

## Regional Toll Advisory Committee Meeting 5 Public Comments

<b>Date received</b>	1/6/2023
<b>Source</b>	Email
<b>From</b>	Gay Walker
<b>Subject</b>	RTAC Public Comment

I understand members of the public may write to this site with their comments about the proposed ODOT tolling initiative until midnight tonight.

I am writing to add my voice to those who believe such a toll set up would massively damage those who are least able to pay. As you must know, the huge bedroom communities of Canby and Woodburn, of Albany and Aloha, provide workers for much of Portland's commercial enterprises, and they would be most affected by a \$10 toll (\$5 each way, I understand). I think this is very short-sighted. The cost of setting up the electronic tagging system alone is staggering, so how long will it be in place before that is paid for?

Tolls do NOT cut down on traffic and congestion, as many more people will be taking the back roads to avoid the tolls, and the congestion is already great there at rush hour since people's GPS systems direct them around back-ups and the increasing slowness of I-5 and 205 during rush hour.

Tolls are also a great burden for those who are on a fixed income and need to get into Wilsonville from Charbonneau for their basic grocery shopping. Who can justify \$10 to go buy groceries beyond the cost of running the car and gas?

Surely there are other ways to pay for what's needed? An annual tax on electric cars for road use would be one possibility (I have one and would be willing as it only seems fair). Encouraging more to go electric? Higher annual or biennial DEQ fees?

I am hoping there will NOT be tolls set up.. Having lived in a state (CT) with toll booths for 20 years which were then actually removed when their goals had been met was edifying. But the tolls electronically zapped between NYC and CT is a nightmare, and their roads are horrible, so how did that help? Please keep Oregon smartly out of this pot hole!

<b>Date received</b>	1/6/2023
<b>Source</b>	Email
<b>From</b>	Josh Vandenburg
<b>Subject</b>	STRAC, RTAC, vote against toll roads

I am writing to express my disinterest in toll roads being established in Oregon. They are a blatant attack on the financially unfortunate and will likely cause massive traffic congestion on other roads, negative

*Memorandum*

RTAC Public Comment / October 24 – December 1, 2022

environmental impact from idle cars, and will allow the government to unlawfully track vehicles. This bill needs to cease immediately.

<b>Date received</b>	1/6/2023
<b>Source</b>	Email
<b>From</b>	Gary & Marti Moody
<b>Subject</b>	Regional Toll Advisory Committee

WE STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH TOLLING OUR HIGHWAYS AND DO NOT WANT IT!!!! We live just off the abernathy bridge and will need to pay tolls every time we are on I205. This is wrong and unfair as we will have to pay tolls constantly. People living near I205 will have the greatest, and wrongful and unfair financial impact! I have read extensively the intent of this toll and it cannot and will not improve traffic flow. As for forcing people to side streets and neighborhoods to lessen congestion on I205 is an absurd proposal. There are no direct driving routes avoiding I205 due to the river. The alternate routes are no solution to reduced traffic on highways. In fact, it is plain wrong to try to convince us that it is!! The other suggestions are not an effective solution either. This appears to be just another tax revenue move that Oregon is FORCING on Oregonians, with no effective solution to help the actual problem.

There are many reasons that tolling is a bad idea. A few are the environmental impact from idling side street vehicles, toll prices, sun-setting of tolls, use of funds, tolling overhead, no free hours, no free lanes, and why only 1 small but expensive section of I-205 to start.

I have read alternative suggestions you have received that are better solutions to the traffic issue that don't require a toll. I am pleading that there is NO toll and that you insist truly improving the problem. Stop spending more and more money on a result that will not solve the problem. We all know that the budget for this project will have many overruns, take much longer than we're told, and in the end won't help anything. This state seems to have a belief system that if the issue just gets more money it will be fixed. Never has, never will, and as taxpayers we resent this tactic deeply. Stop forcing your opinions on us and actually be responsible with solutions that work. DON'T FOCE THIS ON US! WE DON'T WANT IT!

Thank you.  
Listen to we the people, please!

<b>Date received</b>	1/7/2023
<b>Source</b>	Email
<b>From</b>	Stephen Lawson
<b>Subject</b>	RTAC Public Comment

I don't think that tolling on I-5 and 205 serves the intended purpose. Traffic passing through the Portland metropolitan area will continue to use these highways because there is no alternative. Local traffic may be discouraged from using these highways and simply bypass through residential streets in Portland as an alternative.

*Memorandum*

RTAC Public Comment / October 24 – December 1, 2022

People aren't going to give up their cars because it's impractical to do so. You cannot shuttle kids around on a bicycle or carry groceries or go anywhere on a bike in the pouring rain or in snow. Public transportation is effective in some areas and for some purposes, but safety is also a concern.

The future is electric vehicles, not no or fewer vehicles. ODOT should do whatever is feasible to accommodate and welcome this future.

<b>Date received</b>	1/7/2023
<b>Source</b>	Email
<b>From</b>	Christopher Hale
<b>Subject</b>	RTAC public comment re: scoping for RMPP

I'm writing to comment on the plan for tolling and congestion pricing on I-5 and I-205. As it currently stands, there are multiple changes that must be made.

First, a bit of background to understand my perspective. I'm a full time ER doctor, who has witnessed first hand the human toll of our current climate crisis. Over the past few years, we have seen our ER flooded with people suffering from heat stroke during our record setting heat waves each summer. When yearly wildfire smoke chokes our air, patient's flood our ER in respiratory distress. This is especially devastating to our most vulnerable populations: children, the elderly, and the economically or historically disadvantaged. As our country warms, tropical diseases are already working their way north into our country. If climate change continues unabated, this will only worsen.

I am also the father of two small children, 4 and 5 years old. I lay awake at night, thinking of the future we are leaving for them. We have a critically narrow window of time in which to fend off the worst outcomes of the climate crisis. Every year that we put off the changes that must be made, and every project where we do not focus every effort on building a sustainable transportation system, we condemn our children and grandchildren to a grim future.

As a commitment to my children, we have made a pledge to do everything in our power to build a brighter future for them. As such, my wife and I bring our kids to and from school every day by bicycle. And I commute to and from work every day by bicycle, on a route that uses that relies on the I-205 multiuser path. Every day, I ride along side the many vehicles congesting this road. The only way to reduce congestion long term and build an equitable, sustainable transportation system is if we give these drivers other viable transportation options.

It is with this perspective that I see the potential for tolling and congestion pricing, but also see where the current plan falls short of what it must accomplish.

The primary purpose of the Regional Mobility Pricing Project should be to reduce vehicle miles traveled. This will help reduce congestion while simultaneously decreasing air pollution, vehicle related deaths, and combatting climate change.

The primary purpose of the RMPP should NOT be revenue, and that revenue should NOT be used to fund further roadway expansion. Doing so will only cause the well known phenomenon of induced demand, meaning that widening freeways leads to more people driving, which causes recurrent congestion, and an INCREASE in pollution, climate exacerbating carbon emissions, and increased deaths of pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers.

Memorandum

RTAC Public Comment / October 24 – December 1, 2022

Any revenue generated from tolling and congestion pricing should be used to fund safe, low-carbon multimodal transportation options, like increased and expanded train services, bus only lanes that allow buses to preferentially bypass congested personal vehicle lanes, infrastructure that allows increased bicycling and micro mobility options, and a plan that prioritizes safety of pedestrians over vehicles.

It is critical that all of the “Urban Mobility Strategy” projects and plans for tolling in the regional freeway system have a complete environmental analysis, including an Environmental Impact Statement.

ODOT should also develop a mechanism to exchange toll revenue for unrestricted federal dollars, in order to fund transit options and projects that do NOT involve expanding freeways for private motor vehicle use.

The travel time impacts shouldn't be assessed for only personal motor vehicle drivers. This is fundamentally unfair, especially for those of lesser means who may not be able to afford to own a car. They are already at an economic disadvantage, and it is an injustice to ignore the effect of the project on their commute by bus, trains, or other means.

Similarly, any project should include an analysis of the impacts to education, affordable housing, access to jobs, safety of pedestrians and bicyclists, air pollution, and other impacts on people living in underserved communities (racial minorities, those in poverty, etc).

As currently proposed, the RMMP does not even reflect the recommendations of ODOT's own Equitable and Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC). EMAC should be involved in all discussions about the RMPP, in order to ensure revenue is administered equitably, and equitable outcomes.

If these changes are made, the plan for tolling and congestion pricing on I-205 and I-5 could become a critical component to our city's long term plans to build an equitable, sustainable, and model transportation system of the future. It will build a a future for our children and grandchildren where people have enhanced mobility, while also maximizing their health, safety, and happiness. Remember, YOUR children and grandchildren will look back at the decisions you make right now, and judge you for how they build their future. Do whatever is necessary to make their future a bright one.

<b>Date received</b>	1/20/2023
<b>Source</b>	Email
<b>From</b>	Sue Kalt
<b>Subject</b>	RTAC public comment

First I want to ask why you are bothering with all these meetings when you have already decided that you are going to have tolling. It is a done deal on your part to see how much more money you can squeeze out of us who are in the low middle income group

Those subsidies you are going to give to lower income people will allow them to travel. Rich people regard that as pocket change. For those of us living as frugally as possible to keep the lights on in our house, we are the ones who will not be afford to go to work. This is disparate treatment UNFAIR treatment. It is a barrier to equitable access to roads we already paid for.

So stop pretending you want our input. You don't. You are tone deaf. You have made a unilateral decision and you really don't want to hear what we have to say about this ridiculous, yes, ridiculous process of road tolling.

First cut your own budgets --- because that is what we will have to do in order to drive to work run errands and go to appointments.

Those toll fees are HUGE. They will impact whether I will eat two meals per day or one meal per day. Yes I already eat only two meals per day and sometimes only one to keep my utilities -- you know those necessities like water, electricity, and heat.

These talking points you provide are pure fantasy

- \* Drivers only pay for what they use.

Does that mean we have to pay that payroll transit tax? Gas taxes? and other fees waged against people who drive cars?

- \* Tolls help traffic move more smoothly.

False. The problem is the number of population has increased. We have more people, hence more people on the roads. Traffic will also be redirected to residential streets causing problems. Any statistical projections over 5 years are bogus. ODOT on their site states by 2045 we will have severe problems. That is a 22 year projection. Those are worthless projections. This is a money grab where you want more money instead of cutting expenses in an over bloated department. Get rid of all the other taxes and fees we already pay. Be transparent where you show how we are being nickled and dimed to death --- list all the ways we already pay. List that payroll transit tax, the gas taxes, the car registration fees, and far more. Also, list the Federal funds you already receive.

- \* Tolls provide a more reliable trip.

Another falsehoods --- where is your data to prove this subjective assertion? How do you define "reliable"? I will argue the least reliable form of transportation is that horrible thing you call Trimet and I have my own personal data, based on those unfortunate times when I had to take that horrible, unreliable and UNSAFE form of transit. Yes, I was attacked on a Trimet bus and the transit police let the perpetrator walk away. Those buses are unsafe as is MAX. Tolling roads is not equitable as it is a barrier to access. What is equitable is to REMOVE barriers -- such as tolling.

- \* Toll prices will not be a surprise.

Really? They are already a HUGE surprise. Variable fees are not consistent and the fact that you have a tiered system already shows the fallacy in your argument.

Also address how we will "pay" this TAX for the privilege of going to work so we can pay even more taxes

Do we have to create an account? Will we be billed? IF so, if we will be billed, what additional fees are you going to assess on that? We all do not have smart phones --- I can't afford one. I don't do online bill pay. Can't afford the Internet.

Memorandum

RTAC Public Comment / October 24 – December 1, 2022

So, how is that process going to manifest itself? I want hard figures -- transparency. All the fees need to be revealed in cold hard numbers. Accurate numbers, not this --- "oh it might be around this much. " No, give me the actual numbers.

Date received	1/24/2023
Source	Email
From	Aaron Dukes
Subject	Attn: Regional Toll Advisory Committee

I'm 100% against this concept... and somewhat alarmed that the legislature and ODOT seem to be moving ahead with this plan.

You can't treat transportation like a sin tax. Poor people, those who can't work from home, or those who are forced to commute from farther out because they can't afford the region's outrageous housing costs (and therefore don't have convenient public transit options), should not bear the brunt of this cost. If truck drivers, cabbies, trades people, and Uber drivers made six figure salaries, fine... but they don't. Look around next time you're on 205 and see who you're sharing the road with.

Why not target those who can afford to pay? Why can't we raise taxes on wealth, high income earners, and corporate profits? Corporations, both instate and out, are the most obvious source for this needed revenue. Why should a truck driver have to pay for access to passage while the corporations whose cargo he or she's hauling remain exempt? (I see endless caravans of WalMart, Amazon, and Fed-Ex trucks on 205. Why not tax them?)

And what happened to the transportation tax that passed a few years back? Every Oregonian is already paying an extra \$0.011 in transportation tax on hourly wages. Why not follow a similar path towards new funding? It would certainly be more fair. Why the move towards tolling?

Lastly, if the idea is to simply discourage car and truck traffic in general, that's a lofty goal... but please don't attempt to shift the associated costs onto working people who have few other options. If you live in a close-in, affluent neighborhood and you work downtown, public transportation might be a good option. But what about someone who lives 50, 70 or 100 miles away? What about someone who scrapes by with a trash-hauling business? Or a cabbie needing to make frequent runs to the airport? Or an Uber driver, barely making minimum wage, who has to explain to a fare that they now have to take "the long way" because their employer doesn't reimburse toll fees?

This is a regressive plan that punishes working class people disproportionately. Why is it that the first option for these revenue streams is always directed at POOR PEOPLE? Why can't these improvements be paid for by the people who can afford it? In many cases, these are the exact same people WHO PROFIT THE MOST FROM IT!

Let's get smart about this and come up with some other ideas... this one's a stinker.

Date received	2/16/2023
Source	Email
From	Brenden Huey
Subject	RTAC Public Comment

Memorandum

RTAC Public Comment / October 24 – December 1, 2022

I'm reaching out because it feels like ODOT is steamrolling ahead with their tolling plans which for a myriad reasons seems like it will hurt our community and neighborhoods rather than help.

By tolling all lanes it's going to push a lot of people on side streets which will make it congested and more dangerous for bikers and pedestrians alike, when deaths of pedestrians and bikers are already rising.

The tolls hurt low income individuals, especially the ones who are just above the 200% poverty threshold proposed or the ones who don't know how to apply for the discount.

There's few public transit options for those commuting up from I-5 in the Portland south metro so the only realistic option is to pay a bunch or take local side streets like Capital Highway to Barbur.

It disincentivizes people from traveling into the city, when Portland's downtown needs all the visitors it can get. Spend money on tolls or just stay home? For many, home will look like a better option.

It's really befuddling why tolling all lanes is the option ODOT is pushing for when states like Colorado have shown the benefits of a single tolled express lane to fund needed projects, reduce congestion, make roads safer, control traffic, and not be a regressive tax on the poor.

Date received	2/16/2023
Source	Email
From	Brian Gutowski
Subject	RTAC: Response to West Linn Tidings Article

On February 13, the West Linn Tidings posted an opinion article by Cam Gilmour that I believe requires a response from the Regional Toll Advisory Committee.

[https://www.westlinntidings.com/opinion/opinion-legislature-needs-to-act-now-and-pause-odot-on-i-205-tolling/article\\_d5ec0dce-ce1c-5f12-8c76-0fc844cfa712.html](https://www.westlinntidings.com/opinion/opinion-legislature-needs-to-act-now-and-pause-odot-on-i-205-tolling/article_d5ec0dce-ce1c-5f12-8c76-0fc844cfa712.html)

As a resident of West Linn, I do not believe the issues or concerns about our community have been adequately addressed and this opinion article states those concerns directly.

Date received	2/16/2023
Source	Email
From	Ken Sibelian
Subject	RTAC

Original email forwarded for response.

Please address these concerns and questions. Much time has been put into this PDF. Your response is critical to my understanding of this project, particularly the need.

When will you present this project to the voters? In all that I have read, I haven't seen when a vote will occur.

**Project – goals & strategy:**



The Oregon Dept. of Transportation (ODOT) is proposing implementation of traffic tolls to reduce traffic congestion on I-5 and I-205. ODOT has asked for public comment on the project. I offer these comments.

**Goals:**

The stated goals are two:

1. Primary goal is to reduce traffic congestion on I-205 by 5%.
2. A secondary goal is to raise revenue for infrastructure projects.

Subsidiary committees like the EMAC are suggesting yet more goals. I will address these additional considerations below.

**Strategy:**

The proposed plan is to implement a traffic toll on I-5 and I-205. Special devices will be installed on both Interstate highways that will identify, via license plate number, the passage of each vehicle. Payment of the toll will be charged to a pre-paid account affiliated with that license number. In the absence of such an account, an invoice will be sent to the owner of record for the license number. ODOT promises there will no manned tollbooths or other manual collection systems to cause traffic to slow to make payment.

Understandably, this early in the development of this project, a great many details have yet to be decided. Some obvious examples: selection of a contractor and an automated toll system, a set budget amount, and/or a project timeline.

However, implementing Oregon's first toll highway is a major change in a state that refuses to have a sales tax or legalize self-serve gasoline service in urban areas. Radical changes in the state's culture require a great deal of information that justifies such changes, and before those changes are implemented. Even then, the public may never accept those radical changes and find ways overt and covert to express their protest, especially if the public has no chance to vote. To date, ODOT has not provided that information. What is lacking is discussed below under Considerations.

**Considerations:**

Questions about the current traffic conditions on I-5 and I-205:

1. What are the current traffic load volumes, in particular, broken out by hours of the day for weekdays and weekends and holidays?
2. What are the traffic flow times measured either in travel time from I-205 & SE Sunnyside Road to the interchange at I-5 or some similar two points? Same question for traffic flow times on I-5 north and south of Portland city center.
3. Using the above numbers, what are ODOT's best estimates of how a 5% reduction in traffic loads would impact:
  - a. The traffic load volumes?
  - b. The traffic flow times?
4. Will the tolls:
  - a. Apply to only privately owned vehicles?
  - b. Also apply to commercial trucks (anything from delivery vans to tractor-trailer rigs)?



- c. Apply twice to a truck traveling through Portland (north to south or south to north), say from Salem to Vancouver (or vice versa)?
5. How much revenue does ODOT project from tolls? Specifically:
  - a. How much toll revenue will be collected *after* the 5% traffic reduction is achieved?
  - b. If ODOT sets a toll amount (e.g., \$3.00 per car trip) and that does not discourage enough commuters to achieve the 5% traffic reduction goal, will ODOT increase the toll repeatedly until the goal is achieved? Or, does ODOT have in mind a maximum toll fee above which they won't go?
  - c. Does ODOT have any projections showing what percentage of those travelling on I-205 will establish a pre-paid account versus how many will wait for a bill in the mail? Is there any concern that the pre-paid accounts will prove unpopular and that most travelers will wait for the bill in the mail?
6. Has ODOT done any surveys or other data gathering to indicate the start and end points of those traveling during commute hours morning and evening? For these times, use: 6:00 am to 9:00 am and 4:00 pm 7:00 pm. If not, how can ODOT be confident that instituting tolls will have the desired result? For example:
  - a. What if those surveys of start and end points reveal that there are *no* reasonable alternatives – neither mass transit nor surface streets/roads - to commuters using I-205 to get from where they live to where they work and back again?
  - b. Assume the tolls *do* reduce traffic loads by 5%: does ODOT have any ideas where the missing 5% of traffic goes? Or, is the assumption that tolls on I-205 will drive more commuters to mass transit?
  - c. If that is the assumption, what information does ODOT have that supports that assumption?
  - d. If that is not the assumption, does ODOT have any projections as to what surface streets might be impacted?
  - e. If the thought is that there will be financial assistance to lower income commuters, from where will that funding come? The state's general revenues? The tolls collected? If the latter, what does that do to toll revenue projections? Will that assistance undermine one of the two primary goals?
7. Similarly, has ODOT done any surveys or other data gathering that measures the commuting public, such as:
  - a. Who are the commuters in terms of what types of work they do?
  - b. What control, if any, do they have over when they have to commute, that is, their jobs require them to work set hours (8-5, 9-6, etc.)?
  - c. What are their income levels?
  - d. Is ODOT confident the commuters' hours worked and income levels won't result in lower income commuters paying most of the toll revenue?
  - e. Does ODOT have any sense of how many
8. ODOT states rather broadly there are, around the country, tolling systems that are similar to what is being proposed. Questions:
  - a. What systems? Specifically:
  - b. Are these systems in communities similar to the Portland metro area in things like demographics, commute traffic patterns, local economy?
  - c. Were they implemented on major routes (Interstate highways) traveling directly into city centers? Or, were they implemented on Interstate highways that are peripheral to the city center?
  - d. Were they the first toll highways implemented in those metro areas?
  - e. Did those metro areas have viable mass transit systems that could serve the commuters displaced by the tolls?
  - f. When these systems were implemented, did the transportation officials have the same two goals: reduction in traffic loads and raising of revenue for infrastructure projects.
  - g. Did those systems meet their, exceed or fall short of their goals?

9. Implementing a system of tolls on either I-5 or I-205 will require an expensive investment in scanning equipment on the roadways, revenue collection policies and procedures, public information campaigns, and a host of other expenses. Once these investments have been made, it will be difficult if not impossible for ODOT to recognize that the tolls system is a failure and discontinue it. Therefore:
  - a. What plans has ODOT made/considered to evaluate the system as it is implemented?
  - b. Has ODOT considered a pilot project either on either I-5 or I-205 or at some other location?  
If not, why not?
10. At the beginning, under **Project – goals and strategy**, the existence of subsidiary committees was mentioned. In particular, the Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee is making a number of suggestions to ensure the tolls don't have an unfairly adverse impact on those who have lower incomes or other disadvantages. Has ODOT considered:
  - a. Toll on roads are fundamentally an engineering and revenue-gathering problem. They collect user fees from those who use the roads; they do not (and cannot) discriminate based upon the social standing or income level of the user.
  - b. ODOT may suggest establishing a system of income-based graduated fees or reimbursements. However, that raises the questions of:
    - i. What would the system of graduated fees look like? How would the brackets be defined, and how would they be adjusted if/when the primary fee be raised/lowered?
    - ii. How would people qualify for a graduated fee? How would they apply? How would their application be vetted?
  - c. Attempts to prevent tolls from adversely impacting low income people unfairly either are doomed to failure or will make the tolls system so complicated it will fail.
11. ODOT's secondary goal is to raise excess funds (gross revenue – total expenses) to improve "infrastructure." It cites the Oregon Constitution concerning use or operation of motor vehicles as follows: "The Oregon Constitution (Article IX, Section 3a) specifies that revenues collected from the use or operation of motor vehicles is spent on roadway projects, which could include construction or reconstruction of travel lanes, as well as bicycle and pedestrian facilities or transit improvements in or along the roadway." From this, one supposes "infrastructure: means transportation-related projects, and excludes non-transportation expenditures for, say, new parks or new government office buildings. This raises questions:
  - a. Will toll revenues, net of expenses, be held in reserve funds to be allocated only to transportation-related projects?
  - b. Who will determine what projects qualify as "transportation-related"? ODOT officials? The state legislature?
  - c. Currently, under the constitutional provision cited, Oregon drivers endure the insult of their gas taxes being used for bike paths and walking paths, and mass transit.
    - i. While mass transit may take a few cars off the road, to the benefit of those drivers still on the roadways. No one seriously believes the few hardy souls who ride bikes or walk in Portland's lousy weather are contributing to any improvement in traffic congestion.
    - ii. Will revenues from road tolls be used for yet more bike paths & walking paths, adding injury to this insult?

## Conclusion

A large number of questions are raised here, questions that can and should be addressed before any decisions are made as to implementing a system of tolls on I-5 and/or I-205. As noted above, the proposed system of tolls in I-5 and I-205 is a major change to the way people travel through and around the state's largest metropolitan area. It will be expensive to implement, and a major intrusion on every person who drives these routes, especially those who do so daily traveling to and from work. ODOT should proceed very cautiously with such a project, being especially careful about reining in the enthusiasms of government officials and state legislators for more revenue. A number of years ago,

Memorandum

RTAC Public Comment / October 24 – December 1, 2022

ODOT failed miserably trying to develop their own computer system for the Dept. of Motor Vehicles. Should ODOT proceed carefully, the tolls system could be an even greater public embarrassment in front of Oregon's single largest group of voters.

Date received	2/21/2023
Source	Email
From	Sue Kalt
Subject	RTAC Public Comment

Tolling is not going to solve anything. VARIABLE pricing? No -- I want a flat rate so I know how to budget, I don't have deep pockets and I need to count all my little shekels. This is a BARRIER to access to get to work. I can't even afford entertainment anymore and you think this will aid in congestion? Population increase is the problem. More people equals more congestion. Simple.

We don't get to choose our work hours  
We don't get to choose our place of work  
We need to work to survive -- no work, no food

Variable is just a money grab on your part. It is a more taxes levied on hard-working individuals

Tolls will increase already inflated prices on foods and other necessities. To think otherwise means you have not looked at the costs involved in pricing those goods and services. Call a plumber and now they will have to charge more because they have to pay tolls. This is a bad idea.

100 people on the road -- no congestion unless there are accidents  
10,000 people on the same roads = congestion and add to that accidents.

TOLLS are only going to raise prices on goods and services and adversely affect those of us who count every penny in our budget . Use the money you already get and use it wisely. We have to do that with our budget; only fair that you do that with yours.

We already pay gas taxes, that usurious Transit Payroll TAX. This is just one more tax for a department that does not follow good fiscal responsibility

Also be transparent about how we will be billed for this -- for the privilege of going to work so we can give you more payroll transit taxes. This is pure evil. If we are charged for tolls do we still have to pay that usurious Payroll Transit TAX? You can't have it both ways. We are already being taxed to death.

Cut your budgets before grabbing more money from ours.

Date received	2/21/2023
Source	Email
From	Sue Kalt
Subject	RTAC Public Comment

Not that my input will make any difference since you have already made this decision a long time ago and are just wasting our time and letting us think you want our input..

Memorandum

RTAC Public Comment / October 24 – December 1, 2022

TOLLS will not decrease traffic jams -- our population is growing. More people = more traffic on the roads

TOLLS will only increase how much more money you get to waste on boondoggle projects. This is a money grab that puts a HUGE BARRIER to access. We need to get to work. Unless you want to pay me for staying home, I will be more than happy to stay home and not lose more money going to a job where you already take money out for that ridiculous TRANSIT PAYROLL tax. As they say, "I already gave at the office." So no thank you to this exclusionary practice of tolls. Some of us are disproportionately affected by this, like you really care.

This is an unfair tax.

Talk about how will we be assessed tolls. I will not give access to a bank account where you take my money out. That is a security and privacy issue.

TOLLS will not decrease the traffic flow. If you think that is so, then I want to know what funny weed you are smoking.

Call it what it really is - another tax to grab whatever money we have left.

Date received	2/22/2023
Source	Email
From	Linda Bright
Subject	RTAC Public Comment

Regarding plans for toll roads on I-5 and I205 in the Portland metro area:

I am a native to the Portland area, born and raised on the west side (Beaverton). I lived out of state up until 8 years ago; I lived in the metro areas of Salt Lake City, Minneapolis, Tucson, Oklahoma City, and Kansas City for a total of 25 years. I now reside in the I205 and Johnson Cr. Blvd. area, just outside of Portland city limits in unincorporated Clackamas County. I work as a healthcare provider in an outpatient clinic in Portland. I have absolutely no ability to change my travel times to work-- and the patients I see for rehabilitation for strokes and brain injuries come into the clinic for care when there are appointment times available (so they, too, have very little control over the time they come into the clinic for treatment). These patients and their families are usually out of work due to illness and the need to provide care to loved ones.

1. I am particularly concerned about tolls on I205 and I5 impacting low income and vulnerable people; and about the complicated process they may need to go through trying to get discounts on these tolls-- much of the time, the process to get discounts or reduced charges for various services or charges is so cumbersome that people do not have the time, energy, or understanding to utilize the benefit.
2. I am also concerned about the "surface" street congestion that will likely occur around the interstate toll corridors. These streets are already congested and dangerous for pedestrians and bikes.
3. My husband used to commute via bike along the I205 Multi Use Path from I205 and Johnson Cr. to Airport way. He stopped the bike commute due to unsafe conditions on this path, temporary structures (with debris/trash) being put up along the path by homeless citizens that blocked or narrowed the path, and some of these citizens aggressively begging/pan-handling. Until the bike paths in the Portland-metro area are cleaned up and safe, it is

extremely unrealistic (and unviable) to expect that creating toll roads will encourage citizens to use this alternative form of commuting.

4. Creating a system of taxing electronic vehicles seems like an additional way to create revenue (versus placing more burden on users of gasoline vehicles-- who are likely, on average, of lower income levels than e-vehicle operators-- where there is already a gas tax being paid). I propose that a new e-vehicle tax be added in addition to the new toll fees that will be paid by all road users; the burden of paying transportation taxes will be more evenly shared (and hopefully less regressive).
5. The Portland metro area has a very large percentage of vehicles using the road system from the state of Washington. These out of state vehicles are on the area roads for multiple reasons: avoidance of paying sales tax, avoidance of paying income tax, to access activities in our metro area such as entertainment, and many more. Capturing tolls from these out of state users, who add significantly to congestion in the Portland metro, is imperative to reaching the goal of 45 MPH or better travel; and it is a fair "usage tax" for the benefit of shopping, recreating, and working in Oregon while getting the benefits of living in Washington.
6. Clackamas County residents are at a greater disadvantage regarding the options for traveling by public transportation. There are little to no public transportation options along the I205 corridor in Clackamas County and unfortunately, the addition of light rail in this part of the metro area is not very likely for at least 10 years. Clackamas County residents are unduly penalized as compared to residents of Washington and Multnomah Counties due to the lack of public transportation options; because of this disparity, Clackamas County residents should be eligible for reduced toll charges.
7. Sadly, the Urban Growth Boundary has created some of this intense traffic congestion. Packing the population into such a small area may preserve some of the natural beauty outside of the area but creates issues leading to decreased livability within the boundary for some residents. I believe the plan for implementing tolls is part of this decreased livability by making the cost of living go up. The Portland metro already has a very high cost of living that prices many people out of the market of home ownership or affordable rent. There is an out-of-control homeless population that is evidence of this factor. Adding the burden of tolls to low and middle income families seems cruel and out of touch on the part of policy makers.