



Portland Area Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis

Summer 2018 Community Engagement Summary Report

Appendix B VERBAL COMMENTS: PAC MEETING #6 (JUNE 27, 2018) AND OTC PUBLIC MEETING (JULY 12, 2018)

Date received	Communication	Contacts	Source
06/25	Portland has the worst congestion in the nation and 35 bottlenecks. You have not told us how ODOT will fix this. We have congestion because we have not increased capacity and our population growth has doubled. Tolling will cause diversion and accidents in the neighborhoods and I feel this entire process has been a sham.	John Ley	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	I have been a longtime (30 years) proponent of congestion pricing. I hope the goal is to maximize vehicle throughput of existing lanes not to maximize revenue; toll rates should be set to do that. Second, I suggest a different option: price all of I-205 from the river to Wilsonville because it is long enough to generate evidence that congestion pricing works and it would leave I-5 unpriced.	John Charles	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	Thank you for your time on this project – it is great work. Another idea: rather than recommending Concept B as an implementation path, look at a variety of ways by starting with an initial subset of entrance ramps. That idea could be expanded and then converted to a mileage-based system. This would be efficient and publicly acceptable. I agree with tolling for operation rather than revenue.	Doug Allen	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	There is no option to price the entirety of I-205. I live in the I-205 corridor, and think this pilot project would benefit the rampant congestion in the area. You would also give tolling authority to end the program if it does not provide results. When people see how well tolling I-205 works, they will be more willing to see it implemented elsewhere in Portland.	Rachel Dawson	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	I want to draw your attention to an aspect of congestion pricing: how value priced roads would benefit the poor. People say it is unfair to make people pay for roads that were once free. However, there are several aspects of the current system that are unfair: the cost of congestion makes a larger dent in a smaller paycheck. Congestion pricing would result in faster commute times for the poor who take transit, and save time and money and reduce auto emissions for those living close to the freeway.	Jakob Puckett	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	I am generally opposed to tolling because the alternatives do not pay their way and motorists subsidize them. The revenue should go to capacity. We need to make the bicyclists pay, and if that includes tolling bicycle lanes, let us do that. We cannot build our way out of this growth. Maybe we ought to look at what Trump is doing and build a wall around Portland or at least divert I-5 around Oregon.	Jerry Puckett	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	Increased capacity could meet our freight needs. Freight is expected to increase by 75 percent by 2030. Population growth is real, too. We do not need a dilemma between capacity and transit. The Western Arterial Route is well studied, would have advantages for freight, commuters and transit and is affordable and provides choices.	Rob Swarren	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	We have serious concerns about diversion into the Overlook neighborhood associated with Concept B. North Portland has higher rates of young, diverse (race and ethnicity), lower income and car-dependent households. Without mitigation, Concept B would place costs on households in the neighborhood and cause safety issues. We are not opposed to tolling, but we are opposed to creating a situation that will cause people to divert into Overlook and North Portland.	Christian Trejbal	PAC meeting verbal comment

06/25	Thank you for your work; West Linn recently had multiple presentations from ODOT. West Linn is going to be greatly impacted. At the ODOT Open House, I got different answers to my question about when and how widening will be paid for. This is a dilemma. I am not anti-tolling, but the PAC needs to put a lot of thought into this and please consider West Linn in the process.	Brenda Perry	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	I am in favor of congestion pricing, although I have concerns about diversion, as a bicyclist. I would like the revenue to go to bus connections, neighborhoods and alternative mode commute routes, which would help alleviate diversion and reduce congestion. In Washington County, renters who are car free must pay for a parking spot and road widenings, which do not benefit them and preserve our climate for future generations.	Naomi Fast	PAC meeting verbal comment
06/25	I cross the bridge and get on the MAX to get to work in Hillsboro from Vancouver. If you toll the bridge, I would have to pay a toll to ride the MAX. A long-term solution is to build another bridge. I do not think big Portland clients – Nike, Intel, banks, trucking – want a toll on federal bridges. Billions of dollars come across that bridge, and tolling will take money away.	Scott Tillman	PAC meeting verbal comment
07/12	Thank you. As a PAC member I appreciate the efforts taken on this project and ODOT and the State's commitment to exploring this issue. After participating in the PAC meetings and learning, I've concluded we should follow the following principles. 1. The purpose of value pricing should be to manage demand, not raise revenue. We all feel the impact of congestion and cost. 2. Reliability matters. Concepts B, C and D do the most for demand management and will have the best results. Long term, we need to explore it in other corridors like Sunset, 217, and I-84. 3. We must improve transit. The successful examples improve transit and mitigate impact on low income and provide choice. They must be explicit in the program purpose and values statement. This must be done with transit in lockstep and not at the end and address safety and diversion on arterials which has impacts to quality of life. 4. We must focus on equity. We must ensure the impact on low income and on people of color is addressed. This will be difficult but can be done.	Jessica Vega Pederson	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	We are in the unfortunate position of sitting aside the bottleneck on I-205. We already have diversion. It's a major issue. There was an accident on the Abernethy Bridge this afternoon, and traffic backed up to the I-5 interchange. I came along Stafford Road today and it was bumper to bumper traffic there. Our streets are not built for this over flow traffic. We have no other options. There are no plans from TriMet to expand our transit. We have one and half buses; that doesn't help. We're a bedroom community, and most of our residents leave the city to work. There are no other freeways for us to take. We either have to take OR-43 or take I-205 to US-99. We don't want to be difficult about this, but we want you to see our issues. There's no money yet to expand. We talk about the extra lane, but there's no money and there won't be for the foreseeable future. We are currently passing ballot measures for ODOT to do the retrofitting of the bridge. We are looking at 3+ years for this work, and yet we desperately need it to be done. We need the bottleneck to be fixed. But we're not sure where the traffic is expected to go. There are no other options or routes. Flexible hours maybe, but I doubt it. We're not in the place like Portland where there are other options. Please consider this when you go forward. This E section will be a problem because people will divert.	Brenda Perry	OTC meeting verbal comment



07/12	<p>My district starts at the Columbia River, extending to Battle Ground and Camas. 40,000 individuals work in Oregon. People don't have a lot of options. There are only two freeways. I did that commute for 15 years and worked on Grand Avenue. I know what diversion looks like and it will happen. As a state representative, I advocate for and don't want to tax Oregon residents in Washington. I feel this is punitive and not fair. I sent a letter with others from in SW Washington. Our gas tax is higher. This is a difficult situation, and I think there are other, more equitable avenues. The people who work here are not making a lot of money and it's a big impact to them. Be cognizant of our communities. If I were driving I-5, I would divert off. I made a lot of money there. Others will look at this. People pay income tax here and don't get much back. They use the roads. You've have that money for years and now you ask my people to pay more for services they are not using.</p>	Paul Harris	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I was actively involved at the committee level on HB 2017 and specifically the congestion reduction committee. I currently serve as Chair of the House Transportation Committee and also authored House Bill 3231 that would have established similar systems to Colorado that are currently providing congestion relief. The miracle of HB 2017 is that it happened at all. It is a miracle that the ultimate amount of \$5 million got the votes from both sides of the aisle. Why do I call this a miracle? Our neighbors don't trust us. I cringe at the likely backlash of tolling without increasing capacity. This backlash will only increase distrust. Every day I talk with someone who is demanding more roads: commuters, farmers, service providers or a manufacturer trying to get the raw goods in and finished goods out. They rely on our roads. It's been argued that value pricing will decrease congestion in two ways: encouraging a change in travel patterns or diverting traffic to local roads. You've already heard why that's a bad idea. Capacity is our only real solution to the issues we face. I appreciate the work that's gone into the report. The I-205 and I-5 core in Portland are good places to start for the tolling experiment, but let's not go down this road until we are clear that this revenue will go to increasing capacity. If we don't, we'll set ourselves back another 30 to 50 years. Commissioner Van Brocklin asked the following question: Representative Vial, I want to clarify your testimony. As I look at House Bill 2017, section 120 reads: "not later than December 31, 2018 the Commission shall seek approval from the FHWA to implement value pricing". After seeking and receiving approval, we would implement. How does that line up with your testimony? I don't see such discretion in this statute. Representative Vial provided this response: I don't think you've got discretion. You've got to come to a conclusion to seek permission to toll some portion of the system by the end of the year. That doesn't mean we'll be able to implement anything then of course. In so doing, if we don't couple that with added capacity, I don't think we've recognized the intent of the legislation. If we were to simply impose a pricing scenario that did not add a lane at the Abernethy Bridge, I think we would be violating the spirit of that. When I hear from the folks from Vancouver, that's precisely what we have to show them. You're getting another lane, you're getting more capacity.</p>	Rich Vial	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>Congestion pricing will reduce congestion over the long haul. Other methods like additional lanes do not work in places around the country where adding lanes just makes them full again in a little while. The direction from the legislature was too limited. The style of congestion pricing that has worked in London and Singapore well is cordon pricing that avoids the problem of diversion to surface streets and raises money for things that reduce congestion like transit and active transportation. If we move forward with the concepts recommended, we're going to need to have robust transit first or the folks that don't get to choose when their shift starts will end up on surface streets. Especially low wage workers on I-205 that can't choose a different time of day and can only divert on surface streets, and those are full already. The next steps should include conversations with Portland and Metro for cordon pricing and a process to use funds for a more robust transit system that will reduce congestion and keep it down.</p>	Mark Gamba	OTC meeting verbal comment

07/12	<p>I'm a member of the Value Pricing PAC. The Vancouver City Council absolutely embraces the need for policymakers and agencies to work together to implement projects within the regional bi-state system. I am going to say that phrase several times because we feel the four counties must work together within this bi-state regional system. We have been working together on the analysis of the regional bi-state transportation system for many years with Metro, JPAC, CTRAN and others to plan and be very thoughtful about the entire system. As we look at regional mitigation, we hope that you continue to realize that this is a bi-state implementation and that all projects have equal applicability to Oregon and Washington. Whether its CTRAN, TriMet, etc., we need to look at all counties for mitigation measures. We realize that the toll revenues will be used to add capacity throughout the region to address bottlenecks and transit. But please realize that the revenue may not be sent over to Washington, so it may take a legislative change to allow this. We do believe in multi-modal improvements. The third piece is to keep us involved in that conversation. The engagement is so important and thank you for including us in the advisory process thus far. The OTC engages so many people that sometimes they forget Washington is part of the system. We're looking to the future including replacing the I-5 bridge. We've enjoyed the opportunity to work with you and thank you so much.</p>	Anne McEnery-Ogle	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I'm also Vice Chair of the Washington House Transportation Committee. I served in the Oregon Legislature in the past and have observed transportation issues for a long time and authored a transportation bill to get Oregon and Washington together to replace the I-5 bridge. I represent people who work in Oregon and pay Oregon taxes and are willing pay their fair share. Additional capacity is key. Watching the transportation committee, tolling in the Puget Sound Region. Choices are important; through transit and value pricing, and options that avoid diversion. A lot of folks in the state invest in these progressive transportation options. Some of that support may not be as strong if there is truck traffic in the neighborhoods. You need to look at the big picture and what works around the world. There are options and smaller steps that can be taken. We will be there for you. We need to consider freight and replace the bridge. We'll come to the table. But we don't want to have it be unfair. Some pay 10 percent of their income to Oregon and don't get much for it. They work hard, and it feels it's punitive to tax them to fix other parts of the system other than what they are using.</p>	Sharon Wiley	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I am the chair of the RTC in the three Washington counties bordering the Columbia River. I'm also on the Board of Directors for the Association of Washington Cities. I'm probably the oldest guy here. When I was born, the first bridge over the Columbia was 20 years old. I got to go to school here in Portland for most of my life and helped pay for the second I-5 bridge, and now of course we need another one, but that's not on this agenda. The RTC Board has been interested in this topic since last summer. We recognize the ODOT staff for being very responsive. Rian Windsheimer is an RTC board member and Mandy Putney and others have made presentations. It's great to have the communication that we have together. On June 5, the RTC authorized a series of comments to be submitted to the OTC, and those will be given again today. I would like to highlight a few things here. Bi-state planning and coordination has resulted in many beneficial improvements over the years. Most notable is replacement of the I-5 Columbia River Bridge. The Value Pricing strategy should support a future I-5 Columbia River Bridge project. Metrics should be defined prior to beginning a pilot project. We intend to remain involved in monitoring this project and the regional input opportunities should be communicated to the bi-state region. Of all the things that I get to be on because I carry my soap box with me, I wouldn't pick yours. I want to thank you for your dedication.</p>	Ron Onslow	OTC meeting verbal comment



07/12	<p>You heard from Paul Davis. His comments that the constituents are letting us know are real and I've spent a lot of time chatting with them. This is the number one topic. The proposal is designed to modify behavior. That's concerning because who wants to be told what to do? We should have the freedom to use the mode we wish and do so with reason. The tolling proposal forces someone to use transit, go earlier or later. They already are. It's getting unreasonable. As we started the meeting one of the commissioners said this should manage traffic demand. Our commuters are driving cars. That's their demand. Otherwise they'd be taking transit. That's not the case. It's critical this solution addresses additional infrastructure capacity and freight for our ports. The user fee is already being paid through employer tax. This is an additional tax. Thanks to the Committee for removing the tolls from the River. There should be no tolling, and you should use any funds to expand capacity and not for transit. We welcome more discussion with our Oregon colleagues. Commissioner O'Hollaren provided the following comments in response to Representative Kraft: Clarification that anyone who works in Oregon pays income tax. I don't believe those taxes fund transportation. When we have a user fee-based system and collect licenses and registration and fuel in the state. Vehicles become more efficient and there's less fuel tax revenue. There are many taxes we pay in Washington. There are property taxes in both states. Because you pay a tax doesn't mean you're paying. When you fly out of PDX part of the money goes to the FAA and pays for various things. It's a user fee based system. I'm sympathetic to not being punitive. If we intend a user fee system, what's your suggestion to capture revenue from all users? What if we were all in the same community? What would you suggest to pay for the system that is underfunded? Representative Kraft provided the following response: You're right. The income tax is not used for transportation. Infrastructure is such a critical need we need to prioritize transportation budget dollars at a higher level. Although not directly related to infrastructure, if it goes to a general fund, you could use it for transportation. It's a key piece of what the government provide for citizens. Commissioner O'Hollaren provided the following additional comments: Washington State in Seattle and elsewhere implement tolls on vehicle and successfully implemented congestion pricing in Seattle. Are you saying, don't do what we did in Washington? We looked at Washington as a successful example. Mayor Ron Onslow provided the following comments: It works in Bellevue. It's expensive when the traffic is very bad. It does seem to be working. I don't know how many in Clark County buy their gas in Oregon. Representative Wiley provided the following comments: In SW Washington we don't all agree with each other. I think it's inevitable and working well in the Puget Sound. People quickly forget that most bridges were tolled for a while. More efficient cars will make us use different things than the gas tax. We have to look at what works so we don't fail. The systems don't always work, it's complicated and you don't want to the do it all at once for acceptance. We're really talking about capacity which can be transit or other things. People need options if they can't afford to pay, otherwise it won't be fair and will hurt productivity and won't do the job. Popole I represent would pay tolls if it helped their commute. Commissioner Simpson provided the following comments: Representative Kraft said governments shouldn't force people to make decisions imposed by government. The point of congestion pricing is to provide choice. The whole point is to provide options to folks. Commissioner O'Hollaren provided the following comments: DOTs do attempt to modify behavior all the time in directing traffic. I realize what we're trying to do is put more people on the same infrastructure. We need to add capacity in different ways together, including building a new bridge. Our intent is to go forward with that. We'll have bridge discussions at some point. Representative Kraft provided the following response: I appreciate the questions and comments. Regarding options, there already are options. Commuters demand car infrastructure. If our commuters were looking at other options, we wouldn't have this issue. The demand is for capacity to drive. Thank you all. This is not easy.</p>	Vicki Kraft	OTC meeting verbal comment
-------	--	-------------	----------------------------

07/12	<p>I have a letter that the County Commission approved that I've brought today. [A printed copy was provided to the Commission]. I sit on the Value Pricing PAC, JPAC, and the R1 ACT. In those capacities I am cognizant of what the other communities are doing. Considering the PAC's recommendation report to the OTC: though each question received the majority of the votes, many of those statements were in conflict with each other. We received the report on June 27 in the afternoon, and that left very little time to comment. It wasn't until last Thursday that we saw how staff reflected the PAC's recommendation. [Commissioner Savas then read the County's letter]. On behalf of Clackamas County, we are pleased to provide our recommendation. We represent communities that are impacted by one of the state's most congested segments. The interstate system in Portland includes segments where congestion is so severe that it is impacting air quality, quality of life and economic competitiveness, namely the Rose Quarter and I-205 segment between Stafford Road and OR 99E. It is no surprise that the Value Pricing PAC recommended additional study of tolling in these areas. We urge you to consider safety concerns caused by diversion. Thousands of trips are diverted a day onto rural county roads, which is impacting the livability of our communities and safety. The lack of parallel systems and routes due to topography, rivers and rural location limits route alternatives particularly for low income individuals. There is also a shortage of transit alternatives in this area. Should the OTC decide to move forward with tolling, Concept E should include at least one lane that is not priced to allow low income drivers an option. Concept B should be studied in conjunction with Concept E. If either highway is tolled, both must be to avoid unwanted diversion. Focus should be on growing capacity. Revenue spent to mitigate concepts should be spent to mitigate impacts. We are mindful that tolling is one of a number of tools to address congestion challenges. It is not a silver bullet. The aforementioned I-205 bottleneck will be shovel ready in 2020. Should the OTC pursue tolling, it should be pursued in a way to ensure the project can be built. I have appreciated participation of the OTC Commissioners on the PAC, and we look forward to continuing to work with you.</p>	Paul Savas	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>You have our letter. For Portland we say, be "bold." This is a once in a generation opportunity to do the right thing. The council is unanimously in favor of congestion pricing. We'd like to see it on all corridors. The recommendation is a step in that direction. We would like the revenue generated on each corridor to be used that corridor.</p>	Matt Grumm	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I want to thank Commissioner Simpson and O'Hollaren for co-chairing the PAC process. The question in front of you today is how do we actually solve congestion in a way that is the least cost to the tax payer and in a way that doesn't cause more pollution? When we add more supply, we actually end up back where we started because of induced demand. We spend billions of dollars, and most of that comes from drivers who aren't creating that demand on the system, we harm communities, pollute the air and heat up the planet. When you add freeway capacity, it induces longer trips and more sprawl. Like a gas, congestion expands to fill space it is given. Texas is an example of this. Congestion has actually worsened, despite freeway expansion. The supply side solution doesn't work. The effective, least cost, environmentally sound way to address congestion is the proposal before you. Driver's pay an automated fare to enter the system and get the promise of a free-flowing commute. Prices are set at the lowest level possible. And we've seen it works. Of course, no one wants to pay. In other areas, frequently 60% oppose, but then that flips once the project is implemented. So when you implement pricing, you effectively add capacity. Taxpayers save a bundle, and we reduce exhaust. We also believe that you have to do it equitably. You have to mitigate diversion to local streets. Modeling is counterintuitive, people are already diverting. Some people may move back on, so it may not be as bad. We absolutely need to implement transit, have to figure out how it will work for low income people (discounts or complete passage). We think of highways as free, but almost totally have forced people to own cars. For our health and wellbeing, we have to get a grasp on this and congestion pricing is the way to do it. We hope you embrace the opportunity.</p>	Chris Hagerbaumer	OTC meeting verbal comment



07/12	<p>Trucking is a huge part of the road network. We pay for more of the road network than we use. Trucking impacts the movement of goods including about 75 percent of goods in Oregon. Many communities are only served by truck. There's a real cost to congestion in fuel and time, hours of service rules are limiting too and impact freight capacity. It impacts ability to meet customers' requirements. The cost of congestion is \$66 billion nationally, and it's a big problem in Oregon. Important points include that pricing roadways should also include adding capacity. The population is growing and there is going to be more demand. Policy should also include freight. Tolloed lanes usually exclude freight. The dollars should go the highway trust fund as the only source of revenue and should be supported. We support the recommendation before you today, because of concerns about diversion. We are also hesitant to toll the whole network before seeing how it works. I had a meeting in Salem today and the trip took a long time. We need to do something. Commissioner Simpson provided the following comments: There's been conversation on impacts on low income communities. What is the impact on the cost of products from congestion in the freight network? Has there been a study? Ms. Jarvis provided the following response: I haven't seen a study, but we know that's part of the cost. There's so much demand in freight, and it effects the cost.</p>	Janna Jarvis	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>My name is Joe Smith, but I'm now known as Jefferson's father and Meredith's husband. I'm going to depart as soon as I'm done to make it to another committee's meeting. Traditionally tolls have been used to raise money. This is different. This is intending to change behavior. Simply put, to increase the flow and reduce the number of private vehicles on the tolled roads at times of high congestion. So, congestion tolling has been shown to work in places like London where it keeps people out of the city at higher times. But if you toll, what's going to happen? Well, almost certainly, folks who can choose will choose to travel at different times of day, which may reduce traffic a bit. Some will decide to take transit, though the record of current use is not encouraging. And some people will divert into neighborhoods, which they won't like, but it's going to happen. But it isn't going to address the big problem because during major traffic times, the vast majority of people are driven by their jobs. Unless you're going to decide that they have to get up much earlier, which isn't consistent with our values. 45 years ago, when I was the Executive Director of the Regional Commission, I commuted to Vancouver every day by bike and traffic was stop and go. That was 45 years ago. Things have not changed. We have to get cars off the road. One way is rapid transit. Will people take it? I had a wild idea back when I commuted. I wanted to interview everyone crossing the bridge and create a system where they can connect with each other and drive together. Well Jimmy Carter killed the Regional Commission, but 45 years later, we have this wonderful thing called the Internet. I would submit that in addition to considering pricing based on time, you consider pricing based on occupancy of the vehicle so somebody driving by themselves or herself pay the full toll and the toll is reduced for multi-occupants. That would be very simple to do. Then you could create a website to make it easy for people to develop carpools. Let the market work its magic. Commissioner O'Hollaren provided the following comments in response: Thank you. Absolutely, occupancy is a key part of this. Other regions have done this effectively.</p>	Joe Smith	OTC meeting verbal comment

07/12	<p>I'm an independent mechanical engineer. I have a different perspective. What's the actual cost to implement the system? I've done engineering all my life and study things like field electronics to do this. There are costs to get things to work. It's a very expensive thing to develop. I'd guess the minimum implementation for any of those things is \$300 million. I don't think it will raise money, after the cost, for five or ten years. This money would go where? Not to Oregon, but to the people who provide tolls and develop the equipment. Where will the sensing equipment come from? Not from Oregon. There are no companies in Oregon that do it. My perspective is that you won't see money return to the transportation system for a very long time. I think, why bother doing it? It won't bring money to our system to increase capacity. It's an insult to me personally to have tolls. Seeing tolls collected on roads I've been using for 60 years, it's an insult to me to think of paying tolls. Thank you for hearing this perspective. There's a huge cost to doing this.</p>	Bob Niemeyer	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I'm the Vice Chair of the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission. An occupational hazard of my volunteer work is that I tend to look at things in the context of Portland plans. All of Portland plans in some form look at this issue. Our population and economy are growing, and our road space is not growing. To grow the road space is impossible because we can't afford it, or we'd have to encroach on already developed land. We have policies to support pricing for just that reason. If we keep the current form of use of our roads--one person in an automobile taking up a significant portion of the lane--there is no economic solution other than to use those lanes more efficiently. Transit, active transportation, telecommuting. From my point of view, pricing is an effective strategy to help people make those choices and provide funding for the other modes that will use the system more efficiently. I want to specifically endorse the PAC's recommendation to devote revenue to transit. Transit takes less space and addresses equity issues to a large extent as it gives people other options. I want to circle back to the idea of induced demand. One of the interesting things from the research: even if you build all of the projects in the RTP through 2027, you still have hyper congestion. Specifically the Rose Quarter project will cost an amazing amount for little improvement. That money would be better spent on supporting new modes.</p>	Chris Smith	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I'm opposed to the recommendation. It's targeted discrimination. Car trips will increase regardless of transit. The need for road capacity is a high need. PBOT and Metro have a car-hater mindset and we're behind the times in our road system. Instead of more room for cars to support growth, PBOT is doing social engineering by reducing capacity to create more congestion and leading to more emissions. This is premeditated congestion. Tolling should be only on new lanes not for bikes or transit. This is an equity issue. I don't know why the Street Trust was on the PAC. Bike riders should pay their own way to have the privilege for bike infrastructure. Adult bike riders should also be tolled. The new light rail line means transit should be more equitable. Transit doesn't cover its costs. Tolling will increase congestion on neighborhood streets. Since there are no other options to get to Vancouver it shouldn't be tolled. Thomas Jefferson said it's sinful to take money from people for services they don't want or need.</p>	Terry Parker	OTC meeting verbal comment



07/12	<p>If I was still living in the Seattle/Tacoma area, I'd be fighting tolls there too. Their system was under designed before they were put in. I left Seattle and moved to Chicago—if you want to experience tolling, move to Chicago. They funded the tollway by borrowing money from the cities, but the tollway authority was so corrupt they weren't paying the cities back for their bonds. It didn't help congestion. It made rush hour 5 hours instead of 2 hours. When I lived back east, every place is tolled. The problem is, they don't increase the infrastructure. They use tolls as a cash cow and never take the tolls down. If we add tolls, will they ever come down? You're pricing people to stay off the road. When you toll the road, money should be used only for that road. Nobody has really talked about increasing capacity. You're tolling to change people's behavior. The gal who sat before me here said we don't need to do this and we should keep the capacity where it is. You're living in a bubble then. In 30 years we'll have another million people. If we don't take the time now to fix this infrastructure, we'll be in trouble. One idea would be to double the size of I-205 and you toll it. You will cut down the traffic on I-5. You want to cut down traffic on I-5? Build the I-605 from Kelso to Beaverton. Right now everybody is coming down 5 to go both directions, and 20f is terrible. Tolling is a non-starter. Toll until the project is paid for, then take them down. You can also apply for grants from FHWA to build project and then toll to pay for them.</p>	James Franson II	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>There's a lot of big picture talk. I want to think about the little picture in North Portland. We will be most impacted by the proposal to start tolling at an exit south of the bridge. Drivers will get off the highway. Some have said people will get back on the highway. It's not clear what new transit could be placed in North Portland. We have buses already that people don't use. We're worried that we're the part of the city that is forgotten. We've suffered through gentrification and have low income residents and people that rely on their cars and can't use transit. They will be disproportionately impacted. We see it on Interstate Avenue and MLK and Greely. If more cars come in, we'll see it on Denver and residential streets where there are kids. Think about dealing with diversion before you commit to a plan with tolling south of the bridge.</p>	Christian Trejbal	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>As information for Commissioner O'Hollaren: if you show your Oregon license in Washington, they will waive the Washington State sales tax. The proposals offered by the Value Pricing PAC did not come from the PAC members but was totally driven by staff and their consultants. Roy Rodgers from Washington County said the proposal was a non-starter. Portland would be the only place in the nation to toll without adding capacity. Tolling is a hugely inefficient way to pay for transportation improvements. In Virginia, they are paying half the cost of tolls for the cost of collection. In Seattle, it's 35% to the cost of collection. And in both locations, they added new lanes for capacity. No business person would ever accept a credit card that costed 35-50% of the revenue. The gas tax provides an efficient way to collect revenue. There is no need to pay tolling collection companies when you could increase the gas tax. If you must go for tolling, there was significant support for Option 4—adding a lane in both direction. It had the best impact on congestion and had the least diversion. Commissioner O'Hollaren said transportation is not an entitlement; everyone has skin in the game. I agree. People are paying gas taxes and fees, yet Oregon spent millions on trying to get bridge for light rail across the Columbia River, and you're about to spend a lot on a pedestrian bridge across I-84. Those are transportation dollars. We feel truckers and drivers are paying the skin for others. You're not going to improve congestion until you add capacity. And it won't get any cheaper.</p>	John Ley	OTC meeting verbal comment

07/12	I fully support Option C. Congestion pricing on all lanes. Revenue should not go to expanding freeways. We've had some similar comments already. Adding lanes does not fix congestion. You can look at any other major city. I grew up in San Diego and know this is true. Revenue should go to transit, bike lanes, light rail and buses. Encouraging automobile use is counter-productive to air quality goals we have, and we should focus on climate change goals. Transit yes, freeways, no.	Bradley Bondy	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	I agree with everything Councilor Parry said. We have a diversion problem. I want to be a young person on the right side of history looking back at this. The congestion at the intersection of OR-43 at Arch Bridge is terrible. At 4 p.m./5 p.m., it takes 45 minutes to get to Oregon City right across the river. The Arch Bridge and the Abernethy Bridge run parallel. To see tolling on the Abernethy Bridge: it's a simple equation, everyone is going to go over the bridge that doesn't cost money. This will cause major problems, a disaster with long wait times. Until we fix the diversion problem and the intersections in West Linn that are backed up all the time... we need to fix those before we do anything else. With the tolls, people are going to get off and go across the Arch Bridge. We need to fix diversion first. If that's not fixed and we start tolling, the impacts will be severe. I'm all for tolls, I'm supportive for means to pay for infrastructure improvements, but ODOT, West Linn and Oregon City have to work together to solve diversion before tolls go into place.	Rory Bialostosky	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	We sent a letter and understand and support the need for transportation improvements. We're uncomfortable with the approach to discourage peak hour traffic but would prefer a system that improves facilities.	Sean Philbrook	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	Oregon had the money to replace the I-5 bridge. The State of Washington said no they won't pay for it. Then before that, there was a proposal to run a train over to Vancouver; they said no they didn't want it. So now they have no mass transit option. The tolls are a very bad idea, I do not like it. But there are other ways we can fund it. Why not have a small transportation tax that everyone pays. If each person paid \$2 a month, we could use that money toward putting lanes in and adding whatever we need. And we need to tell Washington it's time to step up and pay for your share of that bridge across I-5.	Mel Vietzke	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	I'm from the Cascade Policy Institute. I support congestion pricing and pay attention to the arguments of the opposition. They see little benefit. That's an adamant opposition. The only thing to move us forward is a well-designed experiment to generate statistically robust data to answer these questions. I don't think the recommendation from the PAC is that experiment. I don't understand it. The partial project on I-5 and small thing in Oregon City. Why? I don't get it. My suggestion is an experiment with a control group on I-5 and a treatment group on all of I-205. It's long enough and has different dynamics along the corridor to learn from. We own the right of way and have robust transit already built and operating. I think that people who want an alternative will have an answer in using I-5 where they can wait in traffic. I think people would be jealous. That's speculation and the only way to get there is through strong experimental design. The proposal is not right, and I don't understand it. I hope we consider my proposal and let the evidence speak for itself.	John Charles	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	I'm going to talk about the consideration to drivers from Vancouver who oppose a pilot project on I-5 as well as citizens of cities like West Linn. What I noticed when looking at your alternatives, there was no alternative for only pricing I-205. I think it would be beneficial for the rampant congestion in the area. I also think it would be beneficial if there was a series of rapid transit buses to get people from I-5 to I-205. This would increase options for those who feel like they don't have them. There would be the option to end the pilot program if you didn't get your results. I don't think the toll on the Abernethy Bridge will work as people will divert and then get back on. I think tolling all of I-205 would show people from Vancouver and around the region how beneficial this could be. This test would be cutting edge. No city is tolling all lanes on an existing freeway. I'm certain when they see the benefits, they will be more than willing to have it implemented elsewhere in the region.	Rachel Dawson	OTC meeting verbal comment



07/12	I'd like to talk about the importance of revenue to fund highway improvements and not transit. Many discuss improving the regional transportation system. The revenue should only go to the roadway system. The goal should be to manage demand and not raise revenue. The main concern is that it creates the wrong incentive to pricing of the systems to a fair rate if it's used for public transportation with high costs like light rail. I believe putting revenue back into the road system is the only fair way as the drivers on the roads are paying the cost and receive the benefit and get a better return on what they pay for. If the revenue is for road maintenance and capacity, we'll see decreased congestion and lower emissions and better road maintenance. It should be a closed loop user fee and used as an effective tool to improve roads. The Oregon constitution requires that it fund roadway improvements and HB 2017 already provides another revenue stream for public transportation	Justus Armstrong	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	I want to draw your attention to an aspect of congestion pricing that is just as valuable but is often overlooked, and that's how value priced roads would benefit low income communities. One of the objections to pricing I've read is that it would harm low income communities by making them pay for roads that were once free. While on the surface this looks unfair, there are aspects of the current system that are just as unfair. Delayed traffic costs more than just time. It costs work opportunities, makes people late to appointments and late to pick up kids. These aspects hit hardest on low income people, so they have the most to gain from congestion pricing. A Texas A&M study showed that a third of low income commuters drive to get to work. The wasted time and traffic costs an average of \$1,000 per year, which makes a larger dent in a smaller paycheck. Pricing would reduce costs of time and fuel. Public transit would also benefit. Another aspect to consider is pollution. Auto emissions of pollution have been linked to asthma and pre-term births, and these are worst closer to the freeway, where residents are more likely to be poor. Reduced congestion would improve public health. A study showed that congestion pricing pollution reductions reduced premature birth rates caused by pollution by 11%. We'd be able to reduce costs and health risks that disproportionately impact low income residents.	Jakob Puckett	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	I'm from the Arbor Lodge neighborhood near Overlook, with two freeway interchanges. I support congestion pricing to manage traffic and demand. There are local impacts too. For diversion, we're concerned. I think having value pricing on the rest of the I-5 corridor in North Portland would reduce diversion. I'm concerned about the schools. We have five schools in the neighborhood and I'm concerned about children getting to their schools. Those schools have high shares of underserved students. The public health concerns and diversion impacts are big concerns.	Tyler Bump	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	Really glad you are taking the time to hear from us. I just wanted to take the time to talk about how value pricing would actually be value for Vancouver as well as Oregon residents. Not only because of the reduced time spent in congestion but also the increased value of time spent on innovation and environmental benefits. INRIX which is a think tank in Seattle found that by 2026, congestion delays and fuel emissions will have cost Portland area residents \$9 billion. This is substantial. Congestion pricing could be a way to make a dent in that number. If we could do all of I-5 or I-205, this could be significant. Look at Stockholm, where they re-implemented pricing at the voter's request because of how it reduced congestion by 20% overnight. You can ask Sherry Clark who told the Seattle Times that she was able to save a half hour of sleep because of congestion pricing on I-405. We also found I-405 in Kirkland saw significant speed increases. That doesn't even get to the fact that congestion pricing and decreased congestion will benefit the environment. In Stockholm, researchers found particulate, soot and asthma rates decreased since the implementation of congestion pricing. These are all values for Portland and Vancouver residents. I applaud you for considering it.	Miranda Bonifield	OTC meeting verbal comment

07/12	Thank you for being thoughtful in your planning on this project and getting input from the public is very meaningful. Thanks to Commissioner Savas and Brenda Pery. I echo the city residents. Value Pricing will adversely affect our city. We have gridlock on I-205 north past the Abernethy Bridge and it's rapidly impacting our neighborhood streets with speeding and unsafe conditions. The middle school parents crossing town to the other school can take an hour to go six miles. We have few transit options and none on the table. We're a city of commuters. Value Pricing will increase the burden on roads and residents. I feel you've acknowledged the burden on West Linn and hope the final plan does this as well.	Jules Walters	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	West Linn is at the bottom of the U in I-205 when you're looking at the diagram. I'm not going to talk to specific statistics and I'm here as a user. I've commuted to Beaverton, downtown Portland and now to East Airport Drive. I've had experience using different parts of the system and transit system. When I was able to, I took the bus into downtown. West Linn has one bus line, which runs up OR-43. If OR-43 is adversely impacted, so is the bus. We don't have any alternatives. Whatever grand plan is implemented using tolled money, I would hope it would impact those of us inside the urban growth boundary but outside Portland city limits, because Portland gets all the transit. I've heard that money favors ridership versus reach. I hope that reach would be a consideration in future projects, particularly light rail. I'm not against value pricing, but I'm concerned about practical impacts on my city. If I take my son to practice after work, there's no way I can get back to my house and back to practice within an hour. Already we have an issue. Every day between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m., it takes an hour to commute. At 5 a.m. in the morning, it takes 20 minutes. I don't know how this is going to solve the issue. How are you going to extend a rush hour that already lasts from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.? If it does happen, I'd like to see increased capacity, a solution to the diversion issue, and more transit for those of us not in the city limits.	Joseph Walters	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	I'm a representative of people. I'm here to put an element of truth in this. Value pricing is a cute name for charging citizens on highways they already own. It's a false narrative. I grew up here. We're still driving on 60s freeways now. This is by design. I talked to a senior ODOT planner 20 years ago and asked when capacity will be added. He said never. Political forces won't accept it. Other places are building beautiful freeways. Value pricing is offered as a cure for congestion they created. It's not a cure but provides revenue to ODOT and a two-tier system where common folks plod along when they can. Tolling will never go away even if it doesn't solve the problem. It's in place in other states and is capped because of pushback when the congestion returns. In Virginia tolls have reached \$50 dollars on one corridor. Let us see the value in value pricing. Build extra lanes. It's a false narrative. False choices. Freeways that didn't get built.	Ken Clock	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	I want to ask you to please implement value pricing on the entire system. Your value pricing consultants have delivered a clear message that the fairest, most beneficial approach is to set the tolls at the lowest level by applying tolls on the entire system. It should be implemented as soon as possible. The value pricing team and consultants did great work but missed the boat on implementation and transit alternatives. The pilot project approach is not the way to move the program ahead. Stretching it out over a number of years is not acceptable. Instead you should ask staff to implement this one ramp at a time, just as you did with ramp meters. These need to be updated regardless what pricing concept you choose. The way to avoiding hyper congestion is to feed vehicles onto the system. Pricing without intelligent metering won't work. Start with a limited controlled roll out where problems can be easily corrected. Eventually, mainline sections can be priced, and even priced based on distance traveled if that's appropriate. In the short term, focus on on-ramps while the public is becoming familiar with the system. By coupling smart meters with pricing, Portland will provide a good reason to the FHWA to move forward. Please provide leadership in educating the legislature and the public that law needs to be fixed so revenue can be spent on providing more effective transit	Doug Allen	OTC meeting verbal comment



07/12	<p>I live in the Rose Quarter. I was disheartened to hear the West Linn neighbors talk of the burden of the fee. I'm already paying a fee. We have to wash the windows of the apartment building because of soot from traffic on I-5. We're expecting our first child and concerned the neighborhood school, Harriet Tubman, won't let children play outside because of air quality. We're paying for the choice of people in places like West Linn who choose to live in places where they have to drive. I started my own business at the bottom of the aerial tram providing bike parking. They originally provided just a few bike parking spots, now we park hundreds of bikes. Do something bold and do something that inspires us. We're considering moving to other city that can do bold things; Stockholm.</p>	Kiel Johnson	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>One thing I've noticed is that no one is addressing the main issue. At the open houses, I felt like I was talking to a brick wall. I don't see why the government doesn't understand that those of us living on fixed incomes don't have extra money to spend. We have less money to live on this year than we did last year. Your plan to toll the Abernethy Bridge is ridiculous. This will overload the other bridge and surface streets. All our hospitals are on the east side of the river. A lot of our shopping is done on the east side of the river in Oregon City. I would suggest tolling only the two inner lanes southbound and only one going north. This way you do not toll Oregon City and West Linn residents for just crossing the bridge. If you toll it, I will never drive on the bridge again. I'll drive the back roads to the hospital. I have to come in frequently for tests. I'll have to pay a toll for going to the doctor, and I can't afford that. The older houses are being ripped up for the mega houses for the rich. I'm totally opposed to tolling, unless there is a way that we can use these without paying. I'm 77 years old and I can't afford this living on less this year than last year. I'm the only one who has spoken about this tonight.</p>	Bob Stowell	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I am the Chief Executive Officer of CTRAN. I'm also a member of the Southwest Washington RTC Board. CTRAN addressed a letter to ODOT and the OTC requesting information. I will not review the specifics of this letter as I'm confident they will review and provide a response. There was a conversation throughout the project about improved transit options. It was difficult to understand why CTRAN wasn't approached to engage in these conversations. CTRAN is the fourth largest transit provider in the state of Oregon. It's the largest provider of interstate transit in Oregon. As a long-time transportation official, I should be a person finding positives in this proposal. Unfortunately there are no specifics to support. There are no specific projects being called out, no exclusive right of way. By simply charging lanes with no application to specific projects, there is a disproportionate impact to certain residents. Specific to CTRAN, we ask that you understand the specific impact bi-state transit has. To date, conversations from a bi-state perspective have been vague. Public transportation is by definition an example of congestion mitigation. Public transportation supports economic vitality and job creation, access to education, and most importantly quality of life. Public transportation supports all. I'd like to thank the Washington representatives on the PAC. I'd also like to thank those who represent Washington residents for their comments.</p>	Sean Donaghy	OTC meeting verbal comment

07/12	I'm on the MPO serving SW Washington. Thanks to Director Garrett for sending staff to the RTC board. We collaborate and are pragmatic. The comments we sent to you are representative of that. A couple comments from an executive perspective. We've had good consultation so far with your staff that keeps us in the know. Bi-state governance is tough for trust and understanding. We need to commit to it. We request to continue consultation. We served on traffic modeling and expect the intensity of the work will pick up. We didn't endorse a concept because the work lies ahead and offer staff time to consult to find the right fit. Second, strings attached: there are many strings regarding use of funds. It's imperative you're clear about what you can do with the funds. People make assumptions about how the funds can be used. In the coming month be clear what funds can be used for and if there's a legislative remedy. We're committed to collaborate and work with you.	Matt Ransom	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	Welcome to the ongoing discussion from increased interstate traffic. This is another phase of the CRC discussion about what to do with the increasing interstate traffic. I hear different sides. We can add capacity and add transit if we consider the cost. ODOT was considering seismic upgrades. Apparently, the response from ODOT was rethought it and projected the costs can be brought down to address the issues. The same is true for interstate traffic. At a forum we had some ideas like the ring road that could address interstate traffic and would connect Cornelius Pass Road and Columbia boulevard. I've asked the legislature to study this. I don't know how ODOT could proceed without some in-depth analysis. It's a shortcut for a popular route and would benefit all modes, including transit. We can make observations from other states. Caltrans is dealing with seismic preparation. We can see examples in Oregon's past of cost effective bridges. We have solutions. I don't know why it's on the back burner and think it isn't the best approach. I don't know how you'll approach the FHWA.	Ron Swaren	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	The stated purpose of congestion pricing is supposed to reduce congestion. I don't see how it works. I've looked, gone to open houses.... The good thing about going this late is everything has been said. I understand you've been mandated and told to do a particular thing. But there's a flaw in this. Everyone that has gone before me mentioned the same thing: diversion. The road system is dependent on itself. The effect of a crash right now is the same as a toll. They are going to take another route if it's available. Due to road diets and reducing capacity, those areas have become just as if not more congested than the areas people are trying to avoid. Those routes are not going to be available. You say okay fine, let's increase transit. According to a recent report from TriMet, they want dedicated transit lanes. Gee, what's that going to do? Reduce car lanes. It's not going to flip flop overnight. If you're not getting the drift, I don't support the tolls because they won't achieve their stated purpose. People being people will try to avoid them, and they can't drive other hours. People are traveling when they're traveling by necessity. If someone is traveling to the beach, they aren't leaving during rush hour. The length of the rush hours is the problem right now. And congestion pricing is not going to resolve that problem. You're going to have to add capacity. If you want to toll to add capacity, that sounds alright to me. Tolling existing capacity is purely a revenue raiser, and I don't see the value in that.	Gary Manougian	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	I live in Overlook Neighborhood and am opposed to the proposal. The driving style is becoming more aggressive with people going through red lights. I'm surprised to see people stop at a stop sign. The result is more accidents. PBOT released a report of road deaths. It spiked from the old average. You're more likely to be in an accident on arterials than the freeway. Tolling will put more cars on the streets and cause more accidents. I want to see people use transit and bike. I want tolling on all freeways. The partial tolling of I-5 and 205 doesn't align with Vision Zero to eliminate roadway deaths. The partial tolling will do the opposite.	Jen Hansen	OTC meeting verbal comment



07/12	<p>I run the City Observatory think tank. You need to be bold and move ahead with pricing. That's the only way that's been proven to substantively impact congestion. This is a win-win proposition. You're going to make the system--an expensive asset--work better for all users. Let's talk ice cream. You know Ben and Jerry's. One day a year they give away ice cream for free. And they get huge lines around the block. You run the transportation system in Oregon like Ben and Jerry's runs their free ice cream day. The price people pay does not reflect the value they get. When you charge people the appropriate price, they will use the system according to its value to them. It will actually provide more capacity and reduce pollution. I would like to provide this investment advice: Do not build more capacity until after you have put the tolling in place because you will not know the value of what you already have in place. For example, Louisville, Kentucky spent a billion dollars doubling bridge capacity over the Mississippi River. After they widened, they put in the tolls. The average driver pays \$1-2. Traffic went from 125,000 on the bridge to 70,000 vehicles today. If you look at the photos, at 5:00 and 5:30, it's basically empty. They built far too much capacity than was needed once they priced the system. Do not waste hundreds of millions of dollars that we won't need if we ask people to pay for the cost of the service they are provided. Commissioner Van Brocklin provided the following comments: Tonight we heard from citizens in Portland neighborhoods and suburban areas. We've heard from economic interests and those across the river. We've seen letters about the economic impact of congestion. We've heard a lot of testimony of about where we should spend the money. You testified about the efficacy of congestion pricing. I'm interested in your thoughts on how we should be looking at those resources in terms of maximizing the value. Mr. Cortright provided the following response: Revenue should go to mitigating some of the negative impacts that are possible--investments in transit to provide alternatives, dealing with diversion and offsetting impacts, and rebate provision to deal with equity impacts. The thing we don't realize is that congestion pricing will produce big benefits. People will get where they need to go when they need to go. And those benefits shouldn't be overlooked.</p>	Joe Cortright	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>We've heard about people not wanting to pay. There's a health cost of driving from pollution. I live in the Elliot Neighborhood near the Harriet Tubman School. Air quality is already bad. Kids are being encouraged to not play outside. Congestion pricing is a good idea to help congestion and means less pollution to the schools, so kids can play outside. The funds are important too. The revenue from reducing traffic would increase when we expand capacity. Instead we use it to improve walking and biking infrastructure. This is more equitable and responsible. If you care about public health, dedicate revenue to active transportation.</p>	Brad Baker	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I'm here to ask for congestion pricing before freeway expansion. I testified in April with a letter signed by several hundred people. The letter highlighted that decongestion pricing is a good thing and a thoughtful approach to address many problems. This is a valid and well supported proposition. Willamette Week published a report about students at Harriet Tubman elementary school not being able to have recess outside. Congestion is linked to asthma and diabetes. Expanding freeways is literally making people sick. \$300,000,000 could be raised from congestion pricing. That's more than TriMet makes from fare box revenue a year. This is a major investment in our communities. I went to Glacier National Park for my 30th birthday. It was beautiful, I saw a bear. You should go soon, because the glaciers are disappearing. 40% of our carbon emissions are coming from transportation. Someone on the committee mentioned the "hardline views" from anti freeway expanders. The very point of congestion pricing is to use market forces to generate benefits for all users. My vision of a Portland region is one where people don't have to forego outdoor recess. My vision is increased transit. My vision is one in where our elected officials address the fact that 40% of our carbon emissions come from transportation. I know this isn't a radical, fringe position. I'm not going to say you have blood on your hands, but I'm going to say you have carbon on your hands.</p>	Aaron Brown	OTC meeting verbal comment

07/12	<p>I'm from the Overlook Neighborhood. I live near the Going exit. My observation is that I'm in favor of congestion pricing, but don't know the prices. I'm worried about diversion. I couldn't get out of the neighborhood the other day because of congestion. I had to divert through residential neighborhoods. There's a proposed baseball stadium, and Interstate is only one lane. I'm worried about diversion. Would you consider tolling on 99E? I assume we'll have FastPass and ODOT will know where we live, so maybe we could drive for free near our homes, whether in North Portland or West Linn. I don't know the diversion roads. I disagree that government doesn't change behavior. It reduced people smoking and can change behavior. It's not always a bad thing and we make economic decisions.</p>	Joyce Worley	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I'm a retired transportation planner. I would like to speak to three fundamental objectives. Eliminate or reduce reliance on existing freeway system. Implement congestion pricing as efficiently and equitably as possible. And spend the toll revenue on alternative transportation options, not on freeway options. When operating efficiently, traffic flows at 35 cars per lane per mile. When too many vehicles enter the system, capacity plummets. Adding lanes at choke points may temporarily solve this problem. But induced demand will quickly return these to pre-expanded conditions. Move quickly. One way to introduce value pricing equitably is to collect the tolls at on-ramps which can be updated to smart ramps that can inform people of tolls before entering them. Build and operate alternatives: expanding light rail and bus service can address demand. Currently there is no light rail alternatives on I-5 except between Expo and Rose Quarter. And there is little bus service. Spending revenue on these alternatives will be far more effective. I have a couple of illustrations on some of these that I would like to provide.</p>	Jim Howell	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I'm a doctoral candidate in sustainable development. I also give tours to delegates from other countries, including from Stockholm. Increasing the road supply won't solve congestion because of induced demand. It's one of the only things we can do is reduce the number of motorists on the road. We need to think about it for young people and get single occupancy motorists to think about other modes like investments in other modes and compact neighborhoods, and things that can impact and promote telecommuting and investment in public transportation. Low income people will be impacted, but the most vulnerable will be the most impacted by the lack of pricing because they are already transit dependent. The room was filled with white people. People of color and others spend hours on transit. A priority should be to commit to eliminate the rules against using the revenue to fund transit and to meet our goals. We should pilot an aggressive program. We need price parity transit prioritization and improvements in bike and pedestrian infrastructure and transit. I hope you'll ensure that minority voices are included. The people most affected are not here today.</p>	Sarah Iannarone	OTC meeting verbal comment



07/12	<p>The population doubles every 20 years. And the freeway system in the Portland metro area has not kept pace. Public roads should not be taxes, we already pay a fuel tax. If you want more money in the system, stop putting money into light rail. Tolling only pushes people onto the side roads. This will not improve emergency services when streets are over congested because people are avoiding the freeways. When I have the government telling me I have to pay to use public roads and how much water I can have in my toilet, I have too much government. When I'm stuck in traffic, it takes me away from my family, my dinner and my TV remote. Drive time is equivalent to working time. People have been talking about alternative transportation choices. I got to see this—a mother with three kids struggling to get her groceries onto a bicycle. Or is it onto the bus? This is ridiculous. My brother in law tried the bicycle thing. It's too dangerous. If you don't believe me, hop on a bicycle and go ride in traffic. When you start tolling, how will it affect commerce? Commercial traffic already pays a road usage mileage tax. So this is double taxation. You're not serving the best interest of the public. You just want the money. Quite frankly I consider you to be bad administrators, and I can prove it. You look at the highway system in the Portland area versus the Vancouver area. The difference is Metro. You've been putting money into light rail rather than the highway system where it belongs. It's either sabotage or bad administration. If you really have confidence in what it is you're doing, let's put it on the ballot and let voters make the decision. If you want to see some transportation public issues, 10 p.m. Sunday night channel 10, they have a program on there that talks about public transport. It's American something. I forget. Anyway, that's all I have.</p>	Everett Hall	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I live in the Woodlawn. I'm an urban planner and business owner. I'm from New Jersey where there are toll roads. Tolls have encouraged people to take transit. There are lower toll rates for low income. I also lived in LA. That's an example of how building more lanes doesn't help congestion. Stakeholders should treat the region as a high-density area with roadways that divide our neighborhoods. Congestion pricing is a tool that will help reach goals, but we need other tools as well. Transportation planners must work together to build connectivity and expand our thinking to act locally. Diversion of commuters should be addressed by supporting telecommuting and more flexibility and economic development to reduce the need for freeways to meet basic needs. Zero emissions technology and policies to move us toward a car free future. Many cities are reducing cars with technology to meet climate change goals. Public health and equity are important. Not all stakeholders are here today. Commissioner Callery provided the following comments: How do you see the interstate system for moving goods? Ms. Ferreira provided the following response: I'm working on a project on zero waste living. I see people buying less in the future. I'd like to see less movement of good across long distances and localizing our economy. It's not possible for everything, but that what our rail networks are for and those should be used.</p>	Evelyn Ferreira	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>We need to do decongestion pricing before we expand freeways. I support the congestion pricing plan and would note to the commenters from Overlook and West Linn that the tolling areas should be expanded so we're not inducing diversion. This is not a money raising project, this is about addressing congestion. Funding should be used to bolster transit and mitigate diversion and impacts to low income folks. Widening freeways will only lead to more congestion because of induced demand. We need to amend the state Constitution to allow these funds to be used for transit.</p>	Doug Klotz	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>I feel the transportation system should be viewed as a way of transporting people and take into account the number of occupants in a vehicle. A fully occupied car is much more efficient. The way people are influenced is by cost and time of travel. It takes longer to take the bus than to drive. I take the bus because I think it's important. Not all can absorb the time cost. The revenue can't build Light Rail, but roadway improvements should improve bus and bike lanes to better transport people around the region.</p>	Paul Lantow	OTC meeting verbal comment

07/12	<p>I live 30 minutes away from Portland--or two hours away depending on traffic. I'm supportive of congestion pricing, not as some token goal to force people out of their vehicles. The truth is, congestion pricing is a way of increasing capacity. It can increase the use of our freeway beyond what we're doing now. Since most people get around by driving and want to get around by driving, if this policy is implemented well, you will be heroes. This will have a big positive impact on our economy. I want to share one key metric: The National Resource Council publishes a thick reference manual called the Highway Capacity Manual. It includes a tremendous amount of empirical research to guide you toward a good execution of this big policy change we're about to do. One element of the manual that would be particularly relevant is the vehicle density section. What is the target flow? What is the optimization point? That is between 35 and 45 vehicles per mile per lane. Thus it is a fact that if density increases above 45 vehicles per mile per lane, capacity declines. If you toll that, you will increase capacity. But it's also a fact that if you toll in such a way where you are reducing beyond 35 vehicles, you are reducing capacity. I would direct your eyes to this key matrix. There is a rational basis to hitting that optimization point. The page in that manual is page 14-4.</p>	Eric Shierman	OTC meeting verbal comment
07/12	<p>The interstate design for transportation and who uses the road to attract businesses but pay nothing to improve the road. [Showed a one-pound license plate holder] This one went to the moon. It was on a TriMet bus for 10 years. It stopped a thousand times a day. They pay nothing for the road. You paid because this was on a public transportation devise. There are 600 buses with this on. Call the general manager for TriMet. Say who is Gillig, they built the busses. Everyone on the road uses oil. Some donate to nonprofits. Direct them to Use it for road repairs. [offered to leave the brochures and weighed the license plate holder] Look at a TriMet bus. There are 74,000 cars from Washington that come to Oregon every day. They are changing the shape of the road. Your employees have advertising on their cars as well. Call the New York Times. Think of how much oxygen and fuel it takes. Take the carbon off your car. Put your car in neutral instead of using the break to reduce your impact. Email Itwillbefun@gmail.com and ask for oxygen.</p>	Zephyr Moore	OTC meeting verbal comment