



Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis MEETING SUMMARY

DRAFT Meeting Summary: Policy Advisory Committee Meeting 5

DATE: May 14, 2018

LOCATION: ODOT Region 1, 123 NW Flanders Street, Portland; Conference Room A/B

TIME: 9:00 am – 12:00 pm

MEETING OBJECTIVE

- Shared understanding of the remaining Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) recommendation process
- Review and discussion of themes and priorities from PAC 4 and public outreach
- Review and discussion of findings from Round 2 concept evaluation
- Discuss initial draft PAC recommendation framework

ATTENDANCE

Bernie Bottomly (TriMet), Brendan Finn (City of Portland), Tony DeFalco (Verde), Craig Dirksen (Metro), Phil Ditzler (Federal Highway Administration), Marie Dodds (AAA Oregon Idaho), Marion Haynes (Portland Business Alliance), Jana Jarvis (Oregon Trucking Associations), Gerik Kransky (The Street Trust), Anne McEnery-Ogle (City of Vancouver), Sean O'Hollaren (Oregon Transportation Commission), Eileen Quiring (Clark County), Curtis Robinhold (Port of Portland), Roy Rogers (Washington County), Vivian Satterfield (OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon), Paul Savas (Clackamas County), Alando Simpson (Oregon Transportation Commission), Kris Strickler (Washington Department of Transportation), Pam Treece (Westside Economic Alliance), Jessica Vega Pederson (Multnomah County), Rian Windsheimer (Oregon Department of Transportation), Park Woodworth (Ride Connection).

AGENDA ITEMS AND SUMMARY

TOPIC: WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Facilitator Penny Mabie (EnviroIssues) led introductions and reviewed the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis timeline, meeting agenda and meeting materials. She notified the PAC she would be calling on all members during the meeting discussion to make sure all voices were heard. Penny asked PAC members if they had any concerns regarding the meeting minutes.

PAC Action: Meeting #4 summary was approved without change.



Penny made a brief process note regarding the end of the PAC meeting 3 and the five concepts that were selected for the round 2 evaluation. At the end of meeting 3, Penny made note that there was not a consensus, which was to be expected as the PAC is not a consensus group. She then turned to Judith Gray, (Project Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation), and asked if she had received the necessary information to bring back to the technical team to inform the round 2 analysis. The intent of this question was to ensure Judith had the necessary input from PAC to allow the project team to move forward. Penny noted the PAC's input was heard throughout the PAC meetings and included in the selection process of the five concepts.

Penny introduced Judith Gray to provide an overview of the meeting process. Judith informed the committee that between PAC Meeting 5 and the final PAC meeting in June, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff's priority is to support the PAC and help inform their deliberations as the PAC comes to a recommendation. Judith outlined a framework for the PAC's recommendation: 1) recommendation context, 2) pricing recommendations (type and location) 3) priority mitigation strategies for further consideration, 4) other topics important to the PAC and 5) individual PAC member comments, which will be attached to the PAC recommendation without modification.

TOPIC: COMMENTS FROM PAC CO-CHAIRS

- Thank you to the PAC members for their participation. There is a lot of passion on this issue; some are passionate with few words and others take more. The written option is there to encourage further participation and we will follow-up and look forward to hearing from everyone.
- This is a very important conversation. It is consuming a lot of time and there is a lot of energy, focus and attention on it. The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and ODOT are making concerted efforts to keep many people informed and provide feedback on this process and how we move forward.
- The key is to be open at the table and keep the conversation flowing, which will hopefully carry onto more suggestions and input for the OTC meeting this Thursday, May 17.

TOPIC: PUBLIC COMMENT

Penny opened public comment and requested 90 seconds per comment. She noted audience members are not required to make public comment; they can send emails to the PAC or submit a comment card in writing or online. Public comments included:

- Thank you for this time. I went to the open forums, which were informative, but they were not a place where we had an opportunity to speak. I'm taking time off to come here today and 90 seconds is not enough time to hear from the public. For me, congestion pricing is a burden shift to the people who have the least to give and those who live in the outskirts. These people are the ones who have the least control of when and what time they can drive. They will be the



most affected. Second, congestion pricing does not solve traffic congestion. The PAC should focus on educating drivers about behavior, such as tailgating and technologies like cruise control. Ultimately, this should be a focus on looking at mass transit, instead of adding lanes or reducing the number of cars. Also, the Westside Bypass would help.

- The North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce is generally in support of the concepts being talked about here. Traffic is an impediment to business in Clackamas County. Regarding the proposals, tolling all lanes on I-5 and I-205 is not the favored concept because it would shift traffic to alternative routes and surface streets to the detriment of the community. Pricing by hours and lanes seems to be the preferred avenue. All of this is clearly a means to get better capacity out of the system we have. Whatever funds are raised need to be designated to the additional lane on I-205.
- We are having this discussion because Oregon needed economic recovery in the 1980s. A Western Arterial Highway is the most sensible and effective solution when we look at the money dumped into tolling and adding lanes. HB 2017 mandated the OTC look at proposals for cost effectiveness, so I urge you to look at this and its cost effectiveness. Public transit could use this facility, as it would make connections. We could even do something like a Western Arterial Highway on the Eastside. We need to get this studied.
- I cannot support plans to toll all lanes on I-5 and I-205. In Seattle, the tolling cost is \$6.00 with a \$2.00 discount for those with a transponder. How much of this toll will go to the private tolling company? According to the Washington State Transportation Commission, they estimate 35 percent. According to Mandy Putney (ODOT): "Some of these scenarios might not raise much more than the cost to cover the operations of the tolling system." Then what is the point? Adding a tolled lane on I-5 and I-205 is the only option to relieve congestion, but option 4 (add a lane to I-5 and I-205) has been eliminated by staff. I urge the PAC to support option 4.
- How many cars need to be removed from I-5 and I-205? You haven't told us: why not? ODOT's Don Hamilton has been telling citizens this is about behavior modification. Let's have all public servant government employees modify their behavior. I'd like to see the 25 PAC members take a bold step and demand option 4 be added back. Abandon your Band-Aid and begin fixing the problem. Jana Jarvis said the trucking industry was promised added lanes. Do not kick the can down the road – the PAC is the one in charge. Band-Aids and behavior modification will not fix the issue.
- The North Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce has had numerous conversations about congestion pricing. Our organization supports the business community and our citizens. Adding a tolled lane is the solution to decrease congestion. Taking a shoulder for transit does not make common sense. The toll revenue needs to stay within the roadway that is tolled. Transparency, honesty and respect are important. We need to distinguish tolling versus congestion pricing. Last, the chamber is concerned about diversion safety.
- The only action to reduce congestion is congestion pricing. Freeway widening will work for a few years, but induced demand will take over. Please institute congestion pricing on our freeways, but it must be implemented equitably. Low-



income mitigation must be included in the package, and we need better transit. The funds need to be invested in better transit service to encourage a safe and convenient economic system. Oregon Goal 12 says a transportation plan must minimize adverse social and environmental impacts. Dedicating the funds to transit will accomplish that.

- The Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates supports congestion pricing. However, we think the equity issue has not been addressed the right way. There is no bus service on I-205, but it is needed. Increased capacity should be in bus seats, not additional vehicles. ODOT should be paying for bus services because TriMet only has one line on the freeway; there is no all-day, 7-day a week service. Buses on the freeway could connect suburbs and benefit those too old to drive or who cannot afford to drive – and that's an equity issue.
- Regarding the materials for today, some PAC members might think the impacts are not as bad as expected, some might think they are worse, some might not understand the analysis and some might not trust the analysis. I hope that you [the PAC] will continue the process and not give up because you do not understand it right now. We've tried all the tools, ODOT and WSDOT [Washington Department of Transportation] and others have added a great deal of capacity in these corridors and a lot of transit service and bike connections. We need to test this tool [congestion pricing] just like our peers have.
- From the Oregon Environmental Council, thank you for your hard work. Congestion has impacts on quality of life, our economy and the environment. It is a hidden tax on the economy. Many neighborhoods were destroyed by freeways. We all pay for freeways whether we use them or not. The Policy Advisory Committee must seek the best outcome for our most vulnerable communities. The most equitable and sustainable solution is putting a price on roadways during peak hours. Reducing congestion will clean our air, reduce our carbon footprint and keep our economies growing. Congestion pricing must also be accompanied by significant improvements on transit.
- The No More Freeway Expansion organization believes this work is the only way we will ever solve congestion. Expanding freeways has never worked. We should invest in decongestion pricing with the revenues put into transit investments. Our letter was signed by 250 people across the region. Folks are interested in air quality, climate justice and improving public health. ODOT is considering expanding freeways. This is an intergenerational theft issue. It may be difficult to tell your constituents but look to decongestion pricing in other cities. As soon as it was implemented, it had massive approval. This is one of many issues in the next few years. Thank you.
- Climate Solutions imagines an equitable northwest powered by clean energy. That's why we are strongly supportive of this process and value pricing. Expanding capacity does not work. It did not work in Houston and Los Angeles. It is bad for drivers and the environment. Transportation is the single largest source of pollution in Oregon at 40 percent. Congestion pricing is an effective tool to reduce pollution. We encourage Oregon to be bold like those in Stockholm and London. We encourage the PAC to design solutions that prioritize communities of color and other historically marginalized groups. This is possible while also moving



with urgency. The federal government is undoing emission standards and we need the west coast to step up. Congestion pricing has the ability to improve lives by getting people out of traffic. Thank you for your efforts.

TOPIC: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION UPDATE

Anne Pressentin (EnviroIssues) provided an update on public participation. There has been extensive outreach since PAC meeting 4 to inform and engage the public. More than 180 people attended 5 recent open houses (bringing the total to 8) and more than 6,500 visited the online open house. In addition, there was social media, news coverage and opportunity to comment via email. Results show similar themes to the winter engagement in January 2018. One theme is that congestion is a problem but there is disagreement about what to do about it: over half of the people who participated are already changing their travel patterns to avoid congestion. Most people who responded to the survey said they would try to find an unpriced route if roadways were tolled. Concepts that maintain an unpriced lane had generally more support than those that did not. Note that this survey is not statistically representative of the entire community. The full report is online and printed as part of the PAC member materials.

TOPIC: MITIGATION STRATEGIES AND PRIORITIES

Penny introduced Kirsten Pennington (WSP) and David Ungemah (WSP) to present on mitigation strategies and priorities.

Kirsten outlined major mitigation themes from the PAC: special provisions for the low-income population, such as discounts, subsidies and cash-based options; improved transit access, affordability and availability – a change in behavior requires travel options; diversion strategies; and skepticism – the importance of demonstrating value and the need to monitor and evaluate the program post-implementation. Other issues include connecting revenue with congestion relief and transportation system improvements; regional congestion pricing analysis; planning for growth (by providing both transit and roadway capacity); and ensuring congestion pricing is designed for all users including those who may not speak English as their first language. PAC comments included:

- Add: We are looking to distribute benefits to the entire area that is impacted.
- Carpooling has been mentioned in several places but did not make it into the general description. I suggest adding one sentence on page 3, which says carpool and vanpool be expanded when transit cannot appropriately serve the commuter.
- Regarding the I-205 section: the mitigation language in the packet is quite vague as it relates to solutions. As someone who knows the geography and the landscape, we need to think ahead as the population changes and grows.
- Expanding capacity was mentioned on several occasions. Mitigating the surrounding communities for what they actually pay in tolls is a wise choice.



- First, mitigation for transit: add investments as well as new routes and services. Investing in transit infrastructure is important to clarify; those are the types of investments we would like to see. Second, there is still confusion with adding lanes. In the models, there are projects assumed to be completed, including the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project and the Abernethy Bridge widening (from Stafford Road to OR99E). That needs to be crystal clear. We are not talking about the roads as they stand today but as they stand in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This includes transit investments, such as the Southwest Corridor LRT Project.
- Without increasing roadway capacity, there is very little value to Washington County. I appreciate the work but not adding [roadway] capacity is a nonstarter. The Rose Quarter, I-205 and Abernethy Bridge widening are critical to Washington County. If we are going to toll, what is going to happen with the tolls revenue? Without adding capacity all we can say is that this has been a wonderful educational experience.
- We might consider having free lanes during less congested times as a mitigation strategy for diversion. A key issue around the table is transparency; being very clear about what we are doing and where the revenues are going. Make sure a regional congestion pricing analysis is continuing and discussion about how we can potentially move that forward.
- I want to emphasize what I heard from public comment regarding the education needed for drivers, especially limited-English speaking populations.

Kirsten emphasized that PAC member comments have been consistent with public comments and input. Key themes from the public include: provisions for low-income communities; skepticism about whether pricing works; ideas about how and where to spend revenue; transportation capacity not keeping up with growth; and fairness is key.

David Ungemah (WSP) presented on potential mitigation strategies that align with themes from the PAC and the public. He began with a roadmap, which emphasized that the project is just beginning and there are mitigation considerations at numerous stages from a region and statewide planning process, and there are several places along the roadmap where a decision to not proceed with a pricing concept may be made. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- [Regarding the roadmap] is it possible to do a budget projection for all the exit points ["off-ramps" from implementing pricing]? This would have been helpful for the Columbia River Crossing project.
 - *That is difficult to estimate at this point in time, because it depends upon the scale and scope of the project. For example, if you are looking at using bonds, that takes high-level financial advisement and costly studies. Under this example, the answer is a few million dollars. Notably, at each of these stages the region can change direction and continue forward on a different path. For example, during the National Environmental Policy Act*



(NEPA) process, the region might come up with different alternatives that are equally desirable to the community. Even if this does not have a pricing component, the project can still advance.

- If the PAC recommends a bistate solution, where would the constitutional limitations be addressed in the roadmap?
 - *The first place would be in the application to the FHWA. The value pricing team at FHWA headquarters has experience with this. For example, congestion pricing in Virginia is right at the Maryland border [Constitutional limitations would ultimately be addressed following the application to FHWA.]*
- Is Virginia the only cross-state example?
 - *North Carolina's program currently under construction is close to the South Carolina border.*
- [Regarding Technical Memorandum 4] where does the origin-destination data come from?
 - *Metro's regional travel demand forecast model, which Chris Swenson (WSP) will expand on when he presents the round 2 concept evaluation results.*

To address the first theme, "special provisions for low-income populations," David explained options including discounts, credits, subsidies and/or rebates on tolls; lifeline tolling registration, universal accounts; and cash-based accounts. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- Regarding the mitigation strategy to provide \$25 toll credits to those making over \$49,200: Can you explain these numbers?
 - *The example comes from Los Angeles, which has two facilities that feed into downtown and cross through communities with low-income populations. The Los Angeles board convened focus groups, and learned the initial seed money for a debit-based account was a burden for the unbanked population. The \$25 credit covers that initial cost. The \$49,200 number represents an income threshold to obtain credits for different households and income levels. In Los Angeles, a household with 4 people making less than \$49,200 qualifies for the one-time \$25 credit. In addition, riding transit also builds toll credits. This is a great way to encourage individuals to ride the bus when they can, but when they need to jump on the tolled system, they have credit.*

To address the theme, "improved transit access and availability," David explained options including new transit routes/services on priced roads; new/expanded Park & Ride locations; free High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) 2+ or 3+ use; more frequent bus service; transit rewards incentive program; benchmark peak period tolls with transit fares; and universal pass – link toll accounts with TriMet accounts.



To address the theme, “diversion strategies,” David explained options including design to minimize unwanted diversion; traffic calming on impacted arterials and neighborhood streets; advanced traffic management; bans on heavy vehicles from neighborhood streets; and improvements for transit, pedestrian and bike infrastructure. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- When diversion is discussed, I never get a very good sense of the extent of diversion. I heard the comment that people divert because of congestion. There are also apps with a system telling individuals about tolls and how to avoid them. It seems the potential for diversion is significant. Understanding the extent of diversion would be helpful.
 - *In terms of diversion, there are positive and negative diversions. Less desirable is route diversion. The definition of diversion changes throughout the process. At this point, diversion refers to route diversion, which requires detailed data analysis to fully understand. During the NEPA scoping process, a refined understanding of diversion would help us understand how travelers are traveling through and within the network.*
- All pricing strategies will be refined during NEPA, but a better understanding of diversion would be helpful. We need to appreciate the opportunities that exist under value pricing through tolling to generate revenues. I don't know if the group understands this opportunity.

To address the theme “other considerations: connecting revenue with congestion relief and system improvements,” David explained options including infrastructure trust fund – e.g. expand capacity, in-line bus stations, Park & Rides, arterial enhancements, multi-modal/multi-use, active traffic control, demand management and shared mobility services); and user-oriented policies, such as revenue dividends and FAIR lane distributions.

To address the theme “other considerations: making sure pricing works,” David explained skepticism often increases until congestion pricing projects are implemented and can demonstrate success and transparency. He provided options including trial/pilot systems, performance standards, monitoring and reporting and partner coordination.

TOPIC: KEY FINDINGS FROM ROUND 2 CONCEPT EVALUATION

Penny introduced David Ungemah (WSP) and Chris Swenson (WSP) to present key findings on the five concepts from the round 2 concept evaluation. David explained these concepts were selected because they have positive levels of cost effectiveness. Note that they have different effects. Concepts A through D are meant to relieve congestion. While Concept E has the benefit of relieving congestion, it was tested for revenue potential and provides a perspective on how to complete the system in terms of what has been funded.



Chris Swenson (WSP) explained key findings and considerations for each concept.

Concept A: Northern I-5 Priced Lanes

Key findings include: minimal congestion reduction; limited diversion; revenue and capital costs are relatively low; maintains two unpriced lanes in each direction but has the highest toll amount per vehicle. In the model, the average toll per mile is \$1.45 in the AM peak, \$1.05 in the PM peak and \$0.34 daily. Per trip modeled toll rates were around \$5.00 in the AM, and about \$3.60 in the PM. It is critical to remember that these toll prices are not proposed toll rates, rather they are used to compare the concepts in the model. The toll price also reflects that pricing only one lane makes the per vehicle toll higher. Considerations include: mitigation strategies for land locked areas; FHWA HOV/HOT lane program for the northbound lane and FHWA Value Pricing Pilot Program for the southbound lane. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- When we talk about the toll prices, this is not what is being proposed. This is what is being used in the models and used to evaluate the concepts.
 - *That is correct.*

Concept B: I-5 Priced Lanes – Toll All Lanes between Going St./Alberta St. and Multnomah Blvd.

Key findings include: congestion reduction and time savings; travel time savings to area Title VI/Environmental Justice communities; modest diversion with increased vehicles per lane per hour on I-5; and a dense network of transit and multi-modal facilities. Considerations include: mitigation strategies could include increased transit service, low-income toll rates and other strategies; and FHWA Value Pricing Program. In the model, the average AM peak hour toll per trip for Concept A is about \$5.00 whereas for Concept B the average AM peak hour toll per trip is \$2.02. For Concept B, the average PM peak hour toll per trip is \$1.55 and the average daily toll per trip is \$0.78; the daily average toll per mile is \$0.34.¹ These toll prices are not proposed toll rates, rather they are used to compare the concepts in the model. The potential annual gross toll revenue estimate for Concept B is \$50 million (in 2017 dollars).² PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- Comparing Concept A to Concept B, it seems the cost is higher because the administration cost is the challenge. What is the administrative cost and how is that evaluated – on a per mile or per area? Is there some kind of scale?
 - *At this point, we are not deciding how this could be implemented, so we do not know the exact cost. In general, the more tolling transactions you*

¹ This was a misstatement. The modeled daily average toll per mile for Concept B is \$0.10. Concept A has a modeled daily average toll per mile of \$0.34.

² Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Analysis, Round 2 Concept Evaluation: Technical Memorandum 4



have, the less each transaction will be. For example, if you go from tolling 10,000 to 100,000 vehicles, the per vehicle transaction cost will drop. However, the overall administration costs will increase.

- Can you tell us how the model evaluates travel time savings?
 - *The model looks at time savings by area. The project team generated a heat map, which shows travel time savings. Metro uses a MCE (Multi-Criteria Evaluation) tool that makes specific evaluations of areas that have higher average concentrations of Title IV and low-income residences than the metro-area.*
- Was I-405 considered in the modeling? I'm thinking about the impacts of diversion and how it might breakdown the system in downtown Portland.
 - *No. However, because we saw traffic increases on I-5 compared to the baseline, I'm not positive that indicates we will have a major diversion issue.*
- The tolling is proposed to start on Going Street, so a lot of the diversion could clog up I-405 north of I-5.
 - *To your point, trips would only be avoiding one toll collection point.*
- The diversion would be outside of the toll area.
- The assumed toll price for each concept except for Concept E is a per mile toll, correct?
 - *Yes, there is not a cordon toll in the models. For Concept B: the per mile toll in the model is much lower than in Concept A.*

Concept C: I-5 and I-205 Priced Roadway – Toll All Lanes

Concept C is much more complex than Concept B. Performance metrics would be used to tune the system to have the desired effect. Key findings include: greatest regional congestion reduction and travel time savings; enhanced jobs access for Title VI/Environmental Justice communities; high probability of diversion, which could be minimized with dynamic tolling; and transit and multi-modal facilities can serve as alternatives, though accessibility varies. Considerations include a phased implementation; mitigation strategies could include increased transit service, low-income toll rates and other strategies; and generates the largest amount of revenue compared to other concepts. Overall, under Concept C the system is operating much more efficiently than currently and would continue into 2027. In the model, the average toll per trip is about \$3.25 in the AM peak, \$3.15 in the PM peak and \$1.39 daily; the average toll per mile is \$0.38 in the AM peak, \$0.37 in the PM peak and \$0.17 daily. These toll prices are not proposed toll rates, rather they are used to compare the concepts in the model. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- Which routes would be most impacted by those trying to divert around the tolls?
 - *That is difficult to say because at this time the modeling only details net diversion. The model is showing us three to five percent net diversion. Diversion would logically impact the parallel routes closest to the tolled facilities. We cannot tell you which route will have the most significant*



impact. Overall, we are looking at significant reduction in hours traveled and we should have a much better performing network than we do today.

- Why is the impact on freight throughput so modest in all concepts? There is a surprising difference between freight and vehicle throughput. Travel times for freight is greatly reduced, but throughput increase is modest.
 - *We are seeing a normal balance between tolls and decreased travel times. We are trying to balance the cost of a toll and the value of travel time savings. In addition, the model has a set number of trips, so that creates limitations.*
- With Concept A, you are not seeing an increase of C-TRAN travel trips.
 - *Correct.*
- When you looked at diversion, did you do an analysis of how diversion would impact existing transit?
 - *The modeling is a high-level analysis. The model does not go into the detailed level of route assignments. That detailed level of modeling, which goes from macro to micro level and microscopic analysis, would be very appropriate in the next step of the (NEPA) analysis. At this broad level, we ask, how would this work as a system? Then we can get into the details during subsequent steps.*
- Regarding the three to five percent diversion - under this option, the round 1 evaluation showed 80,000 trips diverted: is that 80,000 option part of the three to five percent?
 - *We would take a deeper look at diversion in future planning phases.*
- In defining "good" and "bad" diversion, can you explain what definition you are using?
 - *In this context, diversion means "net diversion," in terms of the amount the throughput is dropping in that segment.*

Concept D: I-205 Priced Lane – OR99E to Stafford Road

Key findings include: minimal congestion reduction; minimal diversion; few transit and multimodal travel options; and maintains two unpriced lanes in each direction, but toll amount per user would be higher. Considerations include FHWA allows tolling outright due to added capacity. In the model, the average toll per trip is about \$5 in the AM peak, about \$2.75 in the PM peak and \$1.21 daily; the average toll per mile is \$1.05 in the AM peak, a little over \$0.50 in the PM peak and about \$0.15 daily. It would raise an estimated \$20 million in annual revenue, which would cover its toll collection costs only. These toll prices are not proposed toll rates, rather they are used to compare the concepts in the model. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- Would the toll support construction of the third lane?
 - *The \$20 million is the total gross revenue. It would not support construction.*
- The toll price is what the model is showing relative to the other concepts. This is not the proposed toll.
 - *Correct.*

**Concept E: Abernethy Bridge Priced Roadway (tested for revenue potential)**

Key findings include congestion reduction and travel time savings for drivers on I-205; some traffic diversion to I-5, particularly freight; and probability of diversion to local facilities. Considerations include mitigation strategies needed, such as increased transit service, low-income toll rates and others. The concept would likely generate sufficient Abernethy Bridge project funding and a portion of the funding for the planned third lane on I-205. Concept E would generate about \$50M per year which, if bonded, would potentially cover the construction expense for the Abernethy Bridge rehabilitation and bridge widening as well as some, probably not all, of the new lane on I-205 between Stafford Road and the eastern terminus of the bridge. These revenues are not based on proposed toll rates, rather they are used to compare the concepts in the model. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- I was a little disappointed in this because of the way this model had to be done. The freeway has two lanes today and the model makes it three. The report is a little misleading, but the revenue generation piece was very informative. Did you consider looking at this with something like the Rose Quarter to manage both corridors?
 - *No, a comparable revenue analysis was not done for the Rose Quarter.*
- I struggled with Concept D and Concept E. These seem to be revenue generating concepts. That piece is needed for revenue generation, not for congestion pricing.

The consultant team provided the following recommendation:

- Concepts A and D not move forward in analysis.
- Initial implementation of Concept B as pilot pricing program, coupled with performance monitoring to evaluate success and scalability;
- Consider implementation of Concept E concurrent with Concept B to balance the system;
- After assessing performance of initial pricing project (assuming successful evaluation), consider implementation of Concept C in phases with comprehensive system analysis; and
- Develop mitigation strategies for low-income and adjacent communities.

TOPIC: PAC INITIAL RECOMMENDATION(S) DISCUSSION

Penny facilitated the discussion, walking the PAC through each piece of the consultant team's recommendation. She noted that it is ultimately the PAC's recommendation that will be forwarded to the OTC, but that the consultant recommendation would be used as a starting point for discussion. Chris Swenson (WSP), David Ungemah (WSP) and Kirsten Pennington (WSP) provided answers to clarifying questions throughout discussion.



**See attachment for a transcription of flip-chart notes taken during the meeting.*

Recommendation topic: Do not implement concept A or D. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- I am comfortable not implementing A or D. However, don't lose the thought of looking at Concept D tolling limits with Concept E.
- When we looked at Concept E, we talked about paying for the bridge. I need to understand what part of the bridge we are paying for.
 - *We would get to that further in the process. Again, all the toll prices will change. These prices and the revenue they generate are used in the modeling to compare concepts.*
- If we are going to build a new bridge, we need to add a third lane.
- I would like to see Concept D and Concept E together.
- I do not want to discard A or D, nor am I proponent of A or D. However, I do not want to take a priced lane concept off the table. In concept C, we are creating the problem of diversion by tolling all lanes.
- It seems Concept A and D address a supply-side issue. This issue exists in A or D, and not in the other concepts.
- I support removing A or D.
- I support not implementing Concept A, but agree with the previous comments regarding Concept D.

Judith Gray (Project Manager, ODOT) requested PAC members display thumbs-up in support of or thumbs-down in opposition to the consultant recommendation, "do not implement Concepts A or D." Of those PAC members who participated, many were supportive of the consultant recommendation, "do not implement Concepts A or D." However, many of the comments bulleted above to retain Concept D when considering Concept E were made after the thumbs-up/thumbs-down assessment was made.

Recommendation topic: Initial implementation of Concept B as pilot pricing program, coupled with performance monitoring to evaluate success. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- Concept C has strong performance. If we move towards Concept B, I'm curious to see the connection between a successful pilot in Concept B and Concept C.
- I would like to see the modeling on origin-destination data on Concept B.
- Does the initial implementation of Concept B mean that Concept C would not be further modeled?
 - *Concept C could still exist in a regional system plan. In terms of the NEPA analysis and next steps, Concept B would be the only concept moving forward in the consultant recommendation.*



- Moving forward with Concept B: we have heard loud and clear there is a strong interest in considering planning efforts for an expanded model, not just Concept C, but region-wide. That concurrent effort is going to be something we are doing moving forward.
- One consideration is to look at the diversion on N Lombard Street, and whether you could extend the starting point further north.
 - *As we get into more detailed travel demand modeling that would be an appropriate time to analyze extending the starting point.*
 - *It is very useful to hear this type of idea from the PAC. The discussion the PAC has now will inform the recommendation to the OTC, even though this topic will be dealt with at a further stage in the process.*
- Relative to Concept B and more generally: I am getting nervous about the lack of clarity and certainty in terms of reinvestment in transit. I'm hearing a lot about how the model looks at existing transit. In my mind, none of these concepts can go forward without the certainty of investments in transit. Second, I appreciate the efforts of staff to hear the mitigation strategies in terms of low-income. I want to go further than mitigation and create a system that inflicts no harm.
- I want to clarify that HB 2017 called for expansion of I-5 through the Rose Quarter.
 - *Correct. The I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project is included in the model.*
- I question the transit capacity to take any additional trips. I am also concerned about the diversion onto I-205. For Concept B to move forward, I would want some sort of tolling on I-205 to be considered.
- From a Port of Portland context, we like to look at the long game: Concept B should be considered as just a piece of how you get to Concept C. We want to look at the 20- or 30-year vision.
- My communities largely reside east of I-205. While I do agree that the long game is necessary, I also think we need to note the high crash corridors near I-205. The transit does not exist around I-205. In speaking for my constituency, I do support Concept B due to the transit options in that area, although I am supportive of Concept C as we move forward.
- In Concept B, there is dense transit. I want to make sure we are not only relying on the anticipated transit in 20 years in the RTP but considering what is required to implement congestion pricing.
- On the west side of the Willamette, the Southwest Corridor light rail planning will be a huge opportunity to give people alternatives.
- Point of clarification: the way the bullet is written looks like you are planning to bypass the operational analysis and go straight to the implementation pilot.
 - *That is due to poor language in the slide. All the steps in the roadmap – with changes depending on the level of complexity – will be followed.*
- It looks like Concept B may cause diversion from I-205 to the I-5 corridor because I-5 performs better. What is the scale of that and how can we address it?
 - *In terms of scale: a couple percentage points. This diversion caught me by surprise as well, until I considered the details. Relieving congestion on I-5 encourages people to divert from I-205 to I-5, especially since the I-205 corridor is a longer route for many trips.*



Recommendation topic: Consider implementation of Concept E concurrent with Concept B. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- From a system management concept, I like the idea of being able to manage both corridors. ODOT does that today with variable message signage, which provides information on which route will be the fastest. I like the idea of continuing this strategy.
- As I understand Concept E, it is meant to generate revenue and build infrastructure. One thing I highly value is talking about congestion pricing as a tool to manage congestion on the roads. I do not want to see our region getting into the habit of using tolling to widen freeways. I am not supportive of moving forward with Concept E.
- I am supportive. We cannot think our population is static, as well as our business community. If things are static, no added capacity is merited.
- When we discuss and analyze priced lanes, we are looking at a restriction for freight. My concern is that congestion pricing should not increase the throughput of I-5 and I-205 with a priced lane that excludes freight.

Recommendation topic: After assessing performance of initial pricing project (assuming successful evaluation), consider implementation of Concept C in phases with comprehensive system analysis. PAC member discussion included:

- I like the idea of considering Concept C, but I would prefer to look at a larger area than Concept C. What about diversion to OR 217? We should be having that conversation.
- I realize Concept C is beyond the limits of what we can do this year. There needs to be a larger analysis. I also appreciate the roadmap that David provided, which shows how long the road is going to be before we get to tolling. I am very supportive of a larger analysis. I would like the language to be modified to indicate that this would be a region-wide system analysis. This analysis would be after the recommendation to the FHWA but before tolling is implemented.
- Concept C has the greatest impacts to safety on local roads and to low-income communities. The goal is to reduce congestion. I support bringing back option 4 (from the round 1 evaluation – add new priced lanes the length of I-5 and I-205 between the state line and the I-5/I-205 interchange) for consideration, because it has the most promise for congestion relief.

Recommendation topic: Develop mitigation strategies for low-income and adjacent communities. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- I have been very pleased to hear conversations around the table on this topic. I would like to emphasize to the PAC that increased transit has to be part of the



package. This cannot just be a mitigation strategy; it has to be part of the package.

- I strongly agree with the support of enhanced transit as long as it includes carpools and vanpools.
- I would like to have on the record that we need to look at mitigation strategies for the entire region.
- Will we have time to add to and adjust these mitigation strategies?
 - *Yes. The purpose of today's meeting is to discuss ideas on mitigation strategies and discuss an initial recommendation, both of which we can bring back to the next PAC meeting for discussion.*
- Looking at where Concept B would start and stop (termini): I remain concerned about diversion on local roads, including SW Barbur Boulevard and NE Martin Luther King Boulevard. At this point, I have a hard time understanding how diversion is mitigated. There is a fair amount of transit. I support moving forward with this, but the devil is in the details.
- TriMet is in the midst of doing outreach for HB 2017. That legislation points towards a concentration of new services for low-income and minority communities where they live, which is not exactly in line with tolling mitigation. It is a different lens, even though we want to mitigate the impacts of tolling on low-income and minority communities. We are not looking at corridors that parallel these toll corridors. That would have to be another conversation.
- Since I am not going to be at the next meeting, I would like to know how you are going to solicit PAC opinions and recommendations for the next meeting. Should we provide something in writing?
 - *ODOT staff will be in touch with PAC members to decide what will be best for the PAC. That is how we structure these meetings - to allow for PAC discussion. We will continue to do that and that is our priority. We are here to help the PAC receive the necessary input to make a recommendation to the OTC.*

Recommendation topic: Other issues important to the PAC, including the need for future system-wide pricing analysis; need tolled freeway capacity (transit and roadways); and specified use of revenues. PAC member discussion included:

Project team clarification and responses are indented and italicized.

- All the transportation systems need to grow: bicycle, pedestrian, transit and vehicle. We need to look at our entire transit system and the economics in a growing economy with a growing population.
- We need to increase transit on our freeways and increase transit in the corridors. This does not fall under freeway capacity, but rather a different approach.
- Regarding the need for a system wide analysis, we need to identify that we are not just interested in money, but rather system wide operations. To make it clear to everyone, we need to express how we want to make the system better.



- When we do the analysis on value pricing, we need to look at the most impacted areas to identify specific projects and work with our partners to prioritize projects to mitigate diversion.
- I agree with the three issues that have been identified as "important to the PAC." We have heard about a system-wide approach from Washington residents. Concept C is a more directed analysis.
- On the point about capacity, it is about system capacity.
 - *As a project team, we agree that capacity is about system capacity, not just freeway capacity.*
- The I-5 bridge needs to be part of the analysis.
- As part of the process, we need to make sure we continuously get public input.
- As one of three PAC members from north of the Columbia River, I want to say that 70,000 people commute from SW Washington on these freeways, and they pay Oregon income tax. I would like to add that we need some sort of mitigation for those commuters. Even if it is not total compensation, they need some ability to be compensated for that additional cost.
- When we look at future pricing and dig deeper into Concept B, are we also taking into account statewide growth and freight movement outside of this region? When the Joint Transportation Committee traveled the state before HB 2017 passed, they found that Portland area congestion was a concern statewide.
 - *We will look into the modeling results and if there is information about statewide freight movements under each concept, we will bring the information back to the next PAC meeting.*

TOPIC: NEXT STEPS

Penny concluded PAC 5 by outlining the next and final PAC meeting on June 25, when PAC members will be receiving draft recommendations based on discussion from this meeting. At PAC 6, recommendations to the OTC will then be finalized after PAC discussion. Commissioner O'Hollaren and Commissioner Simpson closed the meeting with final comments:

- Thank you to everyone. A lot of voices have been heard and there are a lot of options. We need to consider the impacts and do our best to be prepared for the unintended impacts. Transit and carpooling and creating options is important so that we aren't discriminating geographically and focusing on Title IV and low-income.
- All of this does not come cheaply. All of it costs money and investment. It should be a user-based system, where those who use the facilities pay.
- The OTC will be looking bigger picture to understand where we want to go in the long-run.
- No option is easy, nor is it inexpensive. No matter what we do, we will not have enough money to pay our way out of congestion given our population growth.
- I appreciate the input, time, consideration and different points of views.
- Lastly, it has been great working with Brendon from the City and we look forward to working with him in his new capacity in the Governor's office.



- Capacity and diversion will be ongoing conversations given our growth rate and current constraints. We never planned for this type of population to exist in our urban environment. The key is to come up with pragmatic solutions.
- This is the first mile to a marathon. We have a lot more work.
- I want to circle back to the comment about the Band-Aid. This is not solely a Band-Aid to transportation alone, but also housing, jobs, education, products and services. As easy as it is for us to advocate for our own goals, aspirations or constituents, we have to keep a broader lens on how this region impacts those factors to create an equitable and prosperous ecosystem that we share.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

DRAFT



Attachment: PAC 5 flip-chart notes – discussion of consultant recommendation

Consultant recommendation: Do not implement Concepts A or D:

- As you move forward with Concept E should also consider Concept D in the future
 - The PAC noted two different ideas: (a) consider tolling all lanes the length of Concept D instead of just on the Abernethy Bridge; (b) consider tolling just one lane the length of Concept D to offer choice
- If we are going to build a new bridge, need to add third lane
- Not comfortable with discarding the priced lane option (e.g. Concept D) – due to lower impacts to low income populations and diversion to local streets
- Concepts A and D address the supply side more than others, whereas Concept E adds capacity
- Agree with not implementing Concept A but need to consider Concept D in future
- Many thumbs up on agreeing with this recommendation

Consultant recommendation: Initial implementation of Concept B as pilot pricing program, coupled with performance monitoring to evaluate success:

- Needs model origin / destination of travelers for Concept B
- Consider broader planning (beyond I-5 and I-205)
- Consider diversion near Columbia/Lombard during future analysis
- Lack of clarity and uncertainty about investment in transit or where the revenue goes, need this certainty before this Concept goes forward
- Go further than mitigation for low-income, need to adopt a comprehensive no-harm approach and there need to be benefits
- This assumes the additional capacity at Rose Quarter
- Capacity issues with transit already
- For Concept B to move forward, need to consider some form of tolling on I-205
- Starting with Concept B then moving to Concepts E and C seems reverse/backwards, need to determine longer-term goal and then look at these pieces as stepping stones to achieve longer-term goal
- Agree long-term goal is important. I-205 is a high crash corridor, without additional transit there is a danger on local streets from diverting highway traffic. Supportive of Concept B but need to consider Concept C
- Need to consider diversion increases -- good and bad in this context
- Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit planning was considered in conjunction with all concepts
- What is the scale of diversion back to I-5?
- Where would you start or stop on this option (termini)?
- Must consider diversion, i.e. onto MLK where there are few redundancies in the system. Must consider transit and transportation options

Consultant recommendation: Consider implementation of Concept E concurrent with Concept B:



- This provides for system management across both corridors and is an opportunity as well to complete a needed project
- Congestion pricing is a tool to manage demand and demand management should be the overarching principle. Therefore, not supportive of this approach, as it is a revenue-generating option, not demand management
- The population is not static, need to think about long term growth and the long-game, and the goal is reducing congestion
- Pay attention to whether traffic being diverted, and low-income impacts can be avoided
- Should keep a priced lane option on the table instead of just tolling all lanes in this area
- Priced lanes often exclude freight – cannot make freight impact worse with a priced lane option

Consultant recommendation: After assessing performance of initial pricing project (assuming successful evaluation), consider implementation of Concept C in phases with comprehensive system analysis:

- Need a more comprehensive look at the entire system, a need to look at the broader system in this recommendation
- Continue a larger regional-area study, post-December 2018 and before regional implementation of tolling
- Greatest impact on diversion and safety impacts on local roads and low income; need to pay attention to these impacts

Consultant recommendation: Develop mitigation strategies for low-income and adjacent communities

- Emphasize to OTC that increased transit service and access be a key recommendation (should be included as part of project scope)
- Strongly agree with increasing transit – as long as it includes vanpools and carpools
- Need to consider communities and benefits to transit north of the Columbia River
- Constitutional limitations must be addressed, especially for transit benefits
- HB 2017 resource for transit, and mitigations for low income is not being looked at in parallel with tolling. This needs to be separate work
- Details matter

Other topics:

- Agree with slide content
- Population is continuing to grow, need to consider the system, some people will always drive, need to consider the economics of growing population
- Increase transit on freeways, also increase overall transit on local streets
- System wide operations analysis is needed – how to make operations better at an entire system level; I-5 bridge replacement should be part of this analysis
- Should identify projects and prioritize funding for the entire system



- Look at areas most impacted, work regionally and systemically to manage impacts through funding, infrastructure, and transit
- Washington residents would want to know why Concept C, will need a system-wide analysis to answer
- Need more system capacity in many forms, not just freeways; need transit and all modes
- Public participation and transparency must be included
- Oregon income tax is paid by Washington residents and financial mitigations should be considered for those in Washington
- Taking into account growth outside of this regional area. Traffic from other parts of the state/region all have to travel through this area, this study needs to consider interstate travel

DRAFT