



Metro

# Regional Congestion Pricing Study

*JPACT*

June 17, 2021

# Regional Congestion Pricing Study

- Process to Date
- Expert Review Panel Summary
- Updates to Study Findings
  - Implementation
  - Equity
- DRAFT Recommendations for Consideration
- Next Steps

# Questions for JPACT

What questions or comments do JPACT members have regarding the updated findings?

What questions or comments do you have about the draft recommendations?

Are there specific areas where you want more information?

# Regional Congestion Pricing Study

## *RCPS Goal:*

*To understand how our region could use congestion pricing to manage traffic demand to meet climate goals without adversely impacting safety or equity.*

*Not recommending project or implementing any pricing measures*

# Planning Context

## Multiple plans identify the need

- *2010 RTP, TSMO Strategic Plan– 2010, Climate Smart Strategy – 2014 & Federal congestion management process*

## 2018 RTP & Metro Council prioritized a near-term comprehensive review of congestion pricing

- *Over \$15 billion in transportation investments need to be paired with travel demand efforts*



### 2018 Regional Transportation Plan

*A blueprint for the future of transportation  
in the greater Portland region*

Adopted December 6, 2018

[oregonmetro.gov/rtp](http://oregonmetro.gov/rtp)

# Process to Date

- Project initiated in summer 2019
- Met with JPACT in July 2019, April 2020, September 2020, April 2021
- Developed scenarios and tested with Metro travel demand model
- Developed and shared findings with partners and Metro committees
- Now bringing draft recommendations to JPACT and Metro Council
- Resolution to accept report with recommendations next month

# Expert Review Panel: April 22, 2021



**Christopher  
Tomlinson**

State Road & Tollway  
Authority, Georgia  
Regional Transportation  
Authority, Atlanta Region  
Transit Link Authority



**Rachel Hiatt**  
San Francisco County  
Transportation  
Authority



**Sam Schwartz**  
Sam Schwartz  
Transportation  
Consultants



**Clarrissa  
Cabansagan**  
TransForm



**Daniel Firth**  
C40 Cities

# Key Takeaways

- **Review of Metro's technical approach** and **findings** found RCPS methods to be sound and findings to be consistent with what they have seen elsewhere related to potential benefits and impacts of four pricing tools
- **Clarity of purpose** is essential for pricing projects/programs- design leads to outcomes desired
- **Equity**- critically important to center equity, and recognize the very real and unintended consequences that can arise from not doing so.



# Key Takeaways

- **Diverse outreach-** it is important to reach out broadly to all stakeholders – hear and when possible address concerns- understanding that not all groups will be supportive, and that public acceptance of the effort will change over time.
- **Place-based strategies-** customize pricing for urban/suburban/rural localities with different transportation and land use. Congestion pricing has been successful *in all types of settings* at improving mobility and addressing other priorities.

# Key Findings - Reminder

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

- They reduced the drive alone rate, vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.
- All scenarios also increased daily transit trips.
- The projected improvements are comparable to or exceed those of 2018 RTP model scenarios (even those with much higher investments in transportation projects).

# Key Findings - Reminder

## **Geographic distribution of benefits, impacts, and costs varied by scenario.**

- Diversion, travel time savings, costs to travelers
- Without changes, some scenarios would have disproportionate impacts
- Need for further analysis with future projects

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

- Overall regional transportation costs and individual traveler costs vary by scenario
- Vehicle miles traveled scenarios have positive results for all studied metrics but also have the highest overall travel costs for the region
- Higher overall transportation costs equal higher revenue

# Updates to Study Findings - Implementation

## Implementation is complex

- Technology: availability, footprint, intrusiveness, compatibility
- Equity considerations (i.e. how to serve those without bank accounts)
- Enforcement: perception, effectiveness, and cost
- Costs and Financial Feasibility: up-front capital and ongoing operations
- Governance/jurisdiction
  - Who has authority to implement? To enforce?
  - How can revenues be spent?
- Ease of use

# Updates to Study Findings - Implementation

- Parking pricing is easiest to implement
- Roadway pricing has high upfront costs and can be hard to enforce
- VMT (aka Road User Charge) could build on OReGO infrastructure, but has potential privacy considerations
- Revenue potential varies by type of pricing. As modeled--
  - VMT had the highest revenues
  - Roadway was second (about  $\frac{1}{2}$  of VMT)
  - Cordon and Parking were third (about  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Roadway)

# Updates to Study Findings - Equity

While implementation is complex and introduces new costs, our current funding and spending system is not equitable-

- regressive (gas tax and vehicle fees)
- reinforces inequity with spending focus on auto infrastructure
- will not achieve the region's urgent climate and equity goals

*Plus, gas tax revenue is shrinking and is insufficient to pay for planned investments.*

# Updates to Study Findings – Equity

## Affordability can be built into a program

- More flexible than current funding sources. Can provide discounts or exempt key groups from paying.

## Revenue can be focused on equity outcomes

- Invest in key neighborhoods or roadways
- Focus on transit, sidewalks, bike lanes
- Invest in senior and disabled services

## Targeting pricing benefits to key locations

- Mobility improvements and air quality

# DRAFT Recommended Considerations

- DRAFT Recommended Considerations in your packet.
- Will be in the final report presented to JPACT and Metro Council for acceptance by resolution.
- Developed from our findings, with input from expert panel, other experts, and partner agencies.
- Recommended considerations are high-level, based on the findings, and are broken out for two groups:
  1. Policy Makers
  2. Future Owners/Operators



# DRAFT Recommended Considerations

*Please see packet for recommended considerations*

# Questions for JPACT

What questions or comments do JPACT members have regarding the updated findings?

What questions or comments do you have about the draft recommendations?

Are there specific areas where you want more information?

# Next Steps

Wrapping up this summer-

- Technical Report with findings and considerations for future owners/operators and policymakers – shared with TPAC last week
- Discuss draft recommendations with Metro Council (6/22)
- Return to TPAC (7/9)
- Resolution accepting report with recommendations to be adopted by JPACT (7/15) and Metro Council (7/22)

# oregonmetro.gov

[elizabeth.mros-ohara@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:elizabeth.mros-ohara@oregonmetro.gov)

[alex.oreschak@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:alex.oreschak@oregonmetro.gov)

