



Appendix A VERBATIM COMMENTS

The following table includes comments submitted via email, online comment form, voicemail, formal letter, at PAC meeting #5 and at an open house for the I-205 widening project.

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.

Date	Communication	Contacts	Source
05/07	<p>Subject line: Congestion Pricing</p> <p>I support tolls on all lanes of I-5 and I-205 from the Columbia River south to the junction of the two highways north of Willsonville. It makes absolutely no sense to me to toll only the HOV lanes on I-5.</p>	Teresa Mantese	Comment form
05/08	<p>Subject line: Portland area road tolls</p> <p>You are proposing to charge people who use cars to earn a living while heavily subsidizing those who use public transit. You've chose to spend billions to create and support mass transit which has done little to impact traffic. You've chosen NOT to build roads and bridges and in so doing harming commerce, increasing pollution and wasting people's time...simply because you have a philosophy that focuses on forcing people into your mould. In the end you negatively impact the people who can least afford it...all to further your agenda while exacerbating the traffic issues. If this was a real world business you be bankrupt and unemployed.</p> <p>Dick Rylander</p>	Dick Rylander	Comment form
05/08	<p>Subject line: Tolling the bridges</p> <p>I am not a profanity user however your position to toll bridges that we the people paid for decades ago and unfairly penalizing Clark County one of the highest income tax revenue generators for the state of Oregon makes me want to use some language that I would be ashamed of. No one believes you are interested in anything but generating more revenue. We do not believe you want to reduce congestion. If you did you would have done something to improve the highway capacity in Portland Metro. The last capacity on the north end of Portland was I205 back in the early 1980s.</p>	Vern Pick	Comment form
05/08	<p>Subject line: Value Pricing a Great Plan</p> <p>Value pricing, tolls, or whatever you want to call it, is a great plan and should have happened a long time ago. I fully support any of the five value pricing concepts under consideration for I-5 and/or 205.</p>	Christy Frenzen	Comment form
05/08	<p>Subject line: Put it to a vote</p> <p>Do not pass this without letting the population of the metro area including Clark county vote. We will NOT stand for being charged a fee to ente the state of Oregon. It is illegal under the US Constitution (Article 4, Section 2, Part 1) to require a citizen to pay an admission fee to cross into another state.</p>	Bill Clark	Comment form
05/09	<p>Subject line: Tolls</p> <p>Tolls are WRONG ! All they do is allow the rich to drive during these times ! It will take hard earned money from the pockets of those that can not afford it but still need to drive during these time periods, You will add to the cost of my commute as i have no choice when i can drive on these routes you are targeting ! This may be a good idea on paper but stinks in the real world ! I SAY NO TO TOLLING !!</p>	James Martello	Comment form

05/09	<p>Subject: Revenue from Value Pricing</p> <p>Mass transportation, bicycle and pedestrian use of funds generated by tolls will not improve the I-5 and I-205 corridor problems, especially interstate. It's time to focus on vehicle traffic on the interstates and not additional inner city and inner regional roads. Many drivers that are already frustrated will become more so if funds collected don't go directly to solve the interstate problem. The HOV lane is not enforced currently, drivers will have little faith if they don't see officers enforcing what is already in place. And, an alternate route is not available for crossing the Columbia River. Long range plans need to be addressed now for increasing lanes/bridges in that area and not just in collecting money. The lanes, at the busiest times, from south of Rosa Parks to the bridge are already backed up so far that I cannot imagine anyone wanting to pay to use a lane that moves minimally or not any faster. I would like to see objective data proving that enacting current tolls will substantially improve traffic flow and ease congestion. Many places in the U.S. with serious interstate problems have put in toll systems as a revenue generator and then contracted the work to be done (for additional lanes, bridges, etc.) rather than waiting 20 years. I believe, and I haven't researched it, that whoever takes these contracts has always made a substantial profit. Often there is a cut off date in the future where the toll system is then removed.</p>	Susan Connell	Comment form
05/09	<p>Subject: First step and most cost effective start to solving traffic congestion, a suggestion</p> <p>Please start by trying the least costly methods to solve traffic congestion, and here is what I suggest: Increase freeway speed limit to 65 miles/hour, post signs along the fwy indicating left lane for passing only or a fine of \$300 to prevent "camping on the left lane", and also post signs along the fwy for no "rubber-necking" or fine of \$300. Try this and see if it will work in reducing traffic jam, before spending money and time to work on creating toll booths.</p>	Surja Tjahaja	Comment form
05/10	<p>Subject: Tolling and Other Options</p> <p>My concern is that by economically forcing drivers off the freeways they will just clog up other arterials which are already congested. And one main problem of this region (as I'm sure you are well aware of) is getting across the Willamette River. I drive I205 around the south end and the only way to cross the river is the Abernathy bridge or Sellwood bridge (which really is not a viable option). We really need to get single occupancy vehicles off the roads, otherwise tolling is just putting a temporary patch on the problem. One thing I would like to see a much more concerted effort is in van pools. The Seattle metro (and Snohomish county) has quite an extensive van pool program. I worked for a small company there that utilized the van pool programs to great success where 30% of the parking lot was filled with van pool vans. When I came to the Portland I was amazed at the lack of a similar program. I would gladly take public transportation, however 2 hours for my home-to-office commute is not feasible (I live near Clackamas Town Center and work near Bridgeport Village - an express bus that makes that run along the south I205 corridor would be great, perhaps making a stop in Oregon City). Thanks for your consideration.</p>	Kevin Lu	Comment form
05/14	<p>Subject: Possible locational bias of committee members</p> <p>I'm not saying there is necessarily bias at play but, seeing as their initial recommendations seem to favor residents of SE Portland and also just for the sake of transparency, I would like to see the neighborhoods where these committee members live listed as part of their bios. Thanks!</p>	Jennifer Wright	Comment form
05/14	<p>Subject: Tolls on 205</p> <p>I just want to let you know, and I realize I'm in the minority, that I strongly feel that I (and my family) will happily pay any toll, and not divert to other roads to avoid them, in order to get the construction happening to widen I-205. The Abernathy is too narrow, and all the merging too convoluted to possibly maintain the current transportation levels. Please also widen the bridges over the Tualatin river. 205 should be minimum 3 lanes (ideally 4) for its entire length. I'd even pay a toll on the Glen Jackson.</p>	Kelli Gallippi	Comment form
05/15	<p>Subject: Feedback on Round 2 Concept E: Abernathy Bridge Priced Roadway</p> <p>I support Round 2 Concept D: I-205 Priced Lane – OR99E to Stafford Rd. The 3rd lane could be utilized as a bus lane, and speed up travel of those who utilize mass transit. As well as provide some revenue to pay for at least part of the project. Round 2 Concept</p>	Josh Vernon	Comment form



	<p>D: I-205 Priced Lane – OR99E to Stafford Rd. This approach would provide the benefit of relieving congestion on I 205. However, you would only be paying for that benefit if your commute involves crossing the Abernathy bridge. It would be more equitable to spread the tolls along a greater stretch of I 205. That way regardless of whether you are commuting to I5 from Oregon City, Lake Oswego, or West Linn you would pay for the benefit of less congestion. As it is proposed, only a resident of Oregon City would pay a toll to get to I5 but all would benefit.</p>		
05/16	<p>Subject: Hayden Island Residents</p> <p>Could you let me know if you are taking into consideration the fact that residents of Hayden Island cannot use any other road other than I-5, and would be forced to pay the toll? I'm hoping that Hayden Island residents will be able to use the span of I-5 on the island and close to the island free of any toll costs.</p>	Solange Ledee	Comment form
05/17	<p>Subject: Toll Road</p> <p>To Whom it May Concern, The fundamental idea of putting a toll road to ease traffic is lacking in data to prove this point. With the increase of traffic throughout our 6 highways, dominated by primarily 2 and 3 lane roads, this already acts as a natural barrier for people driving and is changing the way drivers and people live within our city. Everyone who actually commutes within the city is realizing the affects of traffic, so bringing in a toll lane without additional lane(s) on any highway, is unfortunately a day late and a dollar short with lacking data. Furthermore, solving Portland's traffic problem falls back on public transportation and MAX being an above-ground system. The money should be invested to create underground transit, allowing for faster and more reliable commuting and less disruption to street traffic. Then ODOT should highly consider putting North I-5 under ground, especially around the Eastbank Esplanade, as this re-usage of land creates an immense value-add for the city and state. Without alternative methods for commuting that are more efficient, this will only become an additional taxation for individuals and businesses without receiving any benefit or improvement in conditions.</p>	Camio Carter	Comment form
05/17	<p>Subject: Regarding the "Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasability" study</p> <p>To all PAC members and Oregonians, I live in Oregon City and work in downtown Portland. For me, as it is for nearly all residents, driving to work is not an option. I will repeat: driving to work is not an optional activity. It is not a behavior that can be "corrected" with de-incentivization; it is not a choice. Driving is a necessity. I cannot bike into work, I cannot take light rail, and I cannot take a bus. I pay hundreds of dollars a month to park in downtown. I pay gas tax on every mile I drive. I pay property taxes on my home. I pay for the roads because I must use them. The thesis that charging tolls will incentivize myself and others to somehow get to work in another way is an outright fallacy. I have no other choice but to drive, and I am not alone. As the claim that tolling our vital thoroughfares will reduce congestion is fallacious on its face, what then could the actual reason for the plan possibly be? Revenue generation seems the only real option. I implore you: Raise My Taxes if you need money. Take out a bond if you want to reduce congestion by expanding light rail access. Procure easments if you want to add lanes to the freeways. Raise my taxes if you must, but please do not block-up the roads with expensive, unnecessary, ill-advised, and dangerous-precedent-setting tolls. Do not open Pandora's Box. I have lived with tolls in places all over this country and I can tell you something the studies and metrics you are using now will not: Toll roads are ruinous to quality of life. Tolls are an incurable malignant cancer, they only spread and bring pain, ruination, and constant frustration in their wake. Tolls will cause more congestion on alternative routes, they will decrease the quality of life of all those forced to take them, they will cause bottlenecks and confusion, and they will negatively affect businesses of all stripes. The answer to all problems will become more tolls: the revenue is irresistible and their justification becomes easier once the foothold is made. Tolls are a mistake. Tolls are forever. They are a mar that can never be erased; a scar on the visage of our community that can never heal. Do not be responsible for this tragedy. Please. Raise my taxes instead. - A concerned resident</p>	Jason Lee	Comment form
05/17	<p>Subject: Value pricing in Portland</p> <p>I don't think that Value Pricing on I-5 or I-205 in Portland will be able to reduce traffic congestion below current levels at all. Apparently it would be several years before tolls</p>	Ron Swaren	Comment form

	<p>could be enacted. I observed the phenomenon of increasing I-5 congestion due to the economic recovery goals of NW Oregon. Now with increasing population and improving West Coast economy our Interstate system will have even more use and will be much worse by the time tolls would produce results. I do agree with some of the promised benefits--such as increased public transportation or car pooling. However much more greatly increased demand will outrun these benefits. Therefore it is important to develop added capacity, particularly to the job engine of Washington County.</p>		
05/21	<p>Subject: Tolls No, no, no. Have you driven I 5 or 205 yourself. The roads are jsmned up all day. When are you going to shift users to... Midnight? I believe this is a veiled effort to get more tax money. N tolls.</p>	David Tooze	Comment form
05/23	<p>Subject: commenting on the options porposed</p> <p>As a former Oregon Resident who traveled for business to Seattle every other week for 25 years and who flew out of PDX once a month for 25 yeas I have extreme intimate knowledge of Portland/Vancouver traffic. The Oregon solutions to resolve congestion including the CRC were attempted and failed me and my customers and some employees. we have moved to Vancouver. I am watching the progress to date and observe that the apparent strategy is to discourage car and truck transport and not necessarily to improve roadways or add additional road systems. while politically comfortable this goes against human nature and that is for personal "freedom" as you can imagine that we raise children who as they get older dream of the freedom to move and that often includes a car of some sort. No child is born and raised with the dream of a bus pass! cars and freedom of transport to go where ever you wish is a right and not something to be discouraged, hindered, cut off, limited etc. other cities including San Diego have dealt with massive population explosion (far greater than ours) with solutions which focused upon smart roadways, highway improvements etc and no tolls or perhaps only one. it is common for a 4,5,6 or 7 lane highway where our largest is three! This permits many thousands to actually go where and when they wish. Has anyone considered understanding how San Diego deals with this? OK here is my solution. yes Toll the roads, value pricing is valuable, also generate a 1-2% sales tax!!! Oregon!!! you are so afraid to go this way and offer a free pass to thousands, perhaps millions who use your infrastructure for free while residents and area locals like us suffer. Lets face it you cannot AFFORD a solution without some meaningful revenue. Lastly if you Toll, please offer how the money will be used for a solution! Road improvements, additional bridge etc are going to be required as you tax base like me will continue to be disenchantred and move as we did. Thank your for this opportunity to comment</p>	Mark Stephen Haworth	Comment form
06/12	<p>In 2004, I accepted employment in Oregon from an Oregon employer recruiter, who reached into Washington for unfilled talent. As an Oregon Income Taxpayer, and from fuel taxes already directly collected via frequent gasoline purchases in Oregon, I have already supported the on-going costs of roadway repairs and expansions. I am already an active carpooler, along with many other Washington residents, so have already done my part to reduce traffic congestion. The addition of tolls would introduce many unintended consequences, such as a powerful disincentive against Washington residents to patronizing Oregon businesses. Washington lawmakers, in turn, would likely consider lifting the Washington Sales tax exemption for Oregon customers, which would financially impact the Washington retailers and Oregon customers. Both Interstate bridges have already been paid for by Federal funding. Per Federal regulations, "23 U.S. Code § 301 - Freedom from tolls," it is against Federal law to toll thoroughfares that have already been paid for, or to fund other projects. Should lawmakers manage to circumvent Federal law and the will of the people by cleverly disguising a toll as "Congestion Control," North Portland neighborhoods will be severely penalized by "Shunpiking."</p>	William Harriman	Comment form
06/18	<p>Subject: Value Pricing</p> <p>The longstanding injustice of forcing the public to pay an indirect feeral highway trucking transportation tax through warping of federal legislation continues in full force. The taxing arrangement (effected by the trucking company-teamsters alliance lobbying at the federal level) means that the public unknowingly favors trucking over rail, because the public pays the disproportionate part of road repair and improvement costs. (In fact, let's face it, we would hardly need freeway road repair at all if it weren't</p>	Janice Green	Comment form



	<p>for the damage caused by trucks!) So now we are commenting on measures to reduce traffic congestion and carbon emissions. The presentation I listened to was almost immoral in its avoidance of the issue of the truck traffic. How come? Clearly, we can have a governmental policy which would gradually increase costs of trucking, gradually forcing freight onto trains (where it belongs in the first place), vastly reducing traffic on interstate highways, and at the same time immensely reducing carbon emissions. And then we public would gladly pay our tolls. Let it be so..</p>		
06/18	<p>Subject: Opposing Tolls</p> <p>I fear that a hatred of car culture is motivating congestion pricing. If congestion pricing revenue is lockbox earmarked for new ROAD construction, well, then that might change my opinion. Using tolls to fluff up the light rail and heavy rail failures (MAX, WES) would not be welcomed.</p>	Eric Squires	Comment form
05/01	<p>Subject line: Meetings</p> <p>Hello, I attended last night's open house but am left with several questions. How can I get these answered? Lori</p>	Lori Korab	Email
05/02	<p>Subject: I-5; I-205 tolls</p> <p>As a native Oregonian currently living in Clark County, Washington, I am informing you that I am opposed to a toll on either of these interstates.</p> <p>My husband and I are both seniors and paying a toll, probably more than one, every time we drive to the west side of Portland to visit our grandchildren, sometimes twice a week, would be an undue financial hardship for us.</p> <p>As Clark county residents, we are a big part of the PDX metro region. We probably know more about Oregon news and politics than we do about Washington's. Many of us in Washington work in Oregon, conduct business in Oregon, see health care providers in Oregon, attend cultural events, and visit with friends and loved ones. I feel as much that I am a citizen of Oregon as well as Washington.</p> <p>I implore you to please consider the many citizens your decisions will affect.</p>	Anita Calnan	Email
05/02	<p>Subject: tolls</p> <p>I am in favor of funding the I-5 bridge with the addition of Max train into Vancouver. A lot of people that I know are wanting the max train service. I would also like to be able to walk and ride my bike over the bridge. This could be paid with tolls.</p> <p>If you use tolls and do not do the above, I am not in favor of it. You have stated that you were going to add tolls to Washington residents that would fix things at the I-5 and I-205 merger south of Lake Oswego. You also had some other plans to use the tolls to fix congestion around the Rose Quarter. In both instances, you are just trying to toll another state's residents for your own road work so Oregon residents can again get what they want without being taxed. That also shows when we notice that I-84 and 26 are not being tolled.</p> <p>I am trying to change my physicians and other professionals/services involved in my life to WA to avoid paying tolls. I imagine others will need to do the same to cut back driving on the interstate. On the one hand you might have fewer people on the interstate. On the other hand, you will be losing business from WA residents.</p> <p>It is really going to hurt people with lower incomes or lower disposable incomes. I often meet people at Gateway to go hiking. A toll would add an additional cost to that activity.</p> <p>I already tend to take the Max train into downtown Portland. I still have to get over a bridge to realistically do it.</p> <p>I am not going to have the money to pay tolls all the time. This is not an area where we</p>	Ruth Flemming	Email

	<p>can simply take an alternate route. This is a river that we have to cross.</p> <p>I noticed that you were saying that tolls would be collected beginning at Marine Drive. It is impossible to get off on Marine Drive on I-205. Airport way would be possible. Can you imagine what the congestion would be like? It is already really bad there with airport traffic.</p> <p>This is all a mess. I would like better public transportation before tolls. . . especially a MAX train going through Vancouver from I-5 to I-205 like was originally planned.</p>		
05/03	<p>Subject: Value Pricing Policy Advisory Letter from Commissioner Rogers</p> <p>Please find the attached letter from Commissioner Rogers to the Oregon Transportation Commission.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Cathy Jacoby Administrative Assistant Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation Office of the Director</p> <p>---[ATTACHED LETTER]---</p> <p>April 24, 2018 Commissioner Sean O'Hollaren Commissioner Alando Simpson Oregon Transportation Commission [address]</p> <p>Re: Value Pricing Mitigation Measures Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>I want to thank you both for your time and commitment to the Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee. I am sorry I was unable to join you in your discussion of mitigation measures at our last meeting due to other commitments. Policies that mitigate the adverse impacts of value pricing are a key factor in the acceptance of a tolling approach and I would like to take this opportunity to share my comments. Please consider these comments along with the other mitigation ideas that were raised at the meeting.</p> <p>The data we have seen at the PAC coupled with everyday experience demonstrates both I-5 and I-205 do not have enough capacity to meet travel demand. Traffic diverts onto other arterials where it contributes to additional congestion and safety problems. The impact this has on travel region-wide and state-wide is clear.</p> <p>Value pricing has the potential to shift trips to transit or to other times of day. Without additional transit or road capacity added to the system however, value pricing has the potential to greatly impact adjacent facilities and not provide additional capacity for those who pay the tolls.</p> <p>To mitigate this, I would like to see the evaluation consider mitigation measures that focus the tolling revenue on adding capacity to the system.</p> <p>I look forward to learning more from the study about the potential for pricing to improve traffic flow on I-5 and I-205 and shift traffic to other times of day, modes or facilities. When our adjacent facilities are already congested, safety is a key concern and transit options are limited, tolling could have adverse impacts and needs to be carefully understood and mitigated.</p> <p>Please share my comments with fellow members of the ODOT Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Roy Rogers, Commissioner Washington County Board</p>	Roy Rogers	Email



	RR/cd/cj cc: Matt Garrett, Director, Oregon Department of Transportation		
05/07	<p>Subject: Tolls</p> <p>Main Point: Why are you going to a transportation model which only benefits the wealthy? Why not start with an HOV lane which encourages better commuting practices and is for all the people, not a select few? I really find it insulting you also call it "value pricing"! It isn't a value to me if I already pay gas taxes, registration fees, county taxes, and property taxes to build and maintain our roads, and now you tell me I'm going to have to pay an additional fee to drive in a lane I have used for 37 years! "Value Pricing" is a complete misnomer and very misleading!! I know you are going to say it will generate more money for better projects, but I have little faith you will spend that money strategically for a better Portland, and by the way, I pay way more taxes than I ever have in my life and with all these extra people who have moved here, I don't see where extra funding is an issue. At least it shouldn't be unless it is being mismanaged!</p> <p>Background & Additional Information: My name is Troy Teyema and I was born in Portland, OR and have lived here my entire life. In my corporate career and during my own wanderings, I have traveled across the US and abroad. I have experienced many modes of personal transportation as well as many forms of mass transit. During my time here, I have seen a time, not so long ago, when you could drive from Gresham to Beaverton in about 35 minutes most times of the day, and I have spent the last 10+ years commuting from Gresham to Beaverton, watching that commute go to 60+ minutes most times of the day and easily 1.5 hours during rush hour. Over the last 20 years, I have been dumbfounded by the incredibly poor planning of all the agencies in charge of transportation progress, their abuse of power, their lack of response to the increase of population, and their denial of the evolution of modern technology in the transportation industry! I understand the theory and beliefs which have led to where we are: Not wanting to perpetuate pollution by increasing the size of the freeways. Wanting to make personal transportation so painful it will be discouraging and force people to mass transit. I have watched over the last 10 years as more and more existing transportation routes on the eastside have been carved up and given to bicyclists. Now, please don't take me wrong, I am all for increasing bicycle access and development. However, I am not in favor of this occurring at the expense of automobiles and motorcycles! Additionally, where is the sense of doing this in Western Oregon, where rains 8+ months each year? Only the most hardcore bicyclists I know commute all 12 months! The thing that bothers me the most is the abuse of power! If you go to the westside, Beaverton, Hillsboro, etc. You see all kinds of freeway expansion projects underway in their general area, so there must be money for expansion. However, nothing is being spent to expand the freeway systems which connect the opposite sides of the Metro area. I understand the geographic restrictions like the west hills and the rivers, but come on. What I really find ironic is we have all these "leaders" stating how they are going to force people on to mass transit and then they build the Max light rail! If you are truly committed to mass transit, you analyze what works well in other existing systems and you at least copy that if not improve upon it! The first thing you learn from a quick analysis is a good mass transit system needs to be separated from other vehicles and pedestrians. You can't treat mass transit like it is 1900 and build a street car! That is so incredibly ignorant it is appalling! There is no capability for an express line during rush hour to expedite travel, and then you build the stops so you can't even add cars to the train to increase capacity! Additionally, it was completely irresponsible for you to purchase a system which can't run when there is too much water, it gets too hot, builds up ice on the wires, etc., etc., etc.. You people should be ashamed to have spent our money this way. You and your predecessor's thinking is flawed and horribly short-sighted!!</p> <p>Here's a story for you. Around 1995, my friend's father-in-law was having a barbecue which I attended. I don't remember exactly what his title was, but he was somehow involved with the city of Portland planning department (sorry I don't remember the details). Anyway, we ended up talking in his study and he had a map of the City of</p>	Troy Teyema	Email

	<p>Portland for the year 2050 on his desk with an estimated population of just over 3 million people (I assume this was the city proper, not metro area). My friend and I were shocked at the number because at the time Portland proper was around 500,000 residents. Anyway, we were pouring over this map, and both my friend and I immediately noticed that all the freeway systems looked exactly the same! We both asked how these freeways were expected to carry 6 times the number of people? He said that the philosophy was to make it so painful to drive that people were forced on to mass transit! He said this philosophy had been developed in response to all the lessons learned from California and their freeway expansion projects which resulted in their increased pollution. At the time, I could see how someone could arrive at this logic, but I also thought this philosophy didn't fit American culture in which freedom and the personal vehicle are heavily intertwined. Now here we sit within a decade of the majority of cars being non-polluting and we are ill-prepared. The unfortunate result of the poor planning and misspent funds of you and your predecessors, over the last 3-4 decades, has rendered one of the most amazing places to live into just another copy of all the great cities which have come before which are now just cesspools of humanity!</p>		
05/08	<p>Subject line: n/a</p> <p>Links to complete your survey didn't work. So...you get a F.</p>	David Tooze	Email
05/08	<p>Subject line: Tolls</p> <p>From my cold dead hands will you take my money you fascist ,America hating money wasteing liberals!. We pay enough in income taxes. Taxation without representation. I could built a another 4 bridges across the river for all the money you stold from washingtonians. China laughing at us due fact your going force more jobs to them and force more families on the street.</p>	Kenneth Harrison	Email
05/08	<p>Subject line: Tolls</p> <p>NO TOLLS. I barely make enough to cover my bills, housing (thanks Portland for pricing so high I had to move across the river), medical and dental insurance, car insurance and vehicle gas to drive the 25 miles to work and then 25 miles home.</p> <p>If you want TOLLS toll your own highways between Oregon city and I 5 interchange. Or between rose garden and the terwillager curves where all the traffic is in the rush hour. I drive 205 everyday and it's not nearly as congested as everyone thinks. Takes 30 minutes to go the 25 miles to Camas. No issues...</p>	Jason Lind	Email
05/08	<p>Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Advisory Committee Oregon Department of Transportation [address]</p> <p>Dear Committee Members,</p> <p>During the 2017 Legislative Session, the Joint Committee on Transportation asked those responsible for the Portland Metro Area's planning efforts why major road construction and improvements had not been made to address the rapidly-increasing congestion in our region. Many of the answers relied on the notion that automobiles are a vanishing commodity. Our population prefers to live in close proximity to one another, it is proffered, and this density demands a different form of transportation. Another common response was that neither the region nor the state has any means of obtaining the resources necessary to make those kinds of investments.</p> <p>Of these explanations, the latter is the only one that is driven by any data. For that reason, the Legislature included specific instructions in HB2017 to consider various ways in which tolling could be implemented through the region. The arguments that have been made to your committee during the past six months are the same that were heard in the Capitol: tolling is unfair to the poor, Oregonians and Washingtonians do not want it, and the Federal government will not allow it.</p> <p>It is true that tolling existing lanes on Federal highways would be a long and arduous process, potentially taking between five and ten years to become approved. There is no reason, however, why new lanes cannot be constructed with which to implement a</p>	Rich Vial	Email



	<p>tolling regime that would not only generate immediate benefits on the road, but also provide us with experience and feedback that will enable us to refine future efforts.</p> <p>A logical place to start with this investment would be the stretch of Interstate 205 between miles three and ten. This currently two-lane stretch is a chronic bottleneck. Constructing a new lane along this portion of road, and tolling it either full time or during peak-periods, would not only save the region millions of dollars in lost time and congestion-related air pollution, but would also generate much needed data and other information that would contribute to congestion-reducing efforts elsewhere.</p> <p>I urge your committee to recommend at least this initiative. Infrastructure tolling is a solution that has stood the test of time - and it is time that Oregon stopped ignoring it as an important tool for solving our region's transportation challenges.</p> <p>Rich Vial State Representative House District 26</p>		
05/09	<p>Subject: Please try easy and less costly options to solve traffic congestion</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I would like to recommend that you to please try an easy and less costly methods or options to solve traffic congestion, before installing toll booths, as follows:</p> <p>Increase speed limit on freeways to 65miles/hour. Install signs along the freeways saying "Left Lane is for Passing Only or Fined \$300" (this prevent "camping on the left lane culture"). Install signs along the freeways saying "No Rubber Necking, Move On or Fined \$300" (this prevent people slowing down to see stopped cars). Enforce the new laws to keep traffic moving and give out fines for Slow Driving on Left Lane and Rubber Necking. Install signs with phone numbers to call to report slow drivers on the left lane and rubber necking.</p> <p>If after you implement this program for one year with no improvement to the traffic congestion, then think about the next costly option.</p> <p>PS. It would be great also if you can give fines to cars blowing smokes/pollutants (you can also install phone numbers on the freeways to call to inform cars polluting so that you can fine them).</p> <p>Thank you, Surja Tjahaja</p>	Surja Tjahaja	Email
05/17	<p>Subject line: My comments on the May 14, hearing meeting</p> <p>I attended as a citizen of Clark County, WA, which probably automatically puts my input in the trash folder. Nevertheless here goes.</p> <p>The term "Value Pricing" is very disingenuous. This is a deliberate attempt by government beaurocrates to obfuscate what should be termed "Congestion Tolling". Without adding capacity there is NO value here.</p> <p>I was amazed at the fact that the committee has already thrown out adding additional lanes to the freeways, even as high speed toll lanes. With the fortunes in tolls to be collected new lanes could be afforded.</p> <p>I was amazed at the fantastic expense for implementing and operating a tolling system. It seems like it would be more cost efficient to impose a straight tax somehow. That would be more cost effective and much, much, more honest with the public.</p> <p>I was also surprised at comments from the planning group that although Value Pricing did nothing to change the existing roadways other than to put tolls on them, that the</p>	Terry Tanner	Email

	<p>cost of the toll system was irrelevant as long as it had the effect of spreading the traffic out over more of the day, reduce the number of trips, or divert traffic onto surface streets.</p> <p>When it comes to forcing people to public transportation, it turns out the Portland area has no real effective bus transportation that could replace Interstate traffic trips. One person noted that there is no Tri-Met presence on the freeways. If public transportation was better people would be using it already instead of their cars.</p> <p>I also learned that any idea that involved putting through some kind of I-5 by-pass that could carry non-Portland area North/South traffic was not even under consideration. There has to be a way of measuring the traffic reduction such a strategy could create.</p> <p>And then there's the issue I attended the meeting for, people who work in Portland, but live in Washington state. I have worked in Oregon and paid Oregon income tax for decades without any vote. I know about existing bad traffic and if you think it is something new, then you have not been commuting to Vancouver for the past 35 years.</p> <p>This is another case where Portland has the ability and opportunity to squeeze more money out of a helpless non-voting population. It's of little comfort to learn you are willing to do it to Oregon citizens as well.</p> <p>How about taking a step back, taking a deep breath, and proposing something with real Value that is worthy of Pricing?</p> <p>I recommend discussion with local radio and TV media. I have heard very little from them about this project, which will have extreme impact on all the area dwellers.</p>		
05/18	<p>Subject: Value Pricing</p> <p>I am against all tolling! Build additional highway capacity. Build a third bridge and add additional lanes. Prioritize additional highway capacity in the transportation budget.</p> <p>Joe Jensen Vancouver, WA</p>	Joe Jensen	Email
05/18	<p>Subject: Toll on Vancouver drivers To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I have to travel from Vancouver to the Kaiser Interstate Clinic on Interstate for periodic treatments for Multiple Myeloma which is a blood cancer. Myeloma is treatable, but to date there is no cure for this cancer. I need to travel to the Interstate Clinic for infusions which are always given at either 8 am or 9 am in the infusion room. The protocol for this infusion time does not change and is not offered in the mid-morning or mid-afternoon when traffic between Vancouver and Portland is fairly light. I do not like the idea of having to pay a toll to get to my cancer treatments. Perhaps the OTC should consider giving those of us who need medical treatment in Portland some form of medical waiver or sticker which would allow travel to & from each city without having to pay a toll. It's bad enough that we have to compete with the commuters in that early morning time slot, but to have to pay to do so seems a bit ridiculous. Please consider giving cancer patients from Vancouver, who need treatment in Portland, a break.</p> <p>Sincerely, Richard Knight [Address] Vancouver, WA</p>	Richard Knight	Email
05/18	<p>Subject: My vote is NO for any tolling! Charging tolls for poorly spent infrastructure spending by Oregonians is an absurd thought process which has proven failure after failure in other states. Why on earth even spend more money on failed systems?</p> <p>Oregon thrives because it has good employees and services provided by both Washington and Oregon residents, many of whom make barely minimum wage AND pay INCOME TAX. Many buy products and services but don't travel every day. Many use the interstates simply to pass through.</p>	J M	Email



	<p>Logic simply says Oregon wants to cripple an already stresses employment structure as both Industry and workers as well as service industries who depend upon sales per person will be damaged irreparably NOT helping other than killing off the very hands that feed your City.</p> <p>You have spent millions "exploring" bridges, failed rapid transit and now Tolling, when you are NOT addressing the need for another bridge and simple old fashioned boulevards, along with rapid transit ABOVE existing roadways.</p> <p>Tolling, bike lanes and rapid transit are MORE WASTED efforts . Oregon is the problem, not the ones who live, visit or pass through,, they keep Oregon money flowing.</p> <p>DO NOT TOLL! We can't, and shouldn't have to when less money spent in other ways is better for all!</p> <p>DO NOT BITE THE HANDS THAT FEED YOU! IT WILL KILL IMPORTANT, FUND RAISING DISTRICTS AND BUSINESSES WILL FLEE WHEN STREETS GET BOARDED UP!</p>		
05/18	<p>Subject: Freeway tolls Gentlepersons,</p> <p>Tolling of our freeways will do nothing for congestion. Building more lane miles will. The only thing that your so-called value pricing tolls accomplish is to tax us for using the freeways we already paid for. I understand that you think the more people you can tax out of their cars and on to controlled public transportation the better. I strongly object to any tolling.</p> <p>Respectfully, Derek M. Becker</p>	Derek Becker	Email
05/19	<p>Subject: comments to share and consider re: toll across the Columbia</p> <p>"a type of toll that aims to reduce traffic congestion with user fees that are higher during more congested times of the day. The goal of congestion pricing is to get the most out of the existing system by encouraging some people to travel at less congested times or to choose an alternative mode such as transit, carpool, bicycle, or walking. The result is reduced congestion and more predictable travel times."</p> <p>Most people cannot choose "less congested times". (Their employers won't allow this.) Crossing the bridges presently cannot be done by transit (I 205), bicycle and walking across the bridges requires a large amount of time to be added to one's travel....and 99% of these travelers need to travel even further, so walking (and most bicycling) is out of the question.</p> <p>If only one bridge is tolled, the other bridge will increase in congestion. The alternate bridges are "too far out of the way" to cross over and not add even more time to the commute. (Also, hey 30 is not built to handle increased traffic, and it will be come more congested.)</p> <p>I support the alternative from tolls of both bridges to another bridge built over Columbia. Then I might support toll on I 205 . (a middle bridge of the three local choices).</p> <p>Thank you for considering my thoughts.</p> <p>Cheers!</p> <p>Michael Holst</p>	Michael Holst	Email
05/20	<p>Subject: Comment to Value Pricing Advisory Committee</p> <p>Value Pricing Advisory Committee Keep Oregon Moving Oregon Department of Transportation</p> <p>20 May 2018</p>	Dierk Polzin	Email

Dear Committee Members,

After reading the reports on your website and in the news media, I am concerned that the solution proposed by your consultants are inadequate and will result in any small progress being rejected.

For many years I have been a proponent of congestion pricing as the only viable solution to relieving the long commute times on area highways. There is no easy solution by attempting to build our way out of this problem. With the Columbia Crossing consistently being rejected by the governmental units of Washington we should expect further increased travel times unless significant steps are taken.

But the proposal to start with congestion tolling on just I-5 will only push more traffic to I-205 which is already at a standstill. Tolling on just I-5 is not a fair solution to the citizens and transportation users in East Multnomah County. It will also be expensive and ineffective and most likely use outdated technology.

What we need to do is multi-faceted and comprehensive use of technology to both increase revenue and decrease congestion:

- use high definition cameras on overpasses (new installed on I-84) to record and ticket expired and unregistered vehicles.
 - o both in-state and out-of-state expired plates should be given a significant penalty for driving expired
 - o collect out of state plate numbers and after 30 days of driving in our state they should be notified that a change of address is expected.
 - o cross reference this data with utility records to verify that these are new residents of Oregon.
- install high definition cameras to check on HOV lanes on I-5 are being used by truly vehicles with two or more occupants.
 - o Motorcycles are not HOV vehicles and should not be allowed in HOV lanes.
 - o Work trucks are not HOV vehicles and should not be allowed in HOV lanes.
- Institute Congestion Pricing initially in three places and start it soon, so the driving community gets the message.
 - o I-5 Bridge - all lanes,
 - o I-205 bridge - all lanes,
 - o I-5 Wilsonville Willamette Bridge - all lanes
 - ? Congestion Pricing - both N and S on these three bridges
 - ? Heavy fee for Trucks during rush hours (6 AM-10AM) (2PM - 7PM)
 - ? Significant fee for single occupancy vehicles - continually adjusted by traffic commute time and traffic counts.
 - ? Free for vehicles with 2 or more occupants initially. tinted windows pay the same as single occupancy.
 - ? Commercial Cabs, Uber or Lyft vehicles pay at the single occupancy rate.
 - o Transponder System or Cell App System.
 - ? We need to embrace the newest technology without saddling with outdated transponders.
 - ? By starting in three locations we can start simple and expand using the best technology.
 - ? Install an App and pay in realtime. No app, we collect your license and send you a bill each month.
 - ? Washington sends bills to Oregon Residents already.
 - Economic Justice
 - o Add a line to the state tax form to get a refund depending on your income.
 - o The state will have your entire record to verify the amount you have paid in congestion price tolling.
 - Benefits of this phased approach
 - o system is up and running sooner.
 - o system can start having an psychological impact sooner and change driving habits.
 - o Urban residents will be confident that roads inside the Metro that are paid already by Oregon Residents will not be the first being tolled.
 - o Through traffic trucking patterns will change quickly and significantly.

This debate needs to happen now. Envisioning a complex solution that only pushes traffic from I-5 to I-205 is not progress.



	<p>I applaud the committee members for working on this important issue. Some of the congestion is caused by the failure of the Washington State governmental units from being far sighted enough to view this as 75 to 100 year problem that only gets worse with delay. Much of the blame also falls on the Federal Officials that have not embraces Public Transit and higher fuel economy standards and taxes on gasoline.</p> <p>Best of luck and I hope you will re-open the discussion to a targeted three point congestion tolling proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dierk Polzin</p>		
05/21	<p>Subject: No tolls!</p> <p>Alot of fancy words all meaning money money and no congestion relief, no tolls!</p>	Sharon Kennedy	Email
05/21	<p>Subject: Tolls on I-5</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns about tolling the I-5 bridge. My husband and I live in downtown Vancouver. My husband is a sheetrocker and commutes to Portland every day for work. He cannot drive at "off-peak" hours for his work, which is primarily in residential remodel. In addition, he would never see our two young girls (3 and 1) if he did. Please do not institute tolls: it would provide an untenable burden to our family and force us to search for work elsewhere. We already pay, at great cost to our family, Oregon income tax. Please have compassion on those of us who simply cannot afford another fee.</p> <p>Thank you, Eliyah Eells</p>	Eliyah Eells	Email
05/25	<p>Subject: Citizen's Representative Office - Customer Entry</p> <p>I think it would be fair to build in an exemption or reduced rate for people in a low income situation especially those on food stamps, assistance, or Social Security disability. Many of these people can barely afford to have a job and if they have tools to pay on top of all this just to get to their Burger King job. They won't be able to keep their job and then will lose their assistance/food stamps.</p>	Becky Lovrien	Email
05/29	<p>Subject: Public Safety Concerns If Tolling Interstate 5 Near N. Going</p> <p>Portland Metro Value Pricing Committee,</p> <p>I am requesting a moment of your time for you to know that tolling Interstate 5 at N. Going Street will cause more neighborhood traffic accidents. Currently during peak traffic hours, Interstate 5 traffic is already spilling off and clogging major side streets paralleling Interstate 5 on N. Interstate, N. Williams and N. Vancouver. These streets are major bicycle commuting and public transportation routes with high density apartments and storefront businesses. By putting a toll near N. Going, commuters will have easy access off and on Interstate 5 on exits near N. Going Street to avoid paying the toll. Placing the tolling near N. Going can only increase traffic related accidents and fatalities in these densely populated areas just off Interstate 5. The Value Pricing Committee must take Vision Zero into account when deciding where to place the Northern toll on Interstate 5.</p> <p>Part of the goal of reducing congestion on Interstate 5 should not be to allow traffic to bleed further into our neighborhoods. Please look into the current commuter impact on these streets now during peak times without a toll on Interstate 5. Commuters with GPS and traffic apps are already off the highway to avoid congestion, they will then further program to avoid toll roads too causing more off-highway congestion and traffic safety issues. To have the least impact on the majority of people in neighborhoods is by moving the tolling to Hayden Island which would have no toll-avoidance opportunities, but no further down Interstate 5 than Delta Park with reduced commuter toll-avoidance to keep some safety within the neighborhoods.</p> <p>Every commuter opportunity taken to avoid paying a highway toll will increase</p>	Fred Brewer	Email

	<p>accidents and fatalities in our neighborhoods. Don't make it easy for them, and don't let this happen. Please consider people's lives as the most important element as part of reducing Interstate 5 congestion.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Fred Brewer</p>		
05/30	<p>Subject: Tolling/Value Pricing: No; only implement on the Oregon border</p> <p>Hi Melanie,</p> <p>I am forwarding a comment regarding value pricing. The customer states they do not believe value pricing or tolling should be implemented in Oregon. But, if they must be, tolls should be placed on Washington, Californian, or even Canadian borders only. They should not be placed on I5.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Caleb Gieger Program Analyst Oregon Department of Transportation Ask ODOT</p>		Email
06/04	<p>Subject: Value Pricing Dear ODOT Value Pricing Representative.</p> <p>As a resident of NE Portland for 13 years and a resident of SW WA for 30 years I'm concerned about recent proposals in the overcrowded and unsafe Portland-Vancouver I-5 corridor.</p> <p>Having served on the Bistate Bridge Committee and I-5 Bridge Replacement Taskforce and commute frequently on the I-5 corridor and regularly but less frequently on I-205 there needs to be real infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>I believe the value pricing option currently under consideration is a mistake in this compressed corridor.</p> <p>While providing funding, it will not reduce emissions, reduce congestion or improve safety. It will however, take scarce funding away from long delayed infrastructure reinforcement. (100 yr. old bridge on the economic artery of the West Coast and several outdated & inefficient designed highway sections in both Portland & SW WA).</p> <p>As our region's population continues to grow at record rates, the capacity of existing infrastructure and much needed transportation infrastructure improvements have not been completed.</p> <p>Can you explain in detail what the specific benefits from "Value Pricing" are for travelers from Seattle, Puget Sound, Olympia and SW WA daily commuters?</p> <p>Large OTR trucks and general commerce vehicles cannot take mass transit. Bike lanes, while popular and often efficient in certain urban settings will not solve the current and future transportation needs as population shifts from the Eastern Seaboard, Gulf States and California continues to migrate to the Pacific NW.</p> <p>Instead of creating a new tolling infrastructure, we need a new Bi-State Commission to examine and decide on long term improvements that benefit NW OR & SW WA efforts to improve safety, corridor flow, increase mass transit options, reduce carbon emissions and plan for the development of better regional traffic systems.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Scot Walstra, Vice President Cowlitz Economic Development Council</p>	Scot Walstra	Email
06/13	<p>Subject: Tolls</p>	Missi Wilde	Email



	<p>As a resident of Washington I feel like your bridge tolls are purposely targeting Washington residents that work in Oregon and unfairly tax us again on top of our income tax that we already have to pay to Oregon, Federal tax, Washington sales tax and Washington Property tax. We get hit from every which way already. Yes I understand traffic has become drastically worse, and more so over the last two years that I have encountered. I moved from Oregon to Washington in '05 and commuted to Oregon since so I have seen the increase and part of that is the lack of housing in the Portland area and part is the cost of buying in Portland versus Vancouver. Are you going to provide a tax break to our Oregon taxes for the amount we have to pay in tolls. You are also encouraging us to see if we can take our jobs with us into Vancouver instead which leads to less collaboration among co-workers. That may be what you want but now Oregon will get less income tax but you will have less people on the roads, give and take. I will also be less likely to shop in Oregon, or visit family and friends because I just get plain tired of having to pay to do so each time. Oregon is supposed to be about getting out and experiencing the city and the area around it, tolls do not encourage that. I just do not agree with tolling.</p> <p>Also, it is hard to tell from the website what is still being proposed, there is no agenda attached to this next meeting, but if the proposal still includes tolling roads other than the bridges I also am not thrilled about that, you are just going to increase traffic on sides streets that do not have the infrastructure to handle that amount of traffic. You are going to risk more accidents because more people are going on side streets now and they are not made for that much traffic. And in Oregon with the number of trees or green areas you have less visibility as you drive already and if you add more people driving on these roads there are going to be all kinds of more incidents. I have a number of friends that live in states/cities that have tolls, and they all avoid the freeways unless they absolutely have to and take side streets, but their cities have the infrastructure for this, the traffic plans and the ability to handle that many cars, Portland does not. Side streets are already busy and could in no way handle the additional traffic. As with myself when I visit the cities with tolls and the people I know that live there, when they map directions, most have the routes setup to avoid toll roads, and I have to say as a visitor to these other cities I don't like tolls. They also usually make you pay more if you pay cash, and some don't even let you pay in cash anymore, which means the rental car companies charge you extra to you for their pass usage. Once again, not good for the tourism that Portland enjoys.</p> <p>Personally I think Portland/Vancouver should do other things to encourage less driving at either high congestion times, encourage companies with incentives to alternate hours of operation. Encourage some companies to move to Vancouver, so those that live in Vancouver have more options for places to work. Why just toll instead of finding other ways to encourage less driving during peak hours. There are already a number of us that just drive across the river to hop on the Max and take that for the rest of our transportation, so it is not like some of us are not trying to drive less in Portland.</p> <p>Thanks</p>		
06/14	<p>Subject: C-TRAN Letter regarding Key Issues and Considerations on Value Pricing Attached is a letter that was approved by the C-TRAN Board of Directors on June 12, 2018. The letter addresses C-TRAN's key issues and considerations as the work of the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee progresses. The original letter will be sent via US Mail. Please contact C-TRAN Chief Executive Officer Shawn M. Donaghy at [phone] if you have any questions.</p> <p>Debbie Jermann, MMC Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board</p> <p>[Content from PDF letter attached to e-mail]</p> <p>MB/SMD/dj</p> <p>June 12, 2018</p> <p>Oregon Department of Transportation [Address]</p>	Debbie Jermann	Email

	<p>[Email]</p> <p>At its meeting on June 12, 2018, the C-TRAN Board of Directors approved this letter to the Oregon Department of Transportation that outlines key issues and considerations as the work of the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee is scheduled to soon complete their work.</p> <p>Although C-TRAN is not a member of the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Advisory Committee, the agency has been closely monitoring the development of the Feasibility Study and appreciates the opportunity to discuss its development with ODOT and other stakeholder agency staff. Prior to any final recommendation or decisions being made, C-TRAN would like to take this opportunity to offer the following transit related considerations and questions that we believe should be answered first: Based on current conditions, C-TRAN is the only transit agency that provides fixed route bus service on both I-5 and I-205. The level of service provided by C-TRAN on the interstates in Oregon makes C-TRAN the fourth largest transit agency in the state of Oregon. Should any value pricing options be implemented in Oregon, it remains unclear whether C-TRAN will be exempt from paying the toll. C-TRAN requests any action taken by the project's PAC include a recommendation exempting transit. Can value pricing revenue collected in Oregon be used to fund C-TRAN service that operates in the state of Oregon? Can value pricing revenue collected in Oregon be used to fund C-TRAN equipment and facilities? If the answer is no to either or both No. 4 and No. 5 above, please explain what action(s) would be required to make the answer yes. For all of the current value pricing options being considered, please provide how the option will impact the existing I-5 northbound High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane.</p> <p>While this list is not intended to be exhaustive, it does reflect some of the agency's key issues that we request responses to prior to the completion of the Value Pricing Feasibility Study.</p> <p>Sincerely, Marc Boldt, Chair, C-TRAN Board of Directors Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Chief Executive Officer</p>		
06/15	<p>Subject: Another One: Second Mueller Attorney Let Go After Anti-Trump Texts Discovered https://www.westernjournal.com/ct/another-one-second-mueller-attorney-let-go-after-anti-trump-texts-discovered/?utm_source=facebook&utm_medium=westernjournalism&utm_content=2018-06-15&utm_campaign=manualpost</p>	Lisa Lee	Email
06/17	<p>Subject: Comments for June 25 Meeting/Recommendations to OTC</p> <p>Please see my attached comments and recommendations.</p> <p>Sincerely, Doug Allen</p> <p>[Content of attached PDF]</p> <p>TO: Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee FROM: Doug Allen DATE: June 16, 2018 SUBJECT: Final Recommendations to Oregon Transportation Commission</p> <p>Based on my observations of your meetings, attendance at open houses, and review of materials presented to the Committee, I wish to share my conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>I believe the consultant work leads to the following important conclusions:</p> <p>The broader the application of value pricing across the freeway network, the more</p>	Doug Allen	Email



	<p>effective it is, the lower the level of required tolling, the greater the benefit in reduced congestion and reduced vehicle travel, and the more equitable it is. The tolling infrastructure will have economies of scale with broader application.</p> <p>2. Tolling for management of all lanes, rather than for revenue, is the most efficient and equitable way to maximize freeway through-put. It also has the least diversion to local streets, and the lower tolls could make it more acceptable to the public.</p> <p>3. The level of diversion to or from the freeway system, and to alternate travel modes, cannot be reliably determined by the level of modeling done so far. Potential safety impacts are unknown. Additional "micro-level" modeling is required.</p> <p>4. Many tolled facilities elsewhere use revenue to help pay for travel alternatives such as express buses, or provide incentives for carpools and vanpools such as free or reduced tolls.</p> <p>Several Committee members have expressed interest in looking at variable tolling of the entire Portland area freeway system, which is allowed by HB 2017.</p> <p>I ask you to make the following recommendations to the Oregon 2017.</p> <p>I ask you to make the following recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission:</p> <p>Plan for, ask FHWA permission for, and do the analysis (including NEPA analysis) for tolling the entire Portland area freeway system. Determine what to implement and in what phases based on a study of the entire system. Of the concepts studied, "C" appears to provide the most benefit. While the charge to the Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee only involved looking at I-5 and I-205, analysis of the consultant work suggests that a broader implementation be investigated, as allowed by section 120(4) of HB 2017. Planning should also include I-84, I-405, Hwy 217, Hwy 26 (Sunset), and I-5 south to Charbonneau.</p> <p>2. The "traffic congestion relief program" mandated by HB 2017 must be implemented in an equitable fashion, and must provide alternatives to single-occupancy freeway travel. Transit, vanpool, carpool, bicycle, and pedestrian alternatives, including off-freeway options, are a necessary part of such a program. Safety issues must be addressed for all components. Financial mitigation must also be implemented for those who lack alternative travel options or financial resources.</p> <p>3. A broadly implemented value pricing system, such as Concept "C" was shown by consultants to generate significant revenue even when tolls are set low to optimize freeway system operation. A wider application of value pricing should provide greater revenue, but the level of tolling must be based on managing reliable and efficient freeway operation, not generation of revenue. The Oregon Transportation Commission should provide assistance to transit from toll revenues within current constitutional restrictions, but the Commission must also investigate and advocate for a path toward modifying the current Oregon Constitution's restrictions on how toll revenue may be spent.</p> <p>Thank you for your time doing this important work. Congratulations to the Oregon Department of Transportation for the broad educational effort involving multiple open houses and a convenient to use website. Much more education will be needed down the road to help elected officials and the public understand the benefits of value pricing that have been shown to the Committee. consultant WSP has provided clear and valuable analysis on a complex topic. Oregon and the Portland region deserve an expedited effort to bring us the benefits of value pricing on the freeway system.</p> <p>Douglas R. (Doug) Allen</p>		
06/18	<p>Subject: No tolls</p> <p>As a long time N Portland resident I feel that tolling I 5 between Alberta and Multnomah Blvd would put an undue burden on the residents who live near the interstate. Drivers</p>	Amy Altenberger	Email

	<p>heading south to downtown would get off at Rosa Parks and take Interstate Ave. We are already experiencing increased traffic and parking problems due to the Max line. Plus residents like myself who use the freeway daily for work and don't have an option to take public transport or bike due to the nature of my job (I do home visits for at risk families) are being penalized the most. This would be a regressive tax. So therefore, I oppose this area for tolling.</p> <p>I agree traffic has increased. Around 40,000 people commute from Vancouver daily, put the toll at Jantzen beach. People who live in Washington cross over into Oregon to take advantage of tax free shopping all the time, let them pay a toll to do so. Please consider my feedback</p> <p>Amy Altenberger Portland</p>		
06/18	<p>Subject: Citizen's Representative Office - Customer Entry</p> <p>As ODOT considers tolling Portland freeways it seems rather unfair to only look at I5 and I205 as the only options for tolling. ODOT has spent a couple Billion dollars in the last 20 years on Highway 26 building, tearing down and rebuilding that highway. The citizens in SW Portland, Beaverton, and Hillsboro have not faced any tolls! Interstate 205 was opened in 1975 and has received almost no improvements. Both Metro and ODOT always short the people living on the East side of the Portland metro area and have for decades. If tolling goes forward the citizens of Southeast Portland and Clackamas County will have no choice but to sue in Federal Court to stop this inequity. Tolls may be a necessary evil, but everyone needs to feel the pain to drive on our freeways we have already paid for. Toll US Highway 26 from the tunnel to Oregon Highway 217!</p>	Dave McNeel	Email
05/08	<p>Subject: RE: Value Pricing Scenarios</p> <p>Dear Co-Chairs and Members of the Committee:</p> <p>On behalf of the City of Happy Valley, I wish to thank the Department of Transportation and the Value Pricing Advisory Committee for considering congestion solutions and seeking feedback throughout the public engagement process. The City Council recognizes that the Advisory Committee is tasked with an enormous responsibility and must operate within a finite timeframe based on the direction set forth in HB 2017. As the Advisory Committee considers which value pricing scenarios to advance this June, the City of Happy Valley urges the Committee's recommendation to carefully consider the following:</p> <p>Geographic Equity The impacts of congestion are felt strongly in Happy Valley. Data collected from Happy Valley in 2016 for the American Community Survey suggests that the average work commute is 29.5 minutes with 76.2 percent of residents commuting via single-occupancy trips and 11 percent carpooling. Local commuters may be unable to change their travel mode as the provision of transit in Happy Valley is severely limited, as is the service connecting Happy Valley to other parts of the region. While the City recognizes the challenges in providing more transit service in the area, without convenient alternatives to personal vehicles, the City anticipates its residents to shoulder a disproportionate cost burden of congestion pricing relative to communities with transit and active transportation networks.</p> <p>Even more broadly, the City is concerned about the geographic equity of tolling limited segments of I-205 as means to generate funding to address the seismic updates and widening project on I-205. Similar regional projects, such as Rose Quarter, have received funding from the state in the most recent transportation package, and the City encourages the I-205 bottleneck to be given the same funding priority through the legislative process. Additionally, the City is concerned that the I-205 pricing options under consideration may not generate enough revenue to pay-off the up-front investment for widening I-205.</p> <p>Clarification of Preferred Outcomes The value pricing scenarios implement tolling through different strategies and locations, resulting in dissimilar outcomes. The City Council requests the Committee clarify its preferred outcome for value pricing, whether it be behavioral changes through dynamic pricing, financing bottleneck improvements, or a combination thereof. The</p>	Jaime Lorenzini	Mail and formal letters



	<p>City recognizes that these outcomes are not mutually exclusive in pursuit of the larger goal of congestion mitigation, but without a preferred outcome, the locational scenarios are too dissimilar for comparison and the potential for net revenue remains undefined.</p> <p>Should net revenues exist, the City encourages the Advisory Committee to prioritize dollars toward capacity expansion and improvements on the highway system.</p> <p>Data Availability Surveys conducted by ODOT during its first round of public outreach indicate that 39 percent of interstate commuters will divert onto local road systems to circumvent tolls. There is no data to suggest where diversion is most likely to occur, or to assess which arterials may experience volume surges beyond their design capacity. The unavailability of data to illuminate the Committee's recommendation is concerning, as certain value pricing scenarios may exacerbate congestion or cause dangerous travel conditions on local streets in Happy Valley and nearby communities.</p> <p>Future Partner Participation The City appreciates the effort the Advisory Committee has taken thus far. As part of the Committee's recommendation to the OTC, the City requests the Committee consider bringing together the affected public agencies to further develop and assess the range of mitigation strategies that may assist adjacent communities. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input in this process. Congestion solutions are complex, and the Committee has been tasked with a difficult responsibility. The City of Happy Valley looks forward to partnering with the Department of Transportation into the future, and the City Council urges the Advisory Committee to carefully consider its final recommendation considering the aforementioned points.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lori Chavez-DeRemer</p>		
05/14	<p>Subject: ICC Value Pricing letter</p> <p>Hi Lynn -</p> <p>Please accept the attached letter and email below regarding Mr. Simpson's engagement with the Portland Region Value Pricing discussion. Feel free to contact me with questions.</p> <p>Many thanks!</p> <p>Sean Philbrook</p> <p>Sean Philbrook, Program Manager Identity Clark County</p> <p>Co-chair Simpson:</p> <p>On behalf of Chairman Tom Mears and President Ron Arp, the business leadership group Identity Clark County submits the following comments for consideration regarding the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing discussion.</p> <p>We look forward to working with you, the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Oregon Department of Transportation as the conversation proceeds.</p> <p>Feel free to call any time.</p> <p>Sean Philbrook</p> <p>Sean Philbrook, Program Manager Identity Clark County</p>	Ron Arp	Mail and formal letters

	<p>[Contents of attached PDF letter]</p> <p>April 30, 2018 Mr. Sean O'Hollaren Mr. Alando Simpson Portland Region Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee Oregon Department of Transportation Region 1</p> <p>Dear Co-Chairs: On behalf of the business leaders who comprise Identity Clark County, we support Oregon's pursuit of federal permission for congestion pricing. Washington State has similar permission and uses a mix of congestion-pricing and traditional tolling to help fund improvements. We also appreciate your involving Southwest Washington leaders to participate in your discussions, which opens more lines of communication and planning between the leaders of our two states.</p> <p>Please consider the following as you prepare a recommendation: ? We strongly favor approaches that generate funding for well-defined improvements within zones where there is nexus between users and improvements. For more than a century, our region's citizens have accepted user fees when necessary for creation or improvement of key passages. By contrast, we do not favor value pricing without specifying improvements or solely to discourage peak-time driving, which already is being discouraged through six-hours of daily traffic congestion. ? We favor metrowide transportation improvement project coordination as your proposal takes shape. Our metropolitan region encompasses two states with an integrated transportation network that does not start or stop at the state line. Local funding will be needed for many regional improvements in the years ahead, and our plans need to be coordinated as we prepare our region for anticipated 40 percent population growth over the next two decades.</p> <p>One natural opportunity for coordination is renewal of conversations to replace the obsolete and accident-prone I-5 bridge which is at significant seismic risk. Through a broadly-supported bill, a bipartisan, bicameral panel of Washington legislators have signaled their readiness to engage in conversations with Oregon legislators. Their request to catalog all past I-5 preparation work has been completed and they have extended invitations to engage in dialogue about a practical bridge replacement that integrates with the region's mass transit system.</p> <p>We appreciate recent work by legislators in both Oregon and Washington to fund transportation improvements through fuel taxes and registration fees. Given the improbability of significant new federal funding, it is incumbent upon local leaders to find new ways to fund critically needed improvements that keep our people, freight, commerce and economy moving. This is why we are supportive of your efforts.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ron Arp, President, Identity Clark County Tom Mears, Chair, Identity Clark County</p>		
06/05	<p>Dear VPAC Members,</p> <p>The City of West Linn appreciates the opportunity to have been briefed by ODOT Representative Judith Gray on the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Project Feasibility Analysis. Some of our council members have also commented or testified at ODOT's advisory committee meetings on the value pricing initiative. As you might imagine, the City is particularly interested in elements of the project that relate to the I-205 Corridor through West Linn. Something must be done about the transportation crisis gripping I-205 and the Abernethy Bridge.</p> <p>We were encouraged by the original transportation package envisioned in HB2017, but discouraged when the final version excluded work on and long term funding for the I-205 corridor. What's more, as of this point in time, there is still no proposal on the table to fund this work. We are hopeful that ODOT will soon present a plan to the Legislature to address this issue during September's Emergency Board.</p>	Russell Axelrod	Mail and formal letters



<p>The presentation we received on the Value Pricing Project emphasized what we believe: There must be a comprehensive effort to solve the gridlock facing residents of the region. Value Pricing may be one important and necessary option or tool toward addressing congestion, but is not fully sufficient, and we still need a broader transportation plan/vision for this area and the greater Metro region.</p> <p>We are encouraged to hear that ODOT has acknowledged our concerns about "diversion of traffic onto surface streets and into neighborhoods." This must be addressed in any final solution. We have seen diversionary traffic grow for nearly a decade to the point where it is a daily occurrence at commute times in our City. Willamette Falls Drive, Johnson Road, Rosemont Road, Highway 43 and many other West Linn streets are becoming dangerously congested as Waze, Google Maps, and other navigation tools divert highway traffic onto increasingly congested neighborhood streets.</p> <p>The City of West Linn has several priorities/comments in this process, including the following:</p> <p>A complete solution must be outlined. ODOT needs to identify funds for continuation of the I-205/Abernethy Bridge project as soon as possible, and legislative approval for the bridge improvements and 3rd lane must be in place before a Value Pricing plan is adopted.</p> <p>2) Mitigation strategies need to be identified and a funding stream needs to be guaranteed. Traffic calming, advanced traffic management, and restrictions on heavy vehicles are good to identify as options, but the City and its need to know exactly what is being proposed, and how ODOT and the state would pay for these measures to mitigate the impact that state Value Pricing might have on our local community. This is a state financial responsibility as part of the state highway project.</p> <p>3) Geographic discounts must be in place, in view of the fact that most West Linn residents have few options for exiting the city but I-205. An electronic system which provides toll credits for local residents needs to be considered.</p> <p>4. Commercial vehicle cost-sharing should be clarified. We understand that commercial trucks pay a weight-mile tax, but we want clarification on how this amount covers the improvements necessary in our region, as well as how tolls for commercial vehicles might be adjusted to take into consideration their larger footprint and impact on our road system.</p> <p>Finally as we mentioned in the recent briefing in West Linn, the episodic or opportunistic approach to transportation we have seen in the past has not been effective. We believe that ODOT, Trimet and Metro need to outline a longer-term vision for the transportation future of our region. Otherwise, as your own analysis points out, the improvements we are suggesting today will simply be overwhelmed as the region grows tomorrow.</p> <p>A truly visionary approach might attempt to incorporate a variety of elements, for instance:</p> <p>[graphic; see attachment]</p> <p>Providing a more comprehensive vision for our community - - and others in our region - - that these improvements are part of a larger and more effective overall effort to ensure that we address our immediate transportation bottlenecks, improve our livability, and protect our communities and neighborhoods.</p> <p>Please include these comments in the official record of the Public Advisory Committee, ODOT, and to your state and regional partners.</p> <p>Sincerely, Russell B. Axelrod Mayor City of West Linn</p>		
--	--	--

06/13	<p>Subject: RE: Comments re: Value Pricing Feasibility Study and follow-on Activities</p> <p>Dear Co-Chairs O'Hollaren and Simpson; and, Chair Baney</p> <p>The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council submits the following Comments for your attention and follow-up in relation to both your ongoing work as part of the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Study, and in anticipation of additional work by the Oregon Transportation Commission.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Matt Ransom</p> <p>[Content of attached PDF]</p> <p>Mr. Sean O'Hollaren Mr. Alando Simpson Co-Chairs of the Portland Region Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee Oregon Department of Transportation Region 1 123 NW Flanders Street Portland, OR 97209</p> <p>Ms. Tammy Baney Chair, Oregon Transportation Commission 355 Capital St. NE MS 11 Salem, OR 97301-3871</p> <p>RE: Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Study and Traffic Congestion Relief Program</p> <p>Dear PAC Co-Chairs and Chair of the Oregon Transportation Commission:</p> <p>The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, which is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Clark County Washington, is providing the following input (Attachment 1) as you consider the potential locations for implementing Value Pricing through a Traffic Congestion Relief Program as mandated by the Oregon Legislature in HB 2017.</p> <p>As the MPO serving southwest Washington state constituencies within this bi-state region, we recognize the immense burden that deteriorating highway performance and forecast population growth will impose on this bi-state region. Keeping pace with those pressures will require innovations in how we collectively fund and implement a coherent regional transportation strategy. We need to work together to implement the Regional Transportation plans which position this region for economic prosperity and creation of a seamless multi-modal bi-state transportation network.</p> <p>With those goals in mind, we have been monitoring the development of your Value Pricing Feasibility Study. Our observations about toll program implementation, drawn from Washington State, find that tolling highways is a complex technical and political endeavor. We believe that the traveling public will expect funded projects and corridor performance and enhancements as a result.</p> <p>We comment that a future Value Pricing program incorporate the following elements: identify and fund specific planned regional system improvements, establish comprehensive and bi-state mitigation program, and define the outcomes you intend to achieve prior to program start. We believe incorporating those elements into a program best promotes regional progress, corridor performance, and transparency of strategy along the immensely valuable bi-state transportation corridors.</p> <p>We request that you notify us regarding your intentions and solicit our feedback. Please contact me and our Executive Director for follow-up. We look forward to hearing from you and providing our insights and perspectives as we pursue regional transportation system improvements.</p>	Matt Ransom	Mail and formal letters
-------	--	-------------	-------------------------



<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL</p> <p>Ron Onslow Chair of the Board</p> <p>Matt Ransom Executive Director</p> <p>ATTACHMENT I</p> <p>Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (June 5, 2018) Input to the Oregon Transportation Commission Value Pricing Application and Project Development Process</p> <p>PARTNERSHIP AND CONSULTATION: Metropolitan area and bi-state planning and project coordination has resulted in many beneficial regional infrastructure improvements over many years. It is expected that continued partnership on projects of mutual bi-state interest will occur and that ODOT will engage in consultation with affected partner agencies. RTC will request consultation as part of future NEPA project evaluation processes in order to assess bi-state and regional transportation system and policy impacts.</p> <p>REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: A regionally significant project improvement plan should be prepared identifying the planned regional and bi-state bottleneck removal and corridor projects (i.e., highway, transit, other modal) that will be funded from toll proceeds. Implementation of value pricing should financially support construction of those projects. Most notable among the planned bi-state bottleneck removal projects is replacement of the existing I-5 Columbia River bridges. I-5 corridor value pricing strategies should support (financial or otherwise) a future I-5 Columbia River bridge replacement project, thereby advancing the project priority and funding plans of the respective metropolitan area Regional Transportation Plans.</p> <p>REGIONAL MITIGATION: Identify and mitigate at the bi-state level, direct and indirect impacts created by a value pricing project. mitigation responses should be tied to the corridor of impact and should be proportional. Legislative remedies need to be pursued to enable project mitigation actions in Washington State, in order to fairly address bi-state impacts, or avoidance of non-mitigatable impacts should be pursued. (For example: a mitigation response to an I-5 value pricing project could be expanding bi-state express bus transit services provided by C-TRAN, thereby providing an alternative and improved regional transit for affected Clark County stakeholders.)</p> <p>REGIONAL SYSTEM MONITORING: Regional corridor outcomes and performance metrics should be defined prior to beginning a value pricing pilot project. Through monitoring, propose corridor specific project mitigations and programs to ameliorate social/economic impacts created by a value pricing project. Corridor monitoring and mitigation towards the outcomes should be continuous for the duration of a pilot project.</p> <p>DECISION MAKING: RTC intends to remain involved in monitoring and providing input into the development and implementation of a value pricing project upon the regional transportation network Disclosure of future project decision-making milestones and input opportunities should be communicated to regional and bi-state governmental agencies and the public at large.</p>	
---	--

06/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These concepts are unfair to West Linn • Concerned about diversion impacts. • I'm all for this • The project is a common good. We should all give our share. • Sensitivity to analysis for Willamette Falls Drive • Traffic calming – stop signs could work • Safety is a problem • Tolling the bridge is a horrible idea. Local traffic will be hard hit • Concept C would toll the whole thing. That makes sense to me. • I am very strongly opposed to tolling only the Abernethy Bridge. This is going to cause significant diversion over the old Oregon City Bridge into downtown Oregon City. Furthermore, it is unfair to local residents who count on using Abernethy Bridge for shopping, doctors etc. I also feel that Clark County is overrepresented in this process and you have No One from West Linn or Oregon City on the committee, yet we will get the biggest impact of tolling the bridge. Very unfair. 		Open house
06/12	Tolling the bridge is the worst idea. No tolls. I don't want to pay a toll for something I already pay for.		Open house
05/14	<p>Albert Lee provided verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[Thank you for this time. I went to the open forums, which were informative, but they were not a place where we had an opportunity to speak. I'm taking time off to come here today and 90 seconds is not enough time to hear from the public. For me, congestion pricing is a burden shift to the people who have the least to give and those who live in the outskirts. These people are the ones who have the least control of when and what time they can drive. They will be the most affected. Second, congestion pricing does not solve traffic congestion. The PAC should focus on educating drivers about behavior, such as tailgating and technologies like cruise control. Ultimately, this should be a focus on looking at mass transit, instead of adding lanes or reducing the number of cars. Also, the Westside Bypass would help.]</p>	Albert Lee	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Ernie Platt provided verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[The North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce is generally in support of the concepts being talked about here. Traffic is an impediment to business in Clackamas County. Regarding the proposals, tolling all lanes on I-5 and I-205 is not the favored concept because it would shift traffic to alternative routes and surface streets to the detriment of the community. Pricing by hours and lanes seems to be the preferred avenue. All of this is clearly a means to get better capacity out of the system we have. Whatever funds are raised need to be designated to the additional lane on I-205.]</p>	Ernie Platt	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Ron Swaren provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[We are having this discussion because Oregon needed economic recovery in the 1980s. A Western Arterial Highway is the most sensible and effective solution when we look at the money dumped into tolling and adding lanes. HB 2017 mandated the OTC look at proposals for cost effectiveness, so I urge you to look at this and its cost effectiveness. Public transit could use this facility, as it would make connections. We could even do something like a Western Arterial Highway on the Eastside. We need to get this studied.]</p>	Ron Swaren	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Margaret Tweet provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[I cannot support plans to toll all lanes on I-5 and I-205. In Seattle, the tolling cost is \$6.00 with a \$2.00 discount for those with a transponder. How much of this toll will go to the private tolling company? According to the Washington State Transportation</p>	Margaret Tweet	PAC meeting verbal comment



	<p>Commission, they estimate 35 percent. According to Mandy Putney (ODOT): "Some of these scenarios might not raise much more than the cost to cover the operations of the tolling system." Then what is the point? Adding a tolled lane on I-5 and I-205 is the only option to relieve congestion, but option 4 (add a lane to I-5 and I-205) has been eliminated by staff. I urge the PAC to support option 4.]</p>		
05/14	<p>John Ley provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[How many cars need to be removed from I-5 and I-205? You haven't told us: why not? ODOT's Don Hamilton has been telling citizens this is about behavior modification. Let's have all public servant government employees modify their behavior. I'd like to see the 25 PAC members take a bold step and demand option 4 be added back. Abandon your Band-Aid and begin fixing the problem. Jana Jarvis said the trucking industry was promised added lanes. Do not kick the can down the road – the PAC is the one in charge. Band-Aids and behavior modification will not fix the issue.]</p>	John Ley	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Laura Edmonds provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[The North Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce has had numerous conversations about congestion pricing. Our organization supports the business community and our citizens. Adding a tolled lane is the solution to decrease congestion. Taking a shoulder for transit does not make common sense. The toll revenue needs to stay within the roadway that is tolled. Transparency, honesty and respect are important. We need to distinguish tolling versus congestion pricing. Last, the chamber is concerned about diversion safety.]</p>	Laura Edmonds	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Doug Klotz provided the following verbal comment at PAC #5:</p> <p>[The only action to reduce congestion is congestion pricing. Freeway widening will work for a few years, but induced demand will take over. Please institute congestion pricing on our freeways, but it must be implemented equitably. Low-income mitigation must be included in the package, and we need better transit. The funds need to be invested in better transit service to encourage a safe and convenient economic system. Oregon Goal 12 says a transportation plan must minimize adverse social and environmental impacts. Dedicating the funds to transit will accomplish that.]</p>	Doug Klotz	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Jim Howell provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[The Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates supports congestion pricing. However, we think the equity issue has not been addressed the right way. There is no bus service on I-205, but it is needed. Increased capacity should be in bus seats, not additional vehicles. ODOT should be paying for bus services because TriMet only has one line on the freeway; there is no all-day, 7-day a week service. Buses on the freeway could connect suburbs and benefit those too old to drive or who cannot afford to drive – and that's an equity issue.]</p>	Jim Howell	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Sorin Garber provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[Regarding the materials for today, some PAC members might think the impacts are not as bad as expected, some might think they are worse, some might not understand the analysis and some might not trust the analysis. I hope that you [the PAC] will continue the process and not give up because you do not understand it right now. We've tried all the tools, ODOT and WSDOT [Washington Department of Transportation] and others have added a great deal of capacity in these corridors and a lot of transit service and bike connections. We need to test this tool [congestion pricing] just like our peers have.]</p>	Sorin Garber	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Angela Crowley Cook provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[From the Oregon Environmental Council, thank you for your hard work. Congestion has impacts on quality of life, our economy and the environment. It is a hidden tax on the economy. Many neighborhoods were destroyed by freeways. We all pay for freeways whether we use them or not. The Policy Advisory Committee must seek the best outcome for our most vulnerable communities. The most equitable and sustainable solution is putting a price on roadways during peak hours. Reducing congestion will clean our air, reduce our carbon footprint and keep our economies growing. Congestion pricing must also be accompanied by significant improvements on transit.]</p>	Angela Crowley Cook	PAC meeting verbal comment

05/14	<p>Aaron Brown provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[The No More Freeway Expansion organization believes this work is the only way we will ever solve congestion. Expanding freeways has never worked. We should invest in decongestion pricing with the revenues put into transit investments. Our letter was signed by 250 people across the region. Folks are interested in air quality, climate justice and improving public health. ODOT is considering expanding freeways. This is an intergenerational theft issue. It may be difficult to tell your constituents but look to decongestion pricing in other cities. As soon as it was implemented, it had massive approval. This is one of many issues in the next few years. Thank you.]</p>	Aaron Brown	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/14	<p>Meredith Conley provided the following verbal comment at PAC meeting #5:</p> <p>[Climate Solutions imagines an equitable northwest powered by clean energy. That's why we are strongly supportive of this process and value pricing. Expanding capacity does not work. It did not work in Houston and Los Angeles. It is bad for drivers and the environment. Transportation is the single largest source of pollution in Oregon at 40 percent. Congestion pricing is an effective tool to reduce pollution. We encourage Oregon to be bold like those in Stockholm and London. We encourage the PAC to design solutions that prioritize communities of color and other historically marginalized groups. This is possible while also moving with urgency. The federal government is undoing emission standards and we need the west coast to step up. Congestion pricing has the ability to improve lives by getting people out of traffic. Thank you for your efforts.]</p>	Meredith Conley	PAC meeting verbal comment
05/08	<p>Jordana Buckler, a Vancouver WA resident, contacted AskODOT and wanted to share her opinion on Value Pricing/Toll roads in the Portland Metro area. Below are her comments:</p> <p>It is not fair to charge tolls between Portland and Vancouver because they are "Twin Cities."</p> <p>All tolling money should go for a new bridge between the two cities.</p> <p>If Oregon charges a toll, Washington should be able to charge a toll as well.</p> <p>I informed her of the 4/30/18 Meeting at the Marshall Community Center.</p>	Jordana Buckler	Phone
05/18	<p>Hi Melanie,</p> <p>FYI No Responses Needed</p> <p>I am forwarding an opinion Ask ODOT fielded over the phone. I referred him to the website, but Tim does not have a computer. Tim believes tolling should not be implemented in Oregon on any road. But, if it is implemented, tollways should be stationed at the borders. They should only toll out-of-state motorists.</p> <p>Thank you and have a great weekend,</p> <p>Caleb Gieger Program Analyst</p>	Tim	Phone
05/03	<p>Hi, my name is Tyrell. My phone number is [phone]. I am against your value pricing or tolling of any lanes because we've already paid for these roads. So this message is for all involved. But my main concern is how come you guys have not issued or released what the pricing is going to be? So that people are informed about how they can plan their travel. This is going to come at a great cost to everybody and the public would like to know. So if we if we could get that information then it would probably determine if we get our pitchforks out or if we quietly pack together like sheep and just go about our business.</p>	Tyrell	Phone
05/08	<p>This doesn't work.</p>		Phone