

# Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**  
Date/time: Friday, June 4, 2021 | 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon  
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

---

**Members Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Karen Buehrig  
Allison Boyd  
Chris Deffebach  
Lynda David  
Eric Hesse  
Dayna Webb  
Jay Higgins  
Jeff Owen  
Chris Ford  
Laurie Lebowsky  
Karen Williams  
Idris Ibrahim  
Rachael Tupica  
Katherine Kelly

**Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
City of Portland  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Community Representative  
Federal Highway Administration  
City of Vancouver, Washington

**Alternates Attending**

Jamie Stasny  
Steve Williams  
Jaimie Huff  
Julia Hajduk  
Jamie Snook  
Jon Makler

**Affiliate**

Clackamas County  
Clackamas County  
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Sherwood and Cities of Washington County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation

**Members Excused**

Don Odermott  
Lewis Lem  
Jessica Stetson  
Donovan Smith  
Gladys Alvarado  
Wilson Munoz  
Yousif Ibrahim  
Rob Klug  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Jeremy Borrego  
Rich Doenges

**Affiliate**

City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
Port of Portland  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration  
Washington Department of Ecology

### **Guests Attending**

Mike Foley  
Jean Senechal Biggs  
Kari Schlosshauer  
Sarah Iannarone  
Alice Bibler  
Will Farley  
Bob Kellett  
Garet Prior  
Sorin Garber  
Kelsey Lewis

### **Affiliate**

City of Beaverton  
Safe Routes to Schools  
Street Trust  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Lake Oswego  
Portland Bureau of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
  
City of Tualatin

### **Metro Staff Attending**

Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead	Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner	Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Cindy Pederson, Research Center Manager	Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner	Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager
Matthew Hampton, Sr. Transportation Planner	Patrick Dennis, Budget Analyst
Robert Spurlock, Senior Regional Planner	Chris Johnson, Modeling and Research Manager
Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, Investment Areas	Alex Oreschak, Investment Areas
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner	Matt Bihn, Investment Areas
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder	

## **1. Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions**

Chairman Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Introductions were made. A quorum of members present was declared. Guests, public and staff were noted as attending. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. It was announced that Metro Council was taking recess during August again this year. They will not hold meetings; as such, no meetings are scheduled for TPAC (and MTAC) as well.

## **2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members**

- **Committee input form on creating a Safe Space at TPAC** (Chairman Kloster) The link to adding comments and input for creating a safe space at TPAC was noted in the chat area of the meeting, which members are welcome to use at any time during the meeting. Comments will be collected and shared at the end of the meeting.
- **Updates from committee members and around the Region** (Chairman Kloster and all) Metro Regional Center (MRC) is planning a pilot project this summer with limited number of employees in the building, using a hotel reservation format for work space. The phone system is being updated. Meetings in MRC are being considered as a hybrid format at a later date.
- Jeff Owen acknowledged MAX disruptions as work is being done on lines, with crews hard at work to complete upgrades. TriMet announces its first woman Board of Directors President in their 51 year history, Dr. Linda Simmons. The hiring process for TriMet's next General Manager continues with an interview panel being formed and selection of final candidates soon.

- Sarah Iannarone acknowledged Metro and other partners with the RTO grant that helped develop the former bike commute challenge program to a more expansive summer move more all transportation multi-modal program this year. Challenge teams have more ways beyond employers to be created and compete. More information on the program: <https://www.thestreettrust.org/MMC21> Contact Ms. Iannarone: [sarah@thestreettrust.org](mailto:sarah@thestreettrust.org)
- Jon Makler announced that Amanda Pietz has been selected to replace the retiring Jerri Bohard as Division Administrator of Policy & Data Analysis at ODOT. Ms. Peets was recently in the State Climate Office. Her long service appointments were acknowledged.
- Eric Hesse noted the announcement on the Portland Bureau of Transportation and Oregon Department of Transportation agreement with the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue transfer. While legislative issue yet need to be finalized, priorities with safety issues and jurisdiction road transfer was important to the region. <https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/ORPORTLAND/bulletins/2e28ae9>
- Jean Senechal Biggs announced that the City of Beaverton is transferring to a new form of government with City Mayor, Council and now City Manager. Jen Haruyama will start as Beaverton's City Manager in September. <https://www.beavertonoregon.gov/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=2190>
- **Fatal crashes update & Safety Forum Recap** (Lake McTighe) The monthly fatal crashes update was provided with the following highlights:
  - As of 5/26/21, there have been 8 traffic deaths in May and 53 in 2021.
  - Thirty percent of the traffic deaths in 2021 have been people walking.
  - There have been no deaths involving people riding bicycles in 2021.
  - Thirty-eight percent of the traffic deaths have occurred on state highways.
  - Eighty percent of the traffic deaths have occurred in Multnomah County.

The Regional Transportation Safety Forum was reviewed. The event had over 100 attendees with information shared and suggestions on moving forward with efforts. Presentation slides, agenda and poll summary from the May 26, Regional Transportation Safety Forum are available at the link below. The recording of the forum will be posted next week. Next week we will send out an email to everyone that registered with the link to the materials and recording.

<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/events/regional-transportation-safety-forum-envisioning-safety-health-and-justice/2021-05-26>

- **US DOT's Rebuilding America Infrastructure with Sustainability & Equity (RAISE) grants announcement** (Ted Leybold) The RAISE Federal grants program was announced as now open to apply, deadline July 12, 2 pm Pacific time. Formerly TIGER and BUILD grant program, the RAISE grants are awarded by the USDOT. The maximum amount for a grant is \$25 million with no more than \$300 million per state. Mr. Leybold encouraged those planning to apply to contact Metro for a letter of support at least one week before the deadline. Tyler Frisbee is working to help coordinate these grant efforts. Those interested can contact Mr. Leybold who will forward information to Ms. Frisbee.

The RAISE grant application announcement: <https://www.transportation.gov/RAISEgrants>  
 Rachael Tupica noted the RAISE Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) states "Eligible

Applicants for RAISE grants are State, local, Tribal, and U.S. territories' governments, including transit agencies, port authorities, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and other political subdivisions of State or local governments..." Webinars are available to assist applicants.

**3. Public Communications on Agenda Items (none)**

**4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from May 7, 2021**

Jay Higgins added a correction to the minutes: Strike the phrase in italics regarding Terra Wilcoxson the named Alternate Member from Gresham. Ms. Wilcoxson is the Alternate Member from Gresham at MTAC. The correct TPAC Alternate Member is Chris Strong.

**MOTION: To approve minutes from May 7, 2021 with this correction.**

Moved: Jay Higgins

Seconded: Jeff Owen

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously, as corrected.**

**5. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 21-5182**

(Ken Lobeck) Mr. Lobeck provided an overview of the MTIP Amendment 21-5182 consisting of twenty-three projects which will complete UPWP project grouping buckets reprogramming for Metro and complete required adjustments, additions, or cancelations to projects impacting ODOT and TriMet enabling them to obtain their next federal approval step.

The June 2021 Formal MTIP Amendment bundle continues the UPWP pre-positioned project grouping buckets (PGB) reprogramming out to FFY 2025 to avoid future conflicts the annual Obligation Targets program. UPWP PGBs reprogrammed as part of the June Formal Amendment bundle include:

- Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) PGBs (FFY 2022 through FY 2024) (3 projects)
- FFY 2022 State Travel Survey (1 project)
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD) program (FFY 2022 through FFY 2024) (3 projects)
- TSMO Administration (FFY 2022 through FFY 2024) (3 projects)
- TSMO Program Sub-allocation Funds (FFY 2022 through FFY 2025) (3 projects)
- Transportation System Management Operations/ITS (FFY 2021) (older allocation -1 project)

Total number of UPWP pre-positioned PGBs being re-programmed: 14. The remaining projects in the bundle are the standard changes required for the end of federal year phase obligations or federal approval steps. Five projects belong to ODOT and included amendments, adding new projects, or canceling projects. Two projects are Metro Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) PGBs supporting the new ODOT Advance Traffic Control Upgrade and Deployment project.

The final two amended projects involve two TriMet projects. The first involves canceling the planned Electric Bus purchase. The cancelation results from infeasible procurement timing during FY 2023 to purchase the buses. Because the project funding is federal CMAQ and has an obligation shelf-life lapse of the end of FFY 2023, Metro worked with TriMet for a suitable substitute that FHWA would approve. A review and submission to FHWA of the TriMet MAX Red Line Extension project in Key 20849 proved to be a satisfactory substitute for the Bus Purchase. As part of the amendment bundle, The CMAQ funds are being removed from the Bus Purchase project in Key 22188 and re-programmed to the MAX

Red Line Extension project in the Construction phase for a planned obligation before the end of FFY 2021. Details on the projects changes are included in the meeting packet staff report.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig noted clarification on the TriMet amendments that regard removing electric bus purchases at this time and re-programming funds to the MAX Red Line. The overall expectation from TriMet in transitioning bus fleets was due to timing of the project. Jeff Owen added that TriMet is fully committed to moving away from diesel fuel to electric buses and would be testing them as funds became available in a more feasible time.

**MOTION: Provide JPACT an approval recommendation for Resolution 21-5182 and the 23 projects under MTIP Amendment JN21-11-JUN**

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Chris Deffebach

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.**

Comments from the committee:

- Jon Makler noted that potential upcoming MTIP amendments from ODOT will have significant importance that will be presented at Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) meetings. Future movement of funds from the Urban Mobility Office with projects including the Rose Quarter and I-205 were given as examples. It was encouraged that for those interested in these projects they follow the OTC meetings. These MTIP amendments will be coming to ODOT, then the MTIP presented at TPAC. Information is available from OTC, ODOT and Metro contacts.
- Jeff Owen noted recent discussions per MTIP amendments emphasized the need for more time to discuss and review materials. Ted Leybold added that plans for TIP issues were being discussed including summer schedules, workshops, and strategies. The decision to make time as a workgroup or TPAC subcommittee has not been decided yet. Feedback from TPAC was appreciated and encouraged. More planning is needed before a final format is decided.

- 6. 2024-2027 MTIP Revenue Forecast** (Ted Leybold/Grace Cho) An overview of the 2024-2027 MTIP revenue forecast was presented. The revenue forecast is a snapshot estimate based on information known to that date related to federal and various state and local revenue streams. The snapshot of the near-term financial outlook provides a look across revenue estimates of federal and relevant state-local funds being administered by ODOT and transit agency partners (TriMet and SMART). The revenue outlook in the broader context plays an important role in discussing near term transportation priorities, tradeoffs, and goals to be achieved for the regional system with limited investment.

The revenue estimates were summarized in total and by each agency with administrative responsibilities of distributing those revenues to transportation projects and programs; Metro, ODOT, SMART, and TriMet. A summary of the revenue forecast for federal fiscal years 2024 through 2027 which outlines a handful of key assumptions and factors that drive the revenue forecast was presented. In total, the estimated total revenue of known available federal and relevant state funds to date is approximately \$1.9 billion for federal fiscal years 2024-2027.

It is important to understand the 2024-2027 MTIP forecast remains an estimate of revenues to be available based on several assumptions pertaining to revenue availability. Factors such as the federal surface transportation reauthorization and estimates for state revenues dedicated for transportation (i.e. state gas tax, employer and employee tax for transit) shape the forecast of revenues and ultimately what is distributed to agency funding allocation programs. However, the forecast information helps to gauge the amount of revenue available, establishes an approximate budget, and facilitates an informed discussion around transportation investment priorities and tradeoffs.

The Regional Flexible Fund is one component of the 2024-2027 MTIP revenue forecast. Recognizing the complexity and the many different factors that could impact the amount of funding available for distribution by the 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Fund allocation, Metro MTIP staff created three potential revenue forecasts. In determining an appropriate forecast for the purpose of the allocation of funds in the Regional Flexible Fund process, several factors are considered which were presented to the committee. Metro staff plans to move forward with the Moderate Growth forecast for purposes of informing the RFFA Program Direction and allocation process. If significant new developments around revenues occur, such as the adoption of a federal transportation reauthorization bill, the forecast will be updated at that time to reflect best known information.

Recognizing the previous Regional Flexible Fund history of funding trail projects and the administrative burden related to running a deliberative and transparent allocation processes, Metro will pilot a streamlined administrative process to combine the allocation of the 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds (RFFA) and the trail-specific funding from the 2019 Parks and Nature (P&N) bond measure. The 2025-2027 RFFA Program Direction will reflect the pilot and will allocate an estimated \$20 million of additional funds for trails available from the P&N bond funds to be allocated through this process.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked about the ODOT 150% approved list. Given the uncertainties with Federal funding, would approving a bigger list for state transportation projects if more funding was possible be advised? Mr. Leybold noted the modified forecast was planned that would give us a wider possible list of outcomes this cycle. The conservative forecast provides for consistent planning that can be updated when more is known. Adjustments for increase or decrease of funding as Federal allocations are finalized can be made.
- Rachael Tupica noted in the latest certification report a list of possible projects if more funding is available. Mr. Leybold acknowledged the illustrative list which could be employed in the RFFA allocation decision. At the moment we have large uncertainty on funding but together with long range forecast planning and the illustrative list some priorities on projects are possible. Ms. Tupica recommended making it publicly clear on these potential projects with funds and the requirements with priorities with them.
- Karen Buehrig noted the discussion of potential funds with RFFA policy direction, and how it might be possible to start to think of these possibilities.

- 7. 2025-27 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Strategic Direction (Dan Kaempff)** Mr. Kaempff provided an overview of the process leading to the 2025-27 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Strategic Direction update. Input from a series of meetings and workshops lead to a number of Program Direction adjustments proposed.

Change to single Step 2 project category – There is support for a single Step 2 category that provides greater flexibility than the previous two funding categories provided to allow for more comprehensive, multi-modal project applications. As was the case in previous RFFA processes, the intent is to provide this flexibility but to retain a focus on projects that advance active transportation (AT) and complete streets, and freight and economic development as the previous categories provided.

The 2025-2027 RFFA Program Direction will have one Step 2 category that reflects the RTP investment priority areas' intent. Projects will be evaluated in how well they implement the four RTP investment priorities. The criteria and associated measures will show that AT and freight and economic development will continue to be emphasized. But no specific funding amount is designated for either focus area.

No weighting of the four RTP priorities – The question of weighting any of the four RTP investment priorities was posed in the discussions. There was not an indication that participants felt any of the four priorities should be emphasized in the technical evaluation. The technical evaluation will develop a rating of each project within each of the investment priority areas in addition to an overall rating.

Outcomes-based criteria – With the creation of a single-category Step 2, project evaluation criteria have been updated to reflect this change and more specifically articulate how the Investment Priority categories will be evaluated as an element of the Program Direction.

Evaluating economic outcomes – The RTP Investment Priorities were developed and adopted with an underlying principle that by focusing the region's investments on Equity, Safety, Climate and Congestion, economic benefits would also be achieved. While discussion indicated an overall belief that it is important to show how RFFA investments are helping improve the region's economy and supporting economic growth, there was not a preferred or recommended methodology identified for how to do that.

Enhanced Transit Corridors/Better Bus – In response to TriMet's proposal to consider funding specific to Better Bus transit improvements, the indicated preference is to consider these investments through Step 2 project applications. Measurement of ETC elements in a proposed project will be included in the Step 2 evaluation methodology.

Metro intends to use the RFFA Step 2 project application and evaluation process in selecting trails projects to be funded through the 2019 Parks and Nature (P&N) bond measure. As RFFA has funded many trails projects and they are a critical part of the region's Active Transportation network, there is significant overlap with the purpose and intent of the P&N bond measure funding dedicated for trails. By using a single application process, the intent is to lessen the burden of funding applications and processes on local jurisdictions, and to improve the efficiency of funding allocation. It is important to note that trails projects will remain eligible for RFFA funding.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig noted that Metro put in a great deal of time gathering input to bring up to this place, but for TPAC only a week was provided to review the information and take action. Ms. Buehrig did a comparison from the last RFFA cycle policy to the proposed policy and it

appeared in the Step 1B category there was a 9% increase in funding programs, and 3% increase in Step 2 programs. It was suggested we consider how we look at programs in the illustrious list because of this change.

Referring to Table 4: Step 2 Project Technical Evaluation Criteria, page 11 of the 2025-2027 RFFA Program Direction document, the first column calls out RTP priorities, there is repetition in the Safety, Climate and Congestion categories “particularly for communities of color and other historically marginalized communities”. It should be reflective of how this would be applied from the past and in the RTP.

The following 2 columns provide information on the outcomes being measured (project criteria), and performance measures to consider. Evaluation criteria differs from performance criteria; past documents were clearer on evaluation criteria. It was noted more time to discuss this was suggested.

On page 12 of the RFFA Program Direction draft, it states “Metro will convene a technical evaluation work group to help develop performance measures and conduct the technical evaluation.” It was suggested to have a work group able to develop the performance measures criteria and a separate group that does the technical evaluation. The reason for this addition is that local jurisdictions have experience in the application process and implication of projects, with ability to refine the performance measure criteria. **Proposed Amendment to approving the RFFA Program Direction: add regional and jurisdiction staff to a separate workgroup to evaluate performance measures.**

- Julia Hajduk carried forward some comments at a recent WA County Coordinating Committee meeting. There was general concern about economic benefits downplayed in the document with the assumption this would be folded into other criteria. It appeared now performance measure speaks to economic benefits to projects.

A question on performance measures and request for clarification with duplications on work groups being created that develop these measures. Another question refers to the Trail Bond funding and RFFA applications. How are applications being processed, submitted as one category or both? Mr. Kaempff noted more discussions are being held on this. It may be determined that applicants state their preference for the funding source. The ideal submission is determining the best projects to fund and appropriate way to get them funded.

- Jon Makler acknowledged Mr. Kaempff and staff work done on the proposed program direction, and for recognizing safety as key importance. ODOTs Regional Director will be pleased by this emphasis as ODOTs position is leading with safety in mind. It was noted the last RFFA cycle had safety programs aligned with equity outcomes, which are being carried forward with projects likely to be covered by the priorities in the RTP. ODOT considered Step 2 criteria being weighted, but the memo in the packet provides clarity that Metro plans to provide raw data to facilitate discussions at TPAC and JPACT. Based on this data advancing RTP goals with safety an important inclusion will give JPACT clear direction.
- Chris Deffebach repeated the question on percent increases in Step 1 & 2 programs. It was agreed that combining the two categories this cycle was preferred as there was so much

overlap in programs. It was recommended that TPAC be clear on what is approved today; take the bold language and not the embellishments on definitions. It was asked if more time for discussion on the performance measures would be held at TPAC. While the economic development and green environmental issues were important and not wanting this to disappear, EVA had limits on projecting transportation forecasts and it could be more broadly thought about. Active Transportation projects should be discussed as such; economic developments may need a separate path in evaluation metrics with more work ahead. Several points in the Performance Measures to consider column (memo) were not clear. Several stand-alone projects showing efficiency may be questionable for evaluating.

Mr. Kaempff noted that more will be developed on the technical evaluation performance measures and methodology. Staff will present the evaluation methodology and framework to TPAC for their review and input prior to the opening of the project call in November 2021. Mr. Kaempff asked if safety was recommended for weighing with criteria on projects, but it was thought JPACT to decide if appropriate.

- Eric Hesse supported the previous comments from members. It was agreed that time be given to review the criteria for project scoring. It was agreed that experience from jurisdictions and agencies added value when evaluating performance measures (amendment proposed by Ms. Buehrig). It was agreed that safety vision not be formally weighted in evaluations, knowing the four pillars of the RTP supported safety in some way.
- Mr. Kaempff noted that the technical evaluations and performance measures were not part of the policy directions. However, some language clarification with the process could provide more flexibility. Regarding the proposed same group between technical evaluation and performance measures, it helps to have understanding of performance measures that reflect the criteria that evaluate projects. If the committee felt there was benefit to having two separate groups this could be considered. Ms. Buehrig noted that the section that addresses how the technical evaluations were developed were valuable to community members for understanding, and jurisdictions for the experience. **Proposed Amendment to approving the RFFA Program Direction: Include language regarding the illustrative list if additional funds become available where RFFA can situate itself for this.**
- Ted Leybold read a proposed amendment that would address additional funds if available for RFFA projects, replacing amendment proposed prior sentence: **Proposed Amendment to approving the RFFA Program Direction: If a Federal Authorization Bill was not completed by the time of the release to call for projects or the timing of the selection of projects, a list of projects will be considered as a mandate of funding levels shared through the region for a pipeline of projects as possible for preparedness of project funding.**
- Julia Hajduk noted the challenge of keeping a regional focus and representation with both the technical evaluations and measuring performance measures that come from different geographical areas of the region where project criteria may fit others differently. Mr. Kaempff noted help on this can be identified from County Coordinating Committees and other groups.

**MOTION:** Provide JPACT an approval recommendation for the 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Program Direction, with the following amendments:

1. Incorporate language on page 12 of the Program Direction to have local jurisdictional staff included in development of the technical evaluation for projects.
2. Include the following statement to address possible additional funding: If a Federal Authorization Bill was not completed by the time of the release to call for projects or the timing of the selection of projects, a list of projects will be considered as a mandate of funding levels shared through the region for a pipeline of projects as possible for preparedness of project funding.

**Discussion on the motion:**

- Chris Deffebach asked for clarification on the motion if this includes not approving extra language in columns 2 and 3 of **Table 4 Step 2 Project Technical Evaluation Criteria**. There was concern the performance measurement criteria would not have a process in place to develop.
- Jon Makler acknowledged the concerns with the criteria in Table 4, but felt comfortable is leaving the Table as written with the footnote *Final RFFA performance measures will be developed prior to the Call for Projects in November 2021*.
- Jay Higgins noted the performance measure caveats need to be included in Table 4, which Ms. Deffebach agreed could be highlighted. It was agreed more discussion on these points of criteria would be further developed.
- Julia Hajduk noted the footnotes (caveats) to Table 4 from the previous comment, column 2 on project criteria should also be highlighted as to how developed with further development.

**Following discussion the final motion was read:**

**MOTION:** Provide JPACT an approval recommendation for the 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Program Direction, with the following amendments:

1. Incorporate language on page 12 of the Program Direction to have local jurisdictional staff included in development of the technical evaluation for projects.
2. Include the following statement to address possible additional funding: If a Federal Authorization Bill was not completed by the time of the release to call for projects or the timing of the selection of projects, a list of projects will be considered as a mandate of funding levels shared through the region for a pipeline of projects as possible for preparedness of project funding.
3. Project criteria and performance measures listed in Table 4 would include would be further developed prior to the Call for Projects in November 2021.

Moved: Karen Buehrig

Seconded: Jay Higgins

**ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.

8. **Regional Congestion Pricing Study – draft findings and recommendations** (Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara) Ms. Mros-O’Hara provided an update on the study findings, summary of key takeaways from the Congestion Pricing Expert Review, and draft recommendations for policy makers and future owners and operators to consider.

Metro engaged congestion pricing experts with extensive experience in policy, project/program development, implementation, equity considerations, funding, legal considerations, and political/public acceptance to review the study, culminating in an Expert Review Panel webinar held on April 22, 2021.

There were several highlights from the panel's independent review of Metro's work, and from the webinar discussion:

- The panel found the methods used in the RCPS study to be sound, logical, and consistent with other places that have implemented congestion pricing.
- The panel found the findings from the study to be consistent with their experiences with congestion pricing projects' performance elsewhere.
- The panel advised project implementers to take the time up front to confirm the project purpose, and then focus on fulfilling that purpose, with an understanding that the design of a congestion pricing program could vary depending on the purpose it is being designed for.
- The panel discussed the critical importance of centering equity, and the very real and unintended consequences that can arise from not doing so.
- The panel recommended reaching out broadly to all stakeholders – and recognizing the diversity of different stakeholder groups – understanding that not all groups will be supportive, and that public acceptance of the effort will change over time.
- The panel talked about the differences between congestion pricing and transit-oriented development in urban, suburban, and rural contexts. Every place is unique, and it is critically important to customize the pricing program to meet a region's unique needs. That said, pricing has been shown to be successful in all types of settings at improving mobility and addressing other priorities.

From the memo in the packet, the big picture findings from the modeled scenarios and research was reviewed:

**All four types of pricing would to help address congestion and climate priorities.**

- All eight scenarios reduce the drive alone rate, vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.
- All scenarios increase daily transit trips. (Roadway A has a small increase).
- The projected improvements are comparable to or exceed those of 2018 RTP scenarios (even those with much higher investments in transportation projects).

**Overall regional transportation costs and individual traveler costs vary by scenario.**

- All eight scenarios increase the overall cost for travel for the region, but some scenarios spread the costs widely while others concentrate them on fewer travelers. Those that spread the costs also have the highest overall cost for the region.

**Geographic distribution of benefits and costs varies by scenario.**

- Roadway scenarios reduce delay on freeways, but increase delay on arterials relative to the Base Scenario.
- Corridor scenarios create delay around the perimeter of the cordon boundaries with vehicles avoiding paying the charge.
- Distribution of benefits and costs have implications for where fee discounts and investments from revenues should be targeted.

**There are tradeoffs for implementing pricing scenarios.**

- Higher overall transportation costs equal higher transportation revenues. Revenues must be high enough to:

- o pay for implementation and operation of a program/project
- o address equity and safety impacts that may be introduced
- Vehicle miles traveled scenarios have positive results for all eight summary metrics for congestion, climate, and equity, but also have the highest overall travel costs for the region. However, the costs are spread widely as they are shared by all drivers.
- Revenue potential for the different congestion pricing types is by far the highest for Vehicle Miles Traveled scenarios, then Roadway scenarios at about half that amount, followed by Cordon and Parking scenarios at about half of the Roadway scenarios.
- While congestion pricing may introduce new complexities, our current transportation funding system will not achieve the region’s urgent climate and equity goals. Current funding and spending structures are regressive and reinforce inequity. In addition, the gas tax does not generate enough money to pay for planned projects.

**Implementation considerations vary by the type of congestion pricing.**

- Implementation of a pricing tool depends on technical tools available, need for enforcement, public acceptance, governance structures/policies/legal considerations, ease of use, equity considerations, and financial feasibility.
- Based on today’s technology and infrastructure parking pricing is the easiest to implement.
- VMT, roadway pricing, and cordon pricing are complicated by the complexity of tolling authority and potentially multiple jurisdictions involved.
- Technology infrastructure costs are highest for roadway pricing.
- Implementing pricing to maximize performance and to address equity and safety requires detailed analysis to understand who/where the benefits and costs occur.
- As modeled VMT has the highest revenue potential, followed by Roadway (about half of VMT), and then Cordon and Parking (about half of Roadway).

**Equity can be built in Congestion Pricing Program**

- The current transportation funding system results in inequity.
- How a congestion pricing program is designed is the number one determinate of whether it can improve equity. For example, the same project charging \$1.00 per mile to drive on a roadway during the peak can either improve or reduce equity depending on the project parameters.
- Pricing programs can improve equity in three ways:
  - Building affordability into the program
    - Provide discounts or exemptions for key from paying
  - Revenue can be focused on equity outcomes
    - Invest in key neighborhoods or roadways
  - Focus on transit, sidewalks, bike lanes
  - Invest in senior and disabled services
  - Targeting pricing benefits to key locations
  - Mobility improvements and air quality

The RCPS report will have recommended considerations based on the technical analysis, research, best practices, and feedback from congestion pricing and equity experts, as well as TPAC, JPACT, and Metro Council. A draft summary of recommended considerations was provided:

### For Policy Makers

- Congestion pricing has been used in multiple cities to improve mobility and reduce emissions. Our study demonstrated that these tools could work in the Portland Region with our land use and transportation system.
- Congestion pricing has a strong potential to help the Greater Portland Region meet the priorities outlined in its 2018 Regional Transportation Plan, specifically addressing congestion and mobility; climate; equity; and safety.
  - Technical analysis showed that all four types of pricing analyzed improved performance in these categories
  - Best practices research and input from experts showed there are numerous tools for maximizing performance and addressing unintended consequences.
- Carefully consider the specifics of how the benefits and costs of congestion pricing impact different geographic and demographic groups.
- In fact, optimizing for one priority or another could lead to different outcomes. Meaning, optimizing for mobility, for revenues, for equity – could lead to the selection of a different congestion pricing strategy and design of a program.
- Congestion pricing can benefit communities that have been harmed in the past, providing meaningful equity benefits to the region.
- Similarly, if not done thoughtfully, congestion pricing could harm minority and low-income communities, compounding past injustices.
- It is therefore imperative that there is clarity around what goals the region and implementing agencies want to achieve, as well as the desired values and outcomes, from the very beginning of any congestion pricing efforts.
- Conversations around congestion pricing costs, revenues, and reinvestment decisions should happen at a **regional scale** and follow regional priorities as pricing programs have benefits and impacts across the region.

### For Project Owners/Operators

- Congestion pricing has been shown to address issues of mobility, greenhouse gas emissions, equity, and safety where it has been applied.
- The success of a project or program is largely based on “how” it is developed and implemented.
- Methodology is important – analysis needs to be detailed to understand how to **maximize benefits** (mobility, shift to transit, less emissions, better access to jobs and community places, and safety) and **address unintended consequences** (diversion and related congestion on nearby routes, slowing of buses; potential safety issues, and equity issues).
- Meaningful engagement and an extensive outreach campaign is required to develop a project that works and will gain public and political acceptance.
- A pricing project should build equity, safety, and affordability into the project definition so a holistic project that meets the need of the community is developed rather than adding “mitigations” later.
- Ongoing monitoring of performance is necessary to adjust and optimize a program once implemented.

Next steps this summer include Technical Report with findings and considerations for future owners/operators and policymakers – shared with TPAC next week, discussion on draft

recommendations with JPACT (6/17) and Metro Council (6/22), Resolution presented at TPAC July 9, then Resolution accepting report with recommendations to be adopted by JPACT (7/15) and Metro Council (7/22).

Comments from the committee:

- Laurie Lebowsky asked when the analysis was being done were housing costs and lower income households for equity considerations included. Ms. Mros-O'Hara noted a great deal of mapping was done to get more detail on transit accessibility, especially finding easy access to jobs. The study included different impacts with locations where improvements to mobility are needed. Project moving forward will need this level of analysis.
- Gareth Prior noted that this study is about 90% where ODOT is with the tolling project. The conceptual language such as in NEPA early in the project is similar. ODOT is looking at the State impacts, not just the local and regional scale of the project, and include economics and tribal governments which is more inclusive with more areas. It was agreed that affordability investments and equity was recommended, but the bullets under them should not necessarily define equity as acceptable or exceptions in neighborhoods, but be more flexible recommendations. Elements for equity and affordability are being discussed with FHWA; may not necessarily best land on purpose and need. Lessons learned from modeling and methodology has helped improve our understanding of the project. But these make look different between Metro and ODOT with elements such as assumptions on trucking routes and Metro's more detailed arterial roadwork outlined. Ms. Mros-O'Hara acknowledged the comments and thanked ODOT for its work and forward thinking on the project. It was noted the study was a high level analysis that could provide guidance for considerations.
- Karen Buehrig acknowledged the work done on this study. It was noted the recommendations to policy makers on the study was a surprise as policy direction was not expected. TPAC has had little time to review the material and it was asked if JPACT would discuss these recommendations. Chairman Kloster noted these were covered in the RTP with regional policy impacts and plans. Ms. Buehrig recommended consolidating the two categories of recommended considerations to avoid the overlaps. It was noted the input from the City of Portland's Equity Committee and EMAC on pricing and toll work projects. It was recommended that the work of local committees be acknowledged and incorporate their input in the future. Ms. Mros-O'Hara noted the equity groups were engaged in the process and will be included in the final report.
- Eric Hesse noted the City of Portland's task force on this issue with draft recommendations was being presented June 14, and action taken on final recommendations July 12. This information can be shared with TPAC. On the point of policy makers and project owners/operators, it was recommended to include project partners in the region. Impacts on these tools and how they interact with other tools in the region, such as modeling, impact other elements. Portland is interested in the resolution coming, how the language impacts/aligns with RTP, and aligns with decisions coming from the OTC and task force legislation as implementation is developed.

- Chris Deffebach appreciated the work of the study that provided a broad view and high level of analysis. It was recommended to call the study findings, not policy recommendations. The study finding will create policy for the RTP.
- Ms. Mrs-O'Hara appreciated all the comments and feedback from the committee. TPAC will receive the final report, minus the Executive Summary, within the next week; feedback and comments are encouraged. The Resolution with report will be presented at the July 9 TPAC meeting. The final report once approved by Metro Council will be released by the end of July.

**9. Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC** (Chairman Kloster) none received.

**10. Adjournment**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kloster at 12:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

*The scheduled agenda item 2024-27 ODOT Administered Funding Program Allocation & Scoping updates was not presented. The presentation and materials were later sent to the committee and are included in this meeting packet.*

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, June 4, 2021

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	6/4/2021	6/4/2021 TPAC Agenda	060421T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	5/28/2021	TPAC Work Program as of 5/28/2021	060421T-02
3	Memo	5/27/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Regional Planner RE: Monthly fatal crash update for 2021	060421T-03
4	Draft Minutes	5/7/2021	Draft TPAC minutes from May 7, 2021	060421T-04
5	Resolution 21-5182	6/4/2021	Resolution 21- 5182 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2021-24 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO COMPLETE THE REPROGRAMMING OF UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) ANNUAL PROGRAM ESTIMATES IMPACTING METRO, PLUS AMEND, ADD, OR CANCEL SEVERAL PROJECTS IMPACTING ODOT AND TRIMET TO ADDRESS THEIR NEXT FEDERAL APPROVAL STEP (JN21-11-JUN)	060421T-05
6	Exhibit A to Resolution 21-5182	6/4/2021	Exhibit A to Resolution 21-5182 2021-24 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program	060421T-06
7	Staff Report	5/27/2021	Staff Report to Resolution 21-5182 Attachments included: 1. A Better Red Fact Sheet 2. MAX Red Line CMAQ Air Quality Emission Reduction Analysis	060421T-07
8	Memo	5/28/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ted Leybold, Resource Development Manager Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2024-2027 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Revenue Forecast Attachments included: Attachment 1 – Summary of Forecast of Federal and State Transportation Revenues ATTACHMENT 2 – 2024-2027 MTIP Revenue Forecast	060421T-08
9	Memo	5/28/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Program Direction	060421T-09

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
10	Memo	5/28/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Jon Blasher, Parks and Nature Director Margi Bradway, Planning and Development Deputy Director RE: Coordinating trails funding processes	060421T-10
11	Report	July 2021	DRAFT 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Program Direction	060421T-11
12	Memo	06/04/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, RCPS Project Manager RE: Regional Congestion Pricing Study -Review of Draft Report and Draft Resolution including attachments Attachment 1: Implementation Considerations Technical Paper Attachment 2: Updated Summary of Key Findings	060421T-12
13	Slide	N/A	May 2021 traffic deaths in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties	060421T-13
14	Presentation	06/04/2021	June 2021 Formal Amendment Summary Resolution 21-5182	060421T-14
15	Presentation	06/04/2021	2024-27 MTIP Financial Forecast	060421T-15
16	Presentation	06/04/2021	2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Program Direction	060421T-16
17	Presentation	06/04/2021	Regional Congestion Pricing Study	060421T-17
18	Handout	6/3/2021	UPDATED 6/3/21 DRAFT Summary of RCPS Recommended Considerations	060421T-18
19	Handout	6/4/2021	2024-2027 STIP Highway Enhance Program	060421T-19
20	Presentation	6/4/2021	2024-2027 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program	060421T-20