

# WRUCC Privacy Research

FOCUS GROUP STUDY

NOVEMBER 2016



Prepared by DHM Research

503.220.0575  
239 NW 13<sup>th</sup> Ave #205  
Portland, OR 97209  
[www.dhmresearch.com](http://www.dhmresearch.com)

# Table of contents

|                            |    |
|----------------------------|----|
| INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY | 2  |
| SUMMARY & OBSERVATIONS     | 3  |
| KEY FINDINGS               | 7  |
| APPENDIX                   | 21 |

# Introduction & Methodology

---

1

DHM Research conducted focus groups with California, Colorado, and Oregon residents regarding a potential road usage charge system. The research was conducted on behalf of the Western Road Use Charge Consortium (WRUCC). The purpose of the study was to determine attitudes about administering a road usage charge program, and specifically to gauge perceptions around privacy and sharing personal information.

**Research Methodology:** The three focus groups were conducted between October 24 and November 1, 2016. A total of twenty-eight residents from Portland, Oregon (10 participants), Sacramento, California (9 participants), and Denver, Colorado (9 participants) participated in the groups. Efforts were made to ensure diversity by gender, age, income, political party, and ethnicity. See Appendix A for complete participant demographics.

**Statement of Limitations:** The focus groups were led by a professional moderator (DHM senior staff) and consisted of both written exercises and group discussions. Although research of this type is not designed to measure with statistical reliability the attitudes of a particular group, it is valuable for giving a sense of the attitudes and opinions of the population from which the sample was drawn.

This report highlights key findings from the focus groups. Each section reviews a major topic from the group discussions and includes representative quotations, as well as evaluative commentary. The quotes and commentary are drawn from both written exercises and transcripts produced from recordings of the group discussions.<sup>1</sup> The referenced appendices provide the complete responses to all written exercises.

**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 nonpartisan and independent and specializes in research projects to support public policy making.

---

<sup>1</sup> Quotations were selected to represent the range of opinions regarding a topic, and not to quantitatively represent expressed attitudes. Some have been edited for clarity to ensure correct punctuation and to eliminate non-relevant or intervening comments.

# Summary & Observations

## 2

**Majority consider transportation an important issue. Congestion is the top transportation issue for participants from all three cities.**

- Many participants say transportation, congestion, and roadway maintenance are the issues most in need of improvement in their community.
  - It's worth noting that the focus groups were conducted in urban markets.
- When it comes to street improvements, participants desire more freeway lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, and better traffic flow at intersections.
- Messaging and communications about transportation generally should address congestion to convey a level of understanding and to resonate with the public on their priorities.
- It's also important to keep in mind that even as the country experiences low unemployment rates, jobs continue to be the biggest issue among the public. Connecting transportation to jobs will add a sense of urgency and level of priority.

**Most participants don't know how their state funds transportation, and they aren't sure whether funding for transportation is increasing or decreasing. Starting discussions with funding will likely not resonate with the public.**

- Participants believe taxes pay for roads and highways, but most are unable to name specific sources of revenue for these services. Uncertainty about public financing—for any service—is common among the public.
  - This lack of knowledge is especially true for transportation as the fuel tax is hidden in the price of gas. Some will mention a vehicle registration fee, but often with prompting by the moderator or because of group discussion.
- Only a few participants in Colorado and California named a gas tax as a type of funding for roads, and even then, some admitted they were guessing. Oregonians, who have passed gas taxes in recent months, were slightly more confident in their knowledge of a fuel tax as the funding source.
  - Based on other DHM studies, guesses on the fuel tax often varied widely from a percentage to cents on the dollar. A common percentage range was 25% to 50% of the price of gas, and five cents to two dollars per gallon.
- Participants from all states couldn't say whether funding was increasing, decreasing, or staying the same. Participants were split evenly between the three choices, indicating a lack of public awareness.
- This lack of understanding and awareness often creates a challenge for public messaging. People are generally skeptical about government (and transportation) spending, and many believe funds are increasing. Any communications about a road use charge system will require public education about decreasing funds and the ongoing challenge of fuel tax revenue in the state. However, funding should be a component of public education and not the leading headline.

**Privacy continues to be an important topic for most when considering a road use charge system, and there is less anxiety over privacy today as more people use and own smartphones. Greater smartphone use and its convenience may be shifting the public to share information.**

- Participants enjoy technology and the many added conveniences. They desire user-friendly programs that set clear and easy guidelines about information use and sharing.
- Most participants use social media platforms and utility apps to stay in touch with friends and for added convenience. Many use apps like Facebook, Weather, Waze, and NextDoor.
- Despite the convenience offered by these apps, participants expressed frustration about confusing privacy settings.
- In designing a road usage charge system, it will be important for the public to understand how their information will be accessed, shared, and stored.
- Participant choice and control of information will be key to reduce privacy concerns.

**Participants who hesitate to share personal information need assurances of the choices available to them, why the information is necessary, and how the information will be used and shared.**

- Approximately half of participants expressed concern about sharing any specific information—like their payment information or their vehicle location—with third parties, regardless of whether the entity is a private company or a state government.
  - There is just as much skepticism and lack of confidence in a private company as in state government. Participants mentioned breaches at Target and other retailers as much as they did government hacking.
- Participants are more likely to share personal information when they feel they have a choice in the matter. Providing users with different options engenders more trust.
- Participants want to be well-informed about the data they share and who controls it. In group discussions giving users control over their data was another way that built trust.

**Participants are either likely to trust both government and private company, or lack confidence altogether. Both private companies and state governments bring unique strengths to security.**

- About half of participants feel confident that both their state government and a private company will protect their personal information.
  - These participants view private companies as accountable and reliant on their patronage to stay in business.
  - They also believe their government has a responsibility and public duty to protect their data, backed with the resources to provide the needed security.
- Oregonians are much less confident that their state government can secure their data compared to people from Colorado or California.
  - Seven of the 10 Oregon participants said they are “not at all confident” that their state government can protect their information.
- Participants who lack confidence in the security of their data—regardless of whether the data is held by a private company or a government—are likely to believe that no system is safe from hackers.

**In approaching a road usage charge program, participants want their state government to balance efficiency, equity, and privacy.**

- Participants value simple and efficient programs, like odometer readings and flat rates. These two options garnered the most support from participants because they are perceived as user-friendly, accurate, and cost-effective.
- Consumers seem to be softening their attitudes toward GPS and location-based services as more people use smartphones and apps. Although most participants still express concerns about privacy, it is related more to confusion over privacy settings and access to information.

**Participants are more willing to provide personal information to third parties if they realize a unique benefit in return.**

- When participants talk about their privacy preferences, they tend to speak in idealistic terms. Participants freely admit that their behaviors change when they are presented with incentives. Many are willing to share their personal information for even a modest incentive or discount.
- A key objective of the focus groups was to examine participants' views of privacy. Incentives were a small area of discussion. It's worth exploring this issue in more depth in future research.

## 2.1 COMMUNICATIONS AND MESSAGE FRAMING

The following recommendations are a framework for communications and messaging on road usage charging based on focus group research in California, Colorado, and Oregon. It's worth noting that three focus groups were conducted, and opinions from these focus groups do not necessarily represent the views of residents in each state. The suggested framework is supported by other research conducted by DHM on road use charging and transportation.

The framework is meant to present broad rules for communication. It is based on decades of past research by DHM and our experience with the values and beliefs of the public. Many of the bullet points are pulled from a research study for the Oregon Department of Transportation in June 2013 which are still relevant today.

Messaging framework:

- Start with values (not facts and figures). Connect transportation to quality of life, time with family and friends, access to the outdoors and recreation, and improving air and water quality. Talk about the direct benefits to average citizens – this resonates better with the public.
- Elevate the importance of transportation by connecting to a healthy economy – job growth and economic development. This is likely to increase the importance of transportation and add a level of urgency.
- Be empathetic by acknowledging that transportation is one issue among other—often higher—priorities. Acknowledge concerns about congestion and traffic.
- Transportation evokes emotion and sometimes strong emotions. Leverage this by connecting to quality of life issues and use the opportunity to connect with people on a topic that they care about.
- Inform the public about the ongoing decline in funding for transportation generally and NOT specifically about the fuel tax. Fuel tax is not well understood.
- Any road usage charging proposal must be simple and easy to understand. Providing too much detail should be avoided.
- Choice is strongly supported by focus group participants. Provide choice in how the data is gathered and in privacy settings. Choice will reduce suspicion of government and private parties.

| Words to Avoid                | Words to Use   |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Privacy                       | User choice and ownership                                    |
| Location tracking             | User control, user approval                                  |
| Mileage tax                   | Usage fee  |
| Selection of an option        | User choice  |
| HEV owners                    | Users 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                               |

# Key Findings

## 3

DHM Research conducted focus groups with California, Colorado, and Oregon residents regarding a potential road usage charge system. The purpose of the study was to determine attitudes about administering a road usage charge program, and specifically to gauge perceptions around privacy and sharing personal information.

### 3.1 COMMUNITY AND TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES

**Transportation is viewed as an important priority across all three communities, and participants from all three cities indicate traffic impacts their quality of life and cite it as a major concern facing their area.**

Although some participants mentioned other issues that affect livability—such as homelessness and education—transportation issues emerged as a top priority for participants. In California, transportation was a top-tier concern, but was overshadowed by concerns about homelessness.

**Table 1**  
**Top Issue Facing Community**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category                          | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|--|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Transportation (all categories)            | 5          | 8        | 9      | 22    |
| Traffic/congestion                         | 3          | 2        | 5      | 10    |
| Transportation, roads, infrastructure      | --         | 4        | 3      | 7     |
| Public transportation                      | 1          | 2        | 1      | 4     |
| Parking                                    | 1          | --       | --     | 1     |
| Homelessness/affordable housing            | 6          | 4        | 6      | 16    |
| Education/schools                          | 3          | 4        | 3      | 10    |
| Crime/safety/security                      | 4          | 3        | --     | 7     |
| Parks, green spaces                        | 2          | 1        | 1      | 4     |
| Community growth and development           | 1          | 2        | 1      | 4     |
| Mental health services/drug rehabilitation | 1          | 1        | 1      | 3     |
| Clean air/pollution                        | --         | 2        | 1      | 3     |
| Taxes                                      | --         | --       | 3      | 3     |
| Litter, community cleanup                  | 1          | 1        | --     | 2     |
| Other                                      | 3          | 5        | 2      | 11    |

Oregon and Colorado participants were more likely than their California counterparts to mention transportation. In Oregon, transportation issues were mentioned nine times unprompted, and eight of the nine participants in Colorado mentioned transportation. Participants from all states mentioned everything from potholes to public transportation expansions to poor driving habits as issues that should be improved in their community.



Across states, traffic and congestion were mentioned more than other specific issues. Roadway improvements, such as additional freeway lanes, sidewalks, and bike lanes were mentioned nearly as many times as traffic. However, the two issues were closely related, and participants connected the need for such improvements to increased traffic, and suggested improvements like “light timing” because it “helps traffic flow.”

*“We’ve got way more population than we have infrastructure for current traffic. Just when we create and expand on our infrastructure, we need to think further out than just going 10 or 15 years.” (Oregon)*

*“Increased population is just flooding the main corridors, so it makes it just a nightmare to go anywhere, especially I-25 to Fort Collins.” (Colorado)*

Public transportation was specifically mentioned by fewer participants (four across all three states).

*“I prefer to take BART from here to San Francisco if there were one, but since there’s not, then I don’t.” (California)*

*“Have more options for people to get around in public transportation everywhere. I mean because people can’t afford to live in the city, and they are moving out. I don’t know why we aren’t getting more public transportation to different places.” (Oregon)*

**Congestion is a top issue for Oregonians, while Colorado participants desire greater investment in roadway improvements and public transportation. Californians are divided between a variety of issues.**

When participants were asked to be more specific about the types of transportation improvements their community needs, geographic differences emerged.

In Oregon, congestion was the top transportation concern, and seven of the 10 participants mentioned it. Half of Oregon participants also specifically mentioned street improvements—not only those designed to improve traffic flow, but also sidewalks and bike lanes.

*“Traffic is terrible. There should be more light rails. I wish there were more opportunities to get to Washington.” (Oregon)*

*“Put in more sidewalks and improve the ones we have. Add lighting.” (Oregon)*

In Colorado, half of participants wanted to see street improvements and public transportation. Participants desired improvements like widened highways, better timing of traffic signals, and bike lanes. Those participants that preferred public transportation investments asked for expanded routes and reliability.

*“I’d like to see more bike lanes, because it’s kind of dangerous to ride your bike around to do errands or go to the store or something like that.” (Colorado)*

*“If you have to be at a certain place at a certain time, you have to catch the bus like an hour before. Plus at the bus stops, some of the bus stops you have no shelter there.” (Colorado)*

In California, participants were split in several directions. California participants were concerned about safety issues, like texting and driving and enforcement of speed limits, but they also mentioned bike-friendly streets and parking.

*“There’s so many people driving and constantly, they’re on their phones. And it’s so dangerous sometimes too. That’s number one right there, cell phones.” (California)*

*"I see it all over where intersections are so bad that they don't clear, and they can't even clear to the next one, because that intersection is backed up at whatever it is, a couple hundred yards down." (California)*

## 3.2 TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

**Participants are sure their taxes pay for transportation, but aren't sure which taxes specifically are used for road and highway maintenance and improvements. In Colorado and California, few are confident a gas tax funds roads.**

Nearly all participants indicated that taxes are used to pay for roads and highways, although a couple participants said they were "not 100% sure."

*"The funds are most likely increasing, but I don't know where they are or who is paying for it." (Colorado)*

Those who knew or guessed that taxes cover these costs weren't always clear on which type of taxes. Several participants said they were state and federal taxes, others said city taxes, and others still mentioned things like tolls and bonds. In the written exercises, only one California participant specifically pointed to gas taxes, along with two Colorado participants. In Oregon, participants were recruited from the Portland area, which just passed a gas tax in May 2016. In the Oregon group, half of the participants mentioned gas taxes specifically.

The size of a gas tax was also in dispute when discussed. Some participants thought the gas tax was a percentage, like sales tax, while others thought it was a dollar amount. Participants' guesses represented a large range. In Oregon, participants guessed between 10 cents and 67 cents per gallon. Two Oregon participants guessed a percentage, 8% and 20%.

*"The last time I remember it was 11 cents or something a gallon. I don't know." (Colorado)*

*"I would hope that [the tax is] maybe like 20 or 10 cents extra." (California)*

*"It wouldn't shock me if it was 50%. It's so built into it." (California)*

**Participants are split as to whether transportation spending in their state is increasing, decreasing, or staying the same.**

Confusion about transportation funding was not limited to sources of funding. Participants also expressed confusion about whether spending was increasing or decreasing, and whether transportation funds were being spent on roads or other priorities.

*"I'm sure it's increasing and taking from us, but it's decreasing that it's working, because there's worse roads. So I don't see it increasing, because they're not spending the money it seems like." (California)*

*"If we actually used the tax money that comes out of gasoline for cars onto the roads, you'd be surprised that we'd have new roads and everything everywhere. The problem is the budget. I mean, it goes to retirees of the Department of Motor Vehicles." (California)*

Although overall, participants were evenly split as to whether their state was increasing its spending on transportation, decreasing, or staying the same, none of the Colorado participants believed transportation funding was decreasing. Californians and Oregonians were more likely to think their state funding was decreasing.

**Table 2**  
**Perceptions of Transportation Funding in Home State**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|-------------------|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Increasing        | 3          | 5        | 2      | 10    |
| Staying the same  | 1          | 4        | 4      | 9     |
| Decreasing        | 5          | 0        | 5      | 10    |

### 3.3 INFORMATION SHARING

**Participants from each state rely on social media platforms and apps that require personal information, such as location services or home addresses, to make their lives easier.**

Participants were asked about their social media habits as an entrée into discussions about technology, privacy, and incentives. Of the 28 total participants, 25 wrote down that they use Facebook, among other social media networks and apps. This was by far the most popular social media platform mentioned.

Participants also listed a variety of apps they use regularly. Many of these apps were retail-oriented, such as the Amazon app, while others provide utility, such as Maps, Waze, and Weather. These latter apps often rely on location services, and some apps, like NextDoor and Neighborhood.com, rely on a home address.

Discussions about social media and apps brought forth key considerations for any new technology. Participants' main concerns with these products were privacy and security. Contrary to these concerns, some participants felt the value and convenience was a net benefit.

*"The tracking. I think it's just so easy for anyone to go and track where you are and kind of see where you've been and where you're going. I think it's really weird."*  
(California)

*"[It's] the principle of the thing. I want my own, I don't want them following me. I hate somebody else knowing what I'm doing."* (Colorado)

*"I do not use Twitter, and I do not use Instagram because it does not have the deep routed security features that Facebook does."* (Oregon)

One participant noted that her frustrations with privacy and security were exacerbated by products that complicate the process of making data private, to the extent that the benefits or services offered are overshadowed by concerns.

*"They make it very difficult to figure out how to make it as private as you would like it to be so it just became more of a headache and not even worth it."* (Oregon)

## **Many participants provide personal information to take advantage of loyalty programs and airline credit cards, mostly to enjoy discounts and cost savings.**

The impact of incentives on consumer behavior was more visible as participants discussed loyalty programs and credit cards. Most of the referenced loyalty programs fell into three major categories: grocery, retail, and airlines. Although participants had mixed feelings about the amount of personal data these programs collect, many participants felt giving up some amount of privacy was worth the benefit—typically cost savings.

*“[I like] the money I get back, period. That’s the only reason I use them. That’s it.” (Colorado)*

Some participants explained that even though they dislike many features of these programs, they joined them anyway to realize the offered benefit.

*“I feel almost obligated. If you don’t sign up, you don’t get the deal.” (California)*

*“Yeah, they price all the things and it’s, ‘Get your percentage off,’ and I want the percentage off, so I’m going to sign up for it.” (California)*

Not all benefits described were monetary. Other participants agreed credit card companies that alert cardholders to possible fraud were providing a valuable service.

*“I have actually had where I go on vacation, the bank will call me. ‘You just made a gas purchase in California. Was it really you doing that?’ So it is kind of nice to know they are looking out for you.” (Oregon)*

These comments illuminate an important consideration: although participants place a high premium on privacy and security as a concept, their behavior shows they are open to making concessions that offer cost savings and additional convenience.

## **Participants indicate they are only slightly more comfortable sharing personal information with private companies than government, although in practice they share such information regularly.**

Most participants use Facebook, other apps, and loyalty programs, so it is no surprise that most participants also indicated they are comfortable sharing their name and address with a private company. Payment information, vehicle identification numbers, and license plate numbers were viewed as slightly more personal, while the number of miles driven by state and vehicle location were considered the most private.

Participants gave detailed opinions about why they were somewhat more willing to share certain types of information with private businesses. As one participant explained, private businesses are expected to provide a higher level of customer service and have built-in accountability systems driven by consumers.

*“If it is a private company and you mess up, you don’t have a job. We are going to take your company away from you. The government, they just say, ‘Well, we are sorry we messed up.’ Nobody loses their job. There is no accountability.” (Oregon)*

*“If [governments] make any sort of mistakes on payment or something, when you go through any sort of government facility or anything, they send you so many different places. You’re on hold for however long, whereas as if you call a private company,*

*they want to have good customer service because they want your business, whereas with state government you don't have a choice.” (California)*

There were few differences by state when it came to the types of information participants were willing to share with private companies. However, California participants were less likely than those in Colorado and Oregon to say they would share payment information, vehicle identification number, and license plate number. One participant in that group came to realize the irony of her preference, considering the FasTrak program for tolls in California.

*“If I do FasTrak, and I didn’t even think of it, is FasTrak a private company? Yeah, it probably is.” (California)*

Despite some misgivings about information sharing with private companies, nearly all participants cited one or more examples of a time they have provided such information to a private company. Often, this information was shared to get an incentive or benefit.

*“I currently give my mileage to my insurance company, because I get a discount for not going over a certain amount.” (Colorado)*

Again, these conversations show a disconnect between personal philosophies about privacy and actual behavior.

### **Participants aren’t concerned about sharing their name and address with their state government, but desire a choice as to whether they share more personal information.**

Participants wrote that they were more willing to share basic information with their state government, like name and address, than they were with a private company. More participants were also willing to share their vehicle identification numbers and license plate numbers because they have already been submitted to the DMV.

*“If you have a vehicle, it’s registered with the DMV, so everybody has access. So, I accept those even if I don’t prefer them.” (Colorado)*

This participant touched on an important fact. When participants answered these questions, many seemed to provide a response that represented their ideal world. The disconnect between an ideal preference and reality—as seen when discussing private companies— was also present in conversations about government.

*“To be honest, I’m not comfortable sharing anything on this list with the government, but they all have your information anyway. I’m not comfortable with it, but I’ll give it to them, because it makes no difference.” (California)*

Less than half of participants, meanwhile, were willing to share their payment information and total number of miles driven with the government. Many participants simply didn’t see a reason their state government would need access to such personal information, and felt choice would not be an option. Several explained that being required to provide personal information to their government felt a lot different than providing such information, by choice, to a private company.

*“The private company, it is one that I hopefully choose. And the government, I don’t know. I think I am a pretty trusting person in the government, but yes. I don’t think they need to know where I am.” (Oregon)*

*“I like having the choice. You can make the choice and sense the energy of a specific company whether you trust it or not. With a state government, you don’t have much of a choice.” (Colorado)*

As these quotes explain, a perceived choice impacts perceptions of trust in government. Many participants’ opinions about trust in government relied both on perceived choice and whether there was a compelling reason to share such information. One participant summed up the innate desire to keep information confidential unless presented with a compelling reason to do otherwise:

*“Nobody needs to know where my vehicle is except me.” (Oregon)*

Opinions about sharing information with state governments were similar across states.

**Table 3**  
**Information Sharing Preferences: State Government**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category               | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Name and Address                | 7          | 7        | 10     | 24    |
| Total number of miles driven    | 6          | 5        | 7      | 18    |
| Payment information             | 3          | 5        | 7      | 15    |
| Vehicle identification number   | 3          | 6        | 6      | 15    |
| Number of miles driven by state | 4          | 3        | 4      | 11    |
| Vehicle location                | 2          | 3        | 3      | 8     |

### 3.4 INFORMATION SECURITY

#### **Participants are primarily concerned with the security of their information because of the risk of identity theft.**

Identity theft is the top concern for participants when it comes to the security of their information. When asked the most important reason to protect their personal data, most participants specifically mentioned “identity theft,” “fraud,” “scams,” and the potential for financial crimes.

*“My biggest concerns are fraud, scams, and fraud.” (Oregon)*

*“For me, it was mostly my credit score, because I want to buy a home. So that would be my main concern, is for them to somehow get my personal information and use it.” (California)*

*“Well, I guess I am worried about enough personal information getting stolen that someone can open up credit cards in my name or buy stuff. I don’t know, just become me.” (Oregon)*

The simple principle of privacy was important, but less so. Fewer participants used words and phrases like “privacy” and “peace of mind.”

*“Just individual privacy being respected, it’s up to me what I share.” (Colorado)*

Other concerns took a backseat to identity theft and general privacy. These issues were more likely to describe a potential inconvenience than a real fear.

**Table 4**  
**Most Important Reasons to Protect Personal Data**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category   | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|---|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Identity theft/fraud  | 6          | 6        | 8      | 20    |
| Privacy/peace of mind/security                                  | 3          | 7        | 3      | 13    |
| Financial crimes/credit score                                   | 3          | 1        | 2      | 5     |
| Junk mail/spam/sale of information                              | 2          | 1        | 1      | 4     |
| Recording errors  | --         | 1        | --     | 1     |
| Tracking  | 1          | --       | --     | 1     |
| Crime prevention (other than identify theft of financial crime) | --         | 1        | --     | 1     |

**Most participants have equal confidence in private companies and state governments to secure their personal data, but Oregonians have concerns about their state's ability to secure such information.**

While earlier discussions about what types of information participants felt comfortable sharing focused on *privacy*, participants were also pressed to talk about differences between private companies and state governments when it comes to *security*.

This discussion brought forth splits in opinion among participants. About half of participants expressed confidence in both private companies and their state government to protect their personal data. The other half lacked such confidence. This split shows some segment of the public will likely lack confidence completely, and that the relative level of trust between private companies and state governments is soft.

In Oregon, participants were particularly cynical about their state government's ability to secure personal data. A majority of the participants in this group said they are "not at all confident" in their state to do so. One participant explained:

*"I think it is a lot harder to sue the government than it is to sue a private company. And I'm pretty sure if they need my information to be somewhere, they will give it to whoever needs it as long as it is important enough, without asking my permission. I trust the government not to ask that permission."* (Oregon)

This cynicism was not shared by participants in other states. Participants in Colorado were equally likely to trust private companies and their state government, and Californians leaned ever so slightly toward trusting their state government more.

**Table 5**  
**Confidence in Private Company to Protect Personal Data**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category    | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|----------------------|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Very confident       | 2          | 1        | 1      | 4     |
| Somewhat confident   | 4          | 3        | 4      | 11    |
| Not too confident    | 2          | 4        | 4      | 10    |
| Not at all confident | 1          | 1        | 1      | 3     |



**Table 6**  
**Confidence in State Government to Protect Personal Data**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category    | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|----------------------|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Very confident       | 1          | 0        | 0      | 1     |
| Somewhat confident   | 6          | 4        | 3      | 13    |
| Not too confident    | 3          | 2        | 0      | 5     |
| Not at all confident | 0          | 3        | 7      | 10    |

Participants who believed private companies would protect their personal data explained that their beliefs relied on the perception that these companies are more accountable and have more to lose.

*“I think the private sector with everything that is going on has a better grip on it. I think the hackers are all over governments trying to make a bigger mess of it than it already is.” (Oregon)*

*“I also think the consequences for a private industry that is compromised is bigger than it is for the state.” (Colorado)*

Those who were confident their state government could protect such information cited the fact that their government has a responsibility to protect residents and might also have more resources to do so.

*“I just feel like the state has better resources, so I’d feel more comfortable giving my information to them.” (California)*

*“For the state government, I said ‘somewhat confident’ because it seems like they would have better protection for stuff like that.” (Colorado)*

*“I’ve got more confidence with the government [because] I think they’re obligated to us as a people, as a state. The government, they have a right to protect us as citizens or us as individuals.” (California)*

The other half of participants—primarily Oregonians—who lacked faith entirely simply believed that no data was ever truly secure.

*“Every system can be hacked.” (Oregon)*

*“I’m not confident in either private or government. Target, that’s private, and the government, yeah, too many eyes, too many hands.” (Colorado)*

*“The government, though maybe with good intentions, is not exempt from having data breached.” –Oregon participant*

*“The goal is to keep it private, but nobody can.” (Oregon)*

**Nearly all participants agree that it is appropriate for a company or government to hold personal information for at least 30 days and up to one year, but they expect that information will not be shared.**

Most participants are comfortable with third parties holding their information for 30 days or more. Only a handful of participants suggested a private company or state government destroy the information in fewer than 30 days.



**Table 6**  
**Length of Time Private Company or State Government Should Keep Personal Information**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category                        | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|--|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Fewer than 30 days                       | 1          | --       | 2      | 3     |
| 30 days                                  | 2          | 1        | 1      | 4     |
| More than 30 days but less than one year | 1          | 1        | 4      | 6     |
| One year                                 | 3          | 4        | 1      | 8     |
| Longer than one year                     | --         | 2        | 2      | 4     |

*\*Several participants did not provide a response*

Discussions focused less on the number of days and more on the intent behind any such policy. Considerations such as why the information needed to be kept and for what purpose the information would be used.

*"I put 30. My first reaction was only 30 days, but then I guess they have to track it a year because everything was like a year, so I guess a year would be my max."*  
*(California)*

*"I didn't put a limit on it. You can have my information for however long you want, but I have to know why you're going to keep it and what it's going to do, why you have it for that period."* *(California)*

The vast majority of participants said the information shouldn't be shared with anyone, and that they wanted to retain ownership of the data. Participants' comments indicated they wanted to provide express approval for sharing specific types of information with specific entities.

*"Not to be shared. If [necessary], only with my knowledge and consent."* *(Oregon)*

*"Without my consent and signature, only those listed on the application."* *(Oregon)*

However, many participants felt comfortable with their information being stored and shared in the aggregate, so long as it is not personally identifiable.

*"In general, I'd say I don't want it shared without my permission, unless they aggregate it into a statistical type of a report or something like that."* *(Colorado)*

*"I would want myself to be the only people that they share it with, or they can make the information public if people had anonymity."* *(Oregon)*

Furthermore, at least one participant saw a potential benefit to keeping information longer:

*"I said they could keep it for a long time if it helps track my efficiency over a certain amount of time, years. That's good data to see."* *(Colorado)*

It was also clear that participants wanted to be able to easily access their information and update it. Concerns about not being able to check for errors made some participants uneasy, and one participant's explanation seemed to reference a prior bad experience:

*"You should just be able to walk into the office and get it taken care of instead of having to go through a million different people. 'Oh, you can't see your own file because that is confidential.' No, it should not be. This is me."* *(Oregon)*

### 3.5 DESIGNING A ROAD USAGE CHARGE SYSTEM

**Many participants view odometer readings and flat rates as simple and efficient, while most exhibited at least some concern with GPS or location-based programs.**

Participants were presented with four potential options for a road usage charge system, and asked to indicate their most preferred options and least preferred options.

**Table 7**  
**Most Preferred System**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category                           | California* | Colorado | Oregon** | Total |
|---|-------------|----------|----------|-------|
| Flat rate                                   | 4           | 2        | 2        | 8     |
| Odometer or manual reading                  | 6           | 2        | 5        | 13    |
| GPS   | 1           | 4        | 2        | 7     |
| Location information you can turn on or off | 2           | 1        | 0        | 3     |

*\*Some California participants chose multiple response*

*\*\*One Oregon participants did not choose a most preferred option*

**Table 8**  
**Least Preferred System**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category                           | California* | Colorado | Oregon** | Total |
|---|-------------|----------|----------|-------|
| Flat rate                                   | 0           | 3        | 3        | 6     |
| Odometer or manual reading                  | 1           | 0        | 0        | 1     |
| GPS   | 3           | 3        | 3        | 9     |
| Location information you can turn on or off | 0           | 3        | 2        | 5     |

*\*Some California participants chose multiple response*

*\*\*One Oregon participants did not choose a most preferred option*

**Table 9**  
**Support for Systems (All States)**  
**(Number of mentions)**

| Response Category                           | Strongly Support | Somewhat Support | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure | Total Support | Total Oppose |
|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|--------------|
| Flat rate                                   | 4                | 7                | 3               | 14              | 0        | 11            | 17           |
| Odometer or manual reading                  | 6                | 11               | 5               | 5               | 1        | 17            | 10           |
| GPS   | 4                | 7                | 5               | 12              | 2        | 11            | 17           |
| Location information you can turn on or off | 4                | 4                | 4               | 9               | 6        | 8             | 13           |

### Odometer reading

The most popular choice among participants for a road usage charge program was an odometer reading. Of the 28 participants, 13 said this was their most preferred choice, and 17 said they strongly or somewhat supported this method. Furthermore, only one participant said they least preferred odometer readings.

Odometer readings were seen by supporters as accurate and reflective of individual driving habits. The program was also viewed as efficient and requiring minimal behavior change; many drivers are already required to provide such information during vehicle inspections. Such a program was described as “easily trackable” and “fairly simple.”

*“I had the odometer manual reading because I feel like it’s easy to track. It’s literally a number and it’s still giving you a good amount of privacy.” (Colorado)*

*“Yeah, the odometer is on the smog now, so they’re tracking it.” (California)*

Detractors were concerned such a program would be inconvenient, requiring additional trips and wait times for readings, and that some residents may try to cheat the system by tampering with their odometers. Some also noted that, if the cost of miles driven were applied all at once—perhaps at the time of registration—a high fee could be cost prohibitive and more difficult to pay than an incremental fee, like a gas tax. Furthermore, there would be no way to distinguish between miles driven within or outside the state.

*“Could possibly cause a high fee on your vehicle registration.” (Oregon)*

*“My concern is some people can manipulate odometer readings.” (Oregon)*

*“If I want to drive across the country, I shouldn’t have to pay somebody else’s gas tax plus this charge, too.” (Oregon)*

### Flat rate

A flat rate program was the second-most preferred option among participants, and eight chose it as their favorite. Although strongly preferred by some, most participants said they somewhat or strongly opposed a flat rate. However, the same can be said about each of the programs except odometer readings.

Those who supported a flat rate program pointed to its efficiency and the low cost to the taxpayer of administering such a program.

*“I think it is easiest, or it pays the same. One way or another, we all use the roads. Let’s just all share the costs and make it work.” (Oregon)*

*“I think it is simple as possible for the government, too. I think it is the cheapest because who runs the government? It is you and I.” (Oregon)*

But those who were only somewhat supportive of such a program or opposed it entirely were concerned about the fairness of a flat rate that charges all drivers the same fee, regardless of the number of miles they drive and the weight and fuel economy of their car.

*“Oversimplified. Too broad, not specific enough to each driver.” (Colorado)*

*“[I somewhat oppose it] because of the inequity of car models.” (California)*

## GPS

A program based on GPS location fared nearly as well as the flat rate program, and seven participants chose it as their most preferred option. However, many participants were opposed to the program (17), and it was also the program with the highest “least preferred” designations (9).

But the fact that one-quarter of participants chose a GPS system as their most preferred option may be indicating a shift in public perception about GPS and privacy. In 2013, the Oregon Department of Transportation studied perceptions of a GPS-based road usage charge. In that study, as in this one, about half of participants said it was their least favorite option. But, of the 45 participants who participated in that study, only one said it was their most preferred option (compared to seven out of 28 in this study). The shift in opinion may be attributable to the increased prevalence of smartphones and location sharing services; although many participants in 2013 noted that not everyone had a smartphone, no such comment was made in this study. Additionally, opinions may have shifted with broader understanding of technology security measures. As one participant who chose GPS as her favorite method mused:

*“I believe that, in spite of the privacy issues, I think there would be ways that you could handle it. I think it’s the fairest and equitable way to collect the information. But I think that the company should use like a reference number for a customer, mask the identity of the person.” (Colorado)*

As this participant explained, the perceived benefits of a GPS program were fairness and accuracy. Other participants noted that drivers would be charged only for the miles they drove and wouldn’t be charged for out of state travel. It also mirrored a gas tax because it would collect revenues based on location.

*“I just felt like it would give more accurate information, especially with the in-state, out-of-state miles. I know there’s definitely cons to it, but I think based on equitable usage of the roads, I think it would give the most equity.” (Colorado)*

*“GPS or location is more like a gas tax because it is proprietary to where you are.” (Oregon)*

Those opposed had a wide variety of concerns. Privacy topped the list, as the program was viewed as “too invasive.” Others also noted that it would be hard to check for errors in the data and that it wouldn’t work for older car models. Additionally, some participants suggested the cost of administering such a program would be much higher—both for participants and for the government.

*“What about [my old] pickup? I don’t want to have to put a lot of money into it for upgrading technology to add GPS.” (Colorado)*

*“[The revenue is] not going to make it to the roads again. They take more money to get the system going, and they’d need more for the system, and then . . .” (California)*

## Location information you can turn on or off

A program that allows users to toggle their location information on and off garnered mixed opinions and raised many questions. Just a few participants said it was their favorite option (3), and slightly more said it was their least favorite (5).

Participants became hung up on how such toggling would work in practice, and whether it would be open to widespread abuse by taxpayers. The program would likely require the most amount of explanation and instructions for the public.

*“Too many people would unfairly turn it off.” (Colorado)*

*"I don't like the option of turning off and on. Maybe I don't fully understand the concept." (Colorado)*

**Although participants say they prioritize the privacy of their information, behaviors suggest they are open to incentive-based models of participation.**

Throughout discussions, participants expressed concern about both private companies and their state government having too much access to personal information. However, much of this discussion was theoretical. Participants described their *ideal* preferences, but often tempered their comments when they thought about potential incentives that might encourage them to share such information. Just as participants described sharing information with retailers to take advantage of discounts, some participants began to name incentives that might inspire them to share their vehicle and location information.

*"I mean, if I'm going to have a tracker, it's going to be the kind of tracker that if my car gets stolen . . ." (Colorado)*

*"I would be incentivized to [participate] if there was some way that the government gave everybody an automatic credit towards buying more fuel or having these cars that are going to be better for the environment." (Colorado)*

**In closing, participants hoped any new policy would be equitable and would ask voters to weigh in on the solution.**

Participants were given an opportunity to provide final advice to their state transportation officials. Several asked for the chance to vote on any changes and facilitate public discourse on the issue.

*"I would suggest, obviously, taking this to the vote. I think they are going to vote on it. I am not entirely sure, but leave it to the people." (Oregon)*

*"I like to have options. If it was like, vote-able, I'd like people to see my point of view. I'd like to see what everybody's point of view is and who is really, what really the best deal everybody thinks is, because for each his own." (California)*

Others wondered whether additional details about vehicles would be considered, aside from the number and location of miles driven. Some participants also viewed a road usage charge as a means to encourage residents to drive less.

*"Are you going to tax the big, these big trucks the same as you do the cars, the Prius? Because the heavier the vehicle, the more wear on your roads." (Colorado)*

*"I think it would be wise to put policy in that is fair to its constituents, but also incentivizes not using a car where you don't need to." (Oregon)*

Importantly, participants want choice. Participants asked for some latitude in choosing the program that best fits their lifestyle.

*"Don't try a one-size-fits-all thing." (Colorado)*

# Appendix

# 4

## Appendix A Participant Demographics

California: Sacramento, 10/24/16; N=9

Colorado: Denver, 10/27/16; N=9

Oregon: Portland, 11/1/16; N=10

### City and Zip Code

| California       | Colorado            | Oregon          |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Sacramento/75826 | Denver/80203        | Tigard/97224    |
| Sacramento/95817 | Brighton/80601      | Portland/97239  |
| Sacramento/95833 | Denver/80249        | Milwaukie/97222 |
| Sacramento/95825 | Commerce City/80024 | Portland/97236  |
| Sacramento/95833 | Littleton/80124     | Gladstone/97027 |
| Sacramento/95829 | Commerce City/80022 | Portland/97232  |
| Sacramento/95838 | Denver/80207        | Portland/97215  |
| Sacramento/95811 | Denver/80224        | Gresham/97030   |
| No response      | Denver/80219        | Portland/97266  |
|                  |                     | Portland/97218  |

### Occupation

| California                | Colorado                             | Oregon              |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Account Manager           | Unemployed                           | No response         |
| Analyst                   | Resource Inventory Specialist        | Student             |
| No response               | Student                              | Property Manager    |
| No response               | No response                          | Educator            |
| Tutor                     | Project manager in software industry | Dispatcher          |
| Military                  | Traffic control/construction         | Testing Coordinator |
| No response               | Music business consultant            | No response         |
| Special Education Teacher | No response                          | Floor Planner       |
| No response               | Self-employed artist                 | Accountant          |
|                           |                                      | Cashier             |

### Education Level

| Response Category  | California | Colorado | Oregon |
|--|------------|----------|--------|
| Less than High School Graduate                                   | 1          | 0        | 0      |
| High School Graduate   | 2          | 2        | 0      |
| Some College, Technical School, Community College, 2-Year Degree | 2          | 2        | 6      |
| College Degree/4-Year Degree                                     | 3          | 4        | 3      |
| Graduate Degree  | 1          | 1        | 1      |
| No Response  | 1          | 0        | 0      |

### Household Income

| Response Category   | California | Colorado | Oregon |
|---------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| Under \$15,000      | 0          | 2        | 2      |
| \$15,000 - \$29,999 | 1          | 1        | 0      |
| \$30,000 - \$49,999 | 4          | 2        | 2      |
| \$50,000 - \$74,999 | 1          | 1        | 2      |
| \$75,000 - \$99,999 | 2          | 2        | 0      |
| \$100,000+          | 0          | 1        | 4      |
| No Response         | 1          | 0        | 0      |

### Political Party

| Response Category | California | Colorado | Oregon |
|-------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| Democrat          | 3          | 4        | 7      |
| Republican        | 1          | 1        | 2      |
| Some Other Party  | 4          | 4        | 1      |
| No Response       | 1          | 0        | 0      |

### Age

| Response Category | California | Colorado | Oregon |
|-------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| 18 – 24           | 1          | 1        | 0      |
| 25 – 34           | 5          | 2        | 3      |
| 35 – 44           | 0          | 1        | 3      |
| 45 – 54           | 1          | 1        | 2      |
| 55 – 64           | 1          | 4        | 1      |
| 65 – 74           | 0          | 0        | 1      |
| 75+               | 0          | 0        | 0      |
| No Response       | 1          | 0        | 0      |

### Gender

| Response Category                   | California | Colorado | Oregon |
|-------------------------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| Male                                | 5          | 4        | 5      |
| Female                              | 3          | 5        | 5      |
| Non-Binary or Gender Non-Conforming | 0          | 0        | 0      |
| Other                               | 1          | 0        | 0      |

### Racial or Ethnic Group\*

| Response Category         | California | Colorado | Oregon |
|---------------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| White/Caucasian           | 3          | 5        | 8      |
| Black/African American    | 1          | 2        | 1      |
| Spanish/Hispanic/Latino   | 3          | 2        | 0      |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1          | 0        | 2      |
| Native American           | 0          | 1        | 0      |
| Other                     | 0          | 0        | 0      |
| No Response               | 1          | 0        | 0      |

\*Multiple responses accepted

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Written Exercise 1**

**Make a list of issues in your community that you would like to see improved. Place a star (\*) by the one that is most important to your quality of life.**

#### **California**

- [No star] Better streets; Better schools
- [No star] Housing for homeless; After school program for kids
- [No star] Mental health facilities; Help for homeless/vets on the street.
- \*Bad driving habits; Theft; Littering
- \*Crime; Homelessness/public intoxication; Traffic; Park maintenance; Shopping center cleanliness, business friendly
- \*More schools; \*More teachers; \*More community centers; \*Improved BART system/public transportation
- \*Security; \*Homelessness; Parking
- \*Security; Turkey control (coyotes too!); Trimming of trees/bushes; Homelessness
- \*Solve homeless problem; Prevent over “infill” such as McKinley Village, Mercy Hospital expansion.

#### **Colorado**

- \*Better roads; cinema
- \*Cost of living; traffic; police brutality; 16<sup>th</sup> street violence
- \*Drug dealing; shootings; police enforcement
- \*Education equality—all schools should provide an excellent education regardless of tax base; Homelessness. Need more shelters and mental health options; Rampant growth is a double edged sword; More public transportation
- \*Homelessness/support for that community; Quality of infrastructure (roads); Quality of education; Too lenient housing regulations for new developers.
- \*More gardening, fruit trees, sustainable/healthy food services for community; More public transportation—affordable housing; More consciousness in regards to air quality; More public assistance for families in need; Less homelessness
- \*More jobs available for people who have done time, but are changing their life; \*Homelessness; traffic
- \*Safety; transportation; education; roads; healthcare
- \*Widened main corridor highways; Community cleanup; Improved schools; Better traffic flow and signage; Fix the potholes!

#### **Oregon**

- \*Affordable housing; Schools; Traffic; More public transit
- \*Better schools; No homeless campers on the streets; Lower taxes; Less traffic congestion
- \*Parks; Traffic/infrastructure; Schools
- \*Pollution control; Housing prices; Homelessness prevention; Drug rehabilitation
- \*Provide more houses for low-income residents/people; Provide more funding for poor services for Portland; Fix and rebuild roads
- \*Public use of marijuana; Property tax increases should be prevailing and capped based on inflation
- \*Reduce traffic; Better sidewalks; More stoplight and pedestrian crossings on major streets; Better street lighting.
- \*Rent control. Landlords raise rent consistently and not in a fair way. Rent hikes have been as much as \$500, causing good renters to leave their places; Traffic. Hard to go anywhere



- \*Taxes on personal property reduced in SE; Improved traffic flow; Housing; Roads fixed/paved/improved; More police
- \*Traffic; Homeless issue; Less density

**Thinking about transportation related issues, what are the most important things that need to be addressed in your community?**

### **California**

- Congested roadways; Not enough public transportation; Roads are [incomplete]
- Driving more safely; Driving more patiently (less road rage); The presence of motorcycles and bicycles on the road.
- Less trucks on Howe Avenue; Fewer motorcycles on Howe Avenue; Speed limits enforced; Cell phone usage is illegal.
- More bicycle-friendly layout. Smarter street division. (Return to two lane from one lane.)
- Parking; cell phone usage
- Reversal of the parking time
- RT more accessible; More carpool lanes
- Traffic; Light rail placement
- Unnecessary stop signs and speed bumps

### **Colorado**

- \*Better roads; \*More relevant bus/light rail routes; \*Easier ways to pay for public transportation. Ex: Tap Up cards.
- Access to safe transportation; options (safe options) for all ages; Pollution (air quality)
- Better roads; better bus transportation
- Congestion on highways and major roads; Light-timing—helps traffic flow; Roundabouts are good where appropriate
- How to have less congestion; Free transportation
- People making last-minute dangerous turns; People not using their blinkers; People speeding through construction zones; Texting and driving
- The buses coming on time!!!; Traffic following traffic rules like no left turn, no U-turn etc.
- Traffic congestion; bad roads; red light cameras
- Widened main corridor highways such as Highway 7 and I-25 to Ft. Collins; Improved signage; Rix the potholes

### **Oregon**

- \*Better traffic flow; Bike lane on some rural roads for safety
- \*Infrastructure; Sidewalks; Bike lanes
- \*More funding for road maintenance; More law enforcement of drivers and bicyclists; Expand freeway, especially I-5
- \*Reduce traffic; Put in more sidewalks and improve the ones we have; Add lighting
- \*The freeway and ancillary roads are crowded from dawn to dusk. The traffic situation should be addressed as some point, preferably right away.
- \*Traffic control and enforcement of drivers not focused on operating a vehicle
- \*Traffic is terrible. Carpooling. New roads (although this increases the traffic in the meantime); Buses are too full. Used to take the bus to work. Can barely fit into the bus.
- \*Traffic/congestion; Safe bike corridors; Parking
- \*Using renewable, green resources for fuel for public transit; Increased availability for public transit; Better bike laws/bike accessibility

- Traffic is terrible. There should be more light rails. I wish there were more options to get to Washington. This is where some of my family has moved and we will probably have to do eventually because of housing costs.

## APPENDIX C

### Written Exercise 2

**Where does transportation revenue come from? How are roads and highways, and maintenance of those systems funded in your community?**

#### California

- City taxes
- Federal and some state
- From taxpayers
- Measure bonds approved by voters; gas taxes
- Not 100% sure
- Our city taxes
- Taxes
- TAXES! By taxes (roads, highways, maintenance) all paid by taxpayers.
- Unsure?? Taxes

#### Colorado

- From taxpayers; Business taxes
- Gas tax; corporate tax; federal tax
- Gas taxes; Tolls E47D; Special Funding (voted on)
- Taxes
- Taxes—state and local
- Taxes; Cannabis?
- Taxes.
- The funds are most likely increasing, but I don't know where they are or who is paying for it.
- They're funded through taxes. I don't know if the funds are staying the same or increasing

#### Oregon

- As for now, taxes.
- Gas tax
- Gas tax (state and federal) State and federal funding other than gas tax.
- Gas tax? For local roads. State for state highway
- Gas taxes. Fund by taxpayers through taxes.
- Not sure but my guess is taxes?
- Taxes, of civilians and business; Taxes on fuel (national average)
- Taxes; Bonds
- Taxes?
- Through taxes from levies and bonds. Voted on by the public through a ballot

#### Is funding increasing, staying the same, or decreasing?

| Response Category | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|-------------------|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Increasing        | 3          | 5        | 2      | 10    |
| Staying the Same  | 1          | 4        | 4      | 9     |
| Decreasing        | 5          | 0        | 5      | 10    |
| No response       | 0          | 0        | 0      | 0     |

**APPENDIX D**  
**Written Exercise 3**

**Which social media platforms are you using or on? Make a short list.**

**California**

- Facebook; Instagram; LinkedIn
- Facebook; online; next
- Facebook; Snapchat; WhatsApp
- Instagram; Facebook
- Instagram; Facebook; LinkedIn; Neighborhood.com
- None
- None
- Online; Television; Facebook; Neighborhood.com
- Snapchat; Instagram

**Colorado**

- Chrome; Facebook; Google; Twitter; Spotify
- Facebook
- Facebook; Instagram
- Facebook; Instagram; Offerup
- Facebook; Twitter; Nextdoor
- Instagram; Facebook; Periscope; Snapchat
- Instagram; Snapchat; Facebook
- PC; Google; Facebook
- Yahoo; Facebook; Gmail; YouTube

**Oregon**

- Email
- Facebook
- Facebook
- Facebook
- Facebook
- Facebook; email
- Facebook; Instagram
- Facebook; Instagram; Pinterist
- Facebook; LinkedIn
- Facebook; Twitter; Instagram

**What loyalty programs do you use, like reward cards, retailers and others? Make a short list.**

**California**

- [No response]
- [No response]
- Costco credit card; MasterCard Air Miles
- myCiti
- None
- Plenti; Macy's star; Kohl's cash
- Plenty card

- SaveWay—points system; Ulta; Buy ten, get one free
- Staples Office Supplies; Amazon

### **Colorado**

- Costco Car; King Soopers Card
- King Sooper Card; Ace Hardware; Restaurant
- King Soopers
- King Soopers; Liquor stores; Tagawa; Credit cards
- King Soopers; Safeway; Grocery stores
- King Soopers; Safeway; Southwest Visa
- Natural Grocers; King Soopers
- None
- Target/Cartwheel; King Soopers/Safeway (grocery); Spot-on; ASOS Premiere; Local business punch cards; Ebates/retailmenot; SW Rapid Rewards

### **Oregon**

- Best Buy; Safeway
- Costco membership; GNC awards; Auto Zone
- Delta Skymiles; Alaska Milage
- Fred Meyer
- Fred Meyer; Costco
- Fred Meyer; Airlines—Alaska & Delta
- Kohls; Chase
- Plenti; Rewards Wells Fargo; Costco rewards
- Random local punch cards (ice cream, tea, etc.)
- Safeway; Fred Meyer; Walgreens; Macys

## **APPENDIX E**

### **Written Exercise 4**

**What are your favorite apps? Which apps do you use most often? Make a short list.**

#### **California**

- Amazon; Lyft; AOL
- E-bay; Amazon; Ibook; School Loop
- Facebook; Google; Craigslist; Nextdoor.com; Yelp; LinkedIn; Amazon; Maps
- Maps; YouTube
- Nextdoor.com; Facebook; UBEC; Bank; Yelp
- Pandora; Instagram; Facebook; message
- TheCHIVE; Weather
- TMZ; Words With Friends; Social Media/Snapchat; Weather App
- Whatsapp; Snapchat; Facebook

#### **Colorado**

- Facebook; Offerup; Instagram; Spotify; MyPregnancy+
- iCardio; Fitbit; Amazon; Nextdoor; Audible; Overdrive; Weather; Google Maps; Kindle; Facebook
- Instagram; Daily Mail; Spotify
- Instagram; Snapchat; Pinterest; Retailmenot; Yelp; Ebates; Spotify; Podcasts
- King Soopers/Safeway; Evite; Slot machines; Panda Pop; Fitbit; Opentable; Facebook; Spotify; Nextdoor; Waze
- Spotify; Trivia.com; Gmail
- Traveling; Google; Shopping
- Weather; Gold Price; Stock
- YouTube; Facebook; Gmail; Yahoo

#### **Oregon**

- ESPN Fantasy; Yahoo Fantasy; Amazon Prime; Email
- Facebook
- Facebook; Chase Bank; Whisper; Chromecast "Google Home"; Torque OBD; Google Music; Pandora; I Heart
- Facebook; News apps; Games
- Fitbit; PDX bus; Facebook
- Gas buddy; Facebook; Ebay; Safari
- Gmail; Camera
- Google maps; Fred Meyer Grocery Shopping List
- Soundcloud; YouTube; Instagram
- WW; News; Banks; Trimet; Snapchat

**APPENDIX F**  
**Written Exercise 5A**

This is a list of different types of information you might be asked to share as part of a road user charge system. Circle the types of information you would share with a private company.

| Response Category                                      | California* | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|--|-------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Name and address                                       | 7           | 7        | 10     | 24    |
| Payment information                                    | 3           | 5        | 7      | 15    |
| Vehicle identification number and license plate number | 3           | 6        | 6      | 15    |
| Total number of miles driven                           | 6           | 5        | 7      | 18    |
| Number of miles driven by state                        | 4           | 3        | 4      | 11    |
| Vehicle location                                       | 2           | 3        | 3      | 8     |

*\*California: One respondent circled two things (Name and address; VIN & license plate) and then crossed them out. This response was not included in the total.*

**Written Exercise 5B**

This is a list of different types of information you might be asked to share as part of a road user charge system. Circle the types of information you would share with your state government.

| Response Category                                      | California | Colorado* | Oregon | Total |
|--|------------|-----------|--------|-------|
| Name and address                                       | 9          | 7         | 10     | 26    |
| Payment information                                    | 5          | 2         | 4      | 11    |
| Vehicle identification number and license plate number | 8          | 5         | 8      | 21    |
| Total number of miles driven                           | 6          | 3         | 8      | 17    |
| Number of miles driven by state                        | 5          | 2         | 4      | 11    |
| Vehicle location                                       | 6          | 2         | 3      | 11    |

*\*Colorado. One respondent did not choose any*

## **APPENDIX G**

### **Written Exercise 6**

**What are the three most important reasons to protect your personal data?**

#### **California**

- Credit score; job opportunity
- Finances; credit; use of another's identity when arrested
- ID theft; ID theft; ID theft; Privacy
- Identity theft; fraud; sell info to other companies
- Identity theft; personal tracking
- Identity theft; security
- Junk mail; extra payments
- Privacy; Hijacking—theft of data; Security
- To prevent being exploited; To prevent being hacked; To maintain privacy

#### **Colorado**

- Hacking is omnipresent; Data is being used against you (?); Data is being used/manipulated to make a point you don't agree with (?)
- ID theft; Errors in the data; Illegal usage of data
- Identity theft
- Identity theft; Robbery/burglary prevention; Privacy
- Individual privacy respected; Fraud/hacking
- Personal autonomy/peace of mind
- Privacy—personal; Stolen credit card/identities
- Privacy; Fear of getting hacked
- Spamming; ID Theft; Marketing

#### **Oregon**

- Credit score; Future
- Fraud security; Avoid targeted marketing; Less dystopian
- Fraud; Safety; Used against me
- Fraud; Scams; Fraud
- Identity theft
- Identity theft; Fraud
- Identity theft; Too accessible is a problem; Unsure
- Money; Confidentiality; Relationship
- Protect from identity theft; Confidentiality; Peace of mind
- Protect ID theft



## APPENDIX H

### Written Exercise 7

How confident are you that a private company will protect your personal data?

| Response Category    | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|----------------------|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Very confident       | 2          | 1        | 1      | 4     |
| Somewhat confident   | 4          | 3        | 4      | 11    |
| Not too confident    | 2          | 4        | 4      | 10    |
| Not at all confident | 1          | 1        | 1      | 3     |
| No response          | 0          | 0        | 0      | 0     |

**Groups 1 & 2 did not provide written responses to this question**

#### Oregon

- [Not at all] I see no reason why they would protect it. I don't trust private companies, to be honest.
- [Not too] Been victim of ID theft
- [Not too] Even though I trust Kohls for shopping purposes, I know information trades happen all the time. I work part-time at a theater—we trade information for marketing all the time.
- [Not too] Every system can be hacked or lost due to carelessness
- [Not too] Unless you request or sign a waiver for them not to, it will be shared.
- [Somewhat] No response
- [Somewhat] The goal is to keep it private, but nobody can
- [Somewhat] They fail they lose their job
- [Somewhat] When there is a will, there's a way
- [Very] As a company they have a lot on the line in protecting their customers or they can very quickly lose them.

How confident are you that your state government will protect your personal data?

| Response Category    | California | Colorado | Oregon | Total |
|----------------------|------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Very confident       | 1          | 0        | 0      | 1     |
| Somewhat confident   | 6          | 4        | 3      | 13    |
| Not too confident    | 3          | 2        | 0      | 5     |
| Not at all confident | 0          | 3        | 7      | 10    |
| No response          | 0          | 0        | 0      | 0     |

Group one: one respondent chose more than one answer

**Groups 1 & 2 did not provide written responses to this question**

#### Oregon

- [Not at all ] Been victim of ID theft
- [Not at all] I think they will summon it up whenever necessary without asking me.
- [Not at all] No response
- [Not at all] Terrible job of programming and data integrity
- [Not at all] The government though, maybe with good intentions is not exempt from having data breached.
- [Not at all] Workers, employees can access if working at a state office

- [Not too] Every system can be hacked or lost due to carelessness
- [Somewhat] No response
- [Somewhat] State governments seem to be on top list for hackers; No “incentive” to be 100%
- [Somewhat] The goal is to keep it private, but nobody can

## **APPENDIX I**

### **Written Exercise 8**

**Imagine you can tell a private company or your state government how to use the information you provide, including: who they can or cannot share it with, how long they can keep it, and what type of access you have to that information. What would you tell them about....**

**How many days to keep the information?**

#### **California**

- 160 days
- 30 days
- 30 days
- 30 days, but to track a year. I guess one year.
- 360
- 365
- 7-10 days
- Keep my records on file until a warranty has expired
- Minimal

#### **Colorado**

- 1 year
- 1 year
- 2 Max
- 30 days
- 365 days
- For the private company—6 months. For the state government—0
- In perpetuity
- Minimal for processing. That I get the data to store as I determine
- No more than 365 days

#### **Oregon**

- 1 month
- 1 week
- 1 week
- 2 months after billing
- 365
- 5-10 years for trending
- 6 months
- 90 days
- As long as needed
- Only as many days as stipulated in the program

**Who can they share the information with, and under what circumstances**

#### **California**

- A company I checked a box to allow
- No one
- No one can have my information without me knowing about it

- No one unless you have broken the law and info is essential
- Nobody
- Nobody
- None. No advertising, no tracking
- Research purposes
- They can share my info with my bank confirming methods of payment

#### **Colorado**

- Me and on a need-to-know basis (related to the business at hand)
- My specific data—no one; Generalized/aggregated into statistical format—anyone
- No data sharing
- No one (private company) No one (government)
- No one except me and possibly a spouse
- No one without speaking to me. 1 year is the length of time the party that receives my info may keep it
- None
- Only the government, for purposes relating to the “use tax” (hypothetically)
- People or businesses I approve of

#### **Oregon**

- I don't know
- Me, or public, only if it's anonymous/used as a statistic
- Myself—Compiled information for usage with companies
- No one
- Not to be shared; If need to, only with my knowledge and consent
- Only shared as needed within the group
- Private—no one; Government—other government agencies
- Share with no one
- Under court order
- Without my consent and signature only those listed on the application

#### **Your access to review and make changes**

##### **California**

- 100% access. Website review for accuracy. Maybe one verification step.
- 360
- Access at any time
- Indefinitely
- Must be able to
- Often
- Should be allowed
- Very accessible
- Whenever I have or need to review

##### **Colorado**

- 1 year
- Almost full (depending on what data)
- Always
- Anytime
- I have full access

- I would definitely like access to review and change my data
- Immediate access and/or change info.
- Total access to all data with verifiable changes
- Yes

### **Oregon**

- 24/7
- Allow me to review data
- Any time
- Constant available access—should be able to walk into office and make changes
- I don't care
- I should be able to access it anytime I want
- I should be allowed to review and change
- I want to be able to access my info
- Make changes
- There is a need; If life changes are made

### **Who owns the personal data?**

#### **California**

- Can't resell
- I own the personal data but have given permission to use for the intended days
- Me
- Me
- Me
- Myself
- Private companies and government
- The government
- The private company or state

#### **Colorado**

- I do
- I do
- I do
- I do. Companies with my permission
- I own the personal data
- I would have ownership and company would only have read-only
- Joint ownership until processed and then I get it.
- Me
- Me

#### **Oregon**

- I own it
- I own the data. They cannot share it. It is on lease to them.
- Ideally me, but I know that is not possible
- Me
- Me and no one else
- Must be the company I initially signed up with.
- Right?? :-(

- The individual
- They do
- You should, but your government does

## APPENDIX J

### Written Exercise 9

These are ways to collect road user data. Indicate your most preferred option by circling it, and your least preferred option by crossing it out. Indicate if you support or oppose each option, and then explain why.

#### Most Preferred

| Response Category                           | California* | Colorado | Oregon* | Total |
|---|-------------|----------|---------|-------|
| Flat rate                                   | 4           | 2        | 2       | 8     |
| Odometer or manual reading                  | 6           | 2        | 5       | 13    |
| GPS   | 1           | 4        | 2       | 7     |
| Location information you can turn on or off | 2           | 1        | 0       | 3     |

*\*Some California respondents chose multiple response*

*\*One Oregon respondent did not choose a most preferred option*

#### Least Preferred

| Response Category                           | California* | Colorado | Oregon* | Total |
|---|-------------|----------|---------|-------|
| Flat rate                                   | 0           | 3        | 3       | 6     |
| Odometer or manual reading                  | 1           | 0        | 0       | 1     |
| GPS   | 3           | 3        | 3       | 9     |
| Location information you can turn on or off | 0           | 3        | 2       | 5     |

*\*Some California respondents did not choose a least preferred option*

*\*Some Oregon respondents did not choose a least preferred option*

#### Overall Support/Oppose All Groups

| Response Category                           | Strongly Support | Somewhat Support | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Flat rate                                   | 4                | 7                | 3               | 14              | 0        |
| Odometer or manual reading                  | 6                | 11               | 5               | 5               | 1        |
| GPS   | 4                | 7                | 5               | 12              | 2        |
| Location information you can turn on or off | 4                | 4                | 4               | 9               | 6        |

## Flat Rate

### Support Flat Rate

**Strongly support N=4; Somewhat support N=7**

| California  | Colorado   | Oregon  |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Seems more equitable</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] A standardized fee and all road users should pay.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] I think this will generate the most revenue</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] More expensive cars</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Because of the cons</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] I believe it may be unfair to some that don't drive a lot.</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] It doesn't matter if you go far or less.</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Less hassle</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] It's the simplest option.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Easiest</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Easy, cost me less tax money to collect it</li> </ul> |

### Oppose Flat Rate

**Strongly oppose N=14; Somewhat oppose N=3**

| California   | Colorado   | Oregon  |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Because of the inequity of the car models</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] No response</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Everyone's lifestyles are different.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Shouldn't make everybody do it if they choose not to.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Some people drive more or less than others</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Strongly] Oversimplified. Too broad, not specific enough to each driver.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] People would overpay, not equitable based on usage.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Too much overpaying when not necessary.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Would definitely overcharge several people</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Not fair for people who drive less</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Do not want to be overcharged</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Higher rate of pay</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] I don't want to overpay</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] I should have to pay the same as someone that drives more than me</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] No response</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Pay for usage</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] We pay higher since it's above the overall average</li> </ul> |

**Not sure Flat Rate N=0**



## Odometer or Manual Reading

### Support Odometer or Manual Reading Strongly support N=6; Somewhat support N=11

| California   | Colorado  | Oregon  |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Best option--manual</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] If you drive more you should pay more</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Most accurate.</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] They do it anyway @smog.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Proportional to amount of driving alone</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Easily trackable</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Fairly simple method, but I don't like the fact that out-of-state miles would be counted.</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] The effort of sending the mileage info to the account manager sounds a bit annoying.</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Would allow older vehicles to participate without added technology</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Individualized with potential for incentives.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] How would you have people submit this?</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Seems like a decently fair way—only problem is out-of-state travel.</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Would everyone give accurate mileage</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Doesn't really matter where I am driving because I am using roads that need to be maintained</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] I'd pay for what I drive</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] If every driver and car has to be registered it just makes sense to lump that fee into the registration. Maybe there could be a special deal for truck drivers, cabs, etc. Odometer reading at the time of registration would be quick and easy, but we would have to trust our fellow citizens to report the truth.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Pay for usage</li> </ul> |

**Oppose Odometer or Manual Reading**  
**Strongly oppose N=5; Somewhat oppose N=5**

| California  | Colorado   | Oregon  |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Less fair for those who don't have a choice concerning miles travelled.</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Too much work</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Accounting? How would we send it in and how often?</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] I would rather every resident/road user pay a flat rate</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Not all will be honest</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Doesn't distinguish between instate/out of state miles.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Don't have time M-F to do such, hardly every during business hours</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Could possibly cause a high fee for your vehicle registration. No way to show any out-of-state driving</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Too much of a chance for fraud. Too much work</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] People can manipulate odometer readings</li> </ul> |

**Not sure Odometer or Manual Reading N=1**

| California | Colorado   | Oregon |
|------------|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Not sure] No response</li> </ul> |        |

## GPS

### Support GPS

**Strongly support N=4; Somewhat support N=7**

| California  | Colorado  | Oregon  |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] No response</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] It minimizes accidents</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] In spite of privacy issues, this would be the fairest method. Should be a system that masks driver identity within company</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] More accurate</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] More accurate—usage</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Too many variables, overcomplicated</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Would be more equitable because it doesn't charge for miles driven on state roads but will be a burden to those with older vehicles</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Answer 2 goes here</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Accuracy for newer cars. What about older ones? Would they be required to install?</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Only applies to the state/city collecting tax</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Answer 1 goes here</li> </ul> |

### Oppose GPS

**Strongly oppose N=12; Somewhat oppose N=5**

| California   | Colorado  | Oregon   |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] No thanks</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Too invasive</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Why should my whereabouts be known to some entity?</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] No tracking</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Privacy</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Privacy issue, tracking every move.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Too hidden. Hard to tell if it is accurate.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] You may not know who has your info.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Constant tracking I do not want</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] I've seen apps give you the longer way to go to a destination than a shorter distance.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Lack of privacy</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Don't like the idea</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Do not work. Government tracking.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] I think I would feel too tracked</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] No response</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] No tracking devices on car</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] What's the difference? [between GPS and Location Information]</li> </ul> |

**Not sure GPS N=2**

| California | Colorado | Oregon  |
|------------|----------|---|
|            |          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ [Not sure] I need more information on technology and who has it</li><li>▪ [Not sure] In my experience, GPS and location services can act faulty</li></ul> |

## Location Information You Can Turn On or Off

### Support Location Information Strongly support N=4; Somewhat support N=4

| California  | Colorado  | Oregon   |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] No response</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Your own terms</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Gives me a choice</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] I don't know.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] I'm not sure how it will work, exactly, but it seems like an okay thing to do.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Because I can turn it on and off.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Sounds flexible</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] No response</li> </ul> |

### Oppose Location Information You Can Turn On or Off Strongly oppose N=9; Somewhat oppose N=4

| California*  | Colorado  | Oregon   |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Distraction</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Privacy</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Privacy issue</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Don't like the option of turning off and on. Maybe I don't fully understand the concept.</li> <li>▪ [Somewhat] You may not know who has your info.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Lack of privacy</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Seems unnecessary. Again, too many outlying variables.</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Too many people would unfairly turn it off</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Somewhat] Better than GPS, but not preferable</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] Fraud and abuse</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] How do you track when you can turn on/off yourself?</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] No response</li> <li>▪ [Strongly] What's the difference? [between GPS and Location Information]</li> </ul> |

\*One California respondent did not fill out this category.

### Not Sure Location Information You Can Turn On or Off N=6

| California   | Colorado  | Oregon   |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Not sure] No response</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Not sure] More accurate usage—not equitable with on/off option</li> <li>▪ [Not sure] No response</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ [Not sure] I need more information on technology and who has it</li> <li>▪ [Not sure] In my experience, GPS and location services can act faulty</li> <li>▪ [Not sure] No response</li> </ul> |