



## Appendix A **VERBATIM COMMENTS: EMAIL, COMMENT FORM AND VOICEMAILS**

The following table includes comments submitted via email, online comment form, in writing at PAC meeting #6 and the special OTC meeting on July 12, or via voicemail.

All information submitted as part of the comment (including the subject line, if provided) is presented below exactly as submitted. No grammatical or spelling edits have been made. Email addresses, phone numbers and personal addresses have been removed for privacy. In addition to email, voicemail and in-person events, members of the public could submit comments through three different online comment forms. Two of these forms included a subject line field, while the third did not.

Date	Communication	Contacts	Source
06/20	The West Linn/Wilsonville area will be negatively impacted by the new tolling idea. With no alternative route available for I-205, we WILL see hundreds if not thousands of cars diverted to using our neighborhood streets to avoid the toll. Large parts of West Linn lack any options for public transit, especially buses or trains, so we lack alternative ways for travel. Many of our streets have no lanes for bikes either, so those are not options for safety. Finally, the biggest negative impact will be on the many families with financial difficulties since they will not be able to afford these tolls. According to many studies, at least 1/3 of the funds raised by the tolls will go to the collection of the tolls themselves. There are other options that have less negative impacts. Increase vehicle registration fees. Raise gas taxes. Encourage car pooling. Consider heavy rail options or water taxis for commuters. Increasing gas taxes is a much more direct way to raise funds and they MUST be voter approved, so there is accountability for increased taxes.	Danny Schreiber	Comment form
06/20	I live in west linn and am absolutely apposed to this. It will be a huge cost to manage and unfair for the poor. We all deserve free access to the roads. Government can barely build a road efficiently and the bureaucracy to manage this crazy plan creates cost and efficiency that we will end up paying. There is plenty of space to add lanes, and make them HOV. Lets build them first we need anyway. I wish we spent the \$\$ on this crazy plan to just build & fix roads...	Richard Mooney	Comment form
06/20	ODOT wastes millions look at the resurfacing of 205 Stafford road to bridge last year now we are going to redo and wSte millions more. No WY tolling IS acceptable. Toll bikes mass transit riders and vehicles with out of state plates ND get fiscally responsible	Neil Loebner	Comment form
06/20	Hello, I live in West Linn and I strongly oppose tolls on the freeways. The very few side roads that exist are already grid locked during the morning and afternoon commutes. Tolls would force more people to those streets and make our area completely unlivable. Please do not vote for tolls on our freeways.	Curt Keller	Comment form
06/20	I believe this will make seniors or fixed income people's lives more difficult. We will be forced to drive on back streets to avoid tolls. Neighborhoods will become more congested.	Patricia Digby	Comment form
06/20	This is the most absurd idea Ove ever been subjected to. I am a resident of West Linn and should value pricing be introduced I will be forced to face unnecessary traffic along roadways in West Linn that were not designed to handle the traffic. Double the size of Rosemont making it an arterial and improve all segments of Hwy 43 to two lanes before you destroy the primary travel route of 205 for the residents, and call the "value pricing" what it is, a luxury tax. Those with the means will save time while those who have no choice but to work the hours our employers need is will spend additional time waiting in traffic. The urban growth boundary and urban densification has not received the appropriate planning and the people are now being forced to pay for the roads we already paid for! Instead of subsidising the crime train and not enforcing payments use the funds paid by motorists on the roadways we use every day! Do not toll 205 or exempt those of us forced to use the route.	Steve Vaughn	Comment form

06/21	I live with my family in the Overlook triangle neighborhood in North Portland. With the proposed "value" or "congestion" pricing, I am concerned that the neighborhoods in N/NE PDX will experience a significant increase in diversion traffic as Washington (WA) residents attempt to bypass the tolling regimes. For N/S surface streets, such as MLK Blvd, N Interstate Ave, and N Greeley, we are already seeing WA drivers during peak AM/PM commute times using surface streets to bypass freeway congestion. This causes further congestion in neighborhoods and lowers quality of life during these hours of the day, as it is increasingly difficult to navigate surface streets as a driver, cyclist, or pedestrian. Clark County residents several times voted down the proposal for a light rail connection across the river and clog our streets without paying a price. I'm tired of subsidizing WA residents who choose to work in Oregon with longer commute times, clogged neighborhood streets, and poor air quality. However, I would certainly pay extra to divert WA drivers out of our neighborhoods and keep them on the freeway where they belong.	Kimberly Pray	Comment form
06/21	This a bad idea. Our neighborhoods in West Linn are already so congested with drivers getting off 205 to avoid traffic I can't imagine what a toll would do. I have a hard time getting out of my driveway on Johnson Road now and it is really bad trying to get on Stafford from Johnson. A toll from Stafford to the bridge would make a bad situation worse. It is also very unfair to poor working people who wouldn't be able to afford a toll just to get to work while wealthier people will just have yet another advantage. This is discrimination. Please don't say use public transportation. It's virtually non-existent out. I have tried to use it and it takes 3 to 4 times longer to get anywhere. This is a very bad idea for the people who live in West Linn.	Kathy Stevenson	Comment form
06/21	I don't even know where to begin on this subject, and whoever the genius that came up with this dumb idea. I think it's totally unfair to the residents of West Linn in both taxation and livability. You will only push drivers off 205 and onto side roads. Send one of your brilliant PAC members to the Willamette Falls Drive in old town Willamette any weekday after 3pm to see how bad it is now. You have two BILLION dollars to be spent on 12 miles of lightrail track that only serves a few while you punish the many. I am in total opposition to this taxation plan. In the simplest of understandable terms, this is total BS. There you go, simple thoughts from a simple guy...	David Winters	Comment form
06/21	Subject: 205 toll  Do not put a toll on 205!!!! We already paid for the road with our txaes. West linn has so much traffic already. We will vote eveyone out the next election if this happens.	Sherron Frost	Comment form
06/21	Subject: Tolls on i-5 and 205  This is actually crazy we have had these highways for years. Build a new highway figure it out and toll and tax people that way like other large cities in the US. So lets punish the taxpayers who have dealt with this congestion for years because no one had the mindset to do something about this years ago. Where will that money go that you will take from those trying to make ends meet going to and from work? Please can Oregon get anything right for once this native Oregonian is sick of thinking to solve anything is to take from what has already been paid for for years. Get it figured out, but this is a huge mistake.	Gail Coleman	Comment form
06/21	Subject: Freeway tolling  NO THANK YOU!!!! It is NOT the Oregon Way! We are NOT East Coast!	Marilyn Whygle	Comment form
06/21	Subject: Tolling  "value (congestion) pricing", Tolling the two main interstate arteries in the Portland / Vancouver area, would leave little to no options for drivers to take. In my opinion, Oregon DOT should utilize revenue from the PUC Tax already being collected. Increasing licensing fees on motor vehicles is also another easy solution even if it is based on specific counties, so the entire state is not impacted by metro congestion. In Seattle Tolling at different times of day and specific sections of road proved to be problematic, Express Lanes were so expensive, the lanes were left unused, adding to increased congestion on remaining lanes. I would feel better if there were some benefit related to proposed Tolls. As an example, replacing the I-5 Bridge is long over due. If a new bridge were in place, I would not be opposed to paying to use it. Replacing the I-5 Bridge has been postponed, and indecisive for so long, I feel that the Federal DOT, WADOT & ODOT all should be ashamed by failing to act. Federal "Stimulus Packages" have come and gone, millions spent on studies... no action.	Lowell McMurray	Comment form



06/21	<p>Subject: I5 &amp; I205 Tolling</p> <p>Good afternoon, Is the state of Oregon going out of their way to find ways to separate citizens from their money? We do not need another tax. You have the state wide transit tax starting July 1 and now tolls. The state of Oregon should have some fancy roads with all the money being collected. I think the frustration of driving during peak times is tax enough. Collecting more money is not the solution.. I</p>	Philip McCarthy	Comment form
06/21	<p>We are getting taxed to death here. Washington County just instilled a \$30 increase on all vehicles as of July 1st per year. Also, this will become a "Rich Man's" Free way where those that can afford it will have no problem paying it &amp; then those who are just trying to leak out a living that has no choice in their working hrs. will still be in the same mess. If anyone is smart, they are not going to ok this until we have a Cost for this &amp; how are you going to regulate it? There will always be those who don't get all the information. I have many friends who don't have internet or cable TV. Are those using this &amp; not have a permit or whatever going to get ticketed or what? And what is to keep you all in line for using the funds for what you say they are going to be used for? We have seen it time &amp; time again, this isn't always the case. Politicians &amp; committees have dipped in &amp; depleted funding because they feel they can do whatever they want. If the normal person would run our checking accounts like you guys run our budget, we'd be in jail. Yes, there needs to be a solution, but I don't think this is it unless you can describe more of who is going to pay this fee/tax &amp; how.</p>	Rea Branch	Comment form
06/22	<p>Subject: Toll on 205 between Stafford road and the Abernethy bridge</p> <p>A toll in this area will do just the opposite of Keep Oregon Moving- it will paralyze West Linn! Drivers will exit 205 to avoid the toll and take Borland - Willamette Falls Drive through the city. The route passes Fields Bridge Park, a haven for families with its ball fields, basketball courts, playground, and walking paths. Street parking is often necessary during ball games and increased non-local traffic provides for dangerous situations! Continuing along the route are numerous residential neighborhoods already fighting traffic congestion to turn onto Willamette Falls Drive, and then the beautiful Historic Willamette District with its numerous restaurants, outdoor seating, and West Linn Summer Market. Please, save our beautiful city from becoming a permanent 205 detour!</p>	Paula Furgason	Comment form
06/22	<p>Subject: I205 toll affect on 97068 residents?</p> <p>I'm reading an awful lot about people saying all drivers will do is drive through West Linn to avoid the toll. How are you going to prevent this? The toll would need to go in between I-5 and the Stanford exit like near the Clackamas county line. If it is put near the bridge you will just force everyone onto Willamette Falls Drive. As a 97068 resident I'm also concerned I would be tolled every time I leave my house to go to Oregon City. Lots to consider here. Our property tax is already through the roof.</p>	Shane Robidoux	Comment form
06/22	<p>Subject: Tolls on our highways</p> <p>I do not support the idea of tolling our highways. Even though I am now retired and don't often use the highway's, I think the idea shows very limited thinking in terms of what it will do to local surface streets. We are already seeing horrible surface street traffic and speeding through our neighborhoods when I-205 backs up, which is pretty much every day. Please explain to me how tolling is going to help relieve traffic congestion. If anything Willamette falls drive needs more stop signs at Dollar street and other side streets in order for residence to get onto Willamette fall drive. When traffic gets backed up, people will not give you the courtesy of letting you in. In a nutshell, freeway congestion needs to stay on the freeway. Tolling is not going to help that.</p>	Michael Nastari	Comment form
06/22	<p>Subject: toll fee on I-5</p> <p>The peak hour traffic in the OverLook neighborhood is already compromised. I am a MAX user, and have lived in Overlook since before MAX arrived. Our through streets are ALREADY crowded and over used by freeway exiters since MAX eliminated 2 lanes on Interstate Ave. I fear for my life when exiting the MAX station, as cars already do NOT slow down. Overlook and the Greeley corridor are already jammed with people trying to avoid I-5 gridlock. An I-5 "exit" to avoid tolls is going to cripple the neighborhood traffic whether is is right at the Interstate Bridge or before the 303 exit south bound, as well as north bound from I-84 to Interstate bridge. A LOT of the traffic jams include MANY cars from Washington state. Since WA state refuses to support</p>	Peggy Bartelt	Comment form

	extended MAX into Clark County, why not start the toll BEFORE the entry into Oregon, specifically for daily commuters that come from WA state into OR state to work?? Why punish the locals? Why punish the tourists? If you choose to live in WA and work in OR, then you pay the fee. If you choose to have a toll road to ease your access, then you pay for it.		
06/23	<p>Subject: Support tolling! BUT tolling Going to Multnomah will unfairly impact low income and minority communities in NoPo</p> <p>Let me start by saying that I fully support tolling the entire I-5 / I-205 highway system. I do not, however, support the proposal for tolling Going to Multnomah as it would unjustly impact residents in North Portland who are more racially diverse, younger, and have lower incomes than those in the city as a whole. These residents will be impacted in two ways: first, more traffic will be diverted through these neighborhoods to avoid tolls (studies done by this committee have demonstrated that); and second, these residents rely more on cars to get to work than the rest of Portland, and being less able to avoid the tolls, will be specifically targeted and financially burdened by them. A recently published study by students in the PSU Masters of Urban Planning program specifically looked at transportation issues in NoPo, focusing on impacts to low income and minority communities:  <a href="https://sites.google.com/view/northpdxconnected/home">https://sites.google.com/view/northpdxconnected/home</a>. It found that the share of people in NoPo who use vehicles to drive to work is higher than in the rest of the city; Willamette Blvd alone carries almost 20,000 vehicles a day to Greeley and I-5. In addition, North Portland is more racially diverse, has lower incomes, and more youth than the city as a whole. Communities of color and those with lower incomes are more heavily concentrated in Kenton, St. Johns and Portsmouth. Portsmouth is the most racially diverse census block in Portland with 51% people of color and an average household income of \$38k; it also hosts New Columbia which is one of the largest mixed income housing projects in the state. I understand that there is a desire to perform a tolling "pilot" but I would urge you to start tolling at the WA/OR border on I-5 and I-205 so there is less diversion through neighborhoods such as these. In addition, tolling the entire stretch of I-205 and I-5 will not result in specifically discriminating against low income and minority residents. I also understand that the political climate may not be great for this right now with the current US administration and more specifically Jaime Herrera Beutler, but that is not an excuse to discriminate. NoPo is losing its low income and minority populations and I urge you to not push through a project that could cause even more of them to have to leave NoPo.</p>	Alexandra Degher	Comment form
06/23	<p>Subject: 205 toll road</p> <p>Please stop the discussion about making I205 a toll road. This would cause the surrounding neighborhoods immense traffic and cause safety concerns for children and families who live in the neighborhoods that surround 205. The toll road is a BAD idea and would only cause problems for the citizens of West Linn and Oregon city.</p>	Nancy Fowler	Comment form
06/24	I am a Willamette resident, traffic on Willamette Falls drive is already horrible when I205 has long delays. A toll on this stretch of I205 would make this problem even worse as motorists will use WFD as a detour to not have to pay the toll. PLEASE don't put this in place!!	Cheryl Rowning	Comment form
06/24	The toll will make it impossible for our family to navigate within our own city of West Linn. Our neighborhood, the high school, middle school and library span three exits of 205. With multiple kids and activities at various times and locations, I should not be forced to pay toll or sit in 1/2 hour traffic just to go four blocks to get home or to my kids activities within the city. This toll will have a negative detrimental impact to the West Linn community.	Erica Bierman	Comment form
06/25	Sirs, I have asked and it appears others too, where are the engineering studies for traffic for the roads, meaning what is current load and what were they designed for. If in fact the issue is the load limits are exceeded your plans are not accurate, further there have been no data on peak hours, and scheduled work loads for business's in the Portland area, again math and data, not we think, it might or maybe, facts data, are real numbers, Also what is the bus or max time to get to destinations? since there are no express services, does this now lead to 10 or 12 hours days....	Steven Silvey	Comment form
06/25	Having just returned from Orlando, Florida, I can see the results of tolling. The traffic was just shoved off onto side streets making them impassible. Additionally, the lower income folks are the people most affected by tolling. More people have moved here. You have got to add lanes to accommodate them. Tolling would make the current gridlock worse.	Angela Roach	Comment form



06/25	As a resident in West Linn and a business owner, I have huge concerns about adding a toll road on I-205. I am certain it will negatively impact my clients' decision about whether to choose another business over mine, because my location will be harder to access. I know I'm not alone - West Linn is teeming with entrepreneurs who rely on 205 as a way to make our business successful. If tolls are added, I fear that our income (and remember: we're talking taxable income) will suffer significantly. This "value pricing policy" has not been well thought out and needs much more review and consideration before being implemented. Please consider the independent business owners; our livelihood depends on it.	Kelly Mooney	Comment form
06/25	OTC Members, I used to live in a city with Value Pricing or Congestion Pricing for highway tolls. While I appreciate its utility as a revenue generator and a tool for broader traffic policy, it unfairly targets individuals who must commute by car by Portland freeways and stretches budgets of already cash-strapped households. I believe in government and the need for taxes and revenue, but please find another source other than people just trying to get to work or do necessary travel by highway. Consider targeting commercial traffic, excise taxes on luxury vehicles, drivers license fees, or other areas that don't harm commuters on limited budgets. Thank you, Jake Seegmuller	Jakob Seegmuller	Comment form
06/25	Much has been considered so far but Quality of Life issues for non-tolled neighborhoods has not been addressed, which is a huge problem. Only noise issues are presented. Factor in visual impacts; safety for local children along sts. & sidewalks, parks nearby; loss of use for gardens & useable lawn areas (right of way i.e., eminent domain). it ignores the emotional & psychological aspects! A huge component of living healthy! Thanks!	Judie Champie	Comment form
06/25	No. absolutely not. Please don't. Not unless extra lanes are added where "value pricing" will be used. Restricting use of a road will never improve traffic on that road. Think about getting onto the freeways today. It's already a task just to get to them because the freeways are packed and backed up onto surface streets. This will cause even more backups on surface streets because there's less freeway lanes to use, making getting to the "value pricing" lanes impossible to get to. Where's the value in that? We won't be able to get to the lanes to use them. There's not been freeway improvements in Portland at all since they were built in '58, and 205 in '83. That's insane! Improve traffic by adding the value pricing lane in addition to the lanes already there. That would add value and improve traffic. Don't compare Portland's roads to Seattle's either. Seattle is constantly improving their infrastructure and adding to their roadways.	Paul paul@mohriplaw.com	Comment form
06/25	It is interesting to note that this entire exercise is against the Interstate Highway Act of 1956. The legislation that started our interstate highways specifically stated "No Tolling" unless a toll road already existed that would run parallel or a bridge that would be expensive. So, if Oregon wanted to start this program, should have started on US 26 or Ore 217, or could have decided to build new roads and bridges with tolls. It is really sad that existing governments cannot live within the law. No wonder nobody obeys laws anymore when governments don't.	David Mansiu	Comment form
06/25	Tolling the Abernathy Bridge area is unfair to the residents of West Linn. We have virtually no alternative public transportation in our area. And basically one way into and out of our area. As someone who lives near Willamete Falls Drive, I see this as having a negative impact on my neighborhood. Traffic is often backed up already from people getting off the freeway to avoid traffic. Without adding more lanes in this area I don't see how tolling is going to positively improve the quantity of traffic we have passing through this area.	Brenda Ege	Comment form
06/25	I guess the next time my group of RV'ers go north we will use the residential road to go past Portland, should be fun in downtown. We may even stay at the rest area south of town and hit the road around 7:00 am. Just have one lane of 205 with no exit and a minimum speed each ways.	Ernie	Comment form
06/25	This is a regressive taxing scheme and will massively negatively impact lower income households that have already been forced to move farther from the core.	Grant Cazinha	Comment form
06/25	Congestion Pricing provides no benefit to everyday commuters. It increases commuting cost, and prioritizes those who can afford it over people who cannot. Funds generated by this type of pricing are frequently redirected to non-commuting efforts, with zero effect on improving, or reducing commuting travel. I speak from experience from using the 91 express system in Corona, CA and the I-15 in San Diego,	Martin Hepp	Comment form

	CA. Do not implement this system in Oregon. The only people to benefit are the folks who are hired to manage the tolls.		
06/25	I am a native Oregonian and I say, no thank you to toll freeways. I am against charging to drive on our roads. I oppose this initiative. Thanks for the new I205 paving. I was fine with it before. I am not interested in paying extra to drive on it just because you needlessly improved it.	Lisa Bell	Comment form
06/25	My recommendation? Please don't do it! Many folks in the Portland Metro area must drive for work and commute - it's not like they are just clogging roadways for fun. I can't imagine any of the folks needing to commute or use the roads being supportive of this new expense that the working class can't afford.	Frank Smith	Comment form
06/25	Charging people to drive on roads we already paid for is stupid and should be as legal as selling one item multiple times with never delivering it to any buyer. If you think tolling people out of congestion will work, build a new road or lane, with out gas tax money, and charge to drive on it. Charging people to drive on roads they already paid for will not help congestion, only move it to other roads. If you are serious about cutting congestion, take E-plate cars away from people and make them take public transportation. Way too many of them driving around with only one person in them.	Win Chester	Comment form
06/25	Charging your way out of congestion will not work with existing roads. This "value pricing" or "congestion pricing" scheme will only cause surface streets to become extremely congested. Many of the examples of where this scheme allegedly works are actually highways that were built with the purpose of them being a faster, tolled alternative to existing roads or highways, or existing highways that had additional lanes built that are tolled. What's being attempted in the Portland area is to take the poor excuses for freeways that have never increased capacity and slap what amounts to a punitive toll on them. What viable alternatives are there? C-Tran service to/from Vancouver, WA is expensive and infrequent. TriMet has a crime problem on their trains which makes that an unattractive alternative, and their bus service currently is an inadequate substitute for I-5 south of Downtown Portland, plus there is no direct public transportation to replace I-205 between Oregon City and Tualatin. Not everyone lives within a reasonable distance of their job or other needs to use a bicycle or to walk, and face it our climate isn't good for either of those at least eight months out of the year. As for trying to get motorists off of the freeway during peak periods, has anyone on these committees stopped to consider that most people can't just change their working hours? Employers have set schedules for a reason, and if people aren't already working from home chances are they just can't. What's more, the text from HB 2017 section 120 reads, "...in addition to the amounts received from value pricing under this section, the moneys in the Congestion Relief Fund shall be used to implement and administer the traffic congestion relief program." So essentially the tolls from this fiasco will merely support the bureaucracy behind it. What happened to the concept of tolls paying for something constructive like new bridges or new highways? Why will such projects be considered only after the tolling bureaucracy is paid? This is a cash grab at the expense of motorists who in many cases are just trying to get to and from work to pay the ever increasing expenses of basic living. Decades of inaction have finally come home to roost. It's been known for quite some time that someday the current infrastructure would be outgrown. Now that we are at that tipping point, the best that Oregon could come up with is a plan to toll Portland and anyone else entering/leaving Oregon via I-5 and I-205 out of congestion? This plan would be laughable if it wasn't so ridiculous and unfair.	Russ Bohanon	Comment form
06/25	I am against ANY congestion pricing, everything is already expensive, we don't need to spend more money to get places. However, since you ignore us all anyway and this is just a formality to cross your T's and dot your I's to say you asked...when it goes into place, I have a REAL problem with "license" plate readings. I've received a traffic ticket because someone had duplicated my plates, and it was my time and money to prove it wasn't my car. Your technology better be THAT good so that doesn't happen.	Kimber Conway	Comment form
06/25	It is not possible to build our way out of congestion while simultaneously adding another 250,000 people to the city. We need rapid transit buses and max that goes to Vancouver. But in lieu of all that I support congestion pricing as an experiment in seeing if people driving habits can be altered. I personally will not be effected, I bike commute or take mass transit every day. Highways for me are occasional.	Kevin Coughlin	Comment form
06/25	Our West Linn household absolutely does not support this measure. It would cause unnecessary traffic on local streets as people avoided the tolls. Something the streets were not built to handle. This is a terrible short term solution- if you need the money	Addie Nichols-Petsu	Comment form



	that bad (which I strongly doubt considering how much the state is already taxing us), raise the taxes. Do not ruin my local street as people cut thru to avoid paying the toll.		
06/25	Tolling our roads and freeways does nothing but increase revenue to the State government and take money from the pockets of our citizens, tourists and commercial fleets. So called "Value Pricing" is much like putting lipstick on a pig. Tolling is a tax and is designed to separate us from our money and our privately owned cars. It will not reduce congestion. It will not make our freeways safer. It will do nothing except transfer more wealth from the public to the bureaucrats. Please stop the dishonesty and tell the public that you simply want us out of our cars and if we do not do so you will make it painful. Much like the I-5 bridge project, that ended in failure, this too is a bad idea dressed up to hide the facts.	Derek Becker	Comment form
06/25	It's stupid. Building bigger freeways, more bridges and freeways, improving the flow is the way to go. You just want to punish all the people who moved to Washington and kept their jobs in Oregon. I avoid crossing the bridges as it is, because of the miserable traffic problems almost any time of the day. If you toll the bridges and freeways, I will just not ever go to Portland for anything. Period . I will do any and all travel away from your tolls. Will spend my money elsewhere.	Dan Vogel	Comment form
06/25	Having lived in several states with real and qualified transportation departments, I am always amazed at the politically inspired car-hate / road-obstructionist views of the Oregon DOT. This concept is a terrible idea - It should first of all be prohibited by Federal Law on the Interstate and I certainly intend to appeal through the Department of Transportation to deny permission if they can. Your whole approach is an example of what happens in a state when a monopoly one-party system goes awry. Your mission is to build and maintain transportation arteries, not choke off our use of them! I also of course have to remind you all about your last great project - spending millions of dollars on an I5 Columbia bridge effort that was so incompetently done that the final design couldn't even clear Coast Guard height limits! That was a perfect example of the low quality of your staff performance and vision. I just hope you realize how much the public hates you and your immature PC ideas..You are not fooling anyone with your euphemisms and newspeak.	Thomas Mintner	Comment form
06/25	Oregon already collects millions of dollars from Clark County residents in the way of income taxes. These dollars should be utilized to expand highways and bridges. Oregon has made millions of dollars in income tax revenue growth since the I-205 bridge was installed, thereby multiplying revenue. This revenue also comes at truly very little cost since Clark County residents do not use most of the services that the income tax dollars are spent on. By adding more bridges across the Columbia, more freeways (like a west loop around downtown from north Vancouver to Wilsonville), and double decker freeways, income would multiply at a much greater rate than expense. Tolling will not bring Oregon businesses or cargo transit more options or greater speed of service or employees. Tolling also will increase rent costs closer to downtown as freedom to commute distances is further restricted.	Charles Antal	Comment form
06/25	Do not put tolls on I205, as a West Linn resident in old Willamette - tolling I205 would cause even greater traffic in the area that already can't support the current volume of traffic it has during the rush hour. Our tax dollars already fund these roads, tolls would just unfairly charge locals residents. Find another way to fund these projects and stop wasting money on a light rail system that less & less people are using.	Michael Meissner	Comment form
06/25	This idea is ridiculous. Cars headed to downtown Portland as a destination or west to Beaverton during rush hour will get off at the Rosa Parks exit and thread their way through the neighborhood streets. Trucks will just add the toll to their freight charge. It won't be a high enough toll to affect them. I am a resident of the area you are planning to divert I5 traffic into. Our neighborhood will oppose this tooth and nail.	Michael Shea	Comment form
06/25	I don't want this. I've lived in Portland since 1999. I've seen the traffic get worse. But I don't think making driving only affordable for rich people is the answer. I don't think adding to the skyrocketing cost of living is the answer. And I don't think even if you do this it's going to help much. And that's because public transit doesn't serve the vast majority of people in this region. Until it does, all you're doing is making the life of that minimum wage person who's been pushed to the outside of the city, but has a job downtown, a little more ragged.	Dan Cooper	Comment form
06/25	Consensus is from all low waged workers making less than a \$100,000. Tolls are unaffordable. Budgets are already jeopardizing basics such as food and shelter.	Fawn Linschoten	Comment form

		Gammelgard	
06/25	I am writing in support of value pricing. It is time to consider the cost of driving and the externalities of driving and properly price the trips taken on our transportation network relative to environmental impact.	Ben Foote	Comment form
06/25	My husband commutes from Yacolt to Hillsboro every day. Between federal taxes, state taxes, property taxes, and sales tax we can't afford a toll on the roads. Are you going to subsidize people like us that can't afford your "value pricing usage fee"?	Jennifer Heine-Withee	Comment form
06/25	Wow - what a surprise - the nazi bureaucrats recommended tolls on I-5 and I-205! I think it's time for all Washington residents to boycott Oregon - I know that I have purchased my last 5 cars there, & had them serviced as well, but that's over. I would rather pay ransom to Al Quaeda than to the Oregon Demo-Nazi's!!! Time to organize a BOYCOTT!!!!!!!	Terry Regis	Comment form
06/25	Absolutely NO. Stop building apartments, stop spending any money on Low-Income Housing until all veterans & handicapped are taken care of, and all of our roads have enough capacity and are in good repair. Absolutely NO, do not do this, it slows down the other lanes and moves less total people. It does not work trying to change people's driving behavior. Remember that ODOT works for the taxpayers, not the other way around.	Alan Boron	Comment form
06/26	I spent a number of years in California before coming back to Oregon (where I grew up). My observation is that tolling the roads does not help with congestion. The tolls started low (.50) and continued to increase to over \$5.00. Many people cannot afford that and were then avoiding the toll roads. The congestion continued, even after the tolls were imposed. California does have many other freeway options to use which does lessen the congestion, however. Since Oregon knows that the freeways were built many years ago and are not big enough, Oregon needs to build more freeways that connect I5 with 26, and I5 with 205 and others so we don't just have one north-south freeway and one east-west freeway. Now with this new transportation income tax being imposed there will be more money. Tolling the roads will not make people drive less. We need more freeways for options.	Sherrie	Comment form
06/26	Lack of resources for new highway capacity has been decades in the making with the region's insistence on light rail over highways. Despite 40 years of "smart" growth, 81% of region commuters still use automobiles, with less than 6% using mass transit, less than half of which is light rail. This is down from 10% mass transit usage in 1980. This is in large part because Trimet (backed by Metro & Portland) sacrifice quality of transit service (bus lines) to feed into new light rail systems to prop up ridership stats. Theoretically to reduce redundancy, but realistically takes away lines serving communities in a timely manner and drastically increases service times as they must divert out of their way to the new light rail line. The orange line is a perfect example of this. \$1.5 billion total cost, a billion of that in federal resources. 17k predicted ridership, 11k actual. That's 11k/2 = 5,500 commuters on an average weekday. Meanwhile highway 99 just south of the Ross Island bridge serves 60,000 vehicles per day including not only commuters, but critically it also includes short & long haul freight, construction, small business, contractors, commerce, emergency, etc. All the things light rail does not. Now we are planning a \$2.8 billion sw corridor line that will again serve few commuters and no freight, contractors, etc. But we are having to toll lower and middle income households who represent 81% of the commuting public to serve less than 3% of commuters and nothing else? No to tolls aka Commuter Tax. The state legislature needs to get back in session and re-include the I-5/205 changes as they were originally part of the transportation package. Tolling is a flat out money grab. An attempt to create a new revenue stream that i'm sure will be bonded and leveraged to spend billions more. And the chances of those additional billions being used to build additional through lanes is slim to none.	Nathan	Comment form
06/26	I am not sure why people that live in Washington and work in Oregon will be the majority of people getting "punished" for using the only bridges available. We already get punished by having so much taken out of our paychecks and now this. I barely can afford to pay my rent and put food on the table for my kids. We do not even have health insurance because I cannot afford it (yet the state seems to think I should be able to). There are other options: 1 - widen the bridges by one lane and have that lane be the "fast pass" or "toll lane" 2 - put in another bridge. The road out towards Camas (I think it is 164th) across would be fantastic area. DO NOT MAKE IT A LIFT BRIDGE. (The lift bridge does nothing but CAUSE traffic, frustration, and a larger carbon footprint from cars waiting, causing more environmental damage to our beautiful home) 3 - replace the lift bridge (or even in addition too) put in a tunnel bridge. I	Gina Roche	Comment form





	went through one in Virginia outside of the naval base all the time. It works - and the Columbia should definitely be large enough and deep enough for this to be an option.		
06/26	Well, I think tolling is not a way to deal with congestion. Less people and more roads reduces traffic density. I guess you think people will have a choice and not be on the roads, but that's a white upper class concept you have there. I can't avoid going into work when I choose. To eat, I have to drive, and you are aiming this attack at me. People live apart from where they work and that is life. Many people can't afford to live where they work. Tolling people to solve road block isn't going to solve the problem. This is just a tax on the working class. How much of this tolling money is even going to go towards road maintenance or bridge replacement? It's just a way for the working class to fill the coffers for your general fund. Tolling the highways will only increase traffic on the surface streets (other than the Clark County people, you'll really give it to them, but that's really one of your goals here--and I don't even live in Clark County). It's going to create a bigger problem, but then again, we know you're not really worried about traffic, it's about money. So, all of your options are mean spirited and blind. I have these images of the committee hunched over a list of ways to make life miserable for people, laughing, drinking scotch, smocking stogies. It's burned into my brain.	Vanessa MacLellan	Comment form
06/26	Fix problems @ Delta Park on ramps. Northbound traffic always picks up speed after bridge in WA. Problems on OR side both NB/SB lanes. 2) Tolls a way to move \$ from groups of people to government's pocket. 3) Trying to get 'solution' to a so called problem by politicians. 4) Fix OR's problem by Rose Quarter first to see what happens to traffic. 5) On ramps are the problem, especially Delta Park S to end of industrial area. 6) All problems aren't fixed by tolls 7) Roads should have been made large enough @ initial construction to handle way more traffic than @ time of construction when materials/labor/land were cheaper to begin with. Poor planning. 8) Why always penalize drivers? 9) Just another form of taxes.	Edward Warren	Comment form
06/26	I do hope you are taking into consideration senior citizens living on fixed incomes who only travel these corridors when necessary, be it caring for an elder parent or attending doctor appointments, treatments of their own when service is not available in Washington.	Becky Grimsrud	Comment form
06/26	Please be aware of how much the tolling will affect the citizens of West Linn. I live near the 10th street exit but quite often need to use the stretch of I-205 between West Linn exits to get to the other side of West Linn to get to my church, the high school, the post office, etc. I use the 205 because it takes much longer to go up the hill due to congestion near Rosemont road. It is also near impossible to turn left onto Highway 43 and is much safer to go by way of the freeway. If you toll that portion, I can't imagine how the already over used Highway 43 will be congested. Please don't solve one problem just to cause and even worse one. Thank you, AnnMarie Webster	AnnMarie Webster	Comment form
06/26	While I am in favor of congestion pricing on our roadways, I am NOT in favor of a half-baked implementation that will undoubtedly divert traffic from I-5 and onto our North Portland neighborhoods. Greeley and Interstate Avenues are already congested enough, bringing bus traffic (35 Line) to a complete standstill during morning and evening rush hours. Worse yet, since many motorists are already speeding through our North Portland streets to cut through congestion on I-5 (and now with more incentive to avoid paying tolls), I fear that this half-implemented tolling strategy will create an even more unsafe environment for cyclists, pedestrians, and children. Just this morning, during a jog with my dog, an impatient driver nearly hit us when the vehicle in front of him stopped for us (at a marked crosswalk), and he felt the need to honk at the driver that had stopped as he tried to swerve and pass the stopped car. If you are not going to toll the entirety of I-5 from the OR-WA border to the I-205/I-5 intersection, then please add speed bumps to every through street in North Portland. Better yet, prevent through traffic with the exception of local traffic by adding barriers or bollards to residential streets.	Octavio Gutierrez	Comment form
06/26	I'm ok with tolling. The only issue I have is where it starts on i5. If it starts at/around Alberta, then Washington drivers will just get off at all the stops before that and use N Greeley, N Interstate or any other north south streets. This will cause traffic in my neighborhood. Please consider starting tolls further north.	Marty Knowles	Comment form
06/26	I am retired and disabled veteran living in Vancouver. I have to travel to the VA Hospital periodically. I also travel through your beautiful State for pleasure. The problem I see with the traffic, is the on and off ramps cause the major part of the	Richard DiPalermo	Comment form

	congestion. Examples would be the Killingsworth exit off of I-205. On I-5, several problems are caused by I-405, I-5, I-84, and bridges merging. Oregon highways, like 26 and 30 do not help at these merging Interstate highways. Was a study on that done before the TOLL idea came into play. Big cities like San Antonio and Phoenix route thru traffic on different HOV lanes that do not interfere with local highway traffic.		
06/26	Is congestion pricing only for out-of-state vehicles, auto only, or does it include any commercial trucks? If pricing is by checking license plates, how about if some people have an OR plate but really live in WA? If we have to go into Portland for medical appointments and or admitted to a hospital in Portland, that will be an added expense. People living in Clark Co. but work in Portland don't have much of a choice in getting to OR and many companies are not going to change starting/ending times for just a few people. Plus how feasible is it to walk or ride a bike from Clark Co. to Portland? One item that I haven't seen addressed is the fact that many Clark Co. people need to use the airport and from the border, it is a mere 4-6 miles. I think there should be a pricing lane such as Los Angeles County has but then I guess an extra lane would have to be built in both directions.	Carolyn Ochs	Comment form
06/26	Tolls are not going to reduce the traffic. The population has increased so much so that most roads are congested all day long anyway. Forcing more cars to travel during another time of day (to avoid tolls) on a system that is already overloaded wont help. I-5 is a great example. So is Hwy 217. Try traveling on I-5 during a Sunday afternoon . Its jammed. We need new freeways through the area both north and south bound and east and west and public transit from the south end of I-5 to downtown Portland. And we need a freeway going from the south of I-5 to the Beaverton area. Its time to think ahead into the future and massively expand the roads and freeways to accommodate the growth not jam up side roads that people will be forced to use to get around and punish people financially who have to travel on the freeways to get to work.	Lyn Burniston	Comment form
06/26	You are specifically targeting SW WA residents who already pay taxes for Oregon's roads and what we use! If you were basing this assesment off of congestion you would be tolling I-84 and HWY 26. Why don't you name the project "screw Vancouver" just an option?	Sarah Kennison	Comment form
06/26	What about tolling all the other roads in and out of Portland that have worse congestion, such as the 405, St. Johns area and the absolutely ridiculous congestion on US 26? Why are you targeting only the bridges and directing it at SW Washington commuters the most? Maybe we should tax ODOT for having bridges that connect to Washington.	Jon Pederson	Comment form
06/26	I do not believe that tolls will reduce congestion! Its a way for Oregon to steal more of our money legally. We already pay taxes and that should be enough to fix this problem.	Debra Johnson	Comment form
06/26	This is a regressive tax on the middle class who generate value for the region. I'd like to see the property taxes leveled and fixed within the region before new taxes are created. The public transportation options from North Portland to East County need improvement, but rail from Vancouver to City Central (or wherever most Vancouver commuters work) would be great if appropriate.	anonymo us	Comment form
06/27	it is enough that we pay state tax and don't get any back and having to pay another tax for the three miles a day I drive in this state	Tracy Moore	Comment form
06/27	Doernbecher Children's Hospital, Shriners Hospitals for Children - Portland, and OHSU Emergency Department are all along the proposed Toll route. You are going to kill me with fees I can't afford! Or actually, kill my daughter. I have a medically fragile disabled child. She sees doctors in Neurology, Gastroenterology, Otolaryngology, Pulmonary, Orthopedics, Audiology, Endocrinology and more added continuously. She also has weekly speech therapy, occupational therapy, and physical therapy at those locations. The goal of the toll is to force people off the roads. If it succeeds, it will be at a great detriment to people's health and livelihood. DON'T DO IT!!!! Please don't take away access to the services my daughter depends on!!!	Michael Stevens	Comment form
06/27	The only congestion pricing that I find acceptable, is to toll an additional lane that is added to an existing freeway. The funds from this tolling must only be used to pay for such additional lanes first, and then to increase freeway capacity in general. The same dollars (which seem to be billions) that are proposed for a light rail and street car extension would would carry far more people, and save far more time for those people, if invested in freeway expansion and/or new freeways.	Richard Leonetti	Comment form



06/27	I am against placing tolls. Tolls are a regressive tax on people who can neither afford to pay more to travel to work, nor afford the additional time to go around. Rising rent, gas, food, and other living expenses already sap the dwindling purchasing power of a paycheck. Adding on yet another tax will contribute even more to inequality and poverty. Those who cannot afford to pay a toll will need to take longer to work through surface streets. More street traffic will contribute to less time with family and an increase in traffic and pedestrian accidents.	Paul Prior	Comment form
06/27	You mentioned, and I quote: "The primary goal is to improve travel: Any funds raised from tolling will go first to pay for implementing the tolling system. If there is additional revenue left over, it must be used for roadway improvements, as mandated by Oregon state law. this money will be going to infrastructure in Oregon that people in Clark County rarely use." According the information, we Washington commuters received from Rep. Jaime Herrera Beutler, the money won't be going toward a new I-5 bridge, new lanes on I-5 or I-205, or to fix any of the infrastructure most of us use.... Not a penny is going to fix the I-5 Bridge..... Oregon's move to impose tolls now and commit that revenue elsewhere destroys trust with Clark County residents and is only impeding a solution for the I-5 Bridge. This plan to toll Washington commuters the moment they cross into Oregon would be a nightmare for our region. And no one should have any misconceptions here: Oregon politicians and decision makers wholeheartedly intend to implement this maximum-tolling plan. Source: <a href="http://www.columbian.com/news/may/27/herrera-beutler-oregon-toll-plan-will-hurt-clark-county-commuters/">http://www.columbian.com/news/may/27/herrera-beutler-oregon-toll-plan-will-hurt-clark-county-commuters/</a> It is my hope, and the hope of many of my fellow Washingtonians, that the Politicians on our side of the river and the Federal Government will oppose any tolling system as it is proposed by Oregon and which will be only benefitting Oregon. Besides, I-5 and I-205 are federal highways and the only means to get over the Columbia River. It almost sounds as if this tolling plan is intended to discriminate against SW Washington residents. Restaurants and stores in the greater Portland area will, without a doubt, see a decline in Washington customers. So, with all that, my vote is NO to any tolling!	HRB	Comment form
06/27	A third bridge crossing the Columbia River is long over due, especially with the growth in East Clark County. Tolling the bridges is inherently unfair to those Washingtonians commuting into Oregon every day. We pay Oregon taxes and see nothing for the taxes we are already paying, without the ability to vote in what happens to our Oregon tax dollars. Unconstitutional and unfair to Washington commuters. Build another bridge at 192nd.	Diane Singleton	Comment form
06/27	I live in Vancouver and fully support tolls if that money is used towards the following: 1) create a freeway and bridge between west Vancouver and Hillsboro/Beaverton 2) create a freeway and bridge between Camas and Troutdale 3) replace the antiquated I-5 Interstate Bridge 4) connect the MAX from the Expo Center to Salmon Creek and down to the Airport I am tired of so much traffic from Washingtonians but they aren't willing to fix the problem. Thank you for taking this on.	Nicholas Coker	Comment form
06/27	By taxing 205 and 5. This is nothing more than holding the ONLY bridges across the river hostage. For people who work and pay taxes into the Oregon fund but live in Washington. There is NO choice. What about the highways going over the bridges into the city or highways going to the beaches. 84 is one of the most congested stretches that runs right into the city. As a person who lived and drove on the so called Seattle examples. The data is b.s. yes, less people drove 520 because we had 90 without toll that went the same place or could drive around the other end of the lake. It made THOSE areas more congested. The 405 corridor or 167 corridor lanes are fast lanes somewhat like carpool. If you want to hit a faster lane you pay, if not you hold the current lane. This proposal is not only bad it is bias beyond belief. NO TOLLS FOR 5 OR 205 BRIDGE AREAS	Sara	Comment form
06/27	I am a disabled vet with a fixed limited income. I live in Vancouver Wa. I would not be able to pay tolls to drive through on I5 or I205. Many vets have to travel from SW Washington to the Portland VA for medical treatment. I know I have to go to the Portland VA for a 1day surgery once every 2months. Your tolls would be beyond my level of income which is about 16K a year.	Mike Kuhl	Comment form
06/27	I own a business in Vancouver with Portland service and install work. We need new roads, not higher fees. I assume our people will be paying a new tax on travel. We are already stretched thin all day long. We need new roads, new ways to get around greater PDX!	AJ Gomez	Comment form

06/27	The commuters of Washington are already paying Oregon State income taxes by commuting to Oregon to work. We get no benefits or representation from the state we pay high income taxes to since we don't live there and now you want to charge us to drive to work too!!!! This plan has no intention of widening the current freeway system or improving it in any way. If you have the greedy need for even more revenue than you already get at least make an additional pay only lane and leave the rest of us be in our crowded free lanes. Many of us are hardly making ends meet as it is, trying to survive in this overpriced town and now you want to charge us even more on top of all the other taxes we already pay as law abiding citizens!!	Evalyn Morales	Comment form
06/27	I don't think everyone should be charged every time for using Oregon roads or crossing the bridge. As with ALL public services, I think tolls should be based on heavy use. I think cars should be tracked and counted, and heavy users should be tolled. It is unconstitutional to tax the poor for problems caused by the rich or abusers of resources. Those who have to cross the Oregon roads should not be punished. But if people choose to drive excessively - which has a heavy toll on physical road conditions as well as the environment in addition to adding to congestion - they should be charged for that excessive use. This will force people onto public transportation and to budget their trips. But if someone has to get to a medical appointment, say, and they are not a heavy user, the road toll should not be a prohibitive factor. The rich won't care about the toll, so you are only hurting the poor, who have enough problems in this economy anyway.	Suzan Heglin	Comment form
06/27	Since the purpose of congestion pricing is to influence behavior rather than raise revenue for the state, the money raised (beyond the costs of implementing and running the program) should not ultimately go to state coffers, since otherwise there would be a disincentive for the state to keep the tolls minimal or to discontinue the program if it turns out not to have the intended effect on congestion. There are many choices of relevant nonprofit organizations who would be more appropriate recipients of that money.	Tim Klein	Comment form
06/27	Well, appreciate you looking to rape the workers of Washington state. We provide a large portion of our income at the end of the year because Oregon refuses to view us as out of state workers. We pay on your schools, your roads, your infrastructure and now you are looking to double dip by tolling us in order to work on areas that we are not even using. Not to mention that you are allowed to shop in Washington without worrying about being taxed. Take your tolls and shove them. Hopefully our congressmen and senators will be able to kill your little program of tax and spend.	Steve	Comment form
06/27	I am a Vancouver resident who works at a clinic in Portland for Native Americans. I find the idea of tolling 205 unfair, as I already have to pay Oregon income taxes despite not being able to vote here or receive any benefit from those taxes. To toll me to get to work would place a significant financial burden on me and there isn't another way for me to get to work, as I have to be at work long before the busses run from Vancouver to Portland. This will only hurt poorer folks. The wealthy will be able to pay it and idle on the freeway in their luxury cars, just as they do now. Build a Max line across the river, build larger crossings/bridges. Tolling alone does nothing other than penalize people who are already being taxed without representation in Oregon.	Travis Wonders	Comment form
06/27	As a Washington state resident I ask, why can't the state of Oregon use my thousands of dollars I pay annually in Oregon state income tax solve this issue one way or the other; new 3rd bridge, an under river tunnel, or fix the existing bridge? Aren't I already paying for the "privilege" to drive on your roads?	Drew Cartwright	Comment form
06/27	After reviewing the congestion pricing proposals I believe that one of the main causes of freeway congestion in our area is being overlooked. Traveling on any of the three major freeways in our area it is easy to see that a large number of the cars traveling on the freeway are from Washington. Tolling only in the areas of the Abernathy bridge and the central city area will do nothing to help with the influx of traffic from Washington. In order for the tolling plan to have any real affect on traffic in our region tolls need to also be collected on I-5 and I-205 near the Interstate and the Glenn Jackson bridges.	Anthony Bottger	Comment form
06/27	I have driven in Europe and Japan where tolls are a fact of life. I believe that tolls represent one tool that planners have to make transportation as efficient as possible. Using tolls to regulate traffic density and flow makes sense in the right situation.	William Robinson	Comment form
06/27	There is a gas tax already in place for road improvement. It's not fair for Washington residents to pay for your roads due to you miss handling funds. We already pay our share to your state. Learn how to handle money!	Nancy Fincher	Comment form



06/27	I've spent time living in the Seattle Area (Redmond, WA) where articles quoting a comparison to the 405 implementing tolls and residents were unhappy but were glad in hindsight that it was done. Let me start by saying I've never heard a single resident say that. The changes only added fees to everyone that has to cross the 405 and did almost nothing to alleviate the insane traffic that clogs up the 405 every day. Having grown up and now moving back to the Portland metro area, the same is going to be true. If people could carpool and do more to reduce traffic and not be stuck in traffic, they would have. No one enjoys being stuck in traffic. The idea that fining people so Oregon can make more more money behind the excuse that this should help is appalling. I hope that by voicing my opinion we can repeal this decision (no matter how slim that may be). If that isn't an option, I am hoping that at least outside of traffic hours the consideration of removing any toll will be considered.	Steven Truong	Comment form
06/27	So, it was bad enough the housing prices got outrageous in Portland area. So we moved across the bridge to afford a place. Now we are going to be tolled to drive to work in Oregon. I already pay income tax there. Where does all the gas tax increase monies go. Essentially we are going to be punishe for moving across the rive because these two states cannot come up with a good solution. Time to just find a job in washington and not contribute to the pdx, oregon revenues. With the homelss problem there and all these issues, why	Kevin Lee	Comment form
06/27	No free option to cross columbia river. SW Washington should not have to pay for Oregon's lack of proper infrastructure planning. As I understand it monies would be used statewide. NO. SW Washington is not brown's piggybank.	James Ferguson	Comment form
06/27	To: Oregon Department of Transportation : Congestion Pricing 6/27 My Thoughts about the Unfair Tolling of I-5 and 205 Bridges ... by Oregon taking over bridges that you do not own. It will only have a minor impact on regonians ... but a major impact on people that live in Washington and work in Oregon AND already have to pay the Oregon Income tax on the wages they earn there ... they are in Oregon approx. 40 hours a week, less vacation, holiday and sick leave time. They do not receive any benefits from the Oregon State taxes they are already paying ... unless, maybe if they need a fireman or policeman. Senior Citizens : my husband is 85, I am 83. We have 2 daughters and there husbands, 4 grandchildren and their spouse's, and 10, soon to be 11 great-grandchildren that live in Oregon. Most live in Sandy, one in Wilsonville. We are blessed to have the love, visits, and care we receive from them. Almost weekly, one or two (with some of their children) come to visit us ... bring dinner, do some projects around the house, work in the yard ... A toll would be putting an extra financial burden on these young families. Our Health : we have several specialty doctors in Portland. My husband's health is not good ... since September 2014 he has had 6 colon operations which put him in ICU many days, and amounted to over 125 days in hospital stays ... one period included 92 days straight ... six weeks of that was in Vibra in Portland. Plus, 2 different Aorta Aneurysm surgeries, one in Portland and the other in Vancouver ... which put him in the hospital and a skilled nursing facility for a month. During all of the above our daughter from Fairview was with us every day after school and stayed generally until 11 at night and her dad was settled for the night. Also, a granddaughter from Sandy, a teacher, came almost daily. They drove round trips over the 205 bridge every day. They were also with us daily the six weeks he was in Vibra .. in Portland. I drove back and forth every day over the 205 Bridge ... from Vancouver to Portland. You might ask, "why don't you move to Oregon to be near your family?" First : We have lived in Vancouver over 20 years and are established here. Second : the cost. Third : we shouldn't have to, to save the enormous cost this will be on our family just to visit us regularly. I pray that the Federal Government sees the unfairness of this situation. If you (Oregon) can take over bridges that you don't own ... what will be next on your agenda to get money for YOUR projects from non-residents? Watch out California !!! You could be next !!! Why don't you toll property that is used by Oregonians? Why don't you toll I-84???? It is in your state. If you toll anyone ... it should be the big trucks that take over the roads, don't keep the posted speed limits, and don't stay in the right lane. I recently took a trip from Vancouver, WA to Springfield, OR to see my sister (she passed away a few weeks later) ... I couldn't believe the number of trucks (sometimes 4 or 5) trying to pass each other on I-5 sometimes where there were only two lanes. Have you made public the amount of TOLL MONEY that will be spent setting up a controlling/or management group; constructing toll booths, hiring, training, benefits, maintenance, etc.? Thank You for letting me share my concerns. cc: Governor Jay Inslee Rep. Herrera Beutler	Margaret Hutchison	Comment form

06/27	I disagree strongly with this initiative. As someone who visits Portland frequently now that I can't afford to live there, I travel on I-84 on a weekly basis. Adding a toll to this road would make it much harder for me to do so. I love my home city, and I hate to see that it's turned on is poor residents. With gas prices soaring, I really don't think that a toll road is necessary or wanted. Poor people have enough trouble getting around as is, why make it worse? Shame on you.	Brookelin McKay	Comment form
06/27	Consider a plan that incorporates both a toll and the expansion of light rail in the same area. The toll revenues can be used to pay for the expansion. For example, if establishing light rail between Portland and Vancouver, the toll entering Portland via Route 5 can be used to fund the expansion.	Shawn Fitzgibbons	Comment form
06/27	No tolls	B. Arden	Comment form
06/27	Tolling I-5 and I-205 is a bad idea for several reasons: 1. It will take time and cause more congestion, to stop cars and collect the toll; 2. Tolls are the worst form of regressive tax on the poor; 3. It will reduce traffic, yes, but what will be lost is products moving to market and employees coming to work and Washingtonians coming to shop in Oregon. Those losses will cause stores to close and companies to leave Oregon. What a shortsighted proposal! A better idea is to increase the gas tax, and implement an equivalent tax on electric cars (perhaps by taxing their batteries based on how many miles are driven on a set of batteries) PLEASE BUILD THREE BRIDGES: a. Replace I-5 bridges with new bridge having at least five lanes each direction (plus MAX) b. Build a new bridge east of Camas; c. Build a new bridge over Sauvie Island, up Cornelius Pass Rd, past Hillsboro, and joining I-5 near McMinnville. Thank you	Kenton Erwin	Comment form
06/27	No tolls!!! Keep our roads & traffic moving!!!! No tolls!!!	Tom Moore	Comment form
06/27	I do not support Oregon's plan for congestion pricing on the I-5 and 205 bridges. The plan submitted does nothing to resolve the congestion as most commuters do not have an option on when they can show up at work, and the revenue generated by the tolling will not go into repairing the I-5 bridge. I see this proposal as a means to transfer an Oregon's tax to non-Oregon residents. I do not oppose the concept of a user fee so long as the proceeds are used to repair or construct something that will benefit those who pay.	Jordan Alexander	Comment form
06/27	I don't understand why we can't have a new bridge!! We can give away millions of dollars to lottery winners but we can't take care of our freeways... I personally don't think this will work we could use a better plan of attack for this issue...	Darrell Rooks	Comment form
06/27	I think tolling is a good idea. When I lived in Milwaukie and was commuting to Vancouver for 10 years, I was for it then, too. I only moved to Vancouver because of congestion, but if a toll would have helped to either reduce or help to regulate the traffic in any way, I would have gladly paid it.	Maria Rose	Comment form
06/27	The state already steals enough money, when purchasing a car and or tags. Why would they need to steal more money to drive on a road that the money they've stolen should I be paying for. This is horribly wrong	Di	Comment form
06/27	After commuting on I-5 and occasionally I-205 for the past 15 years and having spent a considerable amount of time commuting in Chicago, here's my take on the situation: 1. The HOV lane is not working, rather it is creating more congestion and cars idling and therefore hurting our air and environment more. Immediately discontinue it and travel times will drop and air quality will improve. 2. If you want to take passenger cars off the road, don't build more roads, build more transit. An elevated train line like those in Chicago and New York with stops at each overpass along I-5 would greatly reduce traffic and encourage use of mass transit and less cars. I would build this as a commuter rail that runs to Vancouver, and south to Portland, dropping passengers at the light rail for transfer. I'd also run express trains during max usage. This would be a far better use of our tax dollars than rebuilding and rebuild and rebuilding roads that fall apart, contest our air, and negatively effect our communities in about every way imaginable. 3. Rebuild the I-5 bridge to accommodate elevated train. 4. Create commuter ferries across the Columbia to the existing light rail at Expo. 5. Encourage freight to travel more heavily on trains than semi trucks. The semi trucks are a major source of traffic slow downs on I-5. They pollute more, damage the roads more and take up 2-3 lanes of car space. 6. Tolling roads are not going to reduce traffic in this situation because there are no other options for travel between Washington and Oregon. You will make money. The	Jeannie Bauer	Comment form



	question is, what will you do with the money? If you build a commuter train and some of the other steps mentioned above, clearly outlining that plan to the public with a payoff in sight, great. To do otherwise would be of great disservice to our communities.		
06/27	How is placing tolls on the only access points crossing from Washington into the Portland area going to reduce congestion? Anyone entering Portland from Washington has no alternative, but to contribute to the congestion at one of the bridges. Until lightrail is an option from the Washington side, the current public transportation setup isn't viable. On I-5, anyone driving south has no alternatives until they reach Martin Luther King Blvd/Marine Drive. For tolling to be fair to all economic classes, tolling booths should be placed where there are alternate routes available. For example, if the booths on I-5 are placed between Marine Drive and Delta Park, those who cannot afford the tolls, have the option to use Martin Luther King Blvd. or Marine Drive to enter Portland's west side. If the booths on 205 are placed between Airport Way and Sandy Blvd., there are likewise alternative routes that could relieve congestion and also ease the burden upon those earning minimum wage.	Denise Rutledge	Comment form
06/27	As a Washington resident that works in Oregon I must pay Oregon income taxes. Though I'm required to pay these taxes I am not afforded any of the benefits that residents of Oregon receive. And now Portland is planning to implement a road tax on top of what I already pay to Oregon in taxes. Additionally, there is no guarantee that Oregon will use the revenue from these tolls on improvement projects specific to I5 and I205. Portland needs to do a better job in designing it's freeway interchanges, expand existing freeways, and create additional freeways that make sense. Use the tax dollars I pay to Oregon to accomplish this. Also, the I5 interstate bridge needed to be replaced years ago but Oregon and Washington couldn't work together to get this done for their residents. It's a nay from me!	Brent Huber	Comment form
06/27	I live in Vancouver and work in Portland. I pay income taxes to the State of Oregon. I thought this was what this type of thing was for. How can I pay tolls on top of income taxes to a state I don't live in. I also have had my tires damaged many times on the potholes that Oregon does not fix so what's the point. At least please exempt people who already pay income taxes to the State of Oregon, but live in Washington. This is beyond excessive.	Angela Bacon	Comment form
06/27	I don't have the option of changing my hours or mass transit. Adding a toll will be a real hardship on my single income family. I live in Washington and already pay a lot in taxes, while I get no say. Adding this toll will result in Washington residents avoiding Oregon, where they spend a lot of time and money. But hey, maybe that's what you want. We've been asking for a 3rd bridge for as long as I can remember. But because we don't want light rail, and the crime it brings, Oregon is looking for revenge.	Doddie Dunbar	Comment form
06/27	I moved down here from Seattle, where they started tolling on the 520 bridge and the 405 road. I was just thinking as I drove from Vancouver to Portland on 205, that I'm so glad they don't toll the roads here! NO, please don't start tolling 5 or 205. Since Portland has gotten too expensive to live, I'm in Vancouver and drive into Portland for work. TOLLING STARTS MAKING IT PROHIBITIVE for many people to afford the drive. Try improving public transportation before setting up tolls. Thank you, Phyllis	Phyllis Moses	Comment form
06/27	NO!!! No tolls on either bridges. Not now, not EVER!!!! Do you know how many people live here and work there?????	Jerry Miller	Comment form
06/27	I think the toll should be progressive, each year getting a little higher to cover the costs of more and more public transit. I'm still angry that a few idiots in Vancouver voted down the funding for a train between Oregon and Washington. So maybe the toll should be a little bit higher for people going to Oregon from Washington. Thank you. Sincerely, A Washingtonian pedestrian	Jennifer Rinehart	Comment form
06/27	Making a toll road out of a section of an interstate highway is just plain stupid! You're punishing California and Washington for Oregon's mismanagement of their highway system.	Jeanne Bort	Comment form
06/27	I drive on 205 over the Glenn Jackson bridge and get off on Airport Way, about a mile is there a way that will identify my car when I get off the bridge? My work is about 2 miles into Portland just behind the airport, the new Post Office facility. I hope there is a way to keep me from having to pay a large toll for such a short drive on 205. On my return home it is the same. I don't drive in Portland much more than that, downtown is	Patricia Jensen	Comment form

	too congested and the drivers are very rude. I already have to pay extra taxes for a light rail that I will never use.		
06/27	Yup! You are living up to your reputations. Seems "taxes uber alles" still stinks as badly no matter what you call it. Most people in this area have no choice when they drive....they do have to show up for work after all. Can you people think outside the box for a change? Where is the innovation in this? Instead of levying another tax on the poor, underpaid worker bee, why not tax the employers. This stupidity could be mostly, if not entirely, solved by business flexing their work hours. Perhaps some could start at 5 or 6 am; others at staggered times throughout the day. Of course you would have to give them some type of incentive (or maybe tax them?) to get it accomplished. Or is the underlying, real, reason that you just want a lot more souls to tax out of Washington? Your "congestion pricing" is just another band aid....not a solution. (I thought you folks were supposed to come up with solutions.)	Anderson	Comment form
06/27	Value pricing? What does that mean? Tolls are increased or decreased dependent on the time of day? That's preposterous! What is acceptable to me is a flat charge of no more than \$1.00 per way, tax deductible on my non-resident Oregon tax form...or a 3rd bridge. Come 7 miles north from downtown Portland and see the nonsense that goes on daily, no matter the time anymore.	Linda Plamondon	Comment form
06/27	Tolling is Not a bad idea to pay for a new bridge which would reduce the congestion on 5 & 205. If you're going to place a toll on certain sections of roadways. You should only charge a toll to people or business's that use that roadway for profit or to make money because I am guaranteed by our great constitution of the United States of America the right to travel upon those roadways free of charge in my journey of Life and in my pursuit of happiness just like everyone else is in their own Life's and their own pursuit of happiness. The people who are using the roadways trying to make a profit are the only ones that are congesting those roadways and they are the only ones that should have to pay or be restricted from those roadways. If you try to toll me or make me pay for the use of those said roadways you will be violating the Constitution of the United States of America and will make yourself open for lawsuit by me and all fellow Americans that are using those roadways trying to live their Life and trying to find what makes them Happy.	Jason Allen	Comment form
06/27	Imposing tolls on the interstates connecting Washington and Oregon is unfair of every respect. We don't need or want another financial hardship as this would cause. The only fair way to toll the bridge is to build another one that would make easier access. Tampa Florida added a toll road to the airport which cut off 15 to 20 minutes of travel time and people jumped at the opportunity to save time. Your proposal for tolls does not save time but would cause commutes to take longer which adds to frustration. That is double frustration, longer commutes and increased cost. Surely the will of the people will prevail.	Brenda Chambers	Comment form
06/27	What a farce. When the taxpayers say NO, you need to figure something else out. I can work from home, I will not be traveling to Portland any more, if you toll any roads. I have sold my home and rental buildings, to move to Vancouver. Now I am glad I have done that.	Wade McLaren	Comment form
06/27	If this is truly about "reducing congestion" I believe reduced fairs and no fair systems should be implemented for High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV). Possibly making the tolls free for 3+ people vehicles and maybe half price fairs for 2+ people vehicles. This could also help mitigate for lower income folks having an option to use the freeway for free during peak hour if they are reducing trips on the roadway by carpooling. It seems like this method will divert a lot of traffic onto local roads that are less funded and less able to accommodate higher volumes of traffic if a reduced or free fair for HOV is not incorporated into this system. And if improving public transportation is truly a goal, excessive traffic on local roads where public bus transportation exists will increase travel times and decrease the quality of public transportation (Example: bus on Barbur Blvd during rush hour is often extremely late - 30 min-an hour). This draft report also did not seem to address possible freight issues or any idea how to deal with non-local traffic. The systems I am aware of that do tolling either use license plates or devices inside a vehicle. I also think it should be more clear where the money collected from this system would be going. First it says the money collected will be used to pay for the tolling system itself and possibly excess used to improve roads. Then it says it will be used to make public transportation improvements. Then it says it will be used to relieve traffic congestion. I think this should be addressed now as to what priority each of these options for the money has and an idea of who will manage the funding we are collecting from a road that has already been paid for with taxpayer money.	Bethany Veil Atekha	Comment form





06/27	This is not an appropriate option. I am strongly opposed. Raise the gas tax to keep up with road needs. You could do this on a regional basis so that those needing the improvements pay for them. Get rid of prevailing wage...it serves very few but dramatically increases costs and limits the contractors who will apply...reduce red tape. Mike Beardsley Uses I-5 in Oregon and Washington	Mike Beardsley	Comment form
06/27	This toll is nothing more than a funding source for anything that the politicians want it to be. It will NOT reduce congestion and everyone with any sense at all knows this. Do you really believe that we cannot see what is going on here? I am 100 % against any sort of tolling. I am in favor of reigning back the frivolous spending that is so rampant in both Oregon and Washington. Sound fiscal policies must be pursued, although they require intelligent thinking and careful planning. We are not the personal piggy bank of this committee.	Jeannette Morello	Comment form
06/27	As a Washington State resident I would support tolling the Oregon roads only if the Non-residents would be able to stop paying Oregon State income taxes. The only benefit out of state employees get is the use of the roads to get to their job... They don't get to vote in elections, or get any say in how their tax dollars they give to State of Oregon are spent.... Seems pretty fair to me!	Mike Hertz	Comment form
06/27	I understand the intent of "Congestion Pricing" is to reduce the traffic congestion (i.e. travel time?) on I5/205. If so what is the criteria and duration that will be analyzed to determine that the Project was successful and should be continued or dropped? I am skeptical that Project will NOT actually reduce (congestion) and after the income stream is established, the tolls will remain in effect to fund other projects. Will motorcycles be given any toll discount? They are less polluting and more economical than most automobiles and could take advantage of smaller lane widths.	Michael Glidewell	Comment form
06/27	Hello, Tolling is a bad idea. I'm not sure why we don't have sufficient highways to support the population, but to make drivers shoulder the cost is unfair, especially to people who are in the lower-economic tiers. Oregon gets plenty of tax revenue from income and corporate taxes. The funds should come from there, not from drivers. Thanks, Eva Kenworthy	Eva Kenworthy	Comment form
06/27	Tolling is an attempt to solve Oregon problems with Washington \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$. NO! NO! NO! if YOU WANT TO REDUCE CONGESTION STOP BUILDING MORE HOUSING AND ESTABLISHING BUSINESSES DOWN TOWN PORTLAND.	Frank L'Amie	Comment form
06/27	We do not want tolls! If you have to do it, at least leave one of them free from it, preferably leave the 205 alone. How about you add another bridge instead of charging people to drive on the roads in their city. Thank you!	Chelsey	Comment form
06/27	It is my belief that a toll to decrease congestion will produce revenues but do little to nothing to decrease congestion. I am assuming that the toll would be imposed during the rush period when vehicles are on the road by necessity not choice. If the tolls collected would be used to add another lane both north and south bound on I-5 and I-205 then a toll might make sense.	David Budde	Comment form
06/27	I've attended some of the past open houses and it's extremely frustrating given the present traffic situation that comments given at the open houses are sanitized and not reported as public comment. This in addition to basically finding out that this is a done deal but just a matter of what form this takes. I find it amazing that no other options are being explored similar to when the public voted no for light rail expansion and it happened anyway. Let's face it if you work your going to pay more. The working public will have travel during "peak" times others won't. Once again middle class will get hammered with more taxes/ fees. I've lived in the Portland / Vancouver area all my life and seen the personal toll that more congestion brings with it. I was in Louisiana recently calling on a customer that just came back from a trip to Portland and Seattle. They've never seen such a liberal city where tents and the stench of pot are prevalent. I sincerely hope that more than one option is explored and presented to the voters. I believe this is what our forefathers intent was. Steven Bartholomaus	Steve Bartholomaus	Comment form
06/27	This plan is ludicrous. No tolls on the bridge. I worked in your state(Oregon) and was raped for full state income taxes for 27 years. I never even lived in Oregon. This was so wrong and dishonest. Oregon stole approximately \$175,000.00 and I got back maybe \$20,000.00. The thieving governors from Oregon allowed this to happen. I was unable to vote in elections in your state even though I paid full time resident state income taxes! Stop the tolls.	Stan Armstrong	Comment form

06/27	Why on earth should the public support this when the HOV lane on I5 North isn't enforced. More than half of the cars I see in that lane during rush hour have a single occupant. In four years of daily commutes on I5 I have never seen a single car pulled over for HOV violation.	Drew Childress	Comment form
06/27	I mind paying a fee if its only used for the replacement of bridge crossing the columbia river. That includes a second and possibly a third bridge.	Robert Loomis	Comment form
06/27	Both my daughter who is just starting her career and my husband will be greatly impacted by a toll. My daughter will probably have to move to Tualatin and forget about knocking out college debt. Her company does not offer great flexibility on times to work. My husband already is losing by driving to Portland with a horrible commute. They both pay Oregon taxes as it is... this is awful and punishing to us. Please find a fairer option. Neither one of them use other area roads that will benefit from the folks.	Kathy Hansberry	Comment form
06/27	This looks like a money grab as there has been several proposals to increase bridge capacity with toll money but this plan offers nothing in return. I am firmly against. You have not increased capacity in 50 years and your one proposal is to charge a fee to tax people out of their cars instead of increasing capacity. Very poor management. Firmly against.	Meredith Patrick	Comment form
06/27	Concerning the bridge crossings, It is completely disengenious. Vancouver residents that are employed in Oregon (and pay the non-resident tax) cannot vary their working hours. It will therefore do nothing to relieve traffic congestion. Portland is millions of dollars in the hole in their roads maintenance due to years of neglect in their "kick the can down the road" approach. The funds collected from Vancouver residents crossing the bridge represents an easy way out for Portland politicians to gouge non-Oregon voters to pay for their own neglect. The dollars collected will not go to the bridge or in any meaningful way to benefit the Washington residents it is being extorted from. I say extorted since Washington residents, unlike Oregon residents are easy "prey" since we have no representation in Oregon. Lots of luck in changing anyone's working hours in the name of relieving traffic congestion across the bridges.	Kenneth Berglund	Comment form
06/27	What part of no tolls don't you understand!!!!!!	Dave Dick	Comment form
06/27	Value pricing lanes during rush hours puts a financial burden on those of us who live in Washington and work in Oregon. I worked for nearly 40 years for Portland General Electric - 10 in downtown Portland and the last 30 in Tualatin. Never in any of those years did I have the option of changing my work hours to off peak hours to avoid rush hour. While there are fairly convenient public transportation options for getting from Vancouver to downtown Portland, there are not ANY reasonable options for getting to Tualatin. I doubt the state of Oregon can prove that value pricing for those willing to pay more would improve commute times. The northbound I5 carpool lanes sure don't help the majority of commuters. Here's and idea - use the income tax we already pay you to improve your roads. Washingtonians don't expect you to pay for our roads, so why should we bankroll yours?	Julie Bailey	Comment form
06/27	No tolls. No congestion pricing. Vancouver residents already pay income tax on top of commuting costs for the privilege of working in Portland. This half baked cash grab doesn't even consider improvements to infrastructure. Clean up your house before you reach out your hand to neighboring states contributing directly to your economy.	Diana O'Haver	Comment form
06/27	We are vehemently opposed to this plan!!! Both my wife and I work in Oregon and already pay high taxes to pay for road upkeep and repair. This is another form of double taxation! This an outrageous proposal! If implemented we will seek work in Washington and do everything we can to never spend any money or come across the bridges again! You want residents of Washington who work in Oregon to pay Washington sales tax, Oregon income taxes and now a bridge tax?! Unbelievable!!! We are already soaked and drowning in high food, gas, clothing, etc. prices on top of ridiculous levels of taxes from numerous sources. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO!!!!!!!!!!!!	Dave Hamilton	Comment form
06/27	No, tolls will not work. A new bridge should have been built yrs ago. A plan was in place and cost millions of dollars for planning in which Vancouver did not want to pay their share. Portland was going in on it. The toll will not ease congestion. I'm retired and I drive so I'm not for a toll so I can drive to Portland occasionally. Need Some smart bridge planners. My cousin is a bridge engineer in Salem and knows all about how much was spent yrs ago on the bridge planning We could of already had a new bridge by now. Be smart about this situation and figure it out. Traffic is awful.	Laura Moore	Comment form



06/27	I am against it. Toll bridges cause more traffic and congestion.	Patty Cassidy	Comment form
06/27	If one of your stated goals is to incentivize public transit usage, please do not institute a toll on interstate 5 north of Delta Park. A significant number of Washington-to-Oregon commuters each day actually already ride transit to downtown Portland. We do so by leaving our vehicles at either the Delta Park or Expo Center park & rides. Our actions thus free up interstate capacity south of there. To toll us would be not only to effectively double our commuting cost (tolls + fare), but also to *disincentivize* our use of public transit. Thank you.	Todd Brochu	Comment form
06/28	Lets be real, almost all major metropolitan cities use trains, light rail, and buses. building more bridges will not reduce the commuting population as most employers are in the Portland metro area. Bring the Max across the existing Bridge (GJ) using the HOV lanes and build parking lots in Vancouver for the Max station. Stop wasting time, tax dollars, and political hot air on solutions that will not improve the situation only line pockets.	Gene B Fisher	Comment form
06/28	How many times do we in Washington have to tell Oregon NO to tolls on our Federal highways and bridges?? Oregonians can come over to Washington and shop and they are tax exempt but Oregon is continually trying to find ways to take our money. If they want to place a toll, put it on streets that are only in Oregon and let the Oregonians raise their own funds. People can't alter when they have to be at work, so how is a toll going to relieve congestion on the bridges? QUIT LYING AND TRYING TO SHAKE US DOWN!!!!!! Maybe its time for Washington to review the tax exempt status of all Oregonians on our side of the river!!!!!!	Christine Berglund	Comment form
06/28	Tolling won't reduce congestion. But it could be a revenue stream to build new train service across the Columbia. another bridge for cars would only add to congestion in both states.	Tim Wightman	Comment form
06/28	Hello, I can certainly appreciate the desire to reduce commute times around the Portland Metro area (I drive from Vancouver to Tualatin for work every week day). However, I feel that the Congestion Pricing solution would provide an unfair disadvantage to those commuters like me who MUST travel the freeways during rush hour times so that I can make it to work and back home again to pick up my child from daycare. I am very concerned about how Congestion Pricing will impact my commute and my ability to provide for my family. For instance, if the Commission opts to toll all lanes, I will be paying the state of Oregon everyday just so I can go to work and support my family (in addition to the income tax I already pay to Oregon). If the Commission opts to create "priced" lanes, I believe that this will only congest the un-priced lanes even more than what we see today because people will either be unable to afford the fee, or will at the very least be unwilling to pay it. I strongly encourage this Commission to fully consider the repercussions that this toll will have on the area's commuters who have no choice but to travel during peak times. My commute is already awful enough, and if I can't afford to drive to work in the tolled lanes, I will be stuck travelling in the potentially un-tolled lanes, which means I may not be able to pick my daughter up from daycare on time, meaning I will incur additional daycare costs. If that happens, I will have to seriously consider whether or not working in Oregon is financially feasible for me anymore. Unfortunately, my income supports my family and I cannot afford to lose my job, like every other commuter in the world. Please reconsider what you'll really be doing to the hard-working people you are trying to "help." This solution will inevitably create new issues for commuter congestion, and I fail to see how this is the only solution to ease rush hour traffic. Thank you for your time, Kaitlin	Kaitlin P	Comment form
06/28	No more tolls or taxes . Enough is enough . The idiots in office welcomes all the homeless and drug addicts , crime skyrockets and they think this is the answer they caused with the over population growth	Tim	Comment form
06/28	I work as a freelance Interpreter for the deaf community. A toll would be extremely expensive for me as I drive both bridges frequently. A bridge expansion or new bridge would be better. But not a toll I would need to pay indefinitely.	Abel Cosentino	Comment form
06/28	I assume "toll booths" will be the type that cars can drive on through using a transponder? Like I-Pass in Illinois? Also, I would like to see the Portlad area light rail system extended into Clark County in Washington. Cost should be shared by both states	Cappy Walls	Comment form

06/28	Regarding congestion pricing on Portland freeways specifically I205 through West Linn I have the following observations: As a resident of West Linn we currently experience major's side street congestion during rush hours on Willamette Falls Dr, Borland road, Stafford road, and Rosemont road, of people trying to circumvent the traffic gone I205 you have to take this into consideration because once you toll this is situation will become even worse and it's a huge inconvenience to the community not to mention a safety concern if emergency vehicles need to get through. I haven't yet heard any rational ways to prevent this so I'd like to know how you're planning on addressing that and controlling that problem.	Donald Feltham	Comment form
06/28	The Value Pricing model proposed and presented is highly reductive. First, demand for commuting is highly inelastic and without alternatives (such as mass transit options) in the local market. This would mean the implementation of tolling will do little to reduce congestion, and only increase costs of commuting. In May of this year, Princeton researchers released a study showing "larger increases in employment in response to labor demand shocks in counties with more open commuting market" and reduction of commuting costs actually led to 3.3% of welfare gains. Translation: the implementation of tolls will increase commuting costs either through direct tolling or through lengthier commutes via non-tolled lanes or surface streets, and will undoubtedly have negative repercussions on employment, housing, and commuting, especially for lower-income residents. Furthermore, the draft recommendation to the OTC proposed Priced Roadway models for both I-5 and I-205. This will leave undoubtedly increase street traffic for individuals looking for more economical commuting opportunities as there would be an absence of toll-free interstate lanes. I would highly encourage the committee to continue searching for other alternatives, as the current regressive draft proposal holds minimal positives for the future of Portland and it's residents.	Chris Williams	Comment form
06/28	So far I have not seen anything that would benefit Washington drivers or commuters. It's very easy to see where the issues are. When you take four lanes down to two through lanes, you have congestion. So far Oregon taxes Washington residents who work there and they get nothing in return. I'm pretty sure the Boston Tea Party was in response to "no taxation without representation". Once again they want to tax people without giving them a voice or real choice and there will not be any real improvements just more costs.	Pat Mathison	Comment form
06/28	This just creates a divide between Vancouver and Portland. We need to connect these two economies so that Portland and Vancouver can thrive off each other instead of acting like we're two different countries. The Columbia river seems to create a divide itself and tolls will only increase this. We pay enough in taxes. And the only way I would pay a toll to drive my own car is if there was a rail system (train) going from Portland to Vancouver and a new I-5 bridge.	Alex	Comment form
06/28	I have lived places with tolling. It does not relieve congestion. People still will go to work, they have no choice. They may choose to spend their free shopping time elsewhere though with their lower expendable income. Employers should be paying for this, not the people they force to drive into an office. Push employers to pay the cost or allow people to work remotely and not commute.	Tanya Burmeister	Comment form
06/28	Overall, the main focus should be making our alternative transportation options more usable. There is not a decent, time effective way to move North - South through the metro area as the bus system requires many changes, and there is not MAX line along the i-5 corridor. Much of Portland traffic involves commuters from Washington, and further into the suburbs as housing prices rise, so the best solution would be developing a much more extensive MAX system, with higher priced express fares with limited stops. The congestion pricing system has potential as a temporary solution, especially if revenue generated goes toward the building of a much more effective and extensive light rail system, AND so long as drivers have a perception of choice in if they use an express roadway or not. It is immoral to make a complete roadway subject to congestion pricing, as there are too few major vehicle arteries in Portland. For most working class Portlanders, it is unlikely that they will be able to shift their work hours to avoid congestion pricing, and if the alternative is to avoid the road, they will still have significant expense in both time and gas for an alternate route. The only way there is a chance of this being adopted is if a lane, and not entire roadways, are subject to congestion pricing so drivers are free to choose it or not, and so long as adequate remaining lanes are left, otherwise the non-congestion priced lanes will have their traffic problems amplified.	Tim Neary	Comment form
06/28	Toll roads add another group of taxpayer funded government employees to the payroll rolls and adds confusion to infrequent travelers. I drove through the same toll	Wendell Beck	Comment form



	<p>both three times in the NYC area before giving up and drive away from the area to restart my GPS guided trip. Extremely frustrating! Tolls become another form of taxation and NEVER go away. In the 1960s, Portland was the bottleneck for I-5 between Canada and Mexico. Portland remains a bottleneck and tolling will not remedy that problem. The I-5 Interstate bridge causes gridlock daily. Fix that problem and figure out how to keep traffic moving smoothly by eliminating choke points. Ensure all road/gasoline taxes are used for their intended purpose. On a side note: I would belatedly like to commend the road crew that, in years past, has paved I-84 between I-205 and I-5 and doing it quickly, minimum disruption, and resulting in a very smooth paved freeway. Thanks!</p>		
06/28	<p>I am currently a resident of downtown Vancouver WA and have lived in Portland OR for 10 years. Obviously we have a huge and growing interstate traffic problem. I believe adding more lanes to I-5 / I-205 is a losing proposition that will merely encourage more traffic. I am in favor of the tolling on I-5 and I-205 because it will provide incentives to people to either: a) not use the freeway or b) find a public transportation alternative. Unfortunately, there are not many options for people living in Clark County. Perhaps if some revenue from the tolls were used for Tri-Met to provide frequent and consistent bus service to Vancouver (think: downtown Vancouver to Delta Park and Fisher's Landing to Parkrose or Cascades). This would free C-Tran from providing this service (which it currently does, at least to Delta Park) allowing it to expand service within Clark County. Perhaps revenue could ultimately extend MAX to Hayden Island allowing for the possibility of a Columbia River Ferry (see attached document) or extension to downtown Vancouver through a dedicated bridge. Projects like these would directly benefit all Portland area residences in the form of less traffic but also Vancouver residences in the form of better public transportation options. In other words: the tolls would not just be penalizing Vancouver commuters. They would actually be funding direct infrastructure for interstate travel.</p> <p>(Attached Document)</p> <p>Columbia River Ferry @ I-5</p> <p>I commute back and forth between Vancouver and Portland everyday and there is one undeniable fact: The Interstate Bridge is over capacity. The Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project, which was to replace the existing Interstate Bridge, was abandoned in 2014. At this point there is no alternative to the already jammed freeways nor will there be for the foreseeable future. The traffic on I-5, bottlenecked at the Interstate Bridge is having a major effect on commerce. How will people get back and forth between Vancouver and Portland? With no support for an expensive, more permanent bridge solution, I believe we have a unique opportunity, right now, to build a ferry system across the Columbia River on the west side of the Interstate Bridge, which will allow commuters and shoppers unencumbered access to both Portland and Vancouver.</p> <p>A ferry across the Columbia is not without precedence. In the past there have been ferries from Vancouver to Portland at the very same location I am proposing, and Washington State currently operates the nation's largest ferry fleet. The Wahkiakum County Ferry is currently in operation across the Columbia River from Puget Island WA to Westport OR. It makes 18 crossing every day, year round.</p> <p>Below are the details of how I imagine this system could be put together and why now is such a unique time for building such a system. The associated numbers relate to the the map at the end of this document.</p> <p>Vancouver is in the process of building a BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) system, called the VINE, from Vancouver Mall to Turtle Place, on 7th Street between Washington and Broadway (1)?.</p> <p>The Port of Vancouver has terminated the lease of the Red Lion Hotel at Terminal 1 and is currently seeking redevelopment plans for the site which is directly adjacent to the Interstate Bridge to the west. New roads and intersections have recently been constructed on Columbia Street which would allow for increased traffic into the site. The VINE could be extended to terminate at this location where the Northern ferry terminal would be built (?).</p>	David Lafayette	Comment form

On the Oregon side, MAX light rail Yellow Line currently terminates at the Expo Center (5?). This would need to be extended across a bridge to Hayden Island. Although the construction of this bridge would be an expensive component of the total project, the bridge could be relatively light, carrying light-rail only, similar to the light-rail bridge from Kenton to Delta Park.

The extension of light-rail to Hayden Island would be a boon for the Jantzen Beach community's economy and a transit stop could be added at the shopping center (4?), allowing transit access similar to Cascades Station on the MAX Red Line near the Portland Airport.

From the Jantzen Beach shopping center the MAX line would continue across Hayden Island and terminate on the site of the old Thunderbird Hotel where the Southern ferry terminal would be built (3?). This site is currently vacant.

The ferry would cross the Columbia River from the old Thunderbird Hotel site (3?) in Oregon to Terminal 1 (2?) in Washington. The distance across the river that this location is approximately half a mile. Because this is a transit endeavour, the ferry boats would not carry automobiles, allowing them to be smaller and cheaper to run and maintain. This would also substantially reduce embarking and disembarking times allowing them to run more frequently.

Connections could be timed so that passengers could move directly from the VINE to a ferry and disembark directly to a waiting MAX train (and vise-versa).

The advantages of such a system such as this are numerous:  
It would be possible to move from Vancouver to Portland (and vise-versa) completely independent of traffic conditions. This is impossible at this time. This advantage alone would entice commuters out of their cars and on to public transportation.

Shoppers to and from Jantzen Beach would have an alternative way to get to the Island. This would take automobile load off the Interstate Bridge both from the North and South side. This may be particularly poignant with Vancouver's waterfront redevelopment, which will bring many more people to downtown Vancouver, within the Jantzen Beach sphere. Additionally, Vancouver's BRT will be replacing the most popular transit line in Vancouver. These people will be able to get to Jantzen Beach and beyond without getting in their cars.

Vancouver is currently redeveloping its waterfront, directly adjacent to the proposed Northern ferry terminal (2?). This would allow residents of this new development (as well as potential hotel guests) the ability to easily move back and forth between Jantzen Beach, North Portland and downtown Portland without ever using an automobile.

Linking Vancouver's business district directly to the Portland Expo Center would open Vancouver's hotels and services to Expo participants.

Alternative way to cross the Columbia River

a. During I-5 maintenance or construction, this would be an alternative route for commuters.

b. In the event of a disaster which may render the Interstate Bridge (and possibly the Glen Jackson Bridge) unsafe, people would have an alternative route to cross from Vancouver to Portland.

The implementation of a ferry at this location will secure land around the existing bridge for possible future I-5 bridge expansion and/or a transit only bridge, should this line prove popular.

I believe we are uniquely positioned to execute this plan at this time:

Vancouver's waterfront is being completely redeveloped, which will bring thousands of additional people to within walking distance of the Northern ferry terminal.

The availability of the Port of Vancouver's Terminal 1 allows for the building of a Northern ferry terminal.

The old Thunderbird site on Hayden Island is available for the building of a Southern ferry terminal.

Vancouver is building its BRT at this moment, which will link the heaviest transit line in Vancouver to the ferry terminal and Jantzen Beach and beyond.

Road infrastructure has already been improved between Columbia Street and the Northern ferry terminal in preparation for the waterfront redevelopment.

In addition to all these advantages, we have no other plan. We must do something and I believe this offers a cheap and relatively quick solution which will give some



	<p>people alternatives to using the Interstate Bridge.</p> <p>Thank you, David Lafayette Vancouver, WA</p>		
06/28	<p>The proposed tolling of only I-5 and I-205 are an attempt to extort money from interstate travelers when there is no intention to expand vehicular capacity. Portland intentionally funneled I-5 through downtown more than 30 years ago. This 'plan' has no vision for solving the dilemma of the city. This is just money flushed down the drain for paving over sections of the 'freeway', so that residents no longer have to look at congestion. This will turn neighborhood streets into 'freeway' shortcuts as GPS navigation systems work to avoid tolling. Make no mistake, this misguided and shortsighted attempt to use Washington residents as Oregon's piggybank will have long term consequences to any future willingness to cooperate on regional issues.</p>	David Williams	Comment form
06/28	<p>My concern about congestion pricing is that it will disproportionately affect those who can least afford it. *As described in a recent OPB News story, gentrification and an overall housing shortage mean that more affordable housing is increasingly in outlying areas, far from the city center -- areas that OPB notes are not well served by public transit. (Example SE Portland east of 122nd, not to mention outlying towns from which people commute to Portland, including Molalla, Colton, Keizer and Damascus.) Thus, lower income people will be hit with higher commute costs due to fuel, time, plus tolls. * While managers and white collar workers often have flexibility to stagger their commute, people who work in lower ranks of business often have the least flexibility in their schedules. These are shift workers who are paid hourly, often at or near minimum wage, and who are expected to be at their posts for set hours. * Transit in greater PDX is decent, but for many of us living outside the city core who work in Portland, even getting to Max or an efficient bus line entails getting on the freeway for a few exits. If you work somewhere other than downtown or near a major transit hub, options are even more limited. "Take public transit" means, for me, getting on the freeway between Oregon City &amp; Sunnyside (tolls?) AND it bumps me to a 4-hour daily commute, rather than 2 to 2.5 hours now. The Clackamas Max line is under-served a rush hour too, relative to other east side trains. There is no easy way to get to Portland from areas like Wilsonville. * I am a fan of HOV lanes. The number of vehicles during commute hours with one person in them is astounding. Combine 3 lone drivers into one carpool. Open HOV lanes and let buses and cars with 3 or more cruise past the congestion. If you must do tolls, find a way to exempt vehicles with 3 or more riders. *Collecting tolls incurs costs, whether using people or automatic machines. Automated tolls that debit a bank account is an undue burden on the group of people (again, less well off) who are outside the banking system. * Countless news stories reflect that wages are basically stagnant and have been for years, but the cost of living keeps going up. Average American household is losing ground, especially with high cost of housing and healthcare and, recently back up, fuel. Tolls add another burden. If you live paycheck to paycheck, as my family has been for several years after layoffs, it is a scary proposition to think about adding one more expense. Please don't go with tolls. It really will be a hardship for many people who are already pushed to the financial limit.</p>	Lucy Allison-Pursley	Comment form
06/28	<p>Dear Oregon, I live in Vancouver and work for Providence Health-systems in Portland since 2000. You just increased your Income tax by 1% beginning July 1st You now take 10% off the top of my already low pay. I did not have the privilege to vote on matters that pertain to the taxes that are taken from my Pay. This is taxation without representation! So now you want to charge me toll to commute to work?! I work Swing shift. Due to the nature of working in a hospital where on occasion, there are emergent situations that force one to work overtime! Connecting with Max or Bus is not possible as well as there are no good connections to where I live. Now you want to penalize me for working in Oregon. Oregonians are able to bypass our sales tax by having a card. Do you plan to offer something to your low cost health care workers who already sacrifice much for the greater good? BTW my father was born in Portland 1918. My family settled in the area in 1851 So I have much history and contributions in your state. Thank You!</p>	Robbin	Comment form
06/29	<p>No tolls anyone who works over in Oregon knows that the congestion is from the lack of proper infrastructure in Oregon and less likely the bridge itself and or crossing... If they need funding and want it from people that live out of state tell Oregonians to use the funds/taxes out of non resident payroll taxes collected illegally from</p>	Chaun	Comment form

	Washingtonians! taxation without representation no vote hiw these funs are spent no accountability for spending of these funds shouldn't they be used to better those lives they are illegally confiscated from! Zero tolls needed! If we do assist in any bridge projects the bridge cost should only be considered from landfall to landfall bank to bank any further infrastructure is the responsibility of said state and the other state shouldn't share in that cost! No traffic slow down tolls for bad Oregon planning!		
06/29	Are there going to be an accommodations for the local residents whose primary means of simply getting to the other side of the Willamette River is the I-205 bridge? For those of us that live in West Linn, we are already dealing with incredible traffic jams if we attempt to cross using the historic (2 lane) Oregon City bridge. Local residents do not have the option of using other means to simply go from West Linn to Oregon City. I wish that those that proposed this, could look at the impact on the local residents. I think that local residents should be given a discount because we do not have another option to cross over the Willamette River. Our closest alternative crossings are Sellwood and the Canby. Please look at the impact on the local residents. Many of us live on fixed incomes.	Carol Smith	Comment form
06/29	I think adding a toll is just stupid. While I work during times that probably wouldn't be tolled, if I didn't work the hours that I work there would be no other options as public transit is not a option for me as it would take 2 hours to drive what normally takes me 20 minutes to drive and that is just one way. I looked at living closer to my job but the cost of housing is just way to high. Paying a toll would also hurt as wages are not very high. My employees also wouldn't be able to pay the tolls. Just a bad idea. Better idea, build road ways to accomodate a growing community.	Larissa	Comment form
06/29	A passenger ferry system from Camas, downtown Vancouver and Ridgefield to downtown Portland should be an option. It is hard to imagine how any tolling will relieve congestion but the money should go to build more local use bridges across the Columbia for local access. One could be at 33rd to SR 14, Ridgefield to Hwy 30 and one at 194th to Trouthale. These local access bridges could also have a small toll. They would relieve the interstate trucking traffic. If I5 and I205 numbers were exchanged that could funnel more drive through traffic to I205. If Hayden Island north bound entrance was closed and traffic rerouted south to Marine drive entrance north that would help. If SR 14 entrance to the bridge was at Mill Plain with two lanes one north bound one south bound that would relieve the congestion of SR 14 coming onto the south bound I5 merge. Also just limiting the speed and lane changes from Marine Drive to 4th Plain to 45 mph and no lane changes would help. The passenger ferry system would be great. I vote for that.	Karen Madsen	Comment form
06/29	I'm sure you (hopefully) thought of this, but people will start taking the back roads and the congestion there will ungodly. It's already bad enough but this will make our work commute so ridiculous. I travel 205-S to I-5 to Wilsonville each work day and I'm just fine getting to work. We are already over taxed, housing is over-priced, gas is highest here than most states so now you want to take the little money we do get to take home and make us pay for the privilege to drive to work. Or have to now leave an hour earlier to take the back roads that will be a rolling parking lot. As most people are saying to each other, this is just another way to get the Government more income for their personal pay. Don't worry about the little people, the elderly on fixed incomes, the people who work 2 or 3 jobs to make ends meet. Let's just charge us all some more. After all, the new BMWs are coming out soon and I'm sure the greedy Gov need another car. And who wants to bet that those same people will get a "special pass" so they don't have to pay the toll. Each year more and more taxes are taken out of our paychecks and I never see anything being done with it. We don't need another scam, just smarter people to control the money we do pay. I guess we have to use that money to help pay for the illegals since they never pay a dime.	Monica	Comment form
06/30	I as a concerned citizen object to tolls on I-5 and I-205 in general and principle because they are freeways, and we already paid for those roads. with that said if tolling is implemented on those roads then there are several considerations that CANNOT be ignored. 1 any and all monies raised HAS to go directly into road improvements with a priority towards improving capacity, and expanding long term functionality. 2 any and all monies raised from tolls on the i-5 and I-205 between the I5/I205 split/merge by wilsonville, and the I5/I205 split/merge at salmon creek should be split between ODOT, and WDOT. 3 this fund should go towards things like: widening I-5 in the rose quarter area, NOT just extending the weave (merge lanes) and DEFINITELY NOT putting "lids" on I-5. 4 this fund should also go towards adding additional routes across the Columbia River, to encourage through travel to go around the Portland metro area and alleviate congestion that way. 5 and this is big. NOT 1 penny of any monies raised via tolls should go into the Oregon general fund, it	Daniel Selfridge	Comment form





	should ALL go directly into a dedicated road fund ONLY! If any monies at all go into the Oregon general fund then this blatant rip off will be exposed for exactly what it is, a cash grab attempt by Oregon to cover up the fact that their policies for over 30 years have been horrible mismanagement and refusals to actually attempt to expand the road infrastructure as necessary to handle growth in use, and plan for the future.		
06/30	The Going St to Multnomah Blvd option will cause traffic to divert to surface streets - bad for neighborhoods and likely leading to more pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities.	Barbara Beier	Comment form
06/30	Our North Portland Neighborhood Watch members (17 total) has unanimously agreed to sell all our properties, move out, and live and work in Clark County, moving out of Multnomah County and into Washington. If the Toll Road project moves forward. We understand that public comment is only lip service, and you have already decided on what to do but, we will document and publicize our move and help enlist other tax paying voters to move out, and away from Portland. We are a group of professionals, Doctors, Lawyers, and include some large developer builders. Our goal is to send a message, by removing a substantial tax base from Multnomah County.	Dr. J. K. Brannaman	Comment form
06/30	Toll roads are one of the worst ideas. Tolls will destroy the quaint residential streets of West Linn and Wilsonville because vehicles will divert to avoid the fees. It actually will encourage more traffic on side roads. The collection of tolls is a horrible way to raise funds with an average of 20% going to fee collection costs. Increasing taxes is a much better solution. Increasing fuel taxes discourage gas vehicles and provides much needed increased revenue. Also increased vehicle registration fees will be easier and better ways to increase revenue. The tolls will hurt poorer residents and fixed income people. Finally, tolls are repressive and do not reflect the Portland areas progressive ideals. The USA decided 50 years ago that tolls were not the way to fund infrastructure and were old fashion. Why go back to a failed system? Tolls in many other states have NOT worked as predicted. Let's not fall for the scam of tolls. Bad idea! We are smarter than tolls!	Danny Schreiber	Comment form
07/01	You are never going to get buy-in from any community on tolling if you don't explain how you're going to keep 205 traffic from being diverted onto local streets. No one is going to just trust you. I don't think West Linn or anyone else should be your congestion pricing guinea pigs. People drive to work on schedules set by employers. If you want their commuting timing to change, work with employers. Don't harass ordinary working people. Either don't toll or toll I-5 and 205 from south of Wilsonville up to Washington State. Everyone should pay, not just West Linn.	Stacey Krish	Comment form
07/01	If you have traveled any of the side roads or hwy 43 in and around West Linn during the hours of 3-7 on weekdays you will already see a significant back up of cars that these roads were not built to handle. Most of the traffic volume is caused by people trying to circumvent the back up from I-5 south to I-205 North. I live in West Linn and commute to downtown Portland. My commute time has increased steadily over the last 9 years. Whichever way I come home there is a bottle neck into West Linn. The proposed tolling on I205 will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities. It will push more people onto arterial roads, create more congestion and make getting home even more difficult than it is now. I would like to know how much this particular issue has been studied in the West Linn/Stafford area specifically and how it will be addressed. I do not support the tolling proposal!	Alesha Buturla	Comment form
07/01	Creating toll roads will add another unnecessary financial hardship upon all the hardworking citizens. Please remember we tax payers have limited funds to support ourselves. If you continue to require us to shell out more and more for this and that, soon we will have nothing left to give. There is a limit to all things.	Lacy Province	Comment form
07/01	I really don't think this will work sill make other roads without tolls have more traffic and not help in any way!	Jessica Bush	Comment form
07/01	I can't even imagine why you would consider tolling highway 205. The back street congestion it would cause through the streets of West Linn is unimaginable. Often times it can take me 20 minutes to go one mile to get out of my neighborhood. Apps like Waze already reroute through the backroads. Also, tolling 205 will stop me from supporting businesses that Require me to drive 205. I will not pay a toll to run to the mall. I will resort to using online businesses. Please consider other options to raise the money needed. Raise our car registration. Toll the bridges into Oregon from Washington. Make a 10 year bond. Consider a tax on electric cars, which use the roads but don't pay a gas tax. I'm happy to pay for the roads but consider the impact this will have on our little town of West Linn.	Stacey Bernal	Comment form

07/01	As a resident of West Linn I feel this is an unfair proposition to those of us who live here. Those who want to avoid a toll will use local roads which is going to increase traffic and accidents on our neighborhood streets. It's the commercial trucks and Washington commuters that are increasing the congestion and toll or no toll, the trucks will roll and Vancouver residents who work in Oregon will continue to clog the freeways as they have to get to and from work. I also feel this is a tax unfair to those who must commute to work and are barely making ends meet as it is. Since side streets through West Linn will have increased traffic, It's the local residents who will bear the brunt of the toll. Those of us who live along the 1-205 corridor between Stafford and the Bridge already avoid the freeway during the busiest times of the day. Congress passed a new tax on Oregonians income with the funds earmarked for roads and transportation. That tax began today, July 1 st. I strongly oppose any of that money be spent towards putting in place the tolling any roads or freeways. If a solution was desired, a designated lane for trucks on both I-205 and I-5 would go a long way to freeing up the other two lanes for passenger vehicles.	Barbara Bobbi Roach	Comment form
07/01	Tolling the 205 from the Abernathy bridge to Stafford Road is bad for West Linn! Our neighborhood street are already incredibly congested and this toll will force even more drivers off the freeway and on to these over taxed streets. Additionally, West Linn is isolated and the Abernathy bridge is essential to the quality of life of West Linn residents in connecting us to Oregon City and the Clackamas area. Please reconsider as this would be devastating for West Linn.	Sarah Clifford	Comment form
07/01	Do NOT place tolls on existing roadways. It will just harm poorer workers and cause mass traffic jams on surface streets and harm neighborhood livability. Tolls only on new freeways or new bridges. There is no public mandate for these current toll proposals.	John Reed	Comment form
07/01	I feel as if the proposed toll area between Abernathy Bridge and Stafford Road is unacceptable... Borland Road is constantly used a bypass for the freeway during busy times already, the added toll will make people bypass that freeway even more and Borland will become even more treacherous and busy. As a local resident to the Westlinn community I feel that this is unacceptable and will wreak havoc on our community and personally my home.	Katie Bauer	Comment form
07/01	This "value pricing" plan is merely another way to tax us! Most drivers do not have options on the time of day they need to drive to work, often dropping children at daycare along the way. Many folks do not have public transportation available where they live or need to get to. This plan will have the opposite effect of increasing congestion on both the tolled roads and the alternative routes through already-busy downtown and residential areas. Over 80 percent of voters rejected tolls - why don't our elected officials listen to us??	Sandra Dau	Comment form
07/01	As a Washington commuter, I feel adding tolls to the only two ways to enter into Portland, is taxation without representation. If there was light rail as an option at least this study would be more logical. If even 1/4 of the commuters tried to ride C-tran into Oregon, they would not be able to handle the increased ridership. This is an ill planned idea. I also have not see any comments about where the money would go.	Brunner	Comment form
07/01	I don't understand how I'm supposed to afford to pay these tolls and keep my job. Also, what will the tolls per day cost be? I can't find this estimate.	Lisa Maxwell	Comment form
07/01	Adding any toll roads to the existing freeways should only be done by a toll on additional added lanes, not tolling already existing lanes. Making all of 205 (including bridges) 3 lanes and making one of the lanes HOV or HOV during certain hours makes much more sense to me than toll lanes. If there is a toll system there needs to be a way to offset towns like West Linn that would have negative impact in cost of living (due to tolls) and quality of life with increased congestion on local roads. Using toll lanes as a source of revenue for transportation is frustrating when taxes for transportation have been used for a light rail system that is not financially solvent.	Mindi Robinson	Comment form
07/01	This is the most ridiculous solution for a very serious situation that Metro has allowed over the last 20 years. YOU CREATED THIS SITUATION FOR US WHO LIVE IN THESE COMMUNITIES! Development without consideration for transportation has created a quagmire at this point. But it isn't just the suburban community responsibility to solve this issue. If you implement a toll on 205 at the locations suggested you will create havoc beyond belief. Those of us who live in these communities travel this section 10-15 times a week, and you asking us to pay a toll each time. We shop in those adjoining communities, we partake in the the restaurants, all the businesses, and all the efforts the towns have spent countless dollars to develop. When you implement this toll we will not be helping and promoting these efforts. If you implement this toll local businesses will FAIL!. What is your purpose here? Is it for the benefit of the	Terry Bostwick	Comment form



	<p>residents of Oregon? Not so. This is a seriously unthoughtful disregard for a serious situation, by those who do not live in these communities or have never considered what the untenable consequence of this decision might be. But most importantly this is a major transportation route for business, transport, travelers for throughout the West Coast going North to South from Mexico to Canada. When all of those using this route, I 205, which was originally developed to move traffic from serious congestion along the I5 corridor through Portland, and those who commute daily, and those who use this route to do business throughout Portland, are confronted with a toll, where do you think they will go????? They will try to circumnavigate through the local towns/routes and create an unendurable road situation along the frontage and side roads that will make living in these towns a desperate situation. You will create road rage at the very least, but also accident, injury and death. The side roads ARE ALREADY enveloped in a quagmire at commute hours, I don't even venture out because a simple trip to a store across the Willamette (which I rely on often during the week) to pick up daily needed items, which normally would take ten minutes, now takes me 30 minutes! If you implement this toll it will be impossible to get my needed sundries or supplies for my basic needs. And GPS suggests how to avoid traffic tie ups on I 205.....Use the side roads! WHAT THE HELL ARE YOU THINKING?</p>		
07/01	<p>if traffic is congested due to an accident, at a time other than rush hour, will the toll be applied? 2) is there any time the toll would not be in effect? 3) my husband has Parkinson's. His doctors are at Adventist (I-205) and his Parkinson's exercise classes are in Tigard (I-205 &amp; I-5). We moved to Oregon City to be in close proximity to both. We try to schedule appointments to avoid rush hours. The tolls will likely be a financial consideration that is not in our budget. Will there be an allowance for exemptions? 4) what happens if this project doesn't meet expectations and has negative outcomes? Will adding an eastbound lane and westbound lane in the two-lane section of I-205 (Abernethy Bridge to Stafford) ever be a consideration?</p>	Cheryl Wetterlin	Comment form
07/01	<p>As a West Linn resident, I am outraged and in disbelief that OTC would consider the 205 highway stretch as an viable "test" section. I can only gather that NONE of the OTC commission members actually live in this area. Not only is this stretch of highway only TWO lanes, but by putting a congestion toll in place, you will push even more people on to the side streets including highway 43. Highway 43 is already a nightmare as are several other streets throughout West Linn. Adding a toll to 205 will only make things unbearable to live in this town. Additionally, how is it that the committee can even consider tolling a two lane highway? That is essentially forcing anyone that uses this highway, including West Linn residents, to either sit in the back log of traffic that will be with everyone else not wanting to pay a toll in one lane or be forced to pay the toll in the other lane. I understand and agree that something needs to be done about the traffic issues in Portland and the surrounding areas....but this is NOT the answer. Please stop trying to ram this toll down the throats of residents that live in West Linn. I don't even work outside the home and I'm am so strongly against the toll idea. I feel pretty confident in saying that if the OTC were to take this to a ballot vote, it would be defeated by large margins. Nobody wants this toll - please understand that. Yes - people want something done about the traffic issue.....but they do not want another tax, which this essentially is. I understand it isn't technically a tax but it is being imposed upon the residents of West Linn whether we like it or not. That is as close to a tax as you can get. WE DO NOT WANT A TOLL ON OUR FREEWAYS. Please hear this message!! OTC needs to go back to brainstorming and come up with other ideas. How about having a contest with actual prize money for the best idea(s) on how to fix the traffic issues? There is a new motor vehicle tax that people are now paying....use this to widen some of the freeways. There are plenty of other options and it does not seem like OTC or ODOT has investigated this enough. It seems more like a money grab than an actual viable solution to the problem. Again...WE DO NOT WANT A TOLL ON OUR FREEWAYS! Thank you, Michelle Cook</p>	Michelle Cook	Comment form
07/01	<p>As a resident of West Linn living directly off Borland rd I am extremely concerned about the impact these tolls will have on my neighborhood. It is already used as a freeway bypass during rush hour and the number of cars on our road will only grow with a toll on the freeway. This will make our neighborhoods unsafe due to the increased number of drivers but will also make it virtually impossible to leave our home during rush hour traffic.</p>	Elizabeth Tanner	Comment form
07/01	<p>I strongly oppose the proposal to toll, or test tolling, within the West Linn city limits or at Abernathy Bridge. Tolls should be put on highways between towns, not in a main road for getting to school/grocery/church/etc. Because of West Linn's topography and</p>	Claire McGrath	Comment form

	street plan, Hwy 43 and 205 within the city limits (and the Abernathy bridge) are needed for residents to take care of daily business throughout the day. It's absurd to think we'd have to drive through toll booths. If this happens I will, 100% for sure, be moving out of West Linn. Pick a stretch of 205 or I-5 that are not right in the middle of a town. This is a totally unfair proposal to the residents of West Linn and neighboring towns.		
07/02	My job requires me to drive around the Portland Metro area, and I'm also resident that commutes to work. I have 23 years of professional driving experience. Believe me when I say that tolling of roads would be a big mistake. Anytime there is an accident on the freeway's, traffic shifts to back roads and side roads of back roads and is a absolute nightmare for drivers trying to commute, drivers trying to pick up their children from day care and those that are trying to do their jobs. I see this happen often. It is exactly what will happen if freeways are tolled, drivers will take to the back roads clogging them up. Those roads are not built to handle that volume of traffic. Infrastructure needs to be built up before this is considered. I am currently on a road trip visiting my ailing father in Arizona. Driving through Phoenix, Salt Lake City, and other large cities that I have driven in the past, they have built their freeways to accommodate large volumes of traffic and Portland metro has not. Portland needs better freeway systems, more lanes and more freeways. The side roads need to be improved and lanes added. I see housing developments going up all over the area but rarely see improvements to roads. Population continues to increase, yet the road systems stay the same. As a long time Portland Metro area resident I feel that whoever is in charge of planning has completely dropped the ball.	Thomas W. Hodgson	Comment form
07/02	This will only create a worse situation for the West Linn-Wilsonville School community. Our buses have a hard enough time making our stops on time due to traffic, let alone all the cars that will take our back road bus routes and congest them instead. You are crazy to think this will solve the issue. Get the semi trucks off the roads during peak commute hours, widen I-205 to three lanes past Stafford Rd and you will see that things will open up.	Concerned Bus Driver	Comment form
07/02	I'm a resident of the Willamette area of West Linn. I am also the router for the school district and work in Wilsonville. Tolling for this section of 205 would dramatically effect not only my commute to and from work but also effect the busing for our school district. Willamette Falls dr is already a mess due to people exiting 205 to get around 205 traffic. The county should have added another lane onto Hwy 205 and toll that lane. In fact I would rather cars were tolled who exit 205 to use back roads. Also I feel that residents who live in this area should not be tolled.	Susan (No Last Name)	Comment form
07/02	I drove from Oregon to New York, and back a couple of years ago. I have never been to many states before that and never been to a toll. Well my experience with those toll roads, were they WERE HORRIBLE! The WORST roads EVER!! Plus. They didn't help traffic at all!! I was stuck on Long Island in New York for 5 hours just because of a toll!! This WILL NOT HELP OUR TRAFFIC, OR REPAIRING OUR ROADS. JUST A WASTE OF MONEY, THAT WILL NOT END UP GOING TO OUR ROADS. PLEASE DO NOT TOLL OUR HIGHWAYS. THANKS.	Christie Thomas	Comment form
07/02	As a business owner in Clackamas in 2017 and in West Linn starting in 2018, AND as a private resident of West Linn, I can say that I am firmly opposed to the plan to develop toll roads. The tributaries in our area (Hwy 43, Stafford rd, Hwy 99, Hwy 213, Willamette falls drive) are becoming increasingly crowded and clogged. Adding a toll to the freeway will only make it substantially worse on the side roads. It will make the quality of life terrible. Last weekend there was an accident on 205 and it was almost impossible to even move around in the neighborhood due to the resulting traffic that flowed into the side streets. Commerce in our office had to be discontinued as patients were unable to make it to their appointments. What would the construction do, not to mention the impact on commuters who are trying to avoid the tolls. We are locked in by the river and bridges and cannot sustain further bottlenecks. In the strongest of sentiment I urge you to find another funding solution that doesn't require the residents and business operators to solely bare the burden for this project. We need a traffic solution not a solution that is only focused on funding.	Kristin Valerius	Comment form
07/02	I think it is another attempt at extortion of the people. Why don't you try cleaning up ODOT's corrupt officials and save some money on administration? how about fixing the most traveled roads so they don't tear our vehicles apart just getting down the damn street. Why are you always asking for more money, and things never change?	Judy Levang	Comment form
07/02	You people are insane. You have one, single answer to everything . . . tax the people to death. You take gas taxes with the promise to spend it on road and then you spend it on trains and bicycle crap. Then come back for more gas taxes for "roads." If	Charles M Provinc	Comment form



	any of you had a brain, you would change the income tax structure so that people are TAXED for every child they have instead of giving them a write-off for every child. The problem is over-population and you are all too stupid to see it.		
07/02	putting a toll on I-205 would be devastating to small businesses and cause intolerable congestion to surface roads already limited by being 2/3 lanes through neighborhoods. While we have better mass transit than some cities our mass transit is NOT sufficient to service even the majority of residents in Multnomah and Clackamas counties, especially Clackamas County!	Bridget O'Boyle-Jordan	Comment form
07/02	I am VEHEMENTLY opposed to tolls on I-5 and I-205. Traffic is already terrible. Toll will result in many people using alternate roads, which are already incredibly congested as well. It will make things even more difficult for businesses and neighborhoods, which already struggle w/ traffic, accidents, etc. We already pay a high amount of taxes to live in the metro area and I don't believe we should be taxed further. Public transportation and car pooling are NOT a good option for many of us and is also very expensive to build and maintain in our community.	Tami Hoogestraat	Comment form
07/02	Tolling I-205 from Oregon City to Stafford would cause huge gridlock on the surface streets, which already back up during commute times. Many days it can take 45 minutes to an hour to travel 10 miles from South Waterfront to West Linn, commuting on Hwy 43/McVey/Rosemont Road. Please do not move forward with the plan to toll I-205.	Barb Daschel	Comment form
07/02	Before adding new taxes, fees or tolls, a complete review of current spending needs to be completed to determine where expenses can be reduced or eliminated.	Dolores Harned	Comment form
07/02	My name is Jennifer Chiba and I live in the Willamette area of West Linn. I have lived here for 22 years and have seen traffic increase on Willamette Falls Drive during rush hour, for people trying to avoid 205 traffic. Please, no tolls!! This will only increase traffic in our area for those who want to avoid traffic AND tolling and decrease livability in my area. Tolling will encourage even more traffic on our side roads and will make it even harder to go anywhere in our city. No tolling!!	Jennifer Chiba	Comment form
07/02	I am against congestion pricing.	David Klemp	Comment form
07/02	This is a terrible idea. Drivers will take side streets through neighborhoods to avoid tolls. This is how our metropolitan area is designed. Tolling will merely change where people drive but not change the actual number of cars on the roads.	Jane Block	Comment form
07/02	In areas where I have lived prior to Oregon, there have been multiple toll roads. (Pennsylvania and Illinois) The significant distinction is that there are alternative highways to use which do not have tolls. Individuals can choose the less congested toll routes or non-toll routes. The committee listed the benefits of congested tolling as decreasing traffic by encouraging individuals to travel at non-peak times or not at all. This is not possible with work commuters and unrealistic. Another benefit of congestion tolling listed by the advisory committee, is that drivers will choose alternative routes. Unfortunately, Oregon does not have alternative route to I-5 and I-205. Tolling those roads will only dramatically increase the traffic through the surrounding communities. Willamette Falls Dr. in West Linn is already horribly congested and would only get worse, as it is the only viable alternative route to bypassing the Abernathy bridge. The last benefit was that people would use public transportation. If you live in West Linn you know that bus service to the area is very limited and again an unrealistic alternative. Oregon needs to create more routes to work, instead of tolling the only routes available to drive. Additionally, placing a toll at Abernathy bridge unfairly burdens those living in and around West Linn, where public transit is limited and our community streets are already overwhelmed with traffic.	Kimberly (No Last Name)	Comment form
07/02	I think your government is totally ridiculous coming up with this toll! It will slow down traffic even more & will only line the pockets of your corrupt government! I have friends that live over there & friends who work over there & this will make it almost impossible for me to visit & for my friends to keep working there!	Lori (No Last Name)	Comment form
07/02	The tolling is a double tax. I already pay taxes to support the roads and this feels like a penalty for poor transportation planning. Not only will drivers have to pay a toll, cost of goods and services will be passed to the consumer thus making the roads we use a triple tax. Please pursue bonds or other short term measures to create a three lane highway system. This is a bad idea and should be put to the vote to the people. This will be a bad day for those in office if this passes.	Lenny Noice	Comment form

07/02	Please do not toll the abernathy bridge! We live in the Willamette neighborhood of West Linn, and believe that this would cause a significant negative impact on our already congested roads. People will simply use the 205 10th st. exit to Willamette Falls Dr. to go to Oregon City instead, which is already a nightmare. I urge you to reconsider this plan!	Abby Eliason	Comment form
07/03	So you're reducing the gas tax then? This will only be more misappropriated tax dollars	Shannon Martin	Comment form
07/03	There is no good public transportation alternative between Abernathy and Stafford so this stretch is at a unique disadvantage to other areas with light rail or adequate bus options. 2. In general, toll roads disadvantage the working poor and are as regressive as sales tax because those who can opt for alternative times to travel are not those who commute during these awful commute times. 3. I don't understand why planning for congestion hasn't been proactive with widening of roads to accommodate 20 year projected traffic. 4. Clackamas County, and Oregon City in particular, has done a poor job of attracting jobs into the community which has forced a bedroom community where commuting is the only option for many to remain in their homes.	Kendra Cruikshank	Comment form
07/03	If you make any section of highway a tollway, I'll use an alternate route, even if it means cutting through residential neighborhoods, to avoid ever paying a toll.	Warren Holzem	Comment form
07/03	We live off Stafford Road and are aghast at the traffic load this street already is facing. Arterial streets like Stafford will be even harder hit if people have to pay to drive on the highways. As it stands now, my family is unable to get onto Stafford and go anywhere from about 4-6 p.m. most days. It can take more than a half hour for us to go four or five miles in our own neighborhood. We absolutely oppose anything that will take more cars off the highway and put them onto our arterials. Tolls on the highway are NOT the answer. Please do better. Congestion is destroying the livability of my neighborhood.	Kate Hoots	Comment form
07/03	Unless the money used from this Tolling that will fall mainly upon WA drivers is used to directly improve the I5 Interstate Bridge or replacement of such or a 3rd bridge at or near the HWY 30/Old Cornelius Pass Road interchange, this becomes just a money grab for other OR pet projects with NO relieve for those paying the tolls.	Matthew Brinkman	Comment form
07/03	One point of view that should be considered for these things: I am currently an intern that has to travel between Gresham and Hillsboro daily. While I have relative ability to adjust my schedule to be able to avoid higher traffic times, not all people have the ability to do so. There are some people who have to make a similar commute with much more strict clock in and clock out times. They too could adjust their schedules, but that would mean they would be spending extra time away from their homes (and in many cases families) if they want to avoid higher toll rates. The idea sounds good, but may not be the best in practice. How will this toll be applied to people who drive through the area on vacations? Rental cars? These things need to be considered and have answers for. If a toll is being made, everyone should be charged, not just local residents, or only Oregonians.	Benjamin Brown	Comment form
07/03	Bad idea. This will only increase the secondary road traffic, which is already beyond maximum capacity.	Cathy	Comment form
07/03	Charging a toll on I-205 places an unfair burden on families that were priced out of living closer in. We're out here because we can't afford to live close to the nicer, safer, more maintained, better served areas of Portland. Adding a charge to travel to work would further the inequity and deepen the divide between the haves and the have-nots.	Katrina Walling	Comment form
07/03	Congestion pricing isn't going to keep people off the roads. They will just wind their way through back streets and neighborhoods, causing more damage to those roads. We need more lanes, not restrictions.	Kim Northway	Comment form
07/03	I am not fully opposed to tolling busy roads to reduce traffic but I do believe that the transit system needs to improve so that there are better alternatives to individual transportation in our own vehicles. For example, I reside in Tualatin and work in West Linn. To take mass transit would require a very indirect route on buses that would take over an hour of my time when driving in my vehicle only takes 20 minutes. Tolls will not motivate drivers to take other forms of transportation unless a better network of alternative forms of transportation are put in place, particularly in the south west corridor, a section of town this toll will dramatically impact.	Megan Boden Alvey	Comment form
07/03	As an Oregon City resident, I think this is a horrible idea! Taxes are high enough as it is, and a new road tax was just implemented. Now you want me to pay if I want to drive to I5 and back? All this is going to do is cause more congestion on local roads for	Shannon	Comment form



	people looking to bypass the tolls. I have family in Hillsboro, and now I'll have to pay to go see them or for them to come see me? Stop mis-managing money and don't tax us any more!		
07/03	I am confused as to why you would choose the section of 205 for your study. This part of the highway does not have the same alternative support structures in place as other proposed highway/interstate sections. You will absolutely see increased traffic in neighborhoods and alternative roads as the area does not have regular bus routes or MAX transportation. Try your study on a section of road that would have more accurate results and alternative modes of transportation. I not opposed to toll roads but some sections of highway do not allow for alternative choices. This study would strong arm or force people into neighborhoods. I can't help but wonder who is in charge of these decisions and do they actually understand and comprehend the whole picture. I hope you consider other study choices. This section is a bad decision since the 205 bridge is the only large bridge in the area to use to get across town...but maybe that is your plan to get revenue!!!	Angela	Comment form
07/03	i dont think tolls is right we already pay a gas tax, registration fees, now a transit tax how much more do you need. tmyou keep taki g more and more money from us and saying its not enough but it is. my pay checks are getting smaller and smaller and the cost of living and traveling to my job keep going up. please figure out how to use the funds you already take from us bef ok r adding more. enough is enough	Ralph	Comment form
07/03	I live in Oregon City and commute to work near Washington Square. Generally I take the Arch Bridge across the Willamette River and get on 205 in West Linn to get to I-5 and 217. In light traffic, it takes me about 25 minutes for the entire commute. If there is a bad accident, it can take a little over an hour, but it has never been worse than that. Sometimes I've taken surface streets instead, but this rarely is a good solution because the surface streets are congested, as well, and I prefer not to bog down neighborhoods. The purpose of congestion pricing would be to encourage people to use other modes of transportation to relieve congestion, correct? I'm not adamantly opposed to using congestion pricing. However, if we're going to have a trial of it on I-205 on the Abernathy Bridge through Stafford Road, there should be other viable options available. What is my other option for commuting to my job in Tigard? As I've stated, my commute is usually 30-60 minutes each way. If I were to take Trimet, my commute would exceed two hours in each direction AT BEST. I already work from home two days a week. If you are going to "encourage" drivers on 205 to use another method to get to work, please provide an actual viable alternative. Even without congestion pricing, I would love to be able to use mass transit to commute. I would probably use it every day if it would only take an hour each way. Please consider adding some loop routes to Trimet for those of us who commute around the city but not through it. There are tons of us, as evidenced by the congestion on 205. Driving more traffic onto surface streets only creates worse congestion and worse air pollution. Let's actually solve the problem instead of shifting it to less adequate roads.	Amy Moran	Comment form
07/03	I would be in favor of the Priced Lane option so that drivers have a choice whether using the faster lane is important enough to warrant the fee they will be charged	Wiley Swogger	Comment form
07/03	I drive for a living as an independent contractor, barely getting by while having to cover my own driving expenses including gas (now over \$3/gal), parking, upkeep and tolls. I do this because I am having trouble finding a fulltime position in my field after turning 50. I moved out of Portland because I could not afford to live there. Housing prices are too high and there aren't enough decent places to live that are affordable. So now I live outside of the big city and commute. It costs me more to travel, obviously, but I don't really have a choice because I can't afford the rent in town. Those of us that drive for a living can't decide to just drive at a different time of day or to take public transportation. And since some of us are not certified and don't drive commercial vehicles, any exemption for these is pointless for us. Do this and now only rich folks will live in Portland and only rich folks will be able to drive when they want/need to drive. My next move is out of state. What's yours?	Jill Oppenheim	Comment form
07/03	Planning was negligent when they built I-205. 2 lanes was never enough to flow that amount of traffic. Now, you want to stop it up further by adding a "slow-down" toll area. Who is educated enough there to even think this is the answer? What option is there to avoid this stretch of hwy when we have a service business in that area? Do you want Willamette and West Linn to be all blocked up with people trying to avoid I-205?	Renee Ross	Comment form

07/03	I drive I-205 -> I-5 -> 217 -> 26 EVERY day. I already leave for work at 5AM in order to avoid the congestion as best I can, but even still, the traffic is bad on the way home leaving at 2PM. And I'm someone lucky enough to have a flexible work schedule that allows me to do this. I have been in OR for 9 years now and I've yet to see any meaningful improvements to these roads. 217 is bottlenecked in multiple spots every single day. Same with I-205 and I-5. 26 has seen some improvements from 2 to 3 lanes, but only where it benefits Intel. We are already paying taxes to improve and upkeep these roads. Public transit is not an option for me. There's no viable route that doesn't include 2+ hours on multiple hops to get from OC to Hillsboro. The public transit system mainly benefits Portland and the wait times vs driving are too high even in the more ideal scenarios (Portland -> Hillsboro). I want to see traffic analysis of the current problem. Proposals to fix the traffic congestion for the next 10-15 years, along with growth plans that adjust along with the rising population and is re-evaluated every 5 years. I then want to see approval and improvements begin, widening I-205 to 4-5 lanes from Stafford to the airport. I-5 should be widened as well. Same with 217. Adding tolls in order to discourage people from using the infrastructure they already paid taxes to support, maintain, and improve is not what I would expect from our elected officials in this state. This will discourage less fortunate folks from driving, reduce mobility for a segment of the population, as well as economic opportunity. It is repressive and not the right way to approach this problem. I bet if you put up a proposal to FIX the current congestion along with growth plans and expected costs and put it up to vote, it would pass. Be creative in how you present the options and vet the options with typical members of the public to determine the viability of it passing. If infrastructure and economic opportunity is something that OR values, these congestion issues need to be fixed soon as our population is booming. We're losing out on economic production and opportunity due to the absolute disastrous congestion in our roads. Repressing traffic and those less fortunate will drive away business and hurt those who are forced to drive the road anyway.	Greg	Comment form
07/03	Hello, I am parent of a 3 year old and 1 year old. I live in NE Portland and work in West Linn. We have 200,000 in student loans, my wife and I work full time to be able to pay off our loans. We also have my in-laws (who live in west linn) watch our kids while we are at work. I travel from NE Portland to West Linn via 205 multiple times a week. I love that we are trying to find ways to bring the congestion down. However, I'm concerned of the impact Congestion Pricing will have on my family. I believe this will just cause people with less money more problems and support a system that favors people that are more privileged. Whatever system that is used it seems important to consider a few things. -Are there other ways to promote less driving? (Car pool lane, incentives for car pooling to work, -Can you apply for a pass that gets you out of paying. Like if you work or have childcare or are below a certain income level. -exemptions to energy efficient cars, and people car pooling. This decision is going to significantly impact my family. There is little we can do to make changes to our commuting to the location of our home, family and work. Please consider the people that cannot change their behavior and will just end up with less money. That does not seem like an effective way to govern. I am sure there are more well thought out plans that can reduce congestion and not hurt the locals who cannot change their commute.	Matt Block	Comment form
07/03	NO TOLL!!! This toll would seriously hurt my small business. Please do not do it, I already pay a fortune in taxes to the State.	James Forster	Comment form
07/03	If this is the plan, what kind of planning do cities need to do to reinforce backroads (Stafford, etc) from people avoiding the toll that don't have financial means.	Sheryl Schiefelbein	Comment form
07/03	Please do not toll from the Abernathy Bridge to Stafford Rd. This would have a very bad affect on those of us who live in Oregon City and have no other true viable options. We already pay more than our share of road costs in Oregon City because we are a through city for areas like Mollala/Colton/Beavercreek and Canby. Traffic coming on 213/Beavercreek Rd/99E already negatively affects our residents. The majority of Oregon City residents receive less TriMet services and have no other choices. It makes more sense toll Multnomah County areas of 205 as they have other options. Please stop picking on the residents of Oregon City.	Amy Willhite	Comment form
07/03	Absolutely not. I am not paying anything.	Jaclyn	Comment form
07/03	Please do NOT do this. We are already paying tons of taxes. We are getting taxed to death all over the place. Rent is high, mortgages are high...How are we supposed to make a living when we are already giving the government money all over the place?	Claudia Williams	Comment form





	Reduce congestion by making it even more difficult for me and my family to get around? What, only rich people get to do anything around here? Only people with disposable income get to have a life? I am just trying to get to work and I have to pay you in order to do that? Absolutely not. Please no toll roads.		
07/03	1. Absolutely sick and tired of paying more and getting less. Just started paying the transit tax on top of other local and state taxes already in place to pay for roads. What I continue to see is billions of tax dollars being spent on light rail that only benefit a tiny percentage of commuters, and a mere pittance spent on improvements to our roads that support the majority of commuters. 2. The only possibility that I would support is building additional lanes on I205 (most of the space is already there) and implementing a toll to use the NEWLY constructed lanes on the highway. I would want to see transparency that shows the amount of money spent to add the extra lanes and an update of how much money is collected in tolls to pay for them (like the Power Ball billboard). Once the construction amount has been reached in tolls, the tolls must be removed. 3. I can't state in strong enough terms how annoyed I am with the amount of money diverted to pay for light rail and bus lines as compared to our road infrastructure and measured against the number of people who actually use public transportation versus private.	Lynn Andersen	Comment form
07/03	Quit with the ridiculous phrases, acronyms and other nonsense words for the new toll road. It's a toll road. Say it: TOLL ROAD. Toll. Road. It's not that hard to say. Btw, it's a sh*t idea and I (and 5000 of my closest friends) would definitely use google maps or waze to avoid it. No matter how cheap it is. No, you don't need my (real) email address for my comment.	MS	Comment form
07/03	No toll roads!!!!!!	Joe Bendon	Comment form
07/03	People in this area can barely afford to pay for basics such as food and housing, now you want to charge them to get to and from work? The only thing this will do is congest the side streets and cause financial strain on those most vulnerable.	Wendy S Breedlove	Comment form
07/03	No! we dont want tolling weve told you no many time and we dont want it in clackamas this isnt portland stop pushing it on us we pay enough in tax tolling wont stop congestion but cause more	Eric	Comment form
07/03	Please don't toll 205. It will cause people to use Stafford / Rosemont to cut off of 205. Some already do it. We are not set up to handle this traffic in semi-rural West Linn and we don't want it.	Robin Socherman	Comment form
07/03	Would love for there to be lower toll or no toll for residents living just off 205.	R Ellis	Comment form
07/03	I am against tolling local residents within Clackamas County on I205 in the proposed section. The better idea would be to set a toll booth on the Washington side on southbound lanes and toll Washington drivers coming in to Oregon for work and tax free shopping. The particular area they want to toll in West Linn is one of the heaviest congested as it is only 2 lanes in each direction. Gas taxes have done nothing but increase, and none of that money is going towards maintaining roads. All you do is tax more and less gets used for what it was intended for. That road has been paid for with taxes. Learn to spend our money responsibly, please. That's why it's called a "budget".	J Paul	Comment form
07/03	Please don't do this. There is no decent public transportation alternative for this route, so you will be punishing commuters who have no other option for the commute, most of them being people who don't make a lot of money. This is a terrible idea.	Andrea Zaugg	Comment form
07/03	You do realize that congestion pricing to encourage people to take an alternative mode of transportation for a route that has no reasonable alternative mode of transportation makes no sense, right?	Andrea Zaugg	Comment form
07/03	Take your toll bridges and shove them up your ass! We Oregonians don't want any toll bridge. Especially not in Clackamas County!	Amber	Comment form
07/04	DO NOT TOLL OUR ROADS. All this will do is f-up all the highways and side streets from people trying to avoid the tolls. At every turn Oregon gets deeper and deeper into our pockets and has absolutely nothing to show for it except begging or forcing us to pay more the next year. We have had 2 new major taxes rammed down our throat this year already!! Start trimming the corrupt fat in the state employee rolls and stupid projects and learn to spend the money you already have responsibly just like we do. I	J Saxe	Comment form

	already pay Oregon more tax than the feds. Enough is enough. DO NOT TAX OUR ROADS.		
07/04	The cost of housing is already too high in the Metro area and wages are not keeping up. Now the State wants to tax how we get to work. If you want to charge fees for a time of use model, you first need to get employers on board to support flex work schedules to help alleviate congestion. If that fails to help then look at charging tolls. The effect you'll have is forcing people to use public transportation, which could take up to three times longer or more. One of the many negative results is more time away from family and higher day care costs, which are already some of the highest in the Nation. There is no silver bullet here but charge more fees and taxes won't work without more negative consequences.	Christopher Cook	Comment form
07/04	This toll will accomplish nothing, you will be taxing us again. Tolls are proven to cause more congestion, look at the Bay Bridge in California, congestion every morning, afternoon and night. This sort of tax will do nothing if you do not plan to invest all the money back into the roads. We as citizens of the 11th state and great nation are tired of being double and triple taxed. Find another feasible way to raise money for road repairs.	Steven Williams	Comment form
07/04	It's hard enough for most of us to afford gas. I need to get to work & can't afford gas & a toll every day. It's creating more stress than anything good.	Theresa Manning	Comment form
07/04	NO WAY, absolutely NOT alright to attempt tolling between the Abernathy Bridge and Stafford in an effort to increase usage of public transit! #1 That section already has enough issues with traffic w/o adding in stoppages for toll payment, #2 there is almost zero viable public transit in that section of the freeway, #3 it is already 10 miles from my home to get TO the freeway and I absolutely refuse to park my car (and where are you suggesting we all park our cars?) and ride a bus or max (DO NOT WANT IT DOWN HERE!) to get to places further south to run errands or visit family, #4 where do you propose a park & ride? There are zero locations near 205/213 to place a park & ride for all the people who would have to catch public transit. Those are just a FEW of the reasons you need to put a little bit of actual thought into this plan. Beyond the above reasons, OREGON DOES NOT WANT TOLLING ON FREEWAYS. This is not Illinois, or California. NO THANK YOU. Why don't you actually focus on solving your INEFFICIENCY in budgeting and waste of money, your bureaucratic wastefulness is a huge cause of much of our budget woes. The rest of us are done paying for your continual ineffectiveness.	Lisa Weber	Comment form
07/04	Rediculous. Stop wasting the monies you get. Was this looney idea from Portland? The city that works? You people need to go home and remove your Spandex. It's clearly depriving your brain of oxygen. A toll road. Laughing my ass off. Get rid of the illegal Mexicans and the traffic will flow more freely.	Janice Williams	Comment form
07/04	A toll is ridiculous considering most families live in same area and need to drive to and from on daily basis to just visit as well as fathers, mothers picking/dropping off children in divorce situations. The OC bridge in downtown will always be backed up and traffic nightmares will be daily. This is a general lifeline from East to West and vice versa for work commuting. I don't believe in tolls since as taxpayers we already pay too much and now this. Find a better way to budget the money instead of always putting the screws to the taxpayers.	Patrice Lahtinen	Comment form
07/04	Tolling will be an acceptable option until alternate Hwys are provided. I have no issue with tolling in large transportation systems such as So California, where alternate routes are still large freeways with multiple lanes. However, the idea of tolling on I-205 creates an equity issue and financial hardship for lower income households, since there are currently no other hwys besides the I-205 corridor. I cannot and will not support this as it goes against all Oregon values.	Christa Wolfe	Comment form
07/04	As someone who lives and works driving all day in the proposed toll test area this really pisses me off the whole tolling thing in general. I have already paid for the maintenance and improvements of these roads twice between income taxes and the gas tax. Yet it's never enough. This state wastes so much money it's not even funny. So in this test area for people that don't want to pay a toll multiple times a day your going to force them onto a secondary road that is already congested? So basically your forcing people to pay a toll or take mass transit which is a joke in itself. Is this greasing the skids for more light rail in the future to Oregon city and beyond? Pretty sure I see that one coming soon. So are you going to be tolling one lane or all lanes in this test area? So this is another privilege tax then. I'll just raise my prices and let the consumer pay for it I guess. I'll add it to my invoices as a state delivery tax/toll.	Lance Schiedler	Comment form



07/04	I'm completely against toll freeways. This will only increase traffic on secondary roads and through our neighborhoods and cause more rush hour congestion in them. Planners need to get going on a long term plan for our growing population, now. They've kicked the can on this and now we're facing gridlock on freeways and longer rush hour times that ever before.	Susan Wans	Comment form
07/04	Why do you even ask for public comment when you do not listen to the public? This will force people to take side roads to go around under affected areas causing more congestion in those areas. Low income people like myself can not afford another tax. You just started a transit tax why isn't this covered under the new tax? This whole thing is a bad idea. I drive a lot for my job all over the area and cannot change times when I do.	William Poindexter	Comment form
07/04	I would support Value Pricing when additional major interstate freeways are built that provide alternative routes. Our current highways that are considered alternate routes along I-205 and I-5 are not 3 or 4 lane highways on either direction. When ODOT can build the transportation system infrastructure we need much like Seattle I-5 corridors and Southern California I-5 corridors, I would support using Value Pricing to pay for the additional congestion user fees.	Justin Wolfe	Comment form
07/05	Toll roads slow down traffic and are costly if you must use them regularly. It is stressful for visitors (tourists) to navigate and could diminish tourism to some degree. If you need revenue we should start charging sales tax. I think at least that is a fair way to generate revenue and we could make significant revenue on tourists as well. Thanks, Veronica Morrow	Veronica Morrow	Comment form
07/05	Hi, My husband works in Portland and pays a hefty State tax already. It seems outrageous to ask us to pay a toll tax to use the roads too. I believe that the State of Oregon collects more than enough money from the Washington commuters through state taxes to cover the cost of road repairs. We do not use your schools, fire departments, etc. Thank you, Sumona	Sumona Gomes	Comment form
07/05	Drop Oregon State Income tax for Washington residents and tolling sounds fair. Without doing that, this is taxing the same people twice, and punishes those who cannot adjust their work schedules because of the type of work that they do. Washingtonians already pay more than their fair share for use of Oregon highways. EVERY PENNY of this 'congestion pricing' funding should go into fixing the very roadways that are being tolled. It is unacceptable to use them as a piggybank for other projects.	Kristen Wallway	Comment form
07/05	This is nothing but a punitive tax on Vancouver Washington drivers, most of whom already pay Oregon state income tax and receive no services. Being a person who drives all around the country, every state I'm in with congestion tolling has the worst traffic. Seattle is a nightmare and a total fail. People will not give up cars if that is the point.	Dustin Schneider	Comment form
07/05	NO TOLLS! NO TOLLS IN OREGON!	Shelly Miller	Comment form
07/05	I have lived in Oregon for over 30 years. I have watched the population explode and in that time there has not been one freeway built. The Oregon legislation has poured a Billion into public transportation to move less than 10% of the population. Now you want to toll us, make us pay more for your poor planning with the idea that it will force people to use other means. I can gurantee every back road back and street will be filled with people who think our idea of tolling is just another way to bilk money from people trying to make a living in this place. With the cost of living in this state your toll roads will hurt more people than it will help. You want to toll something build a freeway and use the toll on it to get it done quick.	Ray Ruggles	Comment form
07/05	We need better mass transit and work from home options, not tolling on the bridges. The 15 bridge is in disrepair and should be torn down/rebuilt. Washington taxpayers should not foot the bill for everything. Washington people who work in Oregon already have to pay income tax, which they get no representation. Those funds should go toward traffic mitigation.	Shelley Bakshas-walker	Comment form
07/05	In the last 50 years, I have never seen tolls successfully alleviate traffic congestion, in fact they generally increase congestion (see IL, NY, NJ, MA). I've also never seen tolls work more successfully at raising revenue than just a straight up tax; (1) there is always the additional cost of a middle company; (2) invariably funds get diverted or the	Ken Anderson	Comment form

	normal part of the allocated state revenue gets reduced (net loss). This is literally one of the stupidest ideas to raise taxes I've seen in my 17 years in Portland.		
07/05	No I'm not in favor of a toll on 205 hiway. I pay enough taxes for roads now.	Debbie Mullins	Comment form
07/05	<p>Congesting Pricing is considered a "stop gap" measure, also a revenue generator. I am not sure if anyone has noticed, it usually does not matter what time during the day you travel on either highway (north or south bound), traffic is in the "stop &amp; go" mode (Saturdays &amp; Sundays included). You do not need a traffic study to confirm this information. The exception to the congestion is after 22:00 (10:00p) and before 05:30 (5:30a), unless there is a wreck, construction or police activity. I am a transplant from the east coast (Boston) and lived through many long days in "traffic congestion". I left Boston before the "Big Dig" was completed. Might I suggest this team take a couple of field trips or reach out to the major cities "on the other side of the mountain" to get a better understanding of their "almost resolution" of traffic congestion. Two bridges across the river will not reduce congestion based on population growth, housing costs and business locations. I believe the end result may be companies relocating out of Portland (or the area), future growth will become stagnant, or traffic will become even more congested as drivers try to find routes off the highway. The surface roads were not designed to handle the additional loads as is proved time and again during traffic accidents (or snow-Armageddon). Another issue with the surface roads is the lack of signal light sequencing. Jacksonville, FL had long range plans in place and recently implemented the changes as their traffic congestion progressively grew. Yes, some neighborhoods were leveled, but that is progress. If one remembers, the highway system during it's construction in the 50's &amp; 60's, neighborhoods and greenery were leveled to make room for the highways. Again, that's progress. The other alternative, mass transit. Portland's is a joke and Vancouver's is almost non-existent. Again, pay a visit to either Boston, New York or Washington D.C. as they have very successful mass transit systems. Heck, even Walt Disney World has a better transit system than Portland/Vancouver combined. I think the most agitating comments behind congestive pricing:</p> <p>Where is the money going?  Who is making the decisions on where the funds are allocated?  What are the long range plans to resolve this problem?  Which direction and where will the "tolling" areas be located?  How long will this be enacted?  Is one to presume maintenance &amp; road repairs will be funded through tolling?</p>	Bill Walsh	Comment form
07/05	<p>Tolling the roads is a bad idea and a slap in the face of every hard working person who uses them to make a living. Portland doesn't have a money problem, we have a leadership problem and planning problem. We continue to pay taxes on gas, on licenses and registration and several other taxes to pay for proper infrastructure. Instead of putting the funds to projects that benefit and sustain the quality of life for Oregonians like properly kept roads and bridges we continue to pour money into bridges for light-rail and walkers and bicyclist and provide no relief to congestion. This is the poor leadership and planning. On one hand you convince people to use alternate forms of transportation and we see an impact. That time and difference in people being off the roads instead of capitalized on to expand and plan for growth in a reasonable and sustainable way we allow the time to be squandered. We allow the growth to outpace the infrastructure. We allow politicians to make poor choices for our city and we do not provide a reliable and safe light-rail that respects the time and schedules of the citizens who it services. Thus punishing those who want to use alternate methods of commuting by not getting them to their destinations on time. Tolls are just another blank check to throw money at a problem instead of coming up with a proper plan to create a sustainable roads and bridges over the long term. The process needs to be fixed before funds are taken from the people and business owners to go into a failing trimet and projects that constantly go over budget by hundreds of millions of dollars.</p>	John Sanders	Comment form
07/05	<p>I personally don't agree with this at all. I very rarely drove into Portland. However you are going to expect me, and others to pay a toll to use a road that there isn't a whole lot of options. I use the I-5 corridor maybe once every 3 months. I don't think that's right. You're also going to expect travelers who may be driving on vacations heading to other states or to visit our state for tourism to pay for this? How about people visiting family from other countries. You're going to expect them to pay a toll to drive these stretches of road? If you come from the airport and go to Hillsboro you dont really have any choice but hit the proposed toll stretch. Now, for the people who do use these stretches daily, you're going to divert a chunk of them onto the</p>	Patrick	Comment form



	<p>interior streets to avoid the tolls. You're going to create more traffic in an already plugged up city. Either you didn't think this all through, or you just don't care. It's all about more money, more money, when a fair amount of dollars in this state are wasted due to mismanagement, and funding things that shouldn't be funded. Another thing, how are you going to enforce it? Are you going to create more traffic jams in an already congested crappy situation?</p>		
07/05	<p>As an Oregonian I don't like to pay extra taxes. Oregon has some of the highest income and property taxes in the union. ODOT has mismanaged the funds for to long and now your proposal is to toll everyone essentially a tax everyday that slows down traffic even more!?! I will donate directly to the current committees opposition as will vote against it. Don't go against public opinion you will set motion to the end of everything you started.</p>	Joshua Daugherty	Comment form
07/05	<p>Congestion tolling may make sense for commuting traffic but doesn't make sense for us downstate citizens who occasionally need to travel through or to Portland on our already tax paid highways. I might suggest another option. Commuting lanes similar to carpool lanes but subject to fast pass tolls during commuting hours. Those fees could help add capacity to I5 and 205. There should be at least two relatively unencumbered through lanes in the rural parts of Oregon on freeways and at least three lanes each way through the Willamette Valley. Also highways connecting the growing Bend should be expanded. I suggest that gas tax dedicated to roads only should be the favored option. Also in road rights of way unnecessary environmental assessments should be waived since the ecosystems have been altered by the existence of roads anyway. We need to reduce the costs of the projects we do to leverage our funds</p>	Peter Ball	Comment form
07/05	<p>Do not toll the roads. Many SW Washington Kaiser patients have to go to Oregon for treatment, like cancer patients radiation at Interstate daily. Also Kaiser surgery is at Sunnyside Hospital. By the time you pay the copays and time off work and gas, there is not much left and tolling takes away from that amount. There is not other option for many medical services. You need to stop wasting money on the mass transit and apply it for the roads. This mess started back in the 1970's and snowballed into today's problems. Also many small business suppliers are only in Oregon. There are no other options in Washington except Seattle to get the supplies. You are going to force people to purchase more from places like Amazon rather than small businesses.</p>	Erin Thoeny	Comment form
07/05	<p>To whom ever it may concern, My family and I are very against this plan or any plan that tolls our roads. My mother is a cancer patient that has to go to the doctor three days a week. We live in Canby and travel to Tualatin sometimes up to five days a week for doctors appointments. She is on disability and doesn't even make enough for our housing bills. This would cut us down even more than we already are. We can not afford to pay to drive to the doctor that many days, and if she does not go she could die from lack of treatment. I also travel that road for school five days a week. We both do not get to choose our times of when we need to leave, the doctors and the school choose them for us. With this tolling system put into place, we would no longer be allowed to leave our town except for back roads. Those will then get backed up and cause us not to be able to be where we need to be. This will cause more problems than we have now. Yes, a lane that is tolled is being used in California around the Livermore area, Washington up by Everett, and Georgia in the Atlanta area. This would be more viable for people that are in the situation we are in. These lanes are only tolled during commute hours. This seems to help them with their traffic though, a toll booth will back up even more than we are now. Look at the Bay Bridge in the San Francisco Bay Area, sometimes it takes an hour just to get to the toll station from the tunnels in Oakland. Which should only be about a 6 minute drive. Thank you</p>	Kelsey M	Comment form
07/05	<p>As a small trucking business (1 truck/trailer), we already pay Oregon a monthly mileage tax for the privilege of driving in Oregon. Adding additional taxes and fees when we're simply trying to do our job is not acceptable. It is not like we're popping over to Oregon to shop, we are working and already pay enough! The latest raise in the mileage tax has added at least \$100-\$150 per month in added taxes. When you add the additional time spent in traffic to get back into Washington after picking up an Oregon based load, we spend at least 8-12 hours a week sitting in congestion. Those 8-12 hours could be spent picking up and/or delivering more loads. I realize that the legislature supposedly created this problem by mandating a review of congestion pricing, but we the people already pay enough. Maybe if Oregon hadn't decided to keep I-5 to two lanes throughout the downtown area in the past there wouldn't be this problem. But now that congestion is getting worse and most traffic during rush</p>	Debbie Johnson	Comment form

	hour is a parking lot, Oregon needs to suck it up and fix the problems created by bad policy, not take even more from people trying to work. Add more lanes through Portland!		
07/05	Not interested in this idea. Anything that costs me more money is a horrible idea. Come up with something else. My paycheck is already paying for state taxes and gas. This is the last thing I would want to pay for. Get a clue! No one wants this	Tad	Comment form
07/05	All these toll are going to do is put more traffic on the side street that are already over crowded. The are not going to help. I think we nee to fire everybody who thought to this idea.	Tony Crowell	Comment form
07/05	Income redistribution scheme. The problem with socialism is that eventually you run out of others peoples money. And income redistribution programs chase productivity out of the region, leaving it a less desirable place for productive businesses to locate, and fewer jobs to compete for, for those unable to move away. Five years from now I'll be glad I don't live in tax-ridden Oregon	Ba Ob	Comment form
07/05	Putting in tolls isn't going to fix anything. We already pay taxes for road improvements. We also just got a new public transit tax starting July 1. We have some of the highest taxes, we can't continue to keep paying more money because of the governments poor spending. Instead of a 2 lane free in one direction it should be made 4 lanes in each direction, this would eliminate a lot of the congestion. We can't afford to continue to pay high taxes, additional taxes and a toll. This is not reasonable.	Amber	Comment form
07/05	Widen the roads first and stop dumping money into public transportation. I have to drive over 50 miles a day to get from home to work from clackamas to hillsboro and the biggest issues are people using exit only lanes to skip all the traffic and the cutting everyone off last minute on both i5 south right after 217 and 205 south at Stafford exit. I know for a fact that if you put tolls on the highways thousands more drivers will simply use the side roads to get around tolls as they already use them to avoid some of the traffic. Congestion is terrible from Stafford to oregon city because it drops from 3 lanes down to 2... traffic eases up both on i5 and 205 once there is another lane again. Most of us can't afford to live in the area as it is. Adding more money into the failed system is not going to help. It will simply make all the side roads worse and add more congestion in the cities instead of the main highway.	Anneliese	Comment form
07/05	Pretty ridiculous idea of putting tolls up. Typical liberal and odot ideas.	Arnold Wardwell	Comment form
07/05	I'm a transportation planning consultant in Portland (+30 yrs) who works nationally and have seen that once the initial pricing is in place - when it's intended to address real and universally accepted congestion problems and is understandable to motorists - it is accepted by all and its usage evolves. I've attended all of the PAC meetings and read through all of the documentation, and while I still have many questions, I do believe that the analysis provides a strong foundation for the OTC to have no hesitation in advancing the program into NEPA so that we can begin to answer the detailed questions. Further, ODOT and its partner agencies have implemented all of the feasible roadway capacity additions, and provided a strong transit and bicycle network in the Portland region. In other words, all that's left to do is to begin to manage traffic flows, as is the essence of pricing. Finally, why can't we institute pricing when 30 other states have? In fact, some of the most conservative leaning legislatures have implemented tolls including those in Kansas, Oklahoma, Indiana, Georgia, the Carolinas, and they are absolutely ubiquitous in Texas and Florida. That is, this is not a red or blue issue, it's a practical solution that addresses multiple needs. We have relied too long on our past successes, including how we price for road maintenance and construction. We are now falling behind most other states in our ability to solve transportation finance and performance problems. It's now time to expand our options with pricing.	Sorin Garber	Comment form
07/05	You are all crazy to charge people who already barely make it. We pay registration and high insurance already. Stop hiking the prices. If you want to make tolls then lower the vehicle registration fees to 40\$ or less a year. We are not banks where you have to charge us for just trying to get to work! How is charging us will resolve congestion? This will place a burden on low income workers who are trying to pay bills. Your government spends money on stupid useless projects and that's where you need to look for money. This has nothing to do with congestion but only about money! Yeah so we either pay a toll bill or buy a loaf of bread--thanks for these idiotic ideas and thanks for making our lives even more miserable.	Nancy Grace	Comment form



07/05	I believe tolling all lanes of I-5 and I-205 in the Portland metro will only create gridlock on city streets. Resulting in cars being used in a less efficient manner and creating more pollution and further deteriorating the quality of life in the city.	Bob Brown	Comment form
07/05	People are having a difficult time paying their mortgage and now you want to make people pay for using the I-5 and the I-205. What is wrong with you? You are not helping the public. You are stealing people's money. You will come up with any idea just to steal money from the people.	Envera Zelkanovic	Comment form
07/05	I will not be paying more to use the freeways that I'm already paying for. I drive from Molalla to Gresham every day, and there are a handful of different routes I can take that will keep me off I-205. Will that be slightly more inconvenient? Sure. But it will be preferable to paying a toll.	John Doe	Comment form
07/05	Do not do this. Your proposal punishes people for going to work. We have already paid for the roads and we should not be charged for using something we already own. I would support a toll for new automobile lanes, new automobile roads. Your plan does not include either. It simply punishes people for using a utility to go to work. I strongly oppose your plan to toll the roads. I strongly oppose your plan for congestion pricing.	Tom Kern	Comment form
07/05	My opinion is that imposing tolls on existing lanes of existing roads/highways/freeways constitutes theft from the driving public who paid for the construction and pay for the maintenance of said lanes of roads/highways/freeways via taxes. I am therefore opposed to imposing tolls on existing road lanes.	Robert Riches	Comment form
07/05	Hello. As someone who uses the I-5 and I-205 freeway systems nearly everyday of the week, I have a REAL solution to the congestion problem. It is painfully obvious that the Portland/Vancouver freeway system is inadequate for the current amount of traffic. I propose that a REAL effort is put into replacing the ancient I-5 bridge, and developing a freeway system that actually sustain the amount of people using it. Placing tolls on the existing system WILL NOT solve the problem. It is merely a method for Oregon to extract more revenue. It is obvious that you are not serious about solving the problem, but only see the driving public as money machines.	Alan Randol	Comment form
07/05	Don't you dare add tolls to these roadways! Taxation in Multnomah County is already too high and forcing drivers to pay more will make their lives more difficult. This will only clog city streets further. In addition, any tolling of small business vehicles will dramatically affect transportation costs thus pushing the price of goods and services higher to compensate. Those prices will then end up at the hands of the consumer thus in effect charging a citizen twice for your tolling. This will have a widespread negative impact on local economy and families. Do not do this!!!	Ryan T	Comment form
07/05	With all due respect, they are called FREEways for a reason. Not only that but, I guarantee that this bad idea is going to cause severe congestion in the residential areas as people bypass the FREEways to avoid paying the toll. You should have seen this coming 20 years ago and started construction on widening the FREEways to accommodate today's traffic. Now, you're trying to play catch-up. Punishing the drivers for your lack of foresight by putting a toll on the FREEways is just wrong.	Ron Patton	Comment form
07/05	Hell no! No more taxes on what we already pay for!	Kate Brown	Comment form
07/05	I support freeway tolling! Keep in mind people might just use alternative routes like neighborhood roads to bypass freeways and tolls. Have a plan to deal with this. Also, consider not implementing this until the Portland-Tualatin light-rail line is completed. And finally, consider using the funds to not only improve public transportation, but also, to fund a new and improved I-5 bridge.	Alex Kaiser	Comment form
07/05	I support tolling on the "free"-ways in Portland, even though I will pay more to get around. For too long, "jumping on the freeway" has been everyone's main way of getting around, and we've all become used to paying nothing for what is an extremely costly system - costly to create, to maintain, and also costly to health and well-being. Because it's so easy and seems so "cheap," everyone is doing it and the highways are now completely gridlocked. It's time to encourage users of the highway system to pay for it directly and support the system that benefits all of us. In the process we can develop a more holistic transportation system for the entire region. Thanks for taking on this project.	Peter Seaman	Comment form
07/05	Congestion pricing is essential, but it should only be used to expand mass transit such as trains and buses and not single occupancy vehicle capacity.	Stone Doggett	Comment form

07/05	I will never allow a tracking device of any kind in my personal vehicle. I even shut off my cell phone when driving. And this toll is just another money grab by Oregon. Just another way to steal revenue fro the pockets of hard working citizens. REDUCE YOUR SPENDING!	Andy Holthouse	Comment form
07/05	I would like to see a possibility of taking a percentage of the amount of taxes paid to the state of Oregon from individual Washington drivers. I understand the purpose of the toll, but, I believe considerations should be applied; such as low income and income taxes already paid. I work 7 miles into Oregon and my husband less, so to pay so much in state taxes and then be tolled, seems excessive. Also, I do see that charging for certain hours would meet your focus of reducing congestion, as it's only between certain time frames.	Keisha Shipley	Comment form
07/05	I'd like to express my support for priced roadways, where the entire road has value pricing. So long anyways as the funds go towards giving people alternatives to driving, ie improved bike and public transit facilities.	Bradley Bondy	Comment form
07/05	I think its a great idea! Funds should go to more pubic transit options and safer sidewalks and bike lanes, to rebalance the lopsided funds and subsidies that have traditionally gone to car centric modes of transportation.	Kent Wu	Comment form
07/05	There are no decent alternative routes that aren't also congested. This idea of tolling 205 further limits and potentially denies access to our already economically disadvantaged population. There are other major bonds coming up on our local ballots - we simply can't afford this and, as it actually makes life more difficult - I would say NO TOLL on 205!	Lindsay Brady	Comment form
07/05	Please consider having the tolled areas start and end beyond the neighborhoods that are adjacent to the freeway, otherwise you will just get tons of traffic on side roads trying to bypass the tolls. For example the tolled area for I-5 should include the I5 bridge and extending to beyond the Rose Quarter to the Marquam bridge at the least. It would also help low income folks if the transit was improved, ie bus only lanes and improvements to bike infrastructure especially the connections from North Portland to the I5 bridge. A park and ride area on the WA side may also be helpful, as well as extending the boundaries of the various e-bike and e-scooter share companies that are just about to start up here. Give people feasible options that are safe, convenient and efficient and many will switch, at least some of the time.	Anna Gonsalves	Comment form
07/05	I feel it's absolutely absurd to place tolls on roads that are paid for with taxpayer dollars. Our roads are so poorly maintained even though we are taxed for that purpose. Adding additional tax and tolls will only fund more committee members salaries and wages for workers and leave no additional money to actually make the needed improvements. Tolls will also only serve to redirect traffic around the toll areas, which will have a huge negative impact on neighborhoods and roads which are not built to withstand the increased traffic flow. Absolute horrible idea!	Marci	Comment form
07/05	No, this is unacceptable as there is no direct bus line that goes that goes from Oregon City to Tualatin. Many people commute from these regions and that's adding more stress to their already limited budget. Plus, there's a new transportation tax that's coming out of our paychecks. Implementing a toll for 205 will only add more congestion to the side roads.	Stephanie L	Comment form
07/05	Living in Portland is far too expensive for the average family, even with double income. That is why my husband and I live in Vancouver. It is where we can afford to live. I tried finding in employment in Vancouver / Clark County, but the job market is nowhere near as strong as in Portland. I would love seeing alternative forms of transit provided. Perhaps I am too idealistic, but what about a couple of express trams between Vancouver and Portland with a few key drop off stations along the line? Poll Clark County residents and see who works where, find out where the greatest work populations are in Portland, and provide disembarkment stations close to those areas. Discount to those willing to use their bike for the balance of their commute. Make it only for folks who work. But I dream. Bottom line: I disapprove of the toll, unless it is temporary and all funds will go into alleviating the congestion. My husband and I already pay OR state tax. Put that money to fixing the problem rather than tolling us to come to Oregon from Vancouver, WA to work.	Katie Konz	Comment form
07/05	So the plan is to punish Washington residents even more, but now with tolls in addition to the tax penalty we pay for providing you a labor force while we support Oregon businesses? Or we could build another bridge and extend the max line into Washington. Which one of these options is most fair and alleviates the problem?	Matt	Comment form





07/05	Regarding tolls... I'm in favor of tolls when they serve to pay for a legitimate expense. For example, if a new bridge was built for a third crossing, or a replacement for the existing I-5 Bridge. However, to use them as a means to 'normalize' congestion, is not what a toll is for. Unless you are using a negative experience such as sitting in traffic as a means to justify taking money from people. Presently the I5 and I205 bridges are choke points for Traffic. The congestion is partly due to the limited number of lanes. This congestion is also a result of people opting to live in Washington and work in Oregon. Both of these facts will not be fixed by adding a toll. In fact, the only way that traffic will be lightened in any way is if people decide to move down to Oregon, closer to their employment. As a Washington Resident, I feel that this is a direct attack on Vancouver, and will not only reduce the population of Vancouver, but will cause a shuttering of business, and tax revenue, that will send Clark County into a negative spiral. People do not chose to drive in congestion. If they had options, they would have chosen those options already. Further punishing someone that is already suffering through traffic does not seem like a valid solution. We need to face the fact that the area has grown past the capability of the arteries in our metropolitan area. The freeways need to grow. If the Tolls are used as a "Temporary Means", I'm ok with that. But I resist the need for a permanent toll.	Anthony Rauch	Comment form
07/05	No means NO! Poor people will not be able to afford this. Side roads will be heavily impacted. This state are horrible, horrible stewards of the taxpayers dollars. Just horrible!	Deb Gray	Comment form
07/05	we carpool downtown from Vancouver. MAKE CARPOOLS EXEMPT FROM TOLLS OR NONTOLL HOURS 2) we already pay Oregon income tax STOP MAKING US PAY FOR YOIR ROADS AND PROJECTS. WE OAY FOR WSDOT AND OREGON PAYS FOR ODOT. SIMPLE. 3) do not tollat the border. This is making all Vancouver commuters pick up your tab. Toll in south of downtown areas ONLY 4) we have the highes Washington sales tax in the country and Oregon has second highest income tax. Oregon employed Vancouver residents are already hit hard. Leave us alone!	Lori Korab	Comment form
07/05	This isn't going to reduce congestion. This will just anger people even more over the terrible driving conditions in the area. As it is the park and ride areas are always full, and you can't guarantee that public transportation will get you where you need to be on time. Not to mention the buses in Portland are usually full. People don't have a choice but to drive from all over the place because they can't afford to live closer due to the ever increasing rent. Lower rent, people will live closer, thus fixing a lot of congestion. What about all the small businesses that drive to get to jobs? Construction workers and contractors can't take all their tools on a bus. Mothers of children don't want their toddlers on a germ infested train. This is obviously not about congestion. If you want to fix congestion expand the roads and get rid of those stupid ramp lights. They just slow traffic down. You can't merge into 55mph traffic doing 30mph, which is what people here are doing because they have to stop before entering the highway. What really needs done is constructing a tolled business bypass. There needs to be another highway in and around. But don't punish people for needing to drive their kids to school. Or not having a choice but to drive from Vancouver to afford their rent and work in Portland. Or veterans trying to get to their doctor's appointment.	Stephani e	Comment form
07/05	This in now way ease the congestion. You already tax way to much. You will continue to force people out of Portland. I feel thatbis your goal however. This is just theft of the people who are forced to cone across due to work. You already take income tax ( way too much) now more? Maybe learn to budget? Maybe put the money were you already get where it's supposed to go? This is a scam.	Matt Wesnee	Comment form
07/06	No tolling. I will not pay if you put a toll on, I will sue to invalidate the tolling.	Joseph Smyth	Comment form
07/06	This is a very, very unfair taxation for the people of the SW Metro region. Why are you targeting out this region? I don't see any plans for tolling going east or west bound on 84 or Hwy 26 Why not them too? This is not right. You will make all of West Linn, Tualatin and Lake Oswego, Tigard and Milwaukee unlivable as people cut through their down towns and neighborhoods to bypass the tolls and get around the grid lock. Your will also damage downtown Portland as people are forced to move companies out of the city because their employees can no longer get to work on the freeways. What we need are plans for more roads and wider lanes now to accommodate for the growth. More and more people are moving here and tolling is not going to help with all the new traffic that will follow.	Lyn Burniston	Comment form

07/06	Thank you for your work on value pricing. I urge you to rapidly adopt the long-term implementation plan identified for I-5 and I-205 (Concept C). As the report notes, this option will most effectively manage demand for highway usage and will generate the greatest amount of revenue. Please dedicate all revenue from value pricing to enhance transit, biking, and walking infrastructure so that more people can enjoy high-quality alternatives to driving when accessing destinations. Using revenue in this way benefits everyone, including people who choose not use transit, bike, or walk, because everyone who pays for value pricing receives faster and more reliable trips in return for their payment. Adding capacity to freeways to eliminate bottlenecks, including through auxiliary lanes, does not meaningfully reduce congestion, and adds to the negative effects motor vehicles have on human and environmental health. Please do not expand our freeways. Thank you!	Matt Ferris-Smith	Comment form
07/06	If the revenue from this toll were to be used to fund the construction of a commuter rail system from Vancouver to portland at the I5 and 205, and fixing the roads / on and off ramps then this would be a great. Also if there were discounts for those folks that have jobs in the portland area due to govt requirements ie. Military personnel or federal employees. Then maybe I could get on board.. California has a great model of a roll road using fast pass in one lane but the other lanes are free, if you want to drive without traffic then you just purchase a fast pass.	Jeff	Comment form
07/06	Can we just take the toll out of the 17% recreational cannabis tax?	Jonah Shore	Comment form
07/06	I do not believe it would be a good idea to charge a congestion fee. People who live in Washington and work in oregon ALREADY pay your taxes, not to mention the people who come to the city and support all businesses are contributors to your city and there is no such thing as a "not so congested" time. With almost 2.5 million people in the portland metro area alone, you're asking a lot from us. I feel you as a team can help distribute the already paid taxes better and more efficiently than it has been done in the past. I hope you do not go through with this. If you do i will make any poiny i can to not travel to your state.	Bailey Moore	Comment form
07/06	I don't think this is going to help with congestion. The issue is not really the bridges, it is all the interchanges in Oregon where people have to merge that are the problem. Oregon really needs to reconsider its revenue sources overall. Have you heard of this thing called a sales tax? It's great, people that don't live there actually contribute to the economy! Such a novel idea. Anyway, seriously, stop trying to get more money from the people, who already pay you so much in taxes and by supporting local businesses. This is a major freeway connecting the entire West Coast of the United States. Think outside of the box, and stop doing stupid things, like having 4 lanes merge into 1 from Airport Way to get on the Glen Jackson bridge northbound.	J P	Comment form
07/06	I So ODOT you really think that tolls on I5 and I205 through the core area are the way to go, you're nuts. People are already using the surface streets to avoid the congestion, it will just put more people onto them because they can easily avoid I5 and I205 on streets that run parallel. And trying to stop that hasn't worked either! Oh and another thing those stupid electronic signs to tell me how long it's going to take to get from where I am to further down the road are just a waste of money. Especially the ones on Hwy 26 through Govy when you should have built on ramps into Govy and out of Govy at both ends, instead of having to cross 50 mph traffic! What were you thinking??	Jack Walker	Comment form
07/06	I I am NOT happy with this idea! I already pay taxes for roads PLUS you people imposed the gas tax and now THIS! No way! Not fair! I	Michael Anderson	Comment form
07/06	I Adding tolls to Portland area highways is an awful idea. It will drive highway traffic to city streets that are not well maintained and not suited for higher traffic volumes. It also punishes people who need to use the highways to get to their jobs in order to stimulate the local economy. A test on Hwy 205 between OC and Lake Oswego would be a nightmare. Drivers would flock to Willamette Dr and Hwy 43 to avoid the toll. Tolls increase traffic on surface streets. The state should consider adding lanes or limiting big rig travel during peak hours like 7-9am and 3-6pm.	Jamie Voelker	Comment form
07/06	Adding tolls to the roads will hurt commuters who have to drive because the public transportation does not connect a majority of the city with places people need to go. The current transportation is also lacking in efficiently connecting Vancouver and the	Heather Strain	Comment form



	Portland area. Instead of charging commuters, why is the city not focused on creating a better public transportation system that better interconnects the whole of the city and focusing on encouraging more bike transportation?		
07/06	<p>I First of all, any plan to charge tolls on public highways is an admission of failure on the part of our elected and appointed officials to accomplish one of their primary job responsibilities. That job is to raise, allocate, and spend money (from all taxpayers) to build and maintain public infrastructure (for all taxpayers). Establishing highway tolls is just a ruse to raise money from taxpayers without having to call it taxes, ducking the hard work (that they volunteered for) in Salem necessary to raise adequate funds. The legislature and governor need to do their jobs, not shove it off onto the public.</p> <p>Secondly, "value, or congestion" pricing is just a dishonest way of saying..."we are going to allow wealthy people to buy their way out of traffic congestion that poor people will just have to put up with". In other states and communities these are called, with good reason, Lexus Lanes! What's next, selling Premium Library Cards that allow some people to jump to the front of the line or get a first shot at new books? Reserved lanes at public swimming pools for people who buy Value Passes? Premium picnic spots at public parks reserved for those who can afford a Platinum Parks Pass?</p> <p>    ---  </p>	France Davis	Comment form
07/06	<p>Congestion pricing is great! It is the only proven way to actually reduce congestion. I'm thrilled this process is moving forward. I think that this is a good first start, but I would ask that you please go bigger and add congestion pricing to the entirety of I-5 and I-205 through the Portland area. This will do the most to reduce congestion and mitigate traffic diverting to local streets. There will likely be some push back at the beginning of the process, but once it gets going, I'm sure people will love it. Thanks and please push for more! Brad Portland</p>	Brad Baker	Comment form
07/06	<p>Dear ODOT / Oregon Transportation Commission, I am writing today to express my strong concerns over the recent news that the state is seeking to add tolls (and/or peak tolling) to Portland area highways. While I understand that this is currently only in a development / pilot phase, I have no doubt it will be implemented in some form or fashion, and extended even further as time goes on (such as to Hwy 217, etc.). Adding tolls to metro area highways is going to burden local residents, local businesses, and tourists alike. Not to mention the fact that pushing traffic (including commuters) to surface streets is going to be a huge issue for the communities that border said highways. Thus, a tolling solution isn't really a "solution" at all -- the problems are simply being shifted elsewhere. At the very least, local governments should be equal stakeholders in this project. For example, in our community of Tigard, the city already has trouble keeping up with street repairs and traffic flow. Adding thousands of additional vehicles per day that are trying to avoid paying tolls by taking surface streets is just asking for a problem. Those repair and law enforcement costs are then passed along to residents and businesses on city utility bills, as well as increased property taxes. Essentially, everything trickles down -- the money has to come from somewhere. From there, of course the long-term push will be to expand public transportation and strongly suggest that people use it. However, not everyone has the desire or ability to ride public transportation, which means getting in a vehicle for travel. It could be due to crime concerns, bad weather, medical or mobility issues, time constraints, childcare, combining errands, transit delays, or just the fact that it is not convenient for their particular location. Implementing tolling on highways is going to create a hardship on local businesses, too. When they have to pay tolls to deliver and move their products across town, they will pass these increased costs along to the consumer. In this way, the tolls will become a de facto sales tax. So, in closing, while ODOT stands to benefit in the way of bringing in millions of dollars to their budget, local cities and counties will have to open their own coffers, local businesses will have to increase operating costs, and local residents will have to open their wallets. This is the hidden and unseen burden that is definitely not being considered in tolling. While I applaud ODOT for seeking to find creative ways to fund highway repairs and expansion in the Portland metro area, I do not think this is the right solution. We have a state budget and pay yearly taxes for a reason -- it involves oversight, accountability, and voter representation. A toll system will have none of these, or just a cursory version of it. If ODOT is truly serious about seeking a toll (or user fee as trialed years ago) for driving on state-maintained highways and roads, then they need push for eliminating state vehicle registration fees and DEQ inspection fees at the same time. There is no such thing as a free lunch. Thank you for your time in</p>	C. DiGennaro	Comment form

	considering these comments, and for providing a way for the public to share their thoughts online. Ironically, not everyone has the ability to travel via a state highway for many miles at commute time to attend a meeting on traffic congestion.		
07/06	I do not believe that this will help the traffic issues in this area at all. There is not enough lanes to support the amount of traffic in the area this is a main arterial for the west coast of the North America continent. There needs to be a bypass and new Bridges put in this area . Paying for the additional lanes and bridges should come from the mass transit and bicyclists that have used the money and not payed there part. The driving community is not supposed to support anything other than the driving community not other special projects.	Doug Fulton	Comment form
07/06	I Charging tolls of any type to use our public highways is a terrible idea and would make me very unhappy. I I --- I	Clare	Comment form
07/06	Value pricing (aka tolling) should not be implemented until there are alternative options that are as or more attractive and as or more affordable for the public as driving on the freeways. Otherwise, it will result in diversion to side streets for those who are price sensitive (either by nature or necessity) and continued use of the freeways by those who are not or for whom driving during peak times on freeways is not a "choice" (i.e. commuters). Instead of fixing traffic problems, we will be diverting the traffic problems to other areas and harming members of our community who will be forced to pay for making a choice that is not really a choice at all - getting to work. I understand some of the current congestion is due to non-mandatory trips, but might I suggest that people who are taking non-mandatory trips in a car are already price insensitive - they have sufficient discretionary funds to be able to choose to flush dollars down the pipe by owning and driving a car and choosing to sit in traffic wasting gas when they don't have to. These are not the folks who will be deterred by a toll. Similarly, I expect that much of the congestion is due to people living far away from work. Given the soaring housing prices in the area, the short term nature of many jobs, and the competition for housing, most people do not have a true choice to live closer to work. They are priced or bid out of this privilege, which is increasingly only available for a lucky few. With tolling, you add insult to injury for folks who might love to live closer to work and leisurely bike or stroll to the office, but cannot afford anything half way decent closer to work and are therefore forced to not only drive a long distance, but to also pay it as well. If tolls are implemented, they must be rolled out at the same time as extensive investment into our public transportation system. I understand funding is an issue, but I don't see an equitable way to implement tolling effectively without this component. If we are serious about reducing congestion, increasing accessibility, and mitigating our environmental impact, we should prioritize building a max line parallel to all freeways with efficient connecting lines, ample parking, and a wide ranging network of buses (including express lines for our far out suburbs which are now among the last affordable places to live in "Portland"). This seems daunting because we are a fairly sprawling small city that is built for cars. Which is the problem! Tolling won't fix the fact that Portland and it's surrounding areas were built for cars, and so driving is not really a "choice" that tolling will change. Perhaps the threat of tolling will provide a perfect incentive for people to start approving massive revenue increases and allocation to our public transit systems - which I expect will be one of the sole truly positive benefits of this value pricing proposal.	Laura Warf	Comment form
07/06	I While I'm not opposed to value pricing in these areas, I really believe it is also necessary to add additional lanes to these highways. As soon as you ask people to go from three lanes to two, traffic stops. To be honest, three lanes doesn't seem like enough with the amount of people moving here everyday. The amount of traffic congestion in the last year has increased so much that I have changed my work schedule twice to avoid sitting in traffic for hours each day. I feel like in addition to value pricing, the roads need to be bigger to accommodate for the growth in the area.	Melanie	Comment form
07/06	I live very near the second exit on I-5 south bound. Seriously, The roads in my neighborhood are already congested enough, what make you think that the cars wont get off I-5 and drive our neighborhoods. I cross marine drive to enter my neighborhood and I have waited as long as 20 minutes to get into my neighborhood, the drivers today are rude. How can you think that this imposed fee wont hurt working class. from a lifelong Oregonian planing to move out of the state I love upon my retirement. I cant afford it.	Julie Higgins	Comment form



07/06	I Can you say GRIDLOCK? Are you people insane? Wow! Here's an idea, Build another 205 on top of the EXISTING 205 DUH	Pete	Comment form
07/06	I It does not seem feasible to encourage people to use alternate forms of transportation in an area so limited to alternate forms of transportation. No bus lines, no Max line, no bike Lanes are available from Abernathy to Stafford. The new tax is already automatically being taken from my paycheck, now on top of that you want me to pay a toll to get to work where. I'm earning the paycheck that you are already taxing? Come on!	Tina Day	Comment form
07/06	I I strongly oppose any tolling or congestion pricing on Oregon roads. The congestion is a result of this State and Portland's misguided policies on transportation which have lavished all the resources to light rail instead of adding more highway capacity. Any attempt to toll the freeways will result in massive public outcry and all politicians who support this will suffer the consequences in the next election. As will the socialist bureaucrats who are foisting this on the public. These highways are paid for with our federal and state taxes. Do a better job of spending this money on roads and bridges instead of the bloated pension system.	Junaid Omar	Comment form
07/07	If you have to put in tolls, then just try one at a time and see how much longer it takes a truck to go from the Interstate Bridge on the OR side to the Tigard exit for example. Only add one more toll if it is less than 5 minutes longer.	Kristin Mangino	Comment form
07/07	Biggest concern: It will re-route the traffic off the freeways to the local surface streets that are way over loaded now and effecting the neighborhoods.	Sue Conachan	Comment form
07/07	I would like to submit the following comments regarding the Value Pricing Policy as proposed.  Tolling without additional capacity. While the proposed tolling, whether limited to Plan B or the full Plan C, is said to be a congestion pricing model to encourage alternate behavior, many employees driving from Clark Co to work in Portland do not have control over their work schedules or destinations. The idea of tolling the routes without expanding capacity is bad policy. Mitigation for Clark County Commuters. Clark County residents that work in Oregon are already paying OR State Income taxes, without receiving much of the benefits of OR residency. To add a toll to their fixed costs would be an added burden that should be either waived or subsidized. This could be done with free toll passes or credit on tax form. Effect on local streets. By tolling I-5 and later I-205, this will merely shift additional traffic onto local streets in Portland as well as Vancouver. This merely passes the financial responsibility to local cities that will need to manage wear from the additional traffic.  I support the concept of studying tolls for sections of the I-5 corridor, but would hold these factors important in any possible recommendation:  Alternate routes would be available without tolls. Normally a tolled road is a freeway/alternative that may be faster or better pavement, not every option to get through an urban community. Tolls would be used to expand capacity. This could be done through bonding, but a significant amount of revenues from the tolling should go to expanding capacity, either by adding lanes and/or adding public transit options. Relief for WA residents working in OR. As mentioned above, WA residents are already required to pay OR income taxes and do not receive the full benefit of these funds. Some consideration should be made to reduce the impact of any tolling system.	Rebecca Wiegand	Comment form
07/07	Hi - I submitted a similar letter to the PAC. Let me start by saying that I fully support tolling the entire I-5 / I-205 highway system because I believe it could lessen congestion and provide needed funding for mobility improvements. I do not, however, support ANY proposal that would implement a toll on I-5 south of the Marine Drive exit (including the current proposal to start tolling at Going) as it would unjustly impact residents in North Portland who are more racially diverse, younger, and have lower incomes than those in the city as a whole. These residents will be impacted in two ways: 1) More traffic will be diverted through these neighborhoods to avoid tolls	Alexandra Degher	Comment form

	<p>(the PAC's study has demonstrated that this will occur at significant rates); and 2) These residents rely more on cars to get to work than the rest of Portland, and being less able to avoid the tolls, will be specifically targeted and financially burdened by them. A recently published study by students in the PSU Masters of Urban and Regional Planning program specifically looked at transportation issues in North Portland, focusing on impacts to low income and minority communities:(<a href="https://sites.google.com/view/northpdxconnected/home">https://sites.google.com/view/northpdxconnected/home</a>). It found that the share of people in North Portland who use vehicles to drive to work is higher than in the rest of the city; Willamette Blvd alone carries almost 20,000 vehicles a day to Greeley and I-5. In addition, North Portland is more racially diverse, has lower incomes, and more youth than the city as a whole. Communities of color and those with lower incomes are more heavily concentrated in Kenton, St. Johns and Portsmouth. Portsmouth is the most racially diverse census block in Portland with 51% people of color and an average household income of \$38k; it also hosts New Columbia which is one of the largest mixed income housing projects in the state. I understand that there is a desire to perform a tolling "pilot" but I would urge you to start tolling north of Marine Dr on I-5 so there is less diversion through neighborhoods such as these. In addition, if the committee made the effort to toll the entire stretch of I-205 and I-5, it would not be deemed as specifically discriminating against low income and minority residents. I understand that the political climate may not be great for this right now but that is not an excuse to discriminate especially in a region that the City has promised to assist. NoPo is losing its low income and minority populations and I urge you to not push through a project that could cause even more of them to have to leave NoPo.</p>		
07/07	<p>Pointless. Oregon has decided to use tolling to (doesn't matter what name you put in it, that is what it is) provide an incentive to a few commuters to change their habits while charging the majority of the committees who for many many reasons are unable to adjust their commute time. Typical uncaring government: we will punish the majority to reward the minority, and don't care what the effects are. Seems to me the actions of Oregon are a step toward tyranny...</p>	Kyle Nickels	Comment form
07/07	<p>Please implement congestion pricing along the full length of I-5 and I-205 through the Portland area. It'll reduce congestion in the area, minimize traffic on local streets, and improve air quality in Portland. Also, please ensure that all revenue raised beyond implementation of congestion pricing goes to improving transit infrastructure in the area. This way we'll ensure congestion pricing is equitable and it'll help keep our air quality better. If excess revenue raised from congestion pricing goes towards more freeway expansion, the whole project will be a waste.</p>	Monique Gaskins	Comment form
07/07	<p>The concept of charging us for driving on roads we've already paid for with gasoline taxes is oppressive, and is another escalation of Portland's war on the automobile. I consider it to be un-American because it threatens my right of freedom of movement. It would be similar to charging us money to vote, another one of our basic rights. And such a plan will not reduce congestion - it's just another socialist type of scheme to take more of our money for the government to waste on inefficient and ineffective projects. Sincerely, James Caster</p>	James Caster	Comment form
07/07	<p>I have two main concerns about this proposed change: 1. Low income families will be unable to afford travel on portland freeways, for which they are already taxed for use (gas tax, transportation tax, etc). Some areas of this proposed toll are readily serviced by mass transit, however, especially the southern most areas, do not have the benefit of this alternate choice. 2. Congestion on surface streets will increase in a way that they are not prepared. Two lane roads will likely be filled with traffic attempting to bypass the freeway in volumes far higher than intended for these roads. This will result not only in congestion, but increased deterioration of these roadways. Shifting the problem is never the answer. Let's evaluate options for more efficient traffic flow throughout the city. In addition, can we finish the current 205 construction that is meant to ease congestion before we propose additional taxes on our population? I understand there is required planning time for projects like this, but how can the need be properly evaluated without a control? Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Micah Hunter	Comment form
07/07	<p>Why is 205 from Stafford to the Abernethy Bridge congested? Because it's only 2 lanes! Whoever decided (back in the 70's) to make it only 2 lanes from I-5 to Gladstone was dead wrong. This is why it's congested, and why it is usually slow and difficult to drive. There is ample room to widen it to 3 or 4 lanes, with the exception of some of the bridge sections. As a daily user of this section of 205 (there is no halfway reasonable alternative) I experience constant slow downs because the infrastructure is poorly designed. Instead of punishing people who use a poorly designed freeway, how about adding a lane and designing the on ramps and off ramps so cars can travel at</p>	Erik Daniels	Comment form



	normal speeds when they take the off ramps and merge via the on ramps? Designing and managing a stupidly designed roadway that CAUSES congestion, then punishing people with a toll is typical Oregon government thinking. There are a number of traffic bottlenecks that always have congestion, and it's either because there aren't enough lanes to handle traffic (some are fixable, some are not) or there are a lot of on/off ramps and people changing lanes which causes slow downs (205 north from Foster to 84). This is simply a way to strong-arm people into paying when there is no suitable alternative.		
07/07	I live in Portland and completely oppose any attempt to place any kind of toll or "value pricing" on our roads. Transportation infrastructure should be free to use and paid for by progressive taxation, not by regressive tolling that disproportionately affects the poor, who have already been forced to live difficult distances away from their jobs by the massive rise in housing costs over the last few years. Tolling is just another attack on the poor, and I won't support it. Please stop.	Ian Krogh	Comment form
07/07	No tolls	Destin Welter	Comment form
07/07	I support tolling the Interstate Bridge and Glenn Jackson Bridge. I do not support tolls anywhere else on the system at the moment. Elsewhere, tolls would simply result in traffic diverting to surface streets, creating an even worse traffic nightmare than we already have. However, in the case of the two bridges, there are no alternate routes, and thus the tolls would actually work as intended, collecting revenue and reducing traffic. In the future, for similar reasons, I could support a toll on US 26 between Sylvan and the Vista Ridge tunnel, where all alternate routes are either much, much slower or very out of the way, and also the Abernathy Bridge and Boone Bridge for similar reasons. However, at the present time with the present infrastructure, I cannot in good conscience support tolling anywhere where direct alternate routes (e.g. Barbur, MLK) exist. Also, even though not quite on subject, PLEASE do something to fix US 26 EB between Sylvan and I-405! It's a total mess even on weekends and evenings, with so much wasted carbon emission. It can't be too hard to make the middle lane a choice between I-405 SB and Market, and physically preventing lane changes in the tunnel would go a long way to helping fix the congestion resulting from terrible drivers.	Anonymous	Comment form
07/08	What about the money you already collect? Sixty-two point four cents a gallon in Portland, \$.55 in Multnomah County, \$.53 in Washington County, \$.55 in Tigard, Milwaukie, \$.54 in Happy Valley, and \$.52 in areas without local taxing. We are on a limited income and depend on our vehicle to keep our lives going. Yeah, you'll charge those who use the roads, but they are already paying for the service in high gas taxes and income taxes. Please consider doing what the rest of us have to do, budget things, look for good prices and make sure that you are not being taken advantage of. Totally opposed to the tax. Toll roads can stay back east, not here in the West.	Linda Pilcher	Comment form
07/09	As a transportation professional who worked on the Columbia River Crossing project for eight years, I understand congestion pricing very well and in general am very supportive. However, the recommendation put forward by the policy committee seems short sighted and has many flaws. I live in southwest Portland near the interchange of I-5 and SW Capitol Highway. Tolling all lanes of I-5 from Multnomah Blvd into the downtown area will instantly clog up Barbur Blvd (OR-99W), which is a major route for TriMet buses. If the Commission cares to put transit first, they will not accept the plan as-is. For changes, first, I would recommend that only one of the general purpose travel lanes on I-5 be converted to a toll lane. That would give a free option for many people traveling on I-5 and would reduce the amount of traffic diversion to Barbur Blvd. It would also give carpools, buses, and SOVs willing to pay a toll, a faster path to downtown. Second, the right lane on Barbur Blvd should be converted to a Business Access Transit (BAT) lane from SW Capitol Hwy to SW Arthur St in both directions. This would allow buses and bicycles to pass congestion, which is still very likely to worsen even if only one lane is tolled on I-5. With the likelihood of light rail coming to the Barbur Blvd corridor very low within the next five years, it is a horrible idea to make I-5 flow and Barbur fill up with cars in the short term. Transit is very well used and very productive on Barbur and it would be ruined if this plan were to go forward as recommended. Moreover, this is an equity issue. It doesn't seem fair to low-income people who are getting a boost in transit funding in 2019 to have them sit in congestion on the bus when the rich people from the Washington County suburbs rush by in their new single occupant vehicles. I believe the intent of the Legislature was to boost transit, not penalize it, when they passed HB2017. Let's make sure that	Ted Stonecliffe	Comment form

	the plan going forward is a boost for transit in the short term as well as the long term. Until we have light rail in the SW Portland I-5 corridor, tolling all lanes should not be considered. This may be the right solution when light rail is built and running, but until then, let's be smart and keep the buses running quickly on Barbur.		
07/09	Thank you for tackling this timely and necessary issue. For far too long, we have spent money subsidizing auto travel on our freeways. This has led to increasing traffic and congestion. I applaud the legislature and the OTC for recognizing that we can't build our way out of congestion. More lanes and wider roads just lead to more traffic and uses money that we need to maintain the transportation system that we have. I largely agree with the committee's recommendations. I would like to highlight a couple of points: 1. We need to invest in transit and other alternatives. The only way congestion pricing works is a robust transit system. The Portland area does not have a robust enough transit system in place. 2. We need to avoid using toll revenues to expand freeways. We don't need to toll Vancouver commuters to pay for a third lane on I-205. Instead, invest the revenues in transit. Every. Single. Dollar. 3. Wherever tolls end up, they need to be dynamic. We need to send price signals that single occupancy vehicles shouldn't travel during peak hours. Pricing can do this. 4. There needs to be a strategy in place to address diversion. This work will need to involve the cooperation of multiple agencies. Thank you for your time and for giving serious matter to a topic that holds so much potential.	Bob Kellett	Comment form
07/09	I am opposed to congestion taxes on Oregon roads and freeways. That said it appears odot wants and will impose new taxes on motorists. Is do the I request that a funds, 100 percent, be dedicated to those same freeways from which the money is collected. Further the added\$ should not reduce funding allocations from other tax and Grant sources. The toll payer must see the \$spent on improving that same freeway. Thanks	David Tooze	Comment form
07/09	I Please do value the trips including all their externalities. Let's make our transportation system safe and sustainable for the environment. I I --- I	Robert Roberts	Comment form
07/09	I Charging people to use roads we have already paid for is stupid. You take taxes on our Gas, sales of new vehicles and from our paychecks in a city tax! I live on a fixed income of \$1100! How the fuck am I supposed to survive? The federal government is not going to raise my income level just because you start taking more money from me. I cannot take public transportation as I cannot be outside in the sun for the 2 the hours each way it takes me to get from my house to the VA using Trimet. This is just STUPID! The money raised in this TOLL TAX will not make it into my just above poverty level pocket like you have stated. "The committee stated the tolling program should include strategies to improve public transportation, provisions to support environmental justice and low-income populations and ways to minimize freeway diversion onto local roads." The local roads are already congested to the breaking point. You needed to add lanes to both I5 and I205 years ago and YOU FAILED NOT US!	Joe	Comment form
07/09	I think tolling would work if it was on the Oregon side of the Columbia only. The toll would only be collected coming into Oregon not leaving. I've been over the Golden Gate Bridge and it seems to work and get traffic out of San Francisco. The toll is only collected going through San Francisco.	Marilyn Fujiyoshi	Comment form
07/09	I am former Seattle (Sammamish) resident who lived through the implementation of Value Pricing on the SR 520 bridge. I know first hand that due to the SR 520 bridge toll, the lower income traffic moved around the toll bridge to side streets and other bridges, while the wealthy people enjoyed an easy commute. The bridge became an unusable route for lower income people who could no longer afford to cross the SR 520 bridge. Rather than move to public transportation (as was marketed by the city of Seattle), lower income people stayed in their cars and changed their route. I now live in the Stafford area of West Linn. We already have a difficult time taking a left turn onto Stafford, Borland, or Rosemont during rush hour. Value Pricing I-205 will move the lower income traffic to these rural roads, creating a traffic nightmare that local residents and lower income Metro area residents will have no choice but to navigate. If you are going to go forward with Value Pricing I-205, please plan for the future with reality in mind. People are not going to move out of their cars and use Tri-Met. Instead rural roads will be the preferred route of lower income commuters, expensive	Laura Greyerbiehl	Comment form





	upgrades on those rural roads will need to be made, and wealthy commuters will enjoy an easy ride on I-205.		
07/09	The back roads around West Linn are already very congested. It's not clear to me how congestion pricing will alleviate traffic on 205 since the alternate routes are already congested as well. Since the studies don't appear to have covered this level of granularity, I think we need to better understand the implications to surrounding communities before implementing the tolling on Abernathy bridge another 205 locations. There also is a good alternate public transportation options in the west Linn area. This is real The back roads around West Linn are already very congested. It's not clear to me how congestion pricing will alleviate traffic on 205 since the alternate routes are already congested as well. Since the studies don't appear to have covered this level of granularity, I think we need to better understand the implications to surrounding communities before implementing the tolling on Abernathy bridge another 205 locations. There also is no good alternate public transportation options in the west Linn area. I have major concerns about the impact to the quality of life of those living in the west Linn area around the 205 exit and Oregon city.	Katie Zabrocki	Comment form
07/09	If congestion pricing has been effective in a high percentage of those 40 other places you mention in your general info, it is worth trying in PDX. However, it's going to be a big problem if the state/city use the money collected on transportation projects that are geared toward the high income yuppies in southeast and northeast Portland--and I'm talking about bike lanes for young professionals who get their daily workout by pedaling downtown from their extremely expensive apartments west of 82nd Ave. This new "tax" may be very hard for Portland working class people to avoid, because they don't have any choice at all about when they go to work (or return home to children who await them). It would be good to provide the public with some stats on what kinds of vehicles are using the freeways at what time of day, so we could have an accurate idea about how much this is geared toward commercial vehicles and how much of it is geared toward local people going about their daily lives.	Leslie Sharp	Comment form
07/09	I already pay \$7,000+ a year in taxes to a state that I do not live in. Allegedly these taxes pay for transportation (since I'm denied nearly every other service provided by OR). Undoubtedly, you'll come up with some lame excuse justify these tolls on top of the income taxes. WA residents should get generous toll credits for income taxes paid.	Mike Campin	Comment form
07/09	There is No Environmental Justice in selecting pilot Concept B prior to completed analysis on the impact from tolling near Going Street. If the goal to reduce traffic on Interstate 5 is to reduce commuter traffic, not commerce traffic, then tolling must be to toll at the borders of the city. Non-diversion opportunity tolling at the borders would be the only way to reduce commuter traffic in our neighborhoods. Equity and diversion mitigation strategies must be completed prior to selecting Concept B as the pilot for Value Based Pricing tolling on Interstate 5. For the measurable goal of reducing traffic on I-5, PLEASE don't spill this traffic into our neighborhoods, or make it difficult for us that live near Interstate 5 to move within the city. Concept B would be a loose-loose scenario for residence near Concept B tolling. Selecting Concept B as the pilot without completing a through and required analysis first will have major costs later to improve many major paralleling streets to I-5, higher cost to maintain safety in high density neighborhoods, and will increase air pollution in neighborhoods. PLEASE review an evaluation for congestion pricing proposals by ODOT December, 2012 on Cornelius Pass. This was quickly rejected because an analysis was completed prior to the pilot project because of a dramatic increase in traffic diversion that would cost in excess of \$30 Million in safety improvements. Even with an analysis, the Concept B pilot would be more complex and administrative with the spend in the project. There are too many entrances and exits around Concept B. If incremental tolling of entrances and exits at Interstate 5 near the Going St. tolling to reduce diversion, then this will unfairly land lock North and North East residences, again. How could this even be considered when tolling at the borders of the city is so much more logical? The Environmental Justice impacts on livability within the affected neighborhoods will never recover. There are no winners within core metro tolling. None of the concepts should not be chosen prior to an Environmental Justice analysis. Yet, if one concept must be chosen prior to an analysis, simple logic is that the only rational tolling is at the borders of the congestion, not the center if the goal is to reduce commuter traffic. PLEASE do not undo the growth of non-vehicle commuting within Portland for the sake of allowing non-core Portland commuters to trample our inner city neighborhoods with more automobile traffic and congestion.	Fred Brewer	Comment form

07/09	No more taxes. I do not like having extra taxes added or having to pay more to drive to work. Find other ways to add revenue to the budget. Taxes are not the solution. This isn't fair to those who work in the area being taxed or those who can't afford it. I will find other ways around to avoid paying taxes. Figure out the budget. Taxes are not the answer.	Laura Adams	Comment form
07/09	I live in OR and work in WA. I have a minor complaint about paying my OR income tax and having a 10% disadvantage over my fellow workers who live in WA but I deal with it because I like the company and people and work for. Now you add however many \$/day to my tax bill for a commute I pay taxes in both state with gas taxes, I will either consider relocating to WA or retiring earlier than planned. That should help your congestion social engineering plan. I am also bothered the revenues will not be 100% accountable to transportation improvements or flexibility.	Jeff Taucher	Comment form
07/09	ODOT should seriously consider congestion pricing. I just returned from a driving trip to Chicago and back - lots of toll roads. Tolling is very efficient and easy to navigate. You can even pay your tolls later on-line, so you don't have to have cash. Tolling would greatly reduce the number of SOV's on the road, and make people think twice about how necessary their next trip to the grocery store is. We can't build our way out of congestion. We need to be creative. Congestion pricing is a good start.	Kathy Lincoln	Comment form
07/09	These roads were built and paid for decades ago. Simply extortion to pays for PERS. I will contact my federal representatives to request that they prevent this from happening. You already squander road dollars on useless expensive non auto bridges, light rail and bike lanes..	Eric Tyvoll	Comment form
07/10	I Are you trying to make more residents homeless? Way to many are on extremely tight budgets, this will push them over the edge. Stop taxing us into bankruptcy. I   ---	Steve Spahr	Comment form
07/10	It is clear from the Round 2 Concept Evaluation that Concept C will perform best. The fact that the TAC instead recommended other alternatives indicates that it was a Political Advisory Committee rather than a Technical Advisory Committee. The OTC should approve Concept C in its entirety.	Alex Bauman	Comment form
07/10	thank you for this opportunity. I have been a 25 year resident in the portland area as a businessman who traveled by car throughout the NW every week. redundant to state that the traffic in the portland area is severely oppressive. I gave up and moved three years ago to Vancouver Wa. Just could not tolerate the absence of forward, business and auto commuter action and planning. I have observed all the meetings and activities and now have read your recommendations. There was not a single mention specifically of increasing roadways, adding lanes, or other automobile accommodations NONE!!! How ironic that you are tasked with solving the lack of road capacity and your solutions only address a small segment of commuters who travel from A to B and ignore the thousands who have busy multi stop days throughout the entire region. You also have not addressed the growing commercial traffic (trucks) coming from the norths a somewhat compounded by the Ports lack of solving union issues and loosing valued shipping into portland. San Diego (lived there for 25 years) needed to solve traffic they got more and better roads and whys, San Jose needed to solve traffic, they got more and better hwys and roads, Boise needed to solve traffic and they got more and better roads and hwys, San Bernadino/ Riverside needed to solve traffic they got better hwys and roads. in my 25 years portland has added three intersection improvements (217 north and south), 84 east to 205 north, and one additional short lane addition on 26 west!!!! Cars will ALWAYS be the major mode of transportation in my lifetime and yours, car sales are at record levels! the transportation committee seems to ignore that, For the foreseeable future Portland /Vancouver will continue to exasperate their population, loose the goodwill and praise of visitors as more of the tax base moves north and helps vancouver expand. After the debacle with the CRC study I have little hope that Oregon will ever come out of denial that there is a terrible problem thank you for this forum.	Mark Stephen Haworth	Comment form
07/10	I fully support adding congestion pricing to our highways. I also fully support bus rapid transit/ light rail projects by TriMet as they seek to provide alternatives to people driving with high quality public transit that is frequent and efficient. Thank you!	Michael Espinoza	Comment form
07/10	NO! So, years of NOT letting Metro extend it's boundaries, so jamming up everything in town. Encouraging tons of building in town. Tons of people moving here and now you want to charge us to drive into town because the roads are too congested. What a surprise!! How do I be where and when my employer wants me to be...and pay even more to do that? Time is money so the people that can't afford the charge will be in	Nancy Padberg	Comment form



	the slow lanes even longer. That leaves their kids alone even more, wastes their gas..just costs them even more.		
07/10	Why should Washington residents who pay over 9% tax to the State of Oregon, with no representation, (and I get no refund), pay to use roads. The congestion is due to OTC not studying this many, many, years ago when they issued new driver licenses to drivers who moved form other states. They saw this coming, they sat on their hands, doing nothing. Now, for some silly reason they feel I should pay to drive on the roads to go to work. They also think that tolling the roads will "eliminate unnecessary driving during peak hours". I never thought that driving to work was unnecessary. But that's how OTC thinks. If I ran my business like OTC, or ODOT, I'd fold. And you want me to pay more to drive to work - totally unfair to Washingtonians. Maybe you could consider to use the money we pay for "out of state tuition", although we pay income tax, to fund the roads. Why hasn't someone designed a new bridge from Gresham-Fairview to Vancouver-Camas years ago? Have you ever been on the road when one bridge had an accident on it? Most importantly, why hasn't someone, or most ODOT employees been fired and lost their jobs over the traffic mess in the Portland area? Do you realize how many years it'll take to clear this mess up? It may never get cleared up. LA. here we come!!! I can only hope the federal government turns their back on Oregon, like I will after I don't work here any longer.	Eileen	Comment form
07/10	Totally against tolling but if Oregon decides to do it keep it off the interstate bridges they are congested enough.	Thomas Moore	Comment form
07/10	I fully support congestion pricing, but ONLY as a means to raise revenue for multimodal projects (specifically- walking, biking, and public transit). Using congestion pricing to fund highway expansion will only create induced demand, increase travel times, and threaten our environment. This is an excellent opportunity to reduce travel times for all and to rethink the way that transportation (and transportation demand) shapes our environment and creates demand for healthier choices	Corey Shayman	Comment form
07/10	It is inappropriate for funds collected from congestion pricing to be used on freeway widening projects. The only way to add capacity is to fund non-vehicle oriented modes such as transit, walking, and biking. This funding source should be prohibited for use on freeway projects.	Taylor Eidt	Comment form
07/10	I'm not fundamentally opposed to the idea, but would urge caution. Anything you do is going to affect the community members, neighboring streets, and traffic to/from WA for work/shopping. If you are not going to construct new lanes, I would suggest starting small with either certain small sections tolled across all lanes, or only tolling one lane throughout a larger section. You should also review options that may have provided more relief than those described in the documents provided (Option 4 from Tech Memo 3). As someone who has frequently crosses the state border for work and personal reasons, I would also urge extreme caution for tolls on the bridges. You will see a noticeable decline in revenue from stores just south of the bridges (Cascade Station, Jantzen Beach, etc.) if there is no way to cross into the state without paying (especially if the expectation is that you pay when you leave as well). You description of peak times doesn't explain if there will be set times where tolling is in place or if it will be variable like 405 in Seattle? If it will be variable, will there be a method in place for people to view changing prices and make plans accordingly?	Kelsey Hudson	Comment form
07/10	I live in Vancouver WA for the last 25 years and before that I lived in Portland Oregon. I work in Portland and I do not support tolling all lanes of I-5 or I205 and would only support a one lane tolling option only or tolling a lane that is totally built new as a tolling lane. I think that most likely Portland will also toll City streets that could become cut through around streets if tolling goes into affect and that will only continue to raise the costs to live in Vancouver or in Portland which is already out of this world.	Craig Goodroad	Comment form
07/10	I Support Value Pricing on all lanes of I5 and I205. I also support the the proceeds from those tolls to be used to improve safety, equity in our transportation, and maintaining our infrastructure, in that order. It is important that the proceeds Do Not go towards increasing capacity on our roadways until all other options, (public transit, biking, walking for example) for increasing smooth transportation through our region have been fully funded. While many associations will advocate for increased capacity on these corridors, they will be better served by getting vehicles off of the roads and their passengers into trains and buses and onto bikes, allowing trips that require automobiles and trucks use the roads as intended. Increased capacity will only encourage more people to use those corridors, and increasing travel times.	Nathan Howard	Comment form

07/10	I favor congestion pricing on all lanes as a way to moderate freeway demand. I would prefer that revenue raised from this be used to improve non-driving transportation modes as a way to balance the impact on low-income people, reduce carbon emissions and mitigate the likely increase of traffic on surface streets.	Keith Packard	Comment form
07/10	I am a resident of SE Portland and I am writing to express my strong support of value/congestion pricing on interstates in the Portland metro area. As a driver, TriMet user, and cyclist, congestion pricing makes sense to me. I think that our highways and interstates are precious resources that we should use wisely. As Portland grows and more drivers hit the road, our public highways and interstates become a "tragedy of the commons". Traffic volumes now frequently render our public highways and interstates dysfunctional, but drivers have no incentive to drive less. Congestion pricing directly addresses this and encourages less wasteful use of our roads, and that is why I very strongly support it. I also support directing tolling revenue primarily towards TriMet, active transportation projects, and other transportation improvements that do not increase volumes on our highways and interstates.	Daniel Derrick	Comment form
07/10	I support congestion pricing (with price differentials based on time and/or real time freeway congestion measures). The funds should not be linked to highway expansion. We cannot build our way out of congestion. We see it time and time again all over the country where millions and millions are spent to 'add capacity' only to see induced demand reduce or maintain current congestion. The tolls should be used for maintenance of highways and bridges (there's no shortage of bridge retrofitting needed), bus only lanes, and rail (light and heavy). Clark county is the source of most of this congestion and we must convince them to build a light rail connection over the Columbia. You must take the political risk now, no new freeways. The only way to change peoples behavior is to make it more expensive to drive and to make light rail cheaper and SAFER. I	Nicholas Larue	Comment form
07/10	I strongly support the plan for congestion pricing, and recommend implementing it on the entire stretch of I-5 from Tualatin to Vancouver. If the tolls start at Going St/Alberta that will cause a large number of southbound drivers to exit at a crowded area of North Portland that has a high density of walkers and bikers (including many children). With Southbound I-5 tolling starting at the interstate bridge instead, there is no incentive to exit I-5 early (and no other easy way to cross the Columbia river), obviating this problem. It is also important for Portland to continue to cherish and maintain its unique status as one of the most bike and pedestrian friendly cities in the U.S. - a vision created over the last few decades that has made our city a uniquely desirable place to live, leading to population growth and the traffic issues we now confront - and accordingly, toll-generated funds should be used not only to support highway growth (important to relieve bottlenecks and create the sense that the tolls paid by drivers are being used to improve their chosen method of transportation), but also to finance bicycling, walking, and mass transit infrastructure in our city.	Barry Schlansky	Comment form
07/10	Hi there, Thank you for soliciting public input on this critical issue. A few important things to consider when weighing this input: * Currently, suburban road users are unfairly subsidized, by having free parking in the city core and using an inordinate amount of the space on our crowded freeways. Use-pricing should aim to curb this subsidy, rather than merely calm traffic and raise revenue. * Freight companies are unfairly subsidized by our prioritization of freight traffic on center-city streets. Our designs need to get back to being people-centered, and this includes roads that are currently administered by ODOT for freight traffic. Building & planning freight hubs that are outside the planned use-pricing, and scaling use-pricing according to weight/capacity to discourage freight traffic in the city center could significantly improve quality of life and free up our urban area to be people-centered. * PLEASE do not devote the funding from these measures to expanding capacity of the automobile network. The point of congestion pricing should be to DISCOURAGE automobile use, and to invest in more capacity (which encourages use) is completely contrary to that aim. Invest the revenue instead in public transportation & active transportation improvements. * Please consider the impact on neighborhood streets by having one endpoint of tolling so far south of the I-5 bridge. Commuters to & from Vancouver already overwhelm the North Portland neighborhoods by cutting through neighborhood streets trying to gain precious minutes in traffic (so much so that Portland has had to build diverters to prevent this behavior!) Can you imagine how much more people would do this crap if there was a toll on the freeway? Totally unacceptable solution. Toll needs to start on Hayden Island or before Marine Dr. exit (or freeway entrances/exits must also be tolled). * Please also consider tolls on I-84 & OR-26 — note that 67% of Clackamas County residents commute to other counties (primarily Multnomah). * One other thing to consider -- Some of the funds raised could	Ben Hubbird	Comment form



	<p>be devoted to investing in affordable housing in the city-center. Some of the residents who currently chose to live in suburban areas do so because they have been priced out of more walkable / bikable urban areas. Helping people who want to live centrally make that choice, and making it easier for everyone to live closer to where they work, would be a great outcome. Thanks!</p>		
07/10	<p>Congestion pricing need to be used to fund alternatives to driving. We cannot build our way out of congestion by widening our freeway system. It would be too expensive, and it wouldn't work. Wider freeways just induce more demand for driving; see the LA region's attempt to reduce congestion on the I-405 by widening it. It actually experiences more delay now than before the widening project. No, we must use the funds from congestion pricing to fund alternatives to driving. The funds must be used to invest in high-quality transit, bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure, to complete the build-out of those networks so they become real alternatives to driving for as many people as possible. When I suggested to the City of Portland that they study congestion pricing, it was in this context: that the funds would be used to fund alternatives to driving, and thus help meet public policy goals for reducing carbon emissions, reducing congestion, lowering transportation-related injuries and fatalities, improving health outcomes, and reducing air pollution. The City approved this study based on those principles. The State must also follow these principles when implementing congestion pricing. Any other path will lead to certain failure, especially one that seeks to use the proceeds from congestion pricing to fund expanding the freeway system (even if "just" at bottlenecks and pinch points).</p>	Garlynn Woodson g	Comment form
07/10	<p>Please use plan C for congestion pricing and use the revenue to fund transit options. Please do not build more freeway capacity as it leads to ever more congestion and makes alternatives less safe.</p>	Brett Yost	Comment form
07/10	<p>I support tolling of all lanes of all highways in the Portland region. Tolls should be set and adjusted to affect the most efficient use of existing highways and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation. Toll revenue should be used to improve the safety and efficiency of alternative modes of transportation. Toll revenue should not be used to expand highways. At the same time, some mechanism should be developed to prevent tolls from placing an onerous burden on low-income commuters. Transportation by private automobile is too expensive, too polluting, too dangerous, and takes up too much space for us to keep spending exorbitant sums on making it easy. Using tolls to discourage driving will be good for economic growth, public health, freight movement, equity, and quality of life. Thank you.</p>	tel jensen	Comment form
07/10	<p>To Whom it May Concern: I am writing to express my concern about adding tolls to the Abernethy Bridge / Stafford Road route through West Linn / Clackamas County. Tolls are not a fair way to distribute the revenue burden for all of Oregon communities which benefit from the commerce that uses the corridor. It adds unnecessary burden to a select few and causes exponential dangers and burdens to the immediate communities. When there are construction projects, accidents or any type of inclement weather issues impacting this area, Oregon City/West Linn feel the immediate impact of those events. Adding a toll will create a daily traffic snarl on side roads that cannot accommodate added commuters to the already busy city traffic that occurs on side streets. This toll will be a burden on businesses and as a Dispatcher, I understand that this will be passed along to consumers as well. So the community will be hit with an additional punishment of 'paying' yet again, for this bad idea. Between adding traffic to side streets where pedestrians, bikes and cars already struggle through clogged intersections and roadways, there is the added cost to the community in loss of income to the commuter and loss of business for the employer. I walk to work and I see on a daily basis how the commuters try to get onto the ramps and cut off pedestrians and bike riders. This is not a safe alternative to add an additional problem where the ramps will note the cost of the toll for value pricing and allow for traffic to try to avoid the on ramp lanes only to cause side street chaos. The better alternative to this issue is to have every citizen pay for the infrastructure that benefits the entire state. Not burden commuters on the City of West Linn and Oregon City. The infrastructure is not able to tolerate more traffic at this point.</p>	Lorraine Converse	Comment form
07/10	<p>If this actual goes in I will never work or do business in Portland. Between the price to park, the traffic, the terrible quality of roads and homeless begging all over I have turned down jobs to work downtown at high tech businesses. Why do you think it will be good for Portland to tax them to come to your city? If you don't watch out, Hillsboro will replace Portland in 10 years. They are doing a lot of positive things to attract business and residents.</p>	Richard Gard	Comment form

07/10	Hey OTC! Please explain how putting tolls on the roads will reduce congestion. Especially at the 2 bridges on the Columbia River. Those people have no other option but to pay up to get to and from work in either direction. You are just placing an additional financial burden on them. You already collect full INCOME TAX with no benefit to them of any kind. You have now instituted a TRANSPORTATION FEE on their paychecks, and now you want TOLLS as well! You are in a nutshell: GREEDY!!	David Willard	Comment form
07/10	NO tolls on existing roads. If you want to toll, build a new bridge.	Ashley	Comment form
07/10	This will only make Portland an even more expensive place to live and work. I see more issues than solutions in this. Yes, hypothetically, fewer people might travel on these highways and more money would be made available for improvement, but that is where the benefits cease. The cost of working, commuting, and living will increase. The very essence of what makes Portland a unique and livable city will be tarnished. Should taxes not be enough to manage the quality of the roads, I truly believe that people would more happily donate to the amelioration of the highways in the Metro Area, rather than being compelled to pay.	Christianna Winters	Comment form
07/10	Put the tolls on US26 on the West side as well as 217. Those are the worst congested nightmares in the Metro area. Try driving westbound on 26 into downtown any day of the week including Sat and Sun. It does not matter what time of day either. You already collect FULL Income Tax from Clark County, WA residents working in Oregon with no say in how their money is spent, as well as the new TRANSPORTATION FEE on their paychecks. Now you want to charge tolls as well at the bridge. Shame on you!	David Willard	Comment form
07/10	No to value pricing. Good fancy name for tolling though. How about you do your job as ODOT and provide adequate roads for cars to use. Just like other government agencies and utilities provide adequate police protection, fire response, water and sewer services, etc.	Jonathan Miller	Comment form
07/10	PlESe set up tolls they will help with congestion.	Aaron Rosenblatt	Comment form
07/10	Tolls are necessary and they should be implemented. Make a program to help low income families. Otherwise, toll everything. We need more transportation funding.	Timothy Wood	Comment form
07/10	Hitting Oregonians with a sales tax on vehicles, after years and years of it being voted down was very low and weak of the Oregon State Government. The state is losing trust of the people. This plan to put in toll roads is not very good. It is another tax grab. It has nothing to do with making the roads better. Once implemented, the money hungry politicians will raise toll rates and keep raising them. Tolls will cause more congestion in such a small metro area. And why call it Congestion Pricing? Call it what it is. It is a tax. Manage money already collected better and stop playing games with Oregonians. Businesses will lose in this too. Traveling to Portland will be difficult for many on low incomes. Folks will choose to go elsewhere to spend their money. This whole plan boils down to what the state wants to do. Not what the people want the state to do.	Charlie Bottifa	Comment form
07/10	We are already taxed to death for infrastructure repairs and yet it's not all kept up and now you want to add tolls? NO MORE. We are considering a move to Vancouver to get away from all the Oregon taxes. Maybe if the funds went where they were supposed to I might feel better about the toll, but it seems taxes are added annually and yet nothing's done.	Penny	Comment form
07/10	As a Clackamas County resident and Multnomah county small business owner, I can unequivocally denounce and state my complete opposition to this idea. It will hurt my family, my employees and my business, and it will not improve congestion issues. DO NOT TOLL THE INTERSTATES!!	Joel Bergman	Comment form
07/10	Members of the OTC, I strongly urge you to adopt Concept C as the preferred alternative for congestion pricing in the Portland region. The entire point of this project is to relieve congestion. Concept C confers the most benefits in this regard at presumably negligible additional costs. In addition, the revenue raised would be ideal for augmenting transit, bicycling, and pedestrian options in the region. Investing the funds from this program into widening freeways is a backwards strategy and should not be adopted. Every successful congestion pricing program in the world invests the overwhelming majority, if not all, of its revenues into alternative modes. We should not buck that trend. Tolling all of I-5 and I-205 is the future of this state. Multimodal options, particularly transit, are the future of regional travel in the Portland area. We can	Jake Davis	Comment form



	greatly advance both objectives by simply adopting Concept C. I hope you will do this. Anything less will put us in a worse place going into the future. Best, Jake Davis		
07/10	I'm an Oregon Driver, tax payer, and small business owner- I support the full congestion pricing plan (option C) for the length of both I-205 and I-5 it is also my belief that at least half of all fund generated should be used to fund biking, walking and mass transit. Any new road capacity construction will only continue to make traffic worse via induced demand. ALL of the available evidence supports this. Building more lanes does not relieve traffic. It doesn't take an MBA to figure that one out- it just so happens I have one.	Daniel Bund	Comment form
07/10	No tolls. Period.	Teresa Galligan	Comment form
07/10	Implementation for new toll roads along congested areas will only force already overtaxed hard working individuals to pay. Side roads are already congested , and we pay a transportation tax , gas tax, income tax, some paying arts tax and sugar tax. With side streets congested it forces people to travel on an infrastructure that cannot simply handle the population however toll roads will not ease congestion.	Jamie Parker	Comment form
07/10	I am a Portland resident and parent of small children who drives much more than I would like to. Traffic congestion will never get better if we don't improve the alternatives to driving alone in cars. Automobile use is already heavily subsidized (by parking policy, zoning codes, and many other incentives). Congestion pricing needs to be used to manage demand for roads, and the income from tolls needs to be used to finance more efficient modes of transportation, not to build more highways. A smart policy will recognize the failure of highway building and help our city become a better place to live and get around.	Stephanie Byrd	Comment form
07/10	Tolls will be regressive and hurt those that can least afford it. Especially in the service industry. IF there are to be tolls they need to be somewhat based on vehicle size. If I am driving an economical small car that is 1/4 the size of one of those huge pick up trucks then i should be paying 1/4 the price. Since this is about congestion something taking up four times as much room as something else should have to pay for it.	Gene Blick	Comment form
07/10	What happened to the 3rd bridge that was supposed to be built? Seems with the 2 hour wait to cross these days maybe that should happen before a toll is considered. Give people a choice to pay out of congestion or wait. To even consider tolls without building another crossing is wrong! Maybe that third bridge could include max running across the river. There are many options but to simply implement tolls is not the way to go!	Heidi Bliss	Comment form
07/10	100% Oppose it, it will lock up side streets even worse!	Joe Mizner	Comment form
07/10	I think there should always be some free lands but tolled lanes to go faster, like in Seattle. Thanks	Stephanie Jones	Comment form
07/10	By placing the toll system in an area like West Linn, you are not doing anything to aid traffic on I-5 and 205. There are only two lanes and bottlenecks created by the Abernathy bridge on one end and North/South I-5 on the other. What will happen is that the congestion will overflow onto the small streets of West Linn that are already congested during rush hour. Where is it that the savings in time will come for drivers needing to get home to West Linn, Oregon City, Clackamas, Wilsonville, etc. that this program supposedly is designed to create? There are no other points of access. The roads of the Portland area are congested because you continue to only resurface existing roads without expanding them and adding lanes. I-5 is crowded due to difficulty also with 217 crowding and 26 crowding. Where else do we go to avoid these tolls? How will the working poor handle extra cost that they can't avoid? This plan is full of holes and is nothing more than a tax. Just be honest and start using sales tax. At least that is something we can avoid and will be something that affects all of us appropriately based on the money we have available to spend instead of having a new bill for something we didn't choose to spend our money on. Please do not move forward with this project or at the very least put it somewhere with more lanes and available alternative routes for drivers wanting to avoid the tolls.	Jeremy Rower	Comment form
07/10	This is a terrible idea. Tolling may reduce congestion, but at what economic cost? Has this even been considered? If you make it more expensive and more time consuming for people to get to their jobs or move their product, what economic impact will that have? And after you decide that you have met the goal of "decreased congestion"	Valerie Hunter	Comment form

	(while ignoring overall economic and quality of life costs), you plan to spread this to other roadways? Are you aiming for a complete economic shutdown? The road to hell is paved with good intentions. Your good intentions will not mitigate the disaster this will cause.		
07/11	Before you simply add a tax against hard working people, who have no other options. You need to have a plan on how you will use the money to increase capacity. Without that in place, this is nothing more than a tax to put money in an undefined slush fund, with no solutions whatsoever. The tax will go on and on, when it does not help the problem, it will be increased. Without a plan to increase capacity for future growth, nothing will be accomplished except extortion of the working class.	Kurt Willett	Comment form
07/11	I feel as though you are not listening to the public and taxpayers at all in this process. This process has become a farce at this point, with pre-determined conclusions all around. Your ODOT spokesman is quoted in the media on 7/5/18 as saying that these projects around the country and around the world have proven effective. Really? In the few areas of the country that are doing this, they immediately added capacity before or simultaneous with toll implementation. You do not plan to do this. You may not even create additional capacity, and to the extent you do, it will be de minimus and not relieve congestion. And this is not London who implemented a congestion tax. Portland = London, England? No! As a taxpayer working hard to live here and provide for my family, I resent that you do not listen to me or many more like me. But since I can't stop you, I can only hope that the federal government will stop your plan, if for no other reason, the lack of adding immediate, traffic relieving capacity to your plan, which I would actually support. Instead, you are engaging in a fleecing of the hard-working taxpayer and creating a slush fund for your social-engineering projects in the area. Well, lower income people will be tremendously impacted by this as well, and they won't just applaud whatever acorns you throw their way. Shameful. I have no intention of remaining in Oregon, and I am sure you are gambling that others will come and replace the taxes I pay to state government for this nonsense. And if you aren't, you had better.	Patrick	Comment form
07/11	As a citizen and a transit bus driver in Columbia County, I hope you realize that there is a lot of Washington driver traffic in the peak hours! The tolling is gonna create a bigger traffic back up by Washington drivers looking to avoid the tolls! Just a thought.	Katt Wenborn	Comment form
07/11	You fuckers always want to screw the drivers in the ass to build your light god damn rail projects!	Thomas Eskridge	Comment form
07/11	Whenever there is a choice I weigh whether to use divided highways or surface streets based on time of day and traffic reports. I don't need the incentive (or should I say disincentive?) of tolling. Similarly when I can drive at off peak periods I do so without regard to tolls. Reviewing your web site I am persuaded that if anything tolling would produce a negative result — channeling traffic to streets that are now relatively clear without relieving existing bottlenecks, especially in areas where there is no viable alternative to the highway. I would much rather you tax me directly if more funds are needed for either roadway improvements or public transit. And though I support mass transit options as a matter of public policy I for one would NEVER abandon my auto for a bus, streetcar or train regardless of any consideration.	Edward Hershey	Comment form
07/11	Dear Representative: I am a middle-aged native Portlander and Oregonian in strong favor of tolling our local highways. Please consider making our community safer and cleaner by implementing "value pricing" to our highway corridors. I am also in strong favor of providing low income households subsidies for mass transit or toll passes. I am also in strong favor of using any requisite toll funds for all roadway safety enhancements, including for bike commuters and pedestrians. I appreciate your consideration,	Toshio Suzuki	Comment form
07/11	Thank you for considering my thoughts on Congestion Pricing. I am in favor of instituting Congestion Pricing in the Portland Area. This will lower the demand for the use of the tolled roads, lessening traffic and air pollution. I am strongly in favor of some of the funds being used to fund alternatives to driving, including improvements for transit, bicycling, and walking. I am open to the idea that these roads would only be tolled during rush hour, or some other mechanism to raise tolls when the roads are overloaded, and lower the tolls when traffic is light. I am mostly in favor of tolling all of I-5 and I-205 from the state line until their junction in Tualatin. There could be different prices on different roads based on that road's congestion. Tolls on I-84, The Sunset Highway, and 217 should also be considered at a later date. Thank you.	David DeFauw	Comment form
07/11	Please implement congestion pricing! This will help encourage people to carpool, take public transit, and bike. To make this successful, please use some of the revenue	Eric Porter	Comment form





	to improve transit and biking routes. If I-5 had an express bus lane down the middle of it, that would be a great alternative. We need to look around the globe and see how major metropolitan cities have improved their traffic problems. MORE LANES IS NEVER THE ANSWER!		
07/11	Please, please raise this money some other way!!!! Traveling on the freeway is already frustrating enough without everyone stacked up like cordwood lined up to pay a toll! Holy cow! Who is in favor of this????	Beverley Davis	Comment form
07/11	Consideration should be given to creating a monorail system similar to the one in Seattle, Washington. It would be costly to build but could be above ground and build on existing road system right-of-way. The rails could be heated so no delay during snow or freezing rain. There would need to be enough legs so people would use it instead of driving. The layout could be similar to rail system in Washington DC area. A special assessment could be put into place to cover cost over a number of years or a toll put in place for a period to recover cost. Elevators could be installed stops for handicap personnel. This would draw a lot more people from driving than anything else.	Emmett Whitaker	Comment form
07/11	We have lived in West Linn for 34 years, over which time we have watched in frustration while the congestion problem has escalated. As we have experienced over this time, additional public transportation and/or bicycle paths are NOT the answer. Commuter destinations are too widespread to be serviced by such fixed systems. Likewise, forcing the commuter public to bear the inefficiencies of buses/MAX/streetcar by imposing a de facto tax in the form of toll roads is unfair. As long as our greater Portland area is supported by workplaces that are spread all over the map, the commuting public needs its private cars. Let's face it, the answer lies in improvements to our antiquated highway system. Isn't that, after all, why we pay gasoline taxes? TOLL BRIDGES OR ROADS ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE.	Roberta Dechert	Comment form
07/11	Portland is decades behind on improving transportation. First course of action should be to add HOV lanes on all major freeways. Then catch up with the rest of the world and put through traffic under ground. If you charge a driver during peak rush hour, anyone under 80 will just use Waze's to avoid the fee and flood residential streets with traffic. As much as Portland planners would like to see everyone jumping on max, a bus or a bike, that just isn't realistic. Instead of adding roads, you have recently taken a major road from two lanes to one...absolutely stupid!!	Doug	Comment form
07/11	Although I am directly impacted infrequently, I am a resident of Washington County and an Oregon taxpayer and thus part of this discussion. It seems to me that anything that reduces congestion and eliminates the need for more freeway construction is a good idea. Tolls in and of themselves are neither good nor bad. The plan, as laid out by the ODOT, sounds reasonable and constructive. I think it should be given a fair chance to succeed. As noted in the background information provided by ODOT: Seattle drivers saved an average of 26 minutes every day in 2016 with their express toll lanes on I-405. It's time to try something new. Tolls are coming eventually anyway, so let's begin with this proposal and see how it works. Good luck!	James L Boone	Comment form
07/11	I moved from Seattle to Portland less than a year ago. As I'm sure you are well aware, they have this type of thing up there. Does Oregon already have a department in place to handle the overwhelming amount of paperwork and computer work required to take on such a project? Do you have the staff in place, trained and with all of the required benefits that come with taking this gigantic step? What I am trying to say is, will it be cost effective? If you must hire additional staff and get them trained and add the required benefits that come with such a position, will it be worth it. I-405 on the Eastside in Washington has something like this and there is still horrendous traffic congestion. I don't know if I think it is worth it. The toll bridge from Seattle to Bellevue took a long time to get into place. The "Good to Go" program still doesn't have all the kinks out of it. I think the first thing that should be done is a cost evaluation of each project. Is it worth the work and the staffing and will it accomplish the goal. Have you spoken with other cities that have tried these types of programs and what have they learned? In my mind, they aren't efficient and aren't worth the time and effort.	Katherine Harris	Comment form
07/11	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I live near the Terwilliger curves, between Barbur Blvd and I5. I am seriously concerned that tolling on I5 South to the Multnomah Blvd exit will divert traffic from downtown Portland onto Barbur and Macadam. It will happen - you cannot ignore that fact. And, while Barbur is technically a highway, it also runs through neighborhoods and gridlock on both I5 and Barbur will degrade my	Eva Calcagno	Comment form

	<p>neighborhood livability. Drivers from downtown will head south on Barbur to Capitol Hwy/I5 on-ramp to avoid the tolls and the infrastructure at Capitol cannot handle that. Or they will head south on Barbur and then east on Terwilliger to get to Lake Oswego, etc. That intersection and bridge are already overloaded during rush hour. I completely understand the need to address congestion from daily commuter traffic from Vancouver/Clark County. I sincerely ask that you end the tolling zone closer to downtown to avoid diverting traffic to Barbur Blvd or Macadam. In addition, Metro is planning the SW Corridor light rail project on Barbur, further complicating traffic (during construction). Light Rail will not be an option to congestion pricing for many years. Your website notes that "Successful congestion pricing programs around the world are usually combined with transit improvements to provide additional travel choices for those not wanting to pay the toll." ODOT is not planning alternatives with implementation of tolling, and is not tasked with mass transit. The reason the I405 tolling works in Seattle is because of the significant rapid bus service/express service infrastructure that runs between Bellevue and Seattle (adequate parking and frequent buses). There is no such option in the Portland area. As noted also on your website, "Any funds raised from tolling will go first to pay for implementing the tolling system. If there is additional revenue left over, it must be used for roadway improvements, as mandated by Oregon state law." That does not include funding for any transportation options to relieve traffic or provide alternatives for people not willing or able to pay the tolls. Please reconsider your recommendation to toll so far south of downtown on I5. It will not be a "value" to the residents of SW Portland, but increase the "congestion" in our already overloaded</p>		
07/11	<p>"The primary goal is to improve travel." Well, it doesn't. What it does is allow the rich to ride fast, while middle-class wage earners who have no choice about when to travel are stuck in even more traffic. I know, I've lived through this when I lived in the Puget Sound area. We all pay taxes for the highways - we should be able to use the roads equally. This is an economic equality issue. Please, Oregon, be the first to reverse the trend towards allowing the rich to buy themselves a special life while consuming more public resources than the rest of us!</p>	Michael Trenga-Schein	Comment form
07/11	<p>I am opposed to tolling on I-205 as it unfairly impacts citizens of West Linn. We have poor transit service and 205 is our main connection to most parts of Portland. I am a senior citizen and would not be able to pay any tolls.</p>	Laureen McGrath	Comment form
07/11	<p>I have reviewed the recommendation report and believe Option B makes sense in terms of addressing congestion in the central city. I would use, and happily pay for, the stretch of freeway covered in this option. I question Option E since it seems to focus less on a congested metro area and more on a bottleneck that was created by ODOT. For the same reason, I would not support options that extend to the I-5 crossing of the Tualatin River, since the I-5 bridge is a local commute route with limited alternatives for pedestrians, public transit, cycling, or surface streets. Having personally paid to use freeways in Washington, and being cognizant of Washington residents' (and their representatives') past reluctance to pay for transit options on I-5 and 205, I am unsympathetic to options that let them off the hook for services used on the Oregon side. I have commuted to Vancouver for work and am willing to pay for use of congested freeways when I do so.</p>	David Busch	Comment form
07/11	<p>Dear OTC, The phased approach should be scrapped and instead replaced with a value pricing of the entire stretches of I-5 and I-205 to more fully reduce dependence on private motor vehicles for transportation. Funds raised by these user access fees need to go into more than highway projects as constant highway expansion will not solve congestion but encourage the growth of vehicle volumes. Bolstering development of transit, bike, and pedestrian alternatives are essential to building a more efficient and equitable transportation system. Adding congestion pricing has the opportunity to reduce delays, decrease air pollution, improve transportation equity, and provide a source of funding to maintain our transportation system. The trap to avoid is funding only maintenance and improvements for a single, inefficient mode of transportation. Thank you.</p>	David Stein	Comment form
07/11	<p>Rolling out bridges is a disaster in the making! We already paid for those bridges. My son works at terminal 6 and lives in Vancouver but pays Ortaxes, now you're expecting him to pay toll fees also! Its outrageous and we don't even have a new bridge yet because Or., delayed meeting the deadlines from the federal government to use federal funds. If we had a new bridge we'd pay the toll on it but only for that reason, otherwise we avoid Oregon now but I don't know what our son will do. He pays plenty enough to your taxes!</p>	Sandy Grahnert	Comment form



07/11	We need you to prioritize decongestion pricing and transit options over freeway expansion. Freeway expansion would be the worst idea for Portland and the neighborhoods it would disrupt, and would only cause more congestion. Decongestion pricing would be much more helpful in changing traffic patterns for the long haul. Furthermore, putting the monies raised by decongestion pricing into a freeway expansion would be ludicrously wasteful - use that money to fund transit options instead! Free fares on TriMet? A MAX line to Vancouver? More bus routes along I5, I205, I84, etc? All are better than more freeway.	Leslie Poston	Comment form
07/11	Oregonians are known for 2 things: no sales tax and no highway tolls. Put this on any ballot in an off-year election/special elections on July 5th, and the answer will be NO! Yes I5 and 205 are crowded, and in spite of what some people may dream, they can't be enlarged. One (expensive) solution is to put a bridge over the entire I5, making it effectively 4 or 5 lane per direction. But the decrepit I5 bridge from 1917 is still there, because Vancouver folks, equally don't want taxes. I would support a tax for a new bridge, with 1 rail line in the middle. If/when people would agree on Max over Columbia, it can be hooked up. Another option is using existing rail line to make a commuter rail line from Vancouver and further up north to NW Portland (unused industrial rail lines with the possibility of a small passenger rail terminal). Trains every hour or so, should do it. WES supposedly is a failure as there are 8 trains per day, extend it to Woodburn/Salem (hey we had that until 1960 or so), or extend the max line from Clackamas along 205 and the middle of I5 to Salem. Surprise you'll eliminate some of that I5 clogging. Expensive, maybe, but better than tolling everything and clogging neighborhoods. Rail lines take less space than a highway! I sometimes take 14 through Vancouver to avoid 84 from SE Portland to downtown. That means 2x tolls for one trip. Come on, put this on a ballot! Thanks.	Ciprian Damboianu	Comment form
07/11	NO TOLLING ON I-5 OR I-205! This is not value or congestion pricing, but a move to extort money from all north/south traffic! I should not have to pay a toll to help Portland commuters when using the INTERSTATE highway to travel to Washington from Oregon. Oregon should be looking into other ways to control congestion with rideshares, public transportation, and hov lanes. The only case where tolling would be acceptable would be if new express lanes or an express toll way was constructed and the new lanes ONLY were tolled! As an Oregon native and resident I am extremely disappointed that this is even being considered as an option. If it does pass and go through then why would Washington, California or any other state not do the same thing for the interstates passing through their congested areas!	Nathan Scott	Comment form
07/11	Save the Village Inn. There is ample time to adjust the plans to avoid destroying an iconic area business. Retaining the restaurant near the transit center would seem to make good sense for both the commuter and other consumers. It serves as a good landmark and staging area for those using the transit system; its presence might promote ridership by offering a comfortable place to wait and meet up with fellow travelers. Portland mass transit serves a small percentage of the population. Why not find a compromise which serves a larger cross section?	Tom Freedland	Comment form
07/11	Tolling is just another way to introduce another stealth tax to drivers. It promises to help reduce congestion by funding ongoing efforts to expand the roadways but merely turns into a way charge people more for driving along their daily routes. A simple look at the cities along the north east coast will give you plenty of evidence that such policies do not do what they promise. All tolls do is make it more expensive to drive and place undue burdens on the citizens, possibly impacting the poor and minorities to a greater degree. You are better off creating a "thru traffic only" section of the highway that passes right through Portland to help decongest the traffic, one without any exits into the actual city. That way, only people who need to get around, or go into, Portland use the local highway.	Jonathan	Comment form
07/11	As an (East) Portland resident who would like faster, more convenient travel options to downtown, I strongly support congestion charging, but only if revenues are used to improve alternatives to single passenger car travel! That means public transit, cycling and walking and car pooling/car sharing. From its inception, congestion charging has been a tool to alleviate congestion in densely populated metro areas where road capacity is maxed out -- and the need arises to make more efficient use of the existing system. This is the case in the Portland area. Arguments have been put forth that revenues from congestion charging should be channeled into freeway widening projects. This is madness! It undermines the very aims of congestion charging as a policy tool. First, the envisioned widening projects focus on short segments of freeway seen as bottlenecks or pinch points. Such projects will, at best, simply displace current	Greg Spencer	Comment form

	<p>traffic bottlenecks further downstream on the road network. And if these projects -- by their false promise of faster, more pleasant commutes -- encourage more people to travel by car (induced demand), then Portland will have even worse congestion on the surface streets where all commutes begin and end. As well, there will be greater strain on parking capacity, more pollution, more GHG emissions, more traffic noise and more road crashes. I applaud decision makers for exploring congestion charging. But congestion charging is a policy tool to alleviate congestion and it won't do this if revenues are spent on road widening projects. Portland needs to discouraging single-passenger car travel and encouraging people to take alternative modes that make more efficient use of existing road space, i.e. public transit, cycling and walking and other shared modes of transport.</p>		
07/11	<p>A key cause of the current congestion is poor strategic planning 10-20 years ago. Rather than using our tax dollars to increase road and bridge capacity, millions were invested in expanding light rail. Light rail is extremely expensive to build and maintain and will never meet the transportation needs of a large percent of the population. Light rail is not flexible and cannot easily be shifted to meet changing populations in various areas. Expand lanes of highway, increase bridge capacity and stop wasting money on light rail (busses are more flexible and less expensive). We've already paid for the roads you now want to toll. If you build new lanes on existing highways or new highways, those could be used as toll roads but it is unconscionable to propose taxing people to use roads that have already been paid for and most people must use to go anywhere in the metro area. You will also force more traffic on surface streets, thereby increasing the risk for pedestrians and bicyclists. You will make the Portland metro area increasingly unaffordable for tens of thousands of families.</p>	Sally Cangelosi	Comment form
07/11	<p>NO WAY!!! NO TOLLS ON OUR ROADS!!!</p>	Stephen Schmidt	Comment form
07/11	<p>Tolling alone will not reduce congestion. Mass transit is not even helping. The infrastructure needs to grow as the community grows but that does not happen. Every town is putting in dense housing without the roads and highways being increased. Most employers are located in metro areas and people are stuck commuting. Portland does not have any express bus or train service to help. Biking is a joke for most families because we don't have the time to bike our kids around and get to work. If tolls are implemented, people will find ways through towns and cities to bypass the tolls as much as possible creating local gridlock. Max designs are not helping. With lack of parking lots at stations the side streets get congested. Down town the stops are to frequent. The trains are full to capacity during peak rush hours. Then they have their reliability issues that need to address. The only way to address this issue is to limit grown in these areas or require the new housing developers to pitch in to widen the highways.</p>	Pete Kleine	Comment form
07/11	<p>I used to be a daily commuter on the Hiway 217 corridor and just dreaded it due to congestion. Fortunately I had an alternate route available on extremely heavy days, like Fridays. I appreciate the desire to improve traffic but I wonder if tolls will just end up moving traffic to the side streets? Also, consider how it will affect tourists and visitors who are only there for a short time. Having to pay a toll to pass through or visit may make visitors and/or tourists reconsider visiting the Portland area, thereby diminishing the tourism dollar to the area. I know I would not want to visit an area if I knew I would have to pay a toll to drive on their hiways.</p>	Erin Ferre	Comment form
07/11	<p>To Whom it may concern, Regarding the proposals by the Oregon Dept of Transportation to issue tolls on I-5 and 205 in the Portland metro area, I find myself in strong agreement with the concerns expressed by AAA of Oregon. Tolling the interstate highways would unfairly punish commuters who have no ability to alter their work schedule and it would only serve to shift traffic onto local roads (in particular I would imagine it severely impact Barbur Blvd, McLoughlin, and 82nd Ave, leading to more hazards for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists). Furthermore, I don't see any proof that tolling would actually have a significant impact on reducing congestion at peak times. As your own study pointed out a couple of years ago, many Portland highways are over capacity at all times of the day so there really isn't a "peak time" anymore for traffic. It also seems that there is a failure to account for the fact that a large amount of traffic on the interstates is truck traffic, not commuter traffic. Would tolling really have any impact on reducing this? What is needed in the Portland area is more highway capacity. The region has more than doubled in population since the 1970s yet the highways haven't expanded to match the increased population. I-5, the busiest highway on the West Coast, carries only 2 lanes through the Rose Quarter (it carries FEWER lanes than I-90 through Spokane, a city of less than 1/4 of Portland's population). As Portland becomes more expensive to live within the city, more working</p>	Colby Burns	Comment form



	<p>class families are moving to the suburbs farther from the city which is only increasing traffic woes. There are few options for commuting other than driving for people farther from the city's core, and adding more bike lanes isn't going to help people who live at a great distance from work. Portland needs more highway capacity and ODOT needs to find a way to fund that without tolling. I would like here to point out that Washington DOT has found a way to fund multiple major highway projects in the last few years without tolling and Washington state doesn't even have a state income tax. I don't know why Oregon can't seem to use any of its transportation taxes on actual projects that would benefit people. As AAA pointed out in their strongly worded letter, this tolling proposal seems to be nothing more than another way for ODOT to pass the buck without actually accomplishing anything. It hurts the working class, and will make surface streets more dangerous. I ask you to please build more existing capacity on our highways before considering any tolling options. Look to Washington state as an example of how to get this done the right way.</p>		
07/11	<p>Put in a west side bypass. Extend 205 south over to Jackson school road. Then tunnel through the hills and cross the Columbia. Then north to I-5. Just stand on the Murray road overpass on US-26 in the morning from 6 am to 9 am. Count the number of cars with Washington licence plates. They are coming over for work at semiconductor plants in Washington county. This will fix all the issues.</p>	David White	Comment form
07/11	<p>I previously submitted a comment, but also want to point out that I am not comfortable paying tolls when we don't know what the revenue will be used for. Revenue earmarked for projects has been diverted to other uses before - it's how we got MAX on the east side of Portland.</p>	Holly Lloyd	Comment form
07/11	<p>Hello, I'm against tolling the areas that have been marked for tolling. We should be tolling Vancouver and Washington residents who use our sections of the freeway to come to Oregon to avoid taxes. They have often been approached to help pay for bridge upgrades and repairs, and consistently vote against them. If this does happen, despite the public outcry, then at least use lane pricing so that people who can't afford tolls have an option. This will directly affect my husband's commute, and we do not need any additional bills to pay. This will also affect my commute, as drivers will assuredly divert onto Highway 43, which is the route I take. It's already congested, has stop lights and few lanes, and this will make it worse. The citizens who are already paying Oregon taxes should not be burdened with tolls.</p>	Holly Lloyd	Comment form
07/11	<p>I hope that throughout this process, you sincerely listen to the people of the state of Oregon. It will have a significant impact on the lives of a significant number of Oregonians. Throughout this process, from what I've heard, these "listening sessions" are nothing but a dog-and-pony show that you must go through in order to rubber-stamp the agenda to put tolls on Oregon roads. If you hear loud and clear from the people that tolling is not the way to go, the plug needs to be pulled on this idea. If the people are in support of the plan, then go for it. Please remember that you are taking money directly out of the pockets of the citizens of Oregon, and anyone else traveling through our state, and a correct decision needs to be made on this project.</p>	Kyler Pace	Comment form
07/11	<p>This toll proposal is ridiculous. It will do nothing to relieve congestion. Nobody travels on 5 or 205 during rush hour for fun. We drive on them because we have to get to work or to appointments. This will just be a tax on people trying to live their lives. There is no viable public transit alternative for most people thanks to "the last mile." Where are the proposals to use toll money to address this? There are none. So far the sales pitch is, "We are going to charge you to use the roads YOU paid for and YOU maintain with gas tax and WE are going to keep the money."</p>	Galín McMahon	Comment form
07/11	<p>Commission Members, The following principles should be included in your work regarding Value Pricing: 1. Price roads based on demand – Any new variable price on driving should be set through a transparent and inclusive policy with the goal of reducing congestion. 2. Fund transportation choices like transit, biking, and walking – in order to get the environmental and equity benefits of pricing, frequent transit service must be a reliable alternative to driving on a priced roadway, which means it must be incorporated into ODOT's plans from the beginning. 3. Pricing roads program should affirmatively and measurably reduce current transportation inequities – It is not enough to mitigate burdens to low income communities and communities of color. A strong pricing program can help reduce travel times, improve air quality, and result in safer and more efficient ways to get around. Thank you.</p>	Robin Scholetsky	Comment form
07/11	<p>I approve of congestion pricing. The sooner the better. Congestion costs money... either pay with dollars or pay with time. My company has employees on the road</p>	Keith Bailey	Comment form

	every day with deliveries or sales staff customer visits. I have to pay my drivers to sit in traffic. Further my capital investment in trucks is tied up in traffic. It is time to do what many other governments have done. From London to Southern California to Seattle... congestion pricing works. Further, we need to toll the Columbia River bridges asap to pay for new capacity over the river.		
07/11	40 years ago Neil Goldschmidt had a vision for the future of transportation planning. In the years since the Portland area has invested heavily in light rail (5.1 billion and counting) and has left the freeway systems at virtually the same capacity. This vision has FAILED MISERABLY. As light rail has siphoned off valuable transportation dollars we are now looking at gridlock on our freeways. Those funds could have increased freeway capacity, something that most tri county residents would agree needs to happen. The gas tax collected between fed and state is over 55 cents per gallon. This tax should and would cover freeway maintenance. Why should area residents have to pay a toll for freeways we have already paid for? Tolls for NEW freeways and bridges are a fine idea. Tolling the lanes the public has already paid for is onerous for all and punitive to many struggling to get to work and get by.	Aaron Aigner	Comment form
07/11	No tolls. No tolls. NO TOLLS! (And NO "value pricing/congestion pricing...what DUMB terms!) The tolls will further penalize working people of Portland and force more people out of the area. Tolls will also severely impact North Portland with more cut through traffic. This toll madness needs to STOP!	Daniel Potter	Comment form
07/11	Part of the reason this idea is being considered is the many complaints of increased traffic through local neighborhoods to avoid the freeway/highway system. If you charge to use the freeway/highway system more people will avoid these roads and end up driving through neighborhoods.	David Conlee	Comment form
07/11	No toll roads. Please. No. Toll. Roads. California and Arizona charge annual vehicle registration fees based on vehicle msrp... Not suggesting that, but it would help versus the 2 year \$89 registration fee.	Chris Pasteur	Comment form
07/11	Regarding the south 205 toll at Tualatin...people already take back roads to avoid traffic on the area. Same will go for the tolls except it will make the back roads even more congested than they are now as nobody will want to pay. Also, most employers WILL NOT provide any raises or compensation to account for the new transportation cost. Even \$60/month in tolls can break a person's budget. Especially when the cost of living is so high in Portland. People already can't make it on their own.	Deana Watkinson	Comment form
07/11	I will not pay twice to use a road. We need more roads not more taxes. This proposal will simply shift traffic to surface streets so people can avoid the tolls on federal highways already paid for by taxpayers. I view this proposal as another reason to flee this state to avoid the political insanity of proposals like this one.	Brian A Rose	Comment form
07/11	I do not like the tolling idea. We already pay high income tax and property tax. As far as I'm concerned there hasn't been anything done to try and solve the congestion. We are closing 4 lane thru roads like Foster down to 2 lanes. This shows me that ODOT does not have the interest of drivers. They are anti car and I don't approve or like a toll road. I-5 has an HOV lane that doesn't help. Get rid of the HOV lane first! Let's see how that helps. Stop closing major thru roads to add a fucking bike lane.	Samantha Lang	Comment form
07/11	Hello- I support the recommendation to add congestion pricing to portions of I-5 and 205. I believe this will encourage people to take public transportation and will cut down on unnecessary use of highways during peak hours. It's important to support low-income communities with fare assistance, as Tri-Met is, to give folks an option if they are unable to afford the congestion pricing.	Frances Hall	Comment form
07/11	Oregon Transportation Commission, I support Value Pricing as described in the recommendation of concepts. I support Concept C, and using congestion pricing to fund alternative modes of transit.	Andrew Glick	Comment form
07/11	Please be careful to think about how to toll the area near the Abernethy Bridge. By actually tolling the bridge you will be limiting or discouraging personal and business access to residents who live and work in the areas of Oregon City and West Linn and vicinities. It will also create more congestion on the old Oregon City bridge, in downtown Oregon City and in Willamette. (Remember there is no other way except a boat to cross the river). I don't think it will necessarily solve a problem but create a larger one. It seems to me you could toll an area just north of the bridge, say between the Park Place exit and Clackamas exit and get what you are looking for without severely impacting locals movement. Locals know and would use the alternative routes to avoid the freeway.	Arliss Wallace	Comment form



07/11	I believe that Value Pricing is yet another example of the poor getting punished for the benefit of the wealthy. While I might enjoy quicker commutes through Portland, those that cannot afford it will end up with longer commutes on side streets and more traffic through their neighborhoods. The public transportation system should benefit all members of the public equally.	Jim Poetsch	Comment form
07/11	We just won't pay, a ridiculous idea, it will def keep people out of those areas! Just another idea to take money away from our pockets and putting it into the pockets of politicians! We are on to you! So our vote is no, a THOUSAND TIMES NO!	Cecelia Klinkenberg	Comment form
07/11	Many Oregon residents had decided to move to Clark County over the past 20 years for lower housing cost and they knew that the bridges would be a bottle neck for their commute. I've seen recent new reports about Clark County residents not registering their cars in Washington to avoid paying taxes on their car. I don't have a problem with a toll (user tax) but these locations are not taxing the where the problem is. Is that because you want to save the State boundary for a future tolls for another failed Columbia River Crossing project?	Jim O	Comment form
07/11	I'm a long time resident of the metropolitan area who can remember when east of 82nd Avenue was sparsely developed, and note how now continued development around Murray Hill seems constant. Just as housing has had to become more dense, transportation routes must also adapt to accommodate the increased volume of cars. People are going to drive cars-it's simply a more convenient option that fortunately technology is making-and will continue to make-automobile commuting less polluting. I suspect in a few decades most autos will be zero emission. The long term solution must be to increase capacity of existing corridors like I-5 and I-84 with double decks. Linking the existing Fremont and Marquam Bridges, and a new double deck Columbia bridge. with this sort of transportation planning is the only viable option to move more traffic. I know the sight of a double deck freeway right across the Willamette River rubs many people the wrong way, and it should. But I also remember when working with an advocacy group in the 1990's about the Bull Run water system the necessity to upgrade the Mt. Tabor reservoirs with an engineered cover that would make the reservoirs look just the same, while sealing off any contamination from birds and humans, was met with too much resistance. That problem hasn't yet been resolved nearly a quarter of a century later. I hope this transportation commission sees part of their mission with recommending a long term solution to move increasing traffic instead of hoping that somehow increasing population will not produce traffic volumes. And just as with the unapproved reservoir solution, double-decked corridors can be engineered to not only be safe, but I suspect no more unsightly than what already exists. Remember when the center span of the Fremont was built on Swan Island and floated upriver on barges and lifted in place? We have the ability to still build new infrastructure locally, and should.	Tom Boon	Comment form
07/11	I don't know that tolls are the answer. It seems your target is the people crossing the Washington/Oregon border-if that is the case then put a toll at that border for people going either way. Use the money to clear the max and more lanes on the freeways. I have lived in. Few large cities and out freeways are not big enough for the number of people here. If your target is people getting off the roads then why are you only rolling two freeways. What about 26 and 217? Those are awful and many points in the day. Expand the max! It doesn't go out to tualatin or Tigard-give more people options to get to work. If it went to my work I would take it. Add lanes-and shoulders. On 84 if there is a wreck there is no shoulder so a lane gets blocked. Again, I don't think tolls are the answer for those who live and work in Portland. There are A ton of Washington plates on the road-toll the border both ways and use that money to expand other things. Don't penalize those of us that work and love in our community!	Ashley Jenkinson	Comment form
07/11	I completely oppose this system. This is just another way to get lower income people out of their cars and in public transportation. This will ruin neighborhoods and lead to more pedestrian and bicycle deaths as people drive around the tolls.	Eric Goranson	Comment form
07/11	I agree with tolling and hope it helps provide part of the answer to the awful congestion.	Kathryn Hanavan	Comment form
07/11	If you decide to toll, 100% of the monies needs to be used to improve vehicular traffic on that roadway. For example, tolling I5 from the WA boarder south into Downton should go to adding more lanes or something similar to that section of roadway. I am not OK with simply adding the monies from tolling into a general fund that is used for any project that ODOT deems worthy.	Matt Ewalt	Comment form

07/11	The state of New Jersey uses tolls not to change behavior, but to provide continued roadway improvement. If I'm being charged a toll, I expect quality service. This plan is intended to change my behavior. That is a fundamental flaw. If I need to travel between points A and B, I will travel in order to economically survive. The Garden State Parkway and NJ Turnpike Authority plan for expansion and provide the service. If you want to charge me money, expand the number of lanes and provide me some additional service. If you want to change my behavior without improving the service, that is a failed plan.	David Allen	Comment form
07/11	Please put up tolls. But think through possible consequences and work with the PBOT. Too many people are driving alone at rush hour. Many of them do not need to be on the road at that time.	Ashbel S Green	Comment form
07/11	I oppose tolling of any kind. It is unfair to those living in Vancouver who work in Portland. It also unfairly targets middle class workers who cannot adjust their start time. I support higher gas tax and registration fees. Hell even a sales tax is better in my opinion!	Josh Ferrell	Comment form
07/11	I hope the study is looking far enough into the future vs. just trying to solve an immediate problem. 2. Some comments I've heard on tolling is to shift the traffic to side streets. This is a crazy goal. The side streets are not designed to handle existing traffic increases plus the future. 3. Specifically what is the money collected to be used for? Bike lanes - no. Pedestrian bridges - no. Even if mass transportation is significantly expanded and used vehicle traffic will continue to increase as population grows and the demand for services increases. Unfortunately to handle existing plus more traffic roads need to be built. This will require purchasing land that has already been developed to build on. The process will be extremely costly. Toll money should go towards these projects.	Larry Jacobs	Comment form
07/11	It is important that the income from this tolling be used to update,improve, or enlarge the highway system. No light-rail funding please.	Bill McCorkle	Comment form
07/11	No tolls! You already get road taxes from fuel!!!	Erik No Last Name	Comment form
07/11	It is completely IDIOTIC to even think about making toll roads out of freeways that are already built. Maybe if the local government would learn how to manage spending instead of lining their own pockets with excessive income for not doing their job there might actually be money in their budget to fix things. Portland city government cares more about their income than they care about their own city, it is disgusting to see them squander away money like they do. I was born and raised in Portland and have seen the extreme downfall of Portland government taking care of anything. If Portland government officials cannot figure out how to use their budget properly to take care of things they should all go without pay until they do figure it out. They do not know how to budget spending, they just know how to waste money. A huge source of revenue would be to impose a usage fee for bicycles. Tons of money is spent on making bike lanes and who pays for it...motorist do, cyclist need to pay their fare share too but then again that is asking WAY too much	Tony D	Comment form
07/11	Use of automated license plate readers for Oregon toll roads would potentially pose the same problem that it does in Washington State: greedy rental car companies will gouge any rental car users forced to traverse them. The way this works is that the first time you pass an electronic plate reader on a toll road, you're charged the toll, plus a service fee, and you CONTINUE to be charged that "service fee" for each additional day of your rental (sometimes up to a cap of perhaps \$20 or \$25), even if you never use another toll road. You have no ability to "sign up" to directly pay the tolls yourself for the duration of the rental, either. This means that a single toll segment can end up costing you \$30, which I think is outrageous -- and in many cases rental car drivers have no option. San Francisco has ended up litigating this practice (see for example "San Francisco Sues Hertz for Charging High Toll Fees" at <a href="https://www.autorentalnews.com/139383/san-francisco-sues-hertz-for-charging-high-toll-fees">https://www.autorentalnews.com/139383/san-francisco-sues-hertz-for-charging-high-toll-fees</a> ) and so have may other jurisdictions. I hope you will ensure that Oregon rental car drivers don't get similarly victimized.	J St Sauver	Comment form
07/11	Tolls crossing the Columbia are acceptable. There are many that live in one state but work in the other. Those that use the roads should help to maintain them. What's disheartening is the idea of tolling the freeways in other places other than the Columbia. Most of us have to commute to work and the cost of living is atrocious in this city. We barely make ends meet as it is. A transportation tax just went into effect in	Pam Miller	Comment form





	Oregon on July 1. To add another bill to an already overtaxed middle class is not doing what's best for the people.		
07/11	Please quit finding additional ways to tax us and figure out how to work within the constraints of your current budget, just as all the constituents you supposedly serve are already forced to do in everyday life.	Chris Holbrook	Comment form
07/11	One of the stated goals of the PAC is to reduce congestion. The best way to reduce congestion is to have fewer cars on the road. It is not to widen freeways, as the examples of Los Angeles, the Bay Area and Atlanta have proved. The funds collected by any tolling scheme should go toward alternatives to driving. This includes: bicycling, walking and public transportation. Another huge element involves coordinated efforts at land-use planning. Businesses should be rewarded for locating in dense places where it's easy for people to get there via ways other than the automobile. I lived in Lake Oswego and commuted to a job in downtown Portland every day for more than 12 years. My wife commuted to her job in Beaverton. We moved to Portland and sold one of our two cars. I began working out of my home. Now, our one car often goes unused for long periods. We bicycle most places. Getting us to drive less had nothing to do with congestion pricing. It was enabled by living closer to places where we can bike and walk.	Michael Tevlin	Comment form
07/11	I know the cogs of government turn slowly, and I understand why that's a good thing. But this has been in the planning stages forever. Start congestion pricing immediately. It looks like you're most interested in doing I5 through downtown first, so build toll booths in NEPO and SWPO and call it a day. Data collection from those tolling areas combined with monitoring traffic on I84 and I205 could inform your next move (whether that's pricing changes, adjustments to manage surface street traffic, or additional tolls on the other highways), but you need to start working now. Our roads are more congested than ever before, anything other than congestion pricing just encourages people to drive. Tolls encourages better social behavior. If Portland wants to be a big city, it's time to deal with traffic like big cities: Make it harder to drive and make public transit more attractive. Do it fast, and do it soon.	Jacob Hyman	Comment form
07/11	Washington Commuters are the only drivers who should pay a toll to use Oregon roads. They refused to build the I-5 bridge back in 2013. When there was Oregon and Federal money available. They contribute to the bulk of I-5 and 205 rush hour traffic.	Chris Hebbeler	Comment form
07/11	Tolls on public highways are the wrong way to raise revenue. I come from Orange County, California where toll roads have been used for years. Faced with the option of a one hour drive home or 20 minutes, I chose the toll road so I could have time with my young children before bed. At first the cost was manageable, but the tolls increased several times a year until it became equal to another car payment each month which I could not afford. Additionally, the toll roads did not reduce traffic on the free alternative. It would still take the same hour or more to get home that way. Please learn from my experience. We do not want Portland to become Orange County for many reasons. Allowing only people who can afford the tolls to get home to spend time with their families is neither fair nor justified. Thank you.	Gregory Eisner	Comment form
07/11	I am absolutely opposed to tolling all the lanes on any freeway. Value pricing has only been demonstrated to work in the US when additional capacity has been added and the new capacity tolled. This goes as far back in Oregon when the Astoria Bridge and second Interstate Span was put into service between Portland and Vancouver. (Once paid for, the tolls were removed) This tolling of additional capacity is exactly what has been done in the Seattle area. A lane has been added, sometimes two, and then the new lane(s) are tolled in variable amounts depending on traffic. At some times there are no tolls; other times the amount varies getting higher when traffic flows get higher. Any other tolling arrangement, without added capacity, would likely shift some small amount of traffic to other arterials but has been, in some sense, not drive people to public transportation but rather keep them out. Case in point, the fare box is heavily subsidized already in Portland, as well as a substantial tax on wage earners but still very small numbers ride public transit. A second example is the shrinking of retail sales in downtown Portland as the parking has been removed.	Richard Leonetti	Comment form
07/11	Toll the bridges from WA. How about getting the appleknockers that come down here to work, draw benefits, live in their cars, shop tax free, and return bottles to finally chip in instead of breaking the backs of average Oregonians?	Ryan Thomas	Comment form
07/11	I fully support (de)congestion pricing of all lanes of I-5 and I-205 as a tool to ameliorate traffic. It's the only known—and proven—solution to reduce traffic volume.	Aaron Ilika	Comment form

	Adding capacity, however, does the opposite; while it may initially reduce traffic, the induced demand it inevitably creates means more people will drive than do now. With global temperatures on the rise, ODOT has a unique opportunity to utilize the funds acquired from (de)congestion pricing to more sustainable forms of transit, including pedestrian, transit, and bicycle infrastructure. What ODOT must not do, however, is funnel the proceeds into more highways, which will encourage more driving and automobile dependence in the Portland metro area, and create further traffic congestion down the road. Aside from not solving congestion problems and being exorbitantly expensive, adding capacity will exacerbate the public and environmental health challenges that auto dependence has created; these include global warming, as referenced earlier, but on a more human scale, increased cases of asthma and diabetes. Please implement (de)congestion pricing and use the proceeds from tolls to improve alternate modes of transportation.		
07/11	I'm opposed to all tolls for public use of public roads, what you call value pricing. By any name, this is an unwarranted tax. I'm a retired Portland resident on a fixed, limited income. I don't want my freedom to travel to be limited by my financial resources. In my opinion, the roads were built with public money and their use should be free to all.	Robert Rubenstein	Comment form
07/11	Dear Representative: I am a middle-aged native Portlander and Oregonian in strong favor of tolling our local highways. Please consider making our community safer and cleaner by implementing "value pricing" to our highway corridors. I am also in strong favor of providing low income households subsidies for mass transit or toll passes. I am also in strong favor of using any requisite toll funds for all roadway safety enhancements, including for bike commuters and pedestrians. I appreciate your consideration, Kyle Mallory	Kyle Mallory	Comment form
07/11	I'm comfortable with the proposed plan as long as an electronic component is added that allows a driver to not have to stop and pay any toll. Rather the car has something that can be read to allow them to be charged - or like they do in Seattle, it reads your plate then sends you a bill.	Marianne Ross	Comment form
07/11	Yes, I am very in favor of toll options to allow paying to get there faster when I need it! Please implement the most extensive toll system proposed!	Ben Miller	Comment form
07/11	I am completely against tolling.	Katrina Docimo	Comment form
07/11	Freeways are FREE. If you want to add a new bridge and/or new lanes, make those subject to tolls. We have already paid for the Freeways in Portland many times with gas tax increases over the years. Portland gets EVERYTHING while the rest of the state suffers, particularly 101.	Glen Morris	Comment form
07/11	As a small business in Clackamas County these proposed Tolls, will just add yet another Tax to our business operations. Now while the economy is good you can pass on this tax to the customer. But when the next recession hits passing along these taxes will be more difficult. If you are going to create another Tax, by Tolling please do it on all of the freeways in the Region. There is no fairness in the current plan. You must toll US 26, OR 217, I405, and make this fair for all businesses.	Dave McNeel	Comment form
07/11	I hate the idea of congestion pricing. The whole idea of putting disincentives in place to move people to public transportation is socialistic and offensive to me. We the public have already paid for these roads. People need to get across the city. Not everyone has the income to pay these taxes so this hits those with lower incomes the hardest. It seems more about income than helping people. What is government for anyway? I do want to say I don't have a problem with charging a fee for a new lane. Additional capacity is needed and this may be the most realistic way to pay for it.	Dave Salholm	Comment form
07/11	No. I recently moved back from a state where tolls were often used as a way to maintain upkeep on bridges. In my 16 years they, the toll cost went from \$1.00 to \$6.00 and were well on it's way to \$9.00 by the end of 2022. Once tolls are established, they become a quick and easy way to pay for all sorts of infrastructure projects without having to pay back money on bonds. In addition, most of the people who will end up paying the tolls are commuters who live in cheaper parts of Washington and Oregon and commute to Portland for work. Toll will directly hurt the least fortunate in our society. Those who can afford to live close to work, will not be heavily impacted by tolls.	Brad Battles	Comment form
07/11	No, I don't think a toll should be added to congest outer already congested highways. Other areas which are sites as successful have more alternate routes than we do. For example I must either take backroads or freeway from Oregon City to stafford at prime time to get my kids to/from school. Both will be more congested with	Lori Dollar	Comment form



	<p>tolls with not many alternate routes. All of our routes are typically congested at that time. Is it fare to pay a toll just to get my kids to school? I can't alternate their start times, but with one in elementary and one in middle school they start 1.5 hour apart. Our little towns are not equipped to handle all of the additional overflow this will cause. Put it to the voters... a voice will be heard. I do not think enough is being done to let the public know about this. Put up signs and billboards in the area to be tolled with the web address tower info. Growth capacity needs to happen on our roads, but this is not the right answer. I don't want increased traffic in our neighborhoods with cars avoiding the freeway. We know what this looks like every time there is a fatal on 205 or snow/ice with HOURS long delays.</p>		
07/11	Tolls can (and will) increase over time and never go away. No tolls for Portland.	Robert Brown	Comment form
07/11	Tolls are not the answer. Work with trimet to create a reliable, timely, and affordable option. Express buses, more trains during peak times, and more reliable trains (ones that don't slow down/just stop working when the weather is below freezing or over 90). Tolls will simply hurt local residents, especially those who cannot afford to move out of the area. The added traffic on our already congested side streets will only make traveling around the metro area even more difficult. More business will close, since less people coming downtown means less revenue.	Maggie Surgeon	Comment form
07/11	I live in Vancouver and work in Portland, so I already pay taxes in both states. If there are tolls on the freeways, I will likely have to find a different job in Vancouver. I would not be able to afford a toll more than \$1 each way, and I know that it will be higher than that. I think the state of Oregon would lose a lot of commerce, especially if both freeways are tolled. One thing that might be better is toll lanes, like on I-405 in Seattle, that way drivers have the option.	Jean Rohde	Comment form
07/11	The mere suggestion of congestion pricing, or tolls as it were, is appalling to me given the fact that our existing taxes on gasoline, diesel, and other fuels are to be used for maintenance and improvement of transportation infrastructure. The State of Oregon has long ignored the need for construction of more freeways and highways, choosing instead to spend our tax dollars on alternatives in disregard of the fact that alternative transportation methods will never satisfy the needs of the State as a whole. Oregon has had net increases in tax revenue from a variety of sources which include hundreds of millions from marijuana sales. To say that the state is short of money for transportation projects and tolling is a viable option is disingenuous at best. I am adamantly opposed to tolling of our roads for any reason. What is needed is proper allocation of the funds already in existence.	Michael Firestone	Comment form
07/12	Tolls On Roads This Oregon Value Pricing on driving, (Tolls), is the perfect example of, "Government Is Like Cancer, It Just Keeps Growing And Growing Until It Kills You." This would require a whole new level of government bureaucracy, meaning another department of government to operate it, more people and more costs of money, etc. A simpler, better, and much cheaper in costs, solution would be for Oregon to raise its gas tax, that is \$.34/gallon. Washington's state gas tax is \$.494/gallon, \$.154 more than Oregon's. Raising Oregon's state gas tax to be about the same as Washington's would be better, simpler, and more cost-effective than Value Pricing or Tolls. We don't need government to get another hand into our pocket, a new tax, that will start out small, but will be sure to grow more and more, as all taxes do. Also this would create lots of unnecessary hassle for those of us paying the tolls. Bob Mattila, Brush Prairie, Washington Editor note: My address is 17924 NE Baker Creek Road, Brush Prairie, Washington, 98606. My phone number is 360-892-8248, cell phone 360-904-8338. Thank you. Bob	Bob Mattila	Comment form
07/12	Tolls are nothing but a way for elites to bully the rest of the working class. With all due respect... please remove your heads from your hind ends. This will solve nothing, it only serves to punish those of us in the real world trying to get to work. If ODOT and Portland would quit pissing away transportation dollars on bicycle paths and multi million dollar max lines there would be enough money to add lanes and reduce congestion. Let's try ACTUALLY fixing the problem.	Ross (No Last Name)	Comment form
07/12	As we all know Tolling isn't intended to make traffic move more freely or reduce congestion. Tolling is a way for Portland and Oregon Govt. to extort more money from the people it is supposed to serve as well as a way for crazy officials to try to get people to stop doing things they need to do, like commute to work, travel to see family, travel for goods and services along freeways that haven't been significantly improved since the '60's. These roads are paid for at every gas station in the State with	Troy Gossett	Comment form

	one of the highest if not the highest Gas Tax in the US as well as with Federal funds that are stolen to subsidize Light Rail, Tram, and other public transit projects that frequently end up with more crime in areas that didn't have it before. Instead of Tolling one of the highest taxed public bodies in the US how about the groups who wasted over \$240,000,000 not building a new bridge over the Columbia. NO TOLLS ON CURRENT ROADS. I would however pay a Toll like that pays off a bond and then expires when paid off. Like the Toll that paid for the Astoria Bridge, if a new Crossing of the Columbia went from Troutdale to Camas. The MAX-Crime light rail doesn't need to spread crime into Washington so leave that out of any new Bridge design.		
07/12	I believe revenue from decongestion pricing must be invested exclusively in non-freeway widening improvements, like transit, biking, and walking. It's the only way to to decongestion pricing equitably and to addressing public health + climate goals.	Rob Mumford	Comment form
07/12	I can't tell you how much of a burden it will be for me and my family. We live in Vancouver and work in Portland. I understand the impact of congestion but have you considered making a carpool lane for going north? Honolulu puts cones up and creates one during high traffic times. I seriously hope you are taking into consideration the people that drive for a living and can't take public transportation. Also people that work in Portland until 1-2am. How are they supposed to get home on public transportation? That is just 2 examples of the impact this will have on a family. Not to mention I pay taxes in both states. Seems incredibly unfair	Loni Morrison	Comment form
07/12	I'm solely in favor of congestion pricing on the suggested portions of I's 5 & 205. 6-9a.m. and 3:30-6p.m. are the time slots when the higher amount would be charged Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. There'd be no tolling between 8p.m.-5a.m. weekdays. Tolling a north and southbound lane on the Glen Jackson Bridge and Interstate Bridge every single day of a year, for \$2.00, to start, would also be encouraged to help pay for a freight-only bridge crossing the Columbia. I'd even impose a toll on the entire stretch of OR 217 every day, at \$5.00 to reduce congestion and encourage public transit. Substantially expand the WES schedule to get commuters out of their vehicles, and run the line all the way to Salem!! Raising the gasoline tax would be a waste, since so many vehicles now get pretty decent gas mileage. Money raised from tolling should also go toward installing electric vehicle charging stations located just off segments of the two interstates.	Dana Weintraub	Comment form
07/12	I Keep up this tax everthing movement and the more people will leave..toll is a tax..oregon is going to wither on the vine.. I	Jo O'Brien	Comment form
07/12	I do not support tolls and certainly not variable rate tolls or tolling all lanes. It is clearly unfairly punitive to those on i5 and southern i205. But, why only i5 and i205? Why not toll i84, i405, Highways 26, 224, 99E, 8 and 10? Why not also unfairly punish those along Highways 224, 213, 99W and 43? I mean seriously, the people on the east side have had the max for 30 years that they could take to avoid tolls on i84 if it were tolled. On the westside, if they tolled Highways 26, 8 and 10 they have had light rail for 20 years they could take to avoid tolls on Highways 26, 8 and 10. Downtown they can take light rail and the street car to avoid tolls on i405. On the east side they have light rail to avoid tolls down Highway 99E. Up north they have light rail along Interstate Ave to avoid tolls on Highway 30. And on the east side they have light rail going down much of i205 that they could take to avoid tolls. But, where you are proposing tolls there is no light rail to avoid the tolls, so I don't support the tolls on the southern part of i205 either. It seem it is really unfair to toll i5 and the southern part of i205 since they don't have light rail to take to avoid the tolls where as all those other areas do. And to add insult to injury, the i5 corridor people have helped pay for the light rail for all those other areas to avoid tolls and now you propose not tolling those areas but tolling i5 and southern i205 instead. That is just ridiculous, arbitrary and punitive. If you are dead set on tolling i5, and i205 just put the tolls on just south of the interstate bridge and i205 bridge to get the freight traffic and visitors that probably won't be paying our gas taxes to help pay their fair share for our transportation system.	John Smith	Comment form
07/12	i would be happy to pay tolls on all new freeways but what is the point on existing roads WE NEED NEW FREEWAYS AND MORE LANES. Phoenix plans their freeways 19 years ahead . Do we even have any new freeways in the planning stage? Thanks	Herb Miller	Comment form
07/12	To me there is only one solution and that is to build two more bridges upstream east of 205 and another west of i5. Tolling is not a reasonable solution on structures that have already been paid for by the public. Commuters are already struggling to make ends meet and will have no option but to seek work outside of Portland. Without	Kyle (No Last Name)	Comment form



	building more infrastructure tolls will do little to ease the problem of congestion. Please do the reasonable thing and build new bridges with or without tolls!		
07/12	I believe there should be a toll on the bridges coming into Oregon over the Columbia. Most states do it elsewhere to compensate for out of state drivers contributing to maintenance.	Brittany (No Last Name)	Comment form
07/12	I'm a resident of the Eliot neighborhood in Portland, a mother of a child who will attend Harriet Tubman School, and a regular bike commuter through the Rose Quarter. I'm very concerned about the quality of air in my neighborhood and particularly outside Tubman School. We need to reduce the total amount of carbon emissions in our air, and the best way to do that is by reducing traffic. Decongestion pricing has the most potential to help us achieve these important goals and make our environment healthier for our children, our most vulnerable citizens. The money raised through decongestion pricing should be directed towards green alternatives, especially public transportation and walking and cycling infrastructure. Taxing use of our roads during the busiest times will discourage optional trips and encourage us to find alternatives; using that money to boost our transit, walking, and cycling infrastructure will make the alternatives cheaper, more convenient, and more attractive. In no case should the money from decongestion pricing be directed towards building more roads. Building more roads is the opposite of what Oregon needs and is counter to our goals of a healthier populace and environment. Oregon has long been a leader in creative solutions to issues faced by our citizens. It's time for us to lead the way and implement decongestion pricing as a way to reduce traffic and air pollution and increase use of public transportation and other green alternatives.	Joan Petit	Comment form
07/12	Transit fares only pay 23% of the cost of operating transit and 0% of capital and construction costs of transit. Transit fares need to pay 100% of transit operating costs and a significant portion of the capital and construction costs before we even consider adding tolls. Also, we need to go to a per mile gas tax. High mpg, electric, hybrid and alternative fuel vehicles do not pay their fair share of the costs of our transportation system either. Set the per mile tax equivalent to what a 20 mpg minivan, pick up or SUV pays. Make these 2 simple changes and we will have more than enough money to pay for the SW Corridor Plan, the i5-99w connector, westside bypass, crc, and widening of 217 and i5.	John Smith	Comment form
07/12	The fact that more than 70% of Portland commuters drive alone may seem natural today, but it has nothing to do with efficiency. The reason that driving alone is the most convenient option for so many Portlanders is because of the deliberate, profit-oriented planning of major US automobile companies throughout the 20th Century. It started with GM and Standard Oil's plan of acquiring and scrapping electric rail transit lines in cities from New York to Los Angeles in the 1930s and converting them to inefficient GM gas buses. They even went so far as to prohibit cities from using non-gas vehicles in future transit projects. After successfully crippling 88% of rail transit lines in the US, GM was convicted of criminally conspiring with Standard Oil and Firestone Tires in 1949. The treasurer of GM was famously fined \$1 for his transgression. But the damage was already done. With rail lines eliminated from competition, GM then turned to lobbying the passage of the National Highway Acts. Key to their success was GM's strategy of helping ensure that motor vehicle-related excise taxes were channeled into the construction of further highway projects, avoiding the Congressional appropriations process that might have allocated funds to public needs rather than private wants. This history is clearly relevant to the current choice in Portland over how to use any potential road pricing revenue. Given this history, it is important to remember, when hearing lobbying from freight and automotive groups and others that bill themselves as "highway users" that their interests are purely selfish and should be viewed with extreme skepticism in terms of their long term public and environmental effects. To the automotive and freight industries, the health of the environment, or to use a local example, the health the students of Harriet Tubman Middle School, are non-factors when compared to the benefits of cheap highway transport. While highway expansion may help generate economic activity and jobs, I hope OTC will consider the cost at which these benefits come.	Colin Gibson	Comment form
07/12	Please toll all the roads in Portland for private vehicle use, so that I, a comparatively rich software engineer with a long commute, can get places quickly driving an entire car all on my lonesome, while poor people who can't afford the tolls are stuck taking the bus.	Hugh Owens	Comment form

07/12	This is only gonna hurt working class people. Please raise taxes.	Rose Cottingham	Comment form
07/12	Please consider Concept C as the mid/long term goal for implementing congestion pricing in Portland. The decision you make is a once in a generation opportunity to chart a course to a better transportation system in Oregon. Oregon has been a pioneer in innovative land use and transportation policy but has recently rested on past progress much to the detriment of our state. In addition to support of Concept C, the OTC needs to find a balance when it comes to using generated revenues and spending all the revenue on more freeways would be another major lost opportunity. More freeway capacity will mean more vehicle travel which carries significant costs in household spending, lost economic activity (fuel costs mostly leave the state), crash injuries (those cars depart the freeway and travel on dangerous arterial streets), pollution, and additional opportunity to be sedentary which impacts health care cost spending. Using a portion or all of the revenue generated by the tolls on expanding transportation options like transit, walking, or bicycle infrastructure is the only way to achieve state and ODOT goals of improving safety and making our communities more livable. Please take this opportunity to make our state and the Portland Region a leader by selecting Concept C and aiming revenue at additional transportation options for people using the transportation system.	Josh Roll	Comment form
07/12	I understand the importance of financing roads and improving transportation. However, I do feel that this will deeply impact those of low-income and borderline middle to low-income who use those roads to get to work. Since the cost will raise and lower based on necessity and congestion that will most likely be times in which people are commuting to work. This seems as if it another way to create institutional racism and a negative social determinant of health. This idea adds barriers and does not lower them. One consideration may be providing deeply discounted or free passes for low-income, middle to low-income, and commuters. The idea that someone must go and alternative route that is not necessarily the best route can create more difficulties. In addition this should be rolled out slowly and cautiously if it does precede to best understand the effects it has on not only traffic but those who must now pay to sit in it.	Shshanna (No Last Name)	Comment form
07/12	Toll roads will divert congestion to side streets. Plus, traffic stopping to pay tolls will create another type of congestion. Just think of all those commercial semi-trucks and two-tandem haulers stalled, waiting for their turn at the toll booth, cars squeezing into exit lanes and off ramps just prior to the toll booths, emergency vehicles not having rapid access to accidents, side street pavements being torn up with traffic overflow. And, yes you say their will be a designated lane for emergency vehicles, etc., but that is a pie in the sky that drivers will not adhere to. Congestion is not the problem, but the symptom of over development without consideration of its cause and effect. The problem is Portland has pursued heavily beyond capabilities of accommodating single and multi housing development in already congested traffic zones let alone commercial development with same or nearby zones. While Portland pursued residential and commercial development, it never pursued correlating long-term planning of its consequences. Portland is continuing its short-sightedness with toll roads. How will the collected fees be spent and who will have a say about the expenditure? Is this not a tax for the privilege of driving on freeways and accessing interstate commerce and interstate connectivity? Shouldn't this tax be handled by legislation? Having toll roads will not resolve congestion. They will only shift congestion and mayhem towards other routes and other means of not being taxed.	Pam Smith	Comment form
07/12	No tolls! We pay enough between property taxes, state taxes, and gasoline taxes. We need more lanes added to help with congestion. No more money spent on bike lanes. Their numbers are minuscule to the numbers of motorized vehicles. Car lanes need to be a priority. And they don't contribute anything to our road improvements through gasoline purchases.	Shannon (No Last Name)	Comment form
07/12	Absolutely against this measure. Don't drive people through our neighborhood because the state can't manage its revenue to add more lanes. Take some of that Lottery money and put it to work !	Jim James	Comment form
07/12	Tolling will do NOTHING to reduce congestion. You know it, EVERYONE knows it. it has never worked anywhere in the country, and never will work. Call this what it is.. a money grab. If you want to reduce congestion, BUILD MORE LANES. Even if, by some miracle people suddenly decided to jump on MAX, you dont have the capacity to handle even a 2 or 3% increase. Based on the street conditions in Portland, its clear road funds do not ever make it to the road.	Randy Rasmussen	Comment form



07/12	I think you're looking for a lawsuit. Taxpayers have already paid for these roads. How about creating a super expressway with a toll? Something that people will actually want to pay for?	Heidi Jones	Comment form
07/12	I support the idea of congestion pricing to help address the city's traffic problem, but only if validated by scientific studies proving that it significantly impacts the amount of traffic. I am concerned that it will not limit traffic much but turn out to be just another source of revenue. And I would add that another possible solution to our traffic congestion is a faster moving MAX line. I am thinking of the BART system in San Francisco. It moves along separate from city streets. If we can't change our current MAX system then maybe have designated rails or trains that have fewer stops.	Doug Beal	Comment form
07/12	Congestion or value pricing on I-5 and 205 makes good sense. I drive in Seattle and have been impressed with the positive impact. Important to include in the project is adding lanes on I-5 be either widening the roadway or elevating it. Just putting tolls on the narrow, insufficient lanes would not be effective.	Sherrie James	Comment form
07/12	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We have reached the point where half measures to address the problems of automotive traffic are insufficient. There is an urgency to this deliberation and I encourage the OTC to: take a steady stride in the direction of pricing the entire I-5 and I-205 corridors in the Portland Metropolitan Region (Option C), and; direct that revenues raised are largely dedicated to expanding transportation capacity and safety for walking, bicycling and transit throughout the metropolitan region. Knowing what we know about the measurable damage to our personal, societal and environmental health resulting from our over-dependence on automobiles, any action that falls short of full implementation on pricing and subsequent investment in proven successful alternatives to our automotive transportation system, is a half-measure we cannot afford. As has been suggested by members of the PAC, any pricing strategy must be focused on managing demand and not raising revenue. Option C has been demonstrated to be the most effective. I recommend that the OTC ensure that we implement Option C. Revenue from tolling should absolutely not be used to expand automotive capacity. Again, thank you for your work and the ease of commenting.	Roger Geller	Comment form
07/12	No. NO. No tolls on roads we have already paid for. Tolls will not add more road space, they'll just add more money to all the other projects the city would rather do. Besides, you've been collecting extra gasoline taxes at the pump to use the money toward road repair. After over a year and a half, not much has been fixed: Just drive on NE Glisan in either direction on the I-205 overpass. Please. No tolls.	Curt Cassigham	Comment form
07/12	This is not a good idea. All it will accomplish is moving traffic off the highway and on to our neighborhood streets. You will be able to publish that traffic on the highway is down; but only because it has been rerouted to hunt down our children playing in front of their house.	Keith Diffendeff er	Comment form
07/12	I have four major concerns: 1) that you find easy to use ways of making any system equitable so that middle class and working people who are just making it financially and low income members of our community are not disadvantaged; 2) that you ensure that traffic does not divert onto neighborhood streets and thoroughfares does not occur without creating barriers that inconvenience residents of those neighborhoods. I live in an area of Portland where the City of Portland created a rarely used 6 block bike lane on a neighborhood thoroughfare and took out one lane used by cars. Now more people are diverting onto side streets because of the congestion that was caused by creating this 6 block bike lane. 3) that you take meaningful action to reduce the increased congestion caused by LIFT and UBER. In city after city there is evidence that both of these services are resulting in people reducing public transit use and taking these forms of single occupancy type vehicles instead. What are you planning on doing about that? Both the New York Times and the Portland Tribune have written about the impacts of this on congestion. 4) I think the term "value pricing" is terrible. Call it what it is, congestion pricing. This is like the use of the term "right sizing" that high level bureaucrats in DAS tried to use in lieu of the real term "downsizing" when the state of Oregon faced cut backs after ballot measure 5 passed. I don't know who the marketing person was who came up with value pricing, but that was a total waste of state resources, and I am very pro-government and a former state employee.	Leila Wrathall	Comment form
07/12	This project will not achieve the desired results, either in the short or long. About the time the project is completed traffic will still be worse than it is now given the growth increase in the area. Based on my personal observation of such projects in the Miami	Robert Schaerfl	Comment form

	and other high traffic areas there has been NO easing of traffic from when the projects began, again because of growth. Seattle is yet another example. The only viable solution is to use the available funding to start an outer loop similar to I-205 on the West side with an additional bridge over the Columbia. Anything less than this will doom the entire area to constantly heavy traffic over the long run and create a slow but sure economic decline. Only this approach will mitigate truck and car traffic that is currently passing through Portland via I-5 and I-205. This whole project needs to be examined for an independent contractor that has the unbiased knowledge and information to look at viable options that will achieve improvements in the short and long run. No amount of fancy misleading titles like "value pricing" is going to work. That is misleading at best. By the way, this project also has an adverse impact on seniors, especially those on fixed income. The unintended consequences and shortsightedness of the project so far are staggering and the public is being misled.		
07/12	I'd consider rioting over this! At least some protesting, my god how much can working people take?! What about service and delivery company's? What a bunch of bull crap!	Jennifer Garber	Comment form
07/12	Wonderful, another tax on the working poor, shifting traffic to surface streets reducing the livability of neighborhoods with increased traffic, all the while you piss the new revenues away on boondoggle, bike lanes, busses, etc instead of spending money on the real problem and widening the freeways (especially 205 to 8 lanes from the state line to Wilsonville and adding capacity on I-5 . Stop with the lame leftist social engineering and start doing your. Jobs for the majority of citizens and not narrow special interests!	Gerald Cox	Comment form
07/12	One stated purpose of the plan is to alter driver behavior and reduce congestion, but what does that really mean? At its core, this is saying that tolls will make the pilot area's less desirable or accessible to drivers. But ..., that's a big problem. Wealthy users will not change behaviors, of course, but, yes indeed, tolls will reduce access and desirability to the poor and economically less advantaged. In essence, we are saying, let's reduce congestion by kicking poor people off our highways. Without further, and better thinking relating to social justice, this proposal would violate basic community values relating to economic justice, harm the working poor and families below the median income in a terribly elitist and ivory tower sort of way. I would suggest we consider at least defraying costs for the less fortunate or looking at other revenue sources that place the burden first on businesses who use and damage our roads most through usage fees and other sources that are tiered or completely exempt the poor.****	Bee Feuleless	Comment form
07/12	I am strongly against any type of tolling in the Portland area. This is a regressive tax that especially hurts low-income individuals and those on a fixed income. There are other much better ways to control traffic. These include express lanes which is been very successful in places such as Seattle. The public and general is very strongly against this idea. the great majority of people want nothing to do with this. I also don't understand why pbot can move ahead with an idea like this when it is so strongly objected to by the public in the metro area. pbot takes public input then they change nothing about what they've already decided they're going to do. Are public officials should rise up against this dictatorial action.	Ron Shilling	Comment form
07/12	Have you considered what would happen if Oregonians pass a Constitutional amendment that bans tolls on public roads? It makes no sense to pay the state of Oregon just to mediate YOUR failure to put in adequate road capacity!		Comment form
07/12	IF the tolling is to take place.. I demand all gas taxes that are earmarked onto the citizens at the pump to be reduced. The very idea that public roads with a recently INCREASED cost in our licensing fees that was voted in by the legislature last session and the idea that to reduce traffic that we must pay more and more.. how are some people supposed to get to work to PAY those fees? And recently as of yesterday.. the Portland City council is demanding that all of I-5 and I-205 to be tolled.. The citizens of Oregon are taxed and taxed and this is only going to make matters worse. On top of that.. Interstate Trucking along the I-5 Corridor will increase.. which will have a corresponding higher prices for goods and services that must be shipped through that region. I urge the commission for NO on this measure	Frank Martin	Comment form
07/12	I We live on a dead end road with the only access being Highway 43. Already at peak times it is almost impossible to get out on the highway. If there is value pricing on Abernathy bridge, there will be many more cars using highway 43 to avoid the tolls. This is truly unfair to those of us living along highway 43. You are not solving the problem you are shifting it to various neighbors along the freeways that were not	Lina Goodman	Comment form





	<p>designed to handle the volume of traffic they already have. I understand there aren't easy solutions but just considering an initial trial of the Abernathy bridge makes no sense! Please don't do it !</p> <p>  ---  </p>		
07/12	<p>This idea will affect Oregon's poor - keeping them off the roads or making it even more expensive than it already is to commute to the jobs they so desperately need. I use Oregon's highways to visit my family, located 40 minutes away from where I live. This would make it prohibitively more expensive to do so, and there are no alternatives! This will simply mean that the rich can use the roads, and the poor cannot. Please reconsider this. I already try not to drive if I can because gas is so expensive with the gas tax. You're already making it hard for the poor to drive. Please let us drive on our roads... we already paid for them!</p>	LMS	Comment form
07/12	<p>This process to install toll booths (or other rolling options) debilitates the lower income families that need to use public roads to get to work. If drivers are below the poverty line, or whatever measurement of life quality we are using these days, surely these people need to be exempt from paying the tolls so as to meet the needs of their families (ie groceries, child care, medical necessities, etc)</p>	Ben Richards	Comment form
07/12	<p>I heartily support congestion pricing along the proposed corridors. A low-income exemption is preferred but it is critical that even if such a mechanism cannot be agreed upon that some type of pricing is instituted.</p>	Thomas Craig	Comment form
07/12	<p>Traffic congestion is so bad in the Portland metro area that I believe that this toll plan will just move the problem from the freeways to the surface streets. The surface streets DON'T need more traffic either. I believe the only way to improve traffic congestion is to use traffic money to build more capacity. The money SHOULD be used to increase traffic lanes and NOT used for bike lanes or pedestrian purposes. To me it is scary that at this point there is NO plan to increase capacity and that a new bridge was not approved by the powers that be.</p>	Steve Berry	Comment form
07/12	<p>I do not believe the tolling of certain routes will have a positive effect on congestion in our area, as long as our population continues to expand. The I-205 was built while I was still in high school over 40 years ago, and since then no new routes have been built, all the while our population has exponentially increased. High density housing exacerbates the situation, even though we have added many commuters using bikes and public transportation. Those who cannot afford extra costs to get to and from work, will resort to flooding 'non tolled' areas, such as residential communities (I have Gladstone in mind). When an accident happens, gridlock everywhere appears.....I recently spent 2 hours going to Vancouver. Additionally, the popularity of 'electric' or 'hybrid' cars has reduced the collection of the gasoline taxes.....I believe a different system for this revenue collection should have happened a long time ago, i.e. through 'cents per mile' during vehicle registration process. Our neighbors to the north do not pay their 'fair share' using Oregon roads.....especially those who work in Oregon. This should also be addressed. I hate to see 'east coast' mentality of tolling happen here in the Northwest.....do you see their congestion relieved through tolling? Are only the 'wealthy' supposed to be able to get to and fro with ease? We need MORE ROADS or MORE LANES to handle the influx of cars. We do not need to destroy the livability of neighborhoods along these corridors to fix the problems. Finally.....I do not feel safe riding MAX.....this needs to be fixed too!</p>	Lucy Stoiber	Comment form
07/12	<p>This is nothing more than THEFT!!! The state of Oregon is leeching off of its citizens and the citizens of Washington as well. I thought the gas tax increases were supposed to help fund roads? I will only come across to Portland if absolutely necessary. Very disappointed</p>	Derek Moulton	Comment form
07/12	<p>I am extremely concerned about the fallout of this value pricing idea. How would you like the overflow coming through YOUR neighborhood? Any time there is an accident on I205, my neighborhood suffers with congestion from the freeway. This would make our neighborhood congested EVERY day at the peak times chosen so people can avoid paying the tolls! "Other travel options and alternate routes" are what come through our neighborhood streets when there is an accident on the freeway. What will ODOT and the state do to then solve this problem? Please do the diligence needed to think this process through thoroughly. I welcome you to come through the neighborhoods that will be impacted to understand this concern. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Lisa O'Brien	Comment form

07/12	Tolls are inherently regressive and hurt more vulnerable people the most. People most impacted by tolls are likely ones who live longer distances from their job and have less flexibility with regard to alternative routes, times travelled, and public transit. Tolls are simply regressive unequally distributed taxes that punish people who might not have other viable alternatives. Adding tolls will just effectively be a tax primarily on the poor since commercial interests and richer individuals will be better able to avoid the tolls. If the goal is to raise funding the only equitable way to do so is raise taxes/issue bonds (or specifically tax freight companies and other heavy users that are the most damaging to the infrastructure). If the goal is to reduce cars on the road then positively incentivise reduction in commuting during congestion times with things like subsidized biking, subsidize ride sharing/carpooling, increase public transit route options, offer businesses incentives to promote telecommuting, promote safer driving education (reduced accidents promote efficient traffic flow). Both can be done in conjunction with the other.	Roswell Coles	Comment form
07/12	I-5 and I-205 are Interstate highways that Oregon does not own, they are highways that are already paid for, if you would like to build a new STATE highway and toll that feel free to, do not charge double for something you have not even paid for in the first place. You are putting limits on interstate commerce which is against the federal law. I know that Oregon thinks it is above federal laws an mandates, but it is not. This is a fool plan, stop wasting money talking about it and your trains.	Sarah Hoskins	Comment form
07/12	Dear OTC, I am writing to say that while I wholeheartedly agree with congestion pricing, I do not think its revenue should go towards expanding freeways. Freeway expansion will not solve congestion and putting more cars on the road goes against any hopes we have for clean air and better public health. The revenue raised should go towards improving pedestrian infrastructure, namely our public transit system to help us move about the city without needing a car! That should be the ultimate goal! Thank you!	Lucy Wong	Comment form
07/12	This would be fine if there were any other alternatives! Build a new bypass/turnpike and toll that. People need a way to get around Portland instead of through it. 205 is no longer the solution. It also disproportionately affects lower income workers who have to live further out and commute in. As someone who has lived here my whole life, I'd hate to see a toll on those roads. the solution is not tolling existing roads but making new pathways to efficiently move people.	Chelsea	Comment form
07/12	Congestion pricing tolls are a terrible way to deal with Portland's problem. Increase the gas tax in Portland instead to pay for wider roadways and upgrades.	Archie Chaffin	Comment form
07/12	Tolling roads will not reduce the level of traffic, it will only increase frustration. Best case scenario is that ODOT shifts the congestion problem to side-roads, which is NOT a solution! Realistically though, congestion would probably not be affected much at all, and toll fees would amount to nothing more than a penalty fee for drivers who already pay all kinds of other fees in the form of countless taxes, etc. Tolls are not a solution, only an additional problem to an overburdened populace.	Brent Jacobs	Comment form
07/12	I don't have a problem if you make the improvement first and ask those that use it to pay for it, however simply slapping tolls on roads already paid for to enable a government slush fund or allowing a reduced state contribution to transportation and filling it with toll revenue is what I'm not in favor of. Other states I have visited have brand new roads that have tolls on them however existing roads are not tolled. Tolling existing roads invites added government waste or misuse of money. Tolls collected must be accountable. Shell games played by legislators with money are not OK. get a loan and build your new road then toll to pay for it has a better chance of having accountability. Unknown to the world in general is that Oregon is among the worst tax states in the US. Keep this up and the nickname Orejersey will be a good reflection of the truth. Think about it the Oregon quality of life is at stake.	Richard Bakernan	Comment form
07/12	My vote is for Value Pricing for both I5 & 205 at the Columbia with the proceeds kept in a separate fund that is used only for I5 bridge updates and a light rail across the river to Vancouver.	Walt Quade	Comment form
07/12	No! Please consider HOV lane instead.	S White	Comment form
07/12	This is a bad idea and will hurt the Portland metro area. I can tell you I will no longer make the journey into Washington which I do to hel a charity organization. Tolls should only be in new construction use the millions that are paid each year to fix the roads wrbhave now that are falling apart and to build a new bridge if we need it. Instead we let the roads crumble, take out lanes on roads and add bike boxes, we are ruining a once great city and state.	Michelle Sparks	Comment form



07/12	The road is federal, existing and paid for. I don't even think ODOT has the right to toll the freeway! If you want to toll everyone to use the road, build a new passthrough that works like every other major city that decides to toll commuters! Tolling i5 and 205 isn't going to solve congestion, it's going to create more - and you're just going to have people (local or not, because now it will create more congestion on the city streets and neighborhoods) spending more time in traffic and growing even more upset.	E. Whiteley	Comment form
07/12	No tolls!!!!	Jeanie Reed	Comment form
07/12	This proposal will make traveling through Portland the only toll I know of on I-5. When traveling to Washington from the valley, I-5 is the only reasonable route, but this toll will slow the road with toll booths, and discourage people from traveling through the area. This may reduce some congestion, but it will also reduce the number of people traveling through Portland, and the income gained from them, as people begin planning routes that do not include taking a toll road. Neighborhoods with roads past I-5 in the toll areas will be hit by traffic being diverted by Garmin and other gps which have an option to avoid toll roads, which many people use as a default. Additionally, the toll road option is a no-going-back situation. If marijuana taxes were to be diverted to roads in the future, and we have more than enough money to pay for these upgrades without taxes, we will have already sold our public roads to private companies.	Crystal Beck	Comment form
07/12	As a Washington resident I feel like this is a money grab by oregon. I don't have control over when I travel to/from work. Also using toll revenues for anything other than to support the tolled road. Your use for bike lanes, transit and any other is lack of leadership on use of existing revenues. If this goes thru I will seek employment in Washington and I'm not alone. You will have to tax your residents more for the loss of tax revenue.	jim ferguson	Comment form
07/12	No tolling existing roadways! It is unfair to force the poor and unprepared to drive in even worse traffic conditions, being forced off of roads they paid for and pay to maintain.	Emery	Comment form
07/12	We have already paid for these roads with our tax dollars .This is unfair to the working man and the poor.	Thomas Poupore	Comment form
07/12	Transportation input? Understand that there are literally THOUSANDS of people that you ignore to "fix" your road issue. You've been given PLENTY of money to fix the problem. You have not fixed the problem. Your latest ploy is to set up TOLL BOOTHS to fix congestion? Hinder the travel of people and products? How the hell is that going to fix the travel issues? You need to ADD TRAVEL AREAS, ADD LANES, IMPROVE OFF RAMP, INCREASE THE NUMBER OF ROADS TO TAKE IN TO ACCOUNT THE PEOPLE THAT USE THEM! Not once did I say we should hinder the travel of people on the roads that MY GAS TAX, and LICENSE TAX and all these other taxes you keep taking for roads have already PAID FOR. try fixing the obvious, you got the job because you proved to someone that you are competent in land use & transportation. NOW PROVE IT! I can drive through the I5, 217 corridors just to name a couple and see the easiest ways to move traffic better, NOT resorting to impede the flow.	Tom Dummer	Comment form
07/12	Subject: Revenue from Congestion Pricing  I strongly believe that all revenue from congestion pricing should be used for public transit and biking infrastructure. This will effectively allow ODOT/TriMet/City of Portland/PBOT/Metro/State of Oregon to meet its climate goals and will allow people to move around in a cheaper, more equitable, less dangerous, and healthier way.	Reed Buterbau gh	Comment form
07/12	Dear Value Pricing Advisory Committee,  As elected officials from Southwest Washington, we write in advance of the June 25 PAC meeting urging you to reject any tolling plan that will disproportionately harm the residents we represent.  We are particularly concerned by the indications tht Oregon intends to move ahead with its maximum tolling design, known as "Concept C," either immediately or as a next-step. Our concerns stem from the following: No choice for Washington residents who work in Oregon: Concept C or any others that would charge Washington residents as soon as they cross into ORegon vai either	Congress woman Jaime Herrera Beutler's office	Comment form

	<p>I-5 or I-205, on all lanes, leaves them with no transportation options - their commutes will become more expensive.</p> <p>No traffic infrastructure improvements for those who will pay: ORegon has indicated that it will use the tolls collected largely from Washington commutes on infrastructure improvements outside of the area where they're charged, hence providing the Washington residents who will pay with little to no benefit.</p> <p>"Congestion pricing" unfairly targets working class Clark and Cowlitz County residents: The "congestion pricing" style of tolling will penalize those Clark and Cowlitz County residents who can't choose to commute to work during non-peak hours. Many of them are teachers, service industry workers and others working low-wage jobs; in other words, those who can least afford additional costs.</p> <p>Case law, longstanding transportation policy and precedent demands that user fees be directed to benefit those who pay the fees, and not diverted elsewhere. It would be unfair for ORegon to devise a scheme to require Washington drivers to pay for transportation infrastructure that they rarely use and for efforts that won't improve their commutes. For this reason, we remain staunchly opposed to any recommendation that resembles "Concept C".</p> <p>We cannot express in strong enough terms the resentment and distrust that is building among Southwest Washington residents toward Oregon as a result of this hasty process. While we appreciate the representation provided by the three Washington representatives on the PAC, the summaries of the meetings and workshops have consistently minimized or ignored the opposition growing among Washington residents.</p> <p>Moving ahead in spite of this opposition will have negative consequences for our mutual interests. We're confident you share our desire to address traffic congestion, freight mobility and river navigation challenges posed by the current I-5 bridge. As you know, such an effort can never happen without bi-state cooperation. If Oregon adopts a plan like "Concept C" that would place a financial penalty on workers every time they commute to and from their jobs, it will hinder any effort to adequately address not just the I-5 bridge, but the transportation challenges within the entire corridor for years, if not longer.</p> <p>Again, we urge you to reject any plan that does not offer significant infrastructure improvements located in the area of, and proportional to, the tolls being charged.</p> <p>Sincerely, US Rep. Jaime Herrera Beutler, 3rd Congressional District. Sen. Lynda Wilson, 17th Legislative District</p>		
07/13	<p>Off the top of my head, I can't think of a local revenue proposal that will be less popular than Congestion Pricing with the commuting population. Unless, of course, you survey people that won't have to pay it. I've lived in the Greater Portland Area since 1974. In that time, I've seen the population and traffic triple (?), but other than I-205, there's been a serious lack of capacity expansion to match the increases in population and traffic. I realize much of this has to do with the geography of Portland. There isn't a good alternative to US26 going west, except for the proposal that Tualatin/Wilsonville has fought for so long. But the City of Portland/State of Oregon bears much of the responsibility as well. Look at what happened to the last I-5 bridge proposal. A lot of money spent, urban progressive transportation visions crushed at the Washington State border. How many tens of millions spent? What started as a vision ended as a boondoggle. There's the biggest single problem. At this point, there's a sizeable gap between the public perception of the agenda and competence of the officials involved, versus actual transportation needs. We NEED another bridge East of 205, since Vancouver grew that direction, and continues on that track. We will get "congestion pricing" to solve... what, exactly? Officials are going to have to do a much better job of convincing the users that you have our best interests at heart, and actually understand the steps it'll take to fix a critical issue. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Earnest Knoelling er	Comment form
07/13	<p>Please, please, please, no tolls. I lived in Jacksonville, FL &amp; the toll roads made the congestion horrible. I can't stress to you the amount of cars that would pile up near the toll booths. You will not make the roads less traveled, just more congested than ever before.</p>	Debi Hays	Comment form



07/13	I live in North Portland and work in Tualatin. I have bought my house and plan to invest in my neighborhood and community. If a toll were to be enacted on I-5, I would have no way to get to work without paying this toll. I cannot realistically use an alternate route. In addition, I believe that this would force people to use neighborhood streets resulting more dangerous streets across the Portland area. I cannot use public transportation as it is not a timely transportation option. This is an existing highway that I cannot avoid. If I were to have to pay for going to work and then coming back home every day, I would have to re-access where I live and would look at moving.	Robert Alexander	Comment form
07/13	Many of us do not have other options than to drive. If I took Trimet my commute from NE Portland to Beaverton would take 90 minutes each way. If the Toll proposal came with increases in Trimet service (Express buses, Express lanes, etc.) that decrease the length of time it takes to go from one end of Portland to the other, my reception to this proposal would be a positive one. I would prefer to take Trimet and leave the driving to someone else. It is an incredibly stressful add to my day. The fact that all Buses and Max go thru downtown, where they come to a crawl is a poorly laid out and dated plan. How can you push for less traffic without solutions to keep us out of our cars and in your buses?	Robin Cusack	Comment form
07/13	I do not think we should incur a fee or toll to use the I-5 or 205 freeways even if it is only during "high use" times. It will push traffic into the suburbs and neighborhoods due to people trying to bypass payment. This can cause normally quiet areas to higher use and decrease property values and make it more dangerous for pedestrians. High traffic streets such as 82nd, Powell, and Division could see even more traffic resulting in higher pedestrian injuries and deaths.	Alexandra Whitehead	Comment form
07/13	I am a North Portland Resident who lives at (address). Over the past ten years, the traffic on N Denver Avenue in the Arbor Lodge neighborhood has become unbearable due to the volume of Washington drivers using Interstate Avenue/Denver Avenue corridor to avoid I-5 north and southbound. I can honestly and accurately estimate that about 1/3 to 1/2 of all cars traveling on N. Denver AVE during rush hours have Washington plates. It has caused unsafe conditions in our neighborhood as Washington drivers treat it as an alternate route to I-5. If tolling were to start as far south as Alberta or Going Streets, what do you think Washington drivers will do? Exactly what they are already doing - cut through our neighborhood by exiting at the Interstate avenue exit. The tolls MUST start much farther north, near Jantzen Beach! Traffic patterns going south in our neighborhood are already packed with cars - Interstate avenue - packed - Greely Avenue - packed - Denver Avenue - packed - I-5 south - packed. It is nearly impossible to even get out of our neighborhood unless you leave at 6am! Please DO NOT encourage Washington drivers to use our neighborhoods. In fact, the OTC should do something to keep them on I-5 instead of ruining our neighborhoods because they choose to live in Washington and continually vote against light rail going to Vancouver! Toll them, and toll them as far North as possible!	Timothy Haberman	Comment form
07/13	I am writing to urge the members of the OTC to ADOPT CONGESTION PRICING CONCEPT "C" IMMEDIATELY, which calls for tolling all of I-5 and I-205 from the Columbia River to the junction of I-5 and I-205. I urge you to adopt this tolling plan with the further condition that any expansion of capacity on the freeways inside the UGB should not be considered until after decongestion pricing has been implemented and studied first. The current PAC recommendation of a combination of Concept B and Modified E (with possible consideration of more substantial measures down the road) is woefully inadequate to address the dire traffic congestion problems the Portland area is currently facing, and would actually be worse than doing nothing. As a resident of inner Northeast Portland, I am deeply concerned that any option that tolls only a portion of I-5 through the city will divert large numbers of autos and trucks onto North and Northeast Portland city streets, thereby further exacerbating neighborhood traffic congestion and air pollution. Please heed the appeal from community groups to adopt the more ambitious plan of Concept C and implement it at the outset. Thank you for your attention.	Daniel Jaffee	Comment form
07/13	I would like to take this opportunity to shed light on how this tolling could effect those of us that live close to these areas. I live in West Linn around the corner from the Abernathy bridge. I also happen to be a low income resident as well as a single mom. I am lucky enough to have my mother come to watch my children daily while I work. I am already barely making it financially. With this toll I would have to pay my mother's fees to and from my home each day as well as paying my own. With the cost of living	Rochele Burns	Comment form

	<p>already so high I simply cannot afford this. Going a different direction to work to avoid the toll would add an additional two hours a day to my commute. That is taking away precious time with my children. Also, the roads around this area are not set up to handle all of the extra traffic this would cause. On heavy traffic days some of these alternative routes are already so congested that what should take ten minutes can take twenty or thirty minutes. I'm not sure what the answer is, but this is not it. This will have a devastating affect on my family and many others that do not have the means to afford this. Thank you.</p>		
07/13	<p>As much as I know new construction and money is needed, my voice is ultimately going to say no on these plans. I teach Driver Education. One of the required routes is the freeway. I can easily go through the toll areas more than 10 times a day. How do I pay for that? Am I even the one who does? What if my employer refuses to pay and that cost is left to me? My employer covers the schools in the I5 Terwilliger and I205 Clackamas areas. So easily over 200 kids in our programs alone will be driving those areas approximately every 3 months.</p>	Tara Schoffstall	Comment form
07/13	<p>When you have to hide a plan for toll charges behind words like 'value pricing' and 'congestion pricing' it becomes clear that the intent is to take money without being honest regarding the goal. The goal is not to provide value. The goal is not to charge only during congestion. The goal does not offset existing fuel taxes for roadwork. The goal does not reduce existing taxes for MAX rail. Please be clear and concise in your communication for the public is all too aware of political double speak that hides true purpose. The goal appears to reserve existing roads for the rich and let others ride the bus.</p>	Kyle Hamar	Comment form
07/13	<p>Making drivers pay for using roads that have already been paid for is a bad idea. Build more roads instead of costly and inefficient light rail. Public transportation should be buses and shuttles only, as they give the most flexibility for their cost. Don't make drivers foot the bill for poor and agenda-driven government planning. That is my two cents.</p>	Roger Payne	Comment form
07/13	<p>Here is my perspective on toll Highways: 1. As I understand, Federal funding for repair and maintenance is forfeit on Interstates, once a state elects to charge tolls under state control. Therefore, will Oregon really come out ahead by collecting tolls for just the Portland area. 2. According to the Metropolitan service district, Portlander overwhelming did not want to pay tolls on the Sellwood bridge. What makes ODOT think Portlanders will accept a toll for I-5 and I-205. 3. I toll way in San Diego called the 125 was built to relieve truck traffic out of Mexico. Trucks refuse to pay the toll and still use I-5. The company that built the tollway bailed and left California holding the bill. 4. I have not driven in any state with a tollway that the roads are any better than non-tollways. IE Chicago and DC/Baltimore. The Columbia made the follow statements in a article. Here is a summary: 1. Pro Tollway folks admit congestion relief in Portland on I-5 and I-205 will is not possible. 2. All tollway plans will not fix I-5 and I-205 except the West Linn Abernathy bridge. In short, most of the funds will be diverted to surface street to assist in over congestion cause by tolls on the I-5 and I-205. 3. ODOT director wants to put tolls on other highways such as 217 and 26. Where is ODOT HQ. Salem? Any tollways in Salem California just raised the gas tax to repair the road. This is the third time this tax has been applied. Funds for the first two taxes were diverted to other state programs. Oregon politicians emulate California Politics. I question the intentions of ODOT. 1. How can surface streets like 82nd Ave, Mclaughlin, Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy be improved to handle more traffic? 2. Will funds really go to roads or will they be diverted to Light rail projects. As you remember the light rail was voted down and put through anyway. I moved to San Diego 4 years ago. I just sold my house. We looking for a place in Oregon or Washington. Tolls will be a major consideration in selecting where we live.</p>	Michael Brown	Comment form
07/13	<p>The majority of drivers I know do so because the other options (public transportation, biking, walking) are not feasible modes of transportation for them. I personally hate using TriMet public transportation. I use TriMet infrequently as I do not feel safe waiting at stops or riding on the MAX. I have been approached every time I've used TriMet in the last 4 years by individuals either aggressively asking for money or a date. Public transportation is not an option for me on a regular basis without a substantial change in security. Additionally, TriMet options between my home and work take at minimum 3 times longer than driving myself and include walking 0.7 mile along a dangerous road with no shoulders and no sidewalk. If tolling is implemented on I-5 and I-205, all funds collected from the tolls should be used to expand roads, with priority going to expanding freeways, and NOT used for public transportation. If you are going to tax drivers through a toll road, drivers should be the beneficiaries of all monies raised.</p>	Jennifer McCamish	Comment form



07/13	<p>My husband and I live in Park Place, an Oregon City neighborhood. We do not have many options when going outside of Oregon City. To go north to Portland our choices are I-205 or McLoughlin, but to get to McLoughlin we must either get on I-205 to go through Gladstone or get on I-205 going south to get on McLoughlin. Yes, it's true we could go through Oregon City proper, but when everyone is trying to do that, the streets back up so that it takes an hour to get to the OC bridge. We attend church in Stafford. We use the freeway to cross the Abernethy Bridge, but we exit at 10th Street now. I guess we could avoid the freeway by going through downtown Oregon City, but . . . see comment above. We are senior citizens on a fixed income. We can't afford several tolls per day, regardless of the time we use the freeway. The congestion problem is a result of ridiculous government policy intended to force us out of our cars and onto bicycles and on foot, and to limit our freedom to move about the area. Refusing to build the originally planned freeways has resulted in Portland being one of the worst mid-sized cities in terms of traffic, and now instead of fixing it, you propose to punish the citizens for government ineptitude. Shame on you.</p>	Mary Elle	Comment form
07/13	<p>The congestion that occurs ALREADY automatically encourages people to take other routes, travel at less busy times, or carpool. No need to add tolls to make that happen and make the busy times even more difficult and expensive in the process. Why not open up a new lane—the area where people pull over, make that a lane for small cars only, limit speed to 50mph? I know it sounds crazy, but if people have an accident or car problem, they can still slow down and block that lane, and so, at that time, cars can't use it. Or they can pull into the dirt if there's room. But at least most of the time it will be free, when open, used for small car traffic. We need to be practical. Tolls create a whole new level of complexity. Please, please, just raise existing taxes if it's absolutely necessary to raise more money. But don't create a new, extra thing that everyone has to deal with, extra tax to complicate people's lives with having to get a sensor on their car, or stopping at a toll booth, another bill to pay—another thing every single driver in the Portland metro area has to abide by, to make our lives more complex and stressful. Besides, I'm sure the government must hire more people to take care of all this. So much of the tolls simply collected to pay those people, which is sheer vanity and accomplishing little. For example, collect 1,300,000 in tolls, but pay 300,000 to run the system, only get 1,000,000 profit. Instead, simply raise existing taxes 1,000,000, and everybody's lives is kept simple, and save taxpayers 300,000 getting the same results in money raised.</p>	Dennis Johnson	Comment form
07/13	<p>There are better ways to relieve congestion than charging to use roads that have already been paid for by tax payers. An additional lane in each direction would be an option. There are also transition lanes which go into the city in the morning and out of the city in the evening, i. e. Dallas, TX. It is not right to tax people who are driving into work or medical appointments.</p>	Dana (No Last Name)	Comment form
07/13	<p>My husband and I live in Vancouver and he works in Oregon. It would be great if the amount tolled could be deducted from his income tax, otherwise this is an unfair burden for those of us not living in Oregon.</p>	Anne McQuary	Comment form
07/13	<p>Overall I don't have a problem with toll roads or congestion pricing. HOWEVER, we ALREADY pay for road upkeep with our gas taxes. If you-all would STOP syphoning off those funds to public transportation -- which does NOT pay for itself, we would have plenty of money for road upkeep. If you want us to support toll roads and congestion pricing, eliminate the taxes we are already paying for the roads.</p>	Bonnie Morse	Comment form
07/13	<p>This is not right, we should not be penalized for driving to and from work daily etc. This will do nothing but create uproar.</p>	Carly Smith	Comment form
07/13	<p>Congestion pricing is a regressive tax. It is something that will only affect working class people who may have no choice but to drive on the highway to get to work. A small toll to a wealthy person is essentially nothing, but if you are living pay check to pay check that will add up. A city that likes to think of itself as progressive should have no business commodifying public goods like roads. The way to decrease congestion in a progressive way is to expand public transit. Make it cheaper too, or even free. Then you will watch as thousands of people start to use that instead. Thanks.</p>	Connor Smith	Comment form
07/13	<p>I don't believe this is the answer to our congestion problems. Marie Dodds said it best: "Tolling of existing capacity should not be used to discourage driving, change travel behavior, or generate revenue for purposes other than the necessary and beneficial improvement and maintenance of safe mobility on the tolled corridor. AAA believes that congestion pricing, when it is imposed on all road users to discourage the use of automobiles during peak traffic periods, is not an appropriate transportation policy.</p>	Ellen Tobias	Comment form

	We have some concerns with options presented at the PAC meetings. Concept B would toll all lanes of I-5 in Portland between S.W. Multnomah Blvd. and N. Going St. This means there would be no toll-free freeway options; rather, drivers would have to take surface streets with the potential to cause significant congestion and disruption in neighborhoods. There doesn't seem to be an understanding of the level of diversion and the impact it would have in the area."		
07/13	I think tolling the 2 major highways in the area is an absolutely awful idea. All this is going to do is push traffic out into the neighborhoods. You have people living in St. Helens or Scappoose for whom public transportation or riding a bike is not a feasible option. They'd have to drive to a max line, ride that to wherever the closest bus to their work is and then take the bus. This could add 3+ hours to their commute. Are any of you willing to get up 3 hours earlier to go to work or spend an extra 3 hours away from your family. The people living in those areas also tend to make less money which is why they live out there in the first place as the cost of living is lower than in the Portland metro area. If you really want to help how about looking into commuter train options for the outlying areas of the city. The MAX line only helps those that are close in. The tolls are going to put the most pressure on the folks who can't afford to live close in or downtown and have to drive to work. In order to avoid the tolls people are going to opt to drive through neighborhoods and backroads increasing the traffic in those areas. You are also going to push a LOT more traffic on to McLoughlin Blvd as people try to avoid I5. I do not believe this is going to help the congestion problem, it is only going to make it worse.	Tara Rockwell	Comment form
07/13	I do not commute between Portland and Vancouver, so tolls are unlikely to affect me substantially. However, I believe tolls such as these are regressive and disproportionately burden low-income people in the region. I believe a gas tax is a fairer way to distribute the cost of maintaining the freeway across all drivers.	Tony Lash	Comment form
07/13	I have two particular points I would like to make. 1) Tolloed roads will have a negative impact on low-income residents as well as arterial roads. What we need unfortunately are additional roadways to make this area livable. Any plan that does not provide for solutions to the above two issues is not a good plan. We particularly don't need to increase the inequity in our population. 2) TRUCKS. I would suggest that the increase in trucking through the center of Portland as well as on all freeways has been a major part of our problem. Trucking needs to have a routing plan that greatly reduces their impact on auto transit. Perhaps banning them from the freeways during the peak hours. Encouraging them to drive through Portland during the night? Additionally their wear and tear on the roads has to be significant.	Beverly Perttu	Comment form
07/13	The subject of tolls for using roads is not the values most Oregonians believe in. This will place an undue hardship on the struggling poor and put surface streets and neighborhoods at risk of gridlock. The solution is adding new lanes or have less on/off ramps on the interstates which slow traffic to a crawl. Look at I-5 in Salem. If the unfortunate decision is to have tolls, I-5 and I-205 tolling should be close in proximity. Having tolling on I-5 up north and I-205 down south by Oregon City only means that people coming south will gridlock I-205 to bypass the toll on I-5. If they were directly across on each road, that probably would not occur. NO TOLLS!!	R Howell	Comment form
07/13	How is it that first thing the state did when confronted with the horrible traffic situation in Portland, was create a tolling committee to make the public pay for a better road system? I drive on those roads every other day at least, to get from Scappoose to Milwaukie, and now I'm going to have to pay to deal with the abhorrent traffic? How would traffic be less with toll booths making every car stop to pay the toll anyways? I firmly believe that this is NOT a solution, and that tolling will only cause a different set of problems.	Courtney Baldwin	Comment form
07/13	This plan is STUPID!!!!!! Where do you think the cars are going to go????????? THEY WILL CLOG UP THE SIDE STREETS THAT ARE ALREADY CONGESTED. Balance YOUR budget. Be good stewards of the tax payer money. Stop the waste. Enough with the bike lanes, MAX, walking bridges, etc. FIX OUR ROADS AND INFRASTRUCTURE.	Kim Hoke	Comment form
07/13	These tolls will be strongest on those who live farther from their workplaces and cannot find alternative routes to commute, such as biking or public transit. Since these populations are proportionally lower-income, this has the effect of regressive taxation. Tolls are not even guaranteed to reduce congestion in any case, since these people with inflexible commutes can't exactly choose not to come to work. I do not support the proposal.	Wes Hilmeyer	Comment form
07/13	This is just another excuse to make money on the public and divert it to other causes than which it was intended. You've made excuses for road repair many times over	No First Name No	Comment form





	the years and continually give the roads no attention. I'm 100% against tolling. It's wrong and not ok.	Last Name	
07/13	I am having to write in a second time based on an article published by the Oregonian after your last public session on 7/12 at University place in which the article states that several transportation board members are now suggesting that the tolling scheme should extend to all lanes of all metro area freeways (5, 205, 405, 84, 26, and 217). There was even talk of delaying the application to the FHA to reformulate this into the proposal coming from Oregon. I have lived in numerous cities around the country as well as internationally. I do not know of any city in the country that has put a toll on all of their metro freeways such that the entire system is tolled, even on the east coast. It looks like Oregon is going to ask the federal government to take an entirely new approach to transportation in the US using Portland as a demonstration project: toll every freeway in the metro region AND add virtually no capacity in exchange for those tolls. I can't see the Fed's going for that because this would be a novel approach in the country and be unpopular in potentially setting precedent elsewhere. I am sorry you did not get your "tax-by-the-mile" proposal through, but it is clear that you continue to try to find a way to sock it to the driving/taxpaying public. It is beyond belief how you are going about this and how poorly thought out everything is. You would likely be more successful with a tolling proposal if you demonstrated significant addition of road capacity to the driving public.	Patrick Dinwiddie	Comment form
07/13	I do NOT want tolling. Not one article has talked about where the traffic goes; it just states that it'll free up congestion. It might free up the congregation on the interstate, but it'll add to the side streets. The drivers are not going to stop making their way to their destinations.	Roger Tobias	Comment form
07/13	This will just push traffic to the side streets causing more congestion. Oregon just raised the gas tax, increased fees at the DMV and started taking a transportation tax out of our paychecks. There is no good argument for tolling existing infrastructure. If you want to toll something, build a new bridge in a new place (maybe Troutdale to Camas). This is just another way for Oregon to get around having to ask the people for a tax increase. NO TO TOLLS!	Jeremiah Sieler	Comment form
07/13	Bad idea that has been proven NOT to work just about everywhere it has been tried. Just a money grab by the State that will not see any new roads and very few new lanes. Build a new westside bypass and toll it. Build an eastside bridge and toll it, but not toll the roads that have already been paid for. Seem like an attack on the Clark Co folks. What about the congestion on 26 and 217? When will there be toll on those roads?	Randy Shaw	Comment form
07/13	Fully against this. You will take people off highways and they will route through neighborhoods to avoid tolling. Do not want this by any means.	Karen Duns	Comment form
07/13	No tow roads!	Rose Stephens	Comment form
07/13	In regards to the very idea of a TOLL on the Abernathy Bridge, \$3.50 seems steep to me. And esp when it's not even going to replacement of the Abernathy Bridge, which will not stand up to an Earthquake! It needs to be rebuilt. IF there is a toll, it should be maybe \$2.00, & everyone pays, including State Workers. That's \$10/wk. if it's your work week! Over \$40/month = 1 tank/gas. And \$520/year! Most tolls only last a year, maybe year & a half. \$3.50 is way to high!! And what is considered "rush hours" anymore in PDX?? Seems busy all the time! Regards, Diane Comer Milwaukie, OR 97267 Ps. Also, I don't think there should be ANY "Toll Bridge" amount due at all during the other times of the day. It's just going to slow down traffic from beginning to end. You'll have to set up a system of buying online monthly passes, & set up cameras so ppl can drive through. One toll booth for debit/credit cards only, & one for cash only. Or all can take both. I still think this idea STINKS if the money doesn't go directly to rebuilding a NEW Abernathy Bridge with can withstand an Earthquake, which we are all expecting anytime. Also, it needs to be widened, southbound. Thank you.	Diane Comer	Comment form
07/13	Portland is over crowded, the side streets are already a mess. This is a very bad idea. Try eliminating unnecessary spending and jobs. In sure there is plenty of waste in alot of places. The city needs to stop spending money on stupid "art" structures like on burnside and mlk. This city wastes way way to much! It's time to be accountable and balance the budget, not tax us more. Rent is through the roof, housing is out of control. Taxing us more is not the answer. Accountability is the answer. This city is in a downward spiral, please dont make it worse.	Charles W Mccarty	Comment form

07/14	I think it's great that you have found a way to keep poor people off the road. I need easier and faster access to I-5 for my H2. Please make the toll as highest possible in order to get the maximum effect on people that can't afford to pay the fine. If you make it 10 or \$20 A-day only people making a \$100000 a year will be able to afford to use the roads and that way my drive will be fast and clear. Perhaps you might consider tripling the cost to register your vehicle, that way poor people won't be able to afford to do that either.	Vaughn Parry	Comment form
07/14	Being a Washington resident now for a little bit over 6 months and seeing both sides now. Oregon taxes my wage and keeps all the money and I have no chance to even get the kicker like the Oregonians do. Plus we do not get to vote in Oregon when they keep 9 or more percent of my check. This is only being pushed because the people in Oregon wants the People in Washington to pay for the Portland roads. There are plenty of news reports and Facebook post to validate this. So if Oregon and Portland goes through with this. I will band Washington residents together to sue Oregon and Portland. Plus will take this to the federal government since these roads were paid for by all federal tax money. You are only really targeting the Washington residents with this toll. You are already taking money from these Washington residents through taxes without any reputation.	Brian	Comment form
07/14	This idea is idiotic. All this will accomplish is to put more cars on surface streets to avoid the freeway tolls, and those are probably also currently near capacity, so you'll essentially just be moving the traffic jams. And if employers were willing to adjust working hours to off-rush hour times, they would have done so already. If you need more money for transportation improvement, then convince our legislators to have some political courage and raise the gas tax a few cents. It's long overdue.	Chris Elbert	Comment form
07/14	It amazes me how neglectful and misdirected the Portland, OR. area 'shakers and movers' are. The social experiment to force us out of our cars is failing. High concentration on Light Rail and bicycles over every thing else for far too many years. When the I-205 Glenn Jackson Bridge was completed, the need for a third bridge across the Columbia was well understood by many of us. By now there should be a fourth bridge. The Mt. Hood Freeway was and is still needed. Everything routed toward the Portland 'Downtown' creates a huge bottleneck. There should be a Freeway ring around the greater Portland area. We pay gas tax fees that should have been spent for an up-to-date road grid. I-5 and I-205 need to be widened. No more money wasted on Mass Transit. No tolls. Tolls on the traffic lanes will slow traffic down more. Many of us will divert to surfaces streets and the added congestion will be unsustainable. I will find ways to avoid your tolls, even if I must cross the river at the Bridge of the Gods. Granted, it is tolled as well. At least I would not be paying the Portland area money hungry politicians.	Norman Fabian	Comment form
07/14	As a former Oregon resident who now lives in Vancouver, Washington but still works in downtown Portland and has family in Clackamas County, I regularly travel I-5 and I-205 and am well-acquainted with the daily traffic congestion. I support demand management but not tolling or congestion/value pricing. I do not believe paying more taxes to Oregon will reduce traffic jams and it will place an unnecessary financial burden on low-income and working-class drivers. Remember that some people need to be solo drivers because their life situations require flexibility and immediate mobility, such as parents with children in day care or school, working in multiple locations or client visits, or running errands before or after work or appointments. Freeway bottlenecks are caused by merging traffic, especially traffic merging onto the freeway. Metered ramp signals don't really help because the merging is slower than the lights. It always amazes me that when driving north on I-5 in jammed-up traffic, it always frees up and speeds up as soon as the state line is crossed on the I-5 bridge. The I-5 bridge is not a bottleneck. All the merge points on the freeway near the bridge are the bottlenecks. I remember one afternoon when the I-405 on-ramp to I-5 N was closed due to an accident. Without all those vehicle merging on, I-5 moved quickly at highway speeds all the way to the state line and beyond. In all the discussions about demand management, I didn't see much discussion about freight traffic. On I-5, I can confirm there are a high percentage of big rigs travelling the freeway daily. Has an express truck lane been considered? Moving large trucks quickly through Portland is good for business and frees up space for passenger vehicles.	Shirley Hewitt	Comment form
07/14	Idiocy of the highest order. Most of money will be funneled off for collection costs and more state employees to oversee it like the Eastern states. Prove me wrong. Post the percentage applied to road construction in every existing tolling project in the US! Will the tolls end when the new lanes are paid off? Of course not! Raise the gas tax!	Alter Hasse	Comment form



07/14	Tolling the freeways will only force drivers to the surface streets. the surface streets art full too. More park and ride would allow for fewer cars. More parking for bus and max riders. I have noticed that the parking lots for the orange max line are full. more parking would help.	Chris Mack	Comment form
07/14	How will the tolling project keep additional traffic off surface streets and out of neighborhood?	David Ehlinger	Comment form
07/14	I am not in favor of tolling the I-5 and I-205 bridges. Please do not do this. We already paid for these bridges, and any maintenance costs should be covered by existing taxes. If you're so desperate to have a toll bridge, then build a new one and charge a toll there.	James Dunn	Comment form
07/14	Why do we have all our eggs in one basket ? If 205 falls from a quake, we are doomed. What we need are more bridges over the river. For starters one at Lake Oswego over to Hwy 224. Make it quake proof from the start. The Wilsonville bridge is a great start. That's what we need , more smaller local bridges to relieve the pressure on the freeways. Lets not put more eggs into one basket ! Even the Ross island is full. We need another bridge. We also need another across the Columbia around Troutdale. Keep the I-5 . We need more baskets ! Not more eggs ! Lets build more smaller bridges that we can count on.	John Pfeifer	Comment form
07/14	I strongly oppose this plan. It fails to offer any reasonable solution to traffic congestion and is more likely to create congestion on the side streets while it adds a mobility tax that will strain underserved and working class populations. The city stood by while the close-in working class communities were gentrified pushing those people to the outer rim of Portland, Vancouver and Gresham. Now the city proposes charging a fee to access the the very neighborhood they were forced to leave. This is a 1960's solution to 21st century problem. Is that the best we can do? We can promote car pooling, create better mass transit solutions (light rail from Vancouver or partner with Amtrak and create a daily shuttle) create actual protected bike lanes. Use some creativity. In the next election I will actively and enthusiastically seek to defeat any commissioner who votes in favor of tolls. A yes vote, demonstrates your lack of creativity and grasp of modern realities. Tolls are regressive and ineffective. Vote No!	Pam Kunse	Comment form
07/14	I am ok with a toll if it would solve congestion. Instead, this is only going to send people onto one lane neighborhood streets which already cannot handle the overflow. You better toll people getting off on random exits so they are tolled for impacting small streets, roads and neighborhoods. This is not going to force people onto public transit. If I was to use public transit, the routes available to me would take me 1.5 hours - public transit is not a solve -all solution. And no way will I ride my bike, not with so many cars ditching the freeways to avoid a toll and going on the neighborhood and country roads.	Michelle Riddle	Comment form
07/14	While our family appreciates your efforts to mitigate traffic, we are 100% AGAINST ANY TOLL ROADS in Oregon! This is realistically just another money grab by the state, and not a legitimate means of reducing traffic! We are already overtaxed on state income tax, and via property taxes, and will not accept or tolerate another grab of money by the communist do nothings in state government. Your proposed taxes would help in one way...our entire family will move out of Oregon, reducing traffic! Just think, that is also less income tax, less property tax, and less gas tax (plus many other overzealous taxes) that the money mongers will lose. And that is four "six figure incomes", not the low welfare type payments of many. Beware what you wish for!	Richard Smith	Comment form
07/14	Oregonians already pay 34 cents a gallon in gas taxes for transportation. Oregon itself is ranked 34th in the nation when it comes to tax burden. That's not that we the a smaller burden, but that there are only 15 states that are worse in the entire country. Couple that with the new minimum wage push and you have a recipe for an economic disaster on the horizon. Adding a toll on the highways, effectively all highways in the Portland metropolitan area (seeing as how 26 and I-84 intersect with both I-5 and I-205) is the last thing Oregonians need. You can solve the congestion problem by ending funding for wasteful things like the Art tax and adding lanes on the freeways. You could decrease the budget by cutting the administration of Portland Public Schools and adding lanes on the freeways. You could stop throwing money at your toy train set by ending subsidization of light rail to the tune of over \$10 a rider. You could have rebuilt the freeways or double their size if you had not build that idiotic waste of money that hardly anyone rides 90% of the time and turns a 20 minute commute into 45 minutes because it has to stop every two blocks along the way. Honestly, my family and I are looking to move out of Oregon because of the	Jeff Seiffert	Comment form

	garbage policies of this state government, their constant dedication to screwing the tax payer any way they possibly can, and their inept but uncanny ability to spend on everything but core government services, such as adequate roads. Furthermore, this toll is not going to alleviate traffic because as you know, the surface streets are just as bad as the highways for size, capacity, coordination of signals and general flow of traffic. Instead, what this proposed tax is, is nothing more than just another money grab against the public. And because of the Oregon Constitution, everyone who has a brain knows that a new tax cannot be earmarked, but rather goes into the general fund, so this won't help the roads one iota. Congratulations on your completely useless efforts. If I ever have to pay this toll, I hope it is as I drive a U-Haul out of the state for the last time, never to look back.		
07/15	I see they are comparing the Portland metro area to Seattle. The big difference is that Portland metro area has 4 main freeways 5,205,405&84. That's it. Seattle has several different freeways and highways to choose from to avoid tolls and traffic, and still get anywhere you need to go. In Portland; you only have the 4, if 2 of them have tolls, that leaves only 2 freeways that everyone avoiding tolls will try to use, except, 405 and 84 do not get you to the same areas as 5 and 205. I do not see this working to reduce traffic, it will only concentrate traffic to the non-tolled areas and overflow into the back streets and side roads. Places like Houston Texas and Washington DC have "feeder roads" along side the tolled roads that are free, and get you to the same place; although much slower than the toll road. This is an example of a toll system that works, people can get to the same places with or without using the toll roads. I see no proposal to build "feeder roads" along side the tolled roads. The existing side streets will not support such an increase in traffic. This proposal will not provide the intended effect. I see it changing where traffic accumulates, not as a solution to the traffic problem.	Kiana	Comment form
07/15	Congestion pricing is unfair to both businesses and average people. Clackamas County residents do not live and work in areas conducive to mass transit. Most cannot just change the hours they work and cannot afford one more fee to burden their shrinking budget. I am totally against this idea. I work for a Coffman Excavation, a construction company that works all over Portland. We have certain hours our job sites are required to work and also cannot deviate those hours. Businesses already pay hefty puc fees and once again an unfair tax.	Julie Puderbaugh	Comment form
07/15	Is this congestion pricing really a way to alleviate traffic congestion or is it because Oregon has a government and leader that cannot balance the budget, doesn't care to and only wants to raise money by adding additional fees (TAXES) on the taxpayer. I think the citizens of Oregon already pay enough fees into the State of Oregon just to see it get wasted on useless and unnecessary projects. I am very familiar with ODOT and other government/state agencies and nearly all of them waste the taxpayers money one way or the other. Pushing traffic into the city streets of Portland will only create a bigger mess as Portland itself has no idea how to repair streets or fix traffic control systems and is always wasting the taxpayers money trying to reduce traffic accidents.	David Slater	Comment form
07/15	As a taxpayer that pays both federal and state taxes. Who has already contributed to the funding of building these two highways, I feel highly offended that you want to tax me more to use these roadways to get to and from my workplace which is what allows me to pay said taxes in the first place. Don't try to minimize adding a tax by calling it some other more nicely worded name - It is a TAX. Unfortunately I do not have the ability to adjust my drive times as I have a set work schedule to avoid such a tax. Secondly, I will be forced to use other already congested neighborhood streets to drive back and forth to work. Driving these neighborhood streets are already hazardous as there is multiple forms of transportation competing with each other on them. There are bicyclists, pedestrians, cars, commercial trucks etc all trying to use these small streets. I and many others will be forced to add to the number of cars as we try to avoid this added taxation. 2017 was the most dangerous year on Portland streets and these tolls will only make them more dangerous. As a homeowner, the situation only depreciates my home value and makes my neighbor more hazardous for walking, the kids and pets. More cars will be traveling thru our neighborhoods because of said tolls. The Commission may not have thought about these issues but I have since I first heard them. I have already planned the routes I will have to take - even at the expense of less time at home and longer drive times. I will not pay the tolls as I don't need this added expense on already tapped budgets. Sad part is I maybe better off than most and it will affect those making minimum wage even more... I honestly see zero benefit to this initiative but a not of downside.	Rick Cruz	Comment form



07/15	I do not think this is the answer, 1.) we are taxed on everything. 2.) The only time I see traffic on the back roads is because of an accident on the freeway and drivers using an alternate route. This is just another tax no matter how you put it. As it is our taxes don't go where they are supposed to. If they did our infrastructure wouldnt be so bad. I say NO!	Tracy Baker	Comment form
07/15	No way, no how! Your poorly hearted way to get more money is not going to fix this problem! The issue with congestion is to many people now live in this area, all this is going to do is direct traffic to an already bad situation! I have had to block part of my driveway entrance to keep the back log from using it as a turaround on Jennings as it is now! This will cause a huge neighborhood street nightmare!!! Please do something else.	Ron G Sarsten	Comment form
07/15	The toll fees should not be implemented until additional or imprived optional routes are available.	Linda Kildow	Comment form
07/15	So by "congestion relief" - that will only apply to the section (or eventually ALL of 205) that has this 'value pricing' in affect. What about the surface streets that this will force everyone onto? This will INCREASE congestion and CREATE a huge safety problem on those surface streets. And in creating a toll, those who are barely able to buy enough gas to get to work now. will have to pay even more to get to that job? Not everyone is close to mass transit options. Where does all the money from the numerous gas taxes we voted for go now? That was supposed to be for fixing our roads. Nothing in going to effectively decrease the amount of people using the freeways. More and more people move here because we continue to give huge corporations huge tax breaks to open companies here. We are inviting people to move here by doing that. The huge corporations should have some responsibility in this. We shouldn't be punishing people just trying to get to work.	Michelle Stringham	Comment form
07/15	I fully support congestion pricing, BUT also want to see these funds go to mass transit and bicycle infrastructure, so that more people have better alternatives to driving alone in their cars.	Kristy Overton	Comment form
07/15	I am a tax paying resident of Portland, and I fully support comprehensive tolling being added to I-5 and I-205. I would greatly appreciate if revenue from tolling went directly into funding affordable, convenient, comprehensive public transit as an alternative. Making driving more inconvenient and transit more accessible is the only way we're going to be able to get less people to drive. Thank you for opening this up for public consultation.	Andy McMillan	Comment form
07/15	I absolutely disagree with this toll, it will force people to go into neighborhoods just to avoid sections of the freeway (not to mention its federal law not to toll federal freeway) that will cause increase traffic in neighbors with animals and children where traffic isn't meant to be!! It is a freeway and that's what's it's made for congestion neighbor hoods aren't made for that kind of traffic. Why not charge everyone a small fee to drive to help with expansions. Or give people tax breaks for not driving during peak times! Tolls are not the answer and not fair! We are a small town and our neighborhoods cant sustain that kind of traffic. I feel if people don't change then they should suffer the long hours on the freeways but small neighborhoods shouldn't have to deal with it. What about people who live right in the zone, I should have to pay for leaving my WL home to get to doctor it's not a reasonable and against federal law to say the least	Denise Woods	Comment form
07/16	I completely support the road pricing program. My problems with how it is being planned are; 1. the program should include all highways that connect to Portland, not just I-5 and I-205; 2. it should extend all the way down to Salem and include the bridges across the Columbia River; 3. it should be done all at once; and 4. a portion of the money generated should go into running a quality commuter train line connecting Portland south to Salem and north to Battle Ground, WA.	Mike De Blasi	Comment form
07/16	No	Cuz	Comment form
07/16	Tolls would not be a problem is they were ever set to reasonable amounts. I have only seen one toll road in my life where that was the case. The toll beneficiaries always try to make them general revenue sources instead of just trying to help control traffic flow.	Howard Brady	Comment form
07/16	I do not approve of the tolling propositions put forth by ODOT. The tolls unfairly target those whom have moved outside of inner parts of Portland and must now commute	Cameron Walker	Comment form

	longer distances. Furthermore, GPS apps encourage diversion and can create driving routes that avoid these tolls, moving traffic off the highway into residential neighborhoods. Congestion is an issue, but should be addressed with improvements in public transportation and more carpool lanes.		
07/16	If Oregon is truly concerned about relieving congestion from the roads going in and out of Portland, then I suggest the following: 1) Incentivize Public Transportation. Work with Vancouver to improve and expand the C-Tran bus service to and from Portland. The main reason more people don't use it is due to the limited service and routes that are offered. Add more Bus services in Portland and the surrounding areas. Add valued pricing discounts for commuters. 2) Expand the major highways by a lane. 3) Build another bridge between Vancouver and Portland. Until there's any real discussion of the above items, then the congestion pricing is blatantly obvious as just another poorly thought out scheme to collect money by a State whose coffers are as empty as the heads of the people coming up with bad solutions to traffic congestion.	Edward Flynn	Comment form
07/16	Dear OTC, From looking at the proposed area for the toll roads there are a few likely outcomes: 1) For the Abernathy Bridge toll it will likely lead to drivers exiting 205 before the toll area and routing additional traffic through the cities of Willamette and Oregon City via the exceptionally narrow Oregon City Bridge. 2) Without adding tolls to I-405 there is a high chance that drivers that would normally access downtown and inner east side Portland will switch to using 405 and cutting through downtown Portland, leading to greater congestion and more potential chaos downtown (drivers cutting off/colliding with MAX light rail trains, running lights, driving the wrong way down one way streets, hitting pedestrians, etc). 3) Greater congestion in neighborhoods: drivers will attempt to depart I-5 and route through neighborhoods to reach their destinations in the toll zones. This already happens to a degree during rush hour, but will increase further if there are tolls involved. 4) Unexpected impacts on area businesses and employees: depending on the cost of tolls this could critically impact employees of downtown Portland businesses, with the impacts being the harshest to employees at or near minimum wage. Given the already high cost of parking downtown this could lead to a loss of employees on a near unimaginable scale as they will no longer be able to afford to drive in to work, and may not be able to use mass transit due to the 2-5x longer commute times it can have. As housing close in to Portland continues to gentrify and become ever more expensive at rates that surpass wage increases this further drives home that gentrification is destroying what little diversity Portland has.	Vanessa White	Comment form
07/16	I am very much against adding tolls to any existing roads in Oregon. If a completely new highway is built with private funds and tolls are used to pay for that highway AND the state has provided a reasonable alternative to the new highway then I'm open to the idea. Metro is already planning it's next light rail expansion. The new line to Bridgeport is estimated to cost \$2.9 billion dollars. Has Oregon ever spent that kind of money on a highway? We have to stop wasting money on rail projects and start investing in infrastructure that benefits all Oregonians. Tolling will only make congestion worse. We need more alternatives to freeways. We should be able to traverse the metro region without getting on a freeway. There are certain obstacles, like the Tualatin River that need more bridges.	David Lowder	Comment form
07/16	No to tolling any roads in Oregon. Stop with the euphemistic name of congestion or value pricing. A toll is a tax when a government agency imposes it. This is a road use tax. A tax that is regressive as there is no discrimination on the basis of income and will contribute to the continual increasing inequality between the rich and poor. Drivers are commuting because they have to travel to their job to earn money. We taxpayers have already paid for the construction of these highways and are continuing to pay for the maintenance of these highways. This idea of imposing a toll as a fix to a congestion problem is flawed. Everyone uses the roads whether they drive or not. Delivery services use the roads to deliver that package that someone ordered. Freight and cargo services use the roads to transport those items for delivery. Emergency services use the roads. Many services that require travel to homes and businesses would be severely penalized by these proposed road tolls. Prices on everything will be raised to compensate for this increased expense. Those many commuters who are barely making ends meet will greatly suffer if these tolls are imposed. If they don't travel on the tolled roads, then many of the other non-tolled roads will receive excess traffic that will greatly affect travel times. If the committee thinks these tolls will change behavior, it won't, the main change in behavior will be an increase in anger at the government. To offer solutions to the traffic flow is outside the scope of this forum, there are no easy solutions. But in case the committee is tiring of only reading, I hope mainly, No responses, here are some ideas: Stagger the start and stop times of businesses and schools. The more difficult solutions: change the tax structure in	Christopher B.	Comment form



	<p>Washington to remove the incentive to live in Washington and commute to Portland. Residents of Vancouver work in Vancouver etc. Reduce the growth of the population living in the Portland-Vancouver area, yes, this idea must be considered: population growth cannot continue, the infrastructure and environment cannot sustain it. Increase the public transportation system, the current system is inadequate to accommodate the potential needs. One does not need a car to live in New York or London due to the large public transportation system. Again, I repeat with enormous force: No to toll roads in Oregon.</p>		
07/16	<p>Following up on my comments of July 12, 2018: The people that are calling for more transit to replace driving completely ignore and/or side step the costs of providing it. As previously stated, one two-axle bus does as much damage to the streets and roads as 1200 cars. The automobile - both at federal level through the Federal Highway Trust Fund that massively funds infrastructure and at the local level by maintaining the street system - heavily subsidizes transit paying more into the system than the riders do. Transit fares barely cover 25% of the operating costs. Yet a common theme among transit advocates is to change the Oregon Constitution to allow gas tax revenues and other motor vehicle taxes and fees to pump even more money into transit's black hole. Reducing the number of cars on the road due to higher taxes and fees (that could include tolls) would likely increase additional the demand for transit while at the same time increasing the costs of transit to provide more connections. Transit never will be or never can be a direct point to point connection for everybody. Moreover, a person also needs to figure in the cost of travel time on transit including starting point to boarding point, wait times - especially if transfers have to be made between starting point and destination - and from deboarding point to final destination. The bottom line here is the economics of replacing driving with transit simply doesn't pencil out until such time as fares are increased to better reflect the true cost of providing it. Furthermore, a balance must exist whereby transit makes sense for some connections, but at the same time, motor vehicle capacity must be increased Metro wide - all of which must be placed under an equity umbrella whereby the users of all alternative transport modes (including bicyclists) are financially assessed to help fund infrastructure costs. In a user paid system, continuing to just add taxes to driving and the automobile is a form of tax discrimination. Roadways shouldn't be just for the rich. Even with low income discounts, tolling would be discriminatory. Tolls paid by moderate income drivers would be caught in the middle subsidizing both ends of the income spectrum. Any value is directly related to income. Therefore any tolling needs to be indexed by income. As an example, say the base toll is \$1.00. This would apply to drivers within \$5,000.00 below or above the annual median income level. For drivers who have incomes above his range, the toll would increase by \$1.00 per each \$10,000.00 income bracket. On the low income side the toll would be reduced by 25% for drivers with annual incomes between the low end of the base range and 50% of the low end of the range, and reduced by 50% for drivers who make less than 50% of the low end of the range. Depending on the system used to charge for tolls, this concept could be complicated to enforce. However, variable tolls is the only equitable and just way to be fair to moderate income drivers. Government vehicles such as the City of Portland's huge fleet of passenger vehicles and light trucks that usually are utilized as single operator vehicles - or in the case of elected officials chauffeured - also need to be required to pay the same tolls as the public does. The only exceptions would be emergency, law enforcement and roadway maintenance vehicles. The city already charges various bureaus for water in this manner and should be setting the example for the public as it relates to transportation and travel too. Finally, ever increasing congestion and the call by car haters to manage that congestion by adding new fees, the push to add density and the destruction of single family home neighborhoods, the lack of affordable housing and homelessness, food and water shortages, and the extinction of species, etc. all have one thing in common: unsustainable human population growth. Yet the only thing coming from the political leadership on all sides of the isle is a "dictatorial" band-aid approach that runs counter to democracy, takes away freedom of choice and puts forward the establishment of bias expenditures on the public such as tolling the freeways. Instead of taking away our freedoms, what is needed is to launch a conversation suggesting smaller families and how to voluntarily manage human population growth. If tolling does take place, drivers must be given clear and posted bypass routes. The best option for those routes is not to toll all lanes. Moreover, transit riders and bicyclists need to start paying their full share of transportation infrastructure costs before drivers are expected to pay more.</p>	Terry Parker	Comment form

07/16	We are required to take these highways to and from work! It's not a decision whether we want to. There are no alternate routes that make sense. The idea is okay, but just not realistic for the way our city is setup, and because we are required to take these roads to work.. HOW ABOUT EXPAND THE FREEWAYS! The roads are not set up to handle the demand and the amount of people moving here.	Megan	Comment form
07/16	First off I live in Molalla OR and travel to Gladstone OR via Hwy 213, via I205 south exit at Oregon city north on McLaughlin and right on Arlington Street in Gladstone. My commute now is a nightmare with so called normal traffic and heaven help me when there is even a small traffic accident on my route--a toll on I205 will throw al the commuters off 205 and to the surface streets immediately and then my commute will be a nightmare. Also why isn't there proposed tolls over on 217, 26 , and 8 as those get more traffic then over here on the east side and I think that the median income over on west side is way more than here on the east side.	Karen DeForest	Comment form
07/17	I am very opposed to a toll to cross the Abernethy bridge! Other than the 2-lane Oregon City bridge (which is usually very slow, and so narrow that it frightens me to drive it), it is the only bridge to cross the Willamette south of the Sellwood Bridge. I live in Oak Grove, have 2 of my children's families in West Linn, and cross the bridge a minimum of 6 times weekly to care for grandchildren. As a retired senior on a fixed income, a toll would be a hardship for me. Thank you for your time.	Victoria Wood	Comment form
07/17	I work in Lake Oswego and Live in Gladstone. Taxing people who ONLY want to use the bridge across the Willamette will do several things. ONE) Make traffic and congestion through old Oregon City a nightmare with all the extra cars who just want to go to the other side of the water for work or play. TWO) Keep people from visiting the small businesses in those areas due to congestion and the added cost associated with their visit, unless they use the old bridge. THREE) Put the burden of extra traffic on the surface streets for people who do not want to pay the tolls. The surface streets will become unnavigable for residents of those areas along the "alternate routes". Oregon is not a place for toll roads. Raise the taxes on Tri-Met! They demand so much and give so little! Install a new bridge between the Sellwood Bridge and the Abernathy Bridge... Loads of people would use that and it would alleviate Sellwood Traffic and West Linn Traffic. Those things would be useful for so many! Oregon has some of the highest road taxes in the nation and adding yet another tax on the roads is wrong. Oregonians will not vote for the person who is behind all this.	Amie Williams	Comment form
07/17	Don't reward Portland 's abysmal street and road management with more money from tolls. A third bridge should have been built instead of spending millions of dollars - yes millions- on studying what, at the outset, was obviously inadequate to deal with the transportation changes and challenges in the urban area. Channeling even more traffic through the middle of Portland did not make sense then or now. And fining people for using the highways that they already paid for is basically punishing the lower classes and poor. A toll makes no difference to wealthy families' budgets, but for those of us that are already being priced out of the urban housing market, getting back and forth is a basic need, with people already pressed to make rent, necessities, etc. And yes, getting to work, getting to medical appointments, and educational destinations are basic needs, too. Start working on a Washington County corridor now, rather than planning to accommodate all their county's traffic flow through urban Portland. And a bridge in the Troutdale area would ease the fast growing eastside traffic needs.	Rachel Hardy	Comment form
07/17	I highly recommend against adopting a congestion pricing scheme. Congestion pricing will do little to alter driver behavior and imposes a non-trivial financial burden on poorer workers who likely have little choice in their commute. At its heart, congestion pricing is a regressive form of taxation that only serves to harm those who can least afford it.	Maxwell Hallock	Comment form
07/17	I have driven between Gladstone and Tigard at least five days a week for the last three years. Some of that time I could determine my own schedule and choose when to leave for work and when to head home. Other times I had to punch a time card. Many times when traffic was exceptionally bad, I would weave through neighborhoods, like everyone else, which created congestion there. The worst thing about this "value pricing" toll idea is that it will negatively impact low-income people the most. Low-income people generally don't have much say about when they have to be at work, and what about those who are trying to get home to families? They do not have the luxury of waiting around until "value pricing" kicks in. Therefore, the people who are already burdened are being asked to bear even more, while wealthy people who can afford the higher prices have the additional luxury of driving	Susan Van Stelle	Comment form





	whenever they want. Why not increase BUS SERVICES and LIGHT RAIL to create an environmentally responsible, FAIR and JUST solution for all??		
07/17	I am opposed to highway tolls to fight congestion. Tolls would not relieve congestion, only transfer it to our neighborhoods where it would cause serious traffic and safety problems. This is already an issue in Willamette neighborhood of West Linn. Tolls would worsen the situation through our downtown business district, and so push even more of that traffic onto the residential side streets. In addition, there are often times now, mostly Friday afternoons, that the traffic between downtown Willamette and the Oregon City Bridge on the road that parallels 205 is at a standstill, a 5-minute drive becoming 30-45 minutes. Tolls would also seriously increase traffic between Wilsonville and Willamette, which has already increased dramatically in the past 5 years, with traffic traveling over Petes Mountain, past Willamette Park and in front of Willamette Primary School, exhaust fumes are unhealthy for all of us, but especially for children. These are the areas I'm most familiar with, but I'm sure all of Hwy 43 would be adversely affected, and there are many other neighborhoods whose non-arterial streets would also become clogged with traffic avoiding tolls. Personally, this would be financially burdensome. Mass transit is not an option for several reasons, and the exhaust fumes in front of my house are already noxious. I am in favor of allocating funds to learn how higher performance railway, river, and transit services may decongest highways of freight and people, and generate a surplus to modernize and maintain great highways without tolls. Thank you for your consideration	Leslie Hayertz	Comment form
07/17	My testimony is typed here, and also attached in a PDF format. Thank you. Dear Commissioners, Thank you for all your work on this effort, as well as for gathering and evaluating testimony from so many groups & individuals. As a member of the public, I've learned a lot through the process. After watching the OTC listening session on July 12th, I have some thoughts and facts to offer in response to questions Commissioners Martin Callery and Alando Simpson asked about freight mobility and the interstate system component. First, I also offered testimony at the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Advisory Committee meeting June 25, & I'd like to restate my support for Option C as a pricing plan. I expect pricing the entire system will seem most fair to the public, & be surer to achieve pricing goals like clean air and mode shifts. I'll also restate the need for revenue to go to transit & bicycle infrastructure to allow safe, efficient, affordable, & climate friendly(1) options for people at all incomes. As someone in a car-free household, I hope for improvements to bike ways for long (15+ mile) work commutes across counties as well as short (1-3 mile) rides to schools & grocery stores. At the listening session, I thought Commissioner Simpson asked Jana Jarvis, president of the Oregon Trucking Association, a very interesting question, about whether produce prices go higher as a result of congestion. Since food on Oregonians' tables is essential, I was surprised Ms. Jarvis responded she hadn't seen a cost study on produce prices and congestion. As noted by Commissioner Simpson, cost of food is especially important to families with little to no discretionary income, who can't participate much beyond food in the retail economy. I was curious why data on such an important issue was not presented by the freight industry. I learned that, according to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2017 Freight Facts & Figures Report,(2) automobiles are the number two value commodity shipped nationwide. And as of 2013 in Oregon, motorized vehicles are the top commodity shipped both to and from the state.(3) Auto shipping is a historic use of the semi-truck, which was invented in 1898 by Alexander Winton, a Scottish emigrant to the United States who wanted a way to deliver cars to buyers.(4) I wondered, then, how critical produce is to the freight industry. The Bureau reports as of 2015, the US freight industry's top two commodities by value are electronics & motorized vehicles. By weight, top commodities are natural gas, coke (a high carbon content fuel) & asphalt, followed by gravel and gasoline. In 2015 the industry hauled 20 times more waste & scrap—the nation's 10th top commodity at 653 million tons—than produce, which saw record shipments of 33.6 million tons in 2017 according to Agricultural Refrigerated Truck Quarterly.(5) The Pacific Northwest reported shipping out just 1.87 million tons of produce in the fourth quarter of 2017, down 3 percent from 2016. Known pollutant 'diesel fuel' is the big expense in produce shipping—and a potential medical expense for people living near freeways. Diesel refrigerated trucks save food from spoiling, but they use 25% more fuel & create more pollution, including noise.(6) It appears produce is far from the most profitable load trucks carry. Even "Other Foodstuffs," which may be subject to new FDA transportation safety rules,(7) and includes things like sugar and coffee, are 9th for weight and 10th for value. That's far below fuel oils, gasoline, coal, and crude petroleum, products that might be affected by a reduced	Naomi Fast	Comment form

demand for single occupancy driving. Bad for oil business profits, perhaps; but good for people’s health and the climate. The Oregon Trucking Association has stated it can’t accept value pricing unless more freeway capacity is added, regardless of whether that capacity would even be needed with smart, successful value pricing. New freeway capacity could no doubt be expected to increase car sales. More new cars trucked here would soon congest new lanes of roads (induced demand). In 2012, Fresno State actually did conduct a study on transport of fresh produce.(8) They found that “on a commodity specific basis the choice of surface transportation mode appears to be linked with relative perishability. Hence, more perishable crops with higher values would utilize air transport, while less perishable low value crops might be more likely to move by rail.” A 2017 FreightWaves article reported a Stifel analysis found it likely that long shelf-life produce shipment will be moved to rail.(9) And a 2018 New York Times article asserts most of America’s fruit is imported, arriving in marine or air containers.(10) Regardless of where produce is grown, the fact remains it is not rated a “top commodity” in the trucking industry. A final Bureau of Transportation Statistics note: the largest percentage of goods are moved short distances, & rail’s the dominant mode for shipments moved further, from 750 to 2,000 miles. (The report uses Great Circle Distance, or “as the crow flies” miles, not driving distance.) It states: “Approximately 50 percent of the weight and 37 percent of the value of goods were moved less than 100 miles between origin and destination in 2015.” That’s no further than Portland to Eugene (in great circle distance miles), or Burns to Ontario in Malheur County. It’d be interesting to ask the question: What percent of our nation’s interstate system is being used for interstate freight movement, versus in-state deliveries, versus local personal driving? Just as an interstate system is connected with the nation, our climate is connected with the world. What we do—or fail to do—with road pricing in Oregon has national and international impacts, as well as local. If we are bold with reducing SOV car use, the Portland area could be seen as a transportation oasis. We should be mindful, too, that our transportation behaviors in Oregon are currently contributing to devastating climate impacts around the world, that in turn affect us here in a myriad of ways. In May of this year, Phil Mote, director of Oregon Climate Change Research Institute and Oregon DEQ director Richard Whitman testified at the inaugural Joint Interim Committee on Carbon Reduction meeting about these global realities.(11) Whitman said Oregon is seeing a substantial rise in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the transportation sector. Oregon is now 10% above 1990 levels of GHG emissions, & about half that 10% increase is due to an increase in transportation-related GHG emissions. He said the fastest growing sub-category within transportation for GHG emissions growth is in the freight sector, with a bump up in GHG from individual passenger vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Back to produce: California produces a 1/3 of the nation’s vegetables and 2/3 of the nation’s fruits and nuts, but one thing that 2012 Fresno State study did not consider is road capacity’s link to rises in GHG emissions from personal VMT & climate change. But a study published in a May 2018 special edition of the peer-reviewed journal Agronomy is concerning.(12) It was written about from Los Angeles Times to Modern Farmer. As a San Francisco KQED reporter highlights, the report warns: “For California, as an agricultural leader for various commodities, impacts on agricultural production due to climate change would not only translate into national food security issues but also economic impacts that could disrupt state and national commodity systems.”(13) We’ve already felt it in Oregon. A couple years ago, shopping for grapefruit at a local Fred Meyer, the produce manager said there’d be no shipment of grapefruit for days. The reason? Storms delaying the harvesting season, and later, huánglóngbing (HLB), a disease which has only affected US citrus crops since 2005.(14) Climate change, worsened with every road we expand, has a far greater impact on produce—and not just its price, but its very availability. More transit & bicycle capacity is clearly in the best interest of achieving our most urgent pricing goals, including the need to protect Oregonians’ local environments, farm land, land for housing, and health (the healthier our bodies, the healthier our wallets). The trucking industry seeking added road capacity seems circular: shipping more automobiles leads to more congestion. Meanwhile, many Oregonians would like to cease being car dependent. Because of Portland’s head start with creating bicycle infrastructure and public transit, Oregon’s now poised to be America’s leader into a new transportation era. I’m excited for the opportunity your evaluation and proposal presents for Oregon to boldly move into our best transportation future. I see that future as one where transit and bicycles have much safer, more efficient, and available infrastructure, creating truly inviting mode choices; a future striding toward environmental justice; & one moving sustainably into our climate unknowns. Thank you again for your time and thought into this issue. Naomi Fast, Beaverton, OR 97006 Sources: 1. On twitter see hashtags: #bike4climate & #bikes4climate 2. [Oregon Department of Transportation](https://www.bts.gov/bts-publications/freight-facts-and-figures/freight-</a></p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)



	<p>facts-figures-2017-chapter-2-freight-moved 3. <a href="https://www.bts.gov/sites/bts.dot.gov/files/legacy/oregon.pdf">https://www.bts.gov/sites/bts.dot.gov/files/legacy/oregon.pdf</a> 4. <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexander_Winton#cite_note-4">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexander_Winton#cite_note-4</a> 5. <a href="https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/RTQ4thquarter2017.pdf">https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/RTQ4thquarter2017.pdf</a> 6. <a href="http://www.takepart.com/article/2015/06/29/coldscaperefrigeratedtrucking">http://www.takepart.com/article/2015/06/29/coldscaperefrigeratedtrucking</a> 7. <a href="http://www.fleetowner.com/regulations/complying-fsma-your-fleet-ready">http://www.fleetowner.com/regulations/complying-fsma-your-fleet-ready</a> 8. <a href="https://www.fresnostate.edu/jcast/cab/documents/1An%20Analysis%20of%20California%20Agricultural%20Transportation.pdf">https://www.fresnostate.edu/jcast/cab/documents/1An%20Analysis%20of%20California%20Agricultural%20Transportation.pdf</a> and see <a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/statistics/">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/statistics/</a> 9. <a href="https://www.freightwaves.com/news/shipping-fresh-produce-is-complicated">https://www.freightwaves.com/news/shipping-fresh-produce-is-complicated</a> 10. <a href="https://www.nytimes.com/03/13/dining/fruit-vegetables-imports.html">https://www.nytimes.com/03/13/dining/fruit-vegetables-imports.html</a> 11. <a href="http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=24903">http://oregon.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=24903</a> 12. <a href="http://www.mdpi.com/journal/agronomy/special_issues/climate-agriculture#published">http://www.mdpi.com/journal/agronomy/special_issues/climate-agriculture#published</a> 13. <a href="https://www.kqed.org/science/1920374/study-climate-change-will-wipe-out-major-crops-in-california">https://www.kqed.org/science/1920374/study-climate-change-will-wipe-out-major-crops-in-california</a> 14. <a href="http://citrusindustry.net/2016/10/28/fresh-grapefruit-shipments-down-track-production-decline/">http://citrusindustry.net/2016/10/28/fresh-grapefruit-shipments-down-track-production-decline/</a></p>		
07/18	<p>I support value-based tolling on I-5, but please don't gate tolling starting at NE Alberta! This would turn North Portland's side streets into an unsafe and congested workaround for I-5. North Portland is known for its bikeability and family friendliness, and if you ruin that by making us the starting point for toll dodgers, my family's quality of life will suffer</p>	Mark Settle	Comment form
07/18	<p>Thank you for recommending value pricing as an option to help solve Oregon's transportation woes, particularly around the Portland metro area. Value pricing on I-5 and I-205 will prove to be a boon to the quality of life in our state and region. After having reviewed supportive letters to the OTC from the Oregon Environmental Council, The Street Trust as well as other letters in opposition, I strongly support the implementation a pilot program to assess the effectiveness of value pricing on I-5 and I-205. Using funds from value pricing to invest in transit and bike/pedestrian facilities will increase the effectiveness of the overall system, even for drivers of single occupancy vehicles, as seen in practice in Copenhagen and elsewhere. (Please take a moment to review this brief article and/or 3 minute video: <a href="http://www.streetfilms.org/congestion-pricing-was-unpopular-in-stockholm-until-people-saw-it-in-action/">http://www.streetfilms.org/congestion-pricing-was-unpopular-in-stockholm-until-people-saw-it-in-action/</a> ) Oregon and the Portland area have taken the lead on modeling innovative active transit measures, land use, and progressive social policies before, and we now have an opportunity once again to show the country how it's really done, now that New York has failed to implement value pricing. There are currently and there will be future voices of opposition to value pricing, though theory and practice have shown in other metro regions that value pricing can be a benefit to all road users, especially when equity measures are implemented in the policy from the beginning. Please do the courageous thing and implement this pilot program with an eye toward its permanency. Even if it fails, we can always go back to the status quo, and we will be able to say we tried our best. Though perhaps we have the chance to do something truly great for our region, state, country and ourselves. Thank you! - Aaron, Kirsten, Sierra, &amp; Anton Choate- SE Portland</p>	Aaron Choate	Comment form
07/18	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose congestion pricing. There are too many negative consequences, both intended and not, to make this worthwhile. On a large scale, it is regressive, and will privilege people who can afford to pay extra to drive. It will create chaos on side streets. In particular, this will impact the poorer neighborhoods near the freeways, as cars speed through these residential streets to save money. The last thing Portland needs is more inequity. Vision Zero, Portland's plan for 100% safe streets, is an impossible goal as it is... this will drive fatalities skyward, as the people avoiding the freeways will inevitably have. On a personal note, I moved here from Orlando, which at the time had the highest cost per mile toll roads in the nation. Their ubiquity was one of the reasons I moved to this city. It increases the general level of irritation one has with a place, and hurts the quality of life. I think tolling the bridge, once it is built, is completely fine, and I am also okay with increasing the gas tax, which has the benefit of encouraging conservation and fuel efficiency. But congestion pricing is a disaster waiting to happen. I strongly oppose it, on the grounds of safety, equity, and quality of life.</p>	Michael Rabby	Comment form
07/18	<p>I have lived in Portland for 50 years and am a home owner in the Hosford Abernethy neighborhood. I favor the most comprehensive of the proposals for congestion pricing; that is, congestion pricing on all freeways within the city of Portland. We must reduce traffic because we can not build infrastructure to support the anticipated</p>	David Robboy	Comment form

	<p>future traffic, and if we could, it would be an environmental disaster, not only to air quality but to quality of life on the ground. I strongly oppose using the revenue from congestion pricing to expand freeways. To expand freeways at this point in time is crazy, and in particular I oppose any expansion of I5 in the Rose Quarter area. Expanding freeways does not reduce congestion, but merely increases the amount of traffic. The revenue should be used to improve public transportation as an alternative to driving cars. It should also be used to relieve the hardship on low income residents who have to get to work. I know the law says the revenue has to be used for transportation, but legal and legitimate ways around that can be found. But in any case, it should be used for public transportation.</p>		
07/18	<p>I am against the idea of any tolls. These roads were built using funding provided by Oregon taxpayers. The situation as exists is a direct result of politicians using available funding for projects unrelated to expediting the traffic problem. Now that it has almost become unmanageable, those same political opportunists want to further penalize the public and gather yet more money which will be directed to projects other than building roads. The solution is not tolls; but, an overhaul of the political structure in Salem .</p>	George Tellot	Comment form
07/18	<p>Tolling is a dastardly plan! We already have some of the highest gas prices. Housing, and rental prices have recently sky rocketed. Is the ultimate plan to squeeze the very life out of us? Enough squeezing and pushing on all sides. The money is already there if it weren't squandered. It's time for responsible spending. No Tolling!</p>	Faith Connell	Comment form
07/18	<p>Dear ODOT – I support the idea of tolling in principle as a way to cut down on discretionary rush hour driving. However, a straight, one-price fits all pricing scheme will be very regressive and punishing to those who can least afford it. Any cursory demographic study will show the wealthiest people live closest to downtown, while those earning the least live in far flung suburbs. The software engineers living in The Pearl can walk or ride their bikes to work. The lawyers and bankers in Alameda can take MAX or drive across the Broadway bridge to their jobs. The sheet-rock hangers, roofers, delivery truck drivers and other blue-collar workers have all been priced out of close-in Portland neighborhoods. To find affordable housing, they commute from Battle Ground, Camas, Estacada, Newberg, Canby; even Salem. Their travel is the opposite of discretionary as they have to leave home at 5:30 or 6:00 to be on time for work. I hope your tolling system will find a workable formula that takes into consideration the financial burden facing these folks. Sincerely, George Fitzpatrick Silverton</p>	George Fitzpatrick	Comment form
07/18	<p>I strongly support Option C. I strongly oppose any option that gives drivers the ability to cross the Columbia River and then exit I-5 before arriving at the toll zone. This will lead to large problems on the surface streets of north Portland.</p>	Paul Allen	Comment form
07/18	<p>I do not agree with charging individual motorists to use public roads. That said, it is important to maintain, improve and, sometimes, expand roads. When necessary, these costs should be in the form of an increased gas tax, not a toll road. In addition: If we are going to charge motorists for the use of public roads, then 100% of the revenue from that charge should go to maintaining, improving and adding to those same roads (not for other methods of transportation). Another alternative for alleviating congestion would be to limit the number of trucks using our roads in high traffic areas and, more importantly, during high traffic times. Modern logistics can create situations where trucks aren't on the roads during "rush hour" and better usage of ships and trains can limit the amount of time freight needs motor transport. Doug Anderson Oregon City</p>	Doug Anderson	Comment form
07/18	<p>I strongly support this recommendation made by Jessica Pederson, Multnomah County Commissioner: Improve transit before implementation . The most successful congestion pricing strategies marry transit improvements with value pricing, to provide an enhanced, affordable, and reliable alternative to being tolled. These improvements help mitigate the impact on low-income communities in particular, and provide choice in moving more people through the system with greater efficiency. They also offer a benefit to the transportation system overall - an important selling point to those skeptical of tolling. Managing demand can mean reducing demand during rush hour, but it can also mean shifting people to a more efficient mode of transportation – transit – as well. Demand management used in isolation won't equitably address the issue of congestion, particularly for low income individuals, if not paired with transit enhancements. It is my hope that any pricing program will include increased transit access on routes related to the priced corridors, particularly on routes that currently have no transit option and/or serve low income communities and communities of color. Improved transit access should be made explicit in the value</p>	Kathy Fitzpatrick	Comment form



	pricing program's framework and problem statement. The value pricing conversation must be done in lock step with improvements in the transit system. This cannot wait until the end of ODOT's process. I also strongly support this recommendation made by the group including PBOT, Metro, The Street Trust, Verde, and others: 2) Increased transit access must be a core part of a pricing program, in order to most effectively manage congestion and provide affordable options for system users. This provides people with equitable alternatives to driving, mitigates the impact on low-income communities, and moves more people through the system with greater efficiency. If we price the use of the roadway, we must provide people with an affordable, reliable option. We ask the OTC to embed increased transit access as a key performance measure for value pricing.		
07/18	Having lived on Hayden Island for decades and had to endure horrible traffic conditions on I-5, I am in favor of anything that might help traffic flows. I believe Hayden Island residents should be exempt from fees as I-5 is our only option. I would like light rail and a new Interstate bridge to be built will you are not busy studying it! Thanks, Ron Fulcher	Ronald Fulcher	Comment form
07/18	I am against tolling in I-5 because creating a boundary at NE Going/Alberta would result in a dramatic increase in "cut-through" traffic through all of the North Portland neighborhoods preceding the tolled portion of I-5	Matvey Rezanov	Comment form
07/18	DO NOT toll all of the lanes on our freeways. It would be acceptable to pay maybe for one lane in ADDITION. To what we have, but the answer is not tolling the population. What should be done is using money from less necessary programs, instead of asking for money, and applying it to make the roads WIDER. In Portland it seems like they are basically asking for people not to not use the roads.	Christopher Cervetto	Comment form
07/19	I believe you can NOT have tolling without building a third bridge between Oregon and Washington.... Thank you,	Lori Anne	Comment form
07/19	have no stake in the game. This is similar to the original PERS board and the mess they created. - Urban Growth. More homes and apartments are being built. Traffic will only get worse - regardless of toll roads or not. - If you are going to toll the freeways, please toll NW Flanders in Portland and State Street in Salem. -Westside Highway, we need a highway from the Hillsboro area heading north crossing the Columbia into Washington. And heading south to Salem. -Eastside highway, we need a highway in the Gresham/Troutdale area crossing the Columbia into Washington. - ODOT has already made up its mind, whether or not the public comments. - I-205 in the Stafford area should have been made an 8+ lane freeway many years ago. - Hwy 224 should be made four lanes from 212/Carver to Estacada. - Install a signal at Hwy 224 and Springwater Road/Carver Bridge. we have been promised a signal for over a year. - I-5 should be an 8+ lane freeway. - Bike/Pedestrian paths should be separated from roads like they do in many countries in Europe. not just a painted white line. Try riding a bicycle on 212 with cars going freeway speed less than a foot away from you. No fun.	John Maurer	Comment form
07/19	I'm writing to comment on congestion pricing for highways in the Portland area. As someone who spends much time for work and volunteering in public lands outside of the metro area, I am often on gravel roads in remote areas. I can't use transit to get to these places; I need a car. I can't live close to where I work, because my destinations change frequently and can be in any direction from the city. That's the case for many other people who live and work in the metro area, such as those in construction, delivery, maintenance, repair, and other services that come to a person's home or office. Transit doesn't work for carrying bulky or valuable items, and unfortunately, it has also become dangerous to use. I want to see the vast majority of money collected from any tolling scheme spent on improving our roads. I see the value of transit and it may keep some drivers off of highways helping to improve my travel times, but it's unfair to ask drivers to bear the burden of building a transit network that only provides an indirect benefit. Transit costs must be borne by transit users and all residents of the region, regardless of whether they drive on the highways or not. The current plan views drivers as a source of money for transit, turning transit into a monster that sucks money from whatever sources it can lay its mitts on. Transit cannot get to every person's destination. It has inconvenient schedules that waste the time of transit users. I've tried Tri-Met and MAX, and I can nearly always get to my destination faster by car. I know that transit is a lifeline to the handicapped and people who cannot drive. But, those people are not and never were contributing to the congestion on our highways. I understand the principle of "induced demand," that	Chris Carvalho	Comment form

	<p>if we build roads they will become congested. However, that principle only works because it fails to take into account that road construction must be a comprehensive part of policy that includes restrictions on development. We should both build roads, and limit housing expansion in our region. Governments continue to assume, and even encourage, more people moving to the region as part of a fallacy that growth is always good. Any gardener can tell you that when things grow uncontrollably, they need to be pruned or taken out. There are plenty of cities, especially in rural Oregon, that need new residents and businesses. We should instead be encouraging people to settle in those areas and provide incentives for that to happen. I moved here for the region's quality of life. That's rapidly vanishing due to a lack of attention to keeping our area livable by making sure the roads and housing are in balance. Instead, we see the highway department failing to maintain the roads and lacking the funding to do it, and we see government planners trying to expand housing without paying for the impact new residents create on our transportation system. One hand doesn't know what the other is doing. This is a completely unworkable and unrealistic policy, and is the reason we're here today with overcrowded roads and day-long traffic jams. Our region's residents need to have an ongoing dialogue where we decide what acceptable travel times are, how we build roads to achieve those times, and how much housing can be built without lengthening those times. ODOT and regional governments need to start working together and with the public to make those goals reality. Tolls need to be devoted to fixing bottlenecks such as the right lane of US 26 eastbound into the Vista Ridge Tunnel, I-84 and I-5 in central Portland, and Highway 217. I want an improved transit system for those who need it, but it must be paid for fairly by everyone, not by putting tolls on our highways. If we toll, then fix the roads with the money and put the brakes on housing development. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>		
07/19	<p>First off - I don't agree with adding tolling to existing roads/lanes, without any direct improvements or firm commitments to improve either the roadways/freeways, or realistic alternatives. The PAC's recommendation tries to make tolling seem normal by using examples of bridges and freeways elsewhere in the country - but these were all financed and built to expand roadway infrastructure, with tolling after the fact to pay the bill - NOT tolling existing paid-for roadways. I don't know why the PAC and OTC haven't considered the diversion impact of tolling north of Wilsonville, when there's a geographic obstacle just south of us. This tolling will cause significant additional diversion and congestion of local city and country roads as commuters seek to avoid the toll. Even today without tolling, the daily freeway congestion causes significant diversion onto back roads throughout the area. This often causes back-ups throughout most of Wilsonville during the evening commute (I've had a 5-min drive across town on surface streets take 40 min), as south-bound drivers in the evening commute take back-roads until they are forced onto I-5 at Wilsonville road to cross Willamette at Boone bridge. Alternative river crossings are few and far between (Oregon city, Newberg, or Canby ferry). By tolling north of Wilsonville, these commuters from south of the Willamette will be further incentivized to get off in Wilsonville prior to the toll zone and take back-roads instead of the freeway. Current bad evening congestion will extend into the morning commute, and the evening congestion will only get worse. Wilsonville has done 4 or 5 major infrastructure projects in the last decade to improve the intersections near Wilsonville road and I-5, but once the freeway stops and the on-ramp backs up it doesn't matter how many turn lanes they add. Freeway improvements are up to ODOT - there's only so much the city can do while no significant action is taken by the state. A city of Wilsonville engineer (Nancy Kraushaar, PE) published an article in November 2016 discussing the issue - as the city was fielding many complaints about local congestion despite several completed improvement projects. She discussed the contributing issues at length. The frequency and spacing of interchanges between Wilsonville road and the rest area to the south is 2x the allowable under current highway code (4 interchanges in under 2 miles). The Boone Bridge also carries nearly as much traffic as the I-5 "Columbia River Crossing", 96% annually. Also, nearby highways interconnect without additional lanes to handle the increased traffic (Highway 551 to the south, and I-205 to the north). These and other factors cause significant weaving lane changes that contribute to the congestion. ODOT is just finally considering adding an auxiliary lane southbound on the Boone Bridge (currently 4 lanes northbound, but only 3 southbound). They won't consider removing the emergency lane and re-striping to squeeze it on - instead the plan is to widen the bridge, but the timeline is 10-15 years until the project will be completed. This is far too late considering the traffic issues we are already experiencing.</p>	Jeff Lewis	Comment form



07/19	<p>Hello, As the chairperson of the Interstate MAX Citizens Advisory Committee, a longstanding member of the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area Committee and chair of the Transportation Subcommittee, and a member of the Columbia River Crossing Task Force, I am most familiar with the challenges of congestion on I-5 south of the Washington State Line. I also live and work in the Interstate Corridor in North Portland so I continue to endure the effects of the traffic diverting from I-5 onto nearby streets including Interstate Avenue. The neighborhood streets south of Killingsworth are often moving at 5 MPH mimicking the flow on I-5 north of the Fremont Bridge in the PM peak. Any tolling on I-5 that causes diversion will only overload the street grid even more. I think diversion points will be used to avoid tolls by those not willing to directly pay for less congestion. If the southbound tolls start after the Alberta St offramp (Exit 303) from I-5, the congestion with a very unwieldy set of intersections for freight and workers will back far from the exit into the travel lane on I-5. Rosa Parks is the next tolling option further north on SB I-5, and while a better choice than the Alberta St offramp because of a straightforward diamond interchange, it still does not have the capacity to handle being the diversion point. The next option north of there is the Delta Park interchange. Using that as the start of tolling would divert plenty of traffic into Kenton on N Denver/Interstate which is already a congested area that is tricky to navigate. If Marine Drive is the last or next-to-last tollfree interchange, OR 99E (MLK) and Interstate would receive overflow traffic. If the goal is to divert traffic from I-5 SB, OR 99E is the best choice from a safety and capacity standpoint. While the ramps at Hayden Island/Jantzen Beach could be the last tollfree interchange, if the planned bridge from the west side of the island to Marine Drive is built, the diverting traffic would take that route to head to St Johns, over the bridge, and into downtown or into the Tualatin Valley via Germantown or Cornelius Pass Rd. So for southbound I-5, either toll everyone at the south end of the bridge over the Columbia River or perhaps at Marine Drive. Tolling northbound traffic on I-5 has similar issues. If I-405 traffic is allowed to proceed tollfree while I-5 is not, the diverting traffic at the Kerby Street exit from the Fremont Bridge will make a busy area even worse. If the tolling ends at N Going St, a tremendous amount of diverting traffic will try to use N Interstate, N Greeley, N Going, N Skidmore and N Alberta to access I-5 north of the tolling area. All of those streets have significant congestion today, and when the apartments and condos under construction in the area are finished, it will probably be worse. If you stop tolling at Rosa Parks or Lombard, the traffic joining the freeway on Interstate/Denver at Delta Park or from OR 99E/Marine Drive will cause the same issue they do today. Tolling up to and including Marine Drive or all the way to the bridge are the best way to prevent diversion. I apologize if I missed this, but I would suggest modeling toll-free periods in the off-peak periods and directions so the true value of congestion pricing could be evaluated. A lower vs. higher toll on all lanes may not be enough incentive to convince drivers to delay their trips and thus increase the overall capacity of the freeway. However, a toll-free window may be the best incentive. I do hope that congestion pricing across the entire freeway system in the Portland area can be implemented to help maximize the usage of the existing system. Thank you and good luck, Brad Halverson</p>	Brad Halverson	Comment form
07/19	<p>To Whom It May Concern: Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Congestion Pricing Policy Advisory Committee's recommendations. The Arbor Lodge Neighborhood Association (ALNA) strongly objects to the proposal to gate tolling at N Going. This proposal will result in traffic diversion onto surface streets throughout North and Northeast Portland. Arbor Lodge is a residential neighborhood along the I-5 corridor which presently is working with the Portland Bureau of Transportation to adapt the design of our streets to address safety issues caused by existing cut-through traffic. Unfortunately, the PAC's recommendation encourages ODOT to undermine the investments PBOT are making to create a safer local transportation network. PAC member Marie Dodds accurately assesses this situation in stating, "We have some concerns with options presented at the PAC meetings. Concept B would toll all lanes of I-5 in Portland between S.W. Multnomah Blvd. and N. Going St. This means there would be no toll-free freeway options; rather, drivers would have to take surface streets with the potential to cause significant congestion and disruption in neighborhoods. There doesn't seem to be an understanding of the level of diversion and the impact it would have in the area." Any proposal for congestion pricing should not incent use of surface streets as a de facto toll-free option. ODOT should study and project the impact to surface streets and neighboring communities, and there should be adequate funding to mitigate these impacts--wherever they should occur. Sincerely, Mark Wyman Board Member Arbor Lodge Neighborhood Association</p>	Mark Wyman	Comment form

07/20	I am firmly against "Value-Pricing" or tolls for I 205 and I-5. Yes, these roads are in desperate need of volume enhancements and I realize this is an expensive process but this is not the way to go as this amounts to little more than reducing congestion by punishing those that use the roads and put an unfair burden on those communities like West Linn and Oregon City that have few alternatives to I-205 and the surface streets that drivers would be forced to use to avoid the toll are already very congested. Perhaps we should look at alternatives like reinstating the old Mt Hood Freeway plan that was abandoned years ago. We have already increased the fees associated with vehicles, increased the gas tax, etc way more than the cost of living and with vehicle traffic so heavy this should allow additional resources for building new road as there have literally been no major new projects since about 1969. If additional funding is required to alleviate the issues than it should be a general obligation that would be shared by all ass all residents of the state would benefit and if it were a gas tax increase or a tax increase on lodging than tourist would pay their share as well. If you most have a toll then it should have a SUNSET clause that it would expire when a certain amount of funding is reached.	Bill Dahl	Comment form
07/20	I feel strongly that it is bad public policy to attempt to fight Portland's highway congestion with toll roads . I'm therefore requesting that the OTC not submit a request to the Federal Highway Administration for permission to toll I-5 and/or I-205. There are numerous , far superior , more equitable, and more sustainable ways to deal with highway congestion . For instance , read details about the Steel Interstate Coalition's strategy to reduce Portland's metro highway congestion at : steelinterstate.org/projects . If you are serious about true fixes to urban vehicle congestion , allocate funds to learn how higher performance railway , river , and transit services may decongest highways of freight and people , and generate a surplus to modernize and maintain great highways WITHOUT TOLLS .	David Medford	Comment form
07/20	Dear ODOT, We support congestion pricing. It is a proven method of transportation demand management. Money raised from congestion pricing must be invested into alternate demand management strategies to provide real options that work. Funds should be used to develop our infrastructure for transit, pedestrians and bicycles. Funds generated should not be used to create more freeway. Making more lanes just makes more traffic. The literature is full of such examples such as Los Angeles, where widening the I-405 to add more lanes only resulted in more traffic. Delays were worse after the project was finished. Funds from tolling should not be used to create more capacity. That would be a failure of the program. We need a more efficient network. The Roadmap to 2020 published by The Oregon Global Warming Commission in 2010 stated, "Using the revenues from new funding sources like congestion pricing allows us to fund efficient options such as urban and intercity transit." (p. 34). Congestion pricing should be implemented on the regional freeway system, including I-5, I-205, I-84, I-405, Hwy 26, and Hwy 217, so that the freeway system can be managed as a whole. Regional partners such as Metro and local county and city governments must be engaged, so that freeway tolling can be combined with cordon pricing to reduce spillover and "cut-through" traffic on local streets. Again, it is imperative that money raised from congestion pricing programs be reinvested. We need real workable alternatives to driving such as transit, pedestrian and bicycle networks to meet our mobility needs. Money should not be wasted on more of the same inefficient freeway system. Congestion pricing has been shown to have wide public support once begun, but we need to make sure we do it the right way. Chairs Catie Goud Emily Guise Ted Buehler CC: All other regional partners:	Ted Buehler	Comment form
07/20	NO! The congestion that tolling would bring to already congested city streets would be unbearable. Please see channel 8 "Viewer Voice" (2 of them last week). 1st one asked if people would like tolling on I-5, I-205, both or none and 75% said none. Both the both choice and the 205 choice got NO percentage!) If you go ahead with this and the traffic lowers the value of our houses then by law the State would have to compensate each of us (that would be expensive). In several of the communities we have doctors, lawyers, CEO's, and State representatives. Consider the ramifications of congestion and devaluing real estate in a representatives neighborhood, no more salary increases nor budget increases to name but 2. Since the feds did away with class action law suits, each homeowner/developer/businesses would then take turns taking the state to court, this would tie up ODOT for decades and be very expensive. The line is already starting to form. Again, tolling/ Value pricing, what ever you want to call it is a NO.	Kathie Halicki	Comment form
07/20	I am very much opposed to tolling, especially the Abernathy bridge. My husband has to drive over that bridge at least twice a day for work. He has looked into public transit, which he would love to use, but there are no alternative transit options for him.	Anna Tobinoko v	Comment form





	<p>He already takes side streets as much as possible, and when he is driving at 4pm, the 20 minute drive is already turned into an hour commute due to traffic. I imagine his commute time will only increase with more people taking side streets. The only other bridge option in the area is the Oregon City bridge, which is already overrun with traffic. It seems like the government is about to impose another tax in the form of a toll, saying that we should use alternate commute routes to reduce the traffic on the freeways, but without providing sufficient alternative transportation routes or modes to accommodate the amount of people commuting. ODOT has created this traffic disaster by refusing to preemptively build appropriate infrastructure for our increasing population and now is asking the people to pay for their poor planning. I would vote for a bond measure to pay for more lanes on 205 on the Abernathy bridge because I know the money would be earmarked for this specific purpose. I am in favor of expanding the roadways. I want to be assured my money is going to specific projects, whereas with tolling, there are no guarantees what road projects will be funded. As far as I can tell, at least with the Abernathy bridge, we will be paying to sit in the parking lot known as 205, with no assurances that the tolling revenue will be used to fix the traffic problems in the metro area. I also believe a bond measure would be a more equitable way to tax so that lower income families aren't unduly burdened. With tolling, it is the lowest income families that will suffer the most. People who work low paying jobs usually have the least flexibility, and most likely will not be able to alter their schedules to drive during a lower cost tolling time. Please, at the very least, allow Oregonians to vote on whether or not tolls should be implemented.</p>		
07/20	<p>I hope that you will think of some other way to raise money for the highways. We have all paid for the bridges and roads equally but this toll would place a greater burden on the citizens surrounding the freeway and the bridges. In Gladstone, Milwaukie, West Linn and cities along the freeways, we need the facilities every workday and can not avoid the use of these. In West Linn, many trips to the Dentist, Grocery stores, banks, etc. are very short but dependent on crossing the Oregon City bridge or the freeway bridge. Businesses on the opposites of the river would probably lose some of their customers. If you could raise money for this by a slight increase in gas taxes across the state, people would share equally. Even people from distant parts of the states benefit from the transportation of goods and services that use the bridges and freeways. Maybe the extra monies could be tied to a sunset clause as was done on the Bridge of the Gods. This tolling idea does not solve the problem of flooding the neighborhood when there is an accident. People would certainly use the alternate routes through our neighborhoods to avoid the tolls daily..I have lived here all of my life (71 years) and I think tolling will only make homes near the tolled roads and bridges much less livable!</p>	Geneva Dahl	Comment form
07/20	<p>Hopefully, upcoming tolls on I-5 and I-205 will reduce traffic congestion, raise public funds, and encourage public transit. However, I object to the placement of a tollbooth on I-205 north at Abernethy Bridge. Currently, West Linn, Gladstone, and Oregon City share a water service district and residents move freely between communities. Tolling at Abernethy Bridge will separate our communities and reduce commerce. The Willamette River at Abernethy Bridge and the nearby Clackamas River are home to water recreation and environmental restoration. A tollbooth at Abernethy Bridge may increase noise and exhaust pollution, stressing fish and fishermen alike. A tollbooth at the Abernethy Bridge may also result in detour traffic problems in downtown Oregon City and Lake Oswego. Placing tollbooths further towards the edges of the Metro will discourage drivers from detouring. Therefore, the I-205 north tollbooth should be further south, before the Stafford Road exit. For the same reason, the tollbooths on I-5 and I-205 south should be just after the Columbia River bridges, rather than at the Alberta Street exit. I suggest the tolling program be flexible, open to change, and require minimal upfront investment. I request that a portion of the tolling funds be spent creating high walls on the Abernethy Bridge and I-205 crossing at High Rocks. These walls would reduce traffic noise currently amplified by the river valleys. The walls would also reduce pollution falling on the rivers and the users of High Rocks and Clackamette Parks. Thanks for your consideration and hard work on this project.</p>	Melanie Throckmorton	Comment form
07/20	<p>Please find attached the letter submitted by No More Freeways PDX in support of a robust approach to decongestion pricing. Please note that our letter has been signed by 282 community members who live in 43 different zip codes across the Portland region.</p> <p>(Attachment included as separate formal letter; see communication #314899)</p>	No More Freeway Expansions Portland,	Comment form

		Aaron Brown	
07/20	<p>Dear ODOT, All proceeds raised from congestion pricing must be invested into modes that move people more efficiently such as high-quality transit, pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure. These networks must be built out to provide a real alternative to driving, in order for congestion pricing to function optimally. Not only do we find that these investments are essential to creating a more equitable transportation system, this strategy was outlined in the Roadmap to 2020 report published by the Oregon Global Warming Commission in 2010: "Using the revenues from new funding sources like congestion pricing allows us to fund efficient options such as urban and intercity transit," (pg 34). Funds raised from congestion pricing programs should not be used to expand the freeway system, even if just by "removing pinch points and bottlenecks." Using the money to make more traffic lanes defeats the purpose of the program and, the effort will be a failure. Please see the effort to widen the I-405 in the Los Angeles region. Adding lanes to the freeway increased capacity, which was immediately filled, leading to even more traffic and longer delays than before the project. This is due to the effect of induced demand. Spending funds on any freeway expansion does not meet the goal of switching to a least-cost model, which was another key strategy outlined by the Oregon Global Warming Commission: "Changing the way we raised and decided how to spend our scarce transportation dollars so we were getting the least-cost, biggest-bang for our buck system. This is defined as maximum mobility and accessibility for people, goods and services at the least cost in dollars, air quality, land consumption and GHG emissions." (pg 34) congestion pricing paired with transit improvements is a better investment than freeway expansion. It both saves money and increases mobility. Congestion pricing should be implemented on the regional freeway system, including I-5, I-205, I-84, I-405, Hwy 26, and Hwy 217, so that the freeway system can be managed as a whole. Regional governments like Metro and local counties and cities should partner so that freeway tolling works along with other tools like cordon pricing to reduce spillover and cut-through traffic on local streets. Again, the revenue from congestion pricing must be used to build out alternatives to driving, including the transit, pedestrian and bicycling networks, so that people are provided with real alternatives other than continued use of automobiles to meet their mobility needs. Money and funds generated from congestion pricing should not be wasted on more of the same inefficient freeway system. Congestion pricing has been shown to have wide public support once begun, and we need to make sure to do it the right way so residents can see the maximum benefit. Thank you, Catie Gould, Co-chair BikeLoudPDX Ted Buehler, Co-chair BikeLoudPDX</p>	Catie Gould	Comment form
07/20	<p>Dear ODOT, All proceeds raised from congestion pricing must be invested into modes that move people more efficiently such as high-quality transit, pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure. These networks must be built out to provide a real alternative to driving, in order for congestion pricing to function optimally. Not only do we find that these investments are essential to creating a more equitable transportation system, this strategy was outlined in the Roadmap to 2020 report published by the Oregon Global Warming Commission in 2010: "Using the revenues from new funding sources like congestion pricing allows us to fund efficient options such as urban and intercity transit," (pg 34). Funds raised from congestion pricing programs should not be used to expand the freeway system, even if just by "removing pinch points and bottlenecks." Using the money to make more traffic lanes defeats the purpose of the program and, the effort will be a failure. Please see the effort to widen the I-405 in the Los Angeles region. Adding lanes to the freeway increased capacity, which was immediately filled, leading to even more traffic and longer delays than before the project. This is due to the effect of induced demand. Spending funds on any freeway expansion does not meet the goal of switching to a least-cost model, which was another key strategy outlined by the Oregon Global Warming Commission: "Changing the way we raised and decided how to spend our scarce transportation dollars so we were getting the least-cost, biggest-bang for our buck system. This is defined as maximum mobility and accessibility for people, goods and services at the least cost in dollars, air quality, land consumption and GHG emissions." (pg 34) congestion pricing paired with transit improvements is a better investment than freeway expansion. It both saves money and increases mobility. Congestion pricing should be implemented on the regional freeway system, including I-5, I-205, I-84, I-405, Hwy 26, and Hwy 217, so that the freeway system can be managed as a whole. Regional governments like Metro and local counties and cities should partner so that freeway tolling works along with other tools like cordon pricing to reduce spillover and cut-through traffic on local streets. Again, the revenue from congestion pricing must be used to build out alternatives to driving, including the transit, pedestrian and bicycling networks, so that</p>	Catie Gould	Comment form



	<p>people are provided with real alternatives other than continued use of automobiles to meet their mobility needs. Money and funds generated from congestion pricing should not be wasted on more of the same inefficient freeway system. Congestion pricing has been shown to have wide public support once begun, and we need to make sure to do it the right way so residents can see the maximum benefit. Thank you, Catie Gould, Co-chair BikeLoudPDX Ted Buehler, Co-chair BikeLoudPDX</p>		
07/20	<p>I am in favor of this Congestion Pricing proposal. I am in favor of permanent congestion pricing on limited-access roadways in order to incentivize driver behavior that would help spread traffic volume out over less-congested times of the day. Freeway expansion projects to accommodate peak-hour volume is costly in both money and environmental impacts. Taxpayer money would be better directed toward Vision Zero goals on surface streets, including active transportation projects.</p>	Betsy Reese	Comment form
07/20	<p>I am a private citizen residing in Portland. Having read through the discussion and inputs from the PAC members, I agree that option C, while the most ambitious, appears to be the only one likely to meet the overall goals. I also agree with those who emphasize that alternatives and mitigations must be in place before congestion pricing goes into effect if it is to have the desired effect of reducing peak demand. What does seem missing from the discussion, though, is ties to land use decisions and policies that aim to build or maintain economically mixed areas of the city; I think it likely that many of the people commuting from outlying areas into the urban core for work are not doing it by choice, and would be happier if they could afford to live closer to their employment, thus reducing roadway demand at the source.</p>	David Lewis	Comment form
07/20	<p>I am opposed to the proposed tolling of our highways. The current proposals do not benefit the people and only serve to tax us on roads we've already bought and paid for. The use of the money is also offensive as it does not build more roads that tolls are collected on but simply go into a large bucket where it may not benefit those footing the bill. That is taxation without representation at the grossest of examples. I also demand that if you continue to force this highly dispised concept, that you allow we the people to vote on the issue. You cannot simply fine people for having to travel at times their jobs demand. You cannot demand that we pay for roads we already paid for.</p>	Bill Osburn	Comment form
07/20	<p>To Whom it May Concern, Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on this issue. I hope that in reviewing all public feedback, consideration will be taken of our thoughts and opinions on the matter. I've lived in Portland for nearly 10 years now and have used my bike for the majority of my transportation needs the last nine years. When I do drive, I find myself frustrated as I see more and more drivers distracted by cell phones and also driving alone in their cars during peak commute hours. Driving is dangerous, polluting, and inefficient. I fully support decongestion pricing on I-5 and 205 but also want the funds raised to be put towards efficient, alternative forms of transportation; NOT freeway expansion. Expanding our freeways is not a solution to any of my concerns- distracted driving, pollution, and inefficiency. Please implement the decongestion pricing and put the funds raised towards dedicated bus lanes, increasing public transportation options/capacity, bike lanes, and improved pedestrian safety measures. Portland can be an example for the world or it can be another example of a city invested in a car-centric history contributing to global warming and auto related deaths. Please choose the former by choosing decongestion pricing and funding better, healthier forms of transportation for humanity and the planet. Best, Caitlin Clark</p>	Caitlin Clark	Comment form
07/20	<p>The Steel Interstate Coalition, a nonprofit 501(c)(3) resolves three things: First, that the Oregon Transportation Commission table the Policy Advisory Committee Recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission for tolling scenarios, pursuant to its responsibilities under Oregon House Bill 2017. Second, that before the Oregon Transportation Commission votes to forward the tolling scenarios to the Federal Highway Administration for approval, it needs to learn how alternative river-based, (e.g. Willamette Falls Locks), railway-based, (e.g., Land Ferry), and "Power Transit," (e.g. a hybrid of rideshare and transit), and other transportation services may decongest highways, with positive lifecycle environmental impacts. Third, to learn more about these three and others, that state and federal elected officials identify and allocate funds to the Oregon Department of Transportation to conduct business feasibility assessments of them. Facts and concepts presented in the position paper titled, "The Steel Interstate Coalition strategy to reduce Portland, Oregon metro highway congestion," (<a href="http://www.steelinterstate.org/Projects">http://www.steelinterstate.org/Projects</a>), serve as a basis for this resolution.</p>	Robinson Foster	Comment form

07/20	Please do not implement tolls on our freeways. it already costs too much money to get around portland via transit. Look Portland is growing and we just have to deal with it, not punish people by charging them to use the roads. We already pay taxes and car fees for road maintenance. Tolling freeways will send traffic in to neighborhoods. What ever happened to the push to go more car-free?	Laura Lawrence	Comment form
07/20	Please no. Drivers don't need to rent the road that's already been paid for.	Scott	Comment form
07/20	Commissioners: Commissioners: As a follow-up to my testimony last week, we went out and did manual counts of I-205 NB traffic at six locations between 3:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. We recorded the data in 10-minute increments. The attached graph shows that I-205 under-performs relative to the optimal value of 2,000 vehicles/lane/hour at all locations for the entire two-hour period. Imposing variable tolls throughout the length of the highway could help maintain speeds of 40-50 MPH, producing near-optimal levels of throughput and thus maximizing the value of current lane capacity. In addition, full-facility pricing would generate the revenue necessary to add lanes where needed. Using I-205 as "treatment facility" and I-5 as the "control" facility in this experiment would provide adequate information to learn about pricing, and provide a political defense against accusations that the hidden agenda here is to milk the drivers in Vancouver, WA. I encourage you to pursue this option in lieu of the PAG recommendation.	John Charles	Comment form
07/20	Dear OTC, I write to you today to give support for the idea of (de)congestion pricing. The fact of the matter is that this area is growing too much to expect everyone to be able to drive everywhere as they please. Currently, we all pay to drive beyond the cost of gas/payments/insurance/etc. We pay in time sitting in traffic. Implementing a congestion charge over some lanes allows folks to make a choice to pay with money instead, and I think that's great! Perhaps while I typically wouldn't pay, sometimes when I'm running late to pick up my kid from after school or when my wife is in labor, or some other extreme emergency occurs, I might have a real need to do this, and I'd love that I had the choice to get out of traffic. Furthermore, this gives our region the ability to have a faster emergency response since emergency vehicles can use these tolled lanes, and in fact it could be useful to have transit buses use them as well since they're so immensely efficient. Congestion tolling will also reduce traffic in general. With less subsidy towards cars, people will be less inclined to drive and those who do have the option of paying to get there faster. The revenues raised can be directed towards sources that can allow folks to drive less! And we certainly need folks to drive less, such as more light rail and better bus/bike networks. We're in a climate state of emergency. There's recently been a piece of news released stating that there are parts of india that are literally too hot for human habitation. We need to address this now. People look at traffic and think "wow there are too many cars." Transportation planners look at congestion and think "wow there's not enough road." I'm glad ODOT is starting to try to change its thinking to something more logical. Thank you for your courageous leadership in the transportation sector, Andrew Sang	Andrew Sang	Comment form
07/20	I support as initial implementation Concept B (between I-405 and Terwilliger) and modified E (Abernethy Bridge).	Colin Cortes	Comment form
07/20	I fully support value pricing. It is an important and long overdue step toward making our transportation system more efficient, equitable, and sustainable by finally capturing some of the externalized costs of driving. Please toll all interstates as soon as possible and consider working with PBOT on a future congestion tax for all motor vehicles entering Portland's downtown. This will help with congestion in the short term and improve our land use and auto-dependence in the long term.	Jason Nolin	Comment form
07/20	I urge you not to accept the Policy Advisory Committee's recommendation for "Congestion Pricing". I do not agree with congestion pricing to solve traffic issues. The roads in the Portland area have needed additional lanes for traffic to assist with traffic flow for many years - especially a 3rd lane on I-205 between Oregon City and Stafford Road. Additionally, congestion pricing on the freeway system is going to divert traffic onto neighborhood side streets and create additional congestion in other areas. More solutions need to be sought. This includes other transportation methods to reduce the amount of Large Truck traffic - such as rail and river transportation. My husband travels from Oregon City to Tigard for work 5 days each week. He already adjusts his travel hours and works long days in order to minimize driving in traffic. To be required to pay large fees in order for him to commute to work, when we already pay our fair share in taxes - gas & income taxes - seems very unfair. Please consider other options! This is not the solution to traffic congestion in our area.	Staci Anderson	Comment form



07/20	<p>Subject: Tolling and Congestion Pricing Proposal and Alternative Funding Method Idea</p> <p>Dear: ODOT Staff I have a number of questions about putting tolls on on I - 5 and I-205. First, I am proposing an idea as an alternative to tolls as a funding source. Why not treat transportation fees as a utility thats similar to gas, electricity, wafer and sewer bill. City of Portland Water Depart paying for the big pipe project and infrastructure improvements with utility billing. For example, people receive a monthly, quarterly or annual bill. The bill based on person's income, ownership of a car, bicycle, or use of public transportation. Rural areas of Oregon would get a smaller bill but funds would go to local roads and state highways. In Portland and Metro area, The funding from this source allocated to a new interstate bridge, critical highway upgrades, seismic upgrades, other parts allocated to bicycle lanes and safety projects and other par allocated to large mass transit project. Individuals that do not drive a vehicle will pay more for bicycle and mass transit projects and a smaller percentage for highways. One disadvantage is that out of state drivers are not billed or possibly truckers. The reasons for this proposal stems from misgivings about the proposed tolling of I-5 and I-205. These concerns are listed as the following: 1. I am concern that low income individuals are impacted since it does not distinguish peoples income although a transponder may have designation for low income persons and charge a lower rate. 2. If Portland area and Vancouver had a more extensive and reliable mass transit system then that may help reduce congestion but Tri-Met and C-Tran do not have large mass transit system in place at this time including light rail in Portland. 3. Not all employers are going to go to flex schedules and employees need to commute to work. The business operations may not be conducive to employee flex schedules. 4. People will avoid the tolls and get on secondary highways causing more congestion on these roads that will result in more wear on these roads and more frequent repairs on them. The repair costs may reduce the gains in funding from tolling. Would truckers use Washington Highway 14 more frequently to avoid tolls or use the Longview bridge and go to Portland on Highway 30? That means more repairs on the bridge and highways from increased traffic . 5. The population continues to grow in the Portland area. The gains in population may overpower the gains in managing traffic congestion tolling. because of additional vehicles on the road. 6. Since, container ships with exception of one carrier no longer visit Port of Portland, the containers transported between Portland Seattle and Tacoma using rails and trucks. The truck traffic will increase with economic growth in Portland area. The trucks add to the congestion. Perhaps two interstate bridges may help divert truck traffic away from Portland area. 7. The report Tolling and Congestion Pricing Research and Policy Support report says that privacy safeguards can be placed incorporated when transponders are used but has this been legislated or regulations been issued for this protection? If not the use of transponders for recording tolls raises some privacy issues. Can an attorney request through a court to obtain transponder records? Could transponder data be used for investigating accidents/ Who has access to the information from the vehicle transponders. Would law enforcement use this information to monitor traffic and even issue citations if the transponders record speed of an individuals vehicle. Will police have to get a search warrant to monitor specific individuals? Would police use transponder information for locating stolen cars? Would the ODOT sell this information to marketers? Would outside law enforcement and other government agencies have access to the information from the transponders? 8. How will ODOT collect from out of state residences if they do not pay a toll? Would ODOT try to impound the vehicle? How would interstate truckers pay the toll? Try to have vehicle registration or driver license suspended in another state? What is the mechanism for enforcement? 9. Would tolling be suspended during a major emergency or weather event or when other secondary roads are not useable? Are there provisions for safe guards in tolling regulations? 10. Tolling may affect various businesses if motorists use secondary roads and cause congestion. Discourage Washington residents from shopping in Portland area. 11. A tolling system would require a staff to administer thats an added cost. Conclusion: I think the congestion may be reduced for awhile with tolling but eventually traffic increases will overpower the tolling system and congestion would return. Second, you need an expanded and reliable mass transit system in place that would include light rail connections to towns outside of Portland and Vancouver to reduce or slow the growth of congestion?</p>	Harvey Schowe	Comment form
07/20	<p>Subject: Portland congestion</p> <p>I think you may be barking up the wrong tree with the toll idea. If the purpose is to raise money, especially from Washingtonians who commute into Oregon, go for it.</p>	David Reingold	Comment form

	<p>However, if you really want to alleviate traffic problems around Portland, I believe the you need to concentrate on parking. I don't know a lot about traffic, but I know two things: rush hour in and around Portland is a disaster, and most of those cars contain one person. My simple conclusion: if we could convert most of those cars from one person to two, we would cut the number of cars by about half. My simple solution: adopt policies that will encourage carpooling. Policy #1: Parking. Raise parking rates for single-person cars, and lower them for multiple person cars. We are already moving to computer-driven parking (Parking Kitty), it should be easy to program this app to include a designation for how many people are in the car. If one, high rate. If two or more, low rate, lower than the current rate. Enforcement: like Max, honor system with spot checks. You station people around town with laptops that tie into the Parking Kitty system. They watch someone get out of their car, see how many people there are, see what they entered into the system. Fines must be huge, say, \$1000 for lying. Security cameras may be able to do this job. If parking is even further reduced for three or more people in a car, maybe even free, we could dramatically decrease the number of cars on the road. Note that in order for this to work, the parking rate for single-person cars has to go up substantially, to the point where it is painful, at least \$5 an hour. Not only to encourage carpooling, but also to make up for lost revenue from the reduced parking fees for pooled cars. Of course, if we don't succeed in making up for pooled cars, it will be because the policy works, traffic is way down, and we are willing to pay the price for improved livability. Policy #2: Public transportation. Two prongs to this. First, there will be more people downtown without their own car. We need to make it easy for them to get around. Bring back the free zone for buses and streetcars. We need to make sure that getting to work with someone else or on public transportation is cheaper than driving. Second, we want to make sure that people are encouraged not to travel during rush hour if they don't have to, to free up spaces on public transportation for those who need to get to work. Rates should be time-dependent. It should cost less to ride public transportation after 9AM and before 4PM (or whenever rush hour "starts"). They do this in Switzerland, and it works.</p>		
07/12	<p>Subject: Citizen's Representative Office - Customer Entry</p> <p>About the proposal for toll roads. I think overall it's the wrong approach. We are starting to see (classification) of people allowing those with money to obtain public services more than those without money. (Nobility). Day fee use parks being one. I don't think it's the best solution. There are a few other things that can possible be done. One is a smaller tax with a license renewal that goes towards projects. Your idea is that to curb traffic you want to eliminate traffic by allowing those who can afford to pay to use. So that above probably won't work. However, if you add a toll express lane only why allowing movement from other lanes and still an opportunity to use other roads. You might actually achieve your goal. Those with money can use a lane that is faster with less traffic and those without money will still be able to use the road without a fee, just takes longer. So there you have my opinion. Troy*</p>	Troy Prouty	Email
07/14	<p>Subject: Citizen's Representative Office - Customer Entry</p> <p>Toll road. If a toll rd. Purpose is to move people off the hwy then it is targeting low income travelers, so only the well off can afford to drive on roads we all pay for. That would also move them onto side roads that are already congested, taking more time, time is money. This would be illegal as it would be discriminatory toward the poor. Low income people already struggle with price of gas, forcing them off the freeway is just wrong. If you want to do this terrible thing, you must stop taxing them to pay for roads they can't use.</p>	Patricia Tawney	Email
06/19	<p>Subject: Value Added Pricing bridge tolls</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to you, the committee, regarding the tolls on I-5 &amp; I-205. There are some commuters from SW WA that do not make enough money to make ends meet after OR taxes are taken out of our paychecks. The added burden of tolls only makes that much more difficult.</p> <p>Gas prices are high, rents are higher and unaffordable for some of us and then you add in the cost of commuting into Portland to work because jobs in SW WA are hard to come by in some fields, along with all those other costs...well it all becomes a nightmare for those of us with no or low incomes.</p> <p>Please, please, please...take all of that into consideration when making you decision. ?? I realize tolls will help maintain the safety of the bridges, if indeed those funds will</p>	Linda Bowman	Email



	<p>actually go to that. But if you are planning on building another bridge then I think there needs to be some fairness involved.</p> <p>Perhaps, a small charge as a percentage of income could be one way of calculating that, which could be determined when non-residents file their annual income tax.</p> <p>I implore you to explore low-cost options for all concerned.</p> <p>Thank you...</p> <p>Regards, Linda Bowman</p>		
06/20	<p>Subject: Tolling 205</p> <p>I live on WFD in Willamette, tolling 205 between Stafford and the Abernathy Bridge will lower the quality of life for all people living in the area. Traffic on WFD is already over the top. People that do not live in Willamette cause major traffic jams already cutting through our Town between Stafford and OC. I can't even get out of my driveway during rush hour due to People that are nasty, rude and angry because they are stuck in traffic.</p> <p>It will lower the value of our Property Risk the lives of our Children, Animals and People in general.</p> <p>It is part of life to drive the Freeways, not drive through Neighborhoods during rush hour, if you don't live here.</p> <p>I have almost been run over several times trying to cross the street on WFD. My Neighbor on 19th sat for 30 mins trying to go to the store, and no one would let her out on WFD.</p> <p>None of you care about the Quality of life here.</p>	Sharon Fratzke	Email
06/20	<p>Subject: Support for decongestion pricing</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>I want to express my support for decongestion pricing. I would like to see it implemented as broadly and ambitiously as possible.</p> <p>Decongestion pricing needs to be implemented for public health, climate mitigation, and congestion relief purposes. It should be installed equitably and thoughtfully.</p> <p>Every dollar raised from decongestion pricing should be redirected into transit, biking, and walking projects, not more freeway expansion. Spending money from decongestion pricing on freeway expansion is like using revenue from a carbon tax to build a coal plant or pipeline. I encourage TriMet, CTRAN, Metro, and ODOT to work closely with frontline communities to determine how to allocate these resources toward investments in reliable, efficient, and effective transit, biking, and walking.</p> <p>I encourage the exploration of mitigation of congestion pricing on vulnerable communities through rebates, funding safety improvements on nearby high crash corridors, and strict initiatives for data privacy.</p> <p>Thank you, Jacob Gellman</p>	Jacob Gellman	Email
06/20	<p>Subject: Public Comment on Tolling Concepts</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As a homeowner in north Portland, several blocks from I-5, I'm vehemently against ODOT's planned Concepts B &amp; C from Round 2 of their evaluation. I'm also disappointed that ODOT and other state leadership are so blind to the real problems causing congestion, and not seriously considering better ways to solve them.</p> <p>Most of the traffic clogging our highways comes from freight trucks passing through our area on their way to Port of Tacoma, etc. (even more so since the Port of Portland has lost major shipping contracts), along with the influx of commuters from SW Washington. I fully understand the desire to raise revenue for road projects, but it should NOT be placed on the mostly backs of Portland residents who already pay a</p>	Jon Ormsby	Email

	<p>premium in gas taxes for road projects. If tolls are absolutely necessary, the only places they should be enacted are at each of the Interstate bridges, and just south of the I-5 &amp; I-205 split, so that 'pass-through' travelers and out-of-state commuters are mainly subject to them.</p> <p>As your own Fact Sheet states, 'During more congested times of the day a higher fee is charged, encouraging some drivers to consider other travel options such as alternate routes...' I encourage your study to come look at northbound Interstate Ave, Vancouver Ave, and MLK Blvd after 2pm any day of the workweek. These residential streets are fully stopped, making it near impossible for local residents to leave their homes by car during those times.</p> <p>Real, realistic relief from this situation isn't going to come from forcing everyone to ride bikes to work, or tolling the route through the middle of town. We desperately need a third route across the Columbia, preferably out West that links to the Hillsboro area so that those commuters don't have to drive into downtown, then out West to work. If you have to make that a toll road to afford it, so be it. Why hasn't that been considered?</p> <p>Another, also more effective, solution would be to extend the MAX Yellow (and perhaps Green) line up across the river into Washington so those commuters to downtown have that option. Adding tolling from Going St. South is only going to encourage those commuters to stop just before Going St., park in our neighborhoods and take the MAX in from here. This already happens and will be made worse by these proposals. I realize there's a cost to this that may equal the cost of tolls, but they'd still avoid the parking costs downtown. Placing a single southbound toll further north, closer to the Interstate bridge would at least encourage the commuters park and riding to do it further north where there is more space, and not in our neighborhoods.</p> <p>I won't even get into the myriad of issues that tolling the downtown core has with respect to the 'affordability crisis' and cost of living problems Portland's leaders simultaneously refer to. If you're going to use Seattle as an example of 'successful' value priced tolling, please also consider their extreme lack of affordability and homelessness problems that have increased along with it.</p> <p>I hope OTC will reconsider their options, and look further into more realistic solutions that target the real problems.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jon Ormsby</p>		
06/20	<p>Subject: I support decongestion pricing policy!</p> <p>I'm writing to express my support for the adoption of decongestion pricing policy. Please direct revenue raised from decongestion pricing towards transit investments instead of freeway expansion. Decongestion pricing is the only policy proven to alleviate traffic gridlock, will help create revenue for sustainable transportation investments, and help the Portland region curb our greenhouse gas emissions. It's imperative that we move forward with decongestion pricing ahead of freeway expansion, an unnecessary and costly public policy initiative that won't solve traffic congestion and will prevent us from investing in alternatives.</p>	Andrew Taylor	Email
06/20	<p>My understanding is that the final proposal will be for a toll on the Abernathy bridge.</p> <p>My fellow citizens in West Linn do not believe that a toll on the Abernathy bridge is the right way to go. A toll on the Abernathy bridge will create a costly barrier between Oregon City and West Linn, two cities that have a long, joint history. If there is a toll on the Abernathy bridge, then some measure must be taken to lessen the harm that would be caused by separating these two cities that have had close ties for over 100 years.</p> <p>I cross the Abernathy bridge at least four times a day. My doctor, my pharmacist, my friends are on the other side of the bridge. They are less than 3 miles away. Yet if the bridged is tolled, I may be forced to pay a toll each time I visit my doctor, my pharmacist and my friends. This is not fair or just.</p> <p>Best regards,</p>	William Ramirez	Email





	William Ramirez		
06/20	<p>Subject: I support decongestion pricing.</p> <p>Just wanted to drop a note of support for decongestion pricing-- it'll certainly affect my driving habits, and it's the right way forward. Cycling (and transit, and walking) infrastructure works well in areas improved thus far, but still has a long way to grow. Safety improvements on high crash corridors are a great way to use the funds.</p> <p>Thanks, Cliff Heaberlin</p>	Cliff Heaberlin	Email
06/20	<p>Subject: I support decongestion pricing. I urge you to too!</p> <p>Hi, I'm a new Portland resident and I support decongestion pricing. It is a valuable tool for improving public health, climate mitigation, and congestion.</p> <p>Every dollar raised from decongestion pricing should be redirected into transit, biking and walking projects -- not more freeway expansion. Spending money from decongestion pricing on freeway expansion is like using revenue from a carbon tax to build a coal plant or pipeline. I encourage TriMet, CTRAN, Metro and ODOT to work closely with frontline communities to determine how to allocate these resources towards investments in reliable, efficient, and effective transit, biking and walking. Part of why I chose to relocate from Massachusetts to Oregon is that I was fed up with the outrageous traffic in the Boston area, poor reliability of transit, and inadequacy of bike infrastructure.</p> <p>I encourage the exploration of mitigation of congestion pricing on vulnerable communities through the exploration of rebates, funding safety improvements on nearby high crash corridors, and strict initiatives for data privacy.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Erica Mattison, MPA, JD</p>	Erica Mattison	Email
06/20	<p>Subject: I support decongestion pricing</p> <p>Decongestion Pricing is Great! I want to see decongestion pricing implemented as broadly and ambitiously as possible.</p> <p>Decongestion pricing needs to be implemented for public health, climate mitigation, and congestion relief purposes. It must be installed equitably and thoughtfully.</p> <p>Every dollar raised from decongestion pricing should be redirected into transit, biking and walking projects, not more freeway expansion. **Spending money from decongestion pricing on freeway expansion is like using revenue from a carbon tax to build a coal plant or pipeline. **</p> <p>We should prioritize projects based on their ability to move people and goods, not cars. This means giving way more priority than I have seen Oregon give in the past to dedicated Transit Right of Way and High-quality bicycling infrastructure designed to appeal to the masses.</p> <p>Thank you Allan Rudwick</p>	Allan Rudwick	Email
06/20	<p>Subject: I support decongestion pricing.</p> <p>Just adding my two cents in support of congestion pricing. We cannot build our way out of the congestion problem Portland is currently facing. Road expansion has shown to be a short term, expensive band aid that reduces congestion for only a short time. Also, it is unlikely that through behavior change alone, we'll get enough drivers to take mass transit or ride their bikes; ridership for the latter continues to grow, though with fits and starts. Lastly, we need to think about what is happening in the transit sector and develop policies and road building to be cognizant of the expected rise in autonomous vehicle adoption. The car manufactures are.</p> <p>I would also be supportive of a revenue neutral pricing scheme, with the revenues returned to tax payers. Might be an easier sell vs the investment model.</p>	Mike Mercer	Email

	Warm regards. Mike Mercer		
06/21	<p>Subject: I-5</p> <p>diversion down to Going Street. As off peak drivers seek to avoid tolls, the neighbors will face difficulties in conflicts between drivers who don't know the area, walkers and bikes. Provide a separated or elevated bike/walk way, to prevent accidents</p> <p>Robert Greene</p>	Robert Greene	Email
06/21	<p>Subject: Decongestion pricing.</p> <p>For drivers, Decongestion pricing leads to ...</p> <p>...less time spent driving  ...healthier environment  ...better quality of life  ...more productivity  ...less stress  ...more money to spend on transportation projects</p> <p>more lanes = more cars</p> <p>more cars has the opposite, negative effect of what decongestion pricing does for Portland.</p> <p>Many people will just think of the out-of-pocket expense. Our city leaders need to lead, show them the overall, net positive effect of decongestion pricing.</p> <p>Personally, I would gladly pay a dollar or two if I knew that I could get across town in a reasonable amount of time. It took me 1:15 on I-84 and I-205 to return home at 3:30PM. I had made the same drive in 30 minutes 4 hours earlier. I'd pay a dollar or two to have that 45 minutes of my life back. My time is worth it.</p> <p>So is the time of all my fellow Portlanders. Please paint this picture for them. Please, lead.</p> <p>-D'Arcy Owen</p>	D'Arcy Owen	Email
06/21	<p>To: Value pricing Policy Advisory Committee; OTC Admin; Value pricing information  Subject: I support decongestion pricing policy!</p> <p>To Whom it May concern,</p> <p>I'm writing to express my support for the adoption of decongestion pricing policy. Please direct revenue raised from decongestion pricing towards transit investments instead of freeway expansion. Decongestion pricing is the only policy proven to alleviate traffic gridlock, will help create revenue for sustainable transportation investments, and help the Portland region curb our greenhouse gas emissions. It's imperative that we move forward with decongestion pricing ahead of freeway expansion, an unnecessary and costly public policy initiative that won't solve traffic congestion and will prevent us from investing in alternatives.</p> <p>In Service,</p> <p>Danny Dunn</p>	Danny Dunn	Email
06/21	<p>Subject: Value Pricing</p> <p>So you build highways at taxpayer expense to expedite traffic. Then when too many people use the traffic expedited highways, you charge them fees so they will use other roads causing those roads to be congested. Circuitous logic like that does not seem surprising from a government agency.</p>	Bill	Email
06/22	<p>Subject: Value pricing or tolling</p> <p>Why would you wait to charge tolls on southbound I-5 until the Alberta / Swan Island exit? In doing so you are going to give motorists the incentive to take the Rosa Parks exit and drive down Interstate Ave to avoid the toll. This will create a traffic nightmare</p>	BRUCE HELLEMN	Email



	<p>on Interstate Ave and affect traffic in all of this part of North Portland. Why not toll at the the Jantzen Beach exit southbound and then again at the Delta Park exit northbound and make all of the drivers who commute from Vancouver pay tolls at these two locations?</p> <p>More thought should go into this, which in my mind is a bad idea, because of the location you have selected.</p> <p>Bruce Hellemn</p>		
06/23	<p>Subject: I-5 and I-205 tolling decision</p> <p>Dear Mr. Garrett,</p> <p>This letter is for those of the state government, but since it also pertains to issues within your control, you get it as well. There's no swearing.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the Oregon State House and Senate,</p> <p>I will be 36 this year. For the last 11 years that I've worked at my current job in Portland, I have been taxed by the state over \$20,000, which is about \$1,800 a year. For those last 11 years, I have gotten roughly 10% of it back in a state refund, for a grand total of about \$2,000...and that was including two years where I made so little that I got nothing. Last year, I made almost \$33,000 and after taxes it was just over \$26,000. It has been that way for the last decade. I am poor. Rent is so high on both sides of the river that I have no choice but to continue living with my aging, ailing parents, who are also poor, despite having worked all their lives at decent paying jobs. If I lived on my own, it would be in a dangerous slum, being a drain on society. I prefer not to be a drain on society. You should prefer that as well, because if I'm not paying taxes, you have no money to spend.</p> <p>Since I'm not an Oregon resident and am not allowed to vote for anything in Oregon, I am being taxed without representation, which, if you are familiar with even your basic American history, was one of the reasons we split from the British Empire. Explain to me how that's legal.</p> <p>I understand that the Oregon State government is fast approaching the time to make, possibly, a final decision on whether or not to toll I-5 and I-205 and at what rate. I pay taxes to help maintain YOUR infrastructure—WHAT HAVE YOU BEEN SPENDING MY MONEY ON?! All of my money should be going straight to the Department of Transportation and at the very least, the State Police and emergency services. I do not live in your state—my tax money should NOT be going to things like schools. No ifs, ands, or buts. Period.</p> <p>I can afford, barely, \$3 a day for tolls. That's 5 days a week, on average 20 days a month, for a total of \$720 a year. If you go with a plan that's in the range of \$9, that's \$2,160 a year. No, "cha-ching!" is the incorrect response to that figure. If you're suggesting I now add that \$2,160 to the \$2,303 I paid in state income tax just last year, for a total of \$4,463, without being able to write it off on my taxes, have voting rights, or be able to designate it specifically to road maintenance (even if it's on roads or bridges I am unlikely to ever drive, which was really the whole reason for this latest toll conversation), you are BEYOND delusional—you are stark raving mad. That would mean I would make \$24,000 a year after taxes, which would further cripple my ability to be a contributing member of society.</p> <p>Not only that, but it would also mean I wouldn't be crossing the river for anything other than work. That means no visits to brunch places over the weekend, no visits to OMSI, any of the parks, anything downtown, no concerts, no trips to the beach, no entertainment related anything, no volunteering for anything, nothing, nothing, nothing—it will have become too expensive to have weekend or holiday excursions. How many businesses in Portland do you think will suffer a slow death when the Washington money is cut off? "Value pricing" doesn't mean much when you're already on a tight budget and spending it on a non-essential. Sure, there's people that would pay regardless, but there are plenty of people like me and a little better off that would rather keep their money on the Washington side. All of that</p>	Elena Martinez	Email

means more unemployment that you then have to pay out, as well as not being able to collect as much in taxes because there's not as much business. I bet you're not going to waive the cost to C-TRAN when they cross, so that means people riding the bus to catch the MAX lines will have to pay more to cover the cost. Transportation costs for anything going over those two bridges will go up, so that'll get passed to the consumer somehow. The cost to ship through UPS, FedEx, the USPS, and any other delivery service will probably go up, which also gets passed to the consumer. And ultimately, if it gets too costly to cross the river for work for someone that makes minimum wage or only works part time, the employers will probably lose people that they'll then have to find replacements for, which means lost revenue because they're busy training people. Lost revenue means less taxes for the state.

And how many Oregonians are going to be affected by this? You have just as many lower income people in Oregon, and believe it or not, people commute to Vancouver or beyond for work as well. Those people are able to vote for some of you—you should probably be worried about what they think. It's going to affect everyone in North Portland, as well as on the east side, and those neighborhoods aren't set up to deal with additional high traffic as people flee the freeways to try and avoid tolls, if they end up being able to. You've done nothing to control rent prices anywhere and it's priced everyone at lower incomes out to the edges of Portland...your inaction has actually caused a lot of Oregonians to cross the river because they could only afford a house in Vancouver. Congestion is the result of other events and you're not addressing them!

So I find it all horrifying, laughable, and disgusting that you are under the misguided notion that a toll will solve congestion and somehow benefit Portland in the long run. You seem to be under the delusion that people are able to negotiate with their employers on their hours, when they work 9-5 jobs that mean they're on the roads at 8am and 6pm. I have to be at work at 9 and there's no way I can change that—I am not alone in that. I'd be willing to bet that 99% of the people crossing those bridges from either side can't telecommute. I suppose your next argument would be to say, well, get another job. What job? The job market sucks, across all sectors, and frankly, if this is some underhanded way to somehow force people from Washington to give up their jobs so Oregonians can have them, then that's petty discrimination, and you're really out of touch with the corporate sector and what they want.

I am barely a drain on your state at all. I'm a safe, licensed driver. An American citizen. I pay my taxes. I pick up after myself. Why are you punishing me further? Is this all retaliation because of the embarrassing \$180 million spent on the slap-shod CRC (Columbia River Crossing) plan that ultimately went nowhere because of gross incompetence on the part of the company tapped to do the surveys and designs? If it bothers you that much, you should probably sue them for failure to do their job properly. Don't take it out on the rest of us. It's not our fault they didn't do an accurate impact study to either the environment or any of the high volume, high income business traffic down the river. You should probably also blame whomever it was that picked them in the first place.

I'd like to point out that it's adorable that you continue to point to Seattle as an example of where tolls work. Stop that. Have any of you ever actually driven up there more than once and used the toll system up there? Seattle has a much bigger road system that incorporates a rather advanced system of express ways and HOV lanes, with four lanes of traffic in most places along I-5, as that is the main corridor through the city. They have a higher population to go along with it. Portland can only boast, as far as I know, probably a three mile stretch of HOV lane up northbound I-5 before the I-5 bridge that is continually violated as a passing lane and otherwise really doesn't do much of anything, as well as mostly two-three lane freeways and highways in the area. The comparison is laughable, just stop.

Here's what the tolling system actually looks like in Seattle, in case you weren't sure. The SR-520 bridge has tolls ranging from \$1.25-\$6.30, based on time—a rush hour of 7-10 am would be about \$4 one way. The I-405 express toll lanes has tolls ranging from \$0.75-\$10, based on how traffic is behaving...if it's bad, it's high; flowing well, very low. The SR-167 HOT lane, which is a high occupancy toll lane, which is in turn a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane that solo drivers may take if they choose to pay the toll ranges from \$0.50-\$9, dependent on the traffic at the time. Then there's the Tacoma Narrows bridge, which is between \$5-\$7, regardless of traffic. If you want to look it up for yourself, it's all at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Tolling/default.htm>



However, Portland is not Seattle. None of those Seattle tolls are on the main artery that is I-5 that's feeding all these other places. There are alternatives. You do not HAVE to take the toll lane on I-405 if you're fine with a longer commute. It's optional. What you're proposing is mandatory. When it backs up on I-5 in Seattle, it's because of an accident—and they have some pretty spectacular accidents up there, no matter what the weather conditions are or the time of day. You don't want to be anywhere near any of them. That has nothing to do with congestion and everything to do with the drivers themselves. Portland has fewer alternatives, especially because there are so many bridges. I would also like to point out that the rush hours around Portland are 6-10:30am and 2-7pm during the week and 10:30am-4:00pm on the weekend...and if the weather is bad, well, you are SOL because it's peak hours all day long.

Frankly, I doubt that a significant portion of you have ever actually crossed either bridge across the Columbia during any of the rush hours for any significant amount of time. If you had, you would quickly realize that congestion in those areas has almost nothing to do with the bridges themselves and EVERYTHING to do with distracted drivers that get into accidents, any kind of precipitation, and all the areas at the heart of Portland where there is any kind of merge point for any reason. To argue otherwise just proves my point. Sure, when the I-5 bridge goes up, it backs up traffic, but once that clears, it backs up further in Portland, long after the bridge.

In my experience, all of the southbound traffic piles up because of something near the Rose Quarter, instead of at the I-5 bridge, and the northbound traffic piles up because of horrible merge points from between Going St. and Jantzen Beach. For I-205, northbound piles up in the right lane because of everyone either going to the airport or going to Camas. Southbound, it's because of traffic to the airport or something happening either past the connection point to I-84 west or somewhere along I-84 east that blocks up the exit for there from I-205 south. I challenge you to drive it for a week and you will quickly understand.

People in Portland don't know how to drive. They can't merge, they can't put down their phones, they can't be patient, they can't control their tempers, they can't use they're turn signals, they can't follow the basic rules they were required to demonstrate during their original driving test. They tailgate, cut in front of people, use off ramps as passing lanes, weave in and out of traffic at high speeds because they're impatient. They can't even take care of their registration—I've seen hundreds of cars in the last six months that have expired tags. You should probably do something about that. If you want to fix congestion, you need to have all those people tested again and deny them licenses if they fail. There are too many people moving here from other parts of the country that bring their HORRIFIC driving skills to the roads that it can't be ignored any longer. Portland keeps harping on about this Vision 20, but it does nothing to address the overall abysmal driving habits that people have on the freeways that they then carry over to the city streets. There's never a cop around when you need one. Nothing's truly been done to make public transportation an acceptable solution...they were cutting bus routes in North Portland just a few years ago and I don't think they ever came back to what they were.

You would not have as much trouble funding your road projects if you used all the tax money you get from Washington residents that work in Oregon for just that and only that. That's what you should be doing anyway. You should have been doing it all along. Why aren't you?

If you're going to toll, aim low. Would you or anyone in your family be happy to pay high tolls every day in order to work? If the answer's no, you should probably rethink your plan. If the answer's yes, then you have too much disposable income and are out of touch with the majority of your constituents' incomes. Seattle has 30 and 40 year bonds on projects they're paying off—they at least have an end goal. I doubt you do because you're trying to raise money for a project that doesn't even fix anything at either of the trouble spots on I-5 or I-205 at the river, much less fix roads that really need the repairs, like the ones out in Clackamas or anything on Portland's east side. Have you seen the pot holes? It's ridiculous!

So use my tax money for your project. Quit trying to price me out of a job. Because

	<p>otherwise I'm going to start wondering which one of you I should be sending my toll bill to.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Elena Martinez</p>		
06/24	<p>Subject: Toll Lanes on I-205 To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>We live in West Linn. At rush hours I-205 is grid locked through West Linn as well Willamette Drive and Willamette Falls Drive. If toll lanes are installed on I-205 many more people will use the local streets to avoid tolls. There are limited mass transit options for west Clackamas County so West Linn residents must use automobiles for transportation.</p> <p>Please do not add toll lanes top I-205.</p> <p>James Nixon</p>	James Nixon	Email
06/26	<p>Subject: Support for decongestion pricing</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>I want to express my support for decongestion pricing. I would like to see it implemented as broadly and ambitiously as possible.</p> <p>Decongestion pricing needs to be implemented for public health, climate mitigation, and congestion relief purposes. It should be installed equitably and thoughtfully.</p> <p>Every dollar raised from decongestion pricing should be redirected into transit, biking, and walking projects, not more freeway expansion. Spending money from decongestion pricing on freeway expansion is like using revenue from a carbon tax to build a coal plant or pipeline. I encourage TriMet, CTRAN, Metro, and ODOT to work closely with frontline communities to determine how to allocate these resources toward investments in reliable, efficient, and effective transit, biking, and walking.</p> <p>I encourage the exploration of mitigation of congestion pricing on vulnerable communities through rebates, funding safety improvements on nearby high crash corridors, and strict initiatives for data privacy.</p> <p>Thank you, Jacob Gellman</p>	Jacob Gellman	Email
06/26	<p>Subject: Public Comment on Tolling Concepts</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As a homeowner in north Portland, several blocks from I-5, I'm vehemently against ODOT's planned Concepts B &amp; C from Round 2 of their evaluation. I'm also disappointed that ODOT and other state leadership are so blind to the real problems causing congestion, and not seriously considering better ways to solve them.</p> <p>Most of the traffic clogging our highways comes from freight trucks passing through our area on their way to Port of Tacoma, etc. (even more so since the Port of Portland has lost major shipping contracts), along with the influx of commuters from SW Washington. I fully understand the desire to raise revenue for road projects, but it should NOT be placed on the mostly backs of Portland residents who already pay a premium in gas taxes for road projects. If tolls are absolutely necessary, the only places they should be enacted are at each of the Interstate bridges, and just south of the I-5 &amp; I-205 split, so that 'pass-through' travelers and out-of-state commuters are mainly subject to them.</p> <p>As your own Fact Sheet states, 'During more congested times of the day a higher fee is charged, encouraging some drivers to consider other travel options such as alternate routes..' I encourage your study to come look at northbound Interstate Ave, Vancouver Ave, and MLK Blvd after 2pm any day of the workweek. These residential streets are fully stopped, making it near impossible for local residents to leave their homes by car during those times.</p>	Jonathan Ormsby	Email



	<p>Real, realistic relief from this situation isn't going to come from forcing everyone to ride bikes to work, or tolling the route through the middle of town. We desperately need a third route across the Columbia, preferably out West that links to the Hillsboro area so that those commuters don't have to drive into downtown, then out West to work. If you have to make that a toll road to afford it, so be it. Why hasn't that been considered?</p> <p>Another, also more effective, solution would be to extend the MAX Yellow (and perhaps Green) line up across the river into Washington so those commuters to downtown have that option. Adding tolling from Going St. South is only going to encourage those commuters to stop just before Going St., park in our neighborhoods and take the MAX in from here. This already happens and will be made worse by these proposals. I realize there's a cost to this that may equal the cost of tolls, but they'd still avoid the parking costs downtown. Placing a single southbound toll further north, closer to the Interstate bridge would at least encourage the commuters park and riding to do it further north where there is more space, and not in our neighborhoods.</p> <p>I won't even get into the myriad of issues that tolling the downtown core has with respect to the 'affordability crisis' and cost of living problems Portland's leaders simultaneously refer to. If you're going to use Seattle as an example of 'successful' value priced tolling, please also consider their extreme lack of affordability and homelessness problems that have increased along with it.</p> <p>I hope OTC will reconsider their options, and look further into more realistic solutions that target the real problems.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jon Ormsby North Portland</p>		
06/26	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'm writing regarding the proposed toll.</p> <p>A toll will not just affect commuters. Doernbecher Children's Hospital, Shriners Hospitals for Children - Portland, and OHSU Emergency Department are all along the proposed Toll Routes. This impacts me personally because I have a medically fragile disabled child. She sees doctors in Neurology, Gastroenterology, Otolaryngology, Pulmonary, Orthopedics, Audiology, Endocrinology and more added continuously. She also has weekly speech therapy, occupational therapy, and physical therapy all at those locations. So as you can imagine we do a lot of traveling in the area.</p> <p>We are a single income family because my daughter requires around the clock care. Our budget is already strained. I drive an overpriced wheelchair van which averages 14 mpg. Public transit does not work for us because there are no sidewalks in so many areas, including between us and the closest bus stops. TriMet Lift is dysfunctional and left us stranded after a surgical procedure at Doernbecher the first and only time we tried that mode of transportation. There's also an insane amount of medical equipment and supplies that we have to bring everywhere we go and lugging all those on public transit, along with a large wheelchair and service dog are extremely difficult or impossible. Plus we will end up paying twice because my wife will have to pay the toll to get to work to support our family.</p> <p>The goal of the toll is to force people off the roads. If it succeeds, it will be at a great detriment to people's health and livelihood. DON'T DO IT!!!! It will force me off the roads, taking away the services that my daughter needs. Please don't take away access to the services my daughter depends on!!! There has to be a better solution than charging tolls!!!! At least make buses more predictable and reliable and bring the Max to more places around the entire Portland Metropolitan Area and especially in the vicinity of OHSU/Doernbecher/Casey Eye Institute/VA Hospital/Shriner's Hospitals for Children before considering forcing tolls on people that can't afford it. Public Transit must be accessible to everyone before you can consider a move like you are proposing and it is far from it.</p> <p>Additionally, my family moved to the San Francisco Bay Area for a few years after my</p>	Michael Stevens	Email

	<p>daughter was born so she could get care and Stanford. I have experienced first hand what toll routes are like. The tolls themselves produced the bottlenecks that stop traffic for miles. It didn't alleviate traffic at all. It only causes more slow downs and robs people of their hard earned money. Watch the morning traffic reports from Bay Area. They all stream live. You will see slow downs at every single one of the seven tolls in the area, even though they implemented FasTrack years ago.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention and consideration!</p>		
06/26	<p>Subject: I support decongestion pricing.</p> <p>Decongestion pricing needs to be implemented for public health, climate mitigation, and congestion relief purposes. It must be installed equitably and thoughtfully.</p> <p>Every dollar raised from decongestion pricing should be redirected into transit, biking and walking projects, not more freeway expansion.</p> <p>Spending money from decongestion pricing on freeway expansion is like using revenue from a carbon tax to build a coal plant or pipeline. I would encourage TriMet, CTRAN, Metro and ODOT to work closely with frontline communities to determine how to allocate these resources towards investments in reliable, efficient, and effective transit, biking and walking.</p> <p>I would encourage the exploration of mitigation of congestion pricing on vulnerable communities through the exploration of rebates, funding safety improvements on nearby high crash corridors, and strict initiatives for data privacy</p>	Patrick Halley	Email
06/27	<p>Subject: Toll on 205</p> <p>I am a bit late but have never gotten any information on this from any source. I feel that there was not proper canvassing to notify residents being effected.</p> <p>I am a resident of West Linn living on Pete's Mtn. If a 205 toll is implemented it will cause even more congestion to Willamette Falls drive as people will try to avoid the tolls. The area is already saturated with non resident traffic. The travel times are almost three times what they were 5 years ago. Now there is new building going on which will bring even more traffic to the area.</p> <p>I would urge the committee to come up with other ways to fill their pockets. Penalizing residents that live n work in the area is not helping the situation nor will it cut down on the traffic on the side streets.</p> <p>Suggestions</p> <p>Raise taxes moderately to widen the fwy where it gets blocked up If a toll is a must put booths at all exits off 205 and at each end but provide residents with proof of residency yearly passes good for all exits. Residents should not be penalized for where they live.</p> <p>Provide residents a complete plan and get suggestions and consider those suggestions. Do a through and complete canvas of the info to all effected residences.</p> <p>Katherine Sherry West Linn resident</p>	Katherine Sherry	Email
06/27	<p>Subject: Washington to target Oregon drivers with a tax of their own</p> <p>I have been lobbying hard for Washington to place a special toll on only Oregon drivers that come to Washington. I hope it goes thru, our roads could use some money from Oregon too.</p>	Jason Paul	Email
06/28	<p>Subject: I5 toll? What is the real toll?</p> <p>As a resident of the Overlook neighborhood for the past 30+ years, I hope my comments will be considered.</p> <p>I have experienced the steady growth of this neighborhood, and of North Portland (NoPo) in general. I have endured and been party to the construction of the Yellow MAX line on Interstate Avenue, and the routing of Greeley Avenue, to accommodate the Adidas campus, and traffic flow to the further UOP, far north, and St. Johns neighborhoods.</p>	Kase	Email





	<p>Population growth in the PMA is inevitable. Increased traffic, (foot, bicycle, auto, public trans, and commercial delivery), is the result.</p> <p>But traffic flow in the PMA is a joke. Our "rush hour" is virtually continuous. Speaking strictly with a NoPo view, the Interstate Bridge North to South (mostly from WA commuters), @ 0700 to @ 1100, is crawling along often 4 hours. Then again from @ 1300 to 1700, perhaps another 4... From South to North, I5 is a virtual parking lot from @1400 often past 1900, or easily 5+ hours. The Interstate Bridge is 3 lanes. Building another bridge is not the remedy unless new lanes are built continuous from downtown Portland to the bridge. The cost would be astronomical. Does the word "bottle-neck" mean anything?.</p> <p>Following this logic, without a total rebuilding of the I5N corridor Portland to Vancouver, placing a toll ANYWHERE along this route would only give incentive for drivers to avoid the monetary cost, and use the alternate off highway routes of N. Interstate, N. Denver, or N. Greeley. This would vastly increase the hidden costs, both physical and psychological for travel to and from NoPo.</p> <p>As a result of the Yellow MAX line, Portland has all but stopped traffic "flow" along Interstate Avenue, where there is currently a traffic signal at almost every intersection. While in a perfect world, everyone in the city on a MAX line would avail themselves, the fact remains almost everyone West of the Rocky Mountains owns and/or uses an automobile! Interstate Avenue is seeing a plethora of multi-use housing, with nothing but on street parking. What's with that logic?</p> <p>Greeley and Denver Ave are mostly residential, and always have been. These are not "alternative corridor" routes. Added traffic along these streets will be inconceivably slow and dangerous to all citizens.</p> <p>The only common sense solution to our dilemma is to institute staggered working hours for commuters, and restricted delivery hours for commercial traffic.</p> <p>Or: simply prohibit auto traffic into the downtown core entirely. Can we force commuters to use public transportation? Try taking our citizen's car away... "It ain't gonna happen in this lifetime..."</p> <p>Thank you for your time, and try driving these streets sometime...</p> <p>KCH</p>		
07/03	<p>Subject: Citizen's Representative Office - Customer Entry</p> <p>Julie Norrande (email address) (phone number)</p> <p>I am also highly opposed to ANY tolls. As a taxpayer, I've paid for these roads &amp; continue to do so with the higher tax gas and various auto fees that have been increased.</p> <p>An increasing frustrated native Oregonian.</p>	Julie Norrande r	Email
07/04	<p>Subject: Tolls</p> <p>You in Oregon screw me every year on taxes. Now you want to get more money from me. Charge tolls I don't care. I will do one of two things. I will drive into Longview cross there and take 30 or I'll retire and you will not only not get tolls from me but the state won't get my taxes any more. You waste so much money on that toy train you run. That money should be going to the roads. Then I here you want to build another toy train line. Is that the real reason for the tolls. If you say no you are a liar. Do as you please you won't get my money.</p>	Mike All	Email
07/06	<p>Subject: Possible tolls</p> <p>Tolls are the best way to increase traffic backups, piss people off, and they will have no effect on the wear and tear of those or other roads.</p>	Jennifer Gambill	Email

	<p>Thanks for finding new ways to destroy Portland. We have done so much in such a short time to destroy the beauty and livability of this city already, and yet it's good to see that the ideas just keep coming.</p> <p>Jennifer Gambill</p>		
07/06	<p>Subject: Tolling</p> <p>I have been hearing about the possibility of tolls for a while now and hoped that ridiculous idea would simply give way to another plan, but since it hasn't...you are hearing from me.</p> <p>As a 4th generation Oregonian I am more than invested in the destruction of our state by what is called "progress."</p> <p>I have watched over the last ten years our freeways become increasingly impossible, but when the Portland population boom was known to be on its way, why did we not make changes then?</p> <p>Bottom line, tolling our only freeways is not a good idea. Other cities do not generally decide to begin tolling the only existing route, they build new alternate routes and impose a toll to pay for those. That makes sense. For instance, the new Newberg-Dundee bypass would have been a perfect toll road. Years ago when the I-5 bridge was built it was tolled, because it was a secondary route, it was also tolled AFTER it was built and paid for by those using it.</p> <p>I am against tolling our main freeways that will push traffic into our neighborhoods and back roads. If you watched KATU's poll on the news yesterday you would see approximately 74% of people said they would find an alternate route should I-5 and I-205 become tolls. That proves that tolling those freeways will not solve our problems.</p> <p>I do understand the need for a solution but this is not it.</p> <p>With some strategic re-painting of the lines on 205 there is space for the much needed third lane, while still allowing the Greenpeace in between. Perhaps money should have been put into adding new lanes on the freeway instead of spending money on the cable barriers.</p> <p>I would also be curious why we are not able to use lottery dollars or marijuana money to fund projects. I am pretty sure weed revenue was the main selling point in getting that to pass.</p> <p>Pleas consider other options, perhaps open it to Oregonians for brainstorming. I dont know who is even reading this email, but I would bet many folks on this committee are not natives to Oregon.</p> <p>Before you go thinking I am a dried up cranky retiree resistant to change, please know I am a 40 year old mental health professional with a masters degree who deeply cares about this state and am concerned about the poor choices I continue to see being made.</p> <p>I do hope the committee will put some energy into finding and proposing a different solution.</p> <p>A concerned citizen, Nicki</p>	Nicki Eggiman	Email
07/07	<p>Subject: I-205 tolling</p> <p>Thank you for your work on this complex project. As a resident of West Linn, the I-205 Abernathy/Stafford value pricing proposal would directly impact me on a daily basis. While I loathe the frustration of the current traffic bottlenecks, the idea of tolling that area and the subsequent flooding of nearby roads like Borland, Ek, and Willamette Falls Drive in Willamette seems a worse nightmare. The historic area of Willamette is already being used as a 3rd lane bypass of the freeway and adding tolls will only cause added pressure to that area. The same is true for the arch bridge area of Oregon City—these two lane/narrow areas aren't capable of absorbing the fallout of this value price option. Why are we not simply tolling both interstate bridges to</p>	Tracy Normoyle	Email



	<p>capture revenue from Washingtonian's who use our roads vs. impacting bedroom communities like West Linn? I strongly urge you to reconsider this target area—if unfairly impacts West Linn residents.</p> <p>Tracy Normoyle (address)</p>		
07/08	<p>Subject: I support decongestion pricing</p> <p>I fully support implementing decongestion pricing on I-205 and I-5 for air quality, traffic congestion relief, and environmental reasons. I would love to see Portland become a public transit-heavy city like NYC with comparatively low rates of car ownership.</p> <p>With the popularity of ride share services, so many new transplants to the city, and the unwillingness to incentivize car manufacturers to create more fuel efficient vehicles, drastic measures must be taken to reduce the effects of climate change on a global scale, as well as to reduce traffic congestion within the city of Portland.</p> <p>I am a car owner but driving is not my preferred mode of transportation. It's only fair to tax drivers (who aren't already experiencing financial hardship) for the amount of time we spend on roads and the distance traveled. I'm a regular driver and I'm telling you I support taxing drivers!</p> <p>Thank you, Sarah Lombardi</p>	Sarah Lombardi	Email
07/09	<p>Subject: We DO NOT want tolls!!</p> <p>Please provide my feedback with all the ODOT commission members.</p> <p>As a West Linn resident, I am outraged and in disbelief that OTC would consider the 205 highway stretch as an viable "test" section. I can only gather that NONE of the OTC commission members actually live in the West Linn area. Not only is this stretch of highway only TWO lanes, but by putting a congestion toll in place, you will push even more people on to the side streets including highway 43. Highway 43 is already a nightmare as are several other streets throughout West Linn. Adding a toll to 205 will only make things unbearable to live in this town. Additionally, how is it that the committee can even consider tolling a two lane highway? That is essentially forcing anyone that uses this highway, including West Linn residents, to either sit in the back log of traffic that will be with everyone else not wanting to pay a toll in one lane or be forced to pay the toll in the other lane. I understand and agree that something needs to be done about the traffic issues in Portland and the surrounding areas...but this is NOT the answer.</p> <p>Please stop trying to ram this toll down the throats of residents that live in West Linn. I don't even work outside the home and I'm am so strongly against the toll idea. I feel pretty confident in saying that if the OTC were to take this to a ballot vote, it would be defeated by large margins. Nobody wants this toll - please understand that. Yes - people want something done about the traffic issue...but they do not want another tax, which this essentially is. I understand it isn't technically a tax but it is being imposed upon the residents of West Linn whether we like it or not. That is as close to a tax as you can get.</p> <p><b>WE DO NOT WANT A TOLL ON OUR FREEWAYS.</b> Please hear this message!!</p> <p>OTC needs to go back to brainstorming and come up with other ideas. How about having a contest with actual prize money for the best idea(s) on how to fix the traffic issues? There is a new motor vehicle tax that people are now paying...use this to widen some of the freeways. There are plenty of other options and it does not seem like OTC or ODOT has investigated this enough. It seems more like a money grab than an actual viable solution to the problem.</p> <p>I was in Wilsonville tonight and could not help but be dumbfounded as to why the stretch of Wilsonville, where it is almost always congested, isn't being considered for a test section. They even have 3 lanes plus it goes over a bridge, which we all know is key to collecting tolls.</p> <p>I truly hope that OTC and ODOT actually listen to the feedback received from West Linn residents. I have not seen ANYONE in West Linn support this.</p> <p>Regards Michelle Cook</p>	Michelle Cook	Email

07/10	<p>Subject: Oregon road tolls</p> <p>I have lived in Oregon my entire life and I HATE the idea of having toll roads. If any road should have a toll, it should be for the Washington drivers on I-84 thru the gorge. Multiple Washington drivers use the Oregon road thru the gorge because they have a substandard road on their side.</p> <p>I would really like to know where all the lottery and marijuana money is going? Those raise a ton of revenue. WHERE IS THIS MONEY GOING?</p> <p>I'm so sick of being nickel and dimed all the freaking time.</p> <p>Rebecca Brown Native Oregonian</p>	Rebecca Brown	Email
07/10	<p>Subject: request: Letter from Washington County</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>It's been reported that Washington County sent a letter commenting on this project.</p> <p><a href="https://bikeportland.org/07/10/as-debate-heats-up-state-transpo-commission-will-hear-from-public-on-congestion-pricing-285576">https://bikeportland.org/07/10/as-debate-heats-up-state-transpo-commission-will-hear-from-public-on-congestion-pricing-285576</a></p> <p>(In) Washington County's letter they encourage the OTC to, "Link tolling directly to increased freeway capacity in the region... this means targeting revenue to completing the investments in the region's bottleneck projects in the Rose Quarter and I-205/Abernathy (sic) Bridge... It is important the people who pay the toll see benefits both in terms of better traffic flow and increased capacity."</p> <p>I don't have time for a longer response during work hours, but suffice to say, the county leaders who sent that must be feeling the effects of sniffing the exhaust fumes they've worked so hard to encourage over all these years of expanding roadways to monstrous proportions -- they better than anyone should know that widening auto facilities only increases auto traffic.</p> <p>Can you please send me a copy of the full letter?</p> <p>Thank you, ~ Peter Beaverton, Oregon</p>	Peter W	Email
07/11	<p>Subject: Re: Interstate Toll Plans Oregon Transportation Commission:</p> <p>Having lived in a couple of states that have huge traffic problems and that have tolls for bridges and roads (Illinois and California), I believe my insight, based on first-hand experience, warrants your consideration.</p> <p>Instituting tolls without a comprehensive traffic/transportation management plan will not produce a reduction in road traffic, especially in an ever-growing area like Portland. A comprehensive plan must include increased public transportation: rail and buses. The plan must first include additional public transportation lines, specifically from WA (Routes 5 and 205) thru Portland and surrounding suburbs.</p> <p>ODOT must not forget to increase parking at MAX rail stops. As an example, the Sunset Transit Center parking lot is full before 6:45 a.m., which means a large number of cars, circle back out and on to route 26. If there is no parking at the stations, then the rail lines will be prohibited from contributing to reducing road traffic.</p> <p>I am willing to talk with any members of the Commission to provide ideas and suggestions. As a professional mediator, I am very experienced in getting individuals with divergent ideas to come to agreement.</p> <p>Nancy</p>	Nancy Yeend	Email
07/12	<p>Subject line: NO on value pricing</p> <p>Olive in NE portland, I don't want my neighborhood traffic any worse than it is.</p>	Julie Higgins	Email
07/13	<p>Subject: 205 value pricing</p>	Miss Hexom	Email



	<p>I have owned my residence on Jennings Ave for 25 years. Without value pricing the increased traffic at transit is astounding. People walk this street, bike on this street. Children walk to schools, School busses. Sidewalks are intermittent often I have to walk on white line with traffic as is. It is dangerous. Traffic right now is staggering. When there is an accident on 205 it turns into a speed way or an over crowded residential street for the rush hour. I think this is just another government scheme to generate more revenue without spending a dime on enlarging the 205 for the new traffic demands. If you want people to use mass transit improve mass transit. If you further want to encourage mass transit make it free. I am sure free mass transit isn't nearly the cost of widening the 205. The county loves the revenue from all of the homes being built but didn't have the fore thought to think that would bring more traffic. So much for county planning, metro and all other agencies we pay taxes to that piecemeal their plans. So for all above reasons I say NO. It will only devalue my home, make walking a death defying act, endanger the grade school and high school kids. Not even to mention the many people that walk to the bus stop at the intersection of Jennings and McLoughlin. Again NO on this proposal.</p> <p>Home owern on Jennings MLiss Hexom</p>		
07/13	<p>Why did you even go through the process of pretending to listen to input? It seems to me that you have done what you meant to do all along. What happened to a trial before implementation? You have lost the trust of Washington commuters.</p>	Sally Sellers	Email
07/13	<p>Subject line: Toll possibility</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>As a home owner and resident with grown children born here in Oregon, extended family, and friends, co-workers, etc., I feel as though I'm speaking for all I've spoken to about this. No one feels they can afford a "Toll" bridge amount, and WHY the Abernathy Bridge??! Why not the bridge between Vancouver and Portland on i5??! Also, would paying ONE way then pay the way BACK? (On the Abernathy Bridge??) Bc many ppl I know live in this direct area. And we all know this bridge needs to be rebuilt. It needs to be Earthquake proof, and widened. If the toll is taken on the Abernathy Bridge, it should be kept FOR rebuilding the Abernathy Bridge ! These are serious questions that need to be answered. Very serious, and FAIR. Thank you.</p> <p>Regards,</p>	Diane Comer	Email
07/15	<p>Subject: Tolls on Oregon Roads</p> <p>Tolls are a regressive tax. As such, they penalize poor people and are not what Oregon wants. Why is ODOT and PBOT shoving tolls down the throats of Oregonians? There are other ways to raise revenue without taxing the poor and working class people. Why not put in priority lanes instead and encourage people to carpool? I am disgusted with how PBOT and ODOT put things into place with out a vote from the people of Oregon and no consideration for those with less means.</p>	Cynthia Eckersley	Email
07/10	<p>July 10, 2018</p> <p>Comissioner Tammy Baney, Chair Oregon Transportatoin Commission Oregon Department of Transportation (Address)</p> <p>Attn: Commision Assistant</p> <p>RE: Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis</p> <p>Dear Chair Baney and Members of the Commission:</p> <p>On behalf of Clackamas County, we are pleased to offer you our position on the recommendations of the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis. Representing communities and residents that are directly impacted by one of the state's most congested freeway segments, we have closely followed the development of the Value Pricing Study stemming from HB 2017.</p>	Clackamas County Board of Commissioners, Jim Bernard, Sonya Fischer, Ken Humberston, Paul Savas, Martha Schrader	OTC meeting written comment

The interstate system in the Portland region has locations in which congestion due to lack of capacity is so severe that it is impacting our quality of life, air quality, and economic competitiveness. Most notably, these areas include the I-5 Rose Quarter and the two-lane segment of I-205 between Stafford Road and Oregon 99E. Both segments contain significant bottlenecks that are of statewide significance. It is, therefore, no surprise that the Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) recommended further study of tolling in both of these sections.

The Board of County Commissioners urges the OTC to be mindful of some fundamental challenges that are unique to our local Clackamas County community:

**Safety Concerns Caused By Diversion:** Currently there are thousands of trips every day that are being diverted off of I-5 and I-205 onto rural County roads. These diverted trips on to the County road system are impacting the livability of our communities and the safety of our residents and the traveling public, resulting in more crashes on the County system.

**Lack of Parallel Systems/Routes:** An issue unique to the southern I-205 corridor is a lack of a developed grid system due to its topography, rivers, and rural location. This limits the route alternatives, especially to low-income populations that cannot afford tolls.

**Shortage of Transit Alternatives:** There is a lack of transit along the I-205 corridor between I-5 and Oregon City. As emphasized by the recommendation from the PAC, the necessity to provide reasoned transit alternatives as a part of this project are imperative to ensure traveling options.

Should the OTC decide to move forward with value priced tolling, the Board's position is as follows:

Concept E should include at least one lane that is not priced to accommodate low-income populations that cannot afford tolls, have limited or no access to transit, and have no feasible alternative routes available.

Concept B should be studied in conjunction with Concept E. If either I-5 or I-205 is tolled, then both must be to avoid unwanted diversion between the two corridors. Emphasis should be placed on ensuring revenues from these Concepts be focused on growing capacity to increase freeway throughput, near and long term, in the region. Revenues spent to mitigate the impacts of these Concepts should only be spent in areas experiencing direct impacts from diversion.

While we are supportive of advancing an analysis of these pricing alternatives, we are mindful that tolling is one of a number of tools to help address the region's congestion challenges. Specifically, value pricing is a tool but not a silver bullet in our efforts to meet the needs of our transportation system.

Lastly, the aforementioned I-205 bottleneck is currently on track to be shovel ready for construction in 2020, yet the project lacks necessary funding for final design and construction. It is imperative to seek remaining project design funding from the 2019 state legislature to keep the project on its current timeline while awaiting future toll revenues for construction. Should the OTC pursue tolling, it should be implemented in such a way as to ensure that the project can be built as expeditiously as possible. Should tolling ultimately prove infeasible or not timely for funding the I-205 project, Clackamas County would stress the need for legislature to identify alternative funding to move construction of the project forward.

We have appreciated the participation of Commissioners Simpson and O'Hollaren on the PAC. Thank you for your consideration of our comments on this very important subject, and we look forward to continuing to work with you in this process.

Sincerely,  
CLACKAMAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Jim Bernard  
Chair

Ken Humberston  
Vice Chair

Sonya Fischer  
Commissioner



	<p>Paul Savas Commissioner</p> <p>Martha Schrader Commissioner</p> <p>cc: Joint Committee on Transportation Matt Garrett, ODOT Director Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager Judith Gray, ODOT Region 1 Value Pricing Project Manager</p>		
07/12	<p>Decongestion pricing must come before any freeway expansion is considered or built. We must invest in climate-friendly solutions and move away from fossil fuel infrastructure such as new highway miles. Funds from decongestion pricing must be put towards transit, bicycling, pedestrian, and other options, not more highway infrastructure.</p>	Josh Hetrick	OTC meeting written comment
07/12	<p>The list I've attached was taken from Oregon legislature.gov or details some fairly recent wasted tax dollars totaling roughly \$1.2 billion, and now you're asking for more. Please stop pricing people out of this city. Many of us live from paycheck to paycheck and are only a rent increase away from losing our homes. Portland's 2016 bond raised taxes and rents followed. Metro wants its own bond to pass this year which will once again raise taxes and rents once again. You want this cash on top of that. Please stop Nickle and diming us while waisting funds you already have. Thanks! Billions of dollars wasted</p> <p>The following notable items are incidents of tax dollars being wasted in recent years by the state of Oregon and its agencies:</p> <p>\$392 million: The US Department of Labor determined that the State overpaid hundreds of millions of follars in unemployment benefits during the aftermath of the Great Recession.</p> <p>\$347 million: An independent audit of the Oregon department of energy's business energy tax credits concluded that a third of the program's \$1 billion dollar in credit issuances "seemed improper, violated statutes or rules, or exhibited suspicious activity." The findings were referred to the Oregon Department of Justice for investigation.</p> <p>\$300 million: The amount of federal grant money the State wasted on the failed cover Oregon health care exchange, which was eventually abandoned in favor of the federal exchange system.</p> <p>\$38 million: An independent audit revealed that the Oregon department of transportation (ODOT) has wasted millions of dollars when building or repairing roads, with one project (the U.S. Highway 20 expansion) going over budget by nearly forty million dollars.</p> <p>\$33 Million: An SOS audit determined nearly \$33 million dollars were wasted on a failed computer program at the Oregon Employment Department.</p> <p>\$95 Million: Oregon's share of state and federal funds spent on the failed Columbia River Crossing project.</p> <p>\$10 million: The amount that the state could've saved if it had required low-income health care providers to meet the same standards that insurance companies do.</p> <p>Adding up the all of the above expeditures, the state of Oregon under democratic administrations has wasted or mismanaged the hard earned tax dollars of oregonians in excess of \$1.2 billion dollars over the past 5-7 years.</p>	John Sorenson	OTC meeting written comment
07/12	<p>Subject: Testimony to the Oregon Transportation Commission related to tolling I-5 and I-205, July 12, 2018</p> <p>I am opposed to the tolling recommendation. It is a form of targeted discrimination.</p> <p>Over the next 20 years, car trips in the Portland-Metro area are expected to increase 49 percent regardless of how much mass transit services is added.* (*Source: Figures gathered by the Portland Business Alliance) Per TriMet's latest survey; congestion, road maintenance and the need to increase roadway capacity was among the top priorities not directly related to transit. Where is the government support?</p> <p>Over the last couple of decades, both PBOT and Metro have developed an exceedingly evident car hater mindset. Portland now has a 30 year behind the times/out of date street and highway system that today is deficient of motor vehicle capacity.</p>	Terry Parker	OTC meeting written comment

	<p>Instead of making more room for cars to accommodate unrestrained population growth and supporting the nearly ten percent of jobs that are tied to the automobile; PBOT has been tinkering with social engineering and attempting to discriminately “dictate” how people travel by reducing motor vehicles capacity with road diets, street modifications and reductions in off-street parking requirements that all combined, create more mass congestion. That in turn leads to engines idling and running longer thereby increasing fuel consumption and emissions. This artificially premediated congestion.</p> <p>If tolling does occur, it needs to take place only on new lanes added to the existing highway system with 100 percent of the revenue dedicated to only adding motor vehicle capacity – not to be used for bicycle infrastructure and/or transit.</p> <p>There is an equity issue here: Why did the Street Trust even have seat at the tolling advisory committee table when the agenda was about tolling freeways? Instead of freeloading on the streets and calling for drivers to pay more, adult bicyclists need to be paying their own way with some type of user or license fee that would fully fund the “privilege” of having bike lanes and any other specialized bicycle infrastructure bicyclists utilize. If drivers are tolled, bicyclists also need to be tolled!!!</p> <p>Likewise, with a prospective two billion dollar light rail line on the horizon, transit needs to become far more financially self-sustainable with fares that help pay for infrastructure costs. One two-axle bus does as much damage to the streets and roads as 1200 cars. (**Source: City Club of Portland) Existing transit fares only cover 25% of the operating costs.*** (Source: TriMet) Motorists should not be subsidizing transit or paying for bicycle infrastructure!!!</p> <p>In closing, tolling the freeways will generate more congestion on city streets thereby creating a huge need for adding auto capacity on major thoroughfares. Any tolling will also generate more cut through traffic on residential streets creating a new set of safety issues. Finally, since there are no optional routes for drivers to go between Portland and Vancouver, the two Columbia River bridges must remain driver accessible without tolls.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Terry Parker Northeast Portland**</p>		
07/12	<p>July 12, 2018 To: Oregon Transportation Commission Re: Tolling on I-5</p> <p>The current proposal to add tolls to Interstate 5 with the north terminus at the Alberta/Going exit or any other exit south of the Interstate bridge would have significant negative impacts on North Portland. The Overlook Neighborhood, which is the location of the Alberta/Going exit, urges the Oregon Transportation Commission and Oregon Department of Transportation to pursue the City of Portland’s request to implement systemwide tolling rather than a phased approach. If a phased approach is necessary, the northern terminus on I-5 should be set at the Interstate bridge to prevent diversion into neighborhoods. No matter the approach, robust mitigation measures must be studied and developed prior to committing to a plan.</p> <p>North Portland is often called the forgotten fifth quadrant and has historically been treated shabbily by the city. Neighborhoods are still recovering from gentrification and the discriminatory housing practices of decades past. Compared to the rest of the city, residents on North Portland on average have lower income, are more diverse, younger, more likely to rent and more reliance on a car to get around. Washington commuters already divert onto the main arteries of North Portland after they cross the bridge. Interstate, Going, MLK and other routes are congested with all of the negative effects associated with traffic, including pollution and safety. Confronted with tolls, more drivers would choose to divert into the neighborhoods, and residential streets could soon see a rapid increase in cut-through traffic.</p> <p>The Portland Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee’s recommendations offer the Pollyannaish theory that when traffic flows more smoothly, drivers will happily get back on the highway. Where do they think that traffic will have gone? Meanwhile, the recommendations offer no serious solutions to how to prevent an exodus into North Portland neighborhoods every morning and afternoon.</p> <p>Residents of North Portland also would pay tolls more than residents of wealthier</p>	Christian Trejbal	OTC meeting written comment





	<p>neighborhoods simply because they live in the wrong part of town. Indeed, under the proposal, simply getting on I-5 at Alberta/Going for the few hundred yards to reach the Fremont Bridge and I-405 could incur costs. Strong plans to ensure equity and social justice is essential.</p> <p>It is incumbent on ODOT and the OTC to mitigate such disproportionate impacts on a part of the city that already has had more than its share of poor treatment by government. The best approach is to spread tolls equitably throughout the system. Next best would be to ensure diversion is not an option to avoid the tolls by beginning them at the Interstate Bridge.</p> <p>At a minimum, however, before committing to a tolling system on I-5, it is incumbent on ODOT and the OTC to determine if a robust mitigation strategy is even possible. Committing to tolls and only then developing mitigation and equity measures could doom North Portland to an inadequate plan once the ball is already rolling.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Christian Trejbal Overlook Neighborhood Association, Chair</p>		
07/12	<p>Candidate for the 35th District of the House of Representatives of Oregon Three minute summery Bob Niemeyer a. Professional Mechanical Engineer b. My company is New Ventures Engineering Been doing some analysis of the equipment costs a. Mechanical cost of equipment b. Software cost c. Software maintenance and licensing cost d. Cost associated with collecting tolls e. Realistically the total is well over \$300 million to get started Oregon will not see any money for the roads for at least 5 years Will there ever be a requirement to produce the money for the roads? Will there be an exit clause that says that if the toll collection costs are more than 50% of the tolls, will the toll roads be shut down? Personally will stand against tolls in Oregon a. Grew up in Oregon b. Tolls just do not belong here c. Tolls are just another money grab Big issue of Privacy</p> <p>I will NOT stand for toll roads in Oregon. There is no power anyplace, anywhere, or anytime that will change my mind on allowing toll roads in Oregon. This in one, of many, of the more important reasons that I am running for the 35th district of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon. Value Pricing is a hoax perpetrated on the wallets of Oregonians and is really a way to hide the fact that Democrat Party Leadership will not do anything about getting our fuel tax dollars spent on roads instead of increasing the size of government to better control our lives, our travel, and our freedoms. Below is an outline of the reasons against toll roads. There are so many reasons that if they were all written out, no one would ever read them all. What makes anybody think that the money collected will go to roads?: a. Virtually no guarantees that the money will not go to light rail instead, or worse, to the general fund . i. There is no way that anybody, anywhere, anytime will be able to convince me that the State will not decide that the people driving could be better served by forcing them to ride a train instead of driving. ii. Even if this were made a Constitutional Amendment that the money will only be for</p>	Bob Niemeyer	OTC meeting written comment

roads (Oh wait, there is one), we have all seen that there is always a way around that pesky Constitution. And remember that the Oregon Legislature found a way to unconstitutionally borrow money to "Fix Our Roads" instead of going with the cash flow of the gasoline taxes as they were collected.

- iii. Do you really BELIEVE that the government will not find a way to spend the money elsewhere?
- iv. Do you BELIEVE the money will NOT just go to PERS instead?
- v. \$1 billion per mile for light rail. That would be far better spent on roads that follow the expansion of where the citizens of Oregon live and work.
- vi. At \$1 billion per mile, there is a lot of people getting a piece of the action than we will ever be allowed to know.
- vii. Talk of 16¢ per gallon, is somehow slated to go to the general fund as part of the toll road bill.

This is just a foothold to spending the money on whatever the government wants to.

- b. Just another temptation for the Legislature to spend the money elsewhere.
  - i. Just feeding the addiction of spending other people's money.
  - c. Need the money for roads?
    - i. Same old excuse to cover wasted tax dollars and the Democrat Party Leadership's steadfast refusal to reduce the size of government.
    - d. Taxing authority handed over to yet another Administrative Law branch of government?
      - i. The Legislature will give the authority to the newly created toll road branch of government.
        - ii. Government's idea of pricing will be far different than people's ability to pay.
    - e. Who is going to pay for the Sensors along-side the roads?
      - i. Not too long ago, there was a series of questions about these stainless steel monoliths being installed in various places on the east coast. These were the tracking sensors.
        - ii. Once again, the people of Oregon are going to pay money to out of state companies for something we really do not want.
          - ii. This is really an east coast company juggernaut turning the people's freedom and privacy into dollars in their pockets far before the dollars collected are turned in revenue for the State.
    - f. What are the tax ramifications of paying tolls?
      - i. Will be able to deduct the cost of tolls in my business?
      - ii. Will be able to deduct the cost of tolls from my personal income?

Tracking and Privacy:

- a. The technology that is being talked about for the collecting the tolls is going to be a device that gets installed into your car.
  - i. Who does the installation and who pays for this is anybody's guess at this point in time.
  - ii. We must ask also, who gets paid to install the tracking device into your car? State authorized installers?
  - iii. Does everybody in the state have to get the device just because you might drive around Highway 2057
- b. The tracking device, they say, will only look at when the tracking device crosses over check points on the roads.
  - i. Sensors will be added to detect and record your car going past.
  - ii. Those tracking devices and sensors will work but can be better accomplished with GPS.
  - c. The tracking could be accomplished by a Global Positioning System (GPS) device that can be sensed as you pass by or could be used to track your car anywhere on earth.
    - i. Those tracking devices and sensors will work but can be better accomplished with GPS.



ii. You can get GPS locators to find your stolen bicycle.  
We would be giving a powerful tool to a power crazed, power hungry, and power wielding government.

a. Do not underestimate for one minute that the government(s) of today would not have already thought of the power that tolls and tracking could bring to bear on the People of Oregon and America

b. We have all heard about hackers being able to turn off your car. The government will be able to do the same thing.

Expansion and Privacy:

a. Expansion of the system to collect money for where ever you go will happen. IT WILL BE EXPANDED TO EVERYWHERE!

i. The State will be able to know where and when you travel to any place.

ii. The State will be able to collect information on you that could be used for something other than collecting tolls. i.e. Advertisement

iii. The system will be expanded to know where and when you travel even if the State does not collect revenues outside the zones that the system was intended.

iv. The cost of expanding the system will consume the revenues that was intended for use to build the roads that were promised.

b. How is the State going to collect the money?

i. Need a bank account or credit card just to drive?

ii. Can the State destroy your life for not paying the bill on time? Take your car? Jail? Turn you into a felon and be able to take away your rights? Turn off your car from space like hackers can?

c. Could the sensors be used to collect money when you go to State Parks?

i. There are so many other applications for the use of the sensors that the expansion for use elsewhere could not be contained.

Can the tolls system be used to police the roads and issue a ticket for speeding?:

a. If you pass checkpoint 1 and then pass checkpoint 2 that is 10 miles away and there is only 5 minutes between the time you passed the two checkpoints, will the system tell the police that the you were driving at 120 mile per hour?

i. Can that data be used to issue citations for speeding?

ii. The world already has a problem with hackers. This would be a form of "Cyber-Police" that could be used and misused far before any fixes to that kind of problem would be taken care of.

b. Facing your accuser will be impossible.

i. The accuser will be nothing more than a computer.

c. Sensors could be used to collect parking information.

i. Overstay your time and you could be sent a ticket.

Exceptions granted. Something our Democrat Party Leadership Controlled Legislature loves to do:

a. As we have all seen, there will be a push within a very short time to grant exceptions to having to pay the tolls.

b. Usual exception for government employees. Just keep an eye on state motor pool vehicles.

c. Usual exceptions for low income people would mean that everybody else would have to pay more.

d. Could the tolls you pay wind up on Oregon Tax returns as a deductible item?

e. Exceptions can work both ways.

i. Higher tolls for car pools or company cars or trucks.

ii. If tolls are the responsible thing to do, then car pools should be free. Kind of like the HOV lanes were intended to get people to share rides.

f. Always remember that for every exception granted, there will be a State agency

with lots of State employees to keep track of and administer the exceptions.

i. Paying State employees to keep track of exception granted will make sure that the money collected will not go to the roads as promised.

Corruption Opportunities:

a. The information for where and when you drive is valuable to advertisers.

i. Advertisement that can be tailored just for you and the car you own.

ii. i.e. You will find out that you can buy a coffee cup meant for just your car? Same color as your car? Maybe even monogrammed?

iii. What about your name printed on a beach towel because you seem to frequently go to the coast?

iv. Someone, someplace, somewhere in government will sell that information under the table.

b. Deals behind closed doors with auto companies and tracking device manufacturers.

i. You can get GPS locators to find you stolen bicycle at a low enough cost that you can use your phone to find your property.

ii. By the time the government buys the same technology, the cost of the device will be at least 100 times more.

Who gets paid to install the tracking device? How much will it really cost?

c. The expansion cost of the system will consume the money collected for the roads.

i. The companies that will be charged with development of the computers, software, and hardware will be the same people that gave us the health care disaster.

d. The Sensors necessary to keep tabs on your whereabouts are being used on the east coast of America right now.

i. Once again, Oregon will be paying out-of-state companies to come to Oregon to install the unnecessary technology. Just like Oracle, the State of Oregon will get involved and mess things up and force the cost way up and out of control.

ii. Money will go to back-east companies for hardware, software, maintenance and support.

iii. Money will go the government employees to run the system.

iv. Most if not all of the tolls collected and probably a good deal of extra money will be needed to get the system working.

e. Can a criminal get his hands on a sensor or a simple phone app that would allow the criminal to detect where a car may have come from and be able to assess the likelihood of valuables being in your car?

No exit clause:

a. What if the system proves to be a failure?

i. Always remember that there is no cost great enough to the People of Oregon that will cause the government to admit it was wrong about doing anything.

ii. What if the dollars collected are consumed by the system instead of going to the counties for road maintenance and new construction? What percent is acceptable before someone can say "shut it down"?

iii. My guess is that less than 20% of the revenues collected will be sent out to the Counties.

Privacy:

a. I can-NOT stress this point enough!

i. Do you want the State to know everything about where and when you travel?

b. Is the state so starved for money that the information could be sold to people that would then tailor advertisement for you and your car?

i. Maybe monogrammed coffee cup that matches the fabric inside the car.

c. Tracking your whereabouts may not always be used for tolls, but the information



can and will be used against you.

i. What if you go to the beach? Will there be a tax collected because you went to a State Park?

d. Can a criminal with a sensor of their own that can tell where your car came from be used to determine if there could be are more valuables available to steal from your car?

e. What if you go out of state? Can the tracking be used to collect money in another state for another state?

i. Could the information also be given or sold to the Federal Government?

ii. Would other states that have toll roads be able to collect money from you for driving in their States?

What about the congestion on all of the side streets that would result from people not wanting to pay the toll?  
The cost will be high.

a. I Heard some estimates of \$8.00 to drive on 205 during peak hours of the mystical "Value Pricing" tolling system.

b. Would create a new taxing authority in Oregon that would be granted the ability to increase the tolls without voter approval.

i. Yes, our Legislature has been granting taxing authority to unelected bureaucratic entities to do the Legislature's Constitutionally required job of being the only taxing authority.

Miscellaneous:

a. DVM

i. Will they be charging a fee to make sure that your tracking device is working?

ii. When you get the DEQ check, will part of the inspection be installing a new battery into the tracking device? At what cost?

b. Radiation

i. If the tracking device is one that does not need a battery, then the amount of power that is needed to energize the tracker will be very large and aimed right at your car and you.

What I believe we should do:  
Traffic used to be measured around the State with counters that are able to sense when a car goes by. That is what the little rubber tubes are you see now and then stretch across the road. Or in the case of some freeways, they look like a short speed bump in the middle of each lane.  
An allocation system to return the dollars to the Counties where the fuel was consumed.

a. The volume of traffic would be used to allocate the road funds as they follow the expansion of where people live.

b. Average dollars per mile collected via gasoline taxes would then be assigned to the location of the roads being used by the Counties.

i. Yes, you could call this a County Entitlement System.

c. Take the allocation of funds out of the hands of the legislature and into the hands of something like a "Secretary of Transportation<sup>11</sup> with the authority to send the money back to the counties.

i. The only Legislative control allowed would be the percent taken away for other projects such as a new Columbia River Bridge. A percentage that would be out in the open for all of the People to see.

How to handle Electric Cars:

a. One time flat rate on the purchase of an electric car that covers the road cost for the life of the car.

i. Assuming about 25 miles per gallon and 150,000 life on a car, 6000 gallons of fuel

	<p>would be consumed by a fuel burning car.</p> <p>ii. At 31C per gallon, that comes to \$1860 of taxes. Tacking that on to an electric car tax, and only one time is a good way to go. No government paid employees out to collect the taxes.</p> <p>b. A drawback to this is getting the State to put these dollars someplace that would grow and pay into the road funds for the long term.</p> <p>c. Does anybody believe that could ever be done?</p> <p>d. You pay taxes on the electricity you use as well!</p> <p>e. Maybe the road tax should be based on the batteries and their replacement as they wear out.</p> <p>There are out-of-state companies working their way across America that already have their hands in the coffers of tolls system in the United States. Why should Oregon have to become another? The answer: Because the Democratic Party Leadership will continue to tax Oregonians out of existence before they will even consider cutting back on the size of government. And do not forget PERS. The all-consuming revenue sinkhole that the Democrat Party Leadership has refused to do anything about for more than 20 years!</p> <p>We have one of the highest gasoline taxes in the Nation. If the money could just get to the roads again, this State would be in great shape.</p> <p>Bob Niemeyer June 6, 2018</p>		
07/12	<p>Testimony of Doug Allen to Oregon Transportation Commission about Value Pricing. July 12, 2018</p> <p>Please implement value pricing on the entire Portland area freeway system.</p> <p>Your value pricing consultants have delivered a clear message that the fairest, most effective, and most beneficial approach is to set tolls as the lowest level needed to keep the freeways moving, and apply pricing on all lanes broadly across the freeway system.</p> <p>You should implement value pricing as soon as possible, in order to help deal with the current traffic mess, and spend some of the revenue on better transit service. The Value Pricing Committee and consultants did great work, but they missed the boat on implementation and providing transit alternatives. Their recommendations to price limited segments of I-5 and I-205, as pilot projects, are not the way to move the program ahead. Stretching development out over a number of years is just not acceptable.</p> <p>Instead, you should direct the Department and consultants to investigate the potential for rolling out value pricing one on-ramp at a time, just as you did in the past with ramp meters. Our ramp meters need to be upgraded anyway regardless of what tolling scheme you choose. They lack the intelligence to properly sense bunching and gaps in traffic and properly time vehicle entry. The key to avoiding hyper-congestion is to feed vehicles onto the system so that they don't overwhelm it. Value pricing without intelligent metering won't give you maximum operational benefit.</p> <p>Install the tolling infrastructure at the same time that each ramp is upgraded. Start with a limited, controlled rollout in which unforeseen problems won't cause a major failure, and can be easily corrected.</p> <p>Eventually, main-line sections of the freeway can be priced in order to charge people entering from outside the region, and even to charge based in part on distance, if that turns out to be appropriate.</p> <p>In the short run, however, there may be a set of strategically located on-ramps where tolling for short peak periods will give you a high return on investment during the initial period when the public is becoming familiar with the system.</p> <p>By combining an investment in smarter ramp meters with value pricing, Oregon will</p>	Doug Allen	OTC meeting written comment



	<p>have a good argument for why the Federal Highway Administration should allow this innovative approach to rapidly move forward.</p> <p>Regarding transit alternatives, I will ask you what the Committee failed to ask: Please provide leadership in educating the Legislature and public why Oregon's Constitution needs to be fixed so that tolling revenue can be spent, at least in part, on providing better and more attractive transit service.</p> <p>Douglass R. Allen (Address)</p>		
07/12	<p>Paul O. Edgar (Address) (Email)</p> <p>A long time ago a very powerful head of ODOT planned an Mt Hood Freeway that was to have run along what is Powell Blvd and they just started buying up land, as people and our community were asleep. It was in a time period when the I-205 Corridor was also being slashed through the east side of Portland and Clackamas County and the citizenry came awake and asked is that what we truly want. It just seems to me as I remember the beginning of where Citizens Involvement took off to another level. Oregon is known for citizens who get involved. The good and bad got sorted out and the Mt. Hood Freeway was KILLED and the I-205 Corridor and route were set in stone and us as citizens found that with our involvement, we can make things better.</p> <p>To me, it is time again for the Citizens to Bring Some Intelligence to this Discussion, of what is Right or Wrong about this plan to "TOLL" the I-5 and I-205 Corridors. We need some Critical Thinking where our Values and Judgement of the Rights and Wrongs are laid out and quantified as to what is in our best interest.</p> <p>Are we going to go along with what the Oregon Legislature and the Oregon Transportation Commission have planned for us? Do we agree with the Transportation Planner see as the best solutions and best places to invest our resources? We all know that congestion on our Roads and Highway is terrible and from what I hear the community in the Portland/Metro Region wants solutions to this congestion. We need the bottle necks and choke points removed.</p> <p>Is this the real solution to solve our Congestion Problems by pricing people out of their cars through TOLLING (Value Pricing) and attempting to get drivers and the commuting public to do something else other than use these critical transportation corridor and add to congestion?</p> <p>So what are the other things the drivers and commuting public can do and what are the positive and negative impacts?</p> <p>To me the first thing the Public Can Do is to "Organize the Citizenry" like long ago, and demand that the needs of our Roads and Highways become the highest priority, to where those investments with our Transportation Dollars, ensure that we get a reasonable Return on Investment. We are not seeing that right now!</p> <p>We must get more involved into the setting of the details of those prioritizations, to ensure that All Purpose Transportation Dollars are invested, that provide more than just a reasonable Return on Investment, but ensure that we are achieving the type of Transportation System that is critical to sustaining the greater needs of people and businesses, that rely on them.</p> <p>We have to tell the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Legislature that we are not in agreement with the prioritizations in ODOT Region 1. For multiple decades the totality of All Purpose Transportation Investment Dollars have disproportionately gone to everything else, than our Roads and Highways.</p> <p>Greater Prioritization with our Transportation Investments Dollars need to fund out other projects without the use of "TOLLS" that achieve quantifiable Returns on Investment. We need to consider repurposing the significant amount of Transit Investment Dollars into other areas and systems that have a proven ability to solve problems and reflect the needed Return on those Investment Dollars. The example is ending the SW Corridor Light Rail Project that is gobbling up the attention of the staffs of too many organizations and taking away far too much of Critical Transportation Investment Dollars. The estimated \$3 Billion Dollars does not have a positive effect in solving our congestion in ODOT Region One. The SW Corridor Light Rail Line/Project provides</p>	Paul Edgar	OTC meeting written comment

	<p>virtually No Return on Investment.</p> <p>We need to end the congestion problems in the I-5 and I-205 corridors and have major positive effects and not bring about negative effects on our arterial like Barber Blvd, OR 43, Interstate Blvd and MLK from diversion.</p> <p>We should not be doing anything that does not have any "ROI" or responsible justification.</p> <p>Some people in high places believe tha the people of Clackamas County, West Linn, and Oregon City will just get "ROLLED" if we do not do anything. Our economic partners and the poeple of SW Washington will be equally "ROLLED" with the unjustified "TOLLING" of the I-5 and I-205 Corridor.</p> <p>The many people that I advocate for who are of limited means, who are working hard to keep their heads above the water and this "TOLLING" will be a Back Breaker and something that they cannot afford. These are the poor people who will be hurt the most.</p> <p>Those who want a high quality of life, will also be hurt with their inability to control the "NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS OF TOLLING" as with the unacceptable impacts it will have on their daily lives with the diversions that will happen with their Neighborhoods, Arterials and Transportation Corridors.</p> <p>Metro/JPACT is taking money right now for the ill-conceived SW Corridor Light Rail Line Project. This is projected to be a financial loser that will never-ever break even. The long term projects are for the Light Rail and Commuter Rail Systems to lose and lose money, estimated to be in the Millions and Millions of Dollars each month. The TriMet Light Rail System is estimated to continue to achieve only an approximate 1% of the total overall Incidents of Travel (Trips) generated in ODOT Region One. It has been estimated that TriMet is only achieving approximately 3% of the overall of Incidents of Travel generated in ODOT Region One. How much money has been invested in Light Rail and Commuter Rail Systems and what is the per rider cost of providing this Mode/Type of travel connectivity.</p> <p>We in ODOT Region One do not need another noose around our necks, which will have to be made up with more new Taxes, Fees and Tolls.</p> <p>To me what we need to have happen is for greater justification for all projects with voter approval of all of the Metro/JPACT investments. The Public needs to agree with the prioritizations of line items like this new MAX Light Rail Line or if that money (\$3 Billion Dollars) should be put to a greater use. Would we all be better off if that money was invested adding the necessary capacity to our roads and highways. To me, we need to all step up and let everyone know we can live with the congestion that they have caused. I just don't like to be Socially Engineered by these designers of what they perceive as their perfect world.</p>		
07/12	<p>Robert Stowell (Address) (Phone Number)</p> <p>I just don't understand why you and other governing bodies can't seem to grasp the idea that those of us who live on a limited income or fixed income just don't have extra money in our pockets. I received a \$10.00 raise in Social Security and the B Coverage ate up most of that. Gas prices and everything else has gone up too. We have less money now to live on than we did a year ago.</p> <p>I have attended a couple of your presentations and have come away with little interest shown to my concerns.</p> <p>Your plan to toll the Abernathy Bridge is ridiculous. The traffic on the old West Linn/Oregon City Bridge will increase and overload the streets in Oregon City. This will also impact the surface streets of West Linn and Gladstone. All of Doctors and Hospital (Kaiser) are on the eastside of the river. Also a lot of our shopping is done on the eastside of the river—Clackamas Town Center, Oregon City Shopping Center, etc, etc.</p> <p>I would suggest tolling the two inter most lanes and leave the outside lane alone between West Linn and Oregon City until another lane is added going north on the bridge.</p> <p>I would suggest until income catches up with price raises be careful what you are doing to us.</p>	Bob Stowell	OTC meeting written comment





07/12	<p>I. THE CONGESTION PROBLEM Costs of Traffic Congestion Growing congestion in the U.S. transportation network poses a substantial threat to the U.S. economy and to the quality of life of millions of Americans. According to the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI), in 2003, congestion in the top 85 U.S. urban areas caused 3.7 billion hours of travel delay and 2.3 billions gallons of wasted fuel, for a total cost of \$63 billion. This figure would be substantially higher (perhaps almost triple) if it accounted for the significant cost of growing system unreliability and unpredictability to drivers and businesses, the environmental impacts of idle-related auto emissions, or higher gasoline prices. In the 10 most congested areas, each rush hour traveler "pays" an annual "congestion tax" of between \$850 and \$1,600 in lost time and fuel and spends the equivalent of almost 8 workdays each year stuck in traffic.</p> <p>Alarming Trends Highway congestion has increased dramatically over the past two decades. Between 1982 and 2003, U.S. highway congestion has increased in extent, duration, and intensity. In 2003, in the largest U.S. cities, highway congestion :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Impacted 67% of travel (up from 33% in 1982);</li><li>• Lasted 7 hours per day in duration (up from 4.5 hours in 1982); and</li><li>• Added an additional 37% to the length of the average rush hour driver's trip (up from 13% in 1982).</li></ul> <p>Congestion is also growing rapidly in small and medium-sized metropolitan areas. Based on current trends, a medium-sized city should expect its congestion in 10 years to be as bad, or worse than, that currently experienced by a large city. The rate of congestion growth has been greater in rural than in urban areas, portending increased congestion in communities of all sizes.</p> <p>Causes Of Congestion At its most fundamental level, highway congestion is caused by the lack of a mechanism to efficiently manage use of capacity. When searching for a solution to the congestion problem, most people immediately think of adding a new lane to an overburdened highway. Construction costs for adding lanes in urban areas average \$10 million per lane mile. Generally, the funding for this construction comes from the tax that drivers pay when buying gas for their vehicles. Overall, funds generated from gas taxes on an added lane during rush hours amount to only \$60,000 a year. This amount is grossly insufficient to pay for the lane addition. The bargain price paid by motorists for use of expensive new capacity encourages more drivers to use the expanded highway. Introducing congestion pricing on highway facilities discourages overuse during rush hours by motivating people to travel by other modes such as car pools or transit, or by traveling at other times of the day.</p> <p>II. WHAT IS CONGESTION PRICING? Transponders are read by overhead antennas, allowing tolls to be paid without stopping</p> <p>Congestion pricing - sometimes called value pricing - is a way of harnessing the power of the market to reduce the waste associated with traffic congestion. Congestion pricing works by shifting purely discretionary rush hour highway travel to other transportation modes or to offpeak periods, taking advantage of the fact that the majority of rush hour drivers on a typical urban highway are not commuters. By removing a fraction (even as small as 5%) of the vehicles from a congested roadway, pricing enables the system to flow much more efficiently, allowing more cars to move through the same physical space. Similar variable charges have been successfully utilized in other industries- for example, airline tickets, cell phone rates, and electricity rates. There is a consensus among economists that congestion pricing represents the single most viable and sustainable approach to reducing traffic congestion. Although drivers unfamiliar with the concept initially have questions and concerns, surveys show that drivers more experienced with congestion pricing support it because it offers them a reliable trip time, which is very valuable especially when they have to be somewhere on time. Transit and ridesharing advocates appreciate the ability of congestion pricing to generate both funding and incentives to make transit and ridesharing more attractive.</p> <p>Effects of Pricing on Vehicle Throughput Vehicle "throughput" on a freeway is the number of vehicles that get through over a short period such as an hour. Once freeway traffic exceeds a certain threshold level, both vehicle speed and vehicle throughput drop precipitously. Data show that maximum vehicle throughput occurs at free flow speeds ranging from 45 mph to 65 mph. The number of vehicles that get through per hour can drop by as much as 50 percent when severe congestion sets in. At high traffic levels, the freeway is kept in this condition of "collapse" for several hours</p>	OTC meeting written comment
-------	---	-----------------------------

after the rush of commuters has stopped. This causes further unnecessary delay for off-peak motorists who arrive after rush hour.

With peak-period highway pricing, a variable toll dissuades some motorists from entering freeways at those access points where traffic demand is high, and where such surges in demand may push the freeway over the critical threshold at which traffic flow collapses. Pricing prevents a breakdown of traffic flow in the first instance, and thus maintains a high level of vehicle throughput throughout the rush hours. As shown in the graph above, each variably priced lane in the median of State Route 91 in Orange County, California, carries twice as many vehicles per lane as the free lanes during the hour with heaviest traffic. Pricing has allowed twice as many vehicles to be served per lane at three to four times the speed on the free lanes.

- Variably priced lanes, involving variable tolls on separated lanes within a highway, such as Express Toll Lanes or HOT Lanes, i.e. High Occupancy Toll lanes
- Variable tolls on entire roadways - both on toll roads and bridges, as well as on existing toll-free facilities during rush hours
- Cordon charges - either variable or fixed charges to drive within or into a congested area within a city
- Area-wide charges - per-mile charges on all roads within an area that may vary by level of congestion

**Technology for Congestion Pricing** With congestion pricing, tolls typically vary by time of day and are collected at highway speeds using electronic toll collection technology. Traffic flows freely, and there are no toll booths. Vehicles are equipped with electronic devices called transponders or "tags", which are read by overhead antennas. Toll rates for different time periods may be set in advance, or they may be set "dynamically" - that is, they may be increased or decreased every few minutes to ensure that the lanes are fully utilized without a breakdown in traffic flow.

Tags range from simple to highly sophisticated devices. Simple tags are "read-only," meaning that they can provide an identification number to overhead readers using power from incoming radio frequency energy. More sophisticated tags are battery-powered, and have processing power and memory. Tags are now the normal way tolls are collected from regular users- 70 to 80 percent of tolls are now collected this way on most urban commuter toll roads in peak hours. Simple "sticker" tags may be obtained for less than \$10.

Global Positioning Systems (GPS) are used to collect truck tolls in Germany on the autobahns. In tests of such systems in the United States, an in-vehicle device records charges incurred based on its location as identified by the GPS unit in the vehicle. All location and payment information remains in the vehicle, and the vehicle owner periodically uploads the summary of charges to a processing center along with payments. The costs of such systems are currently high - as much as \$500 per vehicle in Germany. Their high costs can be justified by additional services provided by the systems, such as in-vehicle navigation and commercial fleet management. Also, the need for roadside equipment for toll collection is reduced.

Cameras are an essential complement to tags and GPS units to gain a record of the identity of vehicles that don't have a working tag or GPS unit. Cameras can be used to deter toll violators. This is known as "video enforcement." In cases where a tag is required for use of a facility, camera images allow a follow-up of violators and imposition of a penalty. Use of a toll facility may be permitted without a tag or GPS unit. In this case, a camera-based system is used to collect what is termed a video toll. This toll includes the additional costs for administration. Cameras are being improved steadily in their capabilities and some believe that very soon toll operators could rely entirely on video tolling.

**Flat tolls, "stepped" variable tolls, and "dynamic" tolls** The first roads in the United States and in many other countries were toll roads. In these cases, toll rates were fixed at a flat rate, since their purpose was to raise revenue, not to manage demand. If tolls are to be used to manage demand, they must vary by the level of demand. They may be set in advance by time of day, based on traffic volumes observed - during the past week, month, or quarter. In each case, the toll schedule may appear as a "stepped" form, as shown below.

Tolls to manage demand may also be set "dynamically." Under this approach, a maximum toll rate may be specified in advance for selected time periods (see schedule for I-15 HOT lanes shown below), but actual tolls typically vary below the



maximum based on real-time traffic observed on the facility. While a driver knows the maximum rate that can be charged, actual rates (which are generally lower) are known to him or her only a few minutes in advance of approaching the priced facility. The driver can then choose to use the priced facility or continue to use toll-free facilities.

**Variably Priced Lanes** Variably priced lanes include Express Toll lanes and HOT lanes. "HOT" is the acronym for "High Occupancy Toll." On HOT lanes, low occupancy vehicles are charged a toll, while High Occupancy Vehicles (HOVs), public transit buses and emergency vehicles are allowed to use the lanes free of charge or at reduced rates. HOT lanes create an additional category of eligibility to use HOV lanes. People can meet the minimum vehicle passenger requirement- or they can choose to pay a toll to gain access to the HOV lane.

With citizens growing more frustrated with under-used HOV lanes, HOT lanes are increasingly being viewed as a solution that can reduce public opposition to HOV lanes. Surveys show that low-income commuters express a high level of support for having a priced express lane option. This is valuable when they absolutely must get somewhere on time. In places like San Diego, support from low-income travelers is over 70 percent. Low-income commuters also benefit from toll-financed transit improvements.

Express Toll lanes are similar to HOT lanes. The difference is that all vehicles are required to pay a toll- HOVs do not get free service. This makes enforcement of toll-cheaters much easier. However, many travelers still have an incentive to carpool. By sharing the ride, each person in a two-person carpool pays only half the price, while each commuter in a four-person carpool only pays one-fourth.

**Variable Tolls on Roadways** With this type of pricing, flat toll rates on existing toll roads are changed to a variable toll schedule so that the toll is higher during peak travel hours and lower during off-peak or shoulder hours. This encourages motorists to use the roadway during less congested periods, and allows traffic to flow more freely during peak times. Peak toll rates may be high enough to guarantee that traffic flow will not break down, thus offering motorists a reliable and congestion-free trip in exchange for the higher peak toll.

Variable tolls can also be introduced on existing toll-free facilities to manage traffic flow. Again, tolls vary by time of day and are charged only on congested highway segments to manage traffic flow and recover the highway's capacity to carry the number of vehicles it was designed for. The most efficient way to operate our freeways is to prevent congestion and keep traffic moving freely. When traffic flow collapses under congested conditions, capacity is lost (see box at right). By preventing congestion, pricing recovers this daily waste of public investment that occurs on congested highways.

Real life examples show the impacts of pricing. In Ft. Myers, Florida, a 50 percent discount on the toll was offered on the Midpoint and Cape Coral bridges for a short period of time before and after the rush hours. Survey data revealed that, among those eligible for the discount, there was an increase in traffic of as much as 20 percent during the discount period before the morning rush hours, with corresponding drops in the rush hour itself.

**Cordon Pricing** Cordon pricing involves charging a fee to enter or drive within a congested area, usually a city center. Singapore introduced the first such pricing scheme in 1975 using low-tech daily charges. In 1998, the city shifted to a fully automated electronic charging system. In 2003, a cordon pricing scheme was introduced in central London. A similar scheme functioned in central Stockholm on a trial basis in 2006 from January through July.

**Area-wide Pricing** The State of Oregon is currently testing a pricing scheme involving per-mile charges, which it will consider using as a replacement for fuel taxes in the future. A congestion pricing component is being tested, with higher charges during congested periods on high traffic road segments. The Puget Sound Regional Council has been testing the travel behavior impacts of a similar charging system in the

Seattle metropolitan area during 2005-2006. Charges are based on the type of facility being used and its level of congestion.

Use of Revenues from Pricing Congestion pricing can generate substantial revenues from tolls. A portion of the revenues generated will be needed to operate the toll collection and traffic management systems. Net revenues after payment of operating costs can be used to pay for expansion of roadway facilities, to support alternatives to driving alone such as public transit, to address impacts on low-income individuals by providing toll discounts or credits, or to reduce other taxes that motorists pay for highways such as fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees or sales taxes.

III. BENEFITS OF CONGESTION PRICING Congestion pricing benefits drivers and businesses by reducing delays and stress, by increasing the predictability of trip times, and by allowing for more deliveries per hour. It benefits mass transit by improving transit speeds and the reliability of transit service, increasing transit ridership, and lowering costs for transit providers. It benefits State and local governments by improving the quality of transportation services without tax increases or large capital expenditures, by providing additional revenues for funding transportation, by retaining businesses and expanding the tax base, and by shortening incident response times for emergency personnel and thus saving lives. By preventing the loss of vehicle throughput that results from a breakdown of traffic flow, pricing maximizes return on the public's investment in highway facilities. And it benefits society as a whole by reducing fuel consumption and vehicle emissions, by allowing more efficient land use decisions, by reducing housing market distortions, and by expanding opportunities for civic participation.

Benefits to Transit Riders and Carpoolers Pricing in combination with transit services provides bus riders with travel time savings equivalent to those for drivers, and reduces waiting time for express bus riders due to more frequent service. Introduction of pricing in central London and Stockholm has resulted in significant shifts of commuters to transit, particularly buses. Bus delays in central London dropped by 50 percent after the pricing scheme was introduced. There was a 7 percent increase in bus riders. In Stockholm, 200 new buses were put into service in August 2005, several months in advance of the pricing trial, which began in January 2006. After the pricing scheme was implemented, daily public transportation use compared to the same month in 2005 was up by 40,000 riders daily. Ridership on inner-city bus routes rose 9 percent compared with a year earlier.

Within three months of the opening of the priced express lanes on California's SR-91, a 40 percent jump occurred in the number of vehicles with more than three passengers. Ridership on buses and a nearby rail line have remained steady. On San Diego's I-15 HOT lanes, revenues generated by toll-payers financed transit improvements that contributed to a 25 percent increase in bus ridership.

After the HOV lanes were converted into HOT lanes on I-15 in San Diego, carpooling increased significantly, even though there was no change in incentives to carpool - carpoolers continued to use the lanes free of charge, as they did before the lanes were converted. Similar effects were observed when the HOV lanes on I-25 in Denver were converted to HOT lanes in June 2006. It's not clear why carpooling increases - it could be a result of the extra publicity by the media.

Benefits to Drivers On the State Route 91 priced lanes in Orange County, California, traffic during rush hours moves at over 60 mph, while the traffic in adjacent lanes crawls at average speeds of 15 mph or less. Commuters on the priced express lanes thus save as much as half an hour each way on the 10-mile trip, or as much as an hour a day. If we could use pricing to restore free-flowing traffic conditions on other metropolitan freeways during rush hours, similar results could be achieved. An average commuter using a 5-mile freeway segment twice each day (i.e., once in each direction) would save about half an hour each day, or 120 hours annually - equal to three weeks of work or leisure time! The day-to-day variation in travel times is now understood as a separate component of the public's and business sector's frustration with congestion. An important benefit of pricing is that it guarantees toll-paying vehicles a reliable trip speed and travel time.

Benefits to Businesses Growing congestion and unreliability threatens truck transportation productivity and ultimately the ability of sellers to deliver products to market. Additionally, when deliveries cannot be relied on to arrive on time, businesses



must keep extra "buffer stock" inventory on hand. This can be expensive. Pricing of the nation's major thoroughfares to guarantee free flow of traffic will ensure that reliability is restored to the transportation system, keeping business and transportation costs low. Lower costs will increase the competitiveness of U.S. businesses in international markets and boost the U.S. economy.

IV. EXAMPLES IN THE U.S. HOT Lanes on I-15 in San Diego Since 1998, single-occupant vehicles pay a per-trip fee each time they use the I-15 HOT lanes. Tolls vary "dynamically" with the level of traffic demand on the lanes. Fees vary in 25-cent increments as often as every six minutes to help maintain free-flow traffic conditions on the HOV lanes. The project generates \$2 million in revenue annually, about one-half of which is used to support transit service in the corridor.

SR 91 Express Lanes in Orange County, California The four variably-priced express lanes in the median of the State Route 91 Freeway opened in December 1995. The toll schedule is adjusted every three months based on traffic observed over the three-month period. Speeds are 60 to 65 mph on the express lanes while congestion on the free lanes has reduced average peak hour speeds to no more than 15 to 20 mph. During the peak hour, which occurs on Friday afternoon (5-6 pm) in the eastbound direction, the two "managed" express lanes each carry almost twice as many vehicles per lane than the free lanes, because of the effect of severe congestion on vehicle throughput in the free lanes. Toll revenues have been adequate to pay for construction and operating costs. In fact, in 2003 the private company that had the franchise to build and operate the facility sold the franchise to the Orange County Transportation Authority for a profit.

Bridge Pricing in Lee County, Florida Variable pricing began August 3, 1998, on the Midpoint and Cape Coral toll bridges in Lee County, Florida. Bridge travelers were offered a 50 percent discount on their toll if they traveled during specific discount periods and paid their toll electronically. The discount periods are 6:30 to 7 am, 9 to 11 am, 2 to 4 pm, and 6:30 to 7 pm. This toll structure was developed to encourage drivers to shift from peak periods to off-peak/discount periods.

Oregon Mileage-Based Pricing Test The State of Oregon is studying an approach that would allow area-wide pricing with smaller expenditures on roadside infrastructure. The study is focusing on mileage-based fees and peak-period driving charges designed to reduce traffic during the most congested periods while at the same time raising revenue to replace existing fuel-based fees. GPS-based technology is being tested.

V. EXAMPLES FROM ABROAD Central London On February 17, 2003, London implemented an ambitious plan for using pricing to combat congestion in central London. The scheme involves a standard per-day charge for vehicles traveling within a zone bounded by an inner ring road. The congestion charge, together with improvements in public transit financed with revenues from the charging system, led to a 15 percent reduction in traffic in central London, with no significant displacement to local roads outside the area. The majority of ex-car users have transferred to public transport. Travel delays have been reduced by 30 percent. Excess waiting time on buses has fallen by around one-third. Motorists are currently charged £8 a day to drive within the central city zone between 7 am and 6:30pm on Monday through Friday. Drivers using a vehicle in the central zone pay the charge either in advance or on the day of travel. Drivers are able to pay on a daily, weekly, monthly, or annual basis by telephone, regular mail, Internet, or at retail outlets. The registration numbers of their vehicles are entered into a database. A network of fixed and mobile cameras observes the license plates of vehicles entering or moving within the central zone. There are no tollbooths, gantries or barriers. Drivers do not have to stop. Their license plate numbers are matched against vehicle registration numbers of those who have paid the charge. A number of exemptions from the charging plan are allowed, including a 90 percent discount for residents.

Singapore Traffic congestion was significantly reduced when peak-period pricing was introduced in downtown Singapore during the morning rush hours in 1975. In spring 1998, the city shifted to a fully automated electronic charging system, with in-vehicle electronic devices allowing payment by smart card, and enforcement using cameras and license plate reading equipment. Variable electronic charges were also

introduced on the expressway system, with charges set by time of day to ensure free flow of traffic. The system, the first of its kind in the world, has reduced traffic by 13 percent and increased vehicle speed by 22 percent.

Stockholm City Center Stockholm is the most recent large international city to deploy cordon pricing, in this case on a test basis from January 2006 to July 2006. The "trial" results were very favorable, with public acceptance climbing throughout the trial, from under 30 percent approval before the trial to over 55 percent towards the end. There was an immediate 22 percent drop in vehicle trips, a decrease in travel times, and a large shift to public transit - ridership on inner-city bus routes rose 9 percent. Buses, taxis and distribution vehicles reported reductions in travel times. Traffic accidents involving injuries fell by 5 to 10 percent. Exhaust emissions decreased by 14 percent in the inner-city and 2 to 3 percent in Stockholm County. Residents of the City of Stockholm voted for continuation of the system in a referendum on September 17, 2006. It will be reinstated in 2007.

Nationwide Truck Pricing in Germany In January 2005, Germany implemented a new system to toll trucks on the autobahns. An average user charge of Euro 0.15 per kilometer (about \$0.31 per mile) replaced the previous fees for time-based permits called "Euro Vignette." All trucks with a permissible gross weight of 12 or more tons are charged electronically using Global positioning Systems (GPS). The tolls are based on distance traveled, number of axles, and the vehicle's emissions class. Net toll revenues go toward funding for transportation infrastructure.

VI. FEDERAL POLICY AND PROGRAMS ON PRICING Federal Legislation There are three programs or provisions within the Federal-aid Highway Program that support congestion pricing:

Value Pricing Pilot Program: This program, initially authorized in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in 1991 as the Congestion Pricing Pilot Program, encourages implementation and evaluation of projects encompassing a variety of strategies to manage congestion on highways, including both tolling of highway facilities and other pricing strategies not involving tolls. This is the only program that provides funding.

High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Facilities: This program allows states to charge tolls to vehicles that do not meet the established occupancy requirements to use an HOV lane if the state establishes a program that addresses the selection of vehicles allowed in such lanes and procedures for enforcing the restrictions.

Express Lanes Demonstration Program: This program permits tolling on up to 15 selected demonstration projects to manage congestion, reduce emissions in a non-attainment area, or finance new and existing Interstate lanes for the purposes of reducing congestion. In addition, there are three programs or provisions within the Federal-aid Highway Program that support tolling for the purpose of highway financing:

Interstate System Construction Toll Pilot Program: This program authorizes up to three facilities on the Interstate System to be tolled for the purpose of financing the construction of new Interstate highways.

Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot Program: This program allows up to three existing Interstate facilities (highway, bridge, or tunnel) to be tolled to fund needed reconstruction or rehabilitation on Interstate corridors that could not otherwise be adequately maintained or functionally improved without the collection of tolls.

Title 23 United States Code Section 129 Tolling Agreements: Section 129 allows tolling of non-Interstate highways as well as Interstate bridges and tunnels. There is no limit to the number of agreements that may be executed.

U.S. DOT's Congestion Relief Initiative The U.S. Department of Transportation's Congestion Initiative further focuses the above tolling programs toward the overall goal of relieving congestion. The Department seeks to enter into Urban Partnership Agreements with selected cities, pursuant to which the cities and Department will commit to the following actions: • Implementing a broad congestion pricing or variable toll demonstration; • Creating or expanding express bus services, which will



benefit from free flow traffic conditions; • Securing agreements from major area employers to establish or expand telecommuting and flex scheduling programs; • Encouraging and supporting use of technology to improve the efficiency of operation of the highway system; and • Expediting completion of the most significant highway capacity projects currently underway that hold the greatest potential for reducing congestion and bottlenecks. To the maximum extent possible, the Department will commit discretionary resources and expertise to support the above actions, including potentially transit Small Starts funds, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) funds, and Value Pricing Pilot Program funds. The Department will work to expedite completion of capacity projects through: • Inclusion of such projects on the Executive Order on Environmental Stewardship and Transportation Infrastructure Project Reviews; and • Providing tolling flexibility, private activity bond borrowing authority, and Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program credit assistance, if necessary.

VII. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS How does electronic tolling work? Typically, drivers simply put small electronic tags, called transponders, on the windshield inside their cars. In conjunction with using the transponder, they open an account with a toll operator. Tolls are then collected as the tag is read at normal highway speeds by electronic scanners suspended from gantries above the highway. Motorists ensure adequate funding is available in their accounts by linking their accounts to their credit card accounts or through a quick call, trip to a kiosk or office, or visit to a website. Tags may emit a signal warning consumers when their account is running low, or they are informed through messages beamed to them as they go by a toll collection point.

How does dynamic pricing work? With dynamic pricing, tolls are continually adjusted according to traffic conditions to maintain a free-flowing level of traffic. Under this system, prices increase when the tolled lane(s) get relatively full and decrease when the tolled lane(s) get less full. The current price is displayed on electronic signs prior to the beginning of the tolled section. This system is more complex and less predictable than using a fixed-price table, but its flexibility helps to consistently maintain the optimal traffic flow. Motorists are usually guaranteed that they will not be charged more than a pre-set maximum price under any circumstances.

How do out-of-town motorists who don't have a transponder pay? This is handled in several ways. Of course, clear signage is used to show drivers which lane(s) or route to use to avoid the toll. This avoids most of these kinds of problems. Some systems also allow drivers to pay via credit card after-the-fact by calling a toll-free line. Some project sponsors simply let drivers use the tolled lane(s) at no charge the first few times. For instance, a letter may be sent to a non-paying driver identified based on matching of a photo of license plates with State vehicle registration databases. The letter would explain that if the driver wants to continue to use the facility, he or she should get a tag or risk a fine, but that initial usage is being allowed at no cost. The operator of an all-electronic toll facility in Toronto, Canada, simply bills such motorists for the cost of the toll plus a \$1 administrative fee. Through these kinds of steps, the chances of tourists, occasional visitors, or inadvertent users being penalized are minimized.

Wouldn't electronic tolling invade a motorist's privacy? All of the operating pricing projects in the United States and more than 250 other toll facilities across the country use electronic toll collection (ETC). Tolling agencies have devised a method to protect the public's privacy by linking the transponder and the driver's personal information with a generic, internal account number that does not reveal the driver's identity and that is not disclosed to other organizations. Also, a motorist can open an anonymous account if he or she so chooses.

How much is the charge? Prices will vary from project to project due to supply and demand, as well as other regional factors. If all lanes on an existing toll-free facility are priced, charges will be much lower, because there will be more "supply" of premium free-flowing traffic lanes, thus lowering the market-based price that must be charged to fully utilize the available capacity. Some projects do use a preset schedule of tolls. This has the advantage of being predictable and simple. With dynamic pricing, the toll fee is adjusted in real-time until optimal traffic flow is achieved. For example, the express lane fees

06/25	<p>-Public transit needs to be put in place if a toll is put in place on I-205 via the Max. Moreover, tickets need to be checked and not increased in pricing. I ride the max everyday and have only had my ticket checked 3 times in the last year. I ride with homeless and working class everyday.</p> <p>-Major corporations need to be consulted. This is only going to increase their costs, which increase the burden on its customers. This makes Portland less competitive and less desirable. Providing no alternatives and only increasing costs is not a positive path forward.</p> <p>-Honestly, I love my job. I have the worst commute among most. I travel from Vancouver (I-205 side) to Hillsboro. However, I have not heard of the solution to give those who work in Oregon their income tax back in place of the toll. I receive no benefits from my income tax as a Washington resident, and yet, I still have to pay it. Oregon won't even give Washington residents a reduced income tax. Therefore, the first thing I will do if this toll goes through is, I will be finding a new job in Washington. Oregon won't be getting my income taxes, my labor, my dollars spent on any food or services during work, and/or any of my money.</p> <p>-Has this committee talked to: the Blazers, the Timbers, the Tacoma Port, Seattle Port, Portland Port, Intel, Nike, Precision Carparts, Boeing, Tektronix, Zeros, Columbia Sportswear, Northwest Pipe, WaferTech (Vancouver), etc... and so many more. Just google "Metro Portland's Major Employers -Relocation Guide"</p> <p>-Tolling will kill Jantzen Beach economy and businesses near the airport that depend on Vancouver commuter, both to work and as buyers.</p> <p>-Why doesn't Oregon have funds available for projects?</p> <p>-Why isn't Washington getting funds from these tolls?</p>	Scott Tilgners	PAC meeting written comment
06/26	<p>I'd like to express strong support for option C.</p> <p>Since buses add capacity with no road-widening necessary, I'd like public transit to be implemented as soon as possible.</p> <p>I'd like revenue from tolling aka value pricing to benefit regional public transit - especially buses - to help suburban commuters travel to PDX without needing to drive, and also allow PDX commuters to travel to suburban employers outside cars. I'd like revenue to also go to increased safety on impacted roads experiencing diversion. I'd like to see safer bicycle infrastructure to allow people to continue biking, and also to encourage mode shifts to biking and walking to transit stops.</p> <p>There is more at stake than travel time. Our very environment is at stake, and the earth's climate. If we can protect the health of future generations by relying less on personal automobiles, we absolutely should, and this region stands to be a leader in climate protective policy.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	Ms Fast	PAC meeting written comment
06/26	<p>I object to double taxation of our roads!</p> <p>There are too many problems with this, so called plan, of taking financial advantage of folks who already pay their share of street taxes!</p> <p>I have a much better solution,</p> <p>Tim Haddock</p>	Tim Haddock	PAC meeting written comment
07/12	<p>Hi, my name is Lisa O'Brien. The number is (phone). You can leave a message if I don't answer and I would love a response from the team. I think this whole concept is fine in some places if it would be a horrible idea around Oregon City and I-5 it's so congested already there. It will cause more congestion and other travel options and Alternate Routes are what come through our neighborhood streets when there's an accident on the freeway. I have sat in my neighborhood on the street trying to get out to leave the neighborhood, but I'm unable to as a result of long lines of cars that are taking alternate routes off the freeway. So that's exactly what would happen if this Price value toll on I-5 came through so that's not a solution for us that's going to just destroy our neighborhood and I've been here over 15 years. That's not an alternative that makes me happy. It's not going to make my home more livable and I don't I don't see it as solving the problem. I also don't know what's going to happen with the what is it dollar or \$3 charge to go over the Abernathy Bridge from Oregon City in to Westland at all times of day as I understand it. Where's that money going to go as I understood it. It's going to go back into the roads. But you know, we should have</p>	Lisa O'Brien	Phone





	done some better thinking before we spent billions of dollars on the max line. That's not carrying enough people to these outlying areas. Thank you for listening.		
07/13	<p>Hi, my name is Diane, and I'm a homeowner and I've lived in the Clackamas County area for 26 to 27 years. Anyway, I'm thinking that there's no way that you should have a toll bridge on the Abernathy Bridge until it's actually rebuilt and widened because it's just going to slow down everything and until you do that wait till after you build it and then pay for it after the fact because it's just going to pollute the air. It's going to slow down everybody. Everybody's going to be late and do it during only rush hour and \$3.50 is way too expensive. You should cut that in half. It should be maybe a \$2 in that pays for both ways. There's just no way that anybody can afford that and then it shouldn't even be a toll during any other. Time during the day shouldn't be a dollar during the day at all. It's just it should be free. So I don't know what you're thinking but people in Oregon. This is not a very wealthy State cannot afford that and you should be asking for federal money for a bridge that's not even for earthquake proof. And that should be the basis for asking for federal money. Also the States been growing too fast to accommodate the people that we have and certainly there should be Federal money for that for the Abernathy Bridge. You should be asking more for I-5. So I V toll toll bridge for the influx of people trying to work in, Oregon. While living in Washington, so how about that and do that instead and if you need to contact me. My phone number is (phone). And I just think that you need to really talk to people about this. I've talked to my friends my family my co-workers and nobody agrees to \$3.50 toll bridge during rush hour and it's not even 6 yet. And it may not even go to the Abernathy repairs and then a dollar during all other times. It's just going to cause a lot of pollution and further back up. And all other roads are already backed up, so I don't know what you're possibly thinking. Thank you, bye-bye.</p>	Diane	Phone
07/13	<p>Hi, my comments are directed to the Oregon Transportation Commission fully realizing this is probably a complete waste of my time and effort your plans are imposed on I-5 and 205 will someone negatively affect all the neighborhoods. With people taking alternate routes people that are on the freeway on 205 and I-5 are not going to take a bus. It's just not going to happen. So you people down in Salem it lay awake at night dreaming these ideas up stop. You're just totally making the entire metro area completely unlivable. David Calloway at 503-803-0648, and I don't need to waste any more time. So please don't call me.</p>	David Calloway	Phone