performance measures. Chris indicated project team members would be taking notes on a jamboard (a digital whiteboard), which would be displayed at the end of the discussion. Key highlights from the discussion of each question are listed below. The jamboard notes are included at the end of this summary.

Question 1: What about the draft goals, objectives, evaluation criteria and performance measures is particularly useful for process equity?

- A committee member indicated it is hard to talk about the effectiveness of measures when it is not clear how information will be collected.
- A committee member noted they like that the draft measures focus on historically impacted people. When looking at equity, we need to think about what brought us to these disparities.
- A committee member likes that the draft measures refer to leveraging community engagement liaisons and EMAC members for the dissemination and gathering of information. Although it is unclear how this measure would be implemented. How will the EMAC members convey to the community that EMAC is a legitimate channel to convey information back to ODOT?

Question 2: What measures seem to be missing? Or, are there measures that are not needed?

- A committee member noted there needs to be consistent use of terms and there should be more focus on public interaction goals versus overall goals of the project.
- A committee member challenged the hierarchical structure of the triangle graphic displaying goals and objectives. Visuals are used to communicate ideas to the community and are important in representing equity. The member also noted the importance of the land acknowledgement and how it can be seen as disingenuous if done while continuing to practice dominant culture business practices. The land acknowledgement should be revisited and how the committee business is conducted.
- Another committee member agreed there is importance in how things are portrayed.
- The committee discussed different graphic representations to display the goals, criteria, and performance measures instead of the pyramid.

Question 3: How can we best measure progress toward building trust?

- A committee member noted it's important to show the process that goes into decision making. Even if the input is not taken, being transparent about the process signals that everyone was heard and information was processed.

- A committee member indicated you can't set a deadline or timeline on building trust. Be conscientious and cautious.
- Another committee member noted the difficulty in building trust in a digital space/virtual setting.
- A committee member indicated there could be a benefit in presenting materials as pros/cons.
- A committee member noted that perhaps trust isn't the goal, but instead transparency. Other committee members agreed with this idea and promoting transparency in the document.

Question 4: What additional thoughts do you have to improve the performance measures?

The committee did not have time to specifically address this question. Some of the discussion related to the questions above was included in response to this question on the jamboard.

Chris reminded the committee that the project team would be asking for volunteers to help move the performance measures forward. Anne indicated that the project team would reach out after the meeting.

STEP 2: OUTCOME EQUITY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Chris introduced the committee to outcome equity. Gareth pointed the committee toward an [outcome equity performance measures](#) document included in their packet that includes current outcome equity performance measures for the I-205 Toll Project. Gareth reiterated that the project team will be providing more information in preparation for the next EMAC meeting.

METRO REGIONAL CONGESTION PRICING STUDY

Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, Metro, provided an overview of [Metro's Regional Congestion Pricing Study](#). Metro is working on a technical analysis to understand the most effective toll pricing and how tolls perform under local conditions. Elizabeth indicated she would like feedback from the committee on the following questions.

1. What are the types of things that could indicate equity is being negatively impacted or positively impacted by a transportation project?
2. What ways do you know to use data differently than what we've discussed, to get at equity impacts?
3. What else can you add to our equity measures and considerations for this study?

Committee questions

Committee members asked clarifying questions and Elizabeth provided responses.

- A committee member asked to clarify if Metro's definition of active transportation includes transit?

- Elizabeth indicated that within the performance measures related to accessibility, transit is included.
- A committee member asked what is the region being looked at? Is it the urban growth boundary (UGB) or outside? A follow up question was whether Metro has looked at health impacts.
 - Elizabeth indicated the focus is on the UGB, but some scenario modeling takes into consideration areas north of the Columbia River (i.e. Vancouver and Clark County). Elizabeth added that emissions and vehicle miles traveled have been looked at related to health impacts and this will be considered further for any projects that move forward in the future.
- A committee member asked for clarification on the interaction between Metro's study and the I-205 Toll Project.
 - Elizabeth indicated there is close coordination between Metro and ODOT and the City of Portland. The efforts are parallel and information is being shared. The findings will help all projects moving forward.
- A committee member asked if the presentation is available online.
 - Anne noted the [Metro presentation](#) is available on the committee webpage and the link will be distributed to the committee.

NEXT STEPS

Anne reviewed next steps for the committee:

- The committee was invited to complete a meeting evaluation survey. A link was sent to committee members during the meeting. Results from the evaluation are included at the end of this summary.
- The project team will reach out for committee volunteers to help finalize process equity performance measures.
- At the next meeting, on March 31, 2021, the committee will focus on developing outcome equity performance measures.
- A committee member asked for additional information on the legislation that was discussed during the meeting.

Hannah thanked the committee members for their time and input. She reiterated the call for committee volunteers to assist with the process equity performance measures 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.

MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

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

Question	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Skipped
1. The meeting met my expectations for equitable involvement and treatment of committee members, consistent with the guiding principles in the Committee Charter.	7	5	0	0	0
2. The presentation and speakers were engaging and encouraged dialog.	10	2	0	0	0
3. I clearly understood the meeting objectives and knew what we were trying to accomplish.	6	6	0	0	0
4. The meeting materials sent in advance were relevant, advanced my learning, and contributed to my ability to meaningfully participate.	7	4	0	0	1
5. I had the opportunity to speak, be heard, and contribute to decisions under consideration.	11	1	0	0	0

Comments on Question 2

- It would be helpful to know which documents to focus on - I scan them all but if we are not going to have a detailed discussion about, e.g. the evaluation performance measures until the next meeting, that would be good to know.
- Metro Study was rushed

Comments on Question 4

- I wasn't in my office between the time the materials were sent and the meeting date, so I was challenged a bit to bounce between the presentation and specific materials that I wanted to spend look at more in-depth.
- Again, information indicating what documents to focus on would be helpful. I did not feel prepared to have the kind of discussion we had about the process equity performance measures and could have better prepared if I had known what sort of questions and input would be being asked during the meeting.
- Sending them out more in advance would be helpful to prepare, and with all the meeting materials (I think Metro preso was not attached)

Open-Ended Questions

Question 6: Were there any aspects of today's meeting that you particularly liked or disliked? (9 answered, 3 skipped)

- The part that I disliked was the feedback portion of the draft equity process only because it was a lot of information to take in and provide feedback on.
- I think we should look at starting the meetings earlier, because toward the end people seem to be worn out.
- The open discussion and flow of ideas.
- I enjoy the opportunity to share comments with the group. And engage others in the conversation
- Maybe this was just me, but I felt like I needed more time to read materials in order to be able to give feedback. Also (as I already mentioned) it's challenging to bounce back and forth between materials and the Zoom - for that reason I don't think I would be a good candidate to help with the JAM board. If I'm looking at that then I can't look at materials unless I print them out in advance but there are too many for me to want to print at home.
- Jam board was great!
- I like the Metro approach to equity it's something we could take a deeper look at
- I really appreciated hearing an update from Lucinda and Garet and getting the chance to ask questions.
- 3.5 hours seems long, especially at the end of the day.

Question 7: What topics or issues do we need to address or revisit in future meetings? (7 answered, 5 skipped)

- Would like to know how the measures in the process equity will be collected and reported on. It's one thing to gather that info but who and when does that get shared with to see if the process is meeting its goals
- I like the idea of sub groups working on topics in detail, then presenting the work of the group to the larger group.
- None come to mind.
- Land Acknowledgement and the process of the meetings
- Land acknowledgement and what the expectations/timelines are for the Metro feedback.
- Land acknowledgement
- I thought the understanding between trust and transparency is probably the best option to lead with

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

Community members submitted the following public comments to the committee via email prior to Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting #6.

Date received	12/8/2020
Source	Project inbox
From	Richard & Tamara Krippaehne

Subject: Committee Public Comment

ODOT Tolling Committee:

Clackamas Commissioners Jim Bernard, Paul Savas, Martha Shrader, Ken Humberston, Sonya Fischer:

Metro Councilors Christine Lewis, Shirley Craddick, Craig Dirksen, Lynn Peterson:

Oregon State Senator Rob Wagner:

Oregon State Representative Rachel Prusak:

We are writing to express our concern about proposed tolling on I-205 in Clackamas County. We live in the Willamette district of West Linn a short distance off of Willamette Falls Drive. We are native Oregonians, have lived in West Linn since 1992, and drive the I-205 freeway and Borland Road/Willamette Falls Drive every day. We experience first-hand the impact of alternate-route driving due to congestion on the freeway. On many days, even now during the pandemic, eastbound traffic backs up from 10th Street approximately 2 miles to the west. Westbound traffic backs up on Willamette Falls Drive from 10th Street half-way to Oregon City. Our freeway system does not have capacity to accommodate the population using it. The region continues to grow, and no amount of social engineering (tolling) will reduce the need to get around. We feel quite certain tolling will severely and negatively affect our neighborhood. We anticipate drivers taking Borland Road/Willamette Falls Drive to avoid paying tolls on the freeway, making it extremely difficult if not impossible to get into and out of our neighborhood to carry out normal daily activities. Also, tolling on the I-205 system from Tualatin to Clackamas unfairly burdens the local residents who more frequently need to use that portion of the freeway. We need the freeway system to get to and from work, and there are no reasonable alternatives to travel through and within the region. Many people do not have a choice of workday hours and do not have the flexibility to alter their driving patterns. Mass transit is not an option because the system does not provide an efficient way to get around.

We strongly oppose tolling on our freeways and feel adding capacity (more lanes) to the freeway system would be a better use of taxpayers' resources.

Sincerely,

Richard & Tamara Krippaehne

West Linn, Oregon

Date received	12/10/2020
Source	Project inbox
From	Anthony Warren

Subject: Committee Public Comment

To Whom it May Concern,

Please listen to tax payers on this issue and do not toll our highways in the state. It will have a negative impact on lower income people who are not able to work from home as easily or have jobs that require more commuting hours travel. It also will negatively affect all the other local roads, neighborhoods as people navigate around the highways.

Please listen to tax payers and stop turning to taxing citizens as the solution to poor administrative government management

Date received	12/10/2020
Source	Project inbox
From	Terry Parker

Subject: Committee Public Comment

To ODOT's [Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee](#) on tolling:

Truthful, straightforward and honest equity requires the users of all modes of transport to pay their fair share for the infrastructure and services being utilized, and not continually fleecing taxpaying motorists as if they are an ATM to support bicyclists that freeload and subsidize public transit all while local jurisdictions like PBOT and the City of Portland create more congestion, fuel consumption and emissions by repurposing motor vehicle infrastructure and not requiring off-street parking with new development. Pre-COVID pandemic, transit fares barely covered just 25% of TriMet's operating costs. Now with buses running nearly empty, who knows. To avoid any further tax discrimination towards motorists, the revenues from any tolling that may occur MUST only be used to increase motor vehicle capacity for a growing population, and not for other modes of transport.

Respectively submitted,

Terry Parker
Portland

Date received	12/10/2020
Source	Project inbox
From	Mary Rigert

Subject: Committee Public Comment

Dear Committee,

This should be set to a vote of the people. Not an arbitrary “consensus”. All taxes should be a vote.

No tolls unless approved by the people of Oregon.

Mary Rigert

7972 SW Red Sunset Lane

Beaverton, OR 97007

Date received	1/29/2021
Source	Project inbox
From	Gary Wood

Subject: Committee Public Comment

Dear Toll Planners,

Please don't take my comments personally or consider them too blunt. I need to be very clear.

All public feedback on tolling has been overwhelmingly negative: WE (THE PEOPLE YOU “SERVE”) DON'T WANT IT! We don't want to pay for planning, implementation or administration. We don't want to pay tolls. We don't want all the problems that come with it. We want none of it.

As hard as it is for you to hear and do something against what you “know” is best for us, THE PEOPLE YOU SERVE request you stop, cease, desist the whole project in all its places of survival. The planners interpreted the overwhelming rejection of tolling as “an obvious need to educate the public.” WRONG! The public is very educated. There is an obvious need to educate the planners. Read our lips: NO TOLL ROADS.

Fold you tents on tolling and go home. Or at least find something WE THE PEOPLE YOU SERVE actually want you to spend OUR money on. Or, oh horrors, reduce to zero the number of people working on tolls and put them to work on something WE want, or give them two months to find another job. That is what happens in the rest of the world. You can handle it.

Please, please, please, just once, listen to me and the thousands of Oregonians who have told you NO ON TOLL ROADS.

Gary Wood

Date received	1/29/2021
Source	Project inbox
From	Mary Rigert

Subject: Say No to Tolls!

I am writing to you regarding your upcoming meeting on February 3rd and the issue of Toll roads on I-205 and I-5.

I don't believe that Toll roads are a good idea or fit for Oregon.

I am asking you to re-think this idea. I say NO to Toll roads and am asking my family and friends to send you emails saying the same thing.

FAMILY AND FRIENDS...

Please lend your support in saying NO to Toll roads here in Oregon.

Send your message to them via email,

oregontolling@odot.state.or.us

Thank you,

Ann Hering

Date received	1/29/2021
Source	Project inbox
From	Mary Rigert

Subject: Committee Public Comment

Dear Committee,

A life-long Oregonian, tax-paying citizen says NO TOLLING ON HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, ROADS!

Two family friend have already left Oregon for high taxes and regulations. More will leave!

Keep Oregon for me!

Mary Rigert

7972 SW Red Sunset Lane

Beaverton OR. 97007

Date received	1/29/2021
Source	Project inbox
From	Michael Angelechio

Subject: Tolls

Good Afternoon Don,

I am not sure if the comment period on this project has closed but I thought I would reach out just in case. We are getting crushed from overregulation and taxes during these challenging times. It seems like implementing a tolling system while 7 other taxes are already coming our way, in a struggling local economy is not the best policy? Additionally, adding the complication of accounting for tolls is an immense responsibility to place on small businesses like us. It seems as though ODOT is looking for input on how to implement the system but the real input is how do we avoid it all together? Traffic is already difficult and adding tolls will only complicate that. If you have any ability to pass my request along it would be appreciated, please please please no new taxes or regulations....

Warm Regards,

Michael Angelechio

12909 NE Airport Way

Portland, OR 97230

(503) 384-2270

(503) 345-0985 fax

Michael.Angelechio@GoNavis.com

Date received	1/30/2021
Source	Project inbox
From	Kiel Johnson

Subject: Committee Public Comment

This message was sent from outside the organization. Treat attachments, links and requests with caution. Be conscious of the information you share if you respond.

Thank you all for your work on this committee. There are a lot of great focuses in the equity framework that really stand out when you compare to how we previously looked at projects. My feedback would be to really understand how the current system is inequitable. What is the cost of doing nothing? It is easy to focus on the cost and price of people paying a toll but what are the current costs of not tolling? What is the trauma of people who spend everyday stuck in traffic? As someone who does not commute on a freeway I find that people who do are different. The emotional and physical toll of spending everyday stuck in traffic seems pretty high and is pretty negative. Please include looking at those costs when you look at tolling.
thank you,
-Kiel Johnson

Date received	1/31/2021
Source	Project inbox
From	Tony

Subject: Committee Public Comment

You are totally wasting money with all the idiotic planning you are doing for a completely idiotic idea. Tolling should NOT be done. ODOT get plenty of money for projects. They just need to grow a brain and learn how to use their budget. Going after motorists for more money because they manage their money so poorly is NOT the answer. Anyone involved with the tolling projects should be fired. Anyone involved on the obvious mismanagement of budgets should be fired. Grow a damn brain and quit trying to take money from us.

JAMBOARD NOTES

Question 1

What about the draft goals, objectives, evaluation criteria and performance measures is particularly useful for process equity?

Focus on historically impacted communities

Need to focus on collection of information first

Leverage CELs for gathering and dispersing information

Weave into the process proof that ODOT is considering input. Space in meetings to provide input back to ODOT.



Oregon Toll Program



www.OregonTolling.org

Question 2

What measures seem to be missing?
Or, are there measures that are not needed?

How we portray things is important. Like the idea of being more circular. Maybe a concentric circle with goals at the center.

Concern with titles - these measures focus on public contact and communication but not on larger project goals of mobility, affordability, etc.

Ensure process is inclusive and meaningful, not tokenism

or the pyramid. Reminds of hierarchical structure. the pyramid does not represent equity visually. visuals that we use as we communicate are important. What would a visual look like that would reflect equity in this

Maybe outcomes should be at the heart of the circle graphic.

Appreciate the land acknowledgement. Not including is reinforcing dominant culture ways of doing business.

Maybe a circular graphic would be better?



Oregon Toll Program

www.OregonTolling.org

Question 3

How can we best measure progress toward building trust?

Is it more humble to not have trust as a specific goal or objective? Maybe focus on transparency as the vehicle over time that builds trust.

Trust is a desired outcome

Explain thought process even if ideas aren't implemented.

We may be able to find some "medium ground" in finding measures, but need to be cautious about building trust in a short amount of time.

How can we invite our communities to participate more in these meetings?

Here today/gone tomorrow effect of agencies. What is the longer term trust that is established?

Humility-things have brewed for a long time.

Long term investment and stability. Need to nurture relationships and show up again and again.

Best way to build trust is to meet, and talk, and get to know eachother. Hard to do virtually.

Be transparent in the scope of managing a full system for lots of people. The cost of the current status quo should be put in to perspective.

Trust can't be put in a box or set a deadline or timeline on trust. This work takes invested time in communities.

Hard to build trust virtually.

Put all cards/costs on the table. In health, time, etc.

Important to show a thought process to consider community input. Be transparent about that thought process to arrive at a decision.

Oregon Toll Program

www.OregonTolling.org

Question 4

What additional thoughts do you have to improve the performance measures?

Reconsider pyramid as a visual to focus more on equity.

Present pros and cons

Oregon Toll Program

www.OregonTolling.org

Miscellaneous Input

Bike Rack / Parking Lot

**Revisit land
acknowledgment to
focus on objectives
of what we are
trying to achieve.**



Oregon Toll Program



www.OregonTolling.org