

# Memorandum

<b>Date</b>	July 17, 2023 <u>Revised July 31, 2023</u>
<b>To</b>	Regional Toll Advisory Committee (RTAC)
<b>From</b>	RTAC Project Team
<b>Subject</b>	RTAC Nexus Project List Development and Selection Criteria

## 1. Introduction

This memorandum documents the proposed approach and revised selection criteria to develop the Regional Toll Advisory Committee (RTAC) list of pedestrian, bicycle, and other roadway projects that have a nexus to improving mobility in concert with a congestion pricing system on I-5 and I-205. This process will be coordinated with the ongoing effort lead by public transportation agencies to develop a Public Transportation Strategy (PTS) that best complements regional congestion pricing.

The information contained herein advances the conversation that began at the June 20, 2023, RTAC meeting, and addresses feedback from members and staff.

## 2. Nexus List Proposed Development Process

ODOT staff will work with senior staff from jurisdictions in the region to draft a list of nexus pedestrian, bicycle, roadway, and other mobility projects for RTAC consideration. The proposed approach to developing the draft nexus project list includes:

1. Develop definition and selection criteria for projects with a nexus to the proposed toll system on I-5 and I-205. RTAC reviews and provides input to the definition and criteria (June-July 2023).
2. ODOT will request jurisdictions/partner agencies to identify potential nexus projects using the definition, criteria, and a simple intake form. Any jurisdiction may submit a project, including jurisdictions not directly represented at the RTAC table (Request initiated in early August 2023).
3. Partner agencies/jurisdictions submit initial nexus projects using the intake form (By September 5, 2023).
4. The ODOT Toll Project team will work with senior partner agency staff to review, discuss, and identify the nexus projects that meet the criteria for discussion of by RTAC (September 2023). Once a draft list has been developed, projects may be sorted or grouped in categories to facilitate review and discussion.
5. RTAC members may choose to submit additional potential projects by October 12, 2023.
6. RTAC will discuss and refine the list of nexus projects as well as next steps based on the outcomes of staff discussions (September and November 2023).
7. The refined nexus project list and next steps will be considered in the development of ODOT's Implementation Plan due to Governor Kotek on December 15, 2023.

8. The list will be considered a working draft as the toll projects continue to develop. In 2024, RTAC will revisit the nexus and PTS project lists as additional traffic modeling data is available and to discuss funding options once revenue projections are known.

### 3. RTAC Input

The following elements of the draft nexus project definition and selection criteria changed as a result of input from several RTAC members and staff:

Many respondents indicated that the definition of nexus either needed no further editing or was headed in the right direction. Minor text edits were made to the definition previously presented to enhance clarity. Several requested more information about the purpose of the nexus project list – this section has been added to this memo.

Many respondents indicated that the selection criteria are generally those that should be considered for nexus project list development. There was eagerness for more information about how selection criteria would be used, and the level of detail required from local jurisdictions. The project team reorganized the selection criteria into three categories, including: relationship to congestion pricing, equity, and project readiness. Additionally, individual selection criteria (project location, readiness) are more clearly defined based on member feedback. This includes broadening the definition for project location and project readiness. Some suggested criteria, such as project funding, were removed to simplify and focus the list. Project funding and cost will now be considered at a later stage.

See attachment for input received.

### 4. Purpose of the Nexus Project List

RTAC, and by association all regional ODOT Toll Project partners and jurisdictions, are asked to engage in an effort to identify pedestrian, bicycle, roadway, and other mobility projects<sup>1</sup> that have a nexus to congestion pricing when it is implemented on I-5 and I-205 in the Portland metropolitan area. The nexus projects are key projects that advance multimodal accessibility, are critical to achieving congestion relief in our region, and provide access to opportunity or address transportation-related disparities and barriers experienced by the Toll Projects' Equity Framework<sup>2</sup> communities.

The nexus project list (as well as the final Public Transportation Strategy project and supportive services list) is intended to aid ODOT and regional partners as the Toll Program advances, funding opportunities become available, and strategic partnerships and investments are aligned. Nexus projects are, in many cases, ambitious and essential infrastructure investments that are needed to provide mobility options in the region within the context of a priced system. Paired together, regional pricing and investments in the pedestrian, bicycle, roadway, and transit systems can support regional and state goals related to equity, mobility and climate. The nexus project list may change and expand as funding and regional priorities and needs change.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note, the Public Transportation Strategy is a separate effort underway to identify specific public transportation projects and supportive services that are complementary to a congestion pricing system on I-5 and I-205.

<sup>2</sup> Toll Projects Equity Framework.

[https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/Toll\\_Projects\\_Equity\\_Framework\\_with\\_AppendixA.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/Toll_Projects_Equity_Framework_with_AppendixA.pdf)

## 5. Nexus Project Revised Definition

Text additions as a result of RTAC member and staff feedback are underlined, and deletions are ~~struck through~~.

Nexus projects are pedestrian, bicycle, roadway, or other mobility projects that would complement a tolling system on I-5 and I-205 in the Portland metropolitan area by:

- Supporting congestion relief on a currently congested corridor that may become more congested with the implementation of tolling, OR improving access to public transportation, OR improving mobility options on a toll highway traffic diversion corridor<sup>3</sup> ~~near the tolled highway~~, AND
- Providing access to opportunity OR addressing transportation-related disparities and barriers experienced by the Toll Projects' Equity Framework<sup>4</sup> communities.

## 6. Nexus Project Revised Selection Criteria

Category	Selection Criteria
<b>Congestion Pricing Nexus</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Project Location</b> – Project is within a <u>traffic diversion corridor<sup>3</sup></u> <del>corridor that may become more congested due to tolling diversion</del>.</li> <li>• <b>Safety</b> – Project is focused on addressing a safety concern at an identified high injury location for vehicle drivers, pedestrians, or bicyclists.</li> <li>• <b>Network Connectivity</b> – Project provides additional connections to the street network.</li> <li>• <b>Congestion Relief</b> – Project supports congestion relief on a currently congested corridor that may become more congested with the implementation of tolls.</li> <li>• <b>Transit</b> – Connects to/expands access to public transportation or complements a Public Transportation Strategy project or supportive service.</li> </ul>
<b>Equity<sup>5</sup></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Project Location</b> – Project serves <u>Equity Framework communities</u>.</li> <li>• <b>Equitable Engagement</b> – <u>Equity Framework communities have had or will have the opportunity to engage in project development</u>.</li> <li>• <b>Benefits</b> – Project reduces travel times or adds modal options for Equity Framework communities.</li> <li>• <b>Access to job centers</b> – Project increases accessibility to job centers for Equity Framework communities.</li> <li>• <b>Climate</b> – Provides opportunities for reduced greenhouse gas emissions (or could contribute to improved air quality) or encourages multimodal transportation use.</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Traffic diversion corridor as defined in 6.8.B Oregon Highway Plan Policy Amendment to Goal 6: Tolling and Congestion Pricing, [https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/OHP\\_Goal\\_6\\_Policy.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/OHP_Goal_6_Policy.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Toll Projects Equity Framework.

[https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/Toll\\_Projects\\_Equity\\_Framework\\_with\\_AppendixA.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Documents/Toll_Projects_Equity_Framework_with_AppendixA.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> EMAC review may result in adjustments to these screening criteria.

Category	Selection Criteria
<b>Project Readiness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Planning stage, implementation phase, public engagement –</b></li> <li>• Project is included in regional transportation plan or a local plan.</li> <li>• <u>Project will be ready for implementation within 5 years.</u></li> <li>• <u>Project will be ready for implementation in 5 to 10 years.</u></li> <li>• <u>Project has had some early planning conducted and/or completeness of project design.</u></li> <li>• Project is supported by facility owner and nearby communities.</li> </ul>

DRAFT

# Memorandum

<b>Date</b>	July 27, 2023 <u>Revised July 31, 2023</u>
<b>To</b>	Regional Toll Advisory Committee (RTAC)
<b>From</b>	RTAC Project Team
<b>Subject</b>	RTAC Nexus Projects: Updated Schedule and Process

This memorandum serves as an addendum to the RTAC Nexus Project List Development and Selection Criteria memorandum dated July 17, 2023 and updated July 31, 2023. It provides greater detail on the purpose and schedule for development of the list of Nexus Projects.

## 1. Purpose of the Nexus Project List

The RTAC project team has received requests for additional information on the purpose of the RTAC nexus project list. We have also heard questions about how the Nexus Project List and the Public Transportation Strategy project and supportive services list relate. Below is a summary of the purpose of the Nexus initiative and how the Public Transportation Strategy effort will integrate into the Nexus timeline:

- The Nexus Project list, as well as the Public Transportation Strategy list of projects and supportive services, will be considered in the development of ODOT's implementation plan due to Governor Kotek on December 15, 2023. These lists will be among the efforts in the region related to managing diversion and addressing equity concerns from tolling.
- If the RTAC decides that the Nexus and Public Transportation Strategy lists are important projects and agree that they complement the toll system, the ODOT will work with the committee to identify potential revenue streams, which could include toll revenue, federal, state funds, etc.).
- RTAC will need to consider equity, managing demand on the system, and other tradeoffs when evaluating the project lists in the context of available toll and other revenue sources.
- In 2025, the Level 2 Traffic and Revenue analysis for the Regional Mobility Pricing Project will provide greater detail on toll revenue, and ODOT will be able to estimate available funding for regional projects in the near and long term.

## 2. Project List Development Schedule

The process to develop a list of regional projects with a nexus to tolling has been updated based on partner agency feedback. Below is a revised schedule:

- **August 1:** Intake form released for Nexus projects. Any jurisdiction may submit a project, including jurisdictions not directly represented at the RTAC table.
- **August 7 – 18:** RTAC project team to hold meetings with partner agencies to collaborate and answer questions. These meetings are currently being scheduled.
- **September 5:** Deadline for partner agencies/jurisdictions to submit initial Nexus projects using the intake form.
- **September 11:** RTAC project team distributes compiled project list to partner agencies in advance of the September 18 RTAC meeting.
- **September 18:** RTAC meets to discuss the initial project list and next steps.
- **September – November 2023:** ODOT Toll Project team will work with senior partner agency staff to review, discuss, and identify the Nexus projects that meet the criteria for further discussion by RTAC. Once the project lists are compiled, they will likely be grouped or sorted for ease of presentation and discussion with RTAC.
- **October 12:** Deadline for RTAC partner agencies/jurisdictions to submit additional potential projects.
- **November 13:** RTAC will discuss and refine the list of Nexus projects as well as next steps based on the outcomes of staff discussions September - November 2023.
- The refined Nexus project list and next steps will be considered in the development of ODOT's implementation plan, due to Governor Kotek on December 15, 2023. The Nexus list will be further refined in 2024 and 2025 once there is more clarity on assumptions, impacts and revenue potential coming from parallel efforts, including:
  - Public Transportation Strategy
  - RMPP environmental review, including required mitigation
  - RMPP Level 2 Traffic and Revenue study
  - Other funding resources

## **Attachments:**

At the last RTAC meeting on June 26, members were asked to provide written feedback on the proposed nexus projects definition, criteria, and process. The following attachments are a compilation of feedback received.

- Spreadsheet of feedback received via paper and online survey form
- Written feedback received via email from Commissioner Paul Savas
- Letter received from Mayor Frank Bubenik

**What additional ideas do you have to achieve process equity in toll program development?  
Could you or your organization partner with ODOT to support this effort?**

Feedback Response 1	N/A
Feedback Response 2	Yes
Feedback Response 3	Issue of equity around overburdened small agencies/organizations. There is not an alternative to driving over the Columbia that does not utilize a tolled facility.
Feedback Response 4	(yes) In the EMAC recommendation to OTC #3 increase % of dollars spent on DBE contracts... While I agree that policy needs to be created to support this, we also need policy to support workforce expectations as to equity. If these are not created together, it will be at the disservice to the other. Contracting equity at the expense of workforce/workforce at expense of contracting.
Feedback Response 5	
Feedback Response 6	See below for equity comments.
Feedback Response 7	In order to achieve process equity, all affected jurisdictions need to be involved. It is not enough to rely upon our RTAC members without also allowing time for them to bring issues to the county coordinating committee. ODOT could also present at the county coordinating committees, taking the burden off the RTAC members to explain issues and gather input. Washington County would be happy to coordinate with ODOT to ensure greater participation by affected communities.
Feedback Response 8	Expand engagement for the development of the Low-Income Toll Program to include the RTAC members. Share RTAC recommendation on the Low-Income Toll Program with the OTC and Legislature. Engage potential Low-Income Toll Program participants to better understand preferred discount levels and program design options to reduce barriers to participation.

**Based on your experience in making choices that center equity, what are lessons learned that can be brought to this process?**

Feedback Response 1	N/A
Feedback Response 2	Go out to the various groups to meet them - don't expect them to come to you.
Feedback Response 3	Geographic equity: this is a North-South toll, so we are asking for greater focus on these impacts.
Feedback Response 4	See above. Delivery mechanisms the include both contracting and workforce goals with training language to ensure the continuation of a skilled, trained, and <u>DIVERSE</u> workforce is essential to the success of the equity efforts.
Feedback Response 5	It's difficult
Feedback Response 6	See below for equity comments.
Feedback Response 7	One thing we learned through our MSTIP project prioritization process was to consider lived experience reported by community members rather than relying on our academic understanding of impacts. We recommend conducting engagement with community based organization partners in affected communities.
Feedback Response 8	It's important to carry identified values through the entire project process. There tends to be an overemphasis on process equity without a commensurate focus on outcome equity. Project outcomes occur throughout the entire development process, not just once it is constructed. For example, policy decisions that set the amount of credit/discount for drivers experiencing low-incomes and the portion of toll revenue committed to projects that complement tolling will affect the region and state's ability to meet climate, equity, and safety goals.

**What additional feedback do you have for ODOT to advance outcome and process equity for the Oregon Toll Program?**

Feedback Response 1	While I appreciate the initial conversation about Nexus projects - I think we first should understand the mitigation projects and transit plan FIRST before even dreaming of putting other projects on our list. It feels like we're putting the cart before the horse. Thank you for your hard work.
Feedback Response 2	Consider asking the large employees, hospitals, school districts, and higher education.
Feedback Response 3	Smaller agencies should be provided additional time/resources to provide feedback and nexus projects/public transportation.
Feedback Response 4	
Feedback Response 5	
Feedback Response 6	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important step in the RTAC process. This step of determining the definition of a nexus project, developing criteria and an evaluation process, and identifying the purpose of the list(s) is an essential part of developing the Oregon Toll Program overall, and Multnomah County does not feel like there has been good process equity incorporated into this step. ODOT has not been able to provide answers to critical questions about important aspects of the nexus project list and the submission process. Public and partner jurisdictions have not had a meaningful chance to engage, ask questions, or provide input and edits to process. Multnomah County is feeling uninformed in conversations surrounding the creation of a nexus project list. Nexus project lists will only be successful, and satisfactory to regional partners, if partners feel aligned and supportive of the process developed to generate those lists. There is currently no clear process for applying the definition and criteria. There are also no clear accountability measures in place for ensuring ODOT implements feedback from RTAC on this process. More clear direction and definition from ODOT on this list and how it will be used could greatly improve this process.
Feedback Response 7	
Feedback Response 8	ODOT has done a great job improving process equity and access to project decision making structures and process for historically excluded and unserved groups. ODOT should focus on taking opportunities to create more equity outcomes. For example, the Low-Income Toll Program will directly and significantly affect groups identified in the Oregon Toll Program Equity Framework. RTAC should be included in discussions to develop the Low-Income Toll Program. The policy decisions associated with this program will have very real impacts on people experiencing low-income. ODOT will be faced with making a choice between investing more resources in equity outcomes or funding projects that complement tolling. RTAC members represent agencies that have useful experience and expertise implementing equity-focused outcomes that could inform the development of the program.

**What is your initial reaction to the definition of nexus projects?**

Feedback Response 1	Heading in the right direction
Feedback Response 2	Heading in the right direction
Feedback Response 3	Heading in the right direction
Feedback Response 4	Generally support
Feedback Response 5	Generally support
Feedback Response 6	Needs edits
Feedback Response 7	Needs edits
Feedback Response 8	Heading in the right direction

**If you selected “needs edits,” please provide a revised definition below.**

Feedback Response 1	Needs equity
Feedback Response 2	
Feedback Response 3	Nexus projects are roadway, [transit, car pool/van pool], bike...
Feedback Response 4	
Feedback Response 5	
Feedback Response 6	Nexus Project Definition: Nexus projects are roadway, bike, pedestrian or other mobility projects or programs that would provide a benefit above and beyond the mitigation projects that will be identified through the NEPA process that could complement a tolling system on I-5 and I-205 in the Portland metropolitan area by: Addressing an anticipated negative impact (define), OR improving access to public transportation, OR improving mobility options near the tolled highway (define/change - see below), AND Providing access to opportunity or addressing transportation-related disparities and barriers experienced by the Toll Projects’ Equity Framework communities.
Feedback Response 7	We don't have a revised definition per se...the definition is generally fine, but we lack much of the information necessary to provide feedback (what is near, relationship with PTS projects, what constitutes a negative impact, etc).
Feedback Response 8	

**Please provide your reasoning. (You can say that you have already submitted written comments.)**

Feedback Response 1	
Feedback Response 2	Already submitted written comments - in previous minutes
Feedback Response 3	Transit providers need support in rolling out solutions
Feedback Response 4	As long as mitigation efforts take priority. I believe through the Nexus definition it is addressed and also addressed in other ways. Safety, equity, and effective system is thoroughly included.
Feedback Response 5	
Feedback Response 6	<p>The relationship between nexus projects and the NEPA process should be clearly stated. That difference is not currently well understood. Something could be written like: Nexus projects are also projects that provide a benefit above and beyond the mitigation projects that will be identified through the NEPA process. Mitigation projects also provide a benefit but are identified as a required part of the tolling project due to the impact caused by the tolling. Certain phrases within the definition need additional details for clarity. What would classify as a negative impact? How are you defining “near the tolled highway?” Will you be using the definition of “corridor” as defined in the Oregon Highway Plan, Action 6.H.2: “The ‘corridor,’ defined as the immediate area of impact adjacent to the priced facility, generally within 1 mile or as defined through the project-specific analysis as being impacted by the project. Additionally, the corridor is limited to facilities that generally move traffic in the same directions.” If so, that needs to be clearly stated in the definition. However, we do not believe that access to opportunity and addressing disparities should not be limited to this narrow corridor definition. Instead, we think that the definition needs to be broader, or rather than location based focus, this should be more oriented around mobility options for people who divert from the tolled highway. The area of impact could extend to various degrees based on route options for drivers at any given point. Modeling and measuring impacts on a regular basis are more important than defining this on specific locations from/near the highway. The definition of nexus project should help clarify the end goal of collecting these lists of projects from each jurisdiction. Knowing, specifically, what ODOT is aiming to do with these nexus project lists, and what they are hoping to learn from each project submittal can help guide the definition. Knowing that the expected funding for these projects has not been identified, and without the clarity around how ODOT will logistically fund, manage, and prioritize these project lists, jurisdictions cannot have a clear understanding of what a nexus project is. It is also crucial to understand whether or not the creation of this list is a one-time process, or will be on-going and reviewed on a regular basis. How would a one-time generated list be sufficient to generate projects that could complement tolling on I-5 and I-205 long-term? If it is not a one-time exercise, please provide the specific plans for how these lists will be reviewed, evaluated, and implemented on a recurring basis.</p>
Feedback Response 7	<p>The AND between the points should be removed - there are many scenarios where impacted areas may not be located in an equity framework community but where impacts should still be mitigated. The definition should not be so narrow so as to preclude projects on perpendicular routes that provide access to parallel routes (i.e. "near"). The definition should make clear that nexus projects are not those required by NEPA. The definition should also make clear that nexus projects are not PTS projects.</p>
Feedback Response 8	

**Please select all the criteria you believe should be considered when determining eligibility or evaluating nexus projects. Please provide other feedback under "other."**

Feedback Response 1	
Feedback Response 2	Transit. Connects to/expands access to public transportation or complements a Public Transportation Strategy project and/or supportive service., Funding. Leverages existing or future funding opportunities (local, federal or other state).
Feedback Response 3	Safety. Addresses a safety need., Transit. Connects to/expands access to public transportation or complements a Public Transportation Strategy project and/or supportive service., Funding. Leverages existing or future funding opportunities (local, federal or other state).
Feedback Response 4	Safety. Addresses a safety need., Traffic operations. Improves reliability and supports congestion relief., Urgency of need. Addresses essential repair or provides a critical connection., Transit. Connects to/expands access to public transportation or complements a Public Transportation Strategy project and/or supportive service., Benefits. Provides benefits to the community, economy, and environment., Geography. Located within impacted corridor as defined by Oregon Highway Plan or in a Metro Mobility CorridorOption 9, Funding. Leverages existing or future funding opportunities (local, federal or other state).
Feedback Response 5	

Feedback Response 6

Project readiness. Included in regional transportation plan or a local plan, early planning conducted, public engagement conducted, and/or completeness of project design., Safety. Addresses a safety need., Traffic operations. Improves reliability and supports congestion relief., Urgency of need. Addresses essential repair or provides a critical connection., Climate. Contributes to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction., Transit. Connects to/expands access to public transportation or complements a Public Transportation Strategy project and/or supportive service., Benefits. Provides benefits to the community, economy, and environment., Ownership. Proposer owns facility or has knowledge of owner support., Funding. Leverages existing or future funding opportunities (local, federal or other state)., Project Readiness & Urgency of need -Jurisdictions need to understand more clearly if this list is a one-time selection or a recurring process. If the goal is to prioritize a project list for near-term funding to complement early tolling implementation, then it would be critical that they are projects that have already had sufficient public engagement and already been adopted into a plan, then we would find project readiness and urgency of need to be important. However, if this will be a recurring process, there are other criteria that would be more relevant for long-term projects that would both complement and be directly impacted by tolling. Safety - "Addressing a safety need" needs to be much more specific. ODOT should clearly identify what they are looking for in terms of addressing safety. For example, the project could be addressing something that is a proven safety countermeasure to address a high injury location or known risk that contributes to serious and fatal crashes, with a priority on pedestrian and bicycle safety. Traffic Operations - This criteria should include projects, roadways and transit routes, that will see an increase of traffic due to tolling, meaning an increase in maintenance and expedited disrepair. Improving reliability and congestion relief, and ensuring that there continue to be safe travel options is critical. Geography - Do Metro mobility corridors have a direct nexus to tolling corridors? If not, why are they used as a criteria here? How are Metro's corridors selected? Project cost - Does this criterion mean that ODOT is considering covering maintenance costs of new infrastructure if it is not an ODOT facility? How will information on the project cost relate to a project's position on the nexus project list?

Feedback Response 7

Project readiness. Included in regional transportation plan or a local plan, early planning conducted, public engagement conducted, and/or completeness of project design., Safety. Addresses a safety need., Traffic operations. Improves reliability and supports congestion relief., Urgency of need. Addresses essential repair or provides a critical connection., Transit. Connects to/expands access to public transportation or complements a Public Transportation Strategy project and/or supportive service., Benefits. Provides benefits to the community, economy, and environment., We cannot select some of these criteria without additional information about how they would be evaluated. How will climate impacts be calculated? Why is ownership important? Why are Metro mobility corridors being considered and how do they relate to an OHP corridor; the ability to leverage funding shouldn't necessarily have weight when this is about impacts; what level of project cost estimates will be expected?

Feedback Response 8

Project readiness. Included in regional transportation plan or a local plan, early planning conducted, public engagement conducted, and/or completeness of project design., Safety. Addresses a safety need., Traffic operations. Improves reliability and supports congestion relief., Urgency of need. Addresses essential repair or provides a critical connection., Climate. Contributes to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction., Transit. Connects to/expands access to public transportation or complements a Public Transportation Strategy project and/or supportive service., Benefits. Provides benefits to the community, economy, and environment., Ownership. Proposer owns facility or has knowledge of owner support., Geography. Located within impacted corridor as defined by Oregon Highway Plan or in a Metro Mobility Corridor Option 9, Funding. Leverages existing or future funding opportunities (local, federal or other state)., Project cost. Project development, construction and maintenance., All of the proposed criteria are important considerations. However, we need to pair this with information about estimated toll revenue to have a complete understanding of the trade-offs inherent to implementing the Oregon Toll Program. The questions in this form regarding nexus project eligibility and potential prioritization considerations are helpful to discuss at the RTAC table. However, a complete and transparent discussion should include efforts to address question about toll revenue allocation for the nexus and PTS project lists. Request: Can ODOT more directly address calls from stakeholders across the region to allocate a portion of toll revenue to the nexus and PTS project lists.

**Should all proposed projects that meet the definition of “nexus” be included on the final list?**

Feedback Response 1	Yes
Feedback Response 2	(Underlined proposed projects twice)
Feedback Response 3	Yes - for context and clarity
Feedback Response 4	No, essential projects should be prioritized, we need 3 lists (essential, meets criteria, wish)
Feedback Response 5	yes
Feedback Response 6	Yes. Since we don't have a funding forecast yet, all projects should be included. Also, please bring a draft of the evaluation criteria back to RTAC before creating the final list, and explain if and how the projects will be prioritized.
Feedback Response 7	Why wouldn't they be included? Yes, if a project meets the nexus project definition, it should be included. Who is the decision making body that will be evaluating and prioritizing the proposed projects?
Feedback Response 8	It's difficult to answer this question without seeing a draft project list and an estimate of annual toll revenue that RMPP will generate over the lifetime of the toll. Perhaps there could be tiers to the final list that reflect a short, medium, longer-term prioritization of the projects. The project list will ultimately need to be refined to provide stakeholders with a greater understanding of the trade-offs associated with implementing tolling on I-5 and I-205.

**Should additional selection criteria be considered?**

Feedback Response 1	Equity
Feedback Response 2	Who will fund (underlined) the project - especially the "partnerships", mitigation for equity & transit systems --> limitation on bi-state funding, diversion items get paid for in Clark County?
Feedback Response 3	Constrained conditions/transportation options available --> are there alternatives, non-tolled facilities available?
Feedback Response 4	
Feedback Response 5	Need way of prioritizing and measurement
Feedback Response 6	Yes - Equity criteria is missing. There are currently no criteria that clearly use an equity lens specific to protected classes. A more specific equity criterion needs to be included that has specific language on how projects “Provide access to opportunity or address transportation-related disparities and barriers experienced by the Toll Projects’ Equity Framework communities.” (from Nexus definition). Equity Criterion about revenue reinvestment: The congestion policies in the draft RTP outline several areas where revenue should be reinvested, such as into modal alternatives, areas affected by diversion to address safety, and into communities with high proportions of people with low-income and people of color. This language in the draft RTP should be used as a framework for the nexus project criteria. Equity Criterion about Job creation: Projects that include workforce equity goals and promote job creation for historically underrepresented communities should be prioritized.
Feedback Response 7	The selection criteria should be based on something -- project goals/vision/desired outcomes - and then evaluation metrics need to be developed for each. Additional criteria and/or metrics may be needed through this process. It's hard to know if additional criteria are needed without metrics to understand how projects will be evaluated.
Feedback Response 8	I would like information about the overall decision-making process ODOT will be using, including information around funding the projects and how ODOT will prioritize projects on the PTS list versus the RTAC list. ODOT's UMO projects should be added to the list because RMPP toll revenue will help fund them. This is important to increasing levels of transparency around ODOT's decision making process. Request: ODOT facilitate a conversation with RTAC members to discuss

potential toll revenue sharing scenarios.

**Should any criteria be combined or separated?**

Feedback Response 1	
Feedback Response 2	
Feedback Response 3	
Feedback Response 4	As we collect data certain criteria may move as to importance and may need to be combined
Feedback Response 5	
Feedback Response 6	Yes, the “benefits” criteria needs to be broken down. It currently includes any benefits to the community, economy, and the environment. Does this mean one project must show equal benefits to all three of those categories? This should be changed to include language that would be a criterion that achieves the equity goals outlined in the second bullet of the current nexus project definition, and additional criteria should be created to discuss other types of benefits.
Feedback Response 7	See above
Feedback Response 8	It would be helpful to weight the criteria to reflect priority outcomes. For example, are projects that contribute to VMT and greenhouse gas emissions reductions more important than projects that connect to transit or support a project identified on the PTS project list? Are both important? The RTAC will need to come to an agreement on how to prioritize projects.

**Will individual criterion help you with evaluation?**

Feedback Response 1	
Feedback Response 2	Is it possible to have a funding recipe for the project?
Feedback Response 3	
Feedback Response 4	Yes
Feedback Response 5	
Feedback Response 6	This question is unclear. Who will be doing the evaluation? How else would projects be evaluated if not on individual criterion?
Feedback Response 7	We don't understand this question. There are no metrics associated with the proposed criteria to understand how projects will be evaluated. We need much more information about how projects will be evaluated, the level of detail desired for proposed projects, the data sources to use so proposals are consistent, etc.
Feedback Response 8	Yes – and it would be helpful to confirm at our next meeting that it is RTAC that will make the recommendations around prioritization. Could ODOT speak more directly (perhaps at an upcoming RTAC meeting) to how the overall decision-making process will be structured?

**What does it mean to center equity in RTAC's nexus project conversation?**

Feedback Response 1	
Feedback Response 2	
Feedback Response 3	
Feedback Response 4	
Feedback Response 5	Looking at all aspects
Feedback Response 6	As mentioned above, Multnomah County does not feel as though there has been process equity in the nexus project conversation thus far. But in addition to that concern, centering equity as RTAC discusses nexus projects, their submittal, and their purpose, would look like allowing a diverse set of voices to participate meaningfully in the development of the submittal and evaluation processes and provide critiques and feedback. It would also mean that we account for the most vulnerable first. Setting a standard of centering the most vulnerable would result in a better process for everyone.
Feedback Response 7	A couple different things: 1) consider diversion impacts to local roadways used by community members; 2) consider increasing funding to promote alternative modes of travel, particularly in equity focus areas; 3) geographic parity in funding for nexus projects
Feedback Response 8	We need to understand the potential impacts of various toll rate schedules to VMT, emissions, equity, and generation of toll revenue over the life of the toll. The value of projects should be evaluated on their ability to contribute to regional climate, equity, and safety goals. In addition, ODOT's UMO strategy projects (the I-5 Rose Quarter, Interstate Replacement Bridge, and Boone Bridge) should be included on the nexus project list because they complement tolling.

**What equity tools would best fit with this effort?**

Feedback Response 1	
Feedback Response 2	? revenue sharing ?
Feedback Response 3	EMAC recommendations
Feedback Response 4	
Feedback Response 5	Means of measurement
Feedback Response 6	Multnomah County has an Equity and Empowerment Lens tool. Feel free to explore it on our website. In addition, we support the equity tools and framework that EMAC has developed.
Feedback Response 7	maps such as the Washington County Mapping MSTIP Equity Index or TriMet's equity maps
Feedback Response 8	Scenario planning tools to illustrate the impacts of decisions to regional and state planning goals could be helpful. Prioritizing benefits to the groups identified in ODOT's Equity Framework when faced with limited funding will also help advance more equitable outcomes.

**What feedback do you have on schedule and proposed process?**

Feedback Response 1	
Feedback Response 2	
Feedback Response 3	
Feedback Response 4	
Feedback Response 5	Not an issue
Feedback Response 6	It is important to engage RTAC in every step of the evaluation projects - from developing the final criteria to evaluating the list of projects - and in partnership with local governments. Please provide more information on how the project list will be used, and edited, in the long-term.
Feedback Response 7	This process is moving much too fast, particularly with the lack of any detailed information about nexus projects, anticipated funding and revenue sharing, lack of coordination with affected communities, etc. The end result would be much better if there was more time built into the call for projects process and if there was data and information sharing from ODOT so all participants felt like the process was transparent and workable.
Feedback Response 8	It would be helpful to align conversations around toll revenue sharing, scenarios, and tradeoffs with modeling milestones, outputs, and analysis. This will better inform regional conversations around project list development, as well as impacts to climate and equity outcomes.

### Advancing Equity for the Oregon Toll Program

*What additional ideas do you have to achieve **process equity** in toll program development? Could you or your organization partner with ODOT to support this effort? Based on your experience in making choices that **center equity**, what are **lessons learned** that can be brought to this process? What additional feedback do you have for ODOT to advance **outcome and process equity** for the Oregon Toll Program*

This process is not equitable because it is rushed and not well defined. To-date, ODOT has issued a “call for projects” to the develop a poorly-defined “nexus project list” without a time or manner for local communities to provide feedback. This is an example of how **NOT** to achieve process equity. Central to “process equity” is making sure that there are opportunities for the jurisdictions and communities that are directly, significantly, and irreparably impacted by the various proposed toll programs to be engaged and provide input.

This is particularly glaring for the “nexus project list” because, to the best of Clackamas County’s knowledge, jurisdictions that do not have a seat at the RTAC table have not been asked to provide a project list. This leaves many highly-impacted cities in Clackamas County, such as Oregon City, Gladstone, Lake Oswego, Wilsonville, Milwaukie, and Happy Valley, out of the process. All jurisdictions, not just those who have representation at RTAC, must be included in the process. Moreover, the purpose and timing behind the “nexus project list” request is still unclear.

Finally, Clackamas County has commented many times on the timing of the I-205 toll project in relation to the broader RMPP project. It is incredibly inequitable, in both process and outcomes, to have our communities tolled first. Not only will it decrease safety, worsen diversion, and have massive negative economic effects on our residents and businesses, but it is deeply inequitable to ask our communities to fund standing up the back office administration for what could become a regional or statewide toll program.

### Nexus Projects: Initial Discussion on Projects to Identify Nexus Projects

*Nexus Project Definition: Nexus projects are roadway, bike, pedestrian or other mobility projects or programs that could complement a tolling system on I-5 and I-205 in the Portland metropolitan area by:*

- *Addressing an anticipated negative impact, OR improving access to public transportation, OR improving mobility options near the tolled highway, AND*
- *Providing access to opportunity or addressing transportation-related disparities and barriers experienced by the Toll Projects’ Equity Framework communities.*

**Q1: What is your initial reaction to the definition of nexus projects?**

**Q1 Response: NEEDS EDITS**

**Q1: If you selected “needs edits,” please provide a revised definition below.**

**Q1 Response to Revised Definition:** A “project purpose” section needs to be added that explains the purpose of this exercise and how the information will be used. There needs to be more explanation on how this will integrate the Public Transportation Strategy projects. Are they part of this list or not?

Do the “Nexus” projects need to meet both of the definitions in the bullet? Nexus projects should not be limited to only addressing Equity Framework Communities – Remove the “AND” between the bullets.

There may be some projects that are needed that are not “near” a tolled highway.

It needs to be clear that nexus projects must be above and beyond NEPA mitigations. These projects are not intended to reduce the scope or change the funding of NEPA mitigations in any way for the tolling project.

**Q1 Please provide your reasoning.**

**Q1 Response to Provide Reasoning:** There are elements of the above definition that still need more explanation. For example – What is negative impact? What is considered near? Does a list of “transportation related disparities and barriers” exist? Also more broadly – what is the point of this process? What will you do with the data? How will these projects be funded? How much money is available to fund the projects? Why is RTAC not more formally discussing the request for revenue sharing over developing this complicated project list approach?

In order to have an informed conversation about “nexus” projects, jurisdictions need to know how much funding is expected to be available to fund the projects, the modeling information to confirm the traffic impacts and agreed upon guidance on the process for selecting the project.

**Q2 Please select all the criteria you believe should be considered when determining eligibility or evaluating nexus projects. Please provide other feedback under "other."**

- **YES-** Project readiness. Included in regional transportation plan or a local plan, early planning conducted, public engagement conducted, and/or completeness of project design.
- **YES** - Safety. Addresses a safety need.
- **YES** - Traffic operations. Improves reliability and supports congestion relief.
- **YES** - Urgency of need. Addresses essential repair or provides a critical connection.
  - How will this be calculated?

- Climate. Contributes to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction.
  - How would this be calculated?
- Access to Transit. Connects to/expands access to public transportation or complements a Public Transportation Strategy project and/or supportive service.
  - Should this be in the PTS Strategy? How would this be different than just Mobility Options? Improves Mobility (Ped/Bike) as a separate category is not on this list.
- **MAYBE** - Benefits. Provides benefits to the community, economy, and environment.
  - Only if it is quantifiable.
- **NO** - Ownership. Proposer owns facility or has knowledge of owner support.
  - A project is a project regardless of ownership
- Geography. Located within impacted corridor as defined by Oregon Highway Plan or in a Metro Mobility Corridor.
  - Please describe why the “Mobility Corridor” is important and how they are different that the OHP corridors.
- **NO** - Funding. Leverages existing or future funding opportunities (local, federal or other state).
  - This should be a narrow discussion of what projects are needed.
- **NO** Project cost. Project development, construction and maintenance.
  - This will be very difficult to quantify in a short period of time. Level of detail expected will be important to note.
- Other:
  - At the heart of this exercise is that the projects are needed because of tolling, but jurisdictions do not have access to the transportation modeling for the RMPP that provides information about the impact area. Projects currently in the RTP or on local TSPs are there to address a need identified without tolling being implemented. Whether or not it is on the RTP or local TSP doesn't provide information on if it is needed as a result of tolling.
  - It is difficult to provide feedback without having a better understanding of how the list will be used. For example, if it will be used to select projects that will be constructed by a certain date, then leveraging is more important.
  - Providing information on Project Cost is also difficult because it will be influence by when the project will be constructed. How will the project cost figure be used?
  - Why does it matter if the project is in a Mobility Corridor? Some of these projects are outside of the MPO

**Q3 - Should all proposed projects that meet the definition of “nexus” be included on the final list?**

**Q3 Response:** YES. Again, more broadly, what will you do with the list? Who is the decision making body on this process?

**Q4: Should additional selection criteria be considered?**

**Q4 Response:** How are ped/bike projects that are needed to complete a gap included? It is missing from above categories, since the only ped/bike item above speaks directly to access to transit.

What is the “Selection Process”?

For the Metro Regional Flexible Funds Allocation process, there is both a Program Guide and an Application Handbook that is agreed upon by the region for the expenditure of RFFA Funds (approximately \$40 M for a 3 year period). Should there be a similar process, agreed upon by RTAC, for on-going distribution of Congestion Pricing Revenue? This should not be considered a “one-and-done” especially if we do not have the modeling data available.

Link to Metro RFFA Program Direction:

<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2021/11/29/2025-27-RFFA-program-direction-adopted-by-council-20210909.pdf>

**Q5: Should any criteria be combined or separated?**

**Q5 Response:** See RFFA Example below. A table should be provided that shows how the Criteria relates to the Desired Outcomes or Investment Priorities. RTAC should have the conversation about the Priorities for expending the Congestion Pricing revenues and match the criteria to the Priorities

**Q6: Will individual criterion help you with evaluation?**

**Q6 Response:** **This is not a process that should be rushed or subjective.** How each of the criteria is expected to be measured has not been discussed. See the level of detail that is provided in the RFFA process for the Scoring of Equity (See Table Below). Specific Scoring criteria were discussed by technical staff. Also, the data that would be used to evaluate the scoring was also provided.

**Q7: What does it mean to center equity in RTAC’s nexus project conversation?**

**Q7 Response:** Having local communities and elected officials participate in the decision making process of selecting the projects is one element of centering equity. RTAC, or local subcommittees for each corridor, should be used as on-going groups to recommend the project list for Congestion Revenue. Technical staff from affected jurisdictions should be leveraged more directly.

Consideration needs to be given to the equity of transportation alternatives. Across all modes (driving, transit, and active transportation), different parts of the metro region have widely different existing conditions and service levels. We must evaluate the existing conditions, impacts of tolling on a particular community, and how we can improve outcomes for users in a potentially-tolled environment.

**Q8: What equity tools would best fit with this effort?**

**Q8 Response:** Increased authority for RTAC to recommend projects to the OTC.

**Q9: Process and timeline: What feedback do you have on schedule and proposed process?**

**Q9 Response:** This process is burdensome, rushed and not data-driven. Again, why is ODOT unwilling to discuss revenue sharing directly with the RTAC members? This alternative approach should be explored and discussed intentionally with the group or ODOT should have a real answer for why they're not facilitating that discussion. Agreement upon revenue sharing could negate the need for the projects process all together.

**The discussed timeline of project submittal during the month of August of 2023 is completely unnecessary.** First, there should be clarity on how the project list will be used, in the near term and on an on-going basis. Secondly, RTAC should take the time to develop clear policy guidance on the selection of projects eligible to use Congestion Pricing revenue. Third, jurisdictions should be provided with comprehensive data and modeling on all tolling projects—current projects on the RTP and TSPs do not consider impacts from tolling. After the policy guidance is developed, then jurisdictions should have sufficient time (3 months minimum) to submit projects. In addition, ODOT should explore using a tool similar to Metro's "Project Hub" to provide for consistency in how projects are submitted as well as for transparency so that all jurisdictions are aware of the projects submitted and under discussion.

<b>CRITERIA EXAMPLE FROM REGIONAL FLEXIBLE FUNDS PROCESS</b>	
<b>RTP Investment Priorities</b>	<b>RFFA Criteria</b>
<p><b>Equity</b> – Reduce barriers and disparities faced by historically marginalized communities, particularly for communities of color and people with low income.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Increased accessibility</b></li> <li>• <b>Increased access to affordable travel options</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Safety</b> – Reduce fatal and severe injury crashes to move the region as quickly as possible toward Vision Zero, particularly for communities of color and other historically marginalized communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Reduced fatal and serious injury crashes for all modes of travel</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Climate Change</b> – Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and small trucks to reduce the impacts of climate change, particularly impacts on communities of color and other historically marginalized communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Reduced emissions from vehicles</b></li> <li>• <b>Reduced drive alone trips</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Congestion Relief</b> – Manage travel demand and increase use of travel options to make travel more reliable on the region’s busiest roadways, particularly for communities of color and other historically marginalized communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Increased reliability</b></li> <li>• <b>Increased travel efficiency</b></li> <li>• <b>Increased travel options</b></li> <li>• <b>Reduced drive alone trips</b></li> </ul>

**SCORING EXAMPLE FROM REGIONAL FLEXIBLE FUNDS PROCESS**

<b>Equity</b>		
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>	<b>Scoring</b>
Project makes improvements in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	<a href="#">Equity Focus Area map layer</a>	Is project in an EFA (Yes/No)?  EFA includes greater than regional average numbers of all three EFA groups <sup>1</sup> ? (Y/N)
Improves access to community places for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC), and underserved communities	<a href="#">Economic Value Atlas walkability and Community Service accessibility score</a>	Is project in tract with a below-regional average walkability score? (Y/N)  Is project in tract with a below-regional average Community Service accessibility score? (Y/N)
Makes active transportation improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	<a href="#">Regional Barometer (life expectancy at birth)</a>  <a href="#">Regional Barometer (diesel particulate matter)</a>  <a href="#">Regional Barometer (respiratory hazards due to air toxics)</a>	Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy (80.5 yrs)? (Y/N)  Is project in area with higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration (>.62)? (Y/N)  Does project area have higher than regional average level of air toxics? (Y/N)
Improves access to low and middle wage jobs	<a href="#">Economic Value Atlas labor access (layers for low and middle/high wage jobs)</a>	Is project in tract with an above-regional average number of low and middle wage jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)? (Y/N)
Identified by community as a priority	<a href="#">Regional Investment Measure project list (Get Moving 2020)</a>  Documentation of public input and prioritization	Is project (or a portion of it) included on the Regional Investment Measure project list? (Y/N)  How has public input informed project's prioritization? (Subjective)
Includes strategy to address displacement	<a href="#">Anti-displacement Strategies memo from the Metro Parks Bond</a>	Have anti-displacement strategies have been considered and included in the project design? (Y/N)

<sup>1</sup> Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income



# City of Tualatin

[www.tualatinoregon.gov](http://www.tualatinoregon.gov)

July 7, 2023

Kris Strickler

Oregon Department of Transportation

355 Capitol Street NE, MS11 Salem, OR 97301

*Via Email*

Director Strickler and Director Finn:

On behalf of the City of Tualatin and the cities of Washington County, I appreciate the opportunity to submit feedback on the definition of “nexus projects,” the process for submitting projects, and the project selection criteria. I am in agreement with Commissioner Savas’ concerns, as well as the feedback submitted by Clackamas County on the RTAC feedback worksheet (attached as an addendum to this letter).

As noted in Commissioner Savas’ email, this process not only feels rushed, it leaves out the voices of the communities who do not have a seat at the RTAC table. As the RTAC member representing Washington County cities, I am concerned that many of the communities in the County will not have sufficient time or background information to effectively participate in the process, considering that there is no modelling data for the RMPP. How can local jurisdictions develop project lists without knowing where toll gantries will be located, how much the tolls will be, and how many vehicles we can anticipate will divert onto our roads?

Furthermore, the City of Tualatin, like many communities in the region, just embarked on a much-needed update to our Transportation System Plan (TSP). This process will take nearly two years, and will require our staff and consultants to carry out a thorough public engagement process. Our TSP is over ten years old, and did not anticipate the impacts of tolling; therefore, we are not prepared to develop a list of mitigation projects. We are also concerned that the effects of tolling cannot be mitigated without detrimental effects on the safety and livability of our community. For example, tolling I-5 would likely result in thousands of drivers diverting onto

Boones Ferry Road, loading Boones Ferry beyond its current capacity. A potential solution, such as widening Boones Ferry Road, would not align with the community's vision.

Finally, we are concerned about the potential lack of funding for mitigation projects. Ultimately, we need to have further conversations regarding revenue, which would be a much more effective use of our time.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,



Frank Bubenik  
Mayor, City of Tualatin

CC: Brendan Finn, Oregon Department of Transportation  
Mandy Putney, Oregon Department of Transportation  
Heather Wills, WSP  
Anne Presentin, WSP  
Kirsten Beale, WSP

Attachment:

- Clackamas County RTAC Nexus Projects Survey Responses – 2023-07-07.pdf

## **Attachments to Revised Memo:**

The following additional feedback to the nexus projects' definition, criteria and process was submitted:

- Multnomah County
- Clackamas County
- City of Portland

=====

**From:** Sarah Paulus <[sarah.paulus@multco.us](mailto:sarah.paulus@multco.us)>

**Sent:** Monday, July 31, 2023 11:43 AM

**To:** PUTNEY Mandy <[Mandy.PUTNEY@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Mandy.PUTNEY@odot.oregon.gov)>; FINN Brendan C

<[Brendan.C.FINN@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Brendan.C.FINN@odot.oregon.gov)>; MOSIER Della D <[Della.D.MOSIER@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Della.D.MOSIER@odot.oregon.gov)>

**Cc:** Jessica Berry <[jessica.berry@multco.us](mailto:jessica.berry@multco.us)>; Taylor Steenblock <[taylor.steenblock@multco.us](mailto:taylor.steenblock@multco.us)>

**Subject:** Re: RTAC Nexus Projects: Additional information and 7/31 office hours

Good morning Mandy and team -

Thanks for providing another chance to add in some final input here. We appreciate the outline of a timeline so we can better picture what will happen between now and December. When looking at that timeline as well as the Nexus List Proposed Development Process, we would like to see more direct language about staff-involvement on a consistent basis across each phase. This timeline is set up to move very quickly, and staff will need to be directly involved and updated to best help our RTAC members and to ensure the process feels transparent. Could there be a recurring staff meeting, or a TAC that is created to achieve this? Having an opportunity for direct communication to ODOT as we navigate this new process would make the timeline more manageable.

In regards to the nexus project definition and criteria, we want to ensure that the impacts seen in Multnomah County from tolling and congestion pricing are able to be addressed through this process. The OHP definition focuses on a limited definition of 'corridor' that will not be able to fully encompass the impacts of tolling in our region. Additionally, the modeling for the RMPP is still in the early stages, and we have not seen how the project-specific analysis of impact will be defined, which makes it difficult to determine which areas of Multnomah County will be considered 'impacted' by ODOT. With that being said, and knowing that a narrow definition of 'corridor' will not fully address all the diversion we see from tolling, we believe the Project Location criteria in the Congestion Pricing Nexus category language should be expanded to better incorporate the part of the nexus project definition that states "...Supporting congestion relief on a currently congested corridor that may become more congested with the implementation of tolling." To do this, it should instead say "Project location - Project is within a traffic diversion corridor, OR a corridor that may become more congested due to tolling." This change would allow the nexus projects to more effectively address the needs we will have outside of the NEPA process.

To clarify the criteria and process - Do nexus projects need to meet each of these selection criteria to qualify? For example, could a project expand access to public transportation, but not be located within a traffic diversion corridor?

Thank you for working with us and other local jurisdictions to ensure this nexus project process effectively addresses the needs of the region.

Sarah Paulus

=====  
**From:** Stasny, Jamie <[JStasny@clackamas.us](mailto:JStasny@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 31, 2023 12:03 PM  
**To:** PUTNEY Mandy <[Mandy.PUTNEY@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Mandy.PUTNEY@odot.oregon.gov)>  
**Cc:** Bezner, Mike <[MikeBez@clackamas.us](mailto:MikeBez@clackamas.us)>; Johnson, Dan <[danjoh@clackamas.us](mailto:danjoh@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** Nexus Process Staff Comments - RTAC

Mandy,

I articulated this at office hours but wanted to reiterate in writing.

We have concerns about the proposed nexus project process laid out in the memo from last Thursday.

Our concerns are –

1. Need a formal staff group to agree upon the process (ongoing) and to make collaborative recommendations to RTAC
2. Need more time. This is rushed and the schedule is not lending itself to a collaborative process that could be successful
  - a. Our board and C4 would review the list the week of Sept 5<sup>th</sup>. We would need to submit by no sooner than September 8<sup>th</sup> to allow for our County process.
3. The readiness criteria is concerning as many projects that may be needed are not currently on the RTP or even on a TSP. If this criteria is included it should not be weighted heavily and should not preclude any of the necessary projects in being included.
4. We support Multnomah county's suggestion as shown below
  - a. Suggested changes:  
Project location: project is within a project diversion corridor **OR a corridor that is not adjacent to the tollway but experiences a increase in diversion traffic because of tolling.**

- Jamie

Jamie Stasny

=====  
**From:** Jordan, Brooke <[Brooke.Jordan@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Brooke.Jordan@portlandoregon.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, July 31, 2023 2:33 PM

**To:** PUTNEY Mandy <[Mandy.PUTNEY@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Mandy.PUTNEY@odot.oregon.gov)>; MOSIER Della D <[Della.D.MOSIER@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Della.D.MOSIER@odot.oregon.gov)>; FINN Brendan C <[Brendan.C.FINN@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Brendan.C.FINN@odot.oregon.gov)>

**Cc:** Reff, Caitlin <[Caitlin.Reff@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Caitlin.Reff@portlandoregon.gov)>

**Subject:** RMPP: City of Portland Comments on the Nexus Projects Development

**Importance:** High

Hi UMO Team:

Thank you for taking time to meet with senior staff and holding space to hear our concerns. Thank you for agreeing to convene another meeting with senior staff to address concerns more directly with the Nexus Projects development and how to move this work forward at the RTAC table. We believe this should be set up as an ongoing senior staff collaboration space, typical of a major project PMG.

It is difficult to identify what could be seen as a finalized list because we don't have enough detailed information about impacts to local facilities and estimated toll revenue potential for RMPP overtime, especially given ODOT's near term major project funding shortfalls. Given this understanding we have the following comments and questions:

- Will ODOT work with regional stakeholders to collaboratively identify and communicate the types of investments in the region that are necessary to complement pricing on I-5 and I-205 in the Implementation Plan submitted to Governor Kotek on December 15? We request that ODOT host an ongoing RTAC senior staff meeting as a Project Management Group (PMG) to address regional stakeholder concerns related to Nexus projects.
- The City would like to work with ODOT to develop framing for needed investments. We suggest considering making a clear commitment to categories or types of investment buckets and/or some representative projects to better demonstrate how the pricing project will deliver positive multimodal and community outcomes.
- From the process proposed it is unclear if ODOT major projects included as part of the UMO's Urban Mobility Strategy will be part of the needed investment and overall pricing value proposition discussion.
- We would like to see VMT and GHG emissions reduction mentioned as part of the nexus project list purpose, this could be in relation to the intent of supporting regional and state goals.

Thanks again for your consideration. We look forward to connecting with you next week.

.....  
**Brooke Jordan** (she/her)  
Capital Project Manager  
Major Projects and Partnerships

**Portland Bureau of Transportation**