

## APPENDIX F: MITIGATION STRATEGIES

Mitigation strategies offered in the other, specify Concept-specific questions (N=31)

#	Concept	Comments
1	A	Change college start times to be different from rush hour and furnish free passes to students.
2	A	Eliminate ability for Waze, etc to redirect to city streets. Eliminate ALL truck traffic. More cops policing the inevitable jerks who drive on city streets to get around freeways (ALREADY an issue on N Albina, Lombard, etc!!).
3	A	Give discount to WA respondents who work in OR. We already pay OR tax. This is essentially a second tax for a state where we don 't live.
4	A	Charge additional cost for commercial vehicles regardless of which lane or freeway they use if they are traveling during the day.
5	A	Design to specifically improve freight movement.
6	A	No tolls on weekends.
7	A	Eliminated the last two NB on-ramps and relocate them.
8	A	Allow people to park at Delta Park without a toll. I almost always park and ride when I go to OR. I am already trying to do my part.
9	A	I 'm already taxed by working in Oregon with no representation in the Oregon government. I only utilize Oregon government services for 9-10 hours per day, Monday through Friday, so I am being "overtaxed " based on my time in Oregon. Now you want to tax me more for using roads as well. If you implement this, 1) I should get a refund on my taxes, 2) have a waiver for my family driving on tolled roads, and 3) get voting rights in Oregon.
10	B	No tolls during off peak hours.
11	B	No charge for non-peak driving.
12	B	Come up with alternative ideas to tolling. Get the trucks off of the main through fares as they are more likely to pay the tolls in order to avoid slowdowns. Normal people will stay off the tolls to save money as everything is going up in price and most people will not be able to pay for it to use it daily.
13	B	Reduce the number of large trucks.
14	B	Use existing lanes for carpools 2+ during peak hours.
15	B	Place limits on the hours of tolling, and devise a procedure to govern any changes to those hours.
16	B	Stop new home and apartment construction until tolling is eliminated.
17	B	The free use during off-peak pricing is recommended and desired.
18	C	Enforcing common sense merging of vehicles would speed traffic more than another tax on driving.
19	C	Reduce semi-trucks on the road.
20	C	Easy pay system so our employers can pay for those of us who drive for work
21	C	The problem with the ENTIRE stretch of I-5 from Aurora to Vancouver is semi-trucks! They should not be allowed to drive past the 205. That is why the 205 was created. Semi-trucks clog I-5, cause accidents & make driving I-5 a nightmare. They don 't use the by-pass lane at Barber, and they frequently use the middle & left lanes which causes more traffic backups. I-5 runs very well when there are NO semi-trucks. Get rid of them, they are the problem. Car respondents are not and we should NOT be taxed/tolled for this! It's stupid.
22	C	Let a private entity construct take over the toll roads so the government isn't involved and the roads will be maintained.
23	C	Do not tax Oregon non-residents who pay Oregon Income tax or there will be REAL protests.
24	D	Have a cap, so those of us that have long commutes so we can afford a place to live don 't go bankrupt getting back and forth from work.
25	D	Reduce commercial truck volume.
26	D	Toll non-West Linn residents only/offer a resident bypass of the toll.
27	D	Raise the speed limit for passenger vehicles.

28	D	Proper use of gas taxes and federal funds.
29	D	Do not charge Oregon nonresidents who pay income tax anything. Period.
30	E	Redesign the on-ramp entrance to improve safety.
31	E	Reduce large truck traffic.

### Mitigation strategies offered in the open-ended question (N=17)

#	Comments
1	Any tolls to promote a "faster highway trip" should be exclusive to a "fast lane" only. Nothing else in the explanation would make sense and otherwise it seems pandering.
2	If you implement tolls, please toll the entire freeway system in the metro area consistently and set the tolls to manage congestion, meaning, when there is adequate capacity for demand, the toll should be \$0.
3	Any household with an individual who receives OHP, SSI, Medicare, VA Benefits etc should get a free pass in the tolling system as they are low income. Make it easy!
4	Toll subsidies for low income. Toll credits for those who use transit on the route. No tolling after certain hours. Plate recognition vs transponders (which can incur addl non-toll costs). Solutions for the unbanked (pay in local retailers).
5	The Semi Trucks on the Freeway are a huge congestion problem. I understand in Southern California they are not permitted 7am to 7pm. Or on the subject of tolls restrict to very high tolls on cargo transport during those hours. Yes on congestion \$
6	Put toll across all of I5 & 205 or don't do it at all. Don't waste our money widening freeways. Spend that money on more cops to monitor diversion traffic, issue tickets to people who don't live on a neighborhood street who use it as a HWY detour.
7	Optimizing stoplights is the best strategy. Traffic calming is the worst idea I have ever heard of for a strategy of diverting traffic. You are just going to make traffic even WORSE on roads adjacent to the tolled freeway.
8	You must first deal with the thousands of semi-trucks that were added to the highways when the shipping companies pulled out of the Port of Portland. This is the main driver of congestion in the last few years. Tolls aren't going to change that!
9	Consider transit credits and toll subsidies for low income drivers. This is a great idea that makes economic sense, but mitigation policies are needed to make sure low income drivers don't face a disproportionate impact. Few transit options in SW pdx
10	Toll discount for low income drivers Low/no toll off hours Transit incentives No tag-pay by mail Traffic calming on impacted arterials Bans on heavy vehicles from neighborhood streets Special cards for low income to buy credits locally
11	I work odd hours, so I can never be in a carpool into Oregon. I like the idea of tolling, seems neat. Hope it does move forward once others understand the benefit, but please no more carpool lanes, unless low emissions cars with singles can use it
12	Fare equity based on age and income
13	no, just no. Seriously, no. No tolls. unless you remove income and local taxes.
14	Different pricing for different times. Encourage large truck traffic at night rather than daytime hours. Ban triple trailer trucks altogether.
15	People travel when and where they need to. Trucks are the main problem in road congestion. They should be restricted in hours they can travel .to nighttime as much as possible. They create many accidents. Increase fines on truck caused accidents.
16	Have you actually assessed how many Washington cars actually cross the bridge to work for 8 hours or more? You already collect income tax from Washingtonians why do you need more? Exempt shift workers work 8 hours or more to work a shift.
17	WA and OR residents should be allowed to deduct sum of all tolls from their Oregon State Income tax. Tolling I 205 and I-5 seems wrong without tolling 217 and I-84.c Tolling existing lands seems wrong. Adding new lanes and rolling those seems okay.

Mitigation strategies offered in the project inbox (N=20)

#	Comments
1	<p>Hi,</p> <p>My name is [REDACTED] and I live in Vancouver, Wa and commute over the I-5 bridge every week day for work. I just wanted to provide my comments as I will not be able to attend the meetings due to the meeting times. I definitely understand the need to reduce congestion going through Portland but I have some concerns on how this may be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My main concern is the check points that the Value Pricing will be placed at. I believe the check points should be after accessible Public Transportation Hubs. Mainly allowing commuters the option to use a Trimet Park and Ride Station. I am most familiar with my own route to work which is using I-5 southbound over the Columbia River bridge. I park at the Delta Park Station Park and Ride where I take the train into Portland. If you want to encourage drivers to use Public Transportation please make all checkpoints for value pricing starting after an area such as this. Otherwise you are punishing drivers who do use Public Transportation. I would suggest just to the North of the I-5 and I-405 split to encourage southbound drivers to use public transportation or use alternative routes through Portland. I am not familiar with the I-205 southbound route out of Washington or the routes coming North on I-5 or I-205 from the south of Portland. But I would suggest similar areas that are after commuters have the option for public transportation or alternative routes.</li> <li>• Will I-84 into Portland be considered for Value Pricing? If not it makes it look like Washington drivers are the specific target as we have no other route into Portland other than I-5 and I-205. Oregon drivers would have the option to take surface streets to I-84 and then into Portland without being affected by Value Pricing.</li> <li>• Has expanding TriMet bus service into Vancouver been considered to help with reducing congestion? While Vancouver's Public Transportation does have service into Portland it is much more limited than what Trimet could provide in terms of service times and route connections. Also for commuters from Vancouver who already pay for a monthly TriMet pass this would allow us to use this coming out of Vancouver rather than needing to drive into Oregon first.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this and if possible I would like to receive a confirmation that this email has been received.</p>
2	<p>Subject: Follow up on remarks at Feb 28 PAC meeting</p> <p>Since the time for public comment was short I would like to finish the remarks I intended to make during Public Comment.</p> <p>1. In reference to the two issues that will make it impossible to REDUCE overall traffic demand these are that the Portland Vancouver area population is very rapidly increasing; and that West Coast industries will ship more and more freight through here. Now I agree that Single occupancy vehicles should be offset by things like ridesharing, improved transit, or alternatives. However the net change will still be overwhelmingly to greater congestion. This is why I say we need added capacity in the form of a western highway.</p> <p>2. In reference to multi tolls: There is an idea, promoted largely by the SW Washington Democrat delegation to completely replace the Interstate 5 Bridges and this would have to be paid via tolls. If I-5 were to have tolls on it, especially if all lanes were tolled, then this would mean that drivers from Washington to Oregon would pay two tolls. This would be an onerous burden on lower income persons. The upshot also would be more people would use side streets to avoid paying tolls.</p> <p>3. The Western Arterial Highway that I emphasized will use existing routes with additional links that are not overly expensive. This route was also identified in a 2017 Washington County Study as "the Northern Connector." Susi Lahsene, of Port of Portland had testified that it was vital to the Washington County economy to have better access to port facilities. Existing thoroughfares that are already adequate to function as portions of this Highway are: N. Columbia Bv, N. Marine Dr., US Hwy 30, portions of Cornelius Pass Rd (and the rest of it with widening to four lanes).</p> <p>4. At present traffic levels the Western Arterial Highway (if operating now) would remove enough commuting traffic from I-5 to make I-5 function close to normal now. I-5 has encountered Speed Flow Delay, a tipping point where it no longer processes the number of vehicles that could use it, if speeds were normal. The Stopping distances are now inadequate, so all traffic slows down in a crescendo. However, the interstate system may need another additional crossing, probably one on the eastern edge of the metropolitan area.</p> <p>5. The Western Arterial Highway was also identified as a High Capacity Transit Corridor. For the new, major commuting route of Vancouver to West Union Junction (Beaverton Hillsboro area) the distance via I-5 and US 26 of 20 miles, is reduced to 14 miles via the Western Highway. This improves it for public transit, and even more if express</p>

	<p>routes are used. Express service could have major stops at intersecting highways, since presently there is not a lot of development in between to service---the Cornelius Pass link is mostly farmland. Thus this route could greatly improve public transit in the Northwest Metropolitan region.</p> <p>6. Since this is a shorter, more efficient path on an increasingly popular commuting route it would support a reasonable toll. Even with additional capacity like this, I-5 could be faced with increasing impact as our region grows. Therefore the Western Arterial Highway would remain a popular option, even with tolls.</p> <p>██████████</p>
3	<p>Subject: Fw: Tolling is not sharing the load ██████ here are my unedited thoughts.... good luck today!</p> <p>Congestion  No we have not gone over the edge yet,  There is an answer one block over.  Tolling is not sharing the load</p> <p>Taxes paid by gas taxes and vehicle fee is meant to pay for the basic infrastructure and maintenance for our sociality to move around. This enormously powerful, needed infrastructure is so important to the economy, safety, and health of our sociality. That's huge. What would we have with no paved roads, highways, bridges, and sidewalk? Vehicles are a tremendous boost for the economy, parts, trinkets, music, items for cars, trucks, and recreational vehicles. Good business, money, and jobs from maintenance, shopping, travel, entertainment, so vehicles are not only to shop for but also to shop with. And - vehicle share their roads everyday with everyone from main streets to the roads less traveled. This service has worked very well for several years. The gas taxes and vehicle fees paying for the basic infrastructure and maintenance percentage has dropped significantly from nearly 100% to approximately 60%, with high debt repayment for many years. The move of taking money from basic transportation infrastructure for social transportation engineering has greatly damaging our road system. The value of social control issues is important enough to have its own funding sources. Trying to get all services and needs paid for out of one group's pocketbook for everyone's use will not work. Directing grants and funding away from basic infrastructure and maintenance to: speed bumps, trees in Blvds., bike infrastructure, extended curbs, "road art", planting, benches, "ped-zones", pet projects, and care of expensive trees and shrubs etc. Those items must get their own funding, not the basic services funds. Basics services such as signage, lights, crosswalks, roads, bridges, freeways, construction, and maintenance is enough of a burden for the vehicle user to handle for sociality. The taxes and grants spent on issues other than basic infrastructure since 1980's need to be added up and returned to the basic infrastructure funds.</p> <p>Adjacent to almost every main street is a side street paralleling it. By creating a multi-modal corridor for walkers, runners, scooters, and bikes, with 5mph limited speed for local vehicle access. License vender to sale coffee, food, rides, and etc., to pay for the upkeep of the multi-modal corridor, provide benches, bathrooms, cost, clean-up, and extra insurance. A safer, less polluted, way to get around, that is pedestrian centered will attract people. Paralleling congested busy streets provide quick access to businesses, while avoiding vehicle traffic, and not adding to it. To start with all you need is stop signs, speed signs, and paint to make a healthier move to a cleaner environment. Move over, from painted lines on a congested fumed street, immediately removing congestion on our main throughways, cleaning the air, and helping everyone. On busy commerce streets, just like pedestrians, scooters, bikes, etc, will still need to use yellow line streets, however for the most part they will have their own limited motorized corridors separated for everyone's benefit.</p> <p>No we have not gone over the edge of no return yet, when it comes to congestion. We just need to move one block over were the gas taxes and vehicle fees have paved yet another road waiting for us to share.</p> <p>Portland is 26th size and 60th in density and yet Portland has been in the top ten most congested cities in the United States for over a decade. That is policy not people. We spend over 50 hours of time in congestion a year then is normal driving congestion. We have lost miles and miles of important lane usage inside the city limits, adding to unsafe environment and congestion. Several major corridors have lost lanes - Interstate Ave, William's Ave, Vancouver Avenue, Glisan, Burnside, plus several streets in downtown, extended curbs keeping vehicles from turning right, traffic calming, removing parking spaces, mixing bikes in traffic, and bus stop placement, etc. We did not have a congestion problems when Metro and the City of Portland started working on making sure we would "Not" get congested at a time when you were able to get most anywhere in Metro area in about 20-minutes, by making policy changes. Changes many people pointed out would cause congestion, were ignored. We used to have a great bus system almost 24 hour everywhere. Now they service is used as a feed-line to light rail, greatly increasing time and transfers, leading people to return to their cars over transit. Data shows this and has shown a loss in transit ridership percentage for awhile. Yet less expensive more flexible bus lines are cut, putting in expensive "Fail Rail", with problems, too hot, too cold, 1-vehicle accident, system shut downs, non-flexible, and a closet smoker getting ½ it's energy from coal electrical plants. Orange road-work signs are everywhere, often closing lanes when workers are not present. The Boardway Bridge now with lane closures for a second time in two years has lanes closed the weekend, evenings and holidays with no workers. The workers</p>

	<p>doing our road work often are working 9-5 Monday- Friday when the majority of the traffic needs to use the bridge. Having our "orange -up" from 5AM – 9PM especially Monday thur Friday will help significantly with congestion.</p>
4	<p>Subject: 5/205 tolls</p> <p>I am submitting my opposition to OR imposing a toll on the 5/205 bridges.</p> <p>I am a frequent user of the bridges and I work and pay significant Oregon state income taxes, and property taxes. If you levy a toll on these bridges I will be taxed even more.</p> <p>This unfair toll will do nothing to ease the traffic congestion.</p> <p>I would encourage you to seek other measures such as extending the transit trains into SW Washington as a means of relief rather than a toll. You could also consider other options but placing a toll would be unfair, and add an additional financial burden to me and my family.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>██████████</p>
5	<p>Subject: Don't Penalize Washington Drivers for Working in Oregon!</p> <p>Dear ODOT,</p> <p>I live in Washington and work in Oregon (OHSU). I pay income tax that benefits Oregon. I ride a bus from downtown Vancouver, WA most days and occasionally drive to work. I should not have to pay more to get to work via toll roads. Oregon should apply the income tax I pay for any roadwork needed to help with congestion.</p>
6	<p>Subject: Tolling WA residents</p> <p>I already pay Oregon income tax and as Oregon has said it is because I use the roads. Since I'm already paying for the roads why should I have to pay more?</p> <p>I already have adjusted my commute to get in by 6:30am and spend hours in traffic each day.</p> <p>My quality of life would be much better if Oregon would fix the roads, thereby cutting my commute time and the need to get up so early.</p> <p>If you start tolling I will be forced to make a choice... pay or don't. I will elect to not pay by either quitting my job or will work from home all the time. Both of which achieve your stated goal of reducing traffic, so great! It will also allow me to not pay Oregon income tax and the toll.</p> <p>A decent car pool lane can make a huge improvement. Oregon completely ignores the current lane and the fact that simply extending the lane and patrol it once a year would make a big improvement. Oregon should do the basics before asking for more money.</p> <p>Lastly, I'm lucky I can adjust my schedule or work from home. What about service workers? They are always scheduled and have no choice in the matter. Do you really want to saddle your infrastructure and tax issues on low wage WA service workers?</p>
7	<p>I almost had a crash tonight Mar.- 05-2018 on the way home. I had plenty of room to change lanes to the right. Me &amp; another pulled out of Sacramento onto ne 122 @ the same times. I put on my right turn signal and the nut behind me went screaming by on my right side horn on. IT did not stay in the lane like they are supposed to then change lanes. You people need to get on the stick and enforce traffic laws. This is why you have such traffic problems, no one gives right of way. I just mail the Info. to Portland ODOT as to the problems of east bound I-84 where it goes over N-205 &amp; where we get off at ne 122 Both are very dangerous. How many miss the 84 over 205 I can just guess of hundreds. OUT here they are very stupid when it comes to traffic E-99 means EASTBOUND &amp; W-99 means WEST BOUND.</p>
8	<p>Hello ██████████</p> <p>-FYI only; there is no need to respond-</p> <p>Ask ODOT received a call from Frank Mounce and he wanted to share his opinion Value Pricing. Here are the main talking points that Frank wanted to get across:</p> <p>Citizen lives in Tigard but works in Vancouver.</p> <p>Citizen is disabled and does not want to take public transit.</p>

	<p>Citizen thinks public transit would take too long to travel to work.          Citizen thinks the congestion problem is mainly because of semi-trucks.          Citizen thinks limiting access of trucks and/or the hours of their operation would help.          Citizen thinks the addition of truck lanes and passenger car lanes would help congestion on I205.          Citizen wants another bridge from Portland to Vancouver.</p>
9	<p>I am against tolls. If we're going to do toll roads, they should be strictly for Oregonian residents, not for people coming in and out of the state of Oregon from other areas.</p>
10	<p>Hi [REDACTED]</p> <p>Thanks for taking input from the Chinese community for your traffic congestion study. So far, all we have talked about were charging a toll to keep the poor people off the freeway and widen the existing roads. No one has tried to find the ROOT CAUSES of the congestion problem. Without knowing the root causes and solving them, the congestion problem will never go away.</p> <p>A toll road/lane without a newly build designated lane would not do much to ease the current congestion problem. It is very costly and wouldn't happen soon. As shown in a survey at the meeting, most drivers are already avoiding the freeways during the rush hours. A toll road will only put more drivers into the side streets. It will congest the streets to the point where the cost of time and gas will no longer justify for the saving of the toll. Then everybody will eventually go back on the freeway as before.</p> <p>Seattle has converted the Northern section of I-405 into two tolled carpool lanes and two non-tolled lanes. Traffic is still backing up miles after miles, and well into mid-night while the two tolled-lanes are stand nearly empty.</p> <p>Adding a new lane wouldn't help much either. The northbound section of I-205 changes from two-lane to a three-lane road at Oregon City, traffic still backed up before and pass Oregon City. The same thing happens at Northbound I-205 near Airport Way. It changes from 3-lane road to a 4-lane road over the Glenn Jackson bridge. Traffic still backed up until it passes the bridge. Then the road on the Washington side is wide opened. Why?</p> <p>If you'll look closer, all traffic congestions are around a freeway entrance and exit, no matter if you have a two-lane road or a four-lane road, and no matter if it is a heavily used freeway entrance or not, as in those on I-205 between I-5 and Oregon City. Why?</p> <p>At the freeway entrance:</p> <p>That is because some people are entering the freeway and change lane prematurely. They did not fully utilize the acceleration lane to reach freeway speed before merging into the freeway. That caused the drivers in the nearby lane to change lane, brake or stop to let them in. Also, some of those drivers would immediately move to the far left lane and cause those other lanes to become slow too. And some drivers on the left-lane would slow down to anticipate those drivers to move into their lane from the right side as they see them coming.</p> <p>For the situation at the Glenn Jackson Bright when the 3-lane road becomes a 4-lane road, the 4th lane is added following the freeway entrance. The extra lane should be able to handle all incoming traffic. But it is congestion by those drivers who always slow down or stop to move to the left lane as soon as they reached the freeway. To making it worse, there are drivers from the left side eagerly move to that 4th lane as soon as it becomes available. That 4th lane is also the exit lane to SR14, but isn't until 2 miles later. The crossovers really making a big mess of congestion on the freeway and extend well into the Airport Way.</p> <p>At the freeway exit:</p> <p>People are trying to cut in front of a line at an exit. They were in the left-hand lane, they didn't move to the right-hand lane until the very last minute, then they slow down, brake, and stop to wait for other drivers to let them in. It also is a major cause of an accident.</p> <p>What can we do?</p> <p>Besides educating the drivers, we can use road stripes (double solid lines, solid and dash lines) like those used in Southern California for their carpool lane to tell the drivers when can change lane and when to move to the right or left. The left-lanes should be reserved for those who are traveling a long distance such as passing through the town. Drivers need to move to proper lane early if they want to exit the freeway. Prohibit any lane change around an exit or entrance. This will allow drivers on the left-hand lanes to maintain its speed and keep the traffic flowing by knowing there will not be any driver cutting in front of them. Use road signs, cameras, and heavy fines to enforce the rule.</p> <p>Also, there are drivers leaving too much spaces between their car and the one in front of it during rush hour traffic. If everyone is like that, the line would be backed up to the border. We need to educate and issue fine to those</p>

	<p>drivers who are taking up too much spaces between cars.</p> <p>I hope you guy will take a serious look into this suggestion. For the cost of the paint to re-stripe the road, it would ease the traffic congestion for many years until the road is widened. Let me know if I need to elaborate more.</p> <p>Thanks for your time,</p> <p>█</p>
11	<p>Subject line: comment on value pricing</p> <p>Hello ODOT,</p> <p>Please kindly consider my comments in regards to your Value Pricing plans. I have watched your online video, the power point and explanation, about the "options" for Keep Oregon Moving.</p> <p>I am a resident in Oregon in Washington County, on the border of Multnomah County, and have lived in Portland Metro all my life. I remember riding max in the 90s when the blue line from Cleveland to Downtown was the only route, and buses were color coded with symbols like beavers and raindrops. While in high school my friends and I would walk to the max in Gresham and take the train into the City. We loved it, it was our ability to get around, we took max to prom at the Tiffany Center. We experienced Portland from that train. And, when I didn't have a car, I relied on the Trimet bus to get to work, boy I hated the bus always being late or now show, but was thankful for it as it got me to work. When I became an adult and worked downtown, I commuted by buses over east side bridges when I live over that direction, and later took the max from Hillsboro when I moved out that way. Also I currently live in walking distance of Sunset Transit. So you see, I have quite extensive life experiences on Trimet. Additionally, as a driver on our roadways as well, I have witnessed the massive explosion of congested traffic, which became quite noticeable about 2009-2014. I have particularly noticed the general driving patterns changing to more aggressive and fast, especially on the freeways. These life experiences are the basis for my comments.</p> <p>My number 1 preference is that the I5 bridge OR/WA border is tolled on all lanes, priced roadway at one point only and during peak times; and the money should be used to build another new bridge, new construction, which is ultimately what we need. The new bridge should be multi vehicle and pedestrian friendly, max, bike lanes, walk lanes, car only lanes, truck only, and bus only lanes. Toll vehicles different prices based on the lane for the vehicle type. Consider a peak time pricing rate difference.</p> <p>My number 2 preference for I5 and I205 congestion, is toll nothing, and build nothing. Instead fund incentive programs to get people using Trimet, carpool, walking or biking. You guys have expanded max greatly, and streetcars, and the Wes train, and I'm sure other endeavours. Go back to having a fareless square, big bonus right there. Give huge discounts to people that buy annual or monthly "commuter" passes, some kind of program to get commuters interested. Like ads ditch the pay to park lot, save tons of money with Trimet, to be clear *slamming good deals on passes for commuters. Help big businesses give shuttles from max stations again like you use to. Give honored citizens better access without disrupting services times, not to be unpopular, but when your in a hurry on the bus and it pulls over for a wheel chair, your stress level elevates because of the extra time it takes. I'm sure the person in the chair feels everyone's gazes, I mean, white elephant. That's the way of it. That's no fair to anyone, help them along quicker and safer somehow and help us get where we need to go faster. People on the train are jerks and stand in the way so wheelchair users can't get on safely and won't move out of their designated area so they can ride safe and comfortable. Honored citizens are harmed, more needs to be done about it. During peak times max gets so full, so also perhaps subsidize uber pool or lyft line for commuters during peak times, as it forces carpooling. Give other carpooling incentives. Don't give bikers a bike tax, (come on Portland!), instead give bike users some kind of perk for miles they track on the bike instead of a car; and same with walkers, distance on foot versus in a car. Also please dear god do something about trimet security. When I was in London, they had CCTV everywhere on the Underground Tube, with spotlight cameras and intercoms monitored 24/7. All you need is those all up in people's faces, people get out of hand, use the speaker and bright light and have staff alert and ready. Some deterence goes a long way.</p> <p>My preference 3, please think about how to expand the Sunset Vista Ridge Tunnel transportation. Perhaps toll the tunnel during peak times, in a similar way to my number 1 preference. We need better transit projects there, specifically enhancements and lane improvements, so many accidents! We need better bike access from westside into Portland, it's very dangerous on Burnside and Cornell and Germantown these days for bikers.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to comment and your consideration.</p>
12	<p>Subject line: Tolls on Columbia River Bridges</p> <p>I support tolls to support infrastructure maintenance and capacity improvements. I think some discount pricing for frequent commuters who only use a small part of Oregon's highway networks, for example pay for only the first 10</p>

	crossings in a month (instead of about 40 for a five day a week commuter) is reasonable. I am a retired Civil Engineer, I cross the river about 6-8 times a month.
13	<p>Subject line: tolling</p> <p>The tolling idea as a way to cut congestion doesn't fly with me. It is just a revenue generator. People know it's going to be a slow slog no matter what is done at the bridges. It's just that there are too many cars for lane space at the same instant. Just have to put up with it. Times change; it can't be back in the 1960's. The freeways weren't built with enough capacity back when things were cheaper. We'll just put it off until a future time when expenses are greater. If there is a wreck it needs to be cleared faster than it is.</p>
14	<p>Subject line: Congestion Pricing Initiative aka Oregon Tolling Scheme</p> <p>This is a horrible plan that will place unnecessary hardship on the general population. Due to decades of poor insight and planning on the part of the government the roads are in disrepair with massive congestion. Instead of repairing roads and funding for future needs such as roads and bridges billions of dollars have been spend installing light rail that people do not use and are afraid to ride. They are simply unsafe. TWO additional bridges are needed crossing the Columbia River. Build at least one with PRIVATE FUNDS and toll that road. Build one with existing tax revenue OPEN TO THE PUBLIC with no additional fees. Expand I-5 and I-205 adding additional lanes. Eliminate the Davis-Bacon Act "Prevailing Wage" that dates back to 1931 that mandates that ALL government initiated projects are 30+% more expensive than real world pay.</p>
15	<p>This is a stupid concept. We pay taxes to get these types of projects handled. Private investment should be able to handle the rest. Putting this on our residents is unfair and will only cause frustration, grow the divide between the wealthy and the poor, and further diminish the existence of a middle class. This is almost as bad as PBOT forcing local businesses to pay for city repairs it should be responsible for handling. I drive a ton for work and have noticed I save a lot of time simply by knowing roadway trends. I STRONGLY believe that better signage and/or regular painting of the roads with "directions" would greatly alleviate traffic on Portland area Highways like I5, I405 and I205. For example, I commute from my home in North Portland's Kenton neighborhood to my office in inner SE at MLK and Main. This means I use I5 until the OMSI exit, 300B. Exit 300A is for I84 and traffic stacks up and congests the whole freeway for this lane shift. If the road had clearly marked signage/roadway paint messages indicating which lane was for which trajectory, I believe this traffic would be greatly reduced. Almost all the build up in traffic here is just due to drivers realizing they are in the incorrect lane for where they're wanting to go and merging lanes. In addition, we NEED better driver's education! We have some of the worst drivers in the country here. Driver's need to understand how to use the "fast" or passing lane. If driver's only used the left lane for passing and not cruising, we would have greatly reduced traffic on highways across the state. This single factor, hands down beyond anything else, is the greatest cause of traffic on interstates and highways.</p>
16	<p>Subject: Better improvement plan than the current one that will have to be expanded upon anyways</p> <p>For successful program build car bridge to Vanc. from St Johns to west of vancouver and bridge to area east of vancouver to eliminate congestion without tolls. Also max line extensions to vancouver and additional hov lanes from existing shoulders. We have lived in dallas texas and orlando florida which you havr used for your study and are trying to emulate. The only problem is that these areas are much larger than portland metro and have many more roads leading out of them. You are most likely going to cause more congestion by not building more bridges first. You have a budget of billions but 2 bridges on both sides of the existing columbia bridges will provide more flow out of the area instead if just taxing vehicles. Eventually you must buold more bridges and I think everyone in government and out of government sees this and knows this so why not start with this issue first as well as completing the max up to vancouver and then around from I5 to 205 with large park and ride spots so those washington cars can stay in washington on a daily basis and people can get on the max from the washington side. Then work on extending the max further west and east from portland out past banks and eventually to seaside by vutting through hills and up to governement camp for an eventual winter olympic bid and then down to eugene for and eventual summer olympic bid. Places like Japan are already equipped for this. There is a better way to use our tax payer money than your current plan. You are thinking too small and will eventually have to address these concerns so lets just start doing these things now.</p>
17	<p>Hi, my name is [REDACTED]. And I just want to leave a comment for the project committee. And that is I am encouraging no toll for the Wilsonville I5-I205 area. What I would suggest is if you lower the speed from Aurora to Tualatin. Or even Tigerd maybe even further up to 77end up to there so that there's not the congestion that you have with those two exits. People drive way too fast. Get police in there or get cameras in there to slow the people down and get the speed lowered to 45 miles an hour so that people don't have so many accidents and you don't have the congestion. You keep the traffic flowing at a moderate pace. Thank you very much. Goodbye.</p>
18	<p>Subject line: Comments on value pricing</p> <p>Issue regarding I-5 &amp; I-205 in Portland area seems to be focused on Portland drivers, but ignores drivers from other parts of the state or from other states. We often drive thru Portland on our way north to Washington.</p> <p>I have driven multiple times I405 and SR 67 in Washington that has lane tolls. I have a daughter who lives in that</p>



	<p>area. The toll lanes has made very little positive difference, if anything, congestion is worse now than before.</p> <p>Suggestions</p> <p>Since Portland mayor and government seem to not want to make improvements to add lanes to I-5 to reduce congestions, but rather sees road congestions as a good thing to force people to use mass transit, I suggest the following that seems to meet Portland mayor's goal and would provide less impact to drivers outside Portland area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Place a toll on all on ramps to I-5 and I-205 in Portland area. Because most of the congestion is caused by Portland area drivers entering the freeways, they should be the ones most affected by the tolls.</li> <li>2. Close about half of the on ramps to I-5 and I-205 in Portland area, especially where the pinch points seem to occur the most. This would achieve 2 things, reduce congestion on I-5 and I-205, and achieve the Portland mayor's objective of forcing Portlanders to use mass transit by making it more difficult to use cars.</li> <li>3. Add an express lanes(s) that drivers can only get in south of Portland and get off in Washington.</li> </ol>
19	<p>Subject line: Toll on I205 and I5 in Oregon</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is [REDACTED]. I live at [REDACTED].</p> <p>I am against tolling either of these freeways. I drive a portion of each of these freeways at least five days a week. I often drive them during rush hours. I never drive these stretches of road for pleasure, I drive them out of necessity. There are so many construction projects blocking the main arterial streets in NE Portland its hard to find a way out.</p> <p>Lately, in the last year or so, I have taken to driving the surface streets as much as possible because people driving the freeways are crazy. I am forced to exceed the speed limit on the freeways (while driving in the right/slow lane) to avoid becoming a speed bump.</p> <p>I think you could ease congestion on both sides of the Columbia River by closing the on ramps to I-5 and I-205 that join the freeway just before the freeways cross the river during peak traffic hours. It would also help with congestion on surface roads around those entrances. On the Oregon side for I-205 this would be the ramps from Airport Way to I-205 and possibly the ramps from Sandy Boulevard/Killingsworth. I'm not sure what ramps join I-5 north of downtown Portland because I gave up driving that stretch of road years ago.</p> <p>If you want to speed up traffic on I-5 North in the afternoon and evening, try closing the I-84 east ramps from the Morrison Bridge and NE MLK Junior Blvd. (I think that's the street) at peak hours in the afternoon, it would speed I-5 along. I currently cut through downtown Portland and catch I-84 east from the Morrison Bridge when driving from the Beaverton area to NE Portland in the afternoon. Saves a lot of time to avoid 405 and the Marquam Bridge. I'm sure a lot of people do this.</p> <p>A suggestion to help short-term would be to have Oregon State Police and Washington State Police crack down on people who speed and weave through traffic on I-5, and I-205. If an unmarked police car, try using a sea-foam green Toyota Yaris, was used you would not believe how much money would be collected. I-84 and the Marquam bridge are in desperate need of policing to slow traffic to prevent the current chaos. When people weave through traffic and speed it slows everyone else down, we have to brake and take evasive action to avoid being hit by these wild drivers. If this suggestion does not fall within the scope of your project, please forward the suggestion to the Oregon State Police.</p> <p>Anyway, thanks or listening,</p>
20	<p>To: Value pricing Policy Advisory Committee Subject: No More Freeway Expansions - Value Pricing PAC Community Testimony</p> <p>Please find our letter in support of Option 2, with particular policy recommendations for designing appropriate, equitable, and climate-smart decongestion pricing policy, attached to this email. We request that this letter be added to ODOT's formal Open House public testimony.</p> <p>Our grassroots organization's letter has been endorsed and co-signed by 225 community members across the state. Their comments, names and zip codes are included in the document.</p> <p>Tremendous thanks for your consideration on this important issue, and for your public service.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

---[SUBMITTED LETTER AND SIGNATURES]---

Date: Monday, April 30, 2018  
To: Portland Region Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee  
Oregon Transportation Commission  
CC: Portland City Council  
Oregon Metro Council  
Megan Channell, Project Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation  
From: No More Freeway Expansions Coalition

The No More Freeway Expansions Coalition is submitting this letter outlining our grassroots organization's position to be included in public testimony for the current Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Value Pricing Open House. It has been cosigned by 225 community members who support our position, outlined below, in which we ask ODOT to move forward with Option 2 and direct revenue raised from decongestion pricing towards transit investments instead of freeway expansion.

Traffic congestion is miserable, and without policy change, it will only get worse. There is only one transportation policy that has ever been proven to improve traffic and stop congestion. We are heartened to see the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) move forward under the direction of the Oregon State Legislature to convene this committee of community partners to discuss how to implement decongestion pricing thoughtfully and equitably.

#### DECONGESTION PRICING INSTEAD OF FREEWAY EXPANSION: FASTER COMMUTES INSTEAD OF FREEWAY CONGESTION

Our advocacy in support of thoughtful decongestion pricing policy stems from our stark belief that the Portland metropolitan area needs to avoid giving the Oregon Department of Transportation a blank check to spend billions of dollars to expand freeways across the region. There isn't a single city anywhere on the planet that has alleviated traffic gridlock by expanding their freeways. It's important to be explicit here - every dollar the region can wrestle away from regional proposals to expand I-205, I-5, and Highway 217 is a dollar we can instead spend on transportation investments quantitatively proven to lead to healthier communities, cleaner air quality, anti-poverty initiatives, traffic safety, a reduction in carbon emissions, preservation of farmland, and (most importantly in the context of this advisory committee), less traffic congestion. Freeway expansion will do none of these things.

Given that we know this to be true, our coalition has taken a stance that we are opposed to any expansion of capacity on the freeways inside the urban growth boundary unless decongestion pricing has been implemented and studied first before expansion. It's senseless for our region to embark on these costly, dangerous, environmentally disastrous freeway expansions that won't solve congestion without first determining if decongestion pricing and robust investments in transit won't solve our traffic gridlock problems first.

Our organization's statement in opposition to the \$450 million Rose Quarter Freeway Expansion Plan has been endorsed by over 1,000 community members, dozens of local advocacy organizations and 9 of the eleven candidates running for Portland's two city council seats; this letter represents the specific opinions solely of the names signed below. Skepticism about ODOT's claims in their support for the freeway project have been covered repeatedly by local media including Willamette Week (1), Portland Mercury (2), BikePortland.org, CityLab (3) and City Observatory.

We believe decongestion pricing is an important, progressive policy tool that must be thoughtfully implemented to address Portland's growing traffic woes while also working in concert with our region's goals for improved public health, carbon emission reduction and development of an inclusive regional economy.

#### DECONGESTION PRICING SUPPORTS A MYRIAD OF PUBLIC HEALTH INITIATIVES

Portland has some of the worst air quality in the nation. (4) Minor upticks in daily walking and biking provide astronomical public health benefits, and building walkable communities where transit, biking and walking is safe and encouraged has been proven to encourage physical activity. (5) Despite commitments at local and state levels of government to work towards

eliminating traffic fatalities, crashes and collisions are on the rise, often on busy arterials with high speeds with poor sidewalks and crosswalks. (6) The stress of driving through a daily traffic jam has been shown to be linked to significant stress, as well as pulmonary and cardiac disease. (7)

Given these realities, it's difficult to disagree that instituting decongestion pricing and using the revenue raised to fund reliable, dedicated transit service isn't a massive opportunity to improve public health across the region.

#### DECONGESTION PRICING IS EFFECTIVE AND NECESSARY CLIMATE POLICY

Forty percent of Portland's carbon emissions come from transportation. Last summer, 1,060 square miles of Oregon burned in wildfires, an area roughly the size of Rhode Island. (8) Reports from the Antarctic this spring suggest that the polar ice caps are melting at a cataclysmic clip beyond what climatologists previously thought possible. (9)

Given these unpleasant realities, it seems wildly inappropriate that the Oregon Department of Transportation is moving forward with massive freeway expansion plans that perpetuate land use patterns with abysmally high carbon emissions. It flies directly in the face of Oregon's reputation as steward of our environment, champion of cogent land use law, and leader on climate action. Moving forward with auto-centric land use patterns that lock our region into further decades of carbon emissions, especially considering the lack of climate leadership at our federal level of government is nothing short of intergenerational theft and predatory delay. (10) Even in the most optimistic world of electric automobiles and robust paradigmatic shifts towards clean energy, our efforts to meet our climate goals will be greatly assisted by efforts to encourage more transit, biking and walking for everyday trips, and no longer heavily subsidizing and encouraging the use of single occupancy vehicles. Oregon's Greenhouse Gas Commission reported last year that Oregon is way off track in achieving its statutorily mandated goal to reduce greenhouse gases by 10 percent from their 1990 levels by 2020. (11) An Oregonian born today is expected to be alive in 2100; acquiescence to our status quo transportation investments is complicity in asking children alive today to clean up our mess.

Decongestion pricing inherently provides the appropriate incentives to help encourage our region to develop climate resiliency. Failing to meaningfully address our regional transportation plans is a failure to act on climate. Period.

#### DECONGESTION PRICING CAN AND SHOULD SUPPORT EVERYONE IN AN INCLUSIVE REGIONAL ECONOMY

There are legitimate concerns from many disenfranchised communities about the implementation of decongestion pricing. With decades of rising housing costs, many low-income communities have displaced to the periphery of the region and rely on automobiles for the majority of their transportation; for many, it's the only reliable transportation option in low-density, sprawling suburbs in a region still lacking robust, reliable transit options in low-income neighborhoods that effectively and reliably provide access to employment centers and other destinations.

Our coalition is sympathetic to these concerns, and aspires to mitigate them by designing pricing policies that don't place undue burden on low-income communities already experiencing economic precarity. Everyone, especially low-income communities, benefits from the end result of decongestion pricing - the elimination of traffic congestion on our major freeways and arterials, which allows better and more reliable access to jobs and services. Initial research suggests that low income commuters are rarely on the freeways during peak travel times; studies published in City Observatory in 2017 and in the Northwest Journal of Business and Economics in 1998 suggest that peak travel time pricing on I-5 would raise more revenue from wealthier commuters. (12)

Given that automobiles are the second largest expenditure to the typical Oregon family, depreciate substantially immediately upon purchase, and require heavy recurring investment in insurance, maintenance and gasoline, any government investment in infrastructure that makes it more necessary (as opposed to less necessary) to own an automobile to access jobs, education, and shopping has significant consequences for mobility options and for asset accumulation for low income communities. Decongestion pricing, designed with appropriate rebates and programs to mitigate harm to low income communities, provides us the opportunity to begin investing in reliable, healthy transportation options that serve people rather than

vehicles. As UCLA Professor Dr. Michael Manville writes,

"It's easy to think of free roads as a subsidy for the poor, but it's more accurate to call them a subsidy for the affluent that some poor people are able to enjoy... It is appropriate to worry that priced roads might harm the poor while helping the rich. But we should also worry that free roads do the same, and think about which form of unfairness we are best able to mitigate. People who worry about harms to the poor when roads are priced, and not when roads are free, may be worried more about the prices than the poor." (13)

Dr. Lisa Schweitzer shares a similar diagnosis, noting that decongestion pricing as a form of taxation must be compared to other forms:

Those who use scarce public resources—including space on the roads—should pay for what they use, in proportion to what they use, and know that they are paying. Knowing that resources have a cost is essential to using those resources judiciously, and our road network will function better when drivers pay the costs of their travel. (14)

#### NO MORE FREEWAY EXPANSIONS - OUR POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Given these reasons, The No More Freeway Expansions group ardently supports Concept 2 proposed by ODOT, which recommends instituting full, variable decongestion pricing tolls on all lanes of I-5 and I-205. Additionally, in the interest of maximizing the full congestion relief, public health, anti-poverty and climate-based benefits that are inherently possible through the implementation of decongestion pricing, we propose additional stipulations. These recommendations represent our good faith effort to address concerns of implementing this policy thoughtfully, equitably, fairly, and with an eye towards data-driven outcomes for public health, climate, equity goals, most notably eliminating the amount of time Oregonians spend stuck in traffic.

? Revenue raised from decongestion pricing should be directed towards investments in transit, biking, walking, not freeway expansion.

We encourage TriMet and C-TRAN to work closely with ODOT to determine how funds from pricing mechanisms can best be channeled into cost-effective, reliable transit investments that will provide better opportunities for commuters who wish to avoid paying the price to drive on the freeway at peak hour. Our coalition believes that decongestion pricing revenue should be spent on investments that increase the frequencies, reliability and efficiency of transit service. This includes capital investments in bus-priority lanes and traffic signals, improvements to bus stops, better sidewalks and crosswalks near busy intersections, and other physical investments that fall within the constitutional limitations of the Oregon Highway Trust.

We're heartened to join organizations including The Street Trust, OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon, Oregon Environmental Council, and Verde in asking for revenue from decongestion pricing to be directed away from freeway expansion.<sup>15</sup> As our coalition alluded in a recent article in BikePortland.org, spending revenue raised from decongestion pricing on freeway expansion is like spending money raised from a carbon tax on a new coal plant. We emphatically believe in induced demand, and that the only way to alleviate traffic congestion equitably is to both price our roads and channel our resources into alternatives to congestion instead of freeway expansion.

#### Low-Income Rebate/Refund Program

We encourage ODOT to model and implement a peak road pricing scheme that provides a program to ensure that low-income workers are not unduly burdened by this anti-congestion measure. We're heartened by TriMet's work to establish a Low-Income Fare, funded thanks to OPAL - Environmental Justice Oregon's advocacy in the state legislature, which is scheduled to launch this July. TriMet intends to allow "adults at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level" to be eligible for "half-price fare," and we encourage ODOT to conduct further study of how similar discounts or rebates could work for decongestion pricing. Ideally, applicants to TriMet's "low income fare" program could also automatically enroll their vehicle in ODOT's decongestion pricing program.

? Mitigation for High Crash Corridors and Potential Cut-Through Routes  
Many community members across the region have expressed concern that pricing

freeways will lead towards additional "cut-through" traffic on neighborhood streets. This is concerning both in low-trafficked neighborhoods that already suffer disproportionately from proximity to freeways in poor air quality, and on nearby busy arterials, many of which (such as 82nd Avenue) suffer disproportionately high rates of traffic violence. We encourage ODOT to consider setting aside decongestion pricing revenue for local neighborhood traffic remediation improvements, including bollards on neighborhood greenways, safety improvements for pedestrians on arterials (particularly near transit stops, schools, libraries and community centers), and traffic safety cameras. These investments should be done in direct collaboration with local neighborhood organizations and community partners.

? Data Privacy

Oregonians, Southwest Washingtonians, and all who drive on our freeways deserve assurances that the data collected on vehicle travel and address registration be kept appropriately secure. Many members of our community feel actively threatened by the presence of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), particularly Washingtonians using drivers cards. We strongly encourage ODOT to work closely with data privacy experts such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to adopt best practices that allow ODOT maximum efficacy to study decongestion pricing implementation while protecting the security of families across the region.

We understand that this is a bold, unprecedented position. We also understand that our region has a history of bold, unprecedented action and leadership for designing our communities with public health, livability and equity as our top line values. Anything short of bold, visionary leadership is unacceptable for anyone who claims to care about acting on climate, designing public policy for public health, or addressing inequalities in our transportation system.

This letter represents our good faith effort to remind ODOT's Stakeholder Advisory Committee of the urgent necessity of displaying similar leadership to vigorously support thoughtful decongestion pricing policy in Oregon. Our ability to innovate with unique, thoughtful answers to our regional transportation problems previously defined us. It's up to elected officials, community leaders, and advocates such as yourself to determine if this will be the legacy we leave to future generations of Oregonians.

The policy decisions championed by this committee should keep these values in mind as we address our myriad of overlapping, intersecting policy aspirations. We encourage this committee to double down on championing instituting pricing on our scarce freeway space, doing so deliberately to avoid undue burden to vulnerable communities, and prioritizing decongestion pricing over costly and ineffective freeway expansion proposals.

The names of 225 community members (from 46 area codes across the Portland Metropolitan region) who have signed on to our letter in support of decongestion pricing, and the necessity of instituting this policy before expanding any freeways inside Metro's Urban Growth Boundary, are provided below, with their additional commentary.

[REDACTED]

Name Zip Code Additional Submitted Comments

[REDACTED] In addition to the general arguments against freeway expansion made in this letter, the PAC and the OTC need to understand that the so-called Rose Quarter project is a particularly wasteful expenditure of money, purchasing very little of value for anyone. If safety were indeed the motivation, then a southbound braided exit lane to I-84 would be the obvious choice, and could be implemented at low cost, leaving the majority of funding available for projects that would actually improve safety and facilitate transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movement. This Rose Quarter project is not at all cost-effective, and clearly the implementation of "value pricing" would reduce congestion, improve safety, and improve travel time for freight. Now is the time to do the analysis, before the money is spent -- am I right?

[REDACTED] Freeway expansion has never helped solve congestion and ultimately makes our community less livable. We need to invest in walking, biking, and transit options, as well as implementing congestion pricing as a strategy.

[REDACTED] It makes no sense for a growing region to invest in transportation that gets worse as more

people use it. Instead we should invest in mass transit, which gets more efficient as more people use it.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] As long as we consider and implement strategies to mitigate inequitable impacts of congestion pricing, we absolutely need to start congestion pricing before freeway dollars are spent. This is the 100 year solution. The one our (great) grand-kids will be glad we made when they are addressing transportation issues 100 years from now.

[REDACTED] I own a business in downtown Portland and have lived in Portland for 10 years. I regularly use transit and bike. I drive somewhat regularly. I'm convinced that decongestion is the most effective way of controlling highway demand and traffic, and spending my tax dollars smartly. I support this approach instead of freeway expansion.

[REDACTED] As some one who grew up in Los Angeles for 25 years I can attest that freeway expansion simply doesn't work. More lanes just leads to more cars and you can not build your way out of traffic. Decongestion pricing can help solve this and the funds collected from it can help provide equitable benefits for everyone if it is used wisely, such as reinvesting in active transportation. Take a hint from the traffic capital that is Los Angeles who has realized building more freeways doesn't work and investing in active transportation gets people out of their cars and cars of the road.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Running a freeway through the middle of a city was a mistake. It displaced and impoverished communities with little political power. It allowed people to take their taxes away from the city while still using its resources. Portland should focus on serving people who live in Portland, and undo-ing the inequities of the past. This means cleaner air, more transit options, schools safe from traffic and pollution, more close-in housing, and reconnecting neighborhoods torn apart by freeways.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I'm a wife, mother, and full-time employee who lives in inner North Portland. I started bike commuting (with my child!) this year because traffic congestion is so unpredictable and time-consuming that I cannot reliably make it to work and daycare via car or transit. Portland has an obligation to remain a national leader on TRULY livable city planning and transportation options. Help me continue commuting safely and carbon-free, while nurturing my family, my health, and contributing to the economy. Decongestion Pricing Please!

[REDACTED] I believe it will help by reducing congestion, but it will also get people to commute by other means, which in turn may increase retail spending in local communities (cafe's, restaurants, etc) while commuters wait it out while raising money for new transportation methods. Because of this, Vancouver may grow as to have their own identity as a destination and not just a place to reside. It's really a win-win.

[REDACTED] Due to induced demand, freeway widening never works for long. Decongestion pricing has worked in other locations. It's time to try it in Portland! And make sure the resulting funds go toward improving transit and other alternatives.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Freeway infrastructure expansion will not only cost a fortune, but is unlikely to reduce congestion. Congestion charging will actually generate revenue that can be used to improve our transportation system, while actually reducing congestion. It is the smart choice. But more than that, it is the moral choice. People die on our roads. They die because cars crash. The more cars on our roads, the more crashes, and the more people who will die. More cars on our roads by expanding freeways will kill more people. Getting less cars on the road via congestion charging will mean less families are destroyed. Please implement robust congestion charging for this reason.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] "Forget the damned automobile and build cities for lovers and friends."

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The Rose Quarter Freeway expansion will not solve the congestion problems on I-5. It's safety benefits will take us no closer to Vision Zero on fatalities. It takes out Flint Street, a heavily used bicycle street to cross the freeway. Decongestion Pricing is the best answer and should be implemented ahead of any freeway expansion within the urban growth boundary.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The planet is melting!!!! Stop freeway expansion!

[REDACTED] It's sensible and fair, and it will make life healthier and safer for all of us in Portland. Behavior that hurts others should be discouraged rather than encouraged, and we will have a better city for everyone when we stop subsidizing car overuse.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Freeway expansion means driving expansion. Opposite of what our future goals are. We need transportation for ALL, not just for drivers sucking the life out of cities.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] there is but one solution to help alleviate congestion and improve freight and other high value transportation movement: implement pricing now!

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] It is well understand from extensive research that increasing road size does not help solve traffic congestion. Knowing what we know how can we double down one of the fundamental failures of the 20th Century? The amount of money to be spent on the proposed expansion could be used more effectively elsewhere to meaningfully decrease congestion for the long term.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The dirty little open secret among transportation engineers is "if you build it, they will come" - widening freeways doesn't work, it only adds more congestion, more pollution, more problems. I saw this happen over many years while living in California. This is 2018 - greener and more ecologically smart choices must be implemented. We've seen lots of bad examples around the country of transportation decisions creating more damage than solutions - this is a great opportunity for Portland decision makers to learn from others' mistakes. Be smart! No freeway expansion; decongestion pricing is the way to go.

[REDACTED] Because more lanes create more traffic!

	<p>██████████ Freeway expansion keeps inducing demand: we know we will never be able to expand our way out of congestion. Let's make smarter decisions by pricing congestion appropriately!</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████ More freeways bring more traffic, more pollution, more cars.</p> <p>██████████ I understand this section is a traffic problem, but it's too much money to solve an issue that should further down the queue of things to fix.</p> <p>██████████ As a car-less individual I'd love to see more resources put into public transportation and biking corridors. On the few occasions where I may borrow a vehicle I am glad to pay congestion prices to use the freeways. I believe making public transportation easier to use at an affordable price will encourage people to change commuting habits. As the city grows, expanded freeways will likely only lead to an expanded congestion problem.</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████ I bike everyday to work because i can't stand the current car traffic situation. The bridge I commute to work on my bike makes me feel safe because there are not many cars or busses for that matter. it is a safe haven. So yes, i support decongestion pricing over freeway expansion. You have to work to make the city less reliant on car transportation not just trying to patch things.</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████ The future of our landscape, quality of air, and wellbeing of all Oregonians begins with the actions of every individual in this state. When we choose to walk, take the bus, ride a bike, or drive a car, these actions have an impact around us. The impact could be the air we all breathe or the time it takes to get to our destination. Expanding freeways will cost us in the long term. As a frequent person who both rides a bike and drives, I would gladly pay money to the state for decongestion pricing. Why? It's for our future. I would love to see the state of Oregon reduce it's deficit and not spend money wildly on freeways. No state has been able to successfully build its way out of congestion. There are many ways for Oregonians to get around, but over reliance on driving is the problem! Encourage people to take alternate methods of transportation instead of driving everywhere.</p> <p>City of Portland and Multnomah County leaders have pledged to make to transition to 100 percent clean energy by 2050. Adding freeways goes against this pledge as it will encourage Oregonions to consume for fuel that necessary. Bring money into the state, add congestion pricing and I, and many other Oregonians, will gladly pay for a roads with less car traffic. Don't dig our state further into debt.</p> <p>██████████ Safer streets for all. Cleaner air too. Investing in community, not cars going by.</p> <p>██████████ It feels great to be in the good company of the many individuals &amp; organizations who are signing this letter, &amp; who've already signed similar petitions! I live in a suburb of Portland, &amp; do not own a car. I love walking &amp; biking in the outdoors, &amp; I want to save remaining unpaved green spaces of Washington County from becoming roads. True to these values, my household relies on public transit to go to downtown PDX. I'd like more bus lines, bus lanes &amp; transit options from Tigard/Beaverton/Hillsboro to Portland, &amp; all the way into Vancouver, WA. I'm signing this letter for myself, &amp; because I envision there are a lot of other people like me, who'd rather ride happily on a clean, efficient bus to commute than behind the wheel of a car they must drive &amp; maintain themselves. And surely, many people would rather see expensive acre</p>
21	<p>Re: Value Pricing Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>I want to thank you both for your time and commitment to the Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee. I am sorry I was unable to join you in your discussion of mitigation measures at our last meeting due to other commitments. Policies that mitigate the adverse impacts of value pricing are a key factor in the acceptance of a tolling</p>



approach and I would like to take this opportunity to share my comments. Please consider these comments along with the other mitigation ideas that were raised at the meeting.

The data we have seen at the PAC coupled with everyday experience demonstrates both I-5 and I-205 do not have enough capacity to meet travel demand. Traffic diverts onto other arterials where it contributes to additional congestion and safety problems. The impact this has on travel region-wide and state-wide is clear.

Value pricing has the potential to shift trips to transit or to other times of day. Without additional transit or road capacity added to the system however, value pricing has the potential to greatly impact adjacent facilities and not provide additional capacity for those who pay the tolls. To mitigate this, I would like to see the evaluation consider mitigation measures that focus the tolling revenue on adding capacity to the system.

I look forward to learning more from the study about the potential for pricing to improve traffic flow on I-5 and I-205 and shift traffic to other times of day, modes or facilities. When our adjacent facilities are already congested, safety is a key concern and transit options are limited, tolling could have adverse impacts and needs to be carefully understood and mitigated.

Please share my comments with fellow members of the ODOT Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

### Mitigation strategies recorded by staff, general (N=46)

#	Comments
1	Identify ways to incentivize public transit (toll credits) to complement pricing
2	Limit special privilege access to express lane (CAV)
3	I-205 between Foster and Powel - northbound, build an auxiliary lane between Foster and Powel, seems to be plenty of room
4	what if paid parents to (?) to homeschool to open school capacity
5	Incentivize businesses to start in rural area
6	Need more comprehensive plan for the system
7	improve local (?) get local ppl off freeway to address congestion
8	Heavy vehicle restrictions
9	Don't just build more lanes. Also needs alternative modes. Make accommodations for bike/peds
10	pair w/alternative modes, not just one answer
11	Speed bumps?
12	Phase tolling implementation by testing it.
13	Offer incentives not penalties
14	Free transit on I-405/I-5
15	If want to increase safety on roads, then raise driving age to 18.
16	Have speed feedback sign on Interstate Bridge because you can't see the traffic ahead at the rise in the roadway
17	enforcement of keeping trucks off streets and entering and exiting toll lanes
18	What about if hotels provided more shuttles?
19	There should be a mileage based system for the driving no you pay for how long the segment is.
20	Some aux lanes cause too short of a distance for merging and exiting
21	Balance - multiple modes, education, enforcement
22	Make tolls payable in cash or a pre-pay system
23	Comcast has a program for reduced internet for families w/children on reduced lunch cost programs. Leverage that for mitigation. Reduce tolls or prepaid transponders.
24	Suggest making the I-5 and I-405 loop a one-way hwy. Let the engineers figure out which direction. Make it binary.
25	Use a combination of tolling w/ramp metering
26	Consider different tolls at different ramps
27	Don't allow trucks to use the left lane where drivers aren't used to seeing them. Trucks are dangerous to drive around.
28	Test toll lanes then scale up if it works
29	No trucks of a certain size at certain time of day (peak)
30	ODOT encourage City of Portland to have new container contractor
31	PSAs etc classes on how to drive on freeway
32	Managing traffic flow - people don't use left lane for passing, enforce
33	Attractive work schedules, start w/state employees (5% of 9-5)
34	Ban studded tires at elevations below 500'
35	Truck bans in the neighborhoods
36	Use specific windows for trucks on freeways
37	Traffic calming or speed limits may not work in all areas. We already have speed bumps
38	incentivize to use other times of day. Especially drivers who can change time of day
39	Use Jantzen Beach for park and ride
40	Make side roads inconvenient for cars (surface streets)
41	Have speed feedback sign on Interstate Bridge because you can't see the traffic ahead at the rise in the roadway
42	enforcement of keeping trucks off streets and entering and exiting toll lanes

43	Change train bridge to lift in middle of the river. Would drop 15 lifts per day. Bridge will last longer, little better flow.
44	Use BNSF bridge with "the Cascades" train during rush hour.
45	Discounts for getting work - 2 free trips a day, not for discretionary trips
46	Free pass for those with disabled placards in vehicle (not discounted based on income, free for disabled)

**Mitigation strategies recorded by staff, Concept-specify (N=23)**

#	Concept	Location	Comments
1	A	Tigard	Allow vehicles to drive on the shoulder when there is congestion
2	B	E. Portland	Think about freight incentives to travel at other times of the day
3	B	Tigard	Have state electeds and offices start later/work later as trial to change behavior (demonstration project)
4	B	Tigard	Pay attention to business freight
5	B	Tigard	On-ramps should be "smarter"
6	B	Tigard	HOV lanes for faster buses
7	B	PDX	Incentivize truckers to use I-205, subsidies.
8	C	Tigard	Freight and trucks removed from I-5
9	C	Tigard	Divert trucks off I-5 - make them divert
10	C	Tigard	Better logic behind ramp meters and conditions on the freeway
11	C	Tigard	Quicker clearance of crashes and breakdowns
12	C	PDX	Provide incentives for off-peak travel (credit)
13	C	PDX	Advisory speed signs on I-5 interstate bridge could help traffic flow
14	C	PDX	Traffic signals leading to freeways should be marked/more coordinated (on-ramps and others)
15	D	Oregon City	Essential for relieve traffic on side street
16	D	East Portland	Need to create viable alternatives to using a tolled road - improve public transit
17	D	PDX	Real carpool lane enforcement
18	D	PDX	Pay trucks to sit out Peak Periods
19	D	Vancouver	Build a lane for truck/freight only - will free up all congestion
20	D	Vancouver	Put in Heavy Rail (like Long Island RR) - more more people
21	E	Oregon City	Would help free up 205 stafford to bridge
22	E	PDX	Travel time signage is useful
23	E	Vancouver	Think about tolling the entrance ramps to bridge so it wont be used for local traffic