

ROAD USAGE CHARGING IN OREGON

Focus Group Report

Prepared For:
Oregon Department of Transportation
June 2013

PREPARED BY:



(503) 220-0575 • 239 NW 13th Ave., #205, Portland, OR 97209 • www.dhmresearch.com

IN COLLABORATION WITH:



1. | INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc. (DHM Research) conducted six focus groups among Oregon voters to test attitudes and perceptions toward a proposal for a mileage fee on new highly fuel efficient vehicles. The research probed participants’ views about existing and ideal methods of funding transportation improvements and explored several possible approaches, including a specific proposal to charge fees on miles driven on new highly fuel efficient vehicles.

The discussion guide was developed in collaboration between DHM Research and ODOT, and included reviews and suggestions from CH2MHill and D’Artagnan Consulting. The focus group research supplemented a prior statewide telephone survey of Oregon voters in September 2012 and a supplemental survey in May 2013 both on road usage charging.

DHM Research: DHM Research has been providing opinion research and consultation throughout the Pacific Northwest and other regions of the United States for over three decades. The firm is non-partisan and independent and specializes in research projects to support public policy-making. www.dhmresearch.com

Research Design: The focus groups took place in May and June 2013 across Oregon. Table 1 presents the date, location, and number of participants of each group.

Date	Location	County	# Participants
May 28	Roseburg	Douglas	8
May 29	Bend	Deschutes	8
May 30	Ontario	Malheur	7
June 1	Pendleton	Umatilla	7
June 4	Portland	Multnomah County	8
June 5	Portland	Washington County	7

In all, a total of 45 randomly selected voters participated in the focus groups. See Appendix A for complete participant demographics. A professional moderator led the focus groups, which included group discussions and written exercises (Appendix B-L).

Statement of Limitations: Although research of this type is not designed to measure the attitudes of a particular group with statistical reliability, it is valuable for giving a sense of the attitudes and opinions of the population from which the sample is drawn. Focus groups can be especially valuable in contributing to the design of related quantitative research.

This report addresses key findings from the discussions and provides DHM analysis of the information discussed in the focus groups. Each section reviews a major topic and includes representative quotations, as well as evaluative commentary. The quotations and commentary are drawn from both written exercises and the conversations.¹ The referenced Appendices provide complete responses to all written exercises.

¹ DHM Research has selected quotations to represent the range of opinions on a topic, and not to quantitatively represent the expressed attitudes. We have edited quotations as appropriate to eliminate non-relevant or repetitive intervening comments, such as “you know,” “I mean,” and other everyday speech.

Report Format: This report is an analysis with observations of focus group discussions and participant written exercises. Additionally, suggestions under Messaging Framework are derived from research conducted for ODOT and DHM’s experience on transportation issues and other relevant topics. The report is organized into the following sections:

Section 2: Analysis and Observations

This section provides a summary of findings from focus group discussions and written exercises.

Section 3: Key Findings

This section addresses each topic discussed in the focus groups and incorporates participant quotes and commentary.

Section 4: Messaging Framework

This section provides a framework for messaging and communications for road usage charging in Oregon.

Section 5: Appendix

This section provides participant demographics, handouts presented to participants, and responses from each written exercise completed by participants.

2. | ANALYSIS & OBSERVATIONS

Transportation was an important issue among focus group participants. An earlier survey of Oregonians also showed transportation as a priority for the state.

- Though in a second tier behind the economy, education, and healthcare, transportation was important to participants.
- Transportation, including maintenance and funding, was mentioned by many participants throughout the focus groups.
 - A survey conducted for ODOT on road usage charging in September 2012 ranked transportation a 7.3 on a 0 to 10 scale, with 10 being very concerned about that issue. And over a majority gave a high rating of 8-10 on the scale.
- Communicating about the importance of transportation improvements in Oregon should resonate with many residents across the state; the barrier may be the level of urgency to do something about it now.
- Communications should link to local improvements and benefits, over general improvements that may not resonate as clearly with the average person.

Funding for transportation was not well understood. Participants did not have a detailed or confident knowledge of the funding source for transportation improvements in Oregon. This is fairly common for any public financing.

- The advantage to this lack of knowledge or certainty may be the opportunity to better inform the public around transportation funding.
 - It's likely the public will be receptive to this information since transportation is of high concern.
- The gas tax was widely recognized as an important source, but there was little sense of how it interacted with other kinds of taxes or funding sources.
 - No one knew the amount of the fuel tax per gallon, or was confident in their guess (though some guesses came close). Guesses ranged from \$.05 cents to \$2 dollars with the average of \$.50 to \$.60 cents for the state fuel tax.
- The topic of transportation funding could not arise, however, without perceptions of wasted taxpayer money – from perceived unnecessary projects like roundabouts and light rail.
- Communications about sustainable funding options must address the need and direct benefit to the public right out of the gates, and pre-empt any discussions of government waste related to transportation projects.

Almost all agreed that drivers should pay their fair share for road usage, regardless of vehicle type. Fairness was more commonly seen in this light compared to equity between rural and urban drivers.

- Each focus group, regardless of whether in rural counties or elsewhere, mentioned people who use the roads should help pay for maintenance.
 - Mentions were unprompted and came up on their own (presenting an opportunity to further explore the idea around a road usage charge).
- Fairness or equity was more closely associated with use of the roads, and less about any perceived inequity between rural and urban areas.
 - Participants even suggested bicycles should pay a user fee.

- Participants did not seem to easily correlate road usage charging as a user fee. This may be an early barrier to overcome.

Road usage charging was supported by 30 out of 45 focus group participants, and evoked strong emotions. The emotions surrounding this topic could be an opportunity to better inform the public on an issue they care about.

- A strong majority across all focus groups supported the proposal around a road usage charge after reading the description and before any discussions.
 - Early and initial support by location: Roseburg 5 out of 8; Bend 6 out of 8; Ontario 5 out of 7; Pendleton 5 out of 7; Portland 4 out of 8; and Portland 5 out of 7.
 - In the September 2012 survey conducted for ODOT, 50% said a mileage fee was the same or more fair than the fuel tax. This should be an additional data point and not used as a direct comparison (a simple question was asked in the survey while a three paragraph description was read in the focus groups).
- A disconnect between the current fuel tax and the mileage tax may be the biggest barrier – it was difficult for people to see the similarities of these two taxes.
 - In addition, the fuel tax was considered an ‘invisible’ fee while a mileage tax would show up on a bill.
- Participants were also concerned about introducing a new administrative burden and the complexity of determining and collecting the tax.
- The most common emotion and frequent objection came from those who felt a change would penalize drivers of high-efficiency vehicles – people trying to do the right thing for the environment and worthy of public support.
- Secondary objection was sympathy for those with no choice but to drive long distances for work. And often perceived as people with lower incomes which only increased sympathy.
- Communications would be best served by focusing on ‘users of roads’ and less on high-efficiency vehicles.
 - Almost all supported a user fee – keep the focus here.
 - Many viewed the tax on high-efficiency vehicles as a penalty for people trying to do the right thing for the environment – pivot away from this.

Road usage charging proposal must be simple and easy.

- The proposal was confusing to a large number of participants.
 - They had difficulty keeping in mind it would only apply to 2015 models of high efficient vehicles (55+ MPG).
 - Participants were also skeptical that the proposal would stay with high-efficiency vehicles, and projected it would apply to standard vehicles.
- Participants seemed to equate road usage fees less with the tax portion of fuel but more with the entire price of fuel.
 - This may be an important point to address in future discussions.
- Participants could not easily link a mileage tax as a user fee in a similar or same way as a fuel tax.

- There was a viewpoint that the existing fuel tax was invisible therefore people weren't paying a tax if they couldn't 'see' it.

Implementation of road usage charging may need to address several key questions and concerns. Among the most prominent were:

- There was no clear agreement on how to gather mileage data.
 - The Basic Plan wasn't Oregon-only; the Advanced and Smartphone Plans depended on GPS, which raised a number of concerns; and the Simplified Plan was based on too many miles for the average driver.
 - Choice was strongly supported by participants.
- High and equal suspicion of government and private parties.
 - Suspicion of private companies was almost as high as suspicion of "Big Brother." Participants figured they'd be paying for the process one way or another, whether through higher cell phone costs, insurance costs, or taxes, and they didn't like the idea of for-profit entities controlling their personal data.
 - Using existing and familiar systems, like DEQ and DMV, were mentioned and appeared to ease concerns amongst participants.
- An assumption that implementation would be complicated, especially for the small number of vehicles, thus costs would exceed any increased revenues.
 - This concern led many to prefer existing fees, like the vehicle registration fee (which unprompted was the most popular form of revenue collection and source of funding). The familiarity of and ability to use an existing structure appealed to many participants.
 - Address declining revenues AND projected declines to further explain the need to implement a new revenue model.

3. | KEY FINDINGS

3.1 | Priority Issues

We asked participants to write down 1) the most important issues that Oregon needs to address, not including the economy and jobs (Appendix B), and 2) the most important transportation issues and their understanding of how transportation improvements in the state were funded (Appendix C).

Education rose quickly to the forefront as a priority in several groups. Seventeen of the 45 participants starred an education-related issue (quality or funding) as their most important. Only 12 omitted education from their lists all together.

General funding for social services such as law enforcement, healthcare, and programs for the elderly, homeless, and drug addiction was also important. A third major category related to taxation, including the amount, the form and/or the need for reform (e.g., sales tax), and the responsible use of tax dollars.

Transportation and road infrastructure issues topped the lists of five participants, and 20 others also included transportation-related topics. "I put my star next to limited public transportation, especially in rural," said a Roseburg resident. "I'm extremely concerned about the condition of the roads," said a participant in Portland. Roseburg and Portland area residents seemed relatively more concerned about transportation issues generally, including traffic, public transit, and infrastructure repair and maintenance.

In the eastern part of the state transportation issues were less likely to come up spontaneously. Bend residents were frustrated with east side/west side traffic congestion in the city. The desire for better public transportation was particularly strong in Bend.

3.2 | Transportation Issues

I put down transportation, thinking mostly of the crummy roads. (Ontario)

Not enough transportation available. (Pendleton)

Our roads are crumbling. (Roseburg)

Transportation is just a headache. The two-lane highways and having all the semis on that. (Bend)

I would like them to extend the light rail from Portland to Bend. (Bend)

I am totally in support of improving the walkability and foot traffic all over Oregon. (Portland)

Asked about transportation in particular, participants pointed to a variety of issues including the condition of roads and bridges, traffic congestion, and the need for better public transit options, especially in rural areas and for longer distances (e.g., Bend-Portland, Seattle-San Diego corridor). But we also heard concerns about “excessive road construction,” and making poor decisions about infrastructure investment. The topic of transportation funding is often closely tied to concerns about government waste and mismanagement.

3.3 | Transportation Funding: Principles and Practices

Cost equalization. Long and short of it: use fees. (Roseburg)

Effect on the environment. (Roseburg)

Fair for everyone. (Roseburg)

Does it meet the needs of the population? (Bend)

Who is using it vs. who is paying for it should match up. (Bend)

Safety. That is pretty basic. We want safe roads. (Ontario)

Look to the future. (Ontario)

Money must be collected according to the wear and tear caused by the vehicle. (Ontario)

It has to be collectively for the common good. (Portland)

What gets the biggest bang for the buck. (Portland)

Guiding Principles. We asked participants to list the underlying principles that policy-makers should use to guide decisions about transportation projects and funding (Appendix D). Fairness, safety, attentiveness to the wants and needs of the public, environmental impact, cost effectiveness, and return on investment came up repeatedly in this context. The principle that users should pay was mentioned in all of the groups. A Pendleton resident came close to anticipating the topic of the focus group by writing, “Transportation was financed by gas tax and fees. With push for electric cars and gas saving cars, should there not be a fee for charging [these electric cars]?”

The underlying message was to use common sense in light of society’s larger objectives (fairness, safety, providing for future generations) and funding constraints (evaluate cost vs. value, avoid waste, acknowledge that we’re in tough times and can’t have everything we want).

Existing Practices. Views about how Oregon already funds transportation improvements were all over the map, and while a fuel tax was mentioned, confident knowledge of this

funding source was weak. Most understood that taxes of some kind were involved, but even there people weren't always sure. Just about every kind of tax came up for mention: gas taxes, heavy highway vehicle taxes, income taxes, property taxes, business taxes, and more generally municipal, state, and federal taxes. We also heard about license and registration fees, tolls, fares, grants (public, corporate, individual), and lottery funds.

How to Fund Transportation – General Ideas and User Fee

If you use it, you should pay for it. (Portland)

People who use should pay more; Tolls for new bridges until paid for; increase license fees, especially on bigger, heavier rigs. (Roseburg)

Electric cars should pay a fee and bicycles who use a lane should perhaps pay a license fee. (Pendleton)

By eliminating the waste and using funding of unnecessary projects to fund those that are necessary. (Portland)

I have no issue with altering the registration system to where you have a ratio of what you pay per year based on the value of your vehicle. (Bend)

When asked how transportation should be funded in Oregon (Appendix E), participants most often adapted or incorporated the funding source they thought were already in place, such as various forms of taxes (gas, freight, property, business, hotel, income, cigarette, et al.), grants, license and registration fees, and lottery funds. Other ideas were legalizing and taxing marijuana, introducing a sales tax, and making do with existing methods by eliminating waste.

Ideas for use-related fees were very popular, and tolls came up frequently: "Toll roads: it works elsewhere, why not here?" from a Bend resident. On the other hand we also heard a concern that toll plazas create congestion. For many, too, the principle that users should pay meant that bicycles should be licensed to share the cost of bike path construction and maintenance.

Participants very often spontaneously endorsed the principle that users should bear their fair share of the cost. However, they did not typically come up with mileage-based fees as the way to implement that principle, but some were quick to see the implications of rising alternative technology on the fuel tax:

I think [a fee on fuel] is reasonable. The writing is on the wall in this world, right. We have got to stop using fossil fuels. It's just that simple. So that is slowly happening after 40 years of hollering about it. People are starting to listen. So as people take on alternate technology, then there is going to be less money on gasoline, buying gas, so that means less is coming to the state, so that means you end up going to the other model of fee on miles. (Bend)

If everybody ends up driving these high efficiency electric vehicles, then there is going to be no money coming anywhere for transportation. Nobody is going to be

buying as much gas as they did. So there are no charges on that. And then we are really going to be low on transportation money. But they're going to get it somewhere. (Ontario)

Despite their readiness to see the issue, however, the implications of a fee on miles were in practice so confusing to many people, and the logistics were so vexed, that even staunch defenders of the “users should pay” principle were capable of rejecting the idea of a mileage fee.

3.4 | Perceptions of Funding Options

We asked participants to rate their level of support for five different options for funding transportation improvements (Appendix F). Table 1 summarizes the results.

**Table 1: Support for Funding Options
(number of participants)**

	Fee on Fuel	Fee on Miles	Toll Fee	Vehicle Reg. Fee	Peak Hour / Congestion Fee
Strongly support	7	7	7	13	5
Somewhat support	14	13	18	16	5
Neutral	9	10	5	9	10
Somewhat oppose	7	10	7	6	10
Strongly oppose	8	4	6	1	12
Don't know	0	1	2	0	3

Source: DHM Research 2013

Fee on Fuel. Participants liked the fee on fuel because it was familiar and corresponded roughly to use. “It’s a user-applied fee,” said a Portland woman. “You want to drive, you feed your vehicle. Duh!”

Fee on fuel was popular for other reasons: “I support it because I don’t like tax period, of course, but it covers everybody,” said an Ontario resident, “even tourists, people on vacation, everybody that buys fuel in Oregon gets it.” Though it rarely came up explicitly, the invisibility of the fee also helped people to accept it. A Bend resident observed: “The gas tax really, to your daily driver, is invisible. You go to the gas pump. It’s there. It is completely invisible, so in essence, we don’t feel like we are paying a tax, in a way.”

Some people saw the fuel tax as so user-based that they had trouble distinguishing it from a fee on miles. “It’s sort of like miles driven,” said a Portland woman. “You don’t drive so much, you won’t have to buy so much gas, you’re still paying for miles driven, whether you’re paying for it in the fuel at the pump, or paying for it as your odometer clicks.”

Meanwhile those who did see the difference often had trouble articulating it clearly. As an example, below is an exchange from Roseburg:

- A fee on fuel affects every single person that uses fuel. A fee on miles will affect mostly the people that are using the roads the most.
- No, they’re the same.

—Isn't there relativity based on miles per gallon?
—What do you mean?
—If your six-mile-per-gallon big old giant motorhome doesn't do nearly as well as the 45-mile car.
—Therefore what?
—Therefore you have to focus on both. I think you got to pick it up on both ends, a way to equalize it.

Fee on Miles. Support for a fee on miles came from those who understood the impact on roads and transportation revenue of high-mileage vehicles and wanted to correct for it. “It helps everyone pay their fair share,” said a Roseburg participant. A Bend resident said, “If you have an all-electric vehicle right now, you’re not paying a gas tax. You’re driving on the roads, and maybe you have studs, or maybe you're just driving a lot on the roads. You're creating wear and tear, and you’re not funding that through a gas tax.”

But there was significant and emotional opposition to the fee on miles idea because the perceived impact landed on two particular drivers: 1) drivers of high-mileage vehicles (primary opposition), and 2) drivers who cannot live near their place of work (secondary opposition). Several people saw the mileage fee as unfairly targeting these groups—people deserving of sympathy, support, or admiration. No one wanted to penalize people that had to drive long distances to work.

“We would be horribly, horribly punished if we did it that way,” said a woman in Bend whose husband commuted to Boise. “Some people can’t help it,” said an Ontario resident. “There are not many jobs here. You have to look. You have to go out there. You may have to drive to Boise an hour away, back and forth every day. It is not like that is your fault.”

Participants supported how buyers of high-efficiency vehicles were trying to do the right thing environmentally, and it didn’t seem right to punish them. “This penalizes vehicle owners who have reduced fuel consumption because of their values or desire to economize,” said a Roseburg woman. “People who choose to drive low fuel mileage vehicles are free to do so, but should pay accordingly. They not only waste fuel but contribute much more air pollution.”

As a consequence of the perceived penalty on high-efficiency vehicles, many participants feared that a fee on miles would reduce or eliminate the incentive to buy efficient cars. “We can buy a cheap little car that gets 40 miles to the gallon,” said a Bend woman, “and we have control over the money that we save, where if it is a fee on miles, it doesn’t matter. We are going to be charged that no matter what. If it is fee on fuel, you have an incentive to drive a gas-efficient or electric car, or whatever it is, where if it is fee on miles, it doesn’t really matter.”

The invisibility of the fuel tax may make this funding source easier to support. The focus group discussions showed that people lump the fuel tax with the price of fuel. With the proposed road usage fees, it seems people may be equating the total cost of gas (versus just the tax) with mileage fees.

The table (WE 7) with examples of mileage-based use fees, introduced later in the focus groups, helped participants put gas prices vs. gas taxes into better perspective and clarified the thinking on some of these issues. The table was able to show the amount of gas tax based on various MPG on an annual basis. This information was then more easily compared with the proposed per-mile charge for new high-efficiency vehicles. First, this level of information was helpful in making the gas tax visible. Second, it was then easier for participants to compare it with the per-mile charge concept.

Other Fees. We heard a lot of support for **toll fees** across groups, with very little opposition. Participants thought there needed to be alternative non-tolled routes to provide choice, and they typically felt the toll revenue should only pay for the project subject to the toll. As shown above in Table 1, **vehicle registration** was the most popular funding option. Some thought there should be a simple flat fee to cover use which would be the same for all drivers. But many others thought the state could graduate the fees based on certain principles. Ideas for calculating registration fees included the value of the car, the size and weight of the car, the mileage characteristics of the car, and the miles driven. This last option led to a natural combination of ideas, and it made sense to a significant number of participants to administer a mileage fee program through the already existing vehicle registration infrastructure. This is discussed in more detail below. Discussion of **fees during peak congestion hours** was limited. The idea of an electronic pass that could be charged based on use of certain lanes at certain hours came up, but was associated with concerns about location tracking.

3.5 | Support for Fee on Miles Proposal

The discussion of funding options primed focus group members to understand and respond to a proposal to charge high-efficiency vehicles for road usage (Appendix G). Thirty of the 45 participants thought the idea was good or very good (Table 2).

Table 2: Support for ODOT Fee on Miles Proposal

	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	TOTAL
Very good	3	0	2	0	1	3	9
Good	2	6	3	5	3	2	21
Neutral	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Poor	1	1	1	1	2	1	7
Very poor	1	1	0	1	1	1	5
DK/Depends	0	0	1	0	1	0	2

Source: DHM Research 2013

Reasons cited in favor of the proposal tied back to the principle that all drivers should pay their fair share of road maintenance and improvement:

Very good: Cost equalization – all users need to pay their fair share. Don’t penalize higher mpg drivers. (Roseburg)

Very good: Since the fuel-efficient cars are buying less gas, we need to come up with the shortfall in dollars for transportation. (Ontario)

Good: Because electric and fuel-efficient vehicle drivers need to pay their share of road fees. (Bend)

Good: Because [fuel efficient cars] are still damaging the roads and the smog emissions are very low on most cars today, so the pollution is not as much of a factor as it once was. How will we deal with their batteries when they need replacing? Very harmful to the environment and expensive to dispose of. (Portland)

Good: And my question still is, the more people who get these cars . . . who is going to pay for the highways? If more and more people are driving these, who is going to pay for them? (Roseburg)

Those who disliked the idea continued to feel that it penalized and unfairly targeted a class of driver.

Good/Poor: I think this could go either way. It's a good idea because it equals out the cost a little bit to the drivers who pay to use the road. It can be a poor idea because it's not right to charge those who are trying to be more efficient. (Ontario)

Poor: Punishing good behavior. First the government wanted fuel-efficient vehicles, then they would be punishing this behavior. It's confusing. (Pendleton)

Poor: I find it incredibly unfair, because it penalizes people who have purchased vehicles that get good mileage. (Roseburg)

Poor: I was strongly opposed. It goes back to the whole employment thing. I know so many people that are coming in from Baker, La Grande just because there are no jobs. And it goes back to the whole transportation [issue]. There is not a good bus transportation for people to come and take them to work. (Ontario)

We distributed a handout with a table showing examples of the fuel tax currently paid by vehicles with different mileage ratings and what the effect would be on high-efficiency vehicles under the new proposal (Appendix H). Seeing the numbers helped several people put the issue in perspective. "I'm more supportive," wrote an Ontario participant, adding, "Fuel-efficient vehicles will still get a savings in gas costs due to requiring less; I don't want fuel-efficiency to be penalized." A Pendleton resident acknowledged that "it actually changes my opinion a little. Seeing these numbers, it looks like a fair way to get anyone using the roads to contribute."

3.6 | Views About Administration

Take it down to the DMV like you do anyways and have them verify it. Boom, you are done. (Ontario)

DMV would check mileage upon registration renewal. (Bend)

You could drive through something like the DEQ line. (Portland)

If everybody just put their odometer mileage on their tax form and initialed by it, I mean there is a lot of money that goes into processing the taxes now for the gas. (Portland)

Microchip in the car annually uploads to a local DMV database and is tallied at the end of the year to then be included like registration. (Bend)

The people should report, if such a system were in place. It is not the job of private businesses or the government to keep track of the number of miles people drive. (Pendleton)

It should not be left up to the citizens to report how much they have driven, because people can be dishonest. Maybe it could be recorded at gas stations? (Pendleton)

Many participants felt car owners should be responsible for reporting their mileage and suggested they do so on income tax forms, at the DMV as part of the registration renewal process, or at the DEQ (at least in the Portland area). Few seemed to think a pure, unverified honor system would work, but a large number felt annual registrations, DEQ visits, or mechanical checkups could provide the needed corroboration. Tying the process to vehicle registrations was very popular. "It would have to be a combination of the driver and possibly the DMV" wrote a Portland resident. A few suggested that a chip or other device could be included in cars and used for mileage reporting. See Appendix I for full responses.

Participants generally did not address the problem of charging for non-Oregon miles in their answers, and that level of precision did not appear to be a significant concern for most participants. Once brought up in discussion, it was desirable to many and mattered a lot to some people.

More than one person worried that an annual lump sum tax payment could be problematic and suggested paying a monthly or quarterly fee based on vehicle characteristics and some prior period's mileage. The adjustment could then be made on tax forms, at the time of registration, or at some other periodic check. "The thing is that everybody in this country is a bad saver of money. I think that in reality there ought to be a flat rate according to your car and according to your previous [mileage] . . . so at the end of the year all of a sudden we don't get this huge bill and we don't have the money to pay it." (Portland)

Thinking about the administration of a mileage fee led some to dismiss the proposal as too complicated. Several participants were skeptical that government could administer such a program efficiently. Yet third parties were not seen as the answer. Very few people spontaneously suggested that private parties be involved in the collection and reporting of mileage data. A couple mentioned insurance companies and at least one suggested gas stations, but by far the majority inclined to existing government agencies like the DMV or DEQ. Testing specific government agency or service (or even specific private parties) was not the key objective of the focus groups, and may be an area worth exploring further in future research.

3.7 | Mileage Reporting Preferences

I am okay with being charged in or out-of-state because maybe they have their own system. So residents of those states would also be doing the same. (Roseburg)

The thought of maintaining a device in my car recording where I go and when makes my skin crawl. Major violation of privacy! (Roseburg)

I think it is ridiculous that the only unreportable option is set at the max number of reportable miles. At least make the mile option reasonable. (Bend)

Way too much technology that could go haywire. (Portland)

There's no plan that I liked 100%. (Roseburg)

I think it would be really difficult to pick one for everybody. . . You've got to give people a choice. (Roseburg)

Near the end of the groups we handed out a description of four mileage reporting plans and asked participants to record their most and least preferred choices (Appendix J). These options were clearly presented as choices for drivers to consider. Table 3 presents results for the most preferred options.

Table 3: Most Preferred Mileage Plans

	Option 1 (Basic)	Option 2 (Advanced)	Option 3 (Smartphone)	Option 4 (Simplified)	None
Roseburg*	6	1	0	2	0
Bend	2	4	0	1	1
Ontario	2	3	0	1	1
Pendleton	2	4	0	1	0
Portland 1	3	1	1	2	0
Portland 2	3	1	0	3	0
Total	18	14	1	10	2

Source: DHM Research 2013

Reasons given for liking and disliking plans were very consistent across groups. The **Basic Plan** was the most popular. Despite the disadvantage of charging all miles regardless of location, participants liked the plan because it was simple and involved relatively little data collection, no third party, and, most important, no GPS location based services, which equated to “tracking” and invasion of participant location data in the minds of the participants.

Those who felt strongly about only paying for travel on Oregon public roads tended to opt for the **Advanced Plan**, provided they could overcome the GPS location based issues. “I only wanted to pay for what I actually drove. I think we are kind of naïve if we think they don’t know where we are already. So I just don’t care that much about it.” (Portland)

For a significant number of people, overcoming the GPS issue was not going to be easy. “My least preferred was the advanced plan, and that is because of all the intrusion, and all the tracking,” said a Pendleton resident. “Big Brother” came up very frequently in discussions of the two GPS options.

Another drawback of the Advanced Plan for many was administration by private entities. “I didn’t care for the idea of collecting all this data and sending it to a private organization,” said an Ontario resident, adding that “they know enough about us already.” A Roseburg participant worried that a third party might sell the data, reflecting another common concern about involving for-profit companies.

The **Smartphone Plan** was the easiest one for most to dismiss (see Table 4 below with results of the least preferred plans). Concerns included that many people may not own smartphones, distrust of GPS location based services, and overloading data networks led to high rejection rates for this plan.

Those who chose the **Simplified Plan** typically did so because it was less invasive and easy. “The simpler you keep it, the less government you need,” said an Ontario resident. A Pendleton participant said, “I would rather pay more money and not be tracked by Big Brother.” Both were representative viewpoints from all focus group discussions.

Participants would have opted for the Simplified Plan more frequently if the mileage threshold weren’t so high. “That’s an outrageous amount of miles. Who drives that?” asked a Portland resident. Asked to come up with a fifth option, several suggested modifying the Simplified Plan to involve more than one mileage increment. “Have it two-tiered, for those with less miles, let’s say 15,000,” suggested a Portland woman. “I thought of a simplified plan,” said a Pendleton resident, “but let’s say you drive less than 20,000 miles, and then some people drive more but less than 40,000. You have to put down the mileage, but then you're in increments.”

Table 4: Least Preferred Options

	Option 1 (Basic)	Option 2 (Advanced)	Option 3 (Smartphone)	Option 4 (Simplified)	None
Roseburg*	1	1	4	2	1
Bend	0	2	4	1	1
Ontario	0	0	5	1	1
Pendleton	1	2	0	4	0
Portland 1	1	1	1	3	1
Portland 2	0	0	6	1	0
Total	3	6	20	12	4

Source: DHM Research 2013

3.8 | Reasons to Support Per-Mile Charge

In the final three focus groups, which included Pendleton and the two in Portland, we asked participants to rate seven reasons to support a per-mile charge for high-efficiency vehicles, and asked that they select the best and worst reasons (Appendix K). Table 5 summarizes the responses.

Table 5: Reasons to Support Per-Mile Charge on HE Vehicles

	1 - Privacy Protection	2 - Choice	3 - Fairness	4 - Gas Tax Offset	5 - Only OR roads charged	6 - Low Cost/ Bureaucracy	7 - Urgency
Very good	6	2	6	8	9	5	5
Good	10	12	9	6	7	9	10
Poor	4	6	5	6	4	7	4
Very poor	0	1	0	0	1	1	2
No response	2	1	2	2	0	0	1
Best reason	6	1	3	3	4	2	2
Worst reason	1	1	4	2	2	4	5

Source: DHM Research 2013

Privacy protection stood out with 16 people rating it a good or very good reason and six as the best. On the flip side, eight rated “low cost, little bureaucracy” as a poor or very poor reason and four rated it the worst. “The worst reason would seem to be the best reason,” said a Portland man, “but I just didn’t agree. I don’t think it is low cost and little bureaucracy.” The gas-tax offset was a case in point for at least one person worried about administrative costs: “To me that is just like administrative costs stacked up. I think you would lose all of your potential revenue in an administrative program.”

Urgency also rated low as a reason (six poor or very poor and five worst). Participants haven’t seen the facts and figures to support the need, and they don’t see that many high-efficiency vehicles on the road to prompt the urgency. More concrete factual information about implementation plans and costs, especially alongside an analysis of lost revenue

based on current AND projected numbers of high-efficiency cars, will be important in making the argument to the public that something needs to be done. In the absence of information skeptics assume nothing needs to change.

3.9 | Final Messages

At the end of the groups we asked participants to think over the discussion and write down the one message they wanted to share with ODOT (Appendix L). The themes will be familiar based on the discussion in this report, and the full range of messages can be found in the appendices. Below are a few representative comments.

Usage fee: whatever it is make it fair and ensure that the money collected will be spent wisely and will benefit the majority of people. (Roseburg)

Have a plan that equalizes fees and taxes for everyone using the roads, without taking away our privacy and/or tracking us. (Roseburg)

I think for me, previously, I kind of opposed any idea of people being charged more money, but presented in the format of, "Yeah, they really are using the roads just as much but paying less gas." That really makes sense to me. I may be opposed to how they are talking about doing it, but I definitely support the idea that people who are driving those vehicles should, in some way, pay for road maintenance. (Bend)

With the plan, please have data be the property of the driver, have data be purged once fees are assessed; have data be an open standard and open source; make it so that I can get the data too. Other notes: please ban studded snow tires! (Bend)

Do it. (Bend)

If a simple breakdown on how exactly you would enforce it could be created, it could be interesting to see where it goes! (Bend)

Make the objective as equitable as possible. Make the machinery of the project as simple as possible. I would not like the third party collectors. (Ontario)

Motorists should have different plans to choose from. (Pendleton)

Do your research and tell us (the people) that whatever you decide to do is backed up by the facts and figures. (Portland)

Collection should be through existing state operations, DMV, DEQ, ODOT, with low overhead; needs to balance the encouragement to drive energy efficient (green) versus highway/transport costs; needs to offer options for reporting. (Portland)

I would only concern myself with this when it reaches the point where it makes economic sense to implement it. I don't think there are enough vehicles of this kind

on the road to warrant it now. If it is enacted, please use the size and weight of the vehicles as its benchmark for the rate it pays. (Portland)

Trying to be fair to all drivers is important, and keeping it simple and clean would be best. I think reporting to the DMV at renewal time would probably be the cleanest and would keep people honest. (Portland)

Finally, many participants expressed appreciation of ODOT for gathering opinions and asking for feedback. In some cases, participants better understood the difficulty of making good policy decisions for funding transportation.

I am impressed that ODOT did this and you guys are actually going out around the state. (Bend)

I want to thank you for asking for our thoughts. This is the first time I felt that anyone cared. (Portland)

It makes me see the other side a little bit. When you are trying to figure out how to collect taxes rather than being the one on guard all the time. It kind of puts new shoes on you and you are looking at it from another perspective. I'm thinking that is not an easy decision. (Portland)

4. | MESSAGING FRAMEWORK

The following recommendations are a framework for communications and messaging on road usage charging in Oregon. They are grouped by key points addressed in an earlier section of the report titled Section 2: Analysis and Observations.

Many of the recommendations are supported by focus group and survey research conducted for ODOT in 2012 and 2013. They are general guidelines and specific to Oregon; while much of the advice may apply outside of the state, it would be wise to conduct independent research to test their effectiveness in other areas.

The framework is meant to present broad rules for communication. It is based on decades of past research by DHM Research and our experience on transportation issues and other relevant topics, in addition to the recent focus groups and surveys for ODOT. The framework will be stronger if supplemented with information that explain or support road usage charging, like the current and projected numbers of highly fuel efficient vehicles in Oregon.

Messaging recommendations are as follows:

Transportation is an important issue among focus group participants. An earlier survey of Oregonians also shows transportation as a priority for the state.

- Bring transportation to **voter's attention**. Connect transportation to a healthy economy – job growth and economic development. This is likely to increase the importance of transportation and add a level of urgency.
- Focus on **outcomes first** and how the public will benefit. Do not get bogged down with process and details. Voters are more concerned with the benefit of a safe transportation system that gets them from point A to B. Move away from too much detail about HOW road usage charging would or could work.
- Use a **positive tone**. It's to maintain and keep our road safe today and tomorrow. Do not take the tone of "if we don't" then "(fill in the blank)." Benefits work better with voters than consequences of failed policies.
- Focus on **maintenance** versus new. There is much more support for government to maintain and maximize past investments versus expand or create something new.
- Talk about transportation as a **public service**. Many voters see maintaining our transportation system as a role for government.
- Be **empathetic** by acknowledging that transportation is one issue among other and often higher priorities. Transportation is important to voters, but in a second tier.

Funding for transportation is not well understood. Voters do not have a detailed or confident knowledge of the funding source for transportation improvements in Oregon. This is fairly common for any public financing.

- Inform the public about **(declining) funding** for transportation generally and NOT specifically about the fuel tax or the price of fuel. Voters don't seem to connect (on their own) the similarities between the current fuel tax and the mileage tax. In addition, the fuel tax is considered an 'invisible' fee, or one you don't pay, while a mileage tax will show up on a bill.
- Inform the public with **several specifics** to make policy proposals credible. Many national and state surveys show that trust in government is declining, thus, a government policy proposal will be viewed with skepticism. Lofty language can be confusing and less believable. Providing a few key facts should lessen the skepticism.
 - What: past, current, project revenue for transportation; number of high-efficiency vehicles today and tomorrow; etc.
 - Why: funding is declining, and will continue to decline; maintain and enhance our quality of life.
 - Who administers: private third party and existing services.
- Add a **quality of life** reference. "A good transportation system is necessary for our quality of life." This reference is more easily understood and resonates with voters. It communicates a strong message that there is a plan for the future. Voters support a proactive approach and one that looks ahead – beyond the next election. Discussions in the focus groups evoked strong emotions among participants. This is an opportunity to connect those emotions to maintaining or enhancing our quality of life.
- Don't try and convince voters of **government efficiency**. It takes too long. And worse, it may pivot conversations to specific transportation projects that went awry. Everyone seems to have a story or experience. The topic of transportation is often associated with perceptions of wasted taxpayer money. Focus on quality of life and direct benefits to the public right out of the gates.
- Do not use the word "**sustainable**" to describe funding. It's confusing to people. Today, this word is used to describe the environment, continuity, food, etc.

Almost all agree that drivers should pay their fair share for road usage, regardless of vehicle type. Fairness is more commonly seen in this light compared to equity between rural and urban drivers.

- Incorporate **shared responsibility** and use words that imply ownership. "WE" need to maintain "OUR" roads; "WE" all should help pay for transportation in "OUR" state. The sense of shared responsibility is likely to cut across party lines and key demographics. It may be the best message to maximize support from difficult groups, like older men, conservative voters, and Eastern Oregon.
- **Paint a picture**. Use descriptive values or outcomes which are easier for voters to identify with – improvements to OUR transportation system so WE can get home and spend more time with family and friends. Stay away from vague descriptions about transportation, like building bridges and widening roads.

Road usage charging is supported by 30 out of 45 focus group participants, and evokes strong emotions. The emotions surrounding this topic could be an opportunity to better inform the public on an issue they care about.

- Communications would be best served by focusing on **'usage of roads'** and less on high-efficiency vehicles. Almost all support a usage fee – keep the focus here. Many view the tax on high-efficiency vehicles as a penalty for people trying to do the right thing for the environment – pivot away from this.
- Connect road usage charging as a **usage fee**, and less as a mileage tax.
- **Connect the dots** between road usage measured in MPG consumed on a trip and miles driven. The public does not automatically make this connection. Highlight that the fuel consumed on every trip is a usage fee, and has other variables with added cost – congestion, stopping, starting, and efficiency of the vehicle. Road usage charging is a cost per mile and avoids other potential charges.
- Work with **partners** like AAA. Include them as spokespeople, especially on the need for a new funding model and any reference to cost. Private-public-nonprofit partnerships are often well received by the public, and even increase the credibility of each organization.

Road usage charging proposal must be simple and easy.

- Again, communications must address road usage charging as a **usage fee**.
- Providing **too much detail** should be avoided. Though transportation funding is not well understood by voters, it does not mean they want the level of detail often included in communications about transportation funding. Any road usage charging proposal must be short and easy to understand.
- Shift the tone to **usage of roads** and away from HEV owners. Owners draw sympathy – they are doing the right thing for the environment and deserve our support. Pivot to usage of roads. Almost all support a road usage fee.
- Stop talking about road usage charging as a **policy**. It's loaded with government reference (and mistrust and waste). Instead, connect it with improving quality of life, the economy, safe roads, shared responsibility (equity), etc.
- Bring **choice** in how the data is gathered and shared up front and center. There is no clear agreement on how to gather mileage data, however, choice is strongly supported by focus group participants. Choice may also reduce suspicion of government and private parties.

Implementation of road usage charging may need to address several key questions and concerns. Among the most prominent:

- There is no clear agreement on how to gather mileage data. Again, bring **choice** front and center. Choice should also be clear and easy to understand.
- Suspicion is equally high of government and private parties. **Choice** may be the best strategy here as well. It is not recommended to try and convince voters of government efficiency. It takes too long and returns are minimal. It is also not wise to convince voters of credibility of private parties in this current climate, especially in light of recent events with major firms providing confidential user information to the National Security Agency. Using existing and familiar systems, like DEQ and DMV, may ease concerns. ODOT may need to explore these alternatives as they were not tested as a key area in the focus groups.

- There is an assumption that implementation will be complicated, especially for the small number of vehicles, thus costs will exceed any increased revenues. Address **declining revenues** AND **projected declines** to further explain the need to implement a new revenue model. Keep a positive tone. Using a negative or alarmist tone – “if we don’t fix it now, roads will fall apart” – will only feed the skepticism about government and reduces credibility. Too many times voters have heard about the dire consequences of not supporting or opposing a proposal and things seem to turn out fine at the end.

Consider the following words to use and avoid in communications and messaging around road usage charging in Oregon.

Words to Avoid	Words to Use
Mileage tax	Usage fee
HEV owners	Usage of roads
Transportation infrastructure	Bridges, roads, public transportation, sidewalks, bike lanes
Expansion or new	Maintain, protect past investments
Policies	Enhance our quality of life
Sustainable funding	Plan or funding for the future
Government efficiency	Existing systems and services, partnering organizations, accountability
Selection of an option	User choice

5. | APPENDIX (WRITTEN EXERCISES AND HANDOUTS)

ODOT Road Usage Charging: FOCUS GROUP RESEARCH

Group 1: May 28, 2013; Roseburg

Group 2: May 29, 2013; Bend

Group 3: May 30, 2013; Ontario

Group 4: June 1, 2013; Pendleton

Group 5: June 4, 2013; Multnomah County

Group 6: June 5, 2013; Washington County

APPENDIX A: Demographics

Occupation			
Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton
Call center supervisor	Web developer	Retail	Retired legal secretary
Business owner	Counselor	Kitchen worker	Music teacher
Botanist	Underwriting rep	N/A	R.V. Builder
Retired hairdresser	Trial assistant, District Attorney's office	Verizon sales rep	College Student
Program assistant	Sales/dry cleaning	Retired telephone answering service	Dairy queen worker
Architectural drafter	Technician	Nurse	Substitute teacher
County court assessor's office	Substitute teacher	Student	Retired courier
Pacific Power operations manager	Case manager		

Occupation	
Portland 1	Portland 2
Student	Accountant
Music specialist / singer	Florist
Legal secretary	Administrator
Hospital admissions clerk	Business owner
Flooring sales rep	Day treatment counselor
Advocate	School Nurse
Purchaser	Nurse Manager
Art therapist	

How long have you lived in Oregon?						
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2
Less than 1 year	0	0	0	0	0	0
2-5 years	0	0	0	0	1	0
6-10 years	2	0	0	1	0	0
11-20 years	1	3	2	2	1	2
More than 20 years	5	5	5	4	6	4

Education Level						
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2
HS grad or less	0	1	2	1	1	0
Some college/2 year degree	5	3	4	4	1	3
College degree/4 year degree	2	2	1	2	3	4
Post college	1	2	0	0	3	0

Household Income						
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2
Under \$29,999	1	3	6	1	0	1
\$30,000-\$49,999	2	4	0	2	4	1
\$50,000-\$74,999	4	0	1	1	2	3
\$75,000-\$99,999	0	1	0	0	1	1
\$100,000 +	1	0	0	3	0	1

Age						
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2
18-34	2	4	4	3	2	1
35-54	3	2	1	1	2	2
55+	3	2	2	3	4	4

Gender						
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2
Male	4	3	3	3	1	2
Female	4	5	4	4	7	5

Political Party						
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2
Democrat	4	3	4	2	3	1
Republican	3	2	1	2	4	3
Independent	1	3	2	2	1	2
Other	0	0	0	1	0	1
Not Registered	0	0	0	0	0	0

APPENDIX B: Written Exercise 1

Besides the economy and jobs, what are the most important issues that we need to address in the state? List everything that comes to mind and star (*) the most important.//How are these funded in Oregon?

Roseburg

- Homelessness*; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Schools/Education. // Not funded; Taxes; Independent funding; Taxes
- Traffic; Roads*; Drug treatment for youth; Clean air; Law enforcement. // Taxes; Levies; Sales Tax; Lottery funds; Grants
- Education*; Forestry- sustained on both private and federal land; drug addiction; poverty. // Federal funds; state allocations; property taxes
- Education*; Infrastructure – bridges, roads. // Taxes – state and federal
- Road repair*; Daylight savings; More parks; More recreation opportunities. // Taxes
- Education*; Law enforcement (lack of)/crime; Taxes; “Welfare”. // All of these issues are mostly funded by taxes. Not 100% sure where welfare money comes from.
- Infrastructure* - roads, public transportation, railway, high speed train; Transportation costs – rising gas prices, cost to commute, cost to purchase vehicle; Regulation of forest lands; Taxation; Democracy by representation; Starvation; Food and Drug Administration. // Government subsidies; State budget; National budget; Lack of sales tax
- Health care*; Public transportation; infrastructure; education. // Taxes; premiums; fees

Bend

- Education funding*; Land use planning done well; Replacement for federal timber funding; funding for public services. // Education funding: general fund, tuition, some federal, No Child Left Behind, possible “race to the top” grant
- Small business friendliness*; Political climate; Wages; Homeless rate; Large business friendliness. // Homelessness is funded by taxes distributed by the government; Non-profits; Fundraising; People (donations)
- Drug abuse (meth)*; Environment; Crime; Employment. // Taxes; Law enforcement levies; Lottery money
- Transportation*; tourist attractions (theater, arts). // Police and fire – taxes; County employees – taxes
- We need to get more people out to vote*; I believe it is time to consider a sales tax; We need to pay teachers more. // Increase general fund
- Quality of life*; Environment; Infrastructure; Schools. // Environmental issues are not specifically funded; Infrastructure is funded by taxes; Schools are funded by property taxes
- Education funding*; Monsanto; Environment; Viable health care that is preventative. // Education: state income tax, bond levies, lottery money; Oregon Health Plan: State/Federal dollars?
- Funding for social services*; Affordable health care (sliding scale); Low-cost mental health care. // Taxpayer money; Grants; Insurance fees; Fundraising; Donations

Ontario

- Healthcare for the elderly in Oregon*; City planning in Ontario; Equal rights; Education // Taxes; State funding; Federal funding
- Gun control*; Immigration // Licensing prior to purchase – like a driver
- Laws on homeschooling*; public education // By the government and our taxes; My own pocket
- I have not put too much thought into it. I am open to hearing everyone’s opinions.
- Schools*; Health care; Infrastructure (roads) // Schools: taxes; Health care: personal finance taxes; Infrastructure: gas taxes and license fees
- Health care*; mental health services and rising costs for services; school funding and class sizes; PERS // Federal and state taxes (not sure how taxes are allocated -- property income, etc.)
- Better education system*; Student loan rules; Recreational programs // Student loans are funded by federal government; education system is funded by school districts; Recreational programs are funded by people

Pendleton

- Education (cost and availability)*; Crime (drugs) // Local funding for education; State funding
- Education*; Music education; Health care; Immigration; Teacher pay; Crime; Drugs // Taxes; Public funding; Volunteers
- Taxes*; Laws that seem dumb; Accountability of government spending at the state and city levels // As much by private enterprise as possible
- Education funding*; Education (instruction); // Education is funded through taxes I believe, but they are slowly being taken away. I think they need to give more, it’s the future, people.
- Education*; Road work and maintenance // Taxes
- Social issues*; Environment; Water rights; Education // Sales tax
- Education reform* // Funding comes from state income, fees, licenses

Portland 1

- Trying to adapt new technology like solar panels and green roofs into everyday life*; Making Portland more accessible to pedestrian traffic and less centered on the automobile. // I assume things are funded by taxes as well as donations, but really I don’t know for sure.
- Education*; public safety; environmental // Money, donations, possible fundraising (for special programs).
- Transportation – car and mass transit*; clean up our rivers; a stable fund for schools. // I am not sure how all transit is funded in this state except to say that gas taxes and registration fees for cars is one source.
- Settle on a better way to budget for schools*; PERS; road repair; decide on the Columbia River bridge // Taxes*; constant extra special bonds.
- Facilities budget*; land use; secondary education/pre-college qualifications. // Voter appeal to constituents; bureaucracy budget to perpetuate; philanthropic donations.

- Education*; clean water; clean air; energy; transportation; GMOs; soil integrity. // Corporate tax; property tax; not sure if else. Don't know about any other issues where funding comes from.
- The ways we are using our tax dollars*; the condition of our roads and bridges; the condition of our schools. // All taxes money in – gas tax, federal funding, property funding, independent funding measures.
- Property taxes*; education (schools); public transportation; health care; employment. // Personal revenue*; health care – State and Federal; public transportation – State.

Portland 2

- Education*; health care; transportation; environment/sustainable lifestyle; freedom // Education is currently funded through state funds – initially based on student count but adjusted by size/area. Does not necessarily favor larger populations.
- Medical support for the elderly*; school support; water situations in Portland; transportation/roads. // Property taxes; water bills I think. We are losing ground for the elderly with Obama care – I don't know.
- How tax dollars are spent*; education*; health care; transportation; public – fire. // Tax dollars; timber tax; federal tax and my contribution.
- Drug use*; overspending on unnecessary projects; helping businesses thrive and grow. // Law enforcement budget/judiciary budget; by waste; lottery and other state programs.
- Parenting support/guidance*; education. // Tax payers; some privately; state, federal.
- Drug addiction*; Family stability and values*; mental health; traffic; environment; education. // Drugs – taxes; Education – taxes, donations.
- Child trafficking/prostitution*; healthcare; job creation. // I don't believe there is much funding now. Police budgets are not robust nor is funding for jails. There aren't many programs designed to rehab kids who are pulled off the streets.

APPENDIX C: Written Exercise 2

What transportation issues need to be addressed? //How is transportation, like road and highway improvements and public transportation, funded in Oregon?

Roseburg

- Smog*; Public transportation; Roads; Availability of transportation. // Unknown; City/State taxes; Taxes; Not sure
- Road maintenance*; Bridges; Speed zones; Laws. // State taxes; Levies; Grants; Lottery funds; Federal taxes
- Road maintenance – fix holes and good paint; Public transportation – access outside of metro areas; Passenger rail. // State allocations; Gas & vehicle taxes
- Roads*; bridges. // Federal and State funding; Taxes?
- Train travel*; Comfortable bus upgrades; Highway improvement. // Taxes; Fees for travel
- Log trucks/semis- people driving too many hours or on poor equipment; Public transit/bus systems can only really thrive in medium to large cities; Bicycling – needing to share spaces that are too tight. Seems like larger cities have more bike trails however some are secluded and “unsafe.”; Different sized communities have different issues. // ODOT, taxes, etc.
- Highway efficiency*; Roads in general; Railway; High-speed train; Public transportation; Cost to travel; Cost to transport goods. // Government: local/state/national – taxes; Personal grants; Corporate grants
- Limited public transport in rural areas*; Infrastructure; Bridges; Limited shoulders; Steep drops. // Taxes; Fees

Bend

- Ban studded tires; Maintenance and repair of infrastructure, mainly bridges. // Transportation funding: federal for large projects, cities for bad roads, ODOT/State for state highways
- Crime rates/safety; Funding or lack thereof; Reaching rural areas; Cost; Reach slightly out of town; Excessive road construction. // Taxes; Bonds; More debt by public
- More mass transit, not just here but statewide. // DMV money
- Road damage; Ease of commute*; Raise speed limit on parkway; More roundabouts on the East Side. // Transportation funded by taxes?
- More frequent timing for buses to run; Abolish Metro. // Metro has become a monster. It eats up its budget and doesn’t improve anything.
- Substandard bridges; Road repair; Extend light rail to Bend. // Bridges are funded by political movements; Road repair funded by gas tax; Not sure about light rail funding.
- Roads/bridges – infrastructure; public transit/availability. // Roads: state income taxes, lottery dollars; Public transit: local funds, state funds, grants.
- More accessible; More environmentally friendly. // Tax payers; Individual people (fares); Smart Car rentals

Ontario

- Gas prices; Road work; Police focus more on bad drivers and on tracking people on cell phone while driving // State and federal funding; Taxes; Grants

- Rapid transit/Mass transit // Gas tax; Heavy highway vehicle tax
- Do not have an opinion about transportation // Not sure of how transportation is funded
- Making sure everyone can make it to school (buses, carpool); Smaller town roads are in bad shape // Taxes
- Bridges and traffic patterns; Potholes and deteriorating surfaces // Taxes, licenses and fees; Gas taxes
- Road repair/maintenance; Public transit; Bridge repair/replacement; Bicycle lanes // With city's property tax or bonds fund
- Don't have taxis; roads aren't all safe for bicycles // Oregon funds by each individual city or district (guess)

Pendleton

- Highway improvements; Freeway speeds; Improve local city streets // State funded by highway improvements
- Buses; Taxis; Pollution; Vehicles // Taxes through government budget are used to fund public transportation
- Quality of old roads and necessity of new roads // Funded with tax dollars or at least subsidized
- Not enough transportation available; Buses aren't really a good option for younger students; Roads aren't patched up well // I think transportation is also funded through taxes but I might be wrong.
- It needs to become more widely available, more locations // Transportation is funded by taxpayer dollars; maintenance is often through adopt-a-highway programs and such
- Airport subsidies; Mass transit // Don't know really; I think it's funded by user fees, subsidies and taxes
- Seems to be okay, not sure about metropolitan areas // Gas tax, license fees

Portland 1

- In Oregon as a whole, I believe that we need to improve the conditions for pedestrian traffic. Wider sidewalks, different parking (angled from the street). // I know that Metro funds public transportation.
- I do not know what the most important transportation issues are. I really appreciate the great TriMet system though. I never really think about transportation issues. // Didn't give a good answer above.
- Repair of our roads and bridges*; linking more mass transit to our cities. // As I stated previously (see the first page) I am not sure other than to add money from the federal government as well as taxes and fees.
- Better roads (paving); more main road in and out of city; another bridge. // Gas tax, business taxes, State and City taxes.
- Maintain*; construct; adequacy of needs // Licensing; taxation; federal dollars input; voter response projects.
- Cleaner long-haul routes (for instance, more consistent and frequent trains between Seattle and San Diego - for Oregon, Portland to Medford). // Partially through licensing, DEQ fees, and other car tax. Don't know what else.

- The condition of the roads and bridges*; replacement of the I-5 bridge; crowded freeways especially at rush hour. // Gas tax; federal funds; state funds; independent measures; county funds; city funds.
- Medical school/VA hospital parking expansion*; green transportation // City, State, Federal money, “gifted funds”.

Portland 2

- Bus/MAX services; bridge maintenance; congestion; road/pothole maintenance. // Bus/MAX is funded by a variety of methods: 1) fares, 2) TM tax/transit tax on bus/SE, 3) other state funds.
- Roads/congestion*; buses – not dependable. // Taxes I guess – State, Federal, gas, etc.
- Roads, potholes – not big enough*; public transportation; bridges – needing repairs. // Public tax dollars; federal tax matching funds.
- Fix bridges; expand freeways; Oregon-Washington turnpike; increase freeway speeds; change focus on spending from light rail to highways. // Transportation is funded by Federal and State combined.
- Traffic (everywhere!)*; Cleaner public transit; bad drivers; biking. // Individuals; tax payers; state.
- Congestion, road conditions. // Taxes and private donations, bonds.
- Freeways need expanding to handle traffic*; bikes need enforcement in following laws. // Federal monies, auto licensing, property taxes.

APPENDIX D: Written Exercise 3

There are many different ways that Oregon could fund transportation improvements. Thinking broadly, make a list of guiding principles that you feel policy makers should consider when developing policies to fund transportation.

Roseburg

- The wants of the majority of people; The safety of the general public; Accessibility
- Fair for everyone; Everyone pays fair share; Eliminate waste; Spend wisely
- Safety; Equitability; Cost/value; Number of individuals who benefit; Environmental impact
- How much the road is used; What types of vehicles use the road 1-trucks, 2-bikes
- Have special group look into what is needed most and how it can be funded
- Who will be using the transportation? What is suitable for a particular area –rural vs. city? How much does it cost? How much can people actually and comfortably afford it?
- Future use; Funding – where will the money come from?; Cost effectiveness; Environmental impact; Future forms of transportation; Compensation
- Cost equalization; Minimize impact; Long term; Is it necessary?

Bend

- Cost of ongoing maintenance; Highest efficiency for project; X dollars spent = high return; Safety improvements; Lower mortality rate; Lower healthcare costs
- Are we meeting the needs of the population?; Are we being environmentally responsible?; Is it accessible?; Is it affordable?; Is it safe?
- How many people would it help? Would it save lives? Would it save resources?
- Overall consumer happiness; Communication with tax payers
- Make transportation affordable and accessible to all walks of life (monetary incomes)
- Stop giving the state's infrastructure to big corporations. They use this state, they should pay taxes; Special interests have used Oregon and ran away when they got a better deal
- Who is using it vs. who is paying it should match up; If they actually listen in Salem to this side of the Cascades instead of what works for Portland
- Most cost efficient for realistic options; Public input; Maintaining the integrity of the environment

Ontario

- Prioritize what the future calls for
- Ultimate economy of end project; Cost to operate and longevity; cost to environment; cost to user
- How will the cost of the project affect the residents of the surrounding area? Is it something that the residents of the area could vote on to approve the project?
- Youth, elders, eco-friendly, safety, timely; combine the issue with youth/elder transportation
- Money must be collected according to the wear and tear caused by the vehicle; Ban oversized loads; Charge huge fees for special loads; Research better materials

- Use: everyone benefits from roads, so everyone should chip in. Who profits the most -- are certain companies or industries being subsidized by the public? Fair share should be paid.
- We need to know what kind of people populates a city or town; Understand economic situation in the area. Speak to all the people, ask questions and suggest ideas to everyone in the town.

Pendleton

- Guiding values to consider: Need? Population? Cost?
- Safety, Safety of passengers (from other passengers); Economy; Low fees; Wide range of places to go
- Private enterprises; Economic feasibility; Ridership – keeping public transit full; Jobs
- Some values that should be taken into consideration are safety; Going back to the maintenance of the roads. Maybe not so much emphasis on making new roads but fixing old ones
- The policymakers should make sure that transportation is widely available (low prices) and make it widely accessible.
- Think of all economic groups. I do think the higher tax bracket should pay their fair share. Trucking businesses should pay more.
- Transportation was financed by gas tax and fees. With push for electric cars and gas saving cars, should there not be a fee for charging?

Portland 1

- Wider sidewalk*; smaller roads; different parking (on the side of the street maybe? Angled?); Leaving room for cyclists; fewer parking lots; talk to the people; manage the money.
- Grounding principles/values policy-makers should consider for funding decisions: They should consider the opinions/values of the people in that area.
- Given the state of the differences between the Democrats and the Republicans, the country and the city folk, I do not see any movement on any of these issues in the near future.
- Who will be using the roads most – trucks? Cars? Bikes?; How would a gas tax affect those people and also the whole group who live there?
- Overall analysis of need; objectives of timing dictates; % factors of budget to overall budget; % of population factors relative to needs.
- How does it serve all Oregonians; how will it prepare Oregon for the future; is it the best use of resources?
- How many people will use X per day?; Can we get Federal dollars to match?; How will the new X integrate into the existing?
- Look at past history of what has worked, what not. Look at 'hybrid' of [illegible word] together for success.

Portland 2

- 1) Safety, 2) Low cost – economically feasible, 3) Availability to large numbers of users bus over MAX, 4) need NOT cutting edge.
- They need to pay attention to the economy and know that a list of what we HAVE to have not what would be nice or we want. We can't have everything we want.
- Amount of traffic at rush hours; consider toll on 'core area' during rush hours; have business consider flex hours.
- Respect the income of families they are taking money from, don't waste it; benefit the majority, not the few.
- Understanding of the average citizen – thoughts and ideas; most efficient.
- Limited tax increases; relocation – limited family and business relocation; safety; longevity of road improvements.
- Where can dollars benefit the majority but still provide funding where smaller populations reside?; Make sure funds spent will spread as thin as possible, 'biggest bang for the buck'.

APPENDIX E: Written Exercise 4

Now think more specifically, make a list of any ideas you have about how Oregon should fund transportation improvements over the next 10-20 years? //Who should pay for these improvements?

Roseburg

- Lottery funds; Drug tax/legalize; Toll system as long as it is used for issue; Sales tax
- Sales tax; Taxes from marijuana; Toll roads
- Gas taxes; Vehicle registration fees/taxes based upon vehicle's gross weight; Bridge tolls; Sales tax
- Federal grants; Lottery; Gasoline tax; Usage
- People who use should pay more; Tolls for new bridges until paid for; Increase license fees, especially on bigger, heavier rigs
- Oregon lottery; Gas taxes; Hotel tax; Small sales tax?; Property tax; Cigarette/other tax
- Publicly funded; Privately funded; Grants tax credit; Major corporation tax; Tax fuel refineries/companies
- Use tax; Sales tax; Marijuana tax; Corporate profit tax

Bend

- Ratio on registration model: high value car=high registration, low value car = low registration
- Taxes (people); Public transit; Bonds
- Federal grants; Lottery dollars; Car registrations and licenses; Special levies
- Lottery dollars; State/Federal funding; Tourism; Property taxes
- I believe gas taxes are used to fund transportation; also trucking companies pay fees to use roads
- These things are and should be funded with taxes. Just needs to be fair
- Bigger tariffs on what moves through the state, i.e., whoever is shipping freight via rail or semi-truck; Toll roads: it works elsewhere, why not here?
- Tax dollars (people/businesses); Apply for federal funding by talking about how transportation impacts access to services for vulnerable populations

Ontario

- Taxes; Stop waste – prioritize projects; Grants; Maybe try to get rid of wasted spending and put toward transportation
- User fees; Municipal bonds; Non-profit providers; Mileage taxes
- Wondering if there are any state funds that won't increase taxes. Unsure on this one.
- Regional system; If the town is somewhat split on doing a transit system...
- Taxes; Use fees; Permits; Research by firms that make road materials – make them pay to use public roads; Experimental vehicles
- Public transit projects should be funded by income tax or by bonds voted on by communities to improve their area locally; Lottery, too
- Every county may obtain a federal grant, depending on the need of transportation; Another suggestion would communicate and ask for a reasonable tax so each city or town can show progress within their needs

Pendleton

- Other things are more important than making more transportation available
- Private companies can be used, such as Greyhound; Consider using trains again
- Get private businesses interested; Keep expenses down; Co-pay
- People complain about taxes but then want things provided and fixed. But overall, that's the best way to be funded. The government doesn't have a money tree. I think they just need to learn how to distribute it better.
- Oregon should fund the transportation improvements with taxes but also with community programs such as fundraisers that will benefit the communities' transportation.
- State bond measure; Trucking should pay more; Toll booths
- Electric cars should pay a fee and bicycles who use a lane should pay a license fee

Portland 1

- I know very little about funding; I wish the Federal government were in a position to help more; taxes being put to better use seems to be the most reasonable way.
- Sales tax on merchandise; toll booths; fundraisers (raise awareness).
- Toll roads and bridges; continued gas tax; continued fees to license cars; revamp our property tax system and add a sales tax – in fact, revamp Oregon's entire tax system.
- According to the most needed then consider who will be most affected; if it is masses, then a State tax as well as a gas tax; if a main road, tolls are best.
- After federal funding, local needs ratio to major state needs/funds; [illegible word] from usage, commercial, recreation, etc.
- I have no idea how to raise funding for transportation while meeting the other demanding needs of Oregon and Oregonians giving limited funding overall.
- Use the gas tax for what it is intended! Toll roads and bridges if needed. Tax bike riders to pay for bike stuff.
- Tobacco tax; taking a small percent every time one makes a purchase with a credit card – this goes into a fund for said transportation.

Portland 2

- Gas tax; use tax – highway vehicle tax (not toll road); large project – federal funding assistance or state funding.
- Pay for use – possibly local taxes; Don't use the taxes collected for transportation for things other than that; Portland has a water bureau that uses water foolishly.
- Toll roads; vehicle weight; encourage car pools; timber tax – cut and replant more; road usage.
- By eliminating the waste and using funding of unnecessary projects to fund those that are necessary; we have never focused on ride-share and that is a much more reliable and economical solution than light rail.
- Tax payers; large corporations; fines from individuals; insurance companies.
- Funded by people moving into area, not as much by people already living here; Have large corporations fund road improvements in their area.
- Toll roads/bridges that need repair; everybody using the roads needs to contribute – add bike licensure; portion of monies paid to use public transportation could go back to road maintenance.

APPENDIX F: Written Exercise 5

Do you strongly support, somewhat support, feel neutral, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose the following options for funding transportation improvements in Oregon? Please write DK if you're unsure.

Fee on Fuel							
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	TOTAL
Strongly support	3	1	0	0	2	1	7
Somewhat support	1	2	2	3	3	3	14
Feel neutral	1	3	2	1	1	1	9
Somewhat oppose	0	0	2	1	2	2	7
Strongly oppose	3	2	1	2	0	0	8
DK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fee on Miles Driven							
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	TOTAL
Strongly support	2	0	0	1	3	1	7
Somewhat support	3	2	5	0	2	1	13
Feel neutral	2	1	1	1	2	3	10
Somewhat oppose	0	3	0	5	0	2	10
Strongly oppose	1	1	1	0	1	0	4
DK	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Toll Fee							
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	TOTAL
Strongly support	0	1	0	1	3	2	7
Somewhat support	6	3	2	2	4	1	18
Feel neutral	0	2	1	1	1	0	5
Somewhat oppose	2	0	2	2	0	1	7
Strongly oppose	0	2	1	0	0	3	6
DK	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Vehicle Registration Fee							
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	TOTAL
Strongly support	4	5	0	1	1	2	13
Somewhat support	1	0	4	4	5	2	16
Feel neutral	2	1	3	2	0	1	9
Somewhat oppose	1	2	0	0	1	2	6
Strongly oppose	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
DK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Fee during Peak/Congestion Times							
	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	TOTAL
Strongly support	2	0	0	0	2	1	5
Somewhat support	1	2	0	1	1	0	5
Feel neutral	2	1	3	2	1	1	10
Somewhat oppose	1	1	3	4	1	0	10
Strongly oppose	1	4	0	0	3	4	12
DK	1	0	1	0	0	1	3

APPENDIX G: Written Exercise 6

(Read road usage charging description)

The Oregon fuel tax is 30 cents per gallon and the primary funding source for our roads. Motorists are switching to fuel efficient vehicles and fuel consumption is dropping, which is decreasing the funds available to repair and maintain our roads, or build new capacity. The federal government is facilitating this transition by raising the national fuel economy standards to a 54.5 MPG average by 2025.

The Oregon Legislature may consider a bill to change fund transportation in the state. This bill imposes a per-mile charge on highly fuel efficient vehicles (55 MPG equivalent and above) for the 2015 model years and later. The proposed per-mile charge is 1.5 cents per mile, which is equivalent to \$1.50 per 100 miles. Those paying the per-mile charge will receive a fuel tax rebate. All other motorists will continue to pay only the fuel tax.

Highly fuel efficient vehicle drivers currently pay nothing or very little for their use of Oregon roads. Meanwhile, the driver of a vehicle getting, for example, 15 miles per gallon and driving 15,000 miles pays \$300 in fuel taxes annually. Should the Legislature decide to raise new road revenue in the future, those paying the fuel tax will cover the portion not paid by drivers of highly fuel efficient vehicles unless the Legislature passes a new law and the drivers of those vehicles are required to pay a per-mile charge.

In general, is this a very good, good, poor, or very poor idea? // Why?

	Roseburg	Bend	Ontario	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	TOTAL
Very good	3	0	2	0	1	3	9
Good	2	6	3	5	3	2	21
Neutral	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Poor	1	1	1	1	2	1	7
Very poor	1	1	0	1	1	1	5
Don't know	0	0	1	0	1	0	2

Roseburg

- Very good // If you use it, make it equal by paying your share. Poorer citizens will have to cover the richer ones if this is not implemented. Just because you can buy a better car (mpg) than another does not make it that you should not pay into a system that supports all.
- Very good // Everyone who uses the roads should pay for the maintenance of them. People who cannot afford the new fuel efficient cars should not be penalized.
- Very good // Cost equalization – all users need to pay their fair share. Don't penalize higher mpg drivers.
- Good // Because it will equalize the cost somewhat.
- Good // It helps everyone pay their fair share. Electric cars should pay a fee to charge up at a recharge station, etc.

- Neutral //My concern is that not everyone can afford a brand-new, fuel efficient vehicle. I am concerned about citizens who drive older vehicles. How can they ever get ahead with one more “tax” after another?
- Poor //Until fuel prices at the pump are regulated no fuel tax should be implemented. It does not matter what or how much the tax is, large corporations control the overall price per gallon. This would discourage people from being more environmentally friendly.
- Very poor //This penalizes vehicle owners who have reduced fuel consumption because of their values or desire to economize. People who choose to drive low fuel mileage vehicles are free to do so, but should pay accordingly. They not only waste fuel but contribute much more air pollution.

Bend

- Good //This is a “decent” option and a pragmatic approach. It still is an incentive to drive less.
- Good // What people pay should be as even as possible
- Good //Only the people with highly fuel-efficient vehicles would be taxed and receive a rebate in the end.
- Good // Bad implementation; State needs money for roads but the levy of the tax is much greater than the gas tax.
- Good // Because electric and fuel-efficient vehicle drivers need to pay their share of road fees
- Good // It’s good because it makes up for the money lost on fuel tax but also doesn’t double-tax people who don’t have fuel-efficient vehicles
- Poor // I think efficient vehicles should get tax incentives, not be punished. If you drive a fuel-efficient vehicle, you purchased it to save, not pay.
- Very poor // If you need an average of \$300 per driver, have them pay it in registration instead of reporting mileage to government!!

Ontario

- Very good //Same as before – you should pay for the wear and tear on the roads that we use.
- Very good //Since the fuel-efficient cars are buying less gas, we need to come up with the shortfall in dollars for transportation.
- Good // It would balance everything out. The person owning a truck that gets 15 mpg will still pay his share, while the more eco-friendly car will start to pay the part. If we already pay, then the 300 dollar-a-year charge for them would not be that bad.
- Good // May be a good idea if fuel tax continues to be the source of road repair.
- Good // A good idea so fuel consumption doesn’t continue to drop and many areas are in need of funding our roads.
- Depends // I think this could go either way. It’s a good idea because it equals out the cost a little bit to the drivers who pay to use the road. It can be a poor idea because it’s not right to charge those who are trying to be more efficient.
- Poor // People will stop using fuel-efficient vehicles causing other issues like air quality, etc.

Pendleton

- Good // High-efficiency vehicle drivers should pay and contribute to the road at least some
- Good // Roads have to be maintained
- Good // Wear and tear on the road
- Good // Yes, they are helping the economy by not using as much fuel but they need to help fund the roads they are using like everyone else.
- Good //As it says in the article, people with efficient cars won't be paying much to help the road. Anyone who is using the roads should also take part in supporting the road.
- Poor // Punishing good behavior; First the government wanted fuel-efficient vehicles; then they would be punishing this behavior. It's confusing.
- Very poor // Charge all drivers equally with a tax. I'm old enough that it probably won't involve me anyway.

Portland 1

- Very good // It is the only fair way to balance the cost of wear and tear on our roads. Much like the bike tax we need!
- Good // If gas tax is our primary source of funding, fuel efficient vehicle drivers should not be nearly exempt of having to pay anything.
- Good // Because according to the info the people driving highly efficient vehicles aren't contributing very much funds for maintenance and new projects, and this way they can share the cost of road usage.
- Good – maybe // How many of these "very efficient vehicles" are there actually? How will it be administrated/collected/rebate given? How many normal vehicles are in Oregon? [Doodle note here: High efficiency divided by normal equals percent.]
- Poor //Because the purpose is to encourage low fuel use vehicles. Oregon wants clean air, and more fuel efficient cars are a part of that goal.
- Poor //They still use our roads, efficient or not.
- Very poor // Efficiency encouraged/penalty is hypocritical.
- NR //I think we need to get away from zeroing in on only cars' fuel use as a way of taxing. What happens when cars are automated or run only on a battery?

Portland 2

- Very good //So they can pay their share. It will penalize seniors who can't afford a new car.
- Very good // Fairness. Especially in a town who advocates for 'greener' cars and lifestyles. This issue is for the condition of the roads and more efficient thoroughfares. Tax the energy spent.
- Very good // Provides equal pay per use of roads. Con – People will have less incentive to buy high mileage vehicle and will reduce car company revenues.
- Good //Because they are still damaging the roads and the smog emissions are very low on most cars today, so the pollution is not as much of a factor as it once was. How will we deal with their batteries when they need replacing? Very harmful to the environment and expensive to dispose of.

- Good // Evens out tax burden; often LESS affluent have older/less efficient cars [and] therefore pay greater share of tax; often fuel efficiency is an increase with cost to a certain extent, so wealthy pay less.
- Poor // How is this going to be managed? A flat fee to all drivers instead of fuel tax would be easier and cheaper to process.
- Very poor // I don't like the per-mile charge for anyone. I don't know what would be better but there must be another way. Perhaps a tax at the time of purchase.

APPENDIX H: Written Exercise 7
(See handout document at the end of this section)

Based on this additional information, what do you think of a per-mile charge on highly efficient vehicles?

Roseburg

- Equalizes the fuel tax/fee charge; Instills idea to own fuel efficient vehicles; Already have technology to track miles
- A combination would make it fairer. Tax on natural gas & electric could also be included
- Since all electric vehicles do not have a mpg rating, would they be exempt? The proposed per-mile charge would be a disincentive to purchase a more fuel efficient car and seems to go against new fuel efficiency standards.
- This does seem to equalize the burden some
- Fuel efficient cars should pay for roads but as lighter cars don't cause as much road damage, they need not pay as much as heavier vehicles.
- The number of electric vehicles in Oregon is probably minimal, at the moment however as more of them are introduced, I do think they should be taxed as well. They might not have the same environmental impacts, but they can certainly have other impacts and they play a role in the rest of the drivers in Oregon.
- When these highways were created, gas was less than \$1.00 a gallon. My parents paid only 25 to 50 cents per gallon. Now it's \$5.00 a gallon and nearly nothing has changed or improved? Why? What would be the incentive for fuel-efficiency?
- This supports cost equalization – all vehicles use the road so all need to pay their fair share. Most do! Not sure of the best dollar amount.

Bend

- This is fine, but will this go into effect in stages? How will it be implemented? And, will the gas tax and electric fees be revisited as the market changes?
- My personal bias is that I don't want to report mileage to any government. Just change the additional in registration fees.
- It looks to be more even. What about people that cannot afford fuel-efficient autos?
- Makes sense.
- This seems to be a sound idea, especially since this group would receive a rebate.
- Guess my math was not that good
- This has strong potential and seems relatively fair as it's based on miles driven for the 55+ mpg cars
- Still a good idea because they are still getting a savings from the lower mpg vehicles.

Ontario

- I am definitely for the per-mile charge on E/EC vehicles.
- Most fuel-efficient vehicles are relatively expensive; drivers could probably afford the additional tax.
- I'm still neutral because I don't think someone should have to pay on something they don't use as far as gas goes. There must be a better way.

- I like it! I'm in the 10mpg bracket. The fuel-efficient car will still pay less than 2/5 of the graph, while using close to no gas. So the yearly expense would probably be minimal.
- This is fine if it is enough to cover expenses.
- I'm more supportive of the proposal. Fuel-efficient vehicles will still get a savings in gas costs due to requiring less; I don't want fuel-efficiency to be penalized.
- Neutral – no one in the community would like to pay the amounts, but if it will benefit everyone in the communities, it's something we have to contribute to.

Pendleton

- Am glad our vehicle gets 30-35mpg and I see it would be about the same at 55mpg.
- This seems somewhat fair. If someone cannot afford a high fuel-efficiency car now, then they will pay for it in increments. This tax should not be in place in the first place, but if it is, everyone should be taxed somewhat.
- I am not supportive of this idea. Too much government.
- I don't think it should be charged the same as a car with 20mpg, but some tax is needed. Not an outrageous tax, though. They shouldn't be getting punished by trying to help the economy and having the money to do so.
- It actually changes my opinion a little – seeing these numbers, it looks like a fair way to get anyone using the roads to contribute.
- I guess it will cost the fuel-efficient car about \$125.00 more per year. Not too bad – I'm maybe a little more in favor of this plan.
- I guess it would be fair. The fuel-efficient car will still come out ahead.

Portland 1

- While I still like the per-mile charge, but it is too much. It should be maybe 80 cents. There should be a reason to buy a more fuel efficient care, because it is good for the environment. They should not be penalized as much and more than a 20 and 30 mpg car.
- I think this seems like a fair idea, so that the people being charged these fees will be able to contribute to the transportation fund too.
- I still think this is a short sighted approach.
- Considering it doesn't seem to keep our roads in good repair now, it won't help. I would gladly pay more money in order to drive a car of my choice!
- Poor idea: Rather fix a surtax at car purchase and around renewal of registration equaling the same objective – money.
- I think it's not a good idea, especially at this rate. It almost nullifies the incentive for having a fuel efficient car. Cars which get 55+ MPG aid our state and national goals for lower air emissions.
- The proposed tax would negate some of the financial incentives of purchasing a high efficiency vehicle. [Note on chart: taxes on power bill.]
- Again, all electric vehicles still need to pay tax. Good for the environment, but does not address road usage.

Portland 2

- Penalizes the most efficient back to 20mpg level – disincentive to save energy with gas. Seems like it should be closer to 30mpg level as overall gas efficiency increased.[Note: studded snow tire damage.]
- This makes me look at this a little different. How are they going to collect more paperwork? I think taxes are good, but [name of other FG participant] hit the nail on the head – how much can we save?
- It comes out about the same for me. I still believe it's a good way to go to make the electric cars pay their fair share.
- The tax should be based on the average fuel efficiency of cars purchased in that year or similar size and weight that is gas/diesel. This is the most fair/logical means to determine the tax rate.
- The idea meets the average of the car owner. Depending on the rebate, fuel efficient cars may balance out, therefore not providing any money for transportation improvements.
- Will not work. Will reduce revenue for car companies as people have no incentive to buy electric car. Need to change entire fee structure so all pay equal amount.
- It seems very fair for them to pay. However, how to collect this money accurately without spending it all in processing fees?

Written Exercise 7

The Oregon fuel tax is 30 cents per gallon of gasoline and diesel. The table below summarizes amount of fuel tax a drivers currently pay annually based on the fuel efficiency of their vehicle and number of miles driven.

Fuel Tax	MPG	Fuel tax per 100 miles	Total annual fuel tax paid by miles driven in a year			
			5,000	10,000	15,000	20,000
\$0.30/gallon	10	\$3.00	\$150	\$300	\$450	\$600
\$0.30/gallon	15	\$2.00	\$100	\$200	\$300	\$400
\$0.30/gallon	20	\$1.50	\$75	\$150	\$225	\$300
\$0.30/gallon	35	\$0.86	\$43	\$86	\$129	\$171
\$0.30/gallon	55	\$0.50	\$27	\$55	\$82	\$109
\$0.30/gallon	All electric vehicle	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

The proposed per-mile charge for new highly fuel efficient vehicles is 1.5 cents per mile driven. The table below summarizes the amount that these vehicles would be charged annually based on the number of miles driven.

Per-mile charge	MPG	Per-mile charge/ 100 miles	Total annual per-mile charge paid by miles driven in a year			
			5,000	10,000	15,000	20,000
\$0.015	55+	\$1.50	\$75	\$150	\$225	\$300

APPENDIX I: Written Exercise 8

Who should be responsible for mileage reporting, tax processing, etc.? // Why?

Roseburg

Question not asked due to time constraints.

Bend

- DMV would check mileage upon registration renewal; A fee could then be assessed at DMV or reflected during tax preparation; Cars can have a transponder which records mileage and reports it back electronically
- That is the problem. I don't think our driving habits should be monitored by anyone but us. If it was left up to honesty, the tax would be ineffective.
- DMV; Department of Transportation
- Microchip in the car annually uploads to a local DMV database and is tallied at the end of the year to then be included like registration.
- The owner of the vehicle should be responsible for reporting their miles.
- GPS monitors in every car? I don't know but I don't like the idea that I'm being tracked.
- DMV – during tax season every year if you have a 55+ mpg car, you would have to fill out a tax form issued by the DMV "driven" by your VIN/vehicle registration
- When renewing registration, DMV may be able to check; DEQ in Portland

Ontario

- Have the odometer read each time you register your vehicle and pay the charge that way.
- A page on the state income tax form, or a line worked in if not a page.
- I have no idea – maybe whomever the car was insured by?
- DMV; Electronics – something in the car can/will probably be able to see that
- Driver/owner pays; DMV can collect when vehicle is registered
- Vehicles could visit a facility every two years to pay odometer fee; maybe self-reporting
- Maybe the DMV can ask us to provide information for mileage and tax processing and keep records for this.

Pendleton

- Reporting mileage: do it yearly on your Oregon tax return. We have to have some honest way of reporting though.
- The people should report, if such a system were in place. It is not the job of private businesses or the government to keep track of the number of miles people drive.
- Individuals who own the vehicle should keep track.
- I think the insurance company should be responsible for reporting the miles the car uses.
- It should not be left up to the citizens to report how much they have driven, because people can be dishonest. Maybe it could be recorded at gas stations – someone could check mileage?

- That's the problem. In Tennessee at an inspection station, all cars have to be checked that all things in the car are in working order. The state of Oregon could do this and check mileage at that time.
- Both consumer and insurance report.

Portland 1

- Really, I have no idea. It would be hard to get an accurate statement. I don't have a clue as to how that would work.
- Who's going to be responsible??? It would have to be a combination of the driver and possibly the DMV.
- Like anything that needs oversight, how we pay to make the process work is a question I can't answer
- The gas stations or DEQ
- Impossible to administrate; additional bureaucracy, not efficiently possible.
- I have no idea how that should be done.
- It should maybe be a division of the motor vehicles department. They could be measured and the tax levied every time the vehicle is registered.

Portland 2

- Could be every two years as vehicles are re-registered, especially if DEQ were used to verify mileage. Use change in odometer reading.
- Who responsible to report mileage? DMV could look at the odometer when getting registration or in PDX the DEQ could check it when renewing. And yearly it's an honor system.
- Done when vehicle is registered or sold, or they put odometer reading on tax form.
- The individual tax payer/car owner.
- Relying on people to be honest will not happen. Need to add check stations like smog check.
- Maybe you could drive through something similar to DEQ lines that could record mileage and take payment. At the same location as DEQ would allow to save on new building and development.

APPENDIX J: Written Exercise 9
(See handout document at the end of this section)

Rank your first choice, second choice, last choice.//Why for the first and last choice?

	MOST Preferred					LEAST Preferred				
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	None/ All	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	None/ All
Roseburg*	6	1	0	2	0	1	1	4	2	1
Bend	2	4	0	1	1	0	2	4	1	1
Ontario	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	5	1	1
Pendleton	2	4	0	1	0	1	2	0	4	0
Portland 1	3	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	3	1
Portland 2	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	6	1	0
Total	18	14	1	10	2	3	6	20	12	4

Roseburg

- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 2 // Limited data collected; Third party collector, could sell information to others, government tracking
- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 4 // Gives me the option on how many miles I want to drive; This assumes I will drive 35,000 miles and I plan on not driving so much!
- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 3 // I don't like any of the plans, but this seems the least invasive and doesn't assume the maximum number of miles. Simplified "plan" is just a flat penalty; Not everyone has a smart phone so number 3 wouldn't work.
- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 3 // Seems to be the most equal plan – does not involve the third party; Not everyone has or wants a smart phone
- Most preferred: 4; Least preferred: 1 // Costs less to operate, less invasive. What I don't like about the plan is that some vehicles are only driven approximately 3,000 miles per year and they would be penalized; All miles driven are not on public roads
- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 3 // I like this because it does not track my location! I am okay with being charged in or out-of-state because maybe they have their own system. So residents of those states would also be doing the same. It's the simplest plan for me; I don't like the thought of "them" being able to track locations at all times. It's too invasive in my opinion.
- Most preferred: 4; Least preferred: 3 // Invasion of privacy, however would not be accurate; Invasion of privacy: Google already knows more about me than I do.

Government control via the internet is never good. No government regulation of any kind on the web

- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 4 // Cost for use fair, don't like my GPS/location reported; Makes assumptions, needs to be actual information
- Most preferred: 1 least amount of reporting needed, while tracking actual miles driven. // Least preferred: Too much data being shared. Where I have been driving, etc. However the thought of maintaining a device in my car recording where I go and when makes my skin crawl. Major violation of privacy!

Bend

- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 3 // This is fine. My concern is about the privacy of the data and how long it is stored? If GPS is collected, GPS Data and miles driven should be purged after fees are assessed; A smart phone is required which can be a hardship for lower income drivers. And, using a smart phone for this is a pain.
- Most preferred: none; Least preferred: all // I strongly oppose this plan and would not buy one of the cars if I had to do these; They are all terrible. I don't want anyone viewing my miles and I think it is ridiculous that the only unreportable option is set at the max number of reportable miles. At least make the mile option reasonable.
- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 3 // It seems to be the simplest, least invasive. Could be monitored by Big Brother and not everyone has a smartphone
- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 3 // With the GPS tracking you can ensure your travel proves to be in Oregon. You can dispute a claim with proof; Not everyone has a smart phone
- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 4 // This seems to be the most efficient plan; This plan is too vague and allows for not enough on too much Exxon
- Most preferred: 4; Least preferred: 2 // Most fair but no tax for out of state users; Do not want any third party/for-profit involved in tax collection
- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 3; It will show data of where improvement might be needed. It shows where traffic is going and where improvements could be made. I'm totally for accountability; It assumes I own a smart phone when I don't. Data overload on networks.
- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 2 // Seems the most straightforward and doesn't use cellular data that I'd pay for; I don't want a third party to know the locations.

Ontario

- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 4 // This plan would be simple and charge per mile and take care of itself; The car should pay per mile, not a 35,000 quota. People should only be charged per mile – no more and no less.
- None // I would not have a third party collecting or reporting my mileage or driving habits, as well as having to pay for the devices.
- Most preferred: 4; Least preferred: 3 // I don't think our vehicles should be tracked. It's our business where we drive. I personally think having something put on our car is a little like Big Brother; It goes back to having something placed on our vehicles. I don't like that option at all.
- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 3 // I do not like the GPS knowing where you are. BUT it would make it nice to know I would only be charged for Oregon road usage. Not

vacation outside of the state; I work for Verizon. There are many people with Smart Phones and many with basic phones. Making someone get a smart phone would be one more charge for them that could range from 10-40 dollars a month.

- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 3 // Simple for low mileage use; No cell phone
- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 3 // Only Oregon miles should count, but I am uncomfortable with GPS data being given to a third party – it's a privacy issue; I don't use a smart phone.
- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 3 // I really like the deuce being played in, that way there are no false records of mileage driven in Oregon. The GPS data that is provided states exactly where you drive; Not everyone has a smart phone, and some people may forget to turn their phones on or off.

Pendleton

- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 4 // Because it only charges for Oregon roads, but would be difficult to "figure" out each trip – say across Oregon to Washington; Don't like the 35,000 mile figure, because I don't drive that much.
- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 2 // People should report their miles; This would create more government tabs on people
- Most preferred: 4; Least preferred: 2 // I don't like being tracked, even though I may not drive that far; Too much "big brother."
- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 4 // Makes sure you are just getting charged for driving in Oregon since you are paying for Oregon roads. It also gets your exact miles so you aren't being charged for more than you drive; It just assumes how much you drive so say the people that don't drive as much have to pay the same as people who drive a ton. Also, it doesn't take into account what state you are driving in.
- Most preferred: 1; Least preferred: 4 // Because no GPS or locations are required, and the device would be an easy way to keep track of mileage; Because it just assumes how many miles people are driving and charges them accordingly.
- Most preferred: 2; Least preferred: 4 // Don't trust smart phone app idea. Number 2 would be easier for me; I don't drive anywhere near 35,000 miles/year. It would hurt senior citizens.
- Most preferred: 2 (a and b only); Least preferred: 1 // Go on a vacation to Denver Colorado. Why be taxed twice at 2000 miles?; GPS tracking is none of the government's business.

Portland 1

- Most preferred: 4 While trying to keep in simple, it contains the ODOT [note: meant mileage reporting device?] that makes me uncomfortable, and would charge more than the second plan or the smart phone plan, but no GPS is good) // Least preferred: 1 I don't like having a bug in my car. I don't want the uncertainty, but it assumes I drive way more than I do.
- Most referred: 1 Because there are no location or GPS data collected // Least preferred: 4 It seems like many people would be over-charged because of the maximum mileage assumed. I don't even drive half of these miles in a year

- Most preferred: 3 I am a smart phone user and feel comfortable with this plan. There is no GPS data and I would prefer that. // Least preferred: 4 This plan assumes mileage that may or may not be a valid number and it penalizes people.
- Most preferred: 2 It keeps all costs relative to Oregon driving – uses a “mileage reporting device” therefore you can’t cheat and all money would be used for Oregon road needs. Seems most fair. // Least preferred: 4 It charges for more miles than I ever drive in a year and it makes it too easy to cheat.
- Most preferred: 1 Simplest – buyers will determine efficiency by auto purchased. // Least preferred: all—Collectively too [indecipherable word], will have too many loop holes, etc.
- Most preferred: 4 I don’t like the idea of where I drive or even exactly the mileage to be reported and kept somewhere. Least preferred: 2 I don’t like that it keeps a GPS location.
- Most preferred: 1 Because it could be consistent and fair with, I would like to think, a zero error rate. // Least preferred: 3 Way too much technology that could go haywire. We would have to increase cell towers! Ugly to our environment.

Portland 2

- Most preferred: 1 No GPS or smart phone, so this by default. // Least preferred: 4 I drive less than 10,000 miles per year. This would penalize me. [Note: None of this addresses the Washington commuters who come daily to Oregon.]
- Most preferred: 4 or 1 I don’t like people knowing any more about my life than need be. However, I think we would have to think about how old we are. 12,000 [miles] is what I do, not 35,000 miles - I don’t know. // Least preferred: 3 [no written feedback]
- Most preferred: 4 Simple – straightforward and I do a lot of driving. // Least preferred: 3 Don’t own a smart phone and don’t plan to go to that expense.
- Most preferred: 1 Not found on GPS data to anyone. Big brother. The pentagon can’t keep the Chinese from hacking their databases, or State data would be compromised at some point. Least preferred: 3 [no comments]
- Most preferred: 1 I think it’s reasonable for implementing a brand new plan to new people. Least preferred: 3 I don’t want my GPS hooked up to companies or the government.
- Most preferred: 4 Keep life simple. // Least preferred: 3 Do not care to have smart phone. Punishes those that use cheaper phones and phone plans.
- Most preferred: 2 I’m only paying for miles I’m really driving in this state. // Least preferred: 3 Unsure how it could differentiate if I’m riding in a car or driving my car when it records the miles.

Written Exercise 9

WRITTEN EXERCISE: Per-mile charge choices for new vehicles with fuel efficiency ratings 55+ MPG.

Definition: A "mileage reporting device" is a small device that plugs into the vehicle's diagnostics port and measures mileage traveled, fuel used and the Vehicle Identification Number (VIN). This information is then transferred to ODOT or a certified private firm to determine a per-mile charge and fuel tax rebate.

Of these four plans, indicated which would be your most preferred plan and which would be your least preferred.

- 1) Basic Plan
 - Charge all miles
 - Report miles to ODOT or private third party
 - No location or GPS data collected
 - Includes "mileage reporting device"

- 2) Advanced Plan
 - Charge only miles driven on Oregon public roads
 - Report miles to private third party
 - Location or GPS data provided to third party
 - Includes a "mileage reporting device"

- 3) Smart Phone
 - App turned on, charge only miles driven on Oregon public roads
 - App turned off, charge all miles
 - Report miles to private third party
 - Includes "mileage reporting device" and connects with app on smart phone

- 4) Simplified Plan
 - Assumes a maximum number of reportable miles (35,000)
 - No mileage reporting required
 - No device required

APPENDIX K: Written Exercise 10
(See handout document at the end of this section)

Below are a number of reasons that someone might support a per-mile charge for highly fuel efficient vehicles. For each, indicate if you think it is a very poor, poor, good, or very good reason. Indicate best and worst reason and why.

Exercise developed later in the project, and presented in Pendleton and Portland (not included in Roseburg, Bend, and Ontario)
Not all participants rated best and worst reasons

Privacy Protection: 1				
	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	Total
Very good	4	2	0	6
Good	3	3	4	10
Poor	0	1	3	4
Very poor	0	0	0	0
No response	0	2	0	2
Best Reason	4	1	1	6
Worst Reason	0	0	1	1
Choice: 2				
	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	Total
Very good	1	0	1	2
Good	6	3	3	12
Poor	0	3	3	6
Very poor	0	1	0	1
No response	0	1	0	1
Best Reason	0	0	1	1
Worst Reason	0	1	0	1
Fairness: 3				
	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	Total
Very good	1	1	4	6
Good	4	2	3	9
Poor	2	3	0	5
Very poor	0	0	0	0
No response	0	2	0	2
Best Reason	1	1	1	3
Worst Reason	3	1	0	4

Gas Tax Offset: 4				
	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	Total
Very good	5	1	2	8
Good	1	4	1	6
Poor	1	1	4	6
Very poor	0	0	0	0
No response	0	2	0	2
Best Reason	1	2	0	3
Worst Reason	1	0	1	2
Only Oregon Public Roads Charged: 5				
	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	Total
Very good	5	3	1	9
Good	2	2	3	7
Poor	0	2	2	4
Very poor	0	0	1	1
No response	0	0	0	0
Best Reason	1	3	0	4
Worst Reason	0	0	2	2
Low Cost / Little Bureaucracy: 6				
	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	Total
Very good	2	1	2	5
Good	4	4	1	9
Poor	1	3	3	7
Very poor	0	0	1	1
No response	0	0	0	0
Best Reason	0	0	2	2
Worst Reason	0	2	2	4
Urgency: 7				
	Pendleton	PDX 1	PDX 2	Total
Very good	1	0	4	5
Good	5	3	2	10
Poor	1	2	1	4
Very poor	0	2	0	2
No response	0	1	0	1
Best Reason	0	0	2	2
Worst Reason	3	1	1	5

Pendleton

- Best reason: 5; Only charge for Oregon mileage; collected by private sector // Worst reason: 4; Road usage charge should not delete fuel tax charge.
- Best reason: 1; // Worst reason: 3; Semi drivers and other larger cars should not pay more for the road than high-efficiency vehicle drivers.
- Best reason: 1; Individual freedom is important above all // Worst reason: 7; The state put itself in this bind.
- Best reason: 4; People should not have to pay both a fuel tax and a per-mile charge. Things will get too expensive, then we won't have to repair roads because no one will be able to afford to use them. // Worst reason: 3; People with electric cars should be benefited some for trying to be economically friendly. Although they do need to help pay for the roads, they don't need to be overcharged.
- Best reason: 3; Anyone who is using the roads should help sustain them, the people who are driving more should be charged more. // Worst reason: 7; Not everyone is going to come up with the money right away to buy this efficient of a car. And people will hold onto their old cars for quite a while. A fuel charge would still be necessary for a while.
- Best reason: 1; Least amount of info to deal with government. I liked 4 too. // Worst reason: 3; Not sure how many cars will really be affected. I don't like 6 either.
- Best reason: 1 (Privacy); Roads must be maintained, however, people should be allowed a way to choose how to pay for it and their privacy should be respected. // Worst reason: 7 (Urgency): Bureaucracy has proven in the past to be both intrusive and expensive, which is why I want the government to be involved as little as possible (this answer should be our best reason). Nothing is that urgent when it comes to government.

Portland 1

- Best reason: 4 Having a gas tax offset also plays into the fairness of the whole situation. I don't want people to be put off buying fuel efficient vehicles. // Worst reason: 7 Urgency can be debated, and I don't believe that this is the only way to replenish our roads funds. It seems like there are so few highly efficient cars, that it won't make too much of an impact.
- Best reason: 1 I like the privacy aspect of this choice. // Worst reason: 6 and 7 after discussion.
- No reasons chosen: I do not have enough information on any of these to make any decisions on any of them. At this point I need to say that I don't particularly care for any of these ideas. Actually they all seem short sighted.
- Best reason: 3 and 5 Fairness is my goal. I'll gladly pay my fair amount but don't want to be forced into choosing a car due to taxation! // Worst reason: 2 This makes for chaos and seems to allow for cheating.
- Best reason: 4 Not feasible but politically might fly // Worst reason: 6 Bureaucracy passed to burden private sector, still has to be government oversight [and] administration.
- Best reason: 5 If it's to help with maintenance of Oregon roads then it seems logical to pay for using them and not another State's. // Worst reason: 3 It's about choice. If people choose a gas guzzler then they pay for it. If people choose an efficient car, then

they shouldn't be penalized. Fairness directly influences choice, so therefore fairness can never be fully reached. Therefore it's a flawed argument.

- Best reason: 5 [no comments].
- Best reason: 5 Addresses little bureaucracy/keeping it simple. // Worst reason: 6 Fuel efficient cars still use the roads – good for the environment but road needs too.

Portland 2

- Best reason: 2 or 3 May need a blend of these; private sector options add a layer of cost. // Worst reason: 4 Administrative costs high – eats up potential revenue.
- Best reason: 6 I like the least bureaucracy possible. // Worst reason: 5 Perhaps we should pay no matter where we are – I don't know.
- Best reason: 6 I would avoid bureaucracy – we need to vote on that. And hopefully keep the roads in good repair. // Worst reason: 7 It wouldn't work – and at this point not enough high efficiency vehicles are out there. But they are coming.
- Best reason: 1 We don't need big brother. // Worst reason: 6 It is just the opposite. This will add layers to bureaucracy and costs.
- Best reason: 3 Fairness with urgent implementation. // Worst reason: 6 Cut out the middle men.
- Best reason: 7 Infrastructure of our roads and bridges cannot wait. // Worst reason: 5 Should be all miles driven.
- Best reason: 7 We have to keep funds coming somehow. // Worst reason: 1 Protecting privacy in itself has nothing to do with monitoring the tax structure.

Written Exercise 10

Below are a number of reasons that someone might support a per-mile charge for highly fuel efficient vehicles. For each, indicate if you think it is a very poor, poor, good, or very good reason. Indicate which best and worst reason and provide any comments way.

- 1. Privacy Protection.** Oregon's road usage charge does not require vehicle location tracking of any kind. Motorists will have a choice of technology for measuring and reporting miles traveled, including non-location-specific technology. Moreover, any personally identifiable information collected, such as vehicle mileage data, will be protected by law and must be destroyed within 30 days of its use for processing the charge.
- 2. Choice.** Motorists subject to road usage charge will be allowed to choose a method of measuring mileage, reporting mileage, and paying the charge. Options available to motorists for managing their accounts include both private sector companies and government agencies.
- 3. Fairness.** Drivers of fuel efficient vehicles such as electric vehicles and hybrids pay little or nothing for their use of Oregon public roads. Others who drive older vehicles or utility vehicles continue to bear the cost burden for the road system through taxes on gasoline and diesel. Road usage charging can correct this situation by requiring drivers of highly fuel efficient vehicles to pay a per-mile charge.
- 4. Gas Tax Offset.** Motorists paying a per-mile road usage charge will receive a credit for any fuel taxes paid. No motorist will have to pay both a per-mile charge and a fuel tax.
- 5. Only Oregon Public Roads Charged.** Should a motorist opt to measure mileage with vehicle location, they will only be charged for miles driven on Oregon public roads. Miles driven in other states, off road, or on private roads will not be subject to the charge.
- 6. Low Cost/Little Bureaucracy.** Per-mile road usage charges can be collected by private sector entities who already have accounts with motorists, such as cellular phone companies, insurance companies, and carmakers. Like cigarette taxes and hotel taxes, Oregon can avoid building a complex bureaucracy to administer the tax and devote more of the road usage charges collected to roadway maintenance and construction.
- 7. Urgency.** With the advent of highly fuel efficient vehicles and new federal government standards of 54.5 MPG by 2025, Oregon's fuels taxes are in steep decline. A per-mile road usage charge on highly fuel efficient vehicles will sustain the revenues necessary to maintain, operate, and build the state transportation system.

APPENDIX L: Written Exercise 11

What is the one message you'd like to share with ODOT as they review road usage charging in Oregon?

Roseburg

- Consider balance of rich vs. poor, efficiency vs. profits. Take the majority over the minority when deciding on road usage charging. Toll fees work if applied to roads!
- Usage fee: whatever it is make it fair and ensure that the money collected will be spent wisely and will benefit the majority of people.
- Don't penalize individuals that currently own or plan to own a high mileage vehicle. Look into alternative fee or taxes to support infrastructure.
- Have a plan that equalizes fees and taxes for everyone using the roads, without taking away our privacy and/or tracking us. Everyone who uses the road should pay per our usage.
- Toll charges, more passing lanes on 2-lane highways, wider roads for bicycles, white center strips on roads in another color so that they can be seen plainly in the rain, water runoff better so big trucks don't splash so you can't see.
- Despite the number of miles I drive per year, which may be high to some and low to others, I like the idea of a mileage use fee. I am okay with paying for my usage. I think people who drive electric and fuel-efficient vehicles can feel good about themselves, however they should also be charged to drive on the roads they are sharing with me. Another concern is price: many Oregonians struggle financially and the more fees they accrue, the tougher it is to get ahead.
- The best idea is one that allows the highest percentage of the public to use transportation at a reasonable cost! Roads in their current form will cost too much to maintain. Take a look at mass transportation in other countries/societies that have proven successful! High speed tram/Amtrak, trains, subways, busses. Highways from here to the coast will prove to be very important in the near future. Widen and straighten highways. Hawaii interstates are 8 lanes wide one-way. Look into grants for this.
- As fuel use continues to decline, the need to replace those dollars will need to be realized through some type of "use fee" for all road usagers that is equal. High MPG vehicles will likely increase road usage and maintenance dollars will need to be increased.

Bend

- With the plan, please have data be the property of the driver, have data be purged once fees are assessed; have data be an open standard and open source; make it so that I can get the data too. Other notes: please ban studded snow tires!
- I support additional taxes for the mentioned vehicles but I don't support it in any of the proposed plans. If the simplified plan was more reasonable (like 20K), then I would understand but 35K is too high. I still support a flat fee which is pretty much what the simplified plan is, just more reasonable.
- Do it

- There are way too many negatives and personal risks to implement something like the mileage tax to proceed. With that said, if a simple breakdown on how exactly you would enforce it could be created, it could be interesting to see where it goes!
- I think a per-mile fee for highly efficient vehicles could be a way to increase revenues for roads. It would help ODOT cover the costs of extensive repairs caused by road usage, chains, and studded tires.
- Any mileage plan (road tax) must include all users of Oregon roads (gas tax includes out-of-state drivers too). No plan should be implemented by private companies. Please fix the parkway!
- Yes, this could be a viable piece of the pie of fee collection. The devil is in the details – don't screw over the little guys (me!) and don't sell out to some nasty, dirty party like Haliburton
- Present the information clearly so people are aware that this proposed solution is specifically for high-efficiency autos. Also, it would help it get approved if there is specific language that the fees of the per mileage won't continuously increase.

Ontario

- I feel that the plan to charge per mile that you drive is a good plan, it just needs a few "bugs" worked out. Possibly check the mileage at each registration time and pay the tax.
- Make the objective as equitable as possible. Make the machinery of the project as simple as possible. I would not like the third party collectors.
- If charging high-efficiency vehicles means not having to place a device on our car, then I would prefer that.
- I support it. Funding between trucks getting 10mpg to the smart car getting 55+mpg would balance out. Hopefully that would negate the revenue/gas tax problem.
- There is a lot of work to do but we need to pay for what we use. Mileage tracking is a possibility and so are higher license fees (boo!)
- Would support it if it is implemented without expanding personal needs or using third parties to manage. The fees should go to the roads.
- I would encourage ODOT to reevaluate their plans and maybe record your mileage through the DMV and allow the state to take care of the mileage tax and not a third private party. Some of the current plans are good but maybe in a different order.

Pendleton

- I suppose that overall, I could go along with the per mile tax charge for high fuel-efficiency vehicles because I figure that by 2025, I'll be 86 and if here, possibly not driving and my husband would be 91 – nothing to be considered by my age group. I do know roads certainly need attention.
- This is a policy where, once in place, it would be a good idea to maintain the roads with a per-mile charge. The best way to police it is by the people self-reporting their mileage. Be reasonable with the fees. However, the policy is a bad idea with more big government. A better way to rule is to have a flat tax and people voting on the percent of taxes that go to transportation. Furthermore, we do not know the future technology and how it will affect transportation. Hopefully it will be cheaper to drive a more environmentally friendly and less gas use vehicle.

- There should be a study done to determine how much wear and tear on the road is caused by new fuel-efficient vehicles before implementing a per-mile charge. Motorists should have different plans to choose from. Monitoring should be done by the private sector when it is implemented.
- A per-mile plan would be great as long as people aren't charged both that and a fuel tax. Also, ensure that people trying to be economically friendly aren't being overcharged and punished. You have to be reasonable enough so people actually still want to buy economically-friendly cars.
- I think it is great that you are gathering public opinion, keep doing that. A mile charge for cars that are not using that much gas would be a good idea so that everyone could support the roads.
- Try and find ways for more people, not just fuel-efficient cars, to pay for road improvements. We need improvements now and I don't think 2015 is early enough to start raising more money. I like the toll booth idea and then maybe tax on fuel-efficient cars could be less.
- I understand the maintenance of the roads and the loss of revenue with more fuel-efficient cars are developed. But we must keep in mind the privacy and encroachment on individual liberties. I also expect ODOT to use the money wisely.

Portland 1

- I just don't understand how you plan on accomplishing this. Will it really raise more money than we spend trying to implement this system? Is this really the best way? Infringing on peoples' privacy?
- I want to say thank you to ODOT for doing this research because I think getting the opinions of everyday Oregonians for future policies and decisions in the area of transportation findings. This is a high value of mine. Also, I never really thought about transportation issues before today. I am happy to have this raised awareness about the various needs on this subject and the possible solutions being considered.
- Do your research and tell us (the people) that whatever you decide to do is backed up by the facts and figures.
- Idealism equals efficiency for all. Reality is preponderance of vehicles is and will continue to be gas vehicles.
- My biggest concern with smart phone reporting would lead to more cell towers and the impact on our environment. And we still do not know if more cell towers have a potential for health issues.

Portland 2

- Collection should be through existing state operations, DMV, DEQ, ODOT, with low overhead; needs to balance the encouragement to drive energy efficient (green) versus highway/transport costs; needs to offer options for reporting to take into account varying levels of technology; needs to recognize that some of most needy will be most gas guzzling and hard hit by gas [tax] so fuel efficient must be taxed.
- First I want to thank you for asking for our thoughts. This is the first time I felt that anyone cared. I know we need to do something but I honestly didn't know what. Trying to be fair to all drivers is important, and keeping it simple and clean would be best. I

think reporting to the DMV at renewal time would probably be the cleanest and would keep people honest.

- I would only concern myself with this when it reaches the point where it makes economic sense to implement it. I don't think there are enough vehicles of this kind on the road to warrant it now. If it is enacted, please use the size and weight of the vehicles as its benchmark for the rate it pays. Larger cars do more damage.
- To all Oregonians, it is our duty as a state and individuals to support and care for our environment and structures. Understand we all have a role in our economy and safety, providing a usage charge to all who use the roads to continue providing safe roads and transportation to all.
- Keep it simple to implement and maintain cheap; Fairness – everybody contributes, bikes/cars/public transportation; Because everybody contributes [it] could be more affordable on an individual basis. You can raise a lot of money one dollar at a time.; Make sure 3rd party involvement makes sense and doesn't eat up the profits.