

## POEM Task Force Draft recommendations – Edited to Reflect Task Force Feedback (updated June 14, 2021)

### Editing Key:

- Gray box at top of each section summarizes feedback received and changes incorporated
- Grammatical changes shown with **bolded/underlined black font**
- Proposed content changes submitted by Task Force members are summarized in gray boxes and shown in track changes
- Where feedback received conflicted or staff felt the topic had not yet been discussed by the group, we have called this out in green comment boxes. *This is where we will focus conversation on Monday night.*

#### Overarching feedback received and changes incorporated:

- Make recommendations more action oriented
- Emphasize need for City leadership
- Recognize potential business implications

### Foundational Statements

#### Summary of feedback received and edits incorporated:

- Collapse Foundational Statements to fewer bullets; make flow more logical
  - Improve connections to Equitable Mobility Framework categories and be more explicit about status quo
  - Add in Foundational Statement about auto-dependence; recognize volume of short trips and reality of car reliance
  - Go beyond "connected communities" --> need to be inclusive, complete
  - Avoid the term "sustainable"—use "climate" for more clarity
- 
- Portland's transportation system today is inequitable, unsustainable-contributes to the climate crisis, exacerbates poor health outcomes, costs our economy, and-and presents safety risks to users from traffic crashes and personal threats on our streets. not safe for all users. There is an urgent need to improve the transportation system to be more equitable, lower transportation greenhouse gas emissions, and improve safetyaddress these challenges. Existing strategies are not making enough progress on any of these fronts and therefore require a stronger and more intersectional approach.
  - We are in a climate crisis. The transportation sector contributes more than 40% of greenhouse gas emissions in the Portland region. Reducing transportation emissions will take a three pronged approach of 1) reducing vehicle miles travelled driving by making other options safer and more attractive; 2) shifting the trips that remain on the road to zero emission vehicles (including cars, buses and freight); and 3) planning and building connected, inclusive, and complete communities-neighborhoods to reduce the need for long trips.
  - Past transportation decisions and historic disinvestment have disproportionately harmed Black people, Indigenous people, and People of Color (BIPOC), low-income individuals and persons with disabilities. This has resulted in demolition of neighborhoods, gentrification, longer travel times, unequal access to transportation options and increased traffic and personal safety risks. In order to achieve a more equitable system, we must improve outcomes for these communities. This includes outcomes related to **not only multimodal** mobility, **but also** climate, health, safety and economic opportunity. We also must make our transportation planning processes more inclusive and accountable. These values are articulated in the [Equitable Mobility Framework](#).
  - The current transportation system prioritizes drivers of private vehicles and deprioritizes the mobility and access of people who do not have the physical or legal ability to drive, and/or who do not have reliable use of a functioning private vehicle. Furthermore, in the US, more than a third of driving trips are shorter than two miles, and in Portland, there are approximately one million non-commute trips under two miles made each day by car—more than double the number of all commute trips in the city. Many Portlanders, however, are reliant on driving to meet their needs within our current system.

## Principles for Pricing for Equitable Mobility

### Summary of feedback received and edits incorporated:

- Further emphasize demand management as priority goal, connecting this to equitable mobility outcomes. Specific language suggestions:
  - New bullet under design guidelines
- Utilize Equitable Mobility Framework to evaluate more than just future pricing policies
- Move revenue design guidelines down the list, given recommendation around revenue generation not being the top priority
- Call out auto access for those who need it in multimodal financial incentives
- Remove transit-oriented development to avoid conflation with affordable housing
- Add more detail to technology and enforcement sections

- Pricing holds promise as an additional strategy to manage the transportation system and help advance equitable mobility help move people and goods in a more efficient, climate-friendly and equitable way, but **ONLY if** it is designed, implemented, and adjusted with intention.
- The City should urgently continue to advance pricing options for equitable mobility policies as part of its efforts to create a more efficient, sustainable, equitable, and safer transportation system. Failure to act will only **worsen** the challenges we experience today and is not an option.
- The City should utilize the Equitable Mobility Framework to guide future pricing policy deliberations and commit to evaluating equitable mobility impacts of the existing system and any future pricing proposed transportation policy.
  - This includes impacts to moving people and goods, safety, climate and health, and the economy.
- Specifically, the City should design future pricing strategies according to the following guidelines:
  - Prioritize the goal of reducing traffic demand and using the existing transportation system as efficiently as possible to move people and goods in a more sustainable climate-friendly and equitable way.
    - While pricing generates revenue and the reinvestment of revenue is a critical way to make pricing strategies equitable, revenue generation should ~~not~~ never be the top priority.
  - Recognize that a pricing policy is only effective if it reduces traffic demand and/or raises enough revenue to fund effective demand management or multimodal improvements.
    - Setting rates or surcharges too low to affect demand or fund improvements is inequitable.
    - Programs should be designed to be data driven and regularly reviewed for impact. Rates and surcharges should be set to meet policy goals.
  - Center climate and equity outcomes (e.g. reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, reducing transportation cost burdens, expanding job access, etc.) throughout pricing program design.
    - This includes evaluating how different variable-rate designs Variable pricing systems, where prices change based on factors like income, time of day, congestion levels, occupancy, or geography, and discounted rates for fuel-efficient vehicles, should be considered for their ability to fuel efficiency may further advance climate and equity goals.

### FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:

A Task Force member raised concerns about variable systems disproportionately benefitting wealthier drivers. Another member noted EV discounts may discourage mode shifting.

During our discussions, we've also heard that variability can improve equitable mobility, and discussed how EV discounts may help support climate and mobility goals.

Does anyone disagree with keeping these design parameters in for further consideration and/or disagree with revised language around evaluation?

- Provide discounts, rebates, and/or exemptions for low-income ~~drivers~~households.
  - The City should develop one set of income-based policy standards that can be applied to current and future pricing programs to limit administrative costs and complexity.
  - When exemptions are not possible, cash rebates or payments to low-income households is preferred as it allows individuals to make the best transportation decisions for their personal situation.
  - More evaluation and community engagement are needed to determine what specific design would be most equitable and would minimize overall burdens, while still achieving demand management outcomes.
  - Pricing programs should build off existing means-testing systems wherever possible to not add additional program access burdens.
- ~~Ensure multimodal transportation options exist in areas where pricing policies are implemented.~~

**FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:**

A Task Force member noted that ensuring multimodal options exist in an area before implementation could prevent action, and suggested combining it with the revenue bullet (below) to say "revenues from pricing policies should be reinvested in multimodal transportation options in the areas where pricing is implemented."

Another noted this should not be limited to the areas where pricing is implemented but be applied citywide since drivers across the city may be impacted by certain policies.

Does anyone disagree with moving this recommendation under the revenue bullet and focusing on multimodal *access* to priced areas? (See revision below)

- Reinvest revenue generated from pricing in strategies that further expand equitable mobility.
  - Pricing revenue should be reinvested in expanding equitable access to multimodal transportation to support multimodal access to areas where pricing is implemented and to mitigate potential negative impacts of traffic diversion.
  - High priority complementary investment areas include transit service, operations and infrastructure; biking and walking infrastructure; affordable housing near transportation options and transit-oriented development; and multimodal discounts and financial incentives, including driving options for those without access who need it. Additional investment areas include electrification infrastructure and rebates as well as maintaining the existing infrastructure necessary for multimodal mobility.
  - Community stakeholders should always be involved in revenue allocation decisions.
- Reduce unequal burdens of technology and enforcement
  - Technology and payment systems must be designed to reduce barriers for individuals with limited access to bank accounts (e.g. by allowing use of prepaid debit cards).
  - Technology and payment systems should include strong privacy protections.
  - The location of pricing infrastructure should be considered so it doesn't overtly impact BIPOC or low-income communities.
  - Automated enforcement mechanisms should be used to reduce the potential for enforcement bias.
  - Tickets and fines for non-compliance should be means-based (i.e. structured by income level) to mitigate disproportionate impacts.
- The City must advance complementary strategies alongside pricing to improve equitable mobility outcomes. Pricing is just one policy tool and not a stand-alone solution.
  - Additional transportation demand management programs; multimodal infrastructure, operations and service investments; land use policies; affordable housing; and more must also be prioritized to create a more equitable and sustainable mobility system

- The City must engage community stakeholders, especially those representing BIPOC communities, low-income Portlanders, people with disabilities, multi-lingual and displaced communities in the next stage of pricing policy development, as well as ongoing evaluation.

## Nearer-term Pricing Recommendations (Advance in next 1-3 years):

### Summary of feedback received and edits incorporated:

- Define nearer-term
- Make recommendation statements more actionable and focused on implementation
- Add additional detail and specificity to the cash out, parking district and urban delivery recommendations
- Remove of statements of "further policy work needed" given redundancy
- Move constitutional restriction and tolling recommendations up to this section

The City should pursue the following recommendations as quickly as possible to advance equitable mobility outcomes. To the extent possible given the urgency of action, the City should advance these actions as a package to achieve maximum mobility and equity benefits:

### FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:

Multiple Task Force members suggested recommending these nearer-term actions be implemented as a suite. One noted concerns about the equity of charging private for-hire options without prices on single-occupancy drivers

Does anyone disagree with adding this language about considering these as a package? [We still plan to still vote on each recommendation in this section individually]

- ~~Support the creation of~~Create a parking cash-out program, requiring employers that provide free or subsidized parking to offer their employees that parking value in taxable cash income or alternative transportation benefits.
  - Several examples of this policy exist including in California and Washington, DC, and these programs can be administered at city, regional or state levels.
  - Further policy work, ~~and~~ stakeholder engagement, ~~and pilot projects are~~ is needed to determine the most effective design and administration of a cash-out program. The City should move as quickly as possible to conduct this policy work and implement a parking cash out policy, with a plan to review and revise to improve the program over time.
- The City should create new parking permit and meter districts and r~~Reduce~~ the time and complexity involved in ~~creating approving~~ new ~~parking management~~ districts, allowing the City to respond more flexibly and responsively to neighborhood parking demand.
  - ~~The current system is unnecessarily complex and~~ leads to inaction.limits the ability to react to changing conditions and acute demand management needs.
  - The City should make the final decision as to management of the significant resource that is the public right-of-way.

### FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:

A Task Force member suggested editing this recommendation to specifically advocate *for* the creation of new parking management districts. They noted the urgency of the situation, saying this should be a citywide demand management policy rather than one of localized neighborhood decision making.

Does anyone disagree with this revision?

- Develop ~~a proposal for applying and implement~~ a fee on privately-owned, off-street parking lots to further advance equitable mobility objectives.
  - As with City-owned parking, using pricing to manage demand for privately-provided parking can help manage trafficimprove efficiency and turnover while, reducing climate and air quality impacts, and make our roads safer.
  - ~~Further policy work and stakeholder engagement is needed to determine the most effective design and administration of a fee.~~

- Accelerate implementation of the 2018 Performance-Based Parking Management policy to assess where parking pricing should be immediately increased and establish a structure for regular evaluation and increase to market rates.
  - As on-street parking demand in the Central City rebounds to pre-pandemic levels, there is a unique opportunity (and a critical need) to apply best practices for on-street meter pricing.

**FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:**

Several Task Force members recommended adding in language about raising existing parking prices to market rates and monitoring moving forward. One person proposed specific language related to accelerating the implementation of Performance-Based Parking. The City adopted the [Performance-Based Parking policy](#) in 2018. Implementation has been delayed due to Covid-19.

Another suggested moving the dynamic parking pricing recommendation to the nearer-term section.

Does anyone disagree with adding this recommendation to respond to these pieces of feedback?

- Develop ~~a proposal for~~ and implement a fee on urban delivery to ~~manage-reduce~~ rapidly growing vehicle miles travelled (VMT) generated by these trips and ~~reduce related-negative~~ mobility, climate and safety impacts.
  - Proposals should recognize ~~the importance of the ways~~ -delivery services ~~in helping to help~~ meet ~~community needs for people who have limited options~~ and be designed to ~~be supportive of the help~~ improve conditions for the urban delivery workforce.
  - Proposals should consider a differentiated fee structure to incentivize moving to zero emission delivery vehicles and should consider variability based on congestion level, time of day, location, or other factors to **best** achieve equitable mobility outcomes.
  - Proposals should integrate whenever possible with flexible curb management strategies, such as short term pick-up/drop-off zones and technology that allows for short term reservation of drop zones for delivery vehicles.
- ~~M~~Develop a proposal to modify the existing fee structure on private for-hire transportation to better manage VMT generated by these trips and reduce negative mobility, climate and safety impacts.
  - Proposals should recognize the ~~importance of ways~~ private for-hire services ~~in providing can provide~~ mobility options ~~for those with limited other choices~~; and be designed to ~~be supportive of the help~~ improve conditions for the private for-hire driver workforce.
  - Proposals should consider a differentiated fee structure to incentivize zero emission private-for-hire vehicles and should consider variability based on congestion level, time of day, location, or other factors to **best** achieve equitable mobility outcomes.

**FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:**

A Task Force member shared concerns about sub-bullets under the urban delivery and private for-hire recommendations, stating it is not the City's responsibility to accommodate these services and concerns about the quality of these jobs.

The POEM Task Force was asked to consider whether pricing in these sectors can help address the impact of these services and improve working conditions. During discussions, we heard pricing does show promise, but also heard about the role these services play in meeting community needs, as well as the importance of protecting workers. Staff have proposed edits to these bullets to clarify this.

Does anyone disagree with keeping these sub-bullets, with the revisions proposed?

- The City should advocate for amending the Oregon state constitutional restriction that limits use of funds generated through taxes on motor vehicles.
  - While capital bike, pedestrian and transit improvements are possible under the current restriction, it does not allow for investments in noncapital, multimodal services like transit operations, which are critical to advancing equitable mobility.
- Regarding highway tolling, the City should advocate for the recommendations and outcomes outlined in the Task Force letter on tolling dated March 9, 2021. The City



should continue to actively engage and advocate for the values articulated in the letter through legislative and intra-agency staff coordination channels.

## Longer-term Pricing Recommendations:

### Summary of feedback received and edits incorporated:

- Strengthen language around statewide RUC advocacy
- Acknowledge unknown long-term impacts of Covid-19 on Central City travel patterns
- Move constitutional restriction and tolling recommendation to nearer-term section; remove qualifying language about tolling promise

The City should also continue considering pricing strategies that could have wider system benefits but may take longer to develop and implement. The longer-term strategies that show the most promise for advancing equitable mobility if developed according to the previously mentioned principles and based on the information considered to date include:

- Truly dynamic demand-based parking pricing designed to reduce VMT and advance climate and equity outcomes.
  - This could build on existing technologies, provide flexibility and responsiveness, and be implemented by the City of Portland.

### FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:

A Task Force member noted concerns that dynamic pricing systems could disproportionately benefit wealthy drivers. Another suggested elevating this recommendation to the nearer-term section, and throughout our discussions and polling to date, a majority of Task Force members indicated they felt truly dynamic parking showed promise for advancing equitable mobility.

Does anyone disagree with leaving this recommendation in for a final vote in July?

- A locally controlled Road Usage Charge (RUC) designed to advance mobility, climate and equity outcomes.
  - A RUC is currently being considered at the state level primarily as a tool to replace the fuels tax and replace transportation revenue.
  - The City should insist upon, advocate for, and mobilize support for the statewide RUC to be designed to advance climate, equity and mobility outcomes, while exploring a City or regional RUC that aligns with POEM principles and prioritizes transportation demand management.

While not recommended **as highly** by the Task Force, the City should also continue exploring how a Central City cordon could help to advance mobility, climate and equity goals.

- The Central City is the area with the most **plentiful** multimodal transportation alternatives, and pre-COVID, it was one of the most congested areas of the city. It is too early to know the longer-term implications of COVID on Central City travel patterns and businesses. More evaluation and monitoring is needed.
- Modeling presented to the Task Force showed that a cordon might lead to significant diversion outside of the Central City and might not be as effective at improving mobility outcomes as other tools.
- Further exploration of the potential benefits and drawbacks of a Central City cordon is necessary.

### FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:

A Task Force member suggested removing this recommendation because it didn't seem to have much potential to improve equitable mobility outcomes.

In the poll taken at meeting #14, about 72% of Task Force members said they felt this showed "some promise, but weren't sure" and 28% said they did not feel this showed promise. Also, while modeling showed mixed results, there were also many caveats and limits to the modeling analysis.

Does anyone disagree with leaving this recommendation in for a final vote in July?

~~The City should advocate for amending the Oregon state constitutional restriction that limits use of funds generated through taxes on motor vehicles.~~

- ~~While capital bike, pedestrian and transit improvements are possible under the current restriction, it does not allow for investments in noncapital, multimodal services like transit operations, which are critical to advancing equitable mobility.~~

~~Regarding highway tolling, the City should advocate for the recommendations and outcomes outlined in the Task Force letter on tolling dated March 9, 2021. While the Task Force does not feel that highway tolling is the most promising strategy for advancing equitable mobility, given state and regional tolling discussions are ongoing, the City should continue to actively engage and advocate for the values articulated in the letter.~~

## Complementary Strategies to Advance Alongside Pricing

### Summary of feedback received and edits incorporated:

- Add a reference to safety investments as an important complementary strategy
- Expand description of connected communities --> connected, inclusive, complete
- Recognize driving access as an inequity today
- Avoid conflating TOD and affordable housing

The POEM Task Force recognizes the importance of all the following complementary strategies in creating a more equitable mobility system:

- Public transit infrastructure, operations and service
- ~~Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and programs~~
- Infrastructure and programs that enhance traffic safety, including from potential traffic diversion
- Incentives and financial support for different travel options
- Strategies to incentivize shift to electric/more fuel-efficient cars, freight and buses.
- Affordable housing connected to multi-modal transportation options
- Land use policy that leads to more connected, complete, and inclusive communitiesneighborhoods

Revenue generated from potential future pricing strategies may not allow for investments in all of these areas and will not be enough to meet every need. Transportation revenues are also declining, while maintenance needs grow, and current restrictions limit some reinvestment opportunities. Acknowledging these constraints, the City should prioritize reinvestment to the extent possible in critical strategies that most help ~~create connected communitiesenable connected, inclusive and complete neighborhoods~~ and improve equitable access to non-driving options, including: public transit, operations, service and infrastructure; bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure; and ~~transit oriented development of affordable housing near transportation options.~~

Additionally, the City must recognize that because of displacement and unequal access to multimodal options in parts of the city, many Portlanders must drive to meet their needs. Car access today is also inequitable. While expanding non-driving options should be the priority, the City should also invest in strategies that improve equitable access to shared and electric automobile travel for people who need it.

In the design of **both** pricing policies and complementary strategies, the City should explore opportunities to provide direct financial support to low-income Portlanders to improve equitable mobility outcomes, enabling community members to make the best decisions for their specific needs.

## Implementation ~~Considerations and Process~~ Next Steps

### Summary of feedback received and edits incorporated:

- Emphasize need for bold leadership
- Retitle section to improve clarity
- Add reference to partnering with local institutions and agencies on data collection and research
- Note importance of data in supporting potential controversial policy positions
- Define "meeting people where they're at"
- Define "community"
- Remove statement about unpopularity of pricing

- The City should be prepared to make the bold decisions required to advance climate, equity and mobility goals. The City should take a leadership role in advancing transformative pricing policies that improve equitable mobility given the urgent need to address the climate crisis and inequitable status quo.
  - This includes piloting strategies where the City has implementation authority and spearheading regional collaboration on interjurisdictional strategies.

- ~~Experience in other places shows that pricing will remain unpopular until after it is implemented and people begin to see benefits.~~
- The City should invest in regular data collection and/or surveying to inform equity analyses of potential pricing and other transportation policies.
  - A more robust understanding of travel behaviors and barriers, including demographic information, is critically important in order to understand likely impacts to BIPOC communities, low-income individuals, people with disabilities and other communities; to support potentially controversial policy positions; and also to evaluate the ongoing impacts of pricing programs. The City should partner with local research institutions and other agencies in this work.
- The City should study the near and longer-term mobility impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic to inform future policy development (e.g. changing travel behaviors, forecasted telework patterns, economic impacts, etc.).
- The City should conduct wider community engagement to inform further pricing policy development.
  - This includes a commitment to meeting people where they are inclusive, accessible public involvement opportunities and centering equity in the public engagement approach.
  - The City should also demonstrate that staff is learning from previous community conversations and build upon **existing community feedback.**
- The City should partner with community members, businesses and organizations to advance the conversation around pricing, helping build a coalition to champion the most transformative pricing options for equitable mobility.
- The City should explore models for a unified credit or rebate system for low-income households that could be applied across pricing programs to reduce burdens on these households and administrative complexity.

**FOR GROUP DISCUSSION ON MONDAY:**

Does anyone disagree with adding this recommendation for a final vote in July?