

1. According to ODOT "The federal infrastructure package allocated \$1.2 billion in additional transportation funding for Oregon. About \$800 million of that spending is directed to specific purposes. An infographic summarizing this funding can be found here: [Infographic](#) . (Note that the link goes to a page that cannot be found. Nowhere can a citizen find out what that funding is being used for which is very odd.)
1. The remaining \$412 million of the federal funds is unallocated. This means the commission can direct these funds in more flexible ways."
1. This is a huge amount of money.
1. When I hear about the shortfall for transportation funding from ODOT, rarely does anyone reference the \$1.2 billion dollar Federal grant Oregon received. I had heard Tina Kotek say that it cannot be used for infrastructure highway improvement in the Portland Metro area to improve congestion and avoid Tolling, because it "must be spread out uniformly over the entire state". The Portland Metro area has the worst congestion hands down. Currently there are only a few daylight hours from between 10AM to 2 PM where the freeway near where I live in Tualatin is not massively congested. It would make more sense to me that the Federal Grant be used to improve congestion in the highest population and most congested areas, instead of Tolling. The 205 two lanes in the south metro area where I live is woefully inadequate and directly contributes to congestion, which eases substantially when the road widens to three lanes.
1. The Tolling proposal to widen the 205 would cost me almost \$2900 per year since I commute from Tualatin to Sunnyside during peak hours, which is when my job requires me to start and leave work. That would reflect a whopping 16% increase in Oregon taxes I pay just to commute to work, which is unreasonable. Since one has to commute across a river with no other means of crossing it save the Abernathy Bridge, options to avoid the tolls are not available. Likewise there are no local transportation options such as buses, trains etc. either.
1. ODOT estimated that 60% of the tolls collected would go to administrative fees i.e., to the company hired to collect the tolls, which is undoubtedly highly automated. Any sane person would think that 60% administrative fees are outrageous, and certainly one would wonder what influence the Toll Collection Company which stands to make a fortune off the backs of Oregonians who live in the southern Metro area has had on officials of ODOT to make them think that 60% fee is OK. How can Oregonians getting back only 40% of every Toll dollar collected for infrastructure improvement be a good deal for Oregon? Yet ODOT seems to think that is fine.

1. Although there is a lot of hoopla about how tolling reduces congestion by keeping folks off the road, the interesting thing is that when I looked at the many cities where congestion tolling is implemented, I could find next to nothing about follow up studies that actually collected data on congestion before and after congestion tolling was initiated that *proved that there was a significant and meaningful reduction in congestion*. Although this works in theory, I would argue that the tolling companies who stand to make a profit are likely falsely making claims about the potential wonderful outcome are using their influence over ODOT to get them to implement a profitable model for the tolling companies, and that ODOT is not approaching this with critical thinking and doing their own research to find out whether the claims are true.
1. I do not know who runs ODOT or how they are appointed or what leeway they have in decision making, but I question their ability to manage ODOT and prepare a critically thought out transportation package regarding congestion. It seems that Legislature oversight of ODOT is inadequate given all of these facts.

Please consider all of this when the transportation package is revamped.

Greg Clark