

Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Workshop**
Date/time: Wednesday July 13, 2022 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Allison Boyd
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Don Odermott
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Lewis Lem
Idris Ibrahim

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley & Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community Representative

Alternates Attending

Jamie Stasny
Sarah Paulus
Peter Hurley
Dayna Webb
Glen Bolen

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Portland
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Karen Williams
Laurie Lebowsky
Jasmine Harris
Katherine Kelly
Rob Klug
Shawn M. Donaghy
Jeremy Borrego
Rich Doenges

Affiliate

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

April Bertelsen
Brett Setterfield
Courtney Duke
Dave Roth
Erik Havig

Affiliate

Portland Bureau of Transportation
Clackamas County
Portland Bureau of Transportation
City of Tigard
Oregon Department of Transportation

Esther Needham
Francesca Jones
Garet Prior
Gregory Mallon
Jessica Engelmann
John Charles
Josh Channell
Josh Mahar
Mel Krnjaic Hogg
Peter Swinton
Sara Wright
Will Farley

Nelson/Nygaard
Portland Bureau of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

City of Beaverton
Cascade Policy Institute
WSP
Kearns West
Portland Bureau of Transportation
Tualatin Hills Parks & Recreation District
Oregon Environmental Council
City of Lake Oswego

Metro Staff Attending

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner
Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner
Thaya Patton, Principal Researcher & Modeler
Cindy Pederson, Research Center Manager
Daniel Audelo, Resource & Dev. Intern

Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager
Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Eliot Rose, Tech Strategic Planner
Chris Johnson, Research Center Manager
Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner
Connor Ayers, Legislative & Engagement Coordinator
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. Chair Kloster noted the all attendees would be listed as panelists for full viewing and participation for this workshop meeting. The link for providing 'safe space' at the meeting was shared in the chat area.

Committee and Public Communications on Agenda Items - none

Consideration of TPAC workshop summary, May 11, 2022 (Chair Kloster) No edits/corrections were received.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Needs Assessment Approach (Eliot Rose, Metro) The presentation began with an overview of the Needs Assessment Approach planned with input asked from the committee. The Needs Assessment in Chapter 4 of the Regional Transportation Plan provides a snapshot of current conditions and trends within the Portland region and highlights key regional transportation challenges and needs for the plan to address. Each update to the RTP begins with updating the goals of the plan, followed by updating the Needs Assessment based on the latest data available to ensure that the policies and the projects in the RTP address the needs of the region now and in the future based on the updated regional goals.

As the region's transportation needs evolve, so does the structure and focus of the Needs Assessment. Through this process, the RTP Needs Assessment continues to evolve from an inventory of multimodal infrastructure needs to a broader focus on transportation's contribution to systemic issues like climate, equity, safety and mobility (i.e., the currently adopted RTP priorities).

Safety policy guidance: Prioritize safety investments, education and equitable enforcement on high injury and high risk corridors and intersections, with a focus on reducing speeds and speeding.

Key findings from the 2018 Needs Assessment:

- Traffic deaths are increasing and are disproportionately impacting people of color, people with low incomes and people over age 65.
- Traffic deaths are disproportionately impacting people who are walking.
- A majority of traffic deaths are occurring on a subset of arterial roadways

A draft update to High Injury Corridors shown is based on new data (2016-2020 vs. 2011-15) and includes HICs on arterial, collector, and local roads. Other proposed Safety analyses include an analysis of crashes by mode, analysis of crashes by Equity Focus Area vs. other communities, providing detailed corridor-level injury scores, exploring how High Injury Corridors overlap with other transportation investments, and analyzing current progress toward Vision Zero.

Equity policy guidance: Use engagement and data to understand the transportation needs and priorities of historically marginalized communities, with a focus on communities of color and people with low income, and prioritize meeting these needs.

Metro has heard from these communities that they need:

- More fast, frequent and reliable transit service
- More affordable transit that connects people to the places and things they need to thrive.
- Better conditions for walking and biking.

The updated draft equity focus areas map shown is based on new data (2016-2020 American Community Survey and 2020 Census vs. 2011-15 ACS). Other proposed equity analyses include highlight gaps in the transit and active transportation system within Equity Focus Areas, map how access to jobs via transit varies throughout the region and within Equity Focus Areas, and overlay Equity Focus Areas with other maps to highlight opportunities to advance both equity and other priorities.

Mobility policy guidance: The Regional Mobility Policy update, now in progress, will guide the assessment of mobility-related needs. Four performance measures are currently being explored:

- Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita
- System completeness
- Travel speed on throughways
- Equity (comparing results between equity focus areas and non-equity focus areas)

We expect to recommend a draft policy and performance measures in September.

Gap maps (System Completeness) and (Draft Transit Network) were shown. Other proposed mobility analyses include a full set of current network gap maps, base year information for recommended Regional Mobility Policy performance measures (e.g., maps of VMT per capita, travel speeds on throughways), and maps highlighting gaps in bike/ped access to transit and other inter-modal connections.

Climate policy guidance: The Climate Smart Strategy establishes a plan to meet greenhouse gas reduction targets set by the State. It identifies high- and moderate-impact climate actions. The 2018 RTP made satisfactory progress implementing Climate Smart and increased transit service as planned, but it did not meet VMT reduction targets.

It was noted it's a busy time for climate action due to Changes to the climate happening more rapidly than expected, the State has adopted new climate and VMT reduction requirements through the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities rules, Agencies are advancing congestion pricing policy and implementation, the State has adopted new policies and programs to speed adoption of clean vehicles and fuels, and USDOT is in a rulemaking process for evaluating GHG emissions from transportation.

Proposed climate analyses include:

- Updated forecasts of regional GHG emissions, taking into account new state, regional and local policies.
- Map showing how VMT/capita varies throughout the region.
- Progress report on Climate Smart Strategy implementation to date.
- Discussion of opportunities to further reduce GHG emissions.

Other proposed elements of the Needs Assessment include: general changes in population, demographics, employment and travel patterns, freight and goods movement, and infrastructure conditions. Mr. Rose noted he will be returning in September to share draft results of the needs assessment and collect feedback. We plan to focus on the proposed analyses that we have discussed today – as well as other ideas that emerge from this conversation.

Comments from the committee:

- Don Odermott noted earlier safety slide was very telling on the plethora of rural crashes in Washington County as urban demand uses rural routes to avoid urban congestion and seeks the fastest path to their destinations.
- Chris Deffebach asked if you could explain again why local roads are included in a regional transportation plan. Local roads are generally not in a RTP. Lake McTighe noted looking at the crash data, there are some collectors that have a high concentration of serious crashes (e.g Jackson School Road). The thinking is that it is consistent with a Safe System approach to include all streets in the HIC analysis regardless of functional classification. Federal HSIP and safety funds can be spent on all roads regardless of ownership and functional classification. And, there are local roads on the regional pedestrian, bicycle and transit networks.

Kim Ellis noted we also have included local connectivity (collectors) in 2040 centers and 2040 industrial areas and employment centers. Ms. McTighe added there are not that many local roads that have been identified as HICs, but there are some. It was a policy decision in the 2018 RTP to not include local roads even if they had a high number of serious crashes per mile. With a better understanding of the Safe System Approach the thinking has changed and we are proposing to include all roads in the analysis. Some local roads function more as regional roads because of their location, lack of connectivity, etc. and may have safety issues as a result. Local roads means/equals roadways not identified on an RTP regional network. All streets in centers and station communities are considered regional.

- Chris Deffebach asked for the definition in this report regarding infrastructure. Was it operations and maintenance, bridges or something else? Mr. Rose noted the bridge conditions are in part of the NEPA assessment in the 2018 RTP. Asked where landslides and resiliency as part of seismic inventory fell with the arterials, it was noted information regarding resilience is on p. 4-60 and 4-61 of the RTP, and pavement condition info begins on 4-40. Ms. Ellis added this is part of Federal reporting which Metro will use from data collected from ODOT as part of the 2017 legislature. The resiliency reporting is a new Federal requirement just beginning. It will be developed as part of phase 2 next year in Emerging Transportation Routes.
- Don Odermott suggested workshop on infrastructure that would include engineers and planners in the region. It was noted a safety improvement project on Jackson School Road referenced earlier was having a ribbon cutting on this section addressing safety issues here. It was noted in the presentation: The RTP must “*confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends.*” - 23 Code of Federal Regulations §450.324. It was suggested to better calibrate our modeling to

capture emissions and key points in bottleneck areas, and help merge the data in modeling to truly reflect travel models.

Regarding the draft transit network gap map, the recent Washington County transit system study highlighted gaps in transit and bike routes as well. It would be helpful to share this information as part of the RTP. It was suggested to include a metric on the hours of operation with vehicles with climate action. Hybrid workforces are changing commute travel and may need to be included in forecasting models. Mr. Rose noted this was part of the emerging trends scenario with the model providing a better accountability for telework that may not be reflected in the surveys totally.

- Eric Hesse noted the purpose of actionable and clear understanding is important. Also important is connecting outcomes to performances. Overlaying maps with project lists is good, but more help and understanding on how this information is assessed with performance measures and accountability may be needed. Further discussion on how the policy questions work together may be helpful also. Mr. Rose noted staff want to give good basis on the current state of performance measures that is closely aligned to future best targets on reaching goals, which are related to the policies in the RTP. Mr. Hesse added he recognizes the challenge balancing growth management with maintenance on roads and bridges addressing resiliency as the Emergency Transportation Routes are developed. Several other questions related to safety would be followed up offline with Mr. Rose and Ms. McTighe.
- Karen Buehrig has glad the things at the beginning of the chapter were kept, that established our topics and purposes. Regarding mode share, it would be helpful to understand progress made as we try to reduce miles traveled; are we shifting away from vehicle travel? It was suggested to report on successes such as high crash corridors where fewer crashes are being reported. The transit gap map was found to be confusing with a lot of data shown. It was suggested to show local work done in help identifying gaps. It was noted there is a how are we achieving our plans vs. needs. It was asked how the equity analysis is being influenced by the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities Rules with requirements around equity analysis. It was noted the emerging trends work fits in well with this needs assessment and could be integrated into Chapter 4.
- Tara O'Brien noted it was helpful and useful to understand the approach in the RTP with the needs assessment. TriMet is finding the NEPA analysis useful in transit planning in the same way, planning for future transit service for more benefits in locations and reasons why the services are planned there. Much work with the Forward Together project process can be incorporated into this work.
- Glen Bolen acknowledged the great job on a lot of work with this project. Appreciation to the focus on safety was given. Agreement on the multi-modal gap being noted and modeled. Not much has been heard about the appropriate use of facilities regarding the right trips to the right facilities. More work on this may come from the Regional Mobility Policy update work and bring into the NEPA analysis. It was suggested to include bottleneck areas in modeling. Have they been identified in the last analysis? Mr. Rose noted bottleneck info was in the 2018 RTP, beginning p. 4-48.
- Chris Deffebach noted simple follow up to be sure to include hours of congestion by facility type so we track how our thoroughways are doing. Per safety upgrades, note the improvements underway on OR 217 to reduce weave/merge and improve safety. Finally would be good to include VMT more broadly to pick up diversion in rural areas but I understand that may be difficult. Ms. McTighe added any projects completed prior to 2016 are of particular interest.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Congestion Pricing Policy Development (Metro) and Oregon Highway Plan Tolling Policy Amendment and Low Income Toll Report (ODOT) (Alex Oreschak, Metro and Gareth Prior & Erik Havig, ODOT) Alex Oreschak began the presentation with a review of where this project is in the timeline; developing and refining RTP language policy through Sept. 2022. A reminder on the summary of recommendations was provided.

- NEW Ch. 3 congestion pricing section
- UPDATE definitions for pricing terms
- NEW congestion pricing policies (Mobility, Equity, Safety, Diversion, Climate, Emerging Technologies)
- Additional information
- UPDATE other RTP Goals, Objectives, and other sections to include pricing
- REVIEW approach to congestion pricing in mobility corridors
- NEW Equitable Funding work; incorporate pricing

Heard from TPAC addressed:

- Create new section in Chapter 3 for congestion pricing
- Refine definitions and terms
- Safety and diversion should have separate policies, and there should be additional detail/clarity on diversion
- Address revenue reinvestment in the policies
- Further clarify the motor vehicle network policies
- Include additional language on partnerships and pricing obstacles

Heard from TPAC not yet addressed:

- Reference economic impacts from pricing, and role of freight
- Address role of pricing as revenue generation tool
- Consider other types of pricing programs (i.e. Multnomah Falls timed-use permits) and other spatial contexts (i.e. river or airspace travel)
- Consider a vision or strategy for applying multiple pricing tools in a coordinated manner

Summary of revised recommendations:

- Safety and Diversion are now separate policies
- Revised new policies & other goals, objectives, policies and sections
- Added new draft action items for each new policy
- Revised definitions/terms and new definitions/terms:
 - Section 166
 - Low-carbon travel options
 - Transit-supportive elements
 - Diversion

The congestion pricing policies were reviewed, starting with mobility. This was defined as improve reliability and efficiency by managing congestion, reducing VMT, and increasing transportation options through investments in modal alternatives, including transit-supportive elements and increased access to transit. Transit-supportive elements include programs, policies, capital investments and incentives such as Travel Demand Management and physical improvements such as sidewalks, crossings, and complementary land uses.

Comments from the committee:

- Tara O'Brien suggested including the Better Bus investments and other such programs, and ensuring that pricing doesn't negatively impact transit travel time on other roadways.

- Eric Hesse highlighted one of the recommended actions regarding net revenues in Attachment 1, 3rd bullet, that would require more work done on this: *Reinvest a portion of net revenues from congestion pricing in modal alternatives both on and off the priced facility that encourage mode shift and VMT reduction, including transit improvements as well as bicycle and pedestrian improvements and improvements to local circulation.*

Mr. Oreschak agreed that more work is needed to be done. The net revenue terms carry over into other action items. Discussions with ODOT have been taking place with this in the amendment language as well.

- Karen Buehrig noted the action items are very detailed, and adequate time and space is needed for discussion. It was suggested to have the description of action items that jurisdictions can think about in terms of when the action items should be used or take place, and how they might be implemented. Asked where further discussion on action items is planned, Mr. Oreschak noted this was listed in next steps of the presentation and offered to meet with anyone for greater detailed discussion.

It was noted there might be conflict between how action items are implemented if not fully described, between expectations and timelines of Metro, ODOT and different regional jurisdictions. Chair Kloster noted consistency with policy language and planning projects would help, and possible appendices on these items in the RTP.

- Chris Deffebach noted the complexity with these action items. It was asked if the mobility policy defined here means we can't use any net revenue of funding to adding capacity to the freeway system or on safety improvements. Mr. Oreschak stated this was not the intent, and if it reads as such, there is more work to be done. Action item one under Mobility reads "Set rates for congestion pricing at a level that will manage congestion and reduce VMT on the priced facility while limiting diversion to nearby unpriced facilities, including arterial, collector, and local streets in the project area." Revenue to achieve this action item is the goal which can include freeway and safety improvements.

The next policy was equity, defined as to integrate equity and affordability into pricing programs and projects from the outset. Karen Buehrig noted it would be helpful to address how and if the EMAC committee recommendations influenced the equity actions. Mr. Oreschak noted future work on cross checking our equity actions with the EMAC recommendations and see where they overlay is planned.

Karen Buehrig noted she believes that the OHP Amendment is clearer that one of the purposes of tolling/congestion pricing is to raise revenue for improvements while the Metro congestion pricing policies are more silent on that, with more of a focus on the need to invest net-revenues in alternative modes and safety etc. Mr. Oreschak noted this was one point of previous TPAC discussions we have not yet addressed yet. It was noted pricing and tolling are tools, with tolling a subset of pricing to raise revenue, and pricing part of the congestion management strategy.

The safety policy was defined as to ensure that pricing programs and projects reduce overall automobile trips and address traffic safety and the safety of users of all modes, both on and off the priced system. Diversion is now separate from safety, to minimize diversion impacts before, during, and after pricing programs and projects are implemented, especially when diversion is expected on the regional high injury corridors. Further definition: Diversion is the movement of automobile trips from

one facility to another because of pricing implementation. All trips that change their route in response to pricing are considered diversion, regardless of length or location of the trip.

It was noted that this new definition of diversion is different in the OHP amendment. Work between Metro and ODOT is being done for clarification. Ms. Buehrig echoed agreement on the difference in how diversion is defined. As we move into conversations with elected officials that will make a difference on explaining why and how they work together. It was noted that past discussions around tolling have helped build the foundation for these definitions.

Climate was described as reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles travelled while increasing access to low-carbon travel options when implementing a pricing program or project. It was noted that Low-carbon travel options include walking, rolling, biking, transit, and electric vehicles. Lewis Lem asked if climate policy was looking broadly at resiliency issues, or more narrowly with climate emissions reduction policy. Mr. Oreschak thought the later. Mr. Lem suggested a more refined definition. Kim Ellis noted staff can look at the different ways to label this, such as pricing strategy, in the RTP while staying within the priorities and working on other issues related to climate.

Emerging technologies was described as coordinating emerging technologies and pricing programs to create an integrated transportation experience for the users of the system. Ms. Buehrig noted the last two bullet points of action in this policy:

- *Weigh existing and emerging equipment and technological advancements when making technology choices, balancing what is time-tested versus what may become obsolete soon. Technology and programs which do not require users to opt-in or track miles manually, for instance, are more likely to see greater compliance.*
- *Review existing laws and regulations to confirm the ability and authority to enforce the selected program and install the selected technology. Technology and enforcement methods must not be in violation of existing laws or city codes, such as prohibition of certain equipment on sidewalks or within city boundaries.*

It was asked when does best practices rise up to be a policy, which are thought to be these. It was important to give guidance but more policies may not always be needed. It was suggested to make sure the actions rise up in importance in the RTP.

Regional Motor Vehicle Network Policies (3.5), policies 6 and 12 had been edited. These revisions were shown and explained why changes proposed. Chris Deffebach noted the questions on who and how decisions are made, how these policies are measured, and asked if projects will be evaluated this way before consideration of going into the RTP. Kim Ellis noted that technically we should be doing this as we develop the transportation system, with consistency in the RTP as capacity is developed. Layers between plans and requirements will force closer scrutiny as we build toward the complete system.

Mr. Oreschak noted Metro's coordination with ODOT on the Oregon Highway Plan Tolling Policy Amendment Concurrent including updates to Metro committees on RTP + OHP, and aligning language and policy goals to the extent possible.

Garet Prior presented information on the Oregon Highway Plan amendment. The OHP overview notes this is Oregon's guiding document for highway and road system that provides vision for the system, reflects the Oregon Transportation Plan, and guides decision making. It provides framework for policies and actions, classifications, designations and targets. Goal 6 on tolling was adopted in 2012 and is need of update.

It was noted the OHP Toll Amendment purpose was to define terms and types of road pricing, clarify the need and goals, address evolving equity, climate, safety, modernization, and funding goals, and provide guidance on rate setting and use of revenues. With the initial analysis of state and regional congestion pricing strategies there are many areas of agreement:

- Why we need congestion pricing
- Mobility goals are addressing the same factors
- Collaboration with regional and local agencies, equitable engagement, and working with transit and multimodal alternative providers
- Interoperability between payment services and transportation service providers
- Program with benefits to address impacts to people experiencing low-incomes (cash-based option)
- Designing for an accessible system, with knowledge of different abilities, languages, and access to technology
- Coordination with new technology and other demand management technologies or strategies

The areas of difference that have yet to be clarified include:

- Dedication of revenues (5 different areas identified in Metro proposed policies)
- Rate setting outcomes
- Monitoring and evaluation

Mr. Prior described some areas of fine tuning.

- Define terms and types of road pricing
- Transit investment language and increased transit and transportation options
- Need to fund infrastructure is missing
- Unsure how these policies will apply to non-roadway types of congestion pricing
- Definitions need some work – diversion and congestion pricing

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig noted that with Clackamas County in the center of recent tolling discussions they are interested in the various toll policies being discussed. Key to elected are having more time to review these policies. It was suggested to lead discussions with the timeline because of the significance. It was a concern to hear of public hearings soon that could give impressions to possible changes in policy soon. It would be better to emphasize the hearing is to collect information that could then change the draft before public comments.

It was good to see the crosswalk that showed the EMAC recommendations being filtered into this OHP amendment, but concern on not being able to view these recommendations until recently. The importance for timing and reviews was stressed. The definitions of diversity may be confusing from past discussions and cause conflicts with policies. It was not clear if the corridor investments were defined as part of the NEPA process. Some specific measures within the OHP amendment were not explained on how they were identified and if having correct tolerances. In section 6.13 it lists the OTC as the toll authority. It was noted this could be an opportunity to reflect the importance statewide as different toll projects move forward, and encouraged more definition with local engagement and local advisory committees providing feedback and comments. It was noted that Metro's policy directly mentions safety but find it harder to see in the OHP amendment, which could be better incorporated.

Mr. Prior noted the technical input with engagement started the process but they will incorporate more with the public for further input. It was agreed that safety importance with the plan amendment needs more incorporation as well.

- Jaimie Lorenzini noted that additional clarification on how the OHP amendment will advance local level goals and how these can be tied to accountability to advance the goals would be helpful. It was appreciated to see the definitions of diversity continue to be fine-tuned. It was suggested to look at diversity and what needs to be mitigated with a creative on open-minded perspective as diversity plays out over time and location.
- Eric Hesse noted the importance of alignment with the amendment and other policies in the RTP and planning processes underway in the region. It was agreed more time for discussions would be beneficial, realizing the timelines are tight. More details on next steps would be helpful.
- Tara O'Brien agreed with the need for coordination with a lot of processes happening now. It was acknowledged there are gaps yet to be addressed and the need to understand how they connect to the EMAC recommendations. It was noted there is interest to learn of opportunity for more time to review. It was asked if the OHP amendment was anticipated to be provided with an early draft with incorporated changes.

Mr. Prior noted he would check with ODOT staff on possibilities with more discussion times. OTC meets in Sept. to consider this amendment, then will have rulemaking on rate setting discussions later in the year. The draft policy will take further comments that can revise the draft including public comment period starting August 1. Metro will continue to work with ODOT on details.

Mr. Prior provided information on the Low Income Toll Project. The Draft Low-Income Toll Report for the Oregon Toll Program was conducted by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) at the direction of the Oregon Legislature. The full report identifies options for consideration on the thresholds and benefits for a low-income toll rate, as well as proposed implementation practices for an equitable, inclusive toll system. The options for consideration (“options”) and proposed implementation practices are intended to start on or before day one of tolling, which is planned for the end of 2024. ODOT will finalize the report and present it to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and Oregon Legislature by September 2022, as required by House Bill 3055.

This report is a culmination of the work ODOT and the OTC have been working on for multiple years regarding how to best address the impacts of the proposed toll projects on people experiencing low incomes. In combination with the Oregon Highway Plan update and coordination and collaboration with the Oregon Toll Program’s Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC), this report is part of a larger ODOT and OTC effort to initiate the Oregon Toll Program in a way that does not disproportionately burden, but rather benefits, people experiencing low incomes and that recognizes that past land use and transportation investments in the Portland metro area—including highway investments—have resulted in negative cultural, economic, and relational impacts on local communities and populations.

The draft report summarizes the engagement, analysis, and research conducted thus far to inform the options for consideration and implementation practices. Focused engagement with the OTC, stakeholders, and the public will occur throughout summer 2022 to further inform and refine the options for consideration and implementation practices presented in the final report.

Options for Consideration:

- Provide a significant discount (e.g., credits, free trips, percentage discount, or full exemption) for households equal to or below 200% Federal Poverty Level.
- Provide a smaller, more focused discount (e.g., credits or free trips) for households above 201% and up to 400% of the Federal Poverty Level.

- Use a certification process that leverages existing programs for verification and further explore self-certification.

It was noted more work is needed, which includes the Oregon Transportation Commission will establish a rate structure that will include income-based adjustments, more work is needed to identify implementation and operations costs, and wherever possible the Low-Income Toll Program will leverage existing systems to streamline implementation and operations.

Next Steps

- Targeted stakeholder engagement – June and July
- Summarize feedback and refine report – August
- Presentation to Oregon Transportation Commission – September 14
- Deliver report to Joint Committee on Transportation – September 15

Mr. Oreschak also added next steps with the work coordination of the RTP update:

- Friday, July 29 - Provide written feedback
- Wednesday, July 27 - MPAC
- Thursday, July 28 - Joint Metro Council/JPACT workshop
- Return to TPAC this Fall to review revised RTP policy language/guidance
- Early fall: related work on RTP financially constrained revenue forecast and RTP finance chapter, including congestion pricing assumptions and equitable funding background research

Chris Deffebach asked for clarification on the July 28 workshop which Mr. Oreschak noted feedback from this meeting would not be incorporated into, but with the deadline of July 29 comments from the committee are encouraged to receive for compilation. Communication on this would be sent to the committee. It was suggested to incorporate or clarify due dates with all this to help the committee see the bigger picture, not just the focus of the RTP. It was noted the RTP has policies on revenue spending, so that net revenue is not needed to be called out in the pricing policy.

Karen Buehrig noted that rate setting is applicable with the low income report, the EMAC recommendations, the Metro congestion pricing actions and policies and the OHP amendment. They are all linked together. It would be helpful to have a graphic that showed how the policies interact and inform each other.

Introduction to the High Capacity Transit Strategy Update for 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (Ally Holmqvist, Metro) The presentation began with an update to the high capacity transit component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – the framework for guiding regional high capacity transit system investments. The High Capacity Transit (HCT) Strategy identifies and categorizes corridors where a higher quality of service would provide the most benefit to the highest number of people.

The first HCT Plan was developed and incorporated into the Regional Transit Strategy as part of the RTP in 2018. It identified projects currently underway, upcoming, and to be completed in the future based on many factors including how “ready” they were to begin construction. The 2018 RTP also classified enhanced transit corridors where “better bus” improvements increasing speed, frequency and reliability are needed to serve growing regional centers and employment areas – including those supporting bus rapid transit.

This HCT Strategy update will build off of previous work to address new policy questions around the future of high capacity transit in our region, re-envision the network with the addition of bus rapid transit and establish a “pipeline” of corridor investments that will help us develop the future high capacity transit system. It will look to a future regional network that is people-focused – connecting community members with where they need to go – serving transit-supportive equity focus areas, supporting affordable housing along its corridors, and completing an integrated regional transportation system.

High capacity transit is a key element of the 2040 Growth Concept – connecting people with hubs of commerce and supporting development in dense areas with a mix of housing and jobs to support healthy, equitable communities and a strong economy. By moving people efficiently and comfortably over long distances, it promotes the efficient use of land, public facilities and services and protects farms and forests. High capacity transit is also critical to implementing the Regional Transportation Plan investment priorities that support this blueprint for the future – equity, climate, safety and mobility.

Fast, convenient and linked to the broader transit and transportation network – high capacity transit provides a viable, more affordable alternative to driving. This makes our transportation system more equitable for people who rely on transit, including people with low incomes, people of color, people with disabilities, people who are older and single-parent families. Fewer cars on the road leads to less air pollution, more physical activity less time in traffic, fewer crashes and more reliability for moving both people and goods – supporting the health, safety, mobility, economy and quality of life of our region.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig noted the large amount of work involved this project. It was noted the bus rapid transit was listed twice in the spectrum; one as bus rapid transit, and bus rapid transit corridors. What is the difference and will both be addressed in the planned strategy. Ms. Holmqvist noted the FTA allows for corridor level distinction with dedicated right-of-way, so both planning efforts for BRT are being considered with opportunities in different places.
- Don Odermott noted this refresh opportunity with the HCT vision was timely given the growth in the region. It was recommended to include an express light rail system from outside Portland to the inner city area for faster transit service. It was noted ODOT has made major strides in their efforts with Bus on Shoulder. Modeling recently shows benefits to strategic park & ride which is still suggested for further development.
- April Bertelsen, PBOT, noted the BRT corridor distinction may need further clarification, as recalled with the FTA capital investments grant to 50% transit way.
- Eric Hesse noted the additions to the broader needs assessment that came for several studies and previous planning. It would be beneficial to bring all this forward to incorporate into this.

Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC – No comments received.

Adjournment

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:58 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC workshop meeting, July 13, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	7/13/2022	7/13/2022 TPAC Workshop Agenda	071322T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	6/30/2022	TPAC Work Program as of 6/30/2022	071322T-02
3	Minutes	05/11/2022	Minutes for TPAC workshop, 05/11/2022	071322T-03
4	Memo	07/13/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Eliot Rose, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Proposed approach to the 2018 Regional Transportation Needs Assessment	071322T-04
5	Memo	07/06/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Brief – Congestion Pricing Policy Development	071322T-05
6	Attachment 1	July 2022	Metro Regional Transportation Plan – Revised Draft Congestion Pricing Policy Language	071322T-06
7	Attachment 2	July 2022	Feedback from June 2022 TPAC Meeting	071322T-07
8	Attachment 3	June 2022	Draft Oregon Highway Plan Toll Policy Amendment	071322T-08
9	Attachment 4	June 2022	Draft Low Income Toll Report	071322T-09
10	Memo	July 6, 2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Introduction to the High Capacity Transit Strategy Update	071322T-10
11	Attachment 1	June 2022	High Capacity Transit Strategy Update Fact Sheet	071322T-11
12	Attachment 2	June 2022	Public Transit 101 Fact Sheet	071322T-12
13	Attachment 3	June/July 2022	HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT STRATEGY UPDATE Key Meeting Dates and Engagement Activities for Project Milestones	071322T-13
14	Attachment 4	June 2022	High Capacity Transit Strategy Update Work Plan	071322T-14
15	Attachment 5	June 30, 2022	High Capacity Transit Strategy Update: Working Group #1 Agenda	071322T-15
16	Attachment 6	June 30, 2022	High Capacity Transit Strategy Update: Working Group #1 Minutes	071322T-16

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
17	Attachment 7	N/A	RTP Policy 4.3.4 Policy 4 HCT Context	071322T-17
18	Presentation	July 13, 2022	RTP Needs Assessment: proposed approach	071322T-18
19	Presentation	July 13, 2022	RTP Congestion Pricing Policy Development	071322T-19
20	Presentation	July 13, 2022	HCT Strategy Update: Introduction	071322T-20